

Doubly Robust Estimation under Possibly Misspecified Marginal Structural Cox Model

Jiyu Luo^{*}, Denise Rava[†], Jelena Bradic[‡] and Ronghui Xu[§]

Abstract

In this paper we address the challenges posed by non-proportional hazards and informative censoring, offering a path toward more meaningful causal inference conclusions. We start from the marginal structural Cox model, which has been widely used for analyzing observational studies with survival outcomes, and typically relies on the inverse probability weighting method. The latter hinges upon a propensity score model for the treatment assignment, and a censoring model which incorporates both the treatment and the covariates. In such settings model misspecification can occur quite effortlessly, and the Cox regression model's non-collapsibility has historically posed challenges when striving to guard against model misspecification through augmentation. We introduce an augmented inverse probability weighted estimator which, enriched with doubly robust properties, paves the way for integrating machine learning and a plethora of nonparametric methods, effectively overcoming the challenges of non-collapsibility. The estimator extends naturally to estimating a time-average treatment effect when the proportional hazards assumption fails. We closely examine its theoretical and practical performance, showing that it satisfies both the assumption-lean and the well-specification criteria discussed in the recent literature (Buja et al., 2019a,c,b). Finally, its application to a dataset reveals insights into the impact of mid-life alcohol consumption on mortality in later life.

Keywords: AIPW, Causal hazard ratio, Causal inference, Machine learning, Time-averaged treatment effect.

^{*}Herbert Wertheim School of Public Health and Human Longevity Science, University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, CA 92093-0112, USA. E-mail: jil130@ucsd.edu.

[†]Department of Mathematics, University of California, San Diego, USA, La Jolla, CA, 92093. E-mail: drava@ucsd.edu.

[‡]Department of Mathematics and Halicioglu Data Science Institute, University of California, San Diego, USA, La Jolla, CA, 92093. E-mail: jbradic@ucsd.edu.

[§]Herbert Wertheim School of Public Health and Human Longevity Science, Department of Mathematics and Halicioglu Data Science Institute, University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, CA 92093-0112, USA. E-mail: rxu@health.ucsd.edu.

1 Introduction

1.1 Background

The marginal structural Cox model (Hernán et al., 2001; Hernán and Robins, 2020) has been widely used in observational studies with survival outcomes to estimate the causal hazard ratio; see, for example, Cole et al. (2003); Feldman et al. (2004); Sterne et al. (2005); Hernán et al. (2006) and Buchanan et al. (2014), among many others. While the interpretation of the hazard function for causal inference has recently been under debate (Prentice and Aragaki, 2022; Ying and Xu, 2023, and references therein), the Cox model formulation continues to be broadly utilized and can be easily adapted to derive more commonly agreed-upon interpretable quantities, such as survival probabilities.

The common approach to estimating parameters under the marginal structural Cox model, i.e. the causal estimands, has been inverse probability of treatment weighting (IPTW) and inverse probability of censoring weighting (Hernán et al., 2001, IPCW); for the rest of the paper we will refer to it as the Cox-IPW estimator. Both weighting schemes require estimation of quantities related to the conditional distribution of treatment assignment and the conditional distribution of censoring given covariates. Parametric or semiparametric models for these conditional distributions are often subject to misspecification, leading to inconsistent estimators of the estimands. More flexible approaches such as machine learning or nonparametric methods, on the other hand, give rise to estimators that converge to the true estimands at slower than \sqrt{n} rates (Belloni et al., 2013).

To overcome the above drawbacks of inverse probability weighting (IPW) approaches, augmented inverse probability weighting (AIPW) methods have been developed (Robins et al., 1995; Scharfstein et al., 1999; Robins et al., 2000a; Robins, 2000; Robins et al., 2000b; Robins and Rotnitzky, 2001; Van der Laan and Robins, 2003; Bang and Robins, 2005; Tsiatis, 2006). These methods often exhibit so-called doubly robust properties, to be elaborated on in more details later. In particular, Robins (1998) derived a generic class of semiparametric estimators for the parameters of marginal structural models with a focus on efficiency, and without being robust against possible misspecification of the propensity score. A main challenge in developing doubly robust estimators under the marginal structural Cox model is the non-collapsibility of the Cox regression model (Martinussen and Vansteelandt, 2013), i.e. the Cox model formulation including the proportional hazards assumption typically no longer holds when a covariate is integrated out from the model, a fact also well-known since the 1980s (Lancaster and Nickell, 1980; Gail et al., 1984; Ford et al., 1995; Xu, 1996). This gives rise to the difficulty of specifying a conditional survival outcome model that is needed in a doubly robust approach, and at the same time compatible with the marginal structural Cox model which defines the causal estimand (Tchetgen Tchetgen and Robins, 2012).

In the use of the Cox proportional hazards model a major concern is the violation of the proportional hazards

assumption. This also applies to the marginal structural Cox model. In such cases, the partial likelihood estimator has been known to be swayed by the nuisance censoring distribution, even in the absence of confounding bias (Xu, 1996; Xu and O’Quigley, 2000). While the doubly robust property helps to guard against possible misspecification of the so-called working models, little has been investigated in the causal inference literature when the model used to define the causal estimand is misspecified.

1.2 Overview of the paper

In this paper we derive an AIPW estimator under the marginal structural Cox model. New to our approach is the joint augmentation of the estimating functions for both the log hazard ratio and the nuisance baseline hazard function under the Cox model. Unlike previous attempts using the partial likelihood under the Cox model, this joint augmentation gives rise to estimating functions with independent and identically distributed (i.i.d.) constructs and enables contemporary developments from semiparametric theory to be applied. The augmentation leads to working models for the treatment assignment given the covariates, i.e. the propensity score, the failure time and the censoring time given the treatment and the covariates. In order to circumvent the non-collapsibility problem described above, and specify a conditional failure time model that is compatible with the original marginal structural Cox model, data adaptive machine learning or nonparametric methods are needed. We show that with cross-fitting the resulting estimator has rate doubly robust property which allows \sqrt{n} inference in the presence of slower than \sqrt{n} convergence rate of the working models (Rotnitzky et al., 2021; Hou et al., 2023).

