

Valid post-selection inference for penalized G-estimation with longitudinal observational data

Ajmetry Jaman^{1,*}, Ashkan Ertefaie², Michèle Bally^{3,5}, Renée Lévesque⁴,
Robert W. Platt¹, and Mireille E. Schnitzer^{5,1}

¹Department of Epidemiology and Biostatistics, McGill University, Montreal, Canada

²Department of Biostatistics, Epidemiology and Informatics, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, U.S.A.

³Department of Pharmacy, Centre Hospital of University of Montreal, Montreal, Canada

⁴Department of Medicine, University of Montreal, Montreal, Canada

⁵Faculty of Pharmacy, University of Montreal, Montreal, Canada

*Corresponding author: Ajmetry Jaman, Email: ajmetry.jaman@mail.mcgill.ca

Abstract

Understanding treatment effect heterogeneity is important for decision making in medical and clinical practices, or handling various engineering and marketing challenges. When dealing with high-dimensional covariates or when the effect modifiers are not predefined and need to be discovered, data-adaptive selection approaches become essential. However, with data-driven model selection, the quantification of statistical uncertainty is complicated by post-selection inference due to difficulties in approximating the sampling distribution of the target estimator. Data-driven model selection tends to favor models with strong effect modifiers with an associated cost of inflated type I errors. Although several frameworks and methods for valid statistical inference have been proposed for ordinary least squares regression following data-driven model selection, fewer options exist for valid inference for effect modifier discovery in causal modeling contexts. In this article, we extend two different methods to develop valid inference for penalized G-estimation that investigates effect modification of proximal treatment effects within the structural nested mean model framework. We show the asymptotic validity of the proposed methods. Using extensive simulation studies, we evaluate and compare the finite sample performance of the proposed methods and the naive inference based on a sandwich variance estimator. Our work is motivated by the study of hemodiafiltration for treating patients with end-stage renal disease at the Centre Hospitalier de l'Université de Montréal. We apply these methods to draw inference about the effect heterogeneity of dialysis facility on the repeated session-specific hemodiafiltration outcomes.

Keywords: causal inference, decorrelated score, G-estimation, longitudinal data, one-step improved estimator, post-selection inference

1 Introduction

Understanding treatment effect heterogeneity is important for decision making in medical and clinical practice, or addressing various engineering and marketing challenges. When dealing with high-dimensional covariates or when effect modifiers are not predefined and need to be discovered, data-adaptive selection approaches become essential. However, with data-driven model selection, the quantification of statistical uncertainty is complicated by post-selection inference. Classical inference is built on a framework where all modeling decisions are made independently of the data from which inference is drawn. The asymptotic distribution of the parameter estimator is challenging to derive due to the non-negligible estimation bias and sparsity effects associated with the high dimensional parameters (Ning and Liu, 2017). If we perform data-driven effect modifier selection, we tend to favor models with strong effect modifiers with an associated cost of inflated type I errors (Zhao et al., 2022). Data-driven selection procedures produce a model that is itself stochastic, and this model selection uncertainty is not accounted for by the classical inference theory.

In the last fifteen years, there have been several proposed frameworks and methods for valid statistical inference following data-driven model selection. Tibshirani et al. (2016) and Lee et al. (2016) developed frameworks for inference under forward stepwise regression, least angle regression, and the Least Absolute Shrinkage and Selection Operator (LASSO). These conditional approaches provide valid inference only for a few specific model selection methods, not for generic variable selection, and are dependent on distributional assumptions for the response. The Post-Selection Inference (PoSI) method, proposed by Berk et al. (2013) and later generalized by Bachoc et al. (2020) provides inferential guarantees for arbitrary model selection approaches, including informal ones. The PoSI method ensures valid inference even when an incorrect model is selected, but this inferential procedure is computationally expensive (Kuchibhotla et al., 2020). By addressing the limitations of the PoSI method and accommodating misspecification of the normal linear model, Kuchibhotla et al. (2020) introduced the Universal Post Selection Inference (UPoSI) approach for OLS regression assuming either fixed or random covariates, which are referred to as fixed-design UPoSI and random-design UPoSI, respectively. The UPoSI approach is computationally efficient—its cost is proportional to the number of covariates—and does not require correct model specification, making it a “model-robust” inferential procedure. Other advancements include the debiased or desparsifying method proposed by Zhang and Zhang (2014), known as the low dimensional projection estimator (LDPE), which constructs confidence intervals for linear or generalized linear models with the Lasso penalty. Ning and Liu (2017) proposed a decorrelated score test for inference in penalized M-estimation. Unlike the work in Zhang and Zhang (2014) which are tailored for individual models, the decorrelated score method (Ning and Liu, 2017) provides a general framework for high dimensional inference that can be used to infer the oracle parameter under misspecified models. Based on the idea of projected estimating equations (Zhang and Zhang, 2014), Xia and Shojaie (2022) developed an inference procedure for linear functionals of high-dimensional longitudinal data using generalized estimating equations (GEE). However, there are few contributions on valid inference for effect modifier discovery in causal modeling contexts. In one such work, Zhao et al. (2022) adapted the approach of Lee et al. (2016) and proposed a conditional selective inference procedure for effect modification estimated using the LASSO. In the context of multistage decision problems of dynamic treatment regimes, Jones et al. (2022) extended the UPoSI approach (Kuchibhotla et al., 2020) to develop valid inference for robust Q-learning. Gao et al. (2023) adapted the approach of Ning and Liu (2017) to develop an asymptotic inference method for multistage stationary treatment policies in the

presence of high dimensional feature variables.

In this paper, we contribute to this growing body of work by developing valid inferential methods for the recently proposed doubly-robust penalized G-estimation (Jaman et al., 2024). This method estimates the proximal effects of exposure with simultaneous data-adaptive selection of effect modifiers within a structural nested mean model (SNMM) framework, particularly for repeated outcomes. We present two different proposals for valid inference on effect modification of proximal treatment effects: one is an extension of the UPoSI approach (Kuchibhotla et al., 2020) and another is based on the decorrelated score test introduced by Ning and Liu (2017). Our methodological development is motivated by a study of hemodiafiltration (HDF), a dialysis technique for treating patients with end-stage renal disease (ESRD). Hemodiafiltration is the standard treatment for ESRD patients at the University of Montreal Hospital Centre (CHUM) outpatient dialysis clinic and its affiliated ambulatory dialysis center (CED). Hemodiafiltration cleans waste and excess fluids from the blood by combining diffusive clearance and convective removal of solutes (Ronco and Cruz, 2007). It involves the ultrafiltration of a large volume of plasma water, which requires substitution fluid to be administered to the patient to preserve fluid balance. Dialysis effectiveness is indicated by the convection volume attained during each session, which is calculated as the sum of the substitution volume and the ultrafiltration volume (Marcelli et al., 2015). Using the data extracted from hospital records, Jaman et al. (2024) explored the effect heterogeneity of the dialysis facility (CHUM vs. CED) on the session-specific mean convection volumes applying penalized G-estimation. In this paper, we apply our proposed methods to provide valid post-selection inference for the effects estimated by Jaman et al. (2024).

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we briefly describe the penalized G-estimator and the two proposed inferential procedures. In Section 3, we evaluate and compare the finite sample performance of the inferential methods along with naive inference based on a sandwich estimator via a simulation study under misspecification of the treatment-free model. We then apply these methods to infer the heterogenous effect of dialysis facility on the session-specific hemodiafiltration outcomes in Section 4. Finally, we present a discussion in Section 5.

2 Methodology

2.1 Notation

Following Jaman et al. (2024), suppose that we have data from J sequential hemodiafiltration sessions for n different ESRD patients. At each session, we record the outcome, the treatment received, and pre-session covariates. We denote the observed continuous outcome for patient i at session j by Y_{ij} , the (binary) treatment received by A_{ij} , and the vector of covariates by \mathbf{L}_{ij} , for all $i = 1, \dots, n, j = 1, \dots, J$. Let \mathbf{H}_{ij} represent the history at occasion j that comprises covariate history $\bar{\mathbf{L}}_{ij} = \{\mathbf{L}_{i1}, \dots, \mathbf{L}_{ij}\}$, past exposures $\bar{A}_{i(j-1)} = \{A_{i1}, \dots, A_{i(j-1)}\}$ and past outcomes $\bar{Y}_{i(j-1)} = \{Y_{i1}, \dots, Y_{i(j-1)}\}$. Throughout we use the potential outcomes framework (Robins, 1989). We define $Y_{ij}(\bar{a}_j)$ as the potential outcome that would have been observed at occasion j for patient i if the treatment history $\bar{A}_{ij} = \{A_{i1}, \dots, A_{ij}\}$ were set counterfactually to $\bar{a}_j = \{a_1, \dots, a_j\}$.

2.2 Proximal effects of treatment

The proximal (short-term) effects of the exposure at measurement occasion j can be modelled using a linear structural nested mean model (SNMM) as follows (Robins, 1989; Vansteelandt

and Joffe, 2014):

$$E\{Y_{ij}(\bar{a}_{j-1}, a_j) - Y_{ij}(\bar{a}_{j-1}, 0) | \mathbf{H}_{ij} = \mathbf{h}_{ij}, A_{ij} = a_j\} = \gamma_j^*(a_j, \mathbf{h}_{ij}; \boldsymbol{\psi}), \quad (1)$$

where $j = 1, \dots, J$, $\gamma_j^*(a_j, \mathbf{h}_{ij}; \boldsymbol{\psi})$, referred to as the ‘‘treatment blip’’, is a scalar-valued function defined in terms of parameter $\boldsymbol{\psi}$, \mathbf{h}_{ij} represent the realized values for \mathbf{H}_{ij} , and $\boldsymbol{\psi} = (\psi_0, \psi_1, \dots, \psi_{K-1})'$ is a K -dimensional vector of parameters. The difference described in (1) shows the effect of treatment a_j compared to the reference treatment 0 on the outcome at occasion j , given the history up to that point. The goal is to estimate the parameters $\boldsymbol{\psi}$ utilizing the observed data via G-estimation (Robins and Hernan, 2008; Vansteelandt and Joffe, 2014). The core idea of this approach is to construct the j -th proximal blipped down outcome, $U_{ij} = Y_{ij} - \gamma_j^*(A_{ij}, \mathbf{H}_{ij}; \boldsymbol{\psi})$, which is a transformation of the observed data such that it has the same mean as $Y_{ij}(\bar{a}_{j-1}, 0)$, i.e., the potential outcome under the reference treatment level 0 at occasion j . Under the restriction that the blip parameters are the same across measurement occasions, we can parameterize the blip as a simple function of the history as follows (Vansteelandt and Joffe, 2014; Boruvka et al., 2018): $\gamma_j^*(a_j, \mathbf{h}_{ij}; \boldsymbol{\psi}) = a_j \mathbf{h}_{ij}' \boldsymbol{\psi}$, where \mathbf{h}_{ij} contains a one and potential confounders (or functions of these) chosen from the histories. Each component of $\boldsymbol{\psi}$ reflects the change in the treatment effect attributable to the corresponding covariate. To ensure consistent parameter estimation under this parametric approach, the blip model must be accurately specified as a function of the history.