Also new in this paper is the consideration of possibly misspecified marginal structural Cox model. In place of the proportional hazards assumption on the distributions of the two potential failure time outcomes, we consider a general time-varying log hazard ratio. We show that the AIPW estimator developed in this paper converges to a well-defined and a *well-specified* time-averaged treatment effect under the potential outcomes framework. We establish rate double robustness under this general time-varying log hazard ratio, which contains the marginal structural Cox model as a special case.

In the following after reviewing related work in the literature, in Section 2 we define the notation, the model and the assumptions, and augment the Cox-IPW estimator of both structural parameters, namely the log hazard ratio and the infinite dimensional baseline hazard function. We study the estimand of the AIPW approach under misspecified marginal structural Cox model in Section 3 and show that it has the interpretation of a time-averaged causal effect. The asymptotic properties of the AIPW estimator are established in Section 4. Through simulations of Section 5 we show that our estimator outperforms the existing IPW-Cox estimator both in terms of finite sample bias and variance, and we apply our estimator to data from a cohort of Japanese men in Hawaii followed since the 1960s in order to study the effect of mid-life alcohol exposure on late life mortality. We conclude with a discussion

in the last section. The proofs of all the theoretical results are given in the Supplementary Material.

1.3 Related work

For survival outcomes, AIPW approaches have been studied outside the Cox model. [Rotnitzky and Robins \(2005\)](#) introduced an augmented IPCW method tailored for censored survival data. Works by [Zhang and Schaubel \(2012a\)](#), [Bai et al. \(2017\)](#), and [Sjölander and Vansteelandt \(2017\)](#) produced doubly robust estimators for a contrast between the expected transformed potential failure times. [Yang et al. \(2020\)](#) designed a doubly robust estimator for structural accelerated failure time models. Both [Petersen et al. \(2014\)](#) and [Zheng et al. \(2016\)](#) derived targeted maximum likelihood estimators (TMLE) with doubly robust properties by discretizing time and framing the failure time as a binary outcome, and [Rytgaard and van der Laan \(2022\)](#) extended them to continuous time with possible competing risks and focuses on cumulative quantities like the survival probabilities. Within the additive hazards model, [Dukes et al. \(2019\)](#) and [Hou et al. \(2023\)](#) presented doubly robust estimators for hazard differences across low and high dimensions, and [Rava and Xu \(2023\)](#) extended these to competing risks.

Outside the causal inference context another significant application of IPCW emerges when there is violation of the proportional hazards assumption. Several studies, including [Xu \(1996\)](#); [Xu and O’Quigley \(2000\)](#); [Boyd et al. \(2012\)](#); [Hattori and Henmi \(2012\)](#); [Nguyen and Gillen \(2017\)](#); [Nuño and Gillen \(2021\)](#), have worked on correcting the bias caused by a nuisance censoring mechanism using IPCW. It is worth noting, however, that not all these works explicitly use the term ‘IPCW’. Some opt for (conditional) survival distribution increments as weights, but mathematically, they align with the inverse probability of censoring weights. Among these works [Xu \(1996\)](#) and [Xu and O’Quigley \(2000\)](#) assumed the censoring distribution to be independent of the regressors in the model. [Boyd et al. \(2012\)](#) allowed the censoring distribution to be different between the treatment groups but otherwise independent of the covariates. [Nguyen and Gillen \(2017\)](#) allowed the censoring distribution to depend on the covariates, and introduced a survival tree method to estimate the conditional censoring distribution given the covariates.

Informative censoring has recently received much attention in applications such as clinical oncology ([Campigotto and Weller, 2014](#); [Templeton et al., 2020](#); [Olivier et al., 2021](#)). Meanwhile efforts have been made in the statistical community in order to select covariates to account for censoring ([Van Lancker et al., 2021](#)), to find transformations that render the relevant model and parameters identifiable ([Deresa and Van Keilegom, 2021](#)), and to apply copula type approaches ([Czado and Van Keilegom, 2023](#)).

Finally, there has been discussion in the literature about model robustness and assumption-lean estimation ([Buja et al., 2019a,c](#), with discussion), in the sense that models are approximations ([Box, 1979](#)) to perhaps much more complex reality. The emphasis here is not on the possibly wrong working models for any nuisance parameters, but on the model that defines the estimand itself. While the original contributions ([Buja et al., 2019a,c](#)) center around

parametric models, the Cox model serves as an obvious example of semiparametric models in the discussion (Whitney et al., 2019; Buja et al., 2019b). It is clear that the problem has not been solved; our work here contributes to finding an assumption-lean solution to a well-specified estimand in that context. We will provide further discussion on this aspect after we describe our approach below.

2 Doubly Robust Score

2.1 Marginal Structural Cox Model

Let A be a binary treatment. Define $T(0)$ and $T(1)$ as the potential failure times for a subject under $a = 0$ and 1 , respectively. Let $\lambda_{T(a)}(t)$ denote the hazard function of the potential failure time $T(a)$, $a \in \{0, 1\}$. The marginal structural Cox model (Hernán et al., 2001) for the potential outcomes posits that

$$\lambda_{T(a)}(t) = \lambda_0(t) \exp(\beta a),$$

where $\lambda_0(t)$ represents an unknown baseline hazard function, and β serves as the causal log hazard ratio, delineating the contrast between the potential failure time outcome distributions when $a = 1$ and $a = 0$. The potential failure time $T(a)$ might be right-censored by $C(a)$. Define $\Delta(a) = I\{T(a) \leq C(a)\}$ where $I(\cdot)$ is an indicator function, and $X(a) = \min\{T(a), C(a)\}$. We use T, C, X, Δ to indicate the observed counterparts once the treatment is received. Denote Z a vector of p -dimensional covariates.

We adopt the standard causal inference assumptions (Hernán and Robins, 2020), and ‘ \perp ’ below indicates statistical independence.