2.3 Effect modifier discovery via penalized estimating equations

For the estimation of the SNMM parameters with simultaneous selection of effect modifiers, Jaman et al. (2024) proposed the penalized G-estimator by adding a nonconvex smoothly clipped absolute deviation (SCAD) penalty (Fan and Li, 2001) in the efficient score function (Chakraborty and Moodie, 2013) of $\boldsymbol{\psi}$. Under the usual causal assumptions (consistency, sequential ignorability and positivity mentioned in Assumptions 1-3 in Appendix Section A.4) for identifiability of the target parameter $\boldsymbol{\psi}$, Jaman et al. (2024) proposed the following penalized efficient score function

$$\mathbf{S}^P(\boldsymbol{\psi}) = \sum_{i=1}^n \left\{ \frac{\partial \gamma^*(\mathbf{A}_i, \mathbf{H}_i; \boldsymbol{\psi})}{\partial \boldsymbol{\psi}'} - E\left(\frac{\partial \gamma^*(\mathbf{A}_i, \mathbf{H}_i; \boldsymbol{\psi})}{\partial \boldsymbol{\psi}'} | \mathbf{H}_i \right) \right\}' \text{Var}(\mathbf{U}_i | \mathbf{H}_i)^{-1} \{\mathbf{U}_i - E(\mathbf{U}_i | \mathbf{H}_i)\} - n \mathbf{q}_{\lambda_n}(|\boldsymbol{\psi}|) \text{sign}(\boldsymbol{\psi}), \quad (2)$$

where $\mathbf{A}_i = (A_{i1}, \dots, A_{iJ})^\top$, $\mathbf{H}_i = (\mathbf{H}_{i1}, \dots, \mathbf{H}_{iJ})^\top$ is a $J \times K$ matrix representing the unit-wise history for the i -th subject, $\mathbf{U}_i = (U_{i1}, \dots, U_{iJ})^\top$, $E(\mathbf{U}_i | \mathbf{H}_i) = \mathbf{H}_i \boldsymbol{\delta}$ is the treatment-free model with $\boldsymbol{\delta}$ denoting its parameters, $\mathbf{q}_{\lambda_n}(|\boldsymbol{\psi}|) = (0, q_{\lambda_n}(|\psi_1|), \dots, q_{\lambda_n}(|\psi_{K-1}|))'$, $q(\cdot)$ indicates the first-derivative of the SCAD penalty, and λ_n is the tuning parameter. Jaman et al. (2024) considered a working structure for $\text{Var}(\mathbf{U}_i | \mathbf{H}_i) = \mathbf{Q}_i^{1/2} \mathbf{R}_i(\rho) \mathbf{Q}_i^{1/2}$, where $\mathbf{Q}_i = \sigma^2 \mathbf{I}_{(J)}$ and $\mathbf{R}_i(\rho)$ is the $J \times J$ matrix representing the correlations among the blipped down outcomes of a patient and is defined with respect to parameter ρ . Some technical aspects related to $\mathbf{R}_i(\rho)$ are briefly outlined in Appendix Section A.2 and further details regarding the estimation of this correlation matrix can be found in the works of Jaman et al. (2016) and Sultana et al. (2023). The penalized efficient score function (Jaman et al., 2024) for $\boldsymbol{\theta} = (\boldsymbol{\delta}^\top, \boldsymbol{\psi}^\top)^\top$ is

$$\mathbf{S}^P(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \mathbf{S}^{\text{eff}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) - n \mathbf{q}_{\lambda_n}(|\boldsymbol{\theta}|) \text{sign}(\boldsymbol{\theta}),$$

where $\mathbf{q}_{\lambda_n}(|\boldsymbol{\theta}|) = (\mathbf{0}', \mathbf{q}_{\lambda_n}(|\boldsymbol{\psi}'|))'$. The penalized estimates of $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ are obtained by solving the following equations:

$$\mathbf{S}^P(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \mathbf{0}. \quad (3)$$

To solve the equations in (3), Jaman et al. (2024) proposed an iterative procedure that combines G-estimation with the minorization-maximization (MM) algorithm (Hunter and Li, 2005) to handle the nonconvex penalty, and considered the doubly-robust information criterion (Bian et al., 2023; Moodie et al., 2023) for tuning parameter selection. Jaman et al. (2024) established the asymptotic properties of the penalized G-estimator and verified the double-robustness property via simulations.

2.4 The problem with post-selection inference

Different models carry different interpretations of the parameters and answer different questions. Let $\mathbf{h}_{ij}(M)$ denote the vector of observed covariates at the j -th measurement occasion for subject i corresponding to the blip submodel M and let $\boldsymbol{\psi}_M$ denote the target parameter vector under submodel M . The target of estimation using $\hat{\gamma}_{j.M} = a_{ij} \mathbf{h}'_{ij}(M) \hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}_M$ given the blip submodel M is $\gamma_{j.M} = a_{ij} \mathbf{h}'_{ij}(M) \boldsymbol{\psi}_M$. Therefore, we do not unbiasedly estimate the true γ_j^* , rather we estimate its approximation $\gamma_{j.M}$ with respect to submodel M . If the submodel M is subject to any kind of model selection using the observed data \mathcal{D} , then we should express the selected model as $\widehat{M} = \widehat{M}(\mathcal{D})$, which is now random. The selected model could be different for another realization \mathcal{D}^* . The target vector of coefficients $\boldsymbol{\psi}_{\widehat{M}(\mathcal{D})}$ for selected model $\widehat{M}(\mathcal{D})$ is also random: a) $\boldsymbol{\psi}_{\widehat{M}(\mathcal{D})}$ may have a different dimension for different data, b) a particular covariate may or may not be present in $\widehat{M}(\mathcal{D})$, and c) for any covariate in $\widehat{M}(\mathcal{D})$, its coefficient value may depend on the set of other covariates in $\widehat{M}(\mathcal{D})$. So, the set of parameters for which inference is sought is also random.

Although the regularized procedure discussed in Section 2.3 showed good performance in identifying effect modifiers with consistent estimation of the target parameters (Jaman et al., 2024), such a regularization method may yield estimators with distributions that are difficult to approximate. Jaman et al. (2024) presented a sandwich formula for the asymptotic variance of the penalized G-estimator. Such sandwich estimators are consistent even when the number of parameters tends to infinity (Fan and Peng, 2004). However, the post-selection inference procedure based on the naive sandwich variance neither takes into account the uncertainty associated with model selection nor the possibility of selecting an incorrect model. In practice, sandwich estimator tends to underestimate the standard errors, and the derived normal confidence regions (CRs) often do not provide acceptable coverage in finite samples (Minnier et al., 2011). We have also observed the same issue with the sandwich estimator in our context (see our simulation results). Hence, developing a valid post-selection inference method for the penalized G-estimation is crucial.

2.5 Our proposals for valid inference with penalized G-estimation

In this section, we present two different proposals for our target of inference: i) an extension of the random design UPoSI approach (Kuchibhotla et al., 2020) to the context of effect modification analysis in SNMMs using penalized G-estimation, and ii) an inference method based on a one-step improved penalized G-estimator derived from a decorrelated score function, following an approach similar to that of Ning and Liu (2017). Both the UPoSI approach (Kuchibhotla

et al., 2020) and the decorrelated score method (Ning and Liu, 2017) were originally developed for OLS regression.

2.5.1 UPoSI approach

Let $v \in \mathbb{R}^q$ is a vector of dimension q , $v(j)$ denotes the j -th element of v , and for any square-symmetric matrix $B \in \mathbb{R}^{q \times q}$, $B(j, k)$ denotes the element of B corresponding to the j -th row and k -th column. We express the r -norm of the vector v as

$$\|v\|_r = \left(\sum_{j=1}^q |v(j)|^r \right)^{1/r} \quad \text{for } 1 \leq r < \infty$$

and the largest element in v as

$$\|v\|_\infty = \max_{1 \leq j \leq q} |v(j)|.$$

Similarly, $\|B\|_\infty$ denotes the largest element (in absolute value) of the matrix B . We will use the term ‘‘model’’ to refer to a subset of covariates in the regression and denote it by $M \subseteq \{1, 2, \dots, K\}$. We define the set of all nonempty models of size no larger than k by

$$\mathcal{M}_K(k) = \{M : M \subseteq \{1, 2, \dots, K\}, 1 \leq |M| \leq k\}, \text{ for } 1 \leq k \leq K$$

where $|M|$ represents the cardinality of M . Note that $\mathcal{M}_K(k)$ is the power set of $\{1, \dots, K\}$ excluding the empty set. The matrix \mathbf{h}_i of dimension $J \times K$ contains the observed values of adjuster variables for subject i , and let $\mathbf{h}_i(M)$ denote the submatrix of \mathbf{h}_i corresponding to submodel M . We also define the following quantities:

$$\widehat{\mathbf{W}}_n = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left[\{\mathbf{a}_i - \widehat{E}(\mathbf{A}_i | \mathbf{H}_i)\} \cdot \mathbf{h}_i \right]' \cdot \widehat{\mathbf{V}}_i^{-1} \cdot [\mathbf{h}_i \quad \mathbf{a}_i \cdot \mathbf{h}_i]$$

and

$$\widehat{\mathbf{G}}_n = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left[\{\mathbf{a}_i - \widehat{E}(\mathbf{A}_i | \mathbf{H}_i)\} \cdot \mathbf{h}_i \right]' \cdot \widehat{\mathbf{V}}_i^{-1} \cdot \mathbf{Y}_i,$$

where \mathbf{V}_i is the shorthand notation for $\text{Var}(\mathbf{U}_i | \mathbf{H}_i)$ and $\widehat{E}(\mathbf{A}_i | \mathbf{H}_i)$ is the J -dimensional vector of estimated propensity scores. Note that $\widehat{\mathbf{W}}_n$ is a $(2K \times 2K)$ -dimensional matrix and $\widehat{\mathbf{G}}_n$ is a $(2K \times 1)$ -dimensional vector, and these are defined in terms of the full model, which refers to M where $|M| = K$. We denote the expected versions of these quantities by \mathbf{W}_n and \mathbf{G}_n , and define the estimation errors of \mathbf{W}_n and \mathbf{G}_n as follows:

$$D_n^W = \|\widehat{\mathbf{W}}_n - \mathbf{W}_n\|_\infty = \max_{M \in \mathcal{M}_K(2)} \|\widehat{\mathbf{W}}_n(M) - \mathbf{W}_n(M)\|_\infty$$

$$D_n^G = \|\widehat{\mathbf{G}}_n - \mathbf{G}_n\|_\infty = \max_{M \in \mathcal{M}_K(1)} \|\widehat{\mathbf{G}}_n(M) - \mathbf{G}_n(M)\|_\infty,$$

where $\mathcal{M}_K(2)$ and $\mathcal{M}_K(1)$ represent the sets of all models of sizes bounded by 2 and 1, respectively. Also note that $\widehat{\mathbf{W}}_n(M)$ is the submatrix of $\widehat{\mathbf{W}}_n$ and $\widehat{\mathbf{G}}_n(M)$ is the subvector of $\widehat{\mathbf{G}}_n$

corresponding to submodel M , which are defined as follows:

$$\widehat{\mathbf{W}}_n(M) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left[\{\mathbf{a}_i - \widehat{E}(\mathbf{A}_i | \mathbf{H}_i)\} \cdot \mathbf{h}_i(M) \right]' \cdot \widehat{\mathbf{V}}_i^{-1} \cdot [\mathbf{h}_i \quad \mathbf{a}_i \cdot \mathbf{h}_i(M)] \quad (4)$$

and

$$\widehat{\mathbf{G}}_n(M) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left[\{\mathbf{a}_i - \widehat{E}(\mathbf{A}_i | \mathbf{H}_i)\} \cdot \mathbf{h}_i(M) \right]' \cdot \widehat{\mathbf{V}}_i^{-1} \cdot \mathbf{Y}_i. \quad (5)$$

The empirical and the expected versions of the unpenalized estimating equations $\mathbf{S}^{eff}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \mathbf{0}$ corresponding to the submodel M can be written as

$$\widehat{\mathbf{W}}_n(M) \widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{n,M} = \widehat{\mathbf{G}}_n(M) \quad \text{and} \quad (6)$$

$$\mathbf{W}_n(M) \boldsymbol{\theta}_{n,M} = \mathbf{G}_n(M), \quad (7)$$

where $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{n,M}$ denotes the G-estimator of $\boldsymbol{\theta}_M$, the target parameters under submodel M . We propose the following UPoSI confidence regions for the G-estimator $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{n,M}$ in the selected submodel M :

$$\widehat{\mathcal{R}}_{n,M}^* := \left\{ \boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{M}|} : \|\widehat{\mathbf{W}}_n(M) \{\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{n,M} - \boldsymbol{\theta}\}\|_{\infty} \leq C_n^G(\alpha) + C_n^W(\alpha) \|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{n,M}\|_1 \right\}, \quad (8)$$

where $C_n^G(\alpha)$ and $C_n^W(\alpha)$ are the bivariate joint upper α quantiles of D_n^G and D_n^W , by construction satisfying

$$P\left(D_n^G \leq C_n^G(\alpha) \text{ and } D_n^W \leq C_n^W(\alpha)\right) \geq 1 - \alpha.$$

The regions in (8) provide an asymptotic coverage guarantee. The region that provides a finite sample guarantee can be defined as

$$\widehat{\mathcal{R}}_{n,M} := \left\{ \boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{M}|} : \|\widehat{\mathbf{W}}_n(M) \{\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{n,M} - \boldsymbol{\theta}\}\|_{\infty} \leq C_n^G(\alpha) + C_n^W(\alpha) \|\boldsymbol{\theta}\|_1 \right\}, \quad (9)$$

The regions in (9) can be obtained by doing simple mathematical operations on equations 6 and 7 (see Theorem 1 and Theorem 2 and the proofs in the Appendix). Since the regions in (9) are difficult to analyze in terms of shape and Lebesgue measure (Kuchibhotla et al., 2020), we focus on constructing the regions in (8) for the penalized G-estimator. The quantiles $C_n^G(\alpha)$ and $C_n^W(\alpha)$ are unknown, which must be estimated from the data using a bootstrap method. In our study, we use the multiplier bootstrap for estimating the joint quantiles, which is described in Appendix Section A.3.1. Also, we can construct coordinate-wise confidence intervals like the form shown in Appendix Section A.3.2. Asymptotic validity of the UPoSI method is described in Theorem 3 with proof given in the Appendix.