Assumption 1 (SUTVA). *The potential outcomes of one subject are not affected by the treatment assignment of the other subjects, and there are no hidden versions of the treatments.*

Assumption 2 (Consistency). $T = AT(1) + (1 - A)T(0)$, and $C = AC(1) + (1 - A)C(0)$.

Assumption 3 (Exchangeability). $(T(a), C(a)) \perp A \mid Z$, for $a = 0, 1$.

Assumption 4 (Strict Positivity). *There exists $0 < \epsilon < 1$ such that $\epsilon < P(A = 1 \mid Z = z) < 1 - \epsilon$, $P(C > \tau \mid A = a, Z = z) > \epsilon$, $P(T > \tau \mid A = a, Z = z) > \epsilon$ for all values of a and z , where τ is a maximum follow-up time.*

Although model (1) does not incorporate the covariates Z , we adopt an informative censoring assumption that allows the censoring time to be dependent on Z .

Assumption 5 (Informative Censoring). $T(a) \perp C(a) \mid Z$, for $a = 0, 1$.

In the following we start with the full data, which include both potential outcomes for $a = 0, 1$ and do not involve censoring. We create our full data estimating functions based on the full data martingale as per model (1) and its increments. We then apply IPW which leads to the identification of the causal estimands using the observed data only. Finally, we develop novel joint augmentation which gives the desired doubly robust property.

2.2 Full-data score

When we consider both the counterfactual outcome and censoring as missing data, the full data, using the notion in Tsiatis (2006), is $(T(0), T(1), Z)$. From this, we can define for $a = 0, 1$, the full data counting process $N_T^a(t) = I(T(a) \leq t)$, and the full data at-risk process $Y_T^a(t) = I(T(a) \geq t)$. It can be shown that

$$M_T^a(t; \beta, \Lambda) = N_T^a(t) - \int_0^t Y_T^a(u) e^{\beta a} d\Lambda(u)$$

is a full data martingale with respect to the filtration $\mathcal{F}_t^a = \{N_T^a(u), Y_T^a(u^+) : 0 \leq u \leq t\}$ under model (1), where $\Lambda(t) = \int_0^t \lambda_0(u) du$ (Fleming and Harrington, 1991). We start by constructing a full data score function, i.e. an estimating function we would use if we were able to observe a single copy of the full data. Using the martingale property, we define the full data scores for $\Lambda(t)$ and β as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} D_1^f(t; \beta, \Lambda) &= \sum_{a=0}^1 dM_T^a(t; \beta, \Lambda), \\ D_2^f(\beta, \Lambda) &= \sum_{a=0}^1 \int_0^\tau a \cdot dM_T^a(t; \beta, \Lambda). \end{aligned}$$

Note that $D_1^f(\beta, \Lambda, t)$ is a martingale difference function that is often used in survival analysis; see for example, Lu and Ying (2004). For each t , the true values of β and $\Lambda(t)$ satisfy $E\{D_1^f(\beta, \Lambda, t)\} = 0$ and $E\{D_2^f(\beta, \Lambda)\} = 0$. In addition, it can be readily verified that for a random sample of size n , these would give the well-known Breslow's estimate of $\Lambda(t)$, as well as the partial likelihood score for β .

2.3 IPW score

The above full data are never observed. Instead we have the observed counting process $N(t) = I(X \leq t, \Delta = 1)$, and the observed at-risk process $Y(t) = I(X \geq t)$. Define

$$M(t; \beta, \Lambda) = N(t) - \int_0^t Y(u) e^{\beta A} d\Lambda(u).$$

Note that $M(t; \beta, \Lambda)$ in general is not a martingale under model (1), creating theoretical challenges in designing an effective estimation scheme. To bridge the divide between the full data and the observed data, inverse probability weighting is commonly employed. This involves weighting an observation by its inverse probability of being sampled

from the target population (Horvitz and Thompson, 1952), resulting in a pseudo-random sample representing the desired population. Specifically, in the presence of non-randomized treatment in observational studies, as well as informative censoring dependent on the covariates, Hernán et al. (2001) applied IPTW and IPCW to obtain consistent estimates of the parameters, provided that the relevant models are correctly specified .

Let $\pi(Z) = pr(A = 1|Z)$ and $\tilde{\pi}(A, Z) = \pi(Z)^A\{1 - \pi(Z)\}^{1-A}$. In addition, let $S(t; A, Z) = P(T > t|A, Z)$ and $S_c(t; A, Z) = P(C > t|A, Z)$ denote the conditional survival function of T and C , respectively. We now have the IPW scores:

$$\begin{aligned} D_1^w(t; \beta, \Lambda, \pi, S_c) &= \frac{dM(t; \beta, \Lambda)}{\tilde{\pi}(A, Z)S_c(t; A, Z)}, \\ D_2^w(\beta, \Lambda, \pi, S_c) &= \int_0^\tau \frac{A \cdot dM(t; \beta, \Lambda)}{\tilde{\pi}(A, Z)S_c(t; A, Z)}. \end{aligned}$$

It can also be readily verified that for a random sample of observed data, $\sum_{i=1}^n D_{1i}^w(t; \beta, \Lambda, \pi, S_c) = 0$ gives a weighted Breslow's estimate of $\Lambda(t)$ and, after profiling out $\Lambda(\cdot)$, $\sum_{i=1}^n D_{2i}^w(\beta, \Lambda, \pi, S_c)$ gives the weighted partial likelihood score for β . The Supplementary Material contains a formal proof of identifiability of these causal estimands via the IPW scores (5) and (6).

2.4 Augmented IPW score

The IPW score is unbiased when the weights, or equivalently, $\pi(Z)$ and $S_c(t; A, Z)$ are known (Hernán et al., 2001). In practice these quantities are typically unknown. Propensity score models and conditional censoring models are often employed to estimate the respective conditional distributions. When these models are misspecified, the resulting estimate of the causal hazard ratio becomes inconsistent.