Theorem 3 (Asymptotic validity of the UPoSI method). *Let $\lambda_{\min}(\mathbf{W}_n(M))$ denote the minimum eigen value of the matrix $\mathbf{W}_n(M)$. For every $1 \leq k \leq K$ satisfying the assumption that the estimation error D_n^W satisfies $kD_n^W = o_{\mathbb{P}}(\omega_n(k))$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, where $\omega_n(k) =$*

$\min_{M \in \mathcal{M}_K(k)} \lambda_{\min}(\mathbf{W}_n(M))$, the confidence regions $\widehat{\mathcal{R}}_{n,M}^*$ in (8) satisfy

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} P \left(\bigcap_{M \in \mathcal{M}_K(k)} \{\boldsymbol{\theta}_{n,M} \in \widehat{\mathcal{R}}_{n,M}^*\} \right) \geq 1 - \alpha.$$

For a specific correlation structure (corstr), the steps for the whole estimation procedure are summarized in Algorithm 1.

Algorithm 1 Universal Post-Selection Inference for Penalized G-estimation

- 1: **procedure** UPoSIPEG($\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{H}, \mathbf{Y}, \widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}, \widehat{\sigma}, \widehat{\rho}, \text{corstr}, \alpha, \widehat{M}$)
- 2: Compute $E(\mathbf{A}_i | \mathbf{H}_i)$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$;
- 3: Compute $\widehat{\mathbf{V}}_i$ using $\widehat{\sigma}$ and $\widehat{\rho}$ according to the corstr for $i = 1, \dots, n$;
- 4: Compute $\widehat{\mathbf{W}}_n(\widehat{M})$ following (4);
- 5: Standardize the continuous variables in \mathbf{H} ;
- 6: Obtain the bivariate quantiles \widehat{C}_n^G and \widehat{C}_n^W following the multiplier bootstrap method described in Section A.3.1;
- 7: Using $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} = (\widehat{\boldsymbol{\delta}}, \widehat{\boldsymbol{\psi}})^\top$ define $\mathcal{B} = \{0\} \cup \{m : m \in \{1, \dots, K-1\} \text{ and } |\widehat{\psi}_m| \geq 0.001\}$;
- 8: **for** each $k \in \mathcal{B}$ **do**
- 9: Construct the $(1 - \alpha) \times 100\%$ confidence interval for the k -th coefficient in $\boldsymbol{\psi}$ as

$$\widehat{\psi}_k \pm \left| \mathbf{c}'_k \{ \widehat{\mathbf{W}}_n(\widehat{M}) \}^{-1} \right| \left(\widehat{C}_n^G(\alpha) + \widehat{C}_n^W(\alpha) \|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}\|_1 \right),$$

where \mathbf{c}_k is a vector that contains 1 at the k -th position and zeros elsewhere.

- 10: **end for**
 - 11: **return** the confidence intervals for the blip coefficients ψ_k , where $k \in \mathcal{B}$.
 - 12: **end procedure**
-

2.5.2 One-step improved penalized G-estimator

For valid inference about the target parameter $\boldsymbol{\psi}$, we can derive a one-step improvement (Ning and Liu, 2017; Gao et al., 2023) of the penalized-G estimator. We make a partition of the target parameter vector as $\boldsymbol{\psi} = (\psi_k, \boldsymbol{\nu}_k)$, where k can take any value in $\{0, 1, \dots, K-1\}$ and $\boldsymbol{\nu}_k = (\psi_0, \dots, \psi_{k-1}, \psi_{k+1}, \dots, \psi_{K-1})$. Let $\mathbf{S}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{S}_i^{\text{eff}}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ and $\mathbf{S}_{\boldsymbol{\psi}} = (S_{\psi_k}, \mathbf{S}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}_k}^\top)^\top$ denote the sub-vector of $\mathbf{S}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ corresponding to the parameters in $\boldsymbol{\psi}$. Let $\mathbf{I} = E[\mathbf{S}_{\boldsymbol{\psi}} \mathbf{S}_{\boldsymbol{\psi}}^\top]$. We denote the submatrix of \mathbf{I} corresponding to the parameters in $\boldsymbol{\psi}$ by $I_{\psi_k \psi_k}$, $\mathbf{I}_{\psi_k \boldsymbol{\nu}_k}$, $\mathbf{I}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}_k \boldsymbol{\nu}_k}$, $\mathbf{I}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}_k \psi_k}$ and define $I_{\psi_k | \boldsymbol{\nu}_k} = I_{\psi_k \psi_k} - \mathbf{I}_{\psi_k \boldsymbol{\nu}_k} \mathbf{I}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}_k \boldsymbol{\nu}_k}^{-1} \mathbf{I}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}_k \psi_k}$. A decorrelated score function can be defined as

$$\ddot{S}(\psi_k, \boldsymbol{\nu}_k, \boldsymbol{\delta}) = S_{\psi_k} - \mathbf{w}^\top \mathbf{S}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}_k}, \quad (10)$$

where $\mathbf{w}^\top = \mathbf{I}_{\psi_k \boldsymbol{\nu}_k} \mathbf{I}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}_k \boldsymbol{\nu}_k}^{-1}$. We need to impose some sparsity assumption on \mathbf{w} to control the estimation error, i.e., we will find the estimator $\widehat{\mathbf{w}}$ of \mathbf{w} that searches for the best sparse linear combination of the nuisance score functions to approximate the score function of the parameter of interest. The score function is uncorrelated with the nuisance score function $\mathbf{S}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}_k}$ in the sense that

$$E[\ddot{S}(\psi_k, \boldsymbol{\nu}_k, \boldsymbol{\delta}) \mathbf{S}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}_k}] = \mathbf{0}.$$

Then we plug-in the estimates of the treatment-free model parameters, and estimate $\ddot{S}(\psi_k, \boldsymbol{\nu}_k, \hat{\boldsymbol{\delta}})$ as follows:

$$\hat{\ddot{S}}(\hat{\psi}_k, \hat{\boldsymbol{\nu}}_k, \hat{\boldsymbol{\delta}}) = \hat{S}_{\psi_k} - \hat{\mathbf{w}}^\top \hat{\mathbf{S}}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}_k}, \quad (11)$$

which can be used for hypothesis testing (Ning and Liu, 2017).

Given the sparse estimator $\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}$, a one-step improved penalized G-estimator $\tilde{\psi}_k$ of ψ_k is

$$\tilde{\psi}_k = \hat{\psi}_k - \hat{\ddot{S}}(\hat{\psi}_k, \hat{\boldsymbol{\nu}}_k, \hat{\boldsymbol{\delta}}) / \hat{I}_{\psi_k | \boldsymbol{\nu}_k}, \quad \text{where } \hat{I}_{\psi_k | \boldsymbol{\nu}_k} = \hat{I}_{\psi_k \psi_k} - \hat{\mathbf{w}}^\top \hat{\mathbf{I}}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}_k \psi_k} \quad (12)$$

with $\hat{I}_{\psi_k \psi_k} = \hat{S}_{\psi_k}^2$, and $\hat{\mathbf{I}}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}_k \psi_k} = \hat{\mathbf{S}}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}_k} \hat{S}_{\psi_k}$. We establish the asymptotic normality of the decorrelated score function in Theorem 4 (see the Appendix for the theorem and its proof). Using the result of Theorem 4 we prove the asymptotic normality of the one-step improved penalized G-estimator $\tilde{\psi}_k$ in Theorem 5 (see the Appendix for the proof).

Theorem 5 (Asymptotic normality of the one-step improved penalized G-estimator). *Under the regularity conditions mentioned in Appendix Section A.2 and the Assumptions 4-8 mentioned in Appendix Section A.4, if $\{\eta_1(n) + \eta_2(n)\} \sqrt{\log K} = o(1)$, $\hat{I}_{\psi_k | \boldsymbol{\nu}_k}$ is consistent for $I_{\psi_k | \boldsymbol{\nu}_k}^*$, and $I_{\psi_k | \boldsymbol{\nu}_k}^* \geq C$ for some constant $C > 0$, then*

$$n^{1/2}(\tilde{\psi}_k - \psi_k^*) I_{\psi_k | \boldsymbol{\nu}_k}^* / \sigma_S^{*1/2} = -\mathbf{S}_{\psi^*} / \sigma_S^{*1/2} + o_{\mathbb{P}}(1) \sim N(0, 1)$$

for $k = 0, 1, \dots, K-1$, where σ_S^* is defined in Assumption 8 in the Appendix section A.4.

Based on the results of Theorem 5, we can construct a $(1 - \alpha) \times 100\%$ confidence interval of ψ_k as

$$\left(\tilde{\psi}_k - \Phi^{-1}(1 - \alpha/2) \frac{\sqrt{\hat{\sigma}_S}}{\sqrt{n} \hat{I}_{\psi_k | \boldsymbol{\nu}_k}}, \tilde{\psi}_k + \Phi^{-1}(1 - \alpha/2) \frac{\sqrt{\hat{\sigma}_S}}{\sqrt{n} \hat{I}_{\psi_k | \boldsymbol{\nu}_k}} \right), \quad (13)$$

where Φ denotes the cumulative distribution function (CDF) of standard normal distribution, and

$$\hat{\sigma}_S = (1, -\hat{\mathbf{w}}^\top) \hat{\mathbf{S}}_{\boldsymbol{\psi}} \hat{\mathbf{S}}_{\boldsymbol{\psi}}^\top (1, -\hat{\mathbf{w}}^\top)^\top. \quad (14)$$

For a specific correlation structure (corstr), the steps for the whole estimation procedure are summarized in Algorithm 2.

In our study, we evaluate the performance of the method with two different sparse weight estimators:

$$\text{LASSO: } \hat{\mathbf{w}} = \underset{\mathbf{w}}{\operatorname{argmin}} \frac{1}{2n} \|\hat{S}_{\psi_k} - \mathbf{w}^\top \hat{\mathbf{S}}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}_k}\|_2^2 + \lambda_{\mathbf{w}} \|\mathbf{w}\|_1 \quad (15)$$

$$\text{Dantzig selector: } \hat{\mathbf{w}} = \underset{\mathbf{w}}{\operatorname{argmin}} \|\mathbf{w}\|_1 \quad \text{s.t.} \quad \|\hat{\mathbf{S}}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}_k}^\top (\hat{S}_{\psi_k} - \mathbf{w}^\top \hat{\mathbf{S}}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}_k})\|_\infty \leq \lambda_{\mathbf{w}} \quad (16)$$

where $\lambda_{\mathbf{w}}$ is the tuning parameter, which we choose by cross-validation. LASSO and the Dantzig selector both produce sparse weight estimates. While LASSO minimizes the residual sum of squares with an L_1 -penalty on the weights, the Dantzig selector minimizes L_1 -norm of the weights with a constraint on the maximum absolute correlation between residuals and nuisance scores. LASSO is computationally faster and performs well when nuisance scores are

Algorithm 2 Inference Using the **One-Step Improved Penalized G**-estimator

1: **procedure** OSIPeG($\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{H}, \mathbf{Y}, \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}, \hat{\sigma}, \hat{\rho}, \text{corstr}, \alpha, \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{\text{seq}}$)
 2: Standardize the continuous variables in \mathbf{H} ;
 3: Compute $\hat{\mathbf{V}}_i$ using $\hat{\sigma}$ and $\hat{\rho}$ according to the corstr for $i = 1, \dots, n$;
 4: $\mathbf{e}_i \leftarrow \mathbf{Y}_i - (\mathbf{H}_i \mathbf{A}_i \cdot \mathbf{H}_i) \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$;
 5: $\mathbf{S}_{\boldsymbol{\psi}} \leftarrow n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{S}_{\boldsymbol{\psi}, i}$, where $\mathbf{S}_{\boldsymbol{\psi}, i} = [\{\mathbf{A}_i - E(\mathbf{A}_i | \mathbf{H}_i)\} \mathbf{H}_i]^\top \hat{\mathbf{V}}_i^{-1} \mathbf{e}_i$;
 6: $\mathbf{I}_{\boldsymbol{\psi}} \leftarrow n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{S}_{\boldsymbol{\psi}, i} \mathbf{S}_{\boldsymbol{\psi}, i}^\top$;
 7: Using $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} = (\hat{\boldsymbol{\delta}}, \hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}})^\top$ define $\mathcal{B} = \{0\} \cup \{m : m \in \{1, \dots, K-1\} \text{ and } |\hat{\psi}_m| \geq 0.001\}$;
 8: **for each** $k \in \mathcal{B}$ **do**
 9: Partition the target estimate $\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}$ as $(\hat{\psi}_k, \hat{\boldsymbol{\nu}}_k)$;
 10: **for each** $\lambda_w \in \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{\text{seq}}$ **do**
 11: Obtain the Dantzig type estimator $\hat{\mathbf{w}}_{\lambda_w}$ according to (16);
 12: **end for**
 13: Choose the optimal λ_w^* using cross-validation and set $\hat{\mathbf{w}} = \hat{\mathbf{w}}_{\lambda_w^*}$;
 14: Compute the decorrelated score function $\hat{S}(\hat{\psi}_k, \hat{\boldsymbol{\nu}}_k, \hat{\boldsymbol{\delta}})$ using (11);
 15: Compute $\hat{I}_{\psi_k | \boldsymbol{\nu}_k}$ according to (12);
 16: Calculate the one-step improved estimator $\tilde{\psi}_k$ using (12);
 17: Construct the $(1 - \alpha) \times 100\%$ confidence interval for the k -th coefficient in $\boldsymbol{\psi}$ as

$$\left(\tilde{\psi}_k - \Phi^{-1}(1 - \alpha/2) \frac{\sqrt{\hat{\sigma}_S}}{\sqrt{n \hat{I}_{\psi_k | \boldsymbol{\nu}_k}}}, \tilde{\psi}_k + \Phi^{-1}(1 - \alpha/2) \frac{\sqrt{\hat{\sigma}_S}}{\sqrt{n \hat{I}_{\psi_k | \boldsymbol{\nu}_k}}} \right),$$
 where Φ denotes the CDF of standard normal distribution and $\hat{\sigma}_S$ is defined in 14;
 18: **end for**
 19: **return** $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\psi}}$ and the confidence intervals for each coefficient.
 20: **end procedure**

not highly correlated. On the other hand, the Dantzig selector is robust and more stable in scenarios where the nuisance scores are highly correlated, but it is computationally intensive.

3 Simulation study

We use a simulation setting similar to that of Jaman et al. (2024). To generate the data for the j -th session ($j = 1, \dots, J$) of each subject, we generated two baseline confounders as $L^{(1)} \sim N(0, 1)$ and $L^{(2)} \sim N(0, 1)$, and the time varying confounders and noise covariates as $L_j^{(3)}, \dots, L_j^{(6)}, X_j^{(1)}, \dots, X_j^{(K-6)} \sim MVN_{K-2} \left((\boldsymbol{\mu}_{L,j}^\top, \boldsymbol{\mu}_{X,j}^\top)^\top, \mathbf{V}_{LX} \right)$, where $\mu_{L,j}^{(k)} = 0.3l_{j-1}^{(k)} + 0.3a_{j-1}$ for $k = 3, 4, 5$ and 6 , and $\mu_{X,j}^{(r)} = 0.5x_{j-1}^{(r)}$ for $r = 1, \dots, K-6$. The covariance matrix \mathbf{V}_{LX} has (r, s) -th element equal to $\tau^{|r-s|}$ for $r, s = 1, \dots, K-2$. We generated the binary exposure according to the probability

$$\mathbb{P}(A_j = 1 | \mathbf{H}_j) = \frac{\exp \{ \beta_0 + \beta_1 l^{(1)} + \beta_2 l^{(2)} + \sum_{m=3}^6 \beta_m l_j^{(m)} \}}{1 + \exp \{ \beta_0 + \beta_1 l^{(1)} + \beta_2 l^{(2)} + \sum_{m=3}^6 \beta_m l_j^{(m)} \}}. \quad (17)$$

We then generated a vector of correlated errors $\boldsymbol{\epsilon} \sim N_J(\mathbf{0}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma})$, where $\boldsymbol{\Sigma} = \sigma_\epsilon^2 \mathbf{R}$ is the variance-covariance matrix and \mathbf{R} is the $J \times J$ correlation matrix defined with parameter ρ according to a ‘‘exchangeable’’ correlation structure. We constructed the outcome as $y_j = \mu_j(\mathbf{h}_j; \boldsymbol{\delta}) + \gamma_j^*(a_j, \mathbf{h}_j; \boldsymbol{\psi}) + \epsilon_j$, where

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_j(\mathbf{h}_j; \boldsymbol{\delta}) = & \delta_0 + \delta_1 l^{(1)} + \delta_2 l^{(2)} + \sum_{m=3}^6 \delta_m l_j^{(m)} + \sum_{m=1}^{20} \delta_{6+m} x_j^{(m)} + \sum_{m=21}^{K-6} \delta_{6+m} x_j^{(m)} \\ & + \delta_{K+1} l_j^{(1)} l_j^{(5)} + \delta_{K+2} l_j^{(3)} l_j^{(4)} + \delta_{K+3} \sin(l_j^{(3)} - l_j^{(4)}) + \delta_{K+4} \cos(2l_j^{(5)}) \end{aligned}$$

is the true treatment-free model and $\gamma_j^*(a_j, \mathbf{h}_j; \boldsymbol{\psi}) = (\psi_0 + \psi_1 l^{(1)} + \psi_2 l^{(2)} + \sum_{m=3}^6 \psi_m l_j^{(m)} + \sum_{m=1}^{20} \psi_{6+m} x_j^{(m)} + \sum_{m=21}^{K-6} \psi_{6+m} x_j^{(m)}) a_j$ is the true blip function, with common parameters at each time point. Let $\boldsymbol{\beta} = (\beta_0, \dots, \beta_6)^\top$, $\boldsymbol{\delta} = (\delta_0, \dots, \delta_{K+4})^\top$ and $\boldsymbol{\psi} = (\psi_0, \dots, \psi_K)^\top$. We set

$$\begin{aligned} \boldsymbol{\beta} &= (0, 1, -1.1, 1.2, 0.75, -0.9, 1.2)^\top \\ \boldsymbol{\delta} &= (1, 1, 1.2, 1.2, -0.9, 0.8, -1, 1, \dots, 1, 0, \dots, 0, -0.8, 1, 1.2, -1.5)^\top \\ \boldsymbol{\psi} &= (1, 1, -1, -0.9, 0.8, 1, 0, 0, \dots, 0, 0, \dots, 0)^\top \end{aligned}$$

Note that $X^{(1)}$ to $X^{(20)}$ have impact on the outcome only and the coefficients of $X^{(21)}$ to $X^{(K-6)}$ were set to zero in the treatment-free model $\mu_j(\mathbf{h}_j; \boldsymbol{\delta})$. The outcome-predictor $X^{(10)}$ was treated as unmeasured. Though we set the coefficients of all the X 's to zero in the blip function $\gamma_j^*(a_j, \mathbf{h}_j; \boldsymbol{\psi})$, we consider a scenario where there is interest in investigating effect heterogeneity by the X variables in addition to the L variables. We consider $K = 20, 50$ and 100 , $n = 500, 800$ and 1200 , $\tau = 0.3$, $\sigma_\epsilon^2 = 1$, and $\rho = 0.8$.

The linear outcome model used in the penalized estimation is misspecified because it ignores the non-linear terms in the treatment-free model and excludes the outcome-predictor $X^{(10)}$. We have five competing methods for our target inference; a) Naive: The naive inference based on the Wald-type confidence interval constructed using the sandwich variance of the penalized G-estimator, b) UPoSI: Inference following the random design UPoSI approach, c) OS.FULL: Inference with the one step improved penalized G-estimator, where improvement

is done using the full weight vector, d) OS.LASSO: Inference with the one step improved penalized G-estimator, where improvement is done using the sparse weight vector estimated by LASSO, and e) OS.Dantzig: Inference with the one step improved penalized G-estimator, where improvement is done using the sparse weight vector obtained by the Dantzig selector. For comparing the performance of the competing inferential methods, we use the following metrics: a) average confidence interval (CI) length of the blip coefficients in the selected model, b) false coverage rate in the selected model, and c) conditional power for the true non-zero blip coefficients in the selected model. Since the naive inference and the UPoSI approach are intended to provide interval estimates only for the selected coefficients, we assessed the conditional power, which refers to the likelihood that the confidence interval excludes zero for a true non-zero coefficients, given that it is included in the selected model. We calculated the average CI length as $E[\sum_{k=1}^{\dim(\psi_{\widehat{M}}^*)} (UL_k - LL_k)/\dim(\psi_{\widehat{M}}^*)]$, the false coverage rate (FCR) as

$$\text{FCR} = E \left[\frac{\#\{1 \leq k \leq \dim(\psi_{\widehat{M}}^*) : (\psi_{\widehat{M}}^*)_k \notin [LL_k, UL_k]\}}{\dim(\psi_{\widehat{M}}^*)} \right]$$

and the conditional power as

$$\text{Power} = E \left[\frac{\#\{1 \leq k \leq d_{\psi^* \neq 0} : 0 \notin [LL_k, UL_k]\}}{d_{\psi^* \neq 0}} \right],$$

where \widehat{M} denotes the selected model, $\psi_{\widehat{M}}^*$ denotes the sub-vector of true blip parameters ψ^* according to \widehat{M} , LL_k and UL_k denote the lower and the upper confidence limits, respectively, and $d_{\psi^* \neq 0}$ denotes the number of true non-zero values in $\psi_{\widehat{M}}^*$. These metrics were calculated from 150 independent simulations.

Table 1: Inferential power (for the selected non-zero coefficients) of different methods.

Sample size	Method	$K = 20$			$K = 50$			$K = 100$		
		Ind	Exch	UN	Ind	Exch	UN	Ind	Exch	UN
$n = 500$	Naive	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
	UPoSI	0.00	0.04	0.08	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	OS.Full	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
	OS.LASSO	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.99	1.00	1.00
	OS.Dantzig	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.99	0.99	1.00
$n = 800$	Naive	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
	UPoSI	0.04	0.39	0.53	0.00	0.06	0.13	0.00	0.00	0.02
	OS.Full	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
	OS.LASSO	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
	OS.Dantzig	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
$n = 1200$	Naive	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
	UPoSI	0.32	0.94	0.98	0.11	0.52	0.73	0.02	0.20	0.40
	OS.Full	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
	OS.LASSO	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
	OS.Dantzig	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00

Ind: Independent, Exch: Exchangeable, UN: Unstructured

The model selection performance metrics of the penalized G-estimator are provided in Ta-




Figure 1: Average confidence interval lengths for each inferential method by number of covariates (K), sample size, and correlation structure (Ind: Independent, Exch: Exchangeable, UN: Unstructured).

ble A1 in the Appendix. We report the average CI lengths and the false coverage rates in Figure 1 and Figure 2, respectively, and the power in Table 1. These metrics were obtained using different inferential methods under three distinct correlation structures for various simulation settings. The naive approach produced the smallest confidence intervals, followed closely by the one-step estimators. Although we see 100% power for selecting non-zero blip coefficients under the naive approach, the false coverage rates under this approach exceeded the nominal significance level (0.05), especially in small samples and when the number of variables was large. Confidence intervals produced by the UPoSI approach were far wider than those of the other competing methods. While the UPoSI method yielded false coverage rates lower than 0.05 in all of the simulations settings, its power to detect true effects was nearly zero in small samples. The power under UPoSI increased with increasing sample size with a low dimensional number of candidate effect modifiers, but when we had high-dimensional covariates the power was far smaller in comparison to the other methods. Inference based on the one-step improved penalized G-estimator, given that the sparse weight vector is estimated by either LASSO or Dantzig selector, provided false coverage rates lower than 0.05, and also resulted in strong power for the non-zero coefficients selected by the initial penalized method.




Figure 2: False coverage rates for each inferential method by number of covariates (K), sample size, and correlation structure (Ind: Independent, Exch: Exchangeable, UN: Unstructured).

4 Application

In this section, we illustrate our methodological developments using the cohort and data previously analyzed by Jaman et al. (2024). The cohort consists of patients undergoing chronic hemodiafiltration at the CHUM and the CED, who started their treatment on or after March 1, 2017, and were followed through December 1, 2021, with a total of 474 patients and 170,761 dialysis sessions recorded. Jaman et al. (2024) explored the impact of dialysis facility (CHUM vs. CED) on session-specific mean convection volumes, with a focus on effect modification by patient characteristics, and found the possibility of effect modification by cancer status. This paper extends the prior analysis by providing valid inference and ensuring robust conclusions about the impact of dialysis facility and effect heterogeneity by patient-level factors.