To protect against possible misspecification of the models, semiparametric theory has been developed to augment the IPW score (Tsiatis, 2006). The resulting AIPW score possesses the doubly robust properties that will be described in details later. In particular, Van der Laan and Robins (2003) augmented the IPTW score function for a binary treatment, and Rotnitzky and Robins (2005) augmented the IPCW score function for a survival parameter of interest. Here we apply these approaches together to the full data martingale increments, in order to simultaneously account for confounding and informative censoring. We will show that the resulting AIPW score is doubly robust.

Denote the counting process for censoring events $N_c(t) = I(X \leq t, \Delta = 0)$, and $\Lambda_c(t; A, Z) = -\int_0^t S_c(u; A, Z)^{-1} dS_c(u; A, Z)$ the cumulative hazard function of C given A, Z . Define $M_c(t; A, S_c) = N_c(t) - \int_0^t Y(u) d\Lambda_c(u; A, Z)$; then it is a martingale with respect to its natural history filtration. Following Zhang and Schaubele (2012b) and Luo and Xu (2022), define also the censor-free counting process $N_T(t) = I(T \leq t)$, and the censor-free at-risk process $Y_T(t) = I(T \geq t)$. Let $M_T(t; \beta, \Lambda) = N_T(t) - \int_0^t Y_T(u) e^{\beta A} d\Lambda(u)$. We note that M_T here is not a martingale, in the presence of confounding.

We proceed to simultaneously augment both equations (5) and (6), leading to AIPW estimate of β and Λ jointly. Joint augmentation mitigates potential bias that may emerge when augmenting distinct model components separately. By considering the interdependencies among augmented elements, it enhances the precision of parameter estimates, thereby bolstering the accuracy and reliability of inferential outcomes. Our simultaneous augmentation leads to the following new estimating equations:

$$D_1(t; \beta, \Lambda, \eta) = 0 \text{ and } D_2(\beta, \Lambda, \eta) = 0,$$

where η denotes the vector of three nuisance functions π, S and S_c (whenever possible),

$$\begin{aligned} D_1(t; \beta, \Lambda, \eta) &= \frac{dM(t; \beta, \Lambda)}{\tilde{\pi}(A, Z)S_c(t; A, Z)} - \frac{E\{dM_T(t; \beta, \Lambda)|A, Z\}}{\tilde{\pi}(A, Z)} + \sum_{a=0}^1 E\{dM_T(t; \beta, \Lambda)|A = a, Z\} \\ &+ \sum_{a=0}^1 w^a(A, Z) \int_0^t \frac{dM_c(u; a, S_c)}{S_c(u; a, Z)} E\{dM_T(t; \beta, \Lambda)|T \geq u, A = a, Z\}, \end{aligned}$$

with $w^a(A, Z) = A^a(1 - A)^{1-a}\{\tilde{\pi}(A, Z)\}^{-1}$, and

$$\begin{aligned} D_2(\beta, \Lambda, \eta) &= \int_0^\tau \left[\frac{A \cdot dM(t; \beta, \Lambda)}{\pi(Z)S_c(t; A, Z)} - \frac{A \cdot E\{dM_T(t; \beta, \Lambda)|A, Z\}}{\pi(Z)} + E\{dM_T(t; \beta, \Lambda)|A = 1, Z\} \right. \\ &+ \left. \frac{A}{\pi(Z)} \int_0^t \frac{dM_c(u; 1, S_c)}{S_c(u; 1, Z)} E\{dM_T(t; \beta, \Lambda)|T \geq u, A = 1, Z\} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Simplifying the conditional expectations above, leads to the newly proposed AIPW scores:

$$\begin{aligned} D_1(t; \beta, \Lambda, \eta) &= d\mathcal{N}^{(0)}(t; \eta) - \Gamma^{(0)}(t; \beta, \eta)d\Lambda(t), \\ D_2(\beta, \Lambda, \eta) &= \int_0^\tau d\mathcal{N}^{(1)}(t; \eta) - \Gamma^{(1)}(t; \beta, \eta)d\Lambda(t), \end{aligned}$$

where for $l = 0, 1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} d\mathcal{N}^{(l)}(t; \eta) &= \frac{A^l dN(t)}{\tilde{\pi}(A, Z)S_c(t; A, Z)} + \frac{A^l dS(t; A, Z)}{\tilde{\pi}(A, Z)} \\ &- \sum_{a=0}^1 a^l \{1 + w^a(A, Z)J(t; a, S, S_c)\} dS(t; a, Z), \\ \Gamma^{(l)}(t; \beta, \eta) &= \frac{A^l Y(t)e^{\beta A}}{\tilde{\pi}(A, Z)S_c(t; A, Z)} - \frac{A^l S(t; A, Z)e^{\beta A}}{\tilde{\pi}(A, Z)} \\ &+ \sum_{a=0}^1 a^l e^{\beta a} \{1 + w^a(A, Z)J(t; a, S, S_c)\} S(t; a, Z), \end{aligned}$$

and $J(t; a, S, S_c) = \int_0^t dM_c(u; a, S_c)/\{S(u; a, Z)S_c(u; a, Z)\}$. Note that the first term in $d\mathcal{N}^{(l)}(t; \cdot)$ is the IPW version of $A^l dN(t)$, and the rest are augmentation for both IPTW and IPCW used in the first term; these expressions are parallel to those derived in Tsiatis (2006) and Bai et al. (2017) for the simple mean of a (transformed) failure time. Similarly, $\Gamma^{(l)}(t; \cdot)$ can be seen as the augmented weighted $A^l Y(t)e^{\beta A}$. We also note that the observed $A^l dN(t)$ and $A^l Y(t)e^{\beta A}$ for $l = 0, 1$ correspond to the building blocks of the original full data score (2) - (3): $dN_T^a(t)$, $a \cdot dN_T^a(t)$,

$Y_T^a(u)e^{\beta a}$ and $a \cdot Y_T^a(u)e^{\beta a}$, respectively. In this way the AIPW score (7) - (8) parallels the full data score via weighting and then augmentation.

The theorem below introduces a crucial doubly robust property inherent to the newly introduced population score, elucidating the significance of the new joint augmentation. This theorem marks an initial stride towards the potential establishment of a rate or model double robust properties, and to the best of our knowledge, it stands as a novel contribution. It underscores that the population equations are centered when either one of the two key conditions holds (but not necessarily both): the first condition pertains to the accurate model specification for the conditional distribution of the failure time, while the second condition concerns the correct model specification of both missingness mechanisms, the conditional censoring as well as the treatment assignment probability. In the following the superscript ‘ o ’ denotes the true value of a parameter.

Theorem 1. *Under Assumptions 1-5, if either $S = S^o$, or both $S_c = S_c^o$ and $\pi = \pi^o$, then for all t , $E\{D_1(t; \beta^o, \Lambda^o, \pi, S, S_c)\} = E\{D_2(\beta^o, \Lambda^o, \pi, S, S_c)\} = 0$.*

3 Misspecified Cox model

The proportional hazards assumption under model (1) might be violated. Without this assumption a saturated model for the causal log hazard ratio that may change over time is

$$\lambda_{T(a)}(t) = \lambda_0(t) \exp\{\beta(t)a\}.$$

Obviously $\beta(t) = \log\{\lambda_{T(1)}(t)/\lambda_{T(0)}(t)\}$. Under the saturated model (11), instead of estimating $\beta(t)$ at every t , in practice it is often of interest to estimate an average log hazard ratio:

$$\beta^* = \frac{\int_0^\tau \omega(t)\beta(t)dt}{\int_0^\tau \omega(t)dt},$$

where $\omega(t) > 0$ is a weight function. If $\beta(t) = \beta_0$, then $\beta^* = \beta_0$.

Under model (11) we may still consider for the full data

$$M_T^a(t; \beta, \Lambda) = N_T^a(t) - \int_0^t Y_T^a(u)e^{\beta a} d\Lambda(u),$$

where $\Lambda(\cdot)$ is right-continuous, non-decreasing with $\Lambda(0) = 0$ and $\Lambda(\tau) < \infty$. Note that $M_T^a(t; \beta, \Lambda)$ is no longer a full data martingale for any constant β (and Λ) if the proportional hazards assumption is violated, i.e. model (1) does not hold.

In order to understand what the full data score (2) and (3) estimate under the saturated model (11), we have the following lemma.

Lemma 1. Under (11) the full data equations $E\{D_1^f(t; \beta, \Lambda)\} = 0$ for each t and $E\{D_2^f(\beta, \Lambda)\} = 0$ have unique solution β^* and $\Lambda^*(t)$ satisfying

$$h(\beta^*) := \int_0^\tau \{\mathcal{E}(\beta(t), t) - \mathcal{E}(\beta^*, t)\} \cdot \sum_{a=0}^1 dF_a(t) = 0,$$

$$\Lambda^*(t) = \int_0^t \frac{\sum_{a=0}^1 dF_a(t)}{\sum_{a=0}^1 S_a(t) e^{\beta^* a}},$$

where $S_a(t) = 1 - F_a(t) = P(T(a) > T)$, and $\mathcal{E}(\beta, t) = e^\beta S_1(t) / \sum_{a=0}^1 e^{\beta a} S_a(t)$.

It can be immediately verified from (13) and (14) that if $\beta(t) = \beta_0$, then $\beta^* = \beta_0$ and $\Lambda^*(\cdot) = \Lambda(\cdot)$ under the marginal structural Cox model (1). In Figure 1 we provide some examples of $T(a)$ distributions and the corresponding β^* values. As illustrated in the figure as well as evident from Lemma 1, the estimand β^* is *well-specified* (Buja et al., 2019c,b) as a functional of the potential outcome distributions only; it does not depend on the treatment assignment mechanism, or the covariate distribution, or the censoring mechanism.




Figure 1: Top row represents the hazard functions for $a = 0$ (blue) and $a = 1$ (red). In the bottom row we have the corresponding log hazard ratio $\beta(t)$ with red dotted line indicating β^* . We use the following scenarios: (a) $\log\{T(a)\} \sim N(-0.5a, 1)$ for $a = 0, 1$; (b) $\log\{T(0)\} \sim N(1.5, 1)$, $T(1) \sim \text{Unif}(0, 10)$; (c) $\log\{T(a)\} = -a + \epsilon$ for $a = 0, 1$ with $\epsilon \sim \text{logistic}$; (d) $\log\{T(0)\} = 2 + \epsilon$ with $\epsilon \sim \text{logistic}$, and $T(1) \sim \text{Unif}(0, 10)$.

To help further understand its interpretation, from (13) using the mean value theorem or first-order Taylor

expansion we can see that (12) holds with $\omega(t) = v(\tilde{\beta}(t), t) \cdot \sum_{a=0}^1 f_a(t)$, where

$$v(\beta, t) = \frac{\partial}{\partial \beta} \mathcal{E}(\beta, t) = \frac{e^\beta S_0(t) S_1(t)}{\{S_0(t) + e^\beta S_1(t)\}^2},$$

$f_a(t) = dF_a(t)/dt$ and $\tilde{\beta}(t)$ lies between $\beta(t)$ and β^* . The above is in fact equivalent to [Xu and O'Quigley \(2000\)](#) under 1:1 randomized treatments, where (13) becomes

$$\int_0^\tau \{E_{\beta(t)}(A|T=t) - E_{\beta^*}(A|T=t)\} dF(t) = 0,$$

and $F(t)$ is the CDF of T . In this case we also have that $\omega(t) = v(\tilde{\beta}(t), t) \cdot f(t)$, $v(\beta(t), t) = \text{Var}(A|T=t)$ which changes very mildly over t for a finite τ , and $f(t) = dF(t)/dt$.