The data extracted from hospital databases for each session includes time-dependent variables for hemodiafiltration prescriptions and dialysis session-specific outcomes, along with detailed patient characteristics, such as hemoglobin levels, albumin, comorbidities according to the Charlson Index (cancer status, hypertension, diabetes, etc.), and dialysis access type (fistula vs. catheter). For a detailed description of the candidate effect modifiers and additional information about the penalized estimation, we refer readers to the application section in Jaman et al. (2024). For each proximal effect estimate, we obtained confidence intervals using

the UPoSI approach, the decorrelated score method, and the naive sandwich variance estimator. Consistent with Jaman et al. (2024), we performed our analysis employing the same four correlation structures: independent, exchangeable, autoregressive of order one (AR1), and unstructured. For example, under the AR1 correlation structure, the selected blip model with adjustment for all potential confounders in the treatment-free part is:

$$\gamma_j(a_j, \mathbf{h}_j; \boldsymbol{\psi}) = (\psi_0 + \psi_1 \times \text{Cancer}_j) \text{CHUM}_j$$

where $j = 1, 2, \dots, 6$. The estimates of the blip parameters are given in Figure 3 with associated 95% confidence intervals obtained using the candidate inferential methods.




Figure 3: Estimated blip parameters and their corresponding 95% confidence intervals obtained using the competing inferential methods under different working correlation structures for the hemodiafiltration study.

The estimated main effect of the dialysis facility was negative across all the working correlation structures considered, with the associated 95% confidence intervals excluding zero for all competing methods except the UPoSI. Cancer was identified as an effect modifier only under the AR1 correlation structure, with the corresponding 95% confidence interval again excluding

zero for all methods except the UPoSI. Results under AR1 structure suggest that the effect of dialysis facility on the convection volume differs by the cancer status of the patient. For patients without cancer, the mean convection volume was 1.85 litres lower at CHUM compared to CED, after adjusting for all other confounders. However, for cancer patients, the mean convection volume was $3.89 - 1.85 = 2.04$ litres higher at the CHUM.

5 Discussion

We extended and evaluated two post-selection inferential methods for valid inference on the effect modification of proximal treatment effects estimated through penalized G-estimation. The one-step improved penalized G-estimator with a sparse weight vector showed good performance, providing valid inferential guarantees for the target parameters. Using the competing inferential methods, we investigated if the effect of dialysis facility on dialysis outcome (convection volume) differed by the demographics, clinical characteristics, and comorbidity status of patients with end-stage renal disease. Our findings suggest that while the CED generally achieved better hemodiafiltration outcomes, cancer patients with similar measured characteristics might have better outcomes at CHUM compared to CED.

The poor power of random design UPoSI in our simulation results can be well understood from the construction of the confidence region under this method. The confidence region or the coordinate-wise confidence interval according to UPoSI involves the L_1 norm of the full parameter vector, which increases with an increasing number of covariates and leads to excessively wide confidence intervals. Further theoretical work is needed to enhance the power of the UPoSI method. Although fixed-design UPoSI produces less conservative confidence intervals as the uncertainty component related to the covariates becomes zero, the dynamic nature of the treatment restricted us from considering the fixed-design UPoSI in our context. Our simulation results demonstrated that the one-step improved penalized G-estimator with sparse weights estimated via the LASSO effectively controls false coverage rates. However, these results may not hold under other forms of misspecification in the outcome model, such as missing exponential terms of confounders. We recommend the Danzig selector for estimating the sparse weights, as it provides higher-order corrections. It is important to note that the oracle properties of the penalized G-estimator rely on minimal signal strength conditions. Conditional methods like UPoSI, or the naive sandwich estimator can not quantify uncertainty for weak signals missed in the regularized estimation. In contrast, the decorrelated score method does not require variable selection consistency and provides reliable uncertainty estimates for small signals.

Future research may explore the robustness of the proposed methods under broader forms of misspecification in the outcome model. Extending these inferential methods to causal frameworks beyond effect modification analysis, including approaches like instrumental variable analyses and mediation analyses, would be a potential future direction.

Software implementation

The R-packs for implementing our methods are available at (<https://github.com/ajmeryjaman/>).

Funding

This work is supported by a doctoral scholarship from the Fonds de Recherche du Québec Nature et technologies (FRQNT) of Canada to AJ and a Discovery Grant from the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada to MES. AE is supported by the research grants (R01DA058996, R01DA048764, and R33NS120240) from the National Institutes

of Health. MES is supported by a tier 2 Canada Research Chair.

References

- Bachoc, F., Preinerstorfer, D., and Steinberger, L. (2020). Uniformly valid confidence intervals post-model-selection. *Annals of statistics*, 48(1):440–463.
- Balan, R. and Schiopu-Kratina, I. (2005). Asymptotic results with generalized estimating equations for longitudinal data. *Ann. Statist.*, 33(1):522–541.
- Berk, R., Brown, L., Buja, A., Zhang, K., and Zhao, L. (2013). Valid post-selection inference. *The Annals of Statistics*, pages 802–837.
- Bian, Z., Moodie, E. E., Shortreed, S. M., Lambert, S. D., and Bhatnagar, S. (2023). Variable selection for individualised treatment rules with discrete outcomes. *Journal of the royal statistical society. Series C (Applied statistics)*, qlad096, <https://doi.org/10.1093/jrssc/qlad096>.
- Boruvka, A., Almirall, D., Witkiewitz, K., and Murphy, S. A. (2018). Assessing time-varying causal effect moderation in mobile health. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 113(523):1112–1121.
- Chakraborty, B. and Moodie, E. E. (2013). Statistical methods for dynamic treatment regimes. *Springer-Verlag. doi*, 10(978-1):4–1.
- Cheng, G., Yu, Z., and Huang, J. Z. (2013). The cluster bootstrap consistency in generalized estimating equations. *Journal of Multivariate Analysis*, 115:33–47.
- Fan, J. and Li, R. (2001). Variable selection via nonconcave penalized likelihood and its oracle properties. *Journal of the American statistical Association*, 96(456):1348–1360.
- Fan, J. and Peng, H. (2004). Nonconcave penalized likelihood with a diverging number of parameters. *Annals of Statistics*, 32:928–961.
- Gao, D., Liu, Y., and Zeng, D. (2023). Asymptotic inference for multi-stage stationary treatment policy with high dimensional features. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2301.12553*.
- Hunter, D. R. and Li, R. (2005). Variable selection using mm algorithms. *Annals of statistics*, 33(4):1617.
- Jaman, A., Latif, M. A., Bari, W., and Wahed, A. S. (2016). A determinant-based criterion for working correlation structure selection in generalized estimating equations. *Statistics in Medicine*, 35(11):1819–1833.
- Jaman, A., Wang, G., Ertefaie, A., Bally, M., Lévesque, R., Platt, R., and Schnitzer, M. (2024). Penalized g-estimation for effect modifier selection in a structural nested mean model for repeated outcomes. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.00154*.
- Jones, J., Ertefaie, A., and Strawderman, R. L. (2022). Valid post-selection inference in robust q-learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2208.03233*.

- Kuchibhotla, A. K., Brown, L. D., Buja, A., Cai, J., George, E. I., and Zhao, L. H. (2020). Valid post-selection inference in model-free linear regression. *The Annals of Statistics*, (5):2953–2981.
- Lee, J. D., Sun, D. L., Sun, Y., and Taylor, J. E. (2016). Exact post-selection inference, with application to the lasso. *Annals of Statistics*, 44(3):907–927.
- Li, Y. and Wang, Y.-G. (2008). Smooth bootstrap methods for analysis of longitudinal data. *Statistics in medicine*, 27(7):937–953.
- Marcelli, D., Scholz, C., Ponce, P., Sousa, T., Kopperschmidt, P., Grassmann, A., Pinto, B., and Canaud, B. (2015). High-volume postdilution hemodiafiltration is a feasible option in routine clinical practice. *Artificial organs*, 39(2):142–149.
- Minnier, J., Tian, L., and Cai, T. (2011). A perturbation method for inference on regularized regression estimates. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 106(496):1371–1382.
- Moodie, E. E., Bian, Z., Coulombe, J., Lian, Y., Yang, A. Y., and Shortreed, S. M. (2023). Variable selection in high dimensions for discrete-outcome individualized treatment rules: Reducing severity of depression symptoms. *Biostatistics*, page kxad022.
- Ning, Y. and Liu, H. (2017). A general theory of hypothesis tests and confidence regions for sparse high dimensional models. *Annals of Statistics*, 45(1):158–195.
- Robins, J. and Hernan, M. (2008). Estimation of the causal effects of time-varying exposures. *Chapman & Hall/CRC Handbooks of Modern Statistical Methods*, pages 553–599.
- Robins, J. M. (1989). The analysis of randomized and non-randomized aids treatment trials using a new approach to causal inference in longitudinal studies. *Health service research methodology: a focus on AIDS*, pages 113–159.
- Ronco, C. and Cruz, D. (2007). Hemodiafiltration history, technology, and clinical results. *Advances in Chronic Kidney Disease*, 14(3):231–243.
- Sultana, A., Lipi, N., and Jaman, A. (2023). A caution in the use of multiple criteria for selecting working correlation structure in generalized estimating equations. *Communications in Statistics-Simulation and Computation*, 52(3):980–992.
- Tibshirani, R. J., Taylor, J., Lockhart, R., and Tibshirani, R. (2016). Exact post-selection inference for sequential regression procedures. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 111(514):600–620.
- Vansteelandt, S. and Joffe, M. (2014). Structural nested models and g-estimation: The partially realized promise. *Statistical Science*, 29(4):707–731.
- Wang, L., Zhou, J., and Qu, A. (2012). Penalized generalized estimating equations for high-dimensional longitudinal data analysis. *Biometrics*, 68(2):353–360.
- Xia, L. and Shojaie, A. (2022). Statistical inference for high-dimensional generalized estimating equations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2207.11686*.
- Zhang, C.-H. and Zhang, S. S. (2014). Confidence intervals for low dimensional parameters in high dimensional linear models. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B: Statistical Methodology*, 76(1):217–242.

Zhao, Q., Small, D. S., Ertefaie, A., et al. (2022). Selective inference for effect modification via the lasso. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B*, 84(2):382–413.

A Appendix

A.1 Assumptions for identifiability of the SNMM parameters

Assumptions 1-3 are the usual causal assumptions for identifiability of the target parameters using the observed data.

Assumption 1 (Consistency). The observed outcome is equal to the potential outcome at occasion j , for $j = 1, \dots, J$, if the observed treatment history matches the counterfactual history at occasion j , i.e., $Y_{ij}(\bar{a}_j) = Y_{ij}$, if $\bar{A}_{ij} = \bar{a}_j$.

Assumption 2 (Sequential ignorability). The potential outcome $Y_{ij}(\bar{a}_{j-1}, 0)$ is independent of A_{ij} conditional on \mathbf{H}_{ij} , for $j = 1, \dots, J$.

Assumption 3 (Positivity). If the joint density of \mathbf{H}_{ij} at $\{\mathbf{h}_{ij}\}$ is greater than zero, then $\mathbb{P}(A_{ij} = a_j | \mathbf{H}_{ij} = \mathbf{h}_{ij}) > 0$ for all a_j , $j = 1, \dots, J$.

A.2 Technicalities related to the working correlation matrix

For subject i the correlation matrix $\mathbf{R}_i(\rho)$ is unknown and is replaced by the estimate $\hat{\mathbf{R}}$ while performing penalized G-estimation. We need the following assumption on the correlation matrix for asymptotic validity of the proposed inferential methods.

Assumption 4 The common true correlation matrix \mathbf{R}_0 for the observed outcomes has eigen values bounded away from zero and $+\infty$. The estimated working correlation matrix $\hat{\mathbf{R}}$ satisfies $\|\hat{\mathbf{R}}^{-1} - \bar{\mathbf{R}}^{-1}\| = O_{\mathbb{P}}(\sqrt{1/n})$, where $\bar{\mathbf{R}}$ is a constant positive definite matrix with eigen values bounded away from zero and $+\infty$, and $\|\cdot\|$ denotes the Frobenius norm.

Under Assumption 4, the two versions of the expected information have the following forms:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{H}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) &= \mathbb{E}\{-\partial \mathbf{S}_i^{\text{eff}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) / \partial \boldsymbol{\theta}^\top\} = \mathbf{D}_i^\top \mathbf{Q}_i^{-1/2} \bar{\mathbf{R}}^{-1} \mathbf{Q}_i^{-1/2} (\mathbf{H}_i \mathbf{A}_i \cdot \mathbf{H}_i), \\ \mathbf{I}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) &= \mathbb{E}\{\mathbf{S}_i^{\text{eff}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \mathbf{S}_i^{\text{eff}}(\boldsymbol{\theta})^\top\} = \mathbf{D}_i^\top \mathbf{Q}_i^{-1/2} \bar{\mathbf{R}}^{-1} \mathbf{R}_0 \bar{\mathbf{R}}^{-1} \mathbf{Q}_i^{-1/2} \mathbf{D}_i. \end{aligned}$$

Details regarding the expressions of these information matrices can be found in Balan and Schiopu-Kratina (2005), where the authors presented a rigorous asymptotic theory for generalized estimating equations.