Finally, since model (11) is saturated, we have as special cases when $T(a)$ follows the semiparametric transformation model

$$g(T(a)) = \gamma a + \epsilon,$$

for $a = 0, 1$, where $g(\cdot)$ is an unspecified strictly increasing function, and ϵ is a member of the G^ρ family ([Harrington and Fleming, 1982](#)). Similar to [Xu and Harrington \(2001\)](#) it can be shown that if τ is large so that $P(T(a) < \tau) = 1$ for $a = 0, 1$, then $\beta^* = -\gamma/(\rho + 1)$ ([Luo, 2023](#)). In this way estimation of the average log hazard ratio β^* leads immediately to the estimation of the causal effect γ under the semiparametric transformation model (16), as $\rho \geq 0$ is assumed known under the model.

Once we understand what the full data score (2) and (3) estimate, it is then perhaps not surprising that with observed data, the AIPW score (7) and (8) identify the causal estimand β^* and Λ^* under model (11). This is shown in the following theorem, together with the doubly robust property just as previously stated under model (1) but now without the proportional hazards assumption.

Theorem 1'. *Under Assumptions 1-5, if either $S = S^o$, or both $S_c = S_c^o$ and $\pi = \pi^o$, then for all t , $E\{D_1(t; \beta^*, \Lambda^*, \pi, S, S_c)\} = E\{D_2(\beta^*, \Lambda^*, \pi, S, S_c)\} = 0$.*

The above result stands in stark contrast to the previous literature under the Cox regression model, where the partial likelihood serves as the standard approach under the proportional hazards assumption, as long as the censoring distribution is independent of the failure time, given the covariates in the regression model. The marginal structural model, on the other hand, does not include any covariates, so IPCW is applied from the start, and AIPW leads to improved robustness and possibly efficiency. In this way, as will be shown in the next section our joint augmentation provides an umbrella approach that gives valid inference for β^o under the marginal structural Cox model (1), but also at the same time, valid inference for the causal estimand β^* (and Λ^*) under the saturated model (11). This is particularly relevant for practical applications where, as we will illustrate later, if we believe that model (1) holds, we

are estimating the log hazard ratio β^o ; in the case that model (1) fails, we are estimating the time-averaged log hazard ratio β^* . The result therefore remains interpretable under possibly misspecified marginal structural Cox model, hence satisfying both the assumption-lean and the well-specification criteria discussed in [Buja et al. \(2019a,c,b\)](#).

4 Asymptotic Double Robust Properties

4.1 Estimation

In the following we assume the general model (11), with model (1) as a special case where $\beta^* = \beta^o$. Given i.i.d. observations $(X_i, \delta_i, A_i, Z_i)$, $i = 1, \dots, n$, we may estimate (β^*, Λ^*) by solving

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n D_{1i}(t; \beta, \Lambda, \eta) = 0 \text{ and } \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n D_{2i}(\beta, \Lambda, \eta) = 0. \quad (17)$$

For $l = 0, 1$, define $\mathcal{S}^{(l)}(t; \beta, \eta) = n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \Gamma_i^{(l)}(t; \beta, \eta)$. Solving for Λ in (17) we obtain a newly proposed AIPW estimate

$$\tilde{\Lambda}(t; \beta, \eta) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \int_0^t \frac{d\mathcal{N}_i^{(0)}(u; \eta)}{\mathcal{S}^{(0)}(u; \beta, \eta)}.$$

With it, we can go back to (17) and obtain a new AIPW estimate of β that solves the estimating equation $U(\beta; \eta) = 0$, with

$$U(\beta; \eta) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \int_0^\tau d\mathcal{N}_i^{(1)}(t; \eta) - \bar{A}(t; \beta, \eta) d\mathcal{N}_i^{(0)}(t; \eta),$$

and $\bar{A}(t; \beta, \eta) = \mathcal{S}^{(1)}(t; \beta, \eta) / \mathcal{S}^{(0)}(t; \beta, \eta)$. We note that $U(\beta; \eta)$ has a parallel expression to the partial likelihood score function under the Cox model, observing that $\bar{A}(t; \cdot)$ is the sum of augmented $A_i e^{\beta A_i} Y_i(t)$ divided by the sum of augmented $e^{\beta A_i} Y_i(t)$, and $d\mathcal{N}_i^{(l)}(t; \eta)$ is the augmented $A_i^l dN_i(t)$ for $l = 0, 1$ as mentioned before. As demonstrated below, these augmentations yield the doubly robust property for inference in large samples. The above derivation and result is to the best of our knowledge new to the literature.

In the above the nuisance functions $\pi(z)$, $S(t; a, z)$ and $S_c(t; a, z)$ are unknown in practice and need to be estimated. We utilize the cross-fitting procedure that is commonly considered in the literature ([Hasminskii and Ibragimov, 1979](#); [Bickel, 1982](#); [Robins et al., 2008](#); [Chernozhukov et al., 2018](#)) and, as will be shown later, provides root- n inference for β^* . The estimation procedure is summarized in Algorithm 1, where the details of the relevant quantities are further given in the Supplementary Material, although the notation used here should also be self-explanatory. Following the fit, under the marginal structural Cox model (1) if needed we may also estimate the survival probabilities, or one minus the risk, $P(T(a) > t)$ by $\exp\{-\hat{\Lambda}(t) \exp(\hat{\beta}a)\}$.

Algorithm 1 Jointly Augmented Cox DR Estimator

Require: A sample of n observations, $(X_i, \delta_i, A_i, Z_i)_{i=1}^n$.

Split the full sample into k folds indexed by $\mathcal{I}_1, \mathcal{I}_2, \dots, \mathcal{I}_k$.

for each fold indexed by m **do**

Let $\mathcal{I}_{-m} := \{1, \dots, n\} \setminus \mathcal{I}_m$

Estimate nuisances $\hat{\eta}^{(-m)} = (\hat{\pi}^{(-m)}, \hat{S}^{(-m)}, \hat{S}_c^{(-m)})$ using the out-of-fold sample \mathcal{I}_{-m} .

Obtain $U_m(\beta, \hat{\eta}^{(-m)})$, the m -th fold estimating equation for β ,

by profiling out Λ from the in-fold equation $\sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_m} D_{1i}(t; \beta, \Lambda, \hat{\eta}^{(-m)}) = 0$.

Construct $\tilde{\Lambda}_m(t; \hat{\beta}, \hat{\eta}^{(-m)})$ as in (18).

end for

return $\hat{\beta}$ as the solution to $U_{cf}(\beta) = 0$ with

$$U_{cf}(\beta) = \frac{1}{k} \sum_{m=1}^k U_m(\beta, \hat{\eta}^{(-m)}) \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{\Lambda}(t) = \frac{1}{k} \sum_{m=1}^k \tilde{\Lambda}_m(t; \hat{\beta}, \hat{\eta}^{(-m)}).$$

4.2 Asymptotic properties and inference

We first focus on rate double robustness and describe some additional assumptions. Let O^\dagger denote a random sample $\{(X_i^\dagger, \Delta_i^\dagger, A_i^\dagger, Z_i^\dagger), i = 1, \dots, n\}$ used for estimating $\hat{\pi}$, \hat{S} and \hat{S}_c . Let (X, Δ, A, Z) be a data point independent of O^\dagger and drawn from the same distribution as O^\dagger . Define below for $f = S, S_c$, where E^\dagger denotes expectation with respect to $(X^\dagger, \Delta^\dagger, A^\dagger, Z^\dagger)$, and E denotes expectation with respect to (X, Δ, A, Z) conditional on O^\dagger ,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\hat{\pi} - \pi^*\|_{\dagger}^2 &= E^\dagger \left[E[\hat{\pi}(Z) - \pi^*(Z)]^2 \right], \\ \|\hat{f} - f^*\|_{\dagger}^2 &= E^\dagger \left[E \left[\sup_{t \in [0, \tau], a \in \{0, 1\}} |\hat{f}(t; a, Z) - f^*(t; a, Z)|^2 \right] \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Assumption 6 (Uniform Convergence). *There exist deterministic limits $\pi^*(z)$, $S^*(t; a, z)$ and $S_c^*(t; a, z)$ such that $\|\hat{\pi} - \pi^*\|_{\dagger} = o(1)$, $\|\hat{S} - S^*\|_{\dagger} = o(1)$ and $\|\hat{S}_c - S_c^*\|_{\dagger} = o(1)$.*

We should point out that the above assumption does not require any of the three models to be correctly specified. Instead, it simply asserts that these models possess population counterparts towards which they converge. This condition is generally fulfilled for the Donsker model class, regardless of whether they exhibit biases. The following theorem provides doubly robust consistency of $\hat{\beta}$, in cases where either the outcome model (i.e. the failure time model) or the missingness model (i.e. the censoring time model and the treatment assignment model) is correctly specified, but not necessarily both, and our proposed estimator remains valid.

Theorem 2 (Consistency). *Under Assumptions 1-6 and additional regularity Assumptions 8-11 in the Supplementary Material, if either $S^* = S^o$, or $(\pi^*, S_c^*) = (\pi^o, S_c^o)$, then $\hat{\beta} \xrightarrow{P} \beta^*$.*

We remind the reader that the limit β^* to which $\hat{\beta}$ converges is the true log hazard ratio when the marginal structural Cox model (1) holds, but otherwise it is the time-averaged log hazard ratio described in the Section 3.

Now let O denote a random sample $\{(X_j, \Delta_j, A_j, Z_j), j = 1, \dots, n\}$ that is independent of O^\dagger above, and drawn from the same distribution as O^\dagger . Recall that $\eta^o = (\pi^o, S^o, S_c^o)^\top$, and define $\tilde{J}_i(t; a) = J_i(t; a, \hat{S}, \hat{S}_c) - J_i(t; a, \hat{S}, S_c^o)$ and $\bar{J}_i(t; a) = J_i(t; a, S^o, \hat{S}_c) - J_i(t; a, S^o, S_c^o)$, with $J_i(t; a, S, S_c) = \int_0^t dM_{ci}(u; a, S_c) / \{S_i(u; a) S_{ci}(u; a)\}$ defined in Section 2. Here we use various shorthand notations of the likes of $\hat{S}_i(t; a) = \hat{S}(t; a, Z_i)$ and $S_i^o(t; a) = S^o(t; a, Z_i)$. Then, with $d\mathcal{K}_i(t, u; a) = d\hat{S}_i(t; a)d\tilde{J}_i(u; a) - dS_i^o(t; a)d\bar{J}_i(u; a)$ we define the *cross integral products* $\mathcal{D}_1^\dagger := \mathcal{D}_1^\dagger(\hat{S}, \hat{S}_c; \eta^o)$ and $\mathcal{D}_2^\dagger := \mathcal{D}_2^\dagger(\hat{S}, \hat{S}_c; \eta^o)$ as

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{D}_1^\dagger &= E^\dagger \left[E \left[\max_{a \in \{0,1\}} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left| \int_0^\tau \int_0^t \{a - \bar{A}(t; \beta^*, \eta^o)\} d\mathcal{K}_i(t, u; a) \right| \right] \right], \\ \mathcal{D}_2^\dagger &= E^\dagger \left[E \left[\max_{a, t \in \{0,1\}} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left| \int_0^\tau \delta(t, \beta^*) J_i(t; a, S^o, \hat{S}_c) \{d\hat{S}_i(t; a) - dS_i^o(t; a)\} \right| \right] \right],\end{aligned}$$

where $\delta(t, \beta^*) = \bar{A}(t; \beta^*, \pi^o, S^o, \hat{S}_c) - \bar{A}(t; \beta^*, \eta^o)$ and E denotes expectation with respect to O conditional on O^\dagger .