Some other regularity conditions for the desired asymptotic properties of the penalized G-estimator are as follows:

(C1) All variables in \mathbf{D}_{ij} , $i = 1, \dots, n$, $j = 1, \dots, J$, are uniformly bounded.

(C2) The unknown parameter $\boldsymbol{\theta}_n$ belongs to a compact subset $\Theta \subseteq R^{2K}$ and the true parameter $\boldsymbol{\theta}_0$ lies in the interior of Θ .

(C3) There exists finite positive constants c_1 and c_2 such that

$$c_1 \leq \omega_{\min} \left(\frac{\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{D}_i^\top (\mathbf{H}_i \mathbf{A}_i \cdot \mathbf{H}_i)}{n} \right) \leq \omega_{\max} \left(\frac{\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{D}_i^\top (\mathbf{H}_i \mathbf{A}_i \cdot \mathbf{H}_i)}{n} \right) \leq c_2,$$

where $\omega_{\min}(\mathbf{D})$ and $\omega_{\max}(\mathbf{D})$ denote the minimum and maximum of the eigenvalues, respectively, of the matrix \mathbf{D} .

(C4) Let $\boldsymbol{\xi}_i(\boldsymbol{\theta}_n) = (\boldsymbol{\xi}_{i1}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_n), \dots, \boldsymbol{\xi}_{in_i}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_n))^\top = \mathbf{Q}_i^{-1/2} (\mathbf{Y}_i - \mathbf{g}_i(\boldsymbol{\theta}_n))$. There exists a finite constant $d_1 > 0$ such that $E(\|\boldsymbol{\xi}_i(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)\|^{2+\rho}) \leq d_1$ for all i and some $\rho > 0$; and there exists positive

constants d_2 and d_3 such that $E(\exp(d_2|\xi_{ij}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)|)|\mathbf{D}_i) \leq d_3$, uniformly in $i = 1, \dots, n$, $j = 1, \dots, J$.

(C5) Let $T_n = \{\boldsymbol{\theta}_n : \|\boldsymbol{\theta}_n - \boldsymbol{\theta}_0\| \leq \Delta\sqrt{1/n}\}$, then $g'(\mathbf{D}_{ij}\boldsymbol{\theta}_n)$, $i = 1, \dots, n$, $j = 1, \dots, J$, are uniformly bounded away from 0 and ∞ on T_n ; $g''(\mathbf{D}_{ij}\boldsymbol{\theta}_n)$ and $g'''(\mathbf{D}_{ij}\boldsymbol{\theta}_n)$, $i = 1, \dots, n$, $j = 1, \dots, J$, are uniformly bounded by a finite positive constant d_2 on T_n ; $g'(\cdot)$, $g''(\cdot)$ and $g'''(\cdot)$ denote the first, second and third derivatives of the function $g(\cdot)$, respectively.

(C6) Suppose s denotes the number of the non-zero blip coefficients plus the number of other fixed parameters in the outcome mean model. When s is not fixed, assuming $\min_{m \in B} |\theta_{0m}|/\lambda_n \rightarrow \infty$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ and $s_n^3 n^{-1} = o(1)$, $\lambda_n \rightarrow 0$, $s_n^2 (\log n)^4 = o(n\lambda_n^2)$, $\log(K_n) = o(n\lambda_n^2/(\log n)^2)$, $K_n s_n^4 (\log n)^6 = o(n^2\lambda_n^2)$, and $K_n s_n^3 (\log n)^8 = o(n^2\lambda_n^4)$. Note that λ_n is the tuning parameter.

These conditions are similar to the regularity conditions in (Wang et al., 2012; Jaman et al., 2024), some of which maybe further relaxed.

A.3 Technical issues related to the UPoSI approach

We follow Kuchibhotla et al. (2020) to state and prove asymptotic validity of the UPoSI method. We will require the following inequality:

$$\|Bv\|_\infty \leq \|B\|_\infty \|v\|_1. \quad (18)$$

Theorem 1. *For a given sets of models \mathcal{M}_K , any set of confidence regions $\{\widehat{\mathcal{R}}_{n,M} : M \in \mathcal{M}_K\}$, and significance level $\alpha \in [0, 1]$, the statements (a) and (b) are equivalent:*

(a) *The post-selection inference problem is solved, meaning that*

$$\mathbb{P}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{n,\widehat{M}} \in \widehat{\mathcal{R}}_{n,\widehat{M}}) \geq 1 - \alpha.$$

(b) *The simultaneous inference problem for $M \in \mathcal{M}_K$ is solved, meaning that*

$$P\left(\bigcap_{M \in \mathcal{M}_K} \{\boldsymbol{\theta}_{n,M} \in \widehat{\mathcal{R}}_{n,M}\}\right) \geq 1 - \alpha.$$

Proof. Let $\mathcal{F}_M = \{\boldsymbol{\theta}_{n,M} \in \widehat{\mathcal{R}}_{n,M}\}$ denote one coverage event inside (b) for a fixed $M \in \mathcal{M}_K$. For a random model \widehat{M} , let $\mathcal{F}_{\widehat{M}} = \{\boldsymbol{\theta}_{n,\widehat{M}} \in \widehat{\mathcal{R}}_{n,\widehat{M}}\}$ be the coverage event inside (a). Both are random events since both of the confidence regions are random.

Note that $\mathcal{F}_{\widehat{M}} \supseteq \bigcap_{M \in \mathcal{M}_K} \mathcal{F}_M$ since $\widehat{M} \in \mathcal{M}_K$. Hence, if (b) is true, it implies that (a) is also true.

To prove the converse, it is sufficient to construct a data-driven selection procedure \widehat{M} that satisfies

$$\mathcal{F}_{\widehat{M}} = \bigcap_{M \in \mathcal{M}_K} \mathcal{F}_M. \quad (19)$$

Let \widehat{M} be any selection procedure that satisfies

$$\widehat{M} \in \arg \min_{M \in \mathcal{M}_K} \mathbf{1}\{\mathcal{F}_M\},$$

where $\mathbf{1}\{E\}$ represents the indicator function of the event E . It follows that $\mathbf{1}\{\widehat{\mathcal{F}}_{\widehat{M}}\} = \min_{M \in \mathcal{M}_K} \mathbf{1}\{\mathcal{F}_M\}$, which is equivalent to (19). Hence, (a) implies (b). \square

Theorem 2. *The UPoSI confidence regions $\{\widehat{\mathcal{R}}_{n,M} : M \in \mathcal{M}_K(k)\}$ defined in (9), satisfy*

$$P\left(\bigcap_{M \in \mathcal{M}_K(k)} \{\boldsymbol{\theta}_{n,M} \in \widehat{\mathcal{R}}_{n,M}\}\right) \geq 1 - \alpha. \quad (20)$$

Also, for any selected model \widehat{M} , where $\widehat{M} \in \mathcal{M}_K(k)$, the following is satisfied

$$\mathbb{P}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{n,\widehat{M}} \in \widehat{\mathcal{R}}_{n,\widehat{M}}) \geq 1 - \alpha. \quad (21)$$

Proof. This proof is free of stochastic assumptions. If we subtract the expected equation (7) from the empirical equation (6), for any $M \in \mathcal{M}_K(k)$ the following holds:

$$\widehat{\mathbf{W}}_n(M)\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{n,M} - \mathbf{W}_n(M)\boldsymbol{\theta}_{n,M} = \widehat{\mathbf{G}}_n(M) - \mathbf{G}_n(M).$$

If we subtract and add $\widehat{\mathbf{W}}_n(M)\boldsymbol{\theta}_{n,M}$ on the left-hand side of this equation we have

$$\widehat{\mathbf{W}}_n(M)(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{n,M} - \boldsymbol{\theta}_{n,M}) + (\widehat{\mathbf{W}}_n(M) - \mathbf{W}_n(M))\boldsymbol{\theta}_{n,M} = \widehat{\mathbf{G}}_n(M) - \mathbf{G}_n(M).$$

If we move the second term from the left to the right-hand side of the equality, take the sup norm and apply the triangle inequality on the right-hand side, we get the following:

$$\|\widehat{\mathbf{W}}_n(M)(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{n,M} - \boldsymbol{\theta}_{n,M})\|_\infty \leq \|\widehat{\mathbf{G}}_n(M) - \mathbf{G}_n(M)\|_\infty + \|(\widehat{\mathbf{W}}_n(M) - \mathbf{W}_n(M))\boldsymbol{\theta}_{n,M}\|_\infty.$$

If we use the inequality (18) to the last term it follows that

$$\|\widehat{\mathbf{W}}_n(M)(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{n,M} - \boldsymbol{\theta}_{n,M})\|_\infty \leq \|\widehat{\mathbf{G}}_n(M) - \mathbf{G}_n(M)\|_\infty + \|\widehat{\mathbf{W}}_n(M) - \mathbf{W}_n(M)\|_\infty \|\boldsymbol{\theta}_{n,M}\|_1.$$

Since $\widehat{\mathbf{W}}_n(M) - \mathbf{W}_n(M)$ and $\widehat{\mathbf{G}}_n(M) - \mathbf{G}_n(M)$ are a submatrix and a subvector of $\widehat{\mathbf{W}}_n - \mathbf{W}_n$ and $\widehat{\mathbf{G}}_n - \mathbf{G}_n$, respectively, we can write

$$\|\widehat{\mathbf{W}}_n(M)(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{n,M} - \boldsymbol{\theta}_{n,M})\|_\infty \leq \|\widehat{\mathbf{G}}_n - \mathbf{G}_n\|_\infty + \|\widehat{\mathbf{W}}_n - \mathbf{W}_n\|_\infty \|\boldsymbol{\theta}_{n,M}\|_1. \quad (22)$$

This inequality is true for any sample and for any submodel $M \in \mathcal{M}_K(k)$. These enable us to take the intersection of the events (22) over all possible submodels and transform it into a ‘‘probability one’’ statement. Using the definitions of D_n^G and D_n^W , we have

$$P\left(\bigcap_{M \in \mathcal{M}_K(k)} \left\{ \|\widehat{\mathbf{W}}_n(M)(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{n,M} - \boldsymbol{\theta}_{n,M})\|_\infty \leq D_n^G + D_n^W \|\boldsymbol{\theta}_{n,M}\|_1 \right\}\right) = 1. \quad (23)$$

Considering the definitions of $C_n^G(\alpha)$ and $C_n^W(\alpha)$ the proof of (20) is complete. The proof of (21) follows by an application of Theorem 1. \square

Theorem 3 (Asymptotic validity of the UPoSI method). *Let $\lambda_{\min}(\mathbf{W}_n(M))$ denotes the minimum eigen value of the matrix $\mathbf{W}_n(M)$. For every $1 \leq k \leq K$ satisfying the assumption that the estimation error D_n^W satisfies $kD_n^W = o_{\mathbb{P}}(\omega_n(k))$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, where $\omega_n(k) =$*

$\min_{M \in \mathcal{M}_K(k)} \lambda_{\min}(\mathbf{W}_n(M))$, the confidence regions $\widehat{\mathcal{R}}_{n,M}^*$ in (8) satisfy

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} P \left(\bigcap_{M \in \mathcal{M}_K(k)} \{\boldsymbol{\theta}_{n,M} \in \widehat{\mathcal{R}}_{n,M}^*\} \right) \geq 1 - \alpha.$$

Proof. For all $k \geq 1$ satisfying $kD_n^W \leq \omega_n(k)$ and for all $M \in \mathcal{M}_K(k)$, if $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{n,M}$ is a uniform-in-model consistent estimator of $\boldsymbol{\theta}_{n,M}$ then

$$\|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{n,M} - \boldsymbol{\theta}_{n,M}\|_1 \leq \frac{|M|(D_n^G + D_n^W \|\boldsymbol{\theta}_{n,M}\|_1)}{\omega_n(k) - kD_n^W}. \quad (24)$$

Under the assumption on the minimum eigen value equation (24) implies that for all $M \in \mathcal{M}_K(k)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \frac{D_n^G + D_n^W \|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{n,M}\|_1}{D_n^G + D_n^W \|\boldsymbol{\theta}_{n,M}\|_1} - 1 \right| &\leq \frac{D_n^W \|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{n,M} - \boldsymbol{\theta}_{n,M}\|_1}{D_n^G + D_n^W \|\boldsymbol{\theta}_{n,M}\|_1} \\ &\leq \frac{D_n^W}{D_n^G + D_n^W \|\boldsymbol{\theta}_{n,M}\|_1} \cdot \frac{|M|(D_n^G + D_n^W \|\boldsymbol{\theta}_{n,M}\|_1)}{\omega_n(k) - |M|D_n^W} \\ &\leq \frac{kD_n^W}{\omega_n(k) - kD_n^W}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\sup_{M \in \mathcal{M}_K(k)} \left| \frac{D_n^G + D_n^W \|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{n,M}\|_1}{D_n^G + D_n^W \|\boldsymbol{\theta}_{n,M}\|_1} - 1 \right| \leq \frac{kD_n^W/\omega_n(k)}{1 - (kD_n^W/\omega_n(k))} = o_{\mathbb{P}}(1).$$

Hence,

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} P \left(\bigcap_{M \in \mathcal{M}_K(k)} \left\{ \|\widehat{\mathbf{W}}_n(M)(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{n,M} - \boldsymbol{\theta}_{n,M})\|_{\infty} \leq D_n^G + D_n^W \|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{n,M}\|_1 \right\} \right) = 1.$$

□

Following the definitions of $C_n^G(\alpha)$ and $C_n^W(\alpha)$ we have the required result.

A.3.1 Multiplier bootstrap

The computation of the UPoSI confidence regions (8) depends on the estimation of the joint quantiles $C_n^G(\alpha)$ and $C_n^W(\alpha)$ using the data. The multiplier bootstrap is a fast and easy-to-implement alternative to the standard resampling bootstrap. The use of multiplier bootstrap to estimate these quantiles can be justified by an application of the high-dimensional central limit theorem (Kuchibhotla et al., 2020). The applicability of multiplier bootstrap for estimating the standard error of parameter estimates when analyzing clustered data using GEE has been mentioned in Li and Wang (2008) and Cheng et al. (2013).

We define the subject-specific vector \mathbf{Z}_i that contains the contribution of subject i to $\widehat{\mathbf{W}}_n$

and $\widehat{\mathbf{G}}_n$ as follows:

$$\mathbf{Z}_i = \left(\left\{ \mathbf{h}_i[k]' \mathbf{V}_i^{-1} \mathbf{y}_i \right\}_{1 \leq k \leq K}, \left\{ \left[\{\mathbf{a}_i - E(\mathbf{A}_i | \mathbf{H}_i)\} \cdot \mathbf{h}_i[k] \right]' \mathbf{V}_i^{-1} \mathbf{y}_i \right\}_{1 \leq k \leq K}, \left\{ \mathbf{h}_i[k]' \mathbf{V}_i^{-1} \mathbf{h}_i[k'] \right\}_{1 \leq k \leq k' \leq K}, \right. \\ \left. \left\{ \mathbf{h}_i[k]' \mathbf{V}_i^{-1} (\mathbf{a}_i \cdot \mathbf{h}_i[k']) \right\}_{1 \leq k \leq k' \leq K}, \left\{ \left[\{\mathbf{a}_i - E(\mathbf{A}_i | \mathbf{H}_i)\} \cdot \mathbf{h}_i[k] \right]' \mathbf{V}_i^{-1} \mathbf{h}_i[k'] \right\}_{1 \leq k \leq k' \leq K}, \right. \\ \left. \left\{ \left[\{\mathbf{a}_i - E(\mathbf{A}_i | \mathbf{H}_i)\} \cdot \mathbf{h}_i[k] \right]' \mathbf{V}_i^{-1} (\mathbf{a}_i \cdot \mathbf{h}_i[k']) \right\}_{1 \leq k \leq k' \leq K} \right),$$

where $\mathbf{h}_i[k]$ represents the k -th column vector of the matrix \mathbf{h}_i for $k = 1, \dots, K$. The number of elements in \mathbf{Z}_i is $K + K + 4 \times \{K + K(K - 1)/2\} = O(K^2)$. We define an event $\{D_n^G \leq d_1 \text{ and } D_n^W \leq d_2\}$ for constructing the bivariate quantiles for D_n^G and D_n^W . As shown by Kuchibhotla et al. (2020), this event for any $d_1, d_2 \geq 0$ can be written as a symmetric rectangle in terms of

$$S_n^Z = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n \{\mathbf{Z}_i - E(\mathbf{Z}_i)\}.$$

Let r_1, r_2, \dots, r_n be independent standard normal random variables and define

$$S_n^{r,Z} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n r_i (\mathbf{Z}_i - \bar{\mathbf{Z}}_n) \text{ with } \bar{\mathbf{Z}}_n = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{Z}_i.$$

Also let $S_n^{r,Z}(I)$ represents the first $2K$ elements of $S_n^{r,Z}$ that contribute towards estimation of \mathbf{G}_n and $S_n^{r,Z}(II)$ represents the remaining elements of $S_n^{r,Z}$ that contribute towards estimation of \mathbf{W}_n . Then the joint quantiles can be estimated using the following steps:

1. Generate R_n random vectors of dimension n from a standard normal distribution and denote the generations with $r_{i,j}$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$ and $j = 1, 2, \dots, R_n$.
2. Compute the j -th replicate of $S_n^{r,Z}$ as

$$S_{n,j}^* = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n r_{i,j} (\mathbf{Z}_i - \bar{\mathbf{Z}}_n) \text{ for } j = 1, 2, \dots, R_n.$$

3. Find any two quantities $\widehat{C}_n^G(\alpha)$ and $\widehat{C}_n^W(\alpha)$ such that

$$\frac{1}{R_n} \sum_{j=1}^{R_n} \mathbf{1} \left\{ \|S_{n,j}^*(I)\|_\infty \leq \widehat{C}_n^G(\alpha), \|S_{n,j}^*(II)\|_\infty \leq \widehat{C}_n^W(\alpha) \right\} \geq 1 - \alpha,$$

where $\mathbf{1}\{E\}$ represents the indicator function of the event E .

Cheng et al. (2013) provided theoretical proof of the estimation consistency for the exchangeably weighted cluster bootstrap method for GEE. Multiplier bootstrap can be viewed as a special class of the weighted bootstrap and it satisfies all the required conditions on the weights for consistency to hold (Cheng et al., 2013). However, we only expect the asymptotic conservativeness of the proposed multiplier bootstrap instead of consistency, because we replace $E(\mathbf{Z}_i)$ with $\bar{\mathbf{Z}}_n$ which is not a consistent estimator.

A.3.2 Coordinate-wise confidence interval under UPoSI

We can construct coordinate-wise confidence interval (Kuchibhotla et al., 2020) for the k -th coefficient in $\boldsymbol{\psi}$ having the form $\hat{\psi}_k \pm \hat{\mathcal{L}}_{k, \widehat{M}}$ under any selected model \widehat{M} (could be any submodel $M \in \mathcal{M}$), where $\hat{\psi}_k$ represents the k -th element of the target estimate $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}$ in the penalized G-estimate $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} = (\widehat{\boldsymbol{\delta}}, \widehat{\boldsymbol{\psi}})^\top$ and $\hat{\mathcal{L}}_{k, \widehat{M}}$ represents the half-length of the confidence interval. We can compute the half-length of the interval as follows:

$$\hat{\mathcal{L}}_{k, \widehat{M}} = \left| \mathbf{c}'_k \left\{ \widehat{\mathbf{W}}_n(\widehat{M}) \right\}^{-1} \right| \left(\widehat{C}_n^G(\alpha) + \widehat{C}_n^W(\alpha) \|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}\|_1 \right)$$

where \mathbf{c}_k is a vector of zeros with value 1 corresponding to the position k .

A.4 Technical issues related to the decorrelated score method

Let $\boldsymbol{\theta}^* = (\boldsymbol{\delta}^{*\top}, \boldsymbol{\psi}^{*\top})^\top$ denote the true values of $\boldsymbol{\theta} = (\boldsymbol{\delta}^\top, \boldsymbol{\psi}^\top)^\top$, $\mathbf{S}_{\boldsymbol{\psi}^*} = \mathbf{S}_{\boldsymbol{\psi}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*)$ be the sub-vector of $S(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*)$ corresponding to $\boldsymbol{\psi}$, and $\mathbf{I}^* = E[\mathbf{S}_{\boldsymbol{\psi}^*} \mathbf{S}_{\boldsymbol{\psi}^*}^\top]$. Recall that for inference regarding ψ_k , i.e., the parameter of interest, we made a partition of the target parameter vector as $\boldsymbol{\psi} = (\psi_k, \boldsymbol{\nu}_k)$, where k can take any value in $\{0, 1, \dots, K-1\}$ and $\boldsymbol{\nu}_k = (\psi_0, \dots, \psi_{k-1}, \psi_{k+1}, \dots, \psi_{K-1})$. We also define $\mathbf{w}^* = \mathbf{I}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}_k \boldsymbol{\nu}_k}^{*-1} \mathbf{I}_{\psi_k \boldsymbol{\nu}_k}^*$. First we state the assumptions required for the validity of the target inference. Assumptions 5-8 are similar to the Assumptions 3.1-3.4 in Ning and Liu (2017) required to establish the asymptotic normality of the one-step improved estimator.

Assumption 5 (Consistency conditions for initial penalized G-estimator). For some sequences $\eta_1(n)$ and $\eta_2(n)$ converging to 0 as $n \rightarrow \infty$ the following holds

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}_{\boldsymbol{\psi}^*} (\|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\psi}} - \boldsymbol{\psi}^*\|_1 \lesssim \eta_1(n)) = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}_{\boldsymbol{\psi}^*} (\|\widehat{\mathbf{w}} - \mathbf{w}^*\|_1 \lesssim \eta_1(n)) = 1,$$

where $\|\cdot\|_1$ denotes the L_1 norm of a vector.

Assumption 6 (Concentration of the gradient and Hessian). We assume $\|\mathbf{S}_{\boldsymbol{\psi}^*}\|_\infty = O_{\mathbb{P}}(\sqrt{\log K/n})$ and

$$\left\| (1, -\mathbf{w}^{*\top}) \mathbf{S}_{\boldsymbol{\psi}^*} \mathbf{S}_{\boldsymbol{\psi}^*}^\top - \mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\psi}^*} [(1, -\mathbf{w}^{*\top}) \mathbf{S}_{\boldsymbol{\psi}^*} \mathbf{S}_{\boldsymbol{\psi}^*}^\top] \right\|_\infty = O_{\mathbb{P}}(\sqrt{\log K/n}).$$

This assumption imposes the sub-exponential conditions for some random variables related to the gradient and Hessian matrix.

Assumption 7 (Local smoothness conditions). Let $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}_0 = (0, \widehat{\boldsymbol{\nu}}_k^\top)^\top$. We assume that for both $\check{\boldsymbol{\psi}} = \widehat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}_0$ and $\check{\boldsymbol{\psi}} = \widehat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}$ the following holds

$$(1, -\mathbf{w}^{*\top}) \{ \mathbf{S}_{\check{\boldsymbol{\psi}}} - \mathbf{S}_{\boldsymbol{\psi}^*} - \mathbf{S}_{\boldsymbol{\psi}^*} \mathbf{S}_{\boldsymbol{\psi}^*}^\top (\check{\boldsymbol{\psi}} - \boldsymbol{\psi}^*) \} = o_{\mathbb{P}}(n^{-1/2}), \quad \text{and} \\ \{ (1, -\widehat{\mathbf{w}}^\top) - (1, -\mathbf{w}^{*\top}) \} (\mathbf{S}_{\check{\boldsymbol{\psi}}} - \mathbf{S}_{\boldsymbol{\psi}^*}) = o_{\mathbb{P}}(n^{-1/2}).$$

Assumption 8 (Central limit theorem for the efficient score function). We assume it holds that

$$\sqrt{n} (1, -\mathbf{w}^{*\top}) \mathbf{S}_{\boldsymbol{\psi}^*} / \sqrt{\sigma_S^*} \sim N(0, 1), \quad \text{where } \sigma_S^* = (1, -\widehat{\mathbf{w}}^\top) \left[\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \text{Var}(n^{1/2} \mathbf{S}_{\boldsymbol{\psi}^*}) \right] (1, -\widehat{\mathbf{w}}^\top)^\top$$

and $\sigma_S^* \geq C$ for some constant $C > 0$.

We follow Ning and Liu (2017) to state and prove the asymptotic normality of the decorre-

lated score function and the one-step improved penalized G-estimator.

Theorem 4 (Asymptotic normality of the decorrelated score function). *We define the score test statistic for the hypothesis $H_0 : \psi_k = 0$ as $\widehat{T}_n = n^{1/2} \widehat{S}(0, \widehat{\boldsymbol{\nu}}_k, \widehat{\boldsymbol{\delta}}) / \sqrt{\widehat{\sigma}_S}$, where $\widehat{\sigma}_S$ is a consistent estimator of σ_S^* . Then under the regularity conditions mentioned in Appendix Section A.2 and the Assumptions 4-8 mentioned in Appendix Section A.4, if $\{\eta_1(n) + \eta_2(n)\} \sqrt{\log K} = o(1)$, we have*

$$n^{1/2} \widehat{S}(0, \widehat{\boldsymbol{\nu}}_k, \widehat{\boldsymbol{\delta}}) \sigma_S^{*-1/2} \sim N(0, 1), \quad (25)$$

and for any $t \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} |\mathbb{P}_{\psi^*}(\widehat{T}_n \leq t) - \Phi(t)| = 0, \quad (26)$$

where Φ denotes the cumulative distribution function of the standard normal distribution.

Proof. In Assumption 7, we defined that $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}_0 = (0, \widehat{\boldsymbol{\nu}}_k^\top)^\top$. Let $\mathbf{S}_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}_0} = \mathbf{S}_\psi(\boldsymbol{\theta})|_{\boldsymbol{\psi}=\widehat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}_0, \boldsymbol{\delta}=\widehat{\boldsymbol{\delta}}}$. Now by the definition of $\widehat{S}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}_0, \widehat{\boldsymbol{\delta}}) = \widehat{S}(0, \widehat{\boldsymbol{\nu}}_k, \widehat{\boldsymbol{\delta}})$, we can do the following decomposition:

$$\begin{aligned} & n^{1/2} |\widehat{S}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}_0, \widehat{\boldsymbol{\delta}}) - \ddot{S}(\boldsymbol{\psi}^*, \boldsymbol{\delta}^*)| \\ &= n^{1/2} |(1, -\widehat{\mathbf{w}}^\top) \mathbf{S}_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}_0} - (1, -\mathbf{w}^{*\top}) \mathbf{S}_{\boldsymbol{\psi}^*}| \\ &\leq n^{1/2} |(1, -\mathbf{w}^{*\top}) (\mathbf{S}_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}_0} - \mathbf{S}_{\boldsymbol{\psi}^*})| + n^{1/2} |\{(1, -\widehat{\mathbf{w}}^\top) - (1, -\mathbf{w}^{*\top})\} \mathbf{S}_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}_0}| \\ &= I_1 + I_2. \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

Applying Assumption 7, we can show that

$$\begin{aligned} |I_1| &\leq n^{1/2} |(1, -\mathbf{w}^{*\top}) \mathbf{S}_{\boldsymbol{\psi}^*} \mathbf{S}_{\boldsymbol{\psi}^*}^\top (\widehat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}_0 - \boldsymbol{\psi}^*)| + o_{\mathbb{P}}(1) \\ &\leq n^{1/2} \|(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}_0 - \boldsymbol{\psi}^*)\|_1 \|S_{\boldsymbol{\psi}^*} \mathbf{S}_{\boldsymbol{\psi}^*}^\top - \mathbf{w}^{*\top} \mathbf{S}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}_k^*} \mathbf{S}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}_k^*}^\top\|_\infty + o_{\mathbb{P}}(1). \end{aligned}$$

By Assumptions 5 and 6, we have $|I_1| \lesssim \eta_1(n) \sqrt{\log K} + o_{\mathbb{P}}(1) = o_{\mathbb{P}}(1)$, and Assumptions 7 implies that

$$\begin{aligned} |I_2| &\leq n^{1/2} |\{(1, -\widehat{\mathbf{w}}^\top) - (1, -\mathbf{w}^{*\top})\} \mathbf{S}_{\boldsymbol{\psi}^*}| + o_{\mathbb{P}}(1) \\ &\leq n^{1/2} \|(1, -\widehat{\mathbf{w}}^\top) - (1, -\mathbf{w}^{*\top})\|_1 \|\mathbf{S}_{\boldsymbol{\psi}^*}\|_\infty + o_{\mathbb{P}}(1). \end{aligned}$$

By Assumptions 5 and 6, we have $|I_2| \lesssim \eta_2(n) \sqrt{\log K} + o_{\mathbb{P}}(1) = o_{\mathbb{P}}(1)$. Together with (27), the bounds for I_1 and I_2 imply $n^{1/2} |\widehat{S}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}_0, \widehat{\boldsymbol{\delta}}) - \ddot{S}(\boldsymbol{\psi}^*, \boldsymbol{\delta}^*)| = o_{\mathbb{P}}(1)$. By Assumption 8, we have $n^{1/2} \widehat{S}(\boldsymbol{\psi}^*, \boldsymbol{\delta}^*) \sigma_S^{*-1/2} \sim N(0, 1)$. Since $\sigma_S^* \geq C$ in Assumption 8, we have that

$$n^{1/2} |\widehat{S}(0, \widehat{\boldsymbol{\nu}}_k, \widehat{\boldsymbol{\delta}}) \sigma_S^{*-1/2} - \ddot{S}(0, \boldsymbol{\nu}_k^*, \boldsymbol{\delta}^*) \sigma_S^{*-1/2}| = o_{\mathbb{P}}(1).$$

Then applying Slutsky's theorem we complete the proof. \square

Theorem 5 (Asymptotic normality of the one-step improved penalized G-estimator). *Under the regularity conditions mentioned in Appendix Section A.2 and the Assumptions 4-8 mentioned in Appendix Section A.4, if $\{\eta_1(n) + \eta_2(n)\} \sqrt{\log K} = o(1)$, $\widehat{I}_{\boldsymbol{\psi}_k | \boldsymbol{\nu}_k}$ is consistent*

for $I_{\psi_k|\nu_k}^*$, and $I_{\psi_k|\nu_k}^* \geq C$ for some constant $C > 0$, then

$$n^{1/2}(\tilde{\psi}_k - \psi_k^*)I_{\psi_k|\nu_k}^*/\sigma_S^{*1/2} = -\mathbf{S}_{\psi^*}/\sigma_S^{*1/2} + o_{\mathbb{P}}(1) \sim N(0, 1)$$

for $k = 0, 1, \dots, K-1$, where σ_S^* is defined in Assumption 8 in the Appendix section A.4.

Proof. Our goal is to show that

$$n^{1/2}|(\tilde{\psi}_k - \psi_k^*)I_{\psi_k|\nu_k}^*/\sigma_S^{*1/2} + (1, -\mathbf{w}^{*\top})\mathbf{S}_{\psi^*}/\sigma_S^{*1/2}| = o_{\mathbb{P}}(1). \quad (28)$$

By the definition of $\tilde{\psi}_k$, we have the following decomposition:

$$\begin{aligned} & n^{1/2}|(\tilde{\psi}_k - \psi_k^*)I_{\psi_k|\nu_k}^* + (1, -\mathbf{w}^{*\top})\mathbf{S}_{\psi^*}| \\ &= n^{1/2}|(\hat{\psi}_k - \psi_k^*)I_{\psi_k|\nu_k}^* - I_{\psi_k|\nu_k}^*\hat{I}_{\psi_k|\nu_k}^{-1}(1, -\hat{\mathbf{w}}^\top)\mathbf{S}_{\hat{\psi}} + (1, -\mathbf{w}^{*\top})\mathbf{S}_{\psi^*}| \\ &\leq n^{1/2}|(\hat{\psi}_k - \psi_k^*)I_{\psi_k|\nu_k}^* - (1, -\mathbf{w}^{*\top})(\mathbf{S}_{\hat{\psi}} - \mathbf{S}_{\psi^*})| \\ &+ n^{1/2}|(1, -\hat{\mathbf{w}}^\top) - (1, -\mathbf{w}^{*\top})\mathbf{S}_{\hat{\psi}}| + n^{1/2}|(I_{\psi_k|\nu_k}^*\hat{I}_{\psi_k|\nu_k}^{-1} - 1)(1, -\hat{\mathbf{w}}^\top)\mathbf{S}_{\hat{\psi}}| \\ &= I_1 + I_2 + I_3. \end{aligned}$$

The proof of Theorem 4 implies that $n^{1/2}(1, -\hat{\mathbf{w}}^\top)\mathbf{S}_{\hat{\psi}}/\sigma_S^{*1/2} = O_{\mathbb{P}}(1)$. Thus, by the consistency of $\hat{I}_{\psi_k|\nu_k}$, we have $I_3/\sigma_S^{*1/2} = o_{\mathbb{P}}(1)$. Similar to the proof of Theorem 4, we can show that

$$|I_2| \lesssim \eta_2(n)\sqrt{\log K} + o_{\mathbb{P}}(1) = o_{\mathbb{P}}(1).$$

Let $S_{\psi_k^*} = \mathbf{S}_{\psi_k}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*)$ and $\mathbf{S}_{\nu_k^*} = \mathbf{S}_{\nu_k}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*)$ be the sub-vectors of $S(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*)$ corresponding to ψ_k and ν_k , respectively. Next, applying the smoothness condition in Assumption 7 we can show that

$$\begin{aligned} |I_1| &\leq n^{1/2}|(\hat{\psi}_k - \psi_k^*)I_{\psi_k|\nu_k}^* - (1, -\mathbf{w}^{*\top})\mathbf{S}_{\psi^*}\mathbf{S}_{\psi^*}^\top(\hat{\psi} - \psi^*)| + o_{\mathbb{P}}(1) \\ &\leq n^{1/2}|(\hat{\psi}_k - \psi_k^*)I_{\psi_k|\nu_k}^* - (\hat{\psi}_k - \psi_k^*)(S_{\psi_k^*}S_{\psi_k^*}^\top - \mathbf{w}^{*\top}\mathbf{S}_{\nu_k^*}S_{\psi_k^*}^\top)| \\ &\quad + n^{1/2}|(\hat{\nu}_k - \nu_k^*)(S_{\psi_k^*}S_{\nu_k^*}^\top - \mathbf{w}^{*\top}\mathbf{S}_{\nu_k^*}S_{\nu_k^*}^\top)| + o_{\mathbb{P}}(1) \\ &\lesssim n^{1/2}\|\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}} - \boldsymbol{\psi}^*\|_1\|\mathbf{X}\|_\infty + o_{\mathbb{P}}(1), \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathbf{X} = [I_{\psi_k|\nu_k}^* - (S_{\psi_k^*}S_{\psi_k^*}^\top - \mathbf{w}^{*\top}\mathbf{S}_{\nu_k^*}S_{\psi_k^*}^\top), S_{\psi_k^*}S_{\nu_k^*}^\top - \mathbf{w}^{*\top}\mathbf{S}_{\nu_k^*}S_{\nu_k^*}^\top]$ is a K -dimensional vector. Since by Assumption 6, $\|\mathbf{X}\|_\infty \lesssim \sqrt{\log K/n}$, so

$$|I_1| \lesssim \eta_1(n)\sqrt{\log K} + o_{\mathbb{P}}(1) = o_{\mathbb{P}}(1).$$

□

This completes the proof.

A.5 Additional numerical results

The model selection performance of the initial penalized G-estimator for the all simulation scenarios considered in the manuscript are given in Table A1.

Table A1: Model selection performance of the initial penalized G-estimator.

		corstr	FN	FP	EXACT	AFP
$K = 20$	$n = 500$	Indep	12.67	1.33	86.00	1.33
		Exch	12.67	1.33	86.00	1.33
		UN	10.67	0.67	88.67	0.67
	$n = 800$	Indep	2.67	2.67	94.67	2.67
		Exch	2.67	2.00	95.33	2.00
		UN	2.67	2.00	95.33	2.00
	$n = 1200$	Indep	0.00	0.67	99.33	0.67
		Exch	0.00	2.00	98.00	2.00
		UN	0.00	1.33	98.67	1.33
$K = 50$	$n = 500$	Indep	22.00	0.00	78.00	0.00
		Exch	18.00	0.00	82.00	0.00
		UN	16.00	0.00	84.00	0.00
	$n = 800$	Indep	0.67	0.00	99.33	0.00
		Exch	1.33	0.67	98.00	0.67
		UN	1.33	0.67	98.00	0.67
	$n = 1200$	Indep	0.00	2.67	97.33	2.67
		Exch	0.67	3.33	96.00	3.33
		UN	0.67	4.00	95.33	4.00
$K = 100$	$n = 500$	Indep	32.00	0.00	68.00	0.00
		Exch	29.33	0.00	70.67	0.00
		UN	30.67	0.00	69.33	0.00
	$n = 800$	Indep	3.33	0.00	96.67	0.00
		Exch	3.33	0.00	96.67	0.00
		UN	3.33	0.00	96.67	0.00
	$n = 1200$	Indep	0.00	0.00	100.00	0.00
		Exch	0.00	0.67	99.33	0.67
		UN	0.00	0.67	99.33	0.67

FN: % of false negatives, FP: % of false positives, EXACT: % of exact selections, AFP: average false positives, Indep: independent, Exch: exchangeable, UN: unstructured