Assumption 7 (Rate Condition).

$$\|\hat{S} - S^o\|_{\dagger} \left(\|\hat{\pi} - \pi^o\|_{\dagger} + \|\hat{S}_c - S_c^o\|_{\dagger} \right) + \mathcal{D}_1^\dagger(\hat{S}, \hat{S}_c; \eta^o) + \mathcal{D}_2^\dagger(\hat{S}, \hat{S}_c; \eta^o) = o(n^{-1/2}).$$

Note that in addition to the common products of error rates as in Chernozhukov et al. (2018); Rotnitzky et al. (2021); Hou et al. (2023), we also have the cross integral product terms. These integral terms are needed because we have two nuisance functions that involve time t ; in contrast, the mixed bias property of Rotnitzky et al. (2021) suffices when at most one of the nuisance functions involves t , as in their cases. Similar integral terms in rate conditions can be found in Wang et al. (2022) and Vansteelandt et al. (2022).

Theorem 3 (Rate Double Robustness). *Under Assumptions 1-7 and additional regularity Assumptions 8-11 in the Supplementary Material, if $(\pi^*, S^*, S_c^*) = (\pi^o, S^o, S_c^o)$, we have*

$$\hat{\sigma}^{-1} \sqrt{n} (\hat{\beta} - \beta^*) \xrightarrow{d} N(0, 1),$$

where the expression for $\hat{\sigma}^2 := \hat{\sigma}^2(\hat{\beta})$ is also provided in the Supplementary Material.

Theorem 3 establishes the rate double robustness property, and as mentioned before this solves the compatibility issue due to the non-collapsibility of the Cox regression models via the use of machine learning or other nonparametric approaches to estimate the nuisance functions. Traditionally, Neyman orthogonal scores (Neyman, 1959) have been considered in the semiparametric literature which, when combined with cross-fitting, gives \sqrt{n} consistent estimators, as long as all nuisance parameters are estimated at faster than $n^{-1/4}$ rate (Newey, 1994; Rotnitzky et al., 2021). However, this $n^{-1/4}$ rate requirement still rules out a number of data adaptive machine learning methods (Bilodeau,

2022; Ogburn et al., 2022; Tang, 2022). The rate double robustness result here improves upon the $n^{-1/4}$ rate requirement: $\hat{\beta}$ is consistent and asymptotically normal even if one of \hat{S} or $(\hat{\pi}, \hat{S}_c)$ converges arbitrarily slow, as long as their product error rate is faster than \sqrt{n} . In practice, very few of the machine learning methods used for time-to-event data have known convergence rates, and in the Simulations section below we will investigate empirically the performance of the methods.

Lastly, if we are satisfied with the saturated model (11) and do not insist on model (1) being valid, we can explore parametric or semiparametric models for the nuisance functions π , S , and S_c , as the compatibility issue is no longer a concern. In this case, no cross-fitting is needed, and $\hat{\pi}$, \hat{S} and \hat{S}_c are regular and asymptotically linear estimators of π , S and S_c , respectively. Let π^* , S^* and S_c^* be their limits; that is, $\|\hat{\pi} - \pi^*\| = \|\hat{S} - S^*\| = \|\hat{S}_c - S_c^*\| = o(1)$, where $\|\hat{\pi} - \pi^*\|^2 = E\{|\hat{\pi}(Z) - \pi^*(Z)|^2\}$, $\|\hat{S} - S^*\|^2 = E\{\sup_{t \in [0, \tau], a \in \{0, 1\}} |\hat{S}(t; a, Z) - S^*(t; a, Z)|^2\}$, and $\|\hat{S}_c - S_c^*\|^2 = E\{\sup_{t \in [0, \tau], a \in \{0, 1\}} |\hat{S}_c(t; a, Z) - S_c^*(t; a, Z)|^2\}$. Similar to Hou et al. (2023) and Wang et al. (2022) it can be shown that the solution $\hat{\beta}_{dr}$ to $U(\beta; \hat{\eta}) = 0$ in (19) enjoys the classical model doubly robust property: it is consistent and asymptotically normal if either $S^* = S^o$ or $(\pi^*, S_c^*) = (\pi^o, S_c^o)$.

5 Numerical Work

5.1 Simulations

In this section, we assess the performance of the proposed estimator under the marginal structural Cox model (1). Extended simulations under the general model (11) are provided in the Supplementary Material. The codes developed in this work has been implemented in the R (R Core Team, 2021) package `CoxAIPW` which is available on CRAN. The package allows three choices: for 1) causal inference with non-randomized observational data but no informative censoring (i.e. AIPTW only), 2) informative censoring without causal inference (AIPCW only), and 3) both causal inference with observational data and informative censoring (AIPW as described in this paper).




Figure 2: Diagram for the data generating mechanism

To induce confounding within a marginal structural model, we adopt the approach outlined by Havercroft and

Didelez (2012). This involves simulating latent variables linked to both the covariates and the event outcome. Let $U = (U_1, U_2, U_3)^T$ where $U_1 \sim \text{Unif}(-1, 1)$, $U_2 \sim \text{Unif}(-1, 1)$ and $U_3 \sim \text{Unif}(-1, 1)$. Let $Z = (Z_1, Z_2, Z_3)^T$ where $Z_1 = 0.5U_1 + U_3$, $Z_2 = U_1 + 1.5U_1^2 - 0.5$ and $Z_3 = U_1 + U_2$. Let $T(a) = -\log(0.5U_1 + 0.5)\exp(a)$ for $a = 0, 1$. This gives $T(a)$ which follows model (1) with $\beta^o = -1$ and $\lambda_0^g(t) = 1$. We then simulate $C(a)$ and A according to the four scenarios described in Table 1, each giving about 50% per treatment arm and about 40% censored due to loss to follow-up. Finally let $T = AT(1) + (1 - A)T(0)$ and $C = AC(1) + (1 - A)C(0)$. For all simulations we set $\tau = 1$; note that this is the maximum time for estimating both the T and C distributions. The details of this data generation process are elaborated in Figure 2. Each scenario involves 1,000 simulated datasets of $n = 1000$, yielding a margin of error about $\pm 1.35\%$ for the 95% confidence intervals.

Table 1: Four scenarios for generating $C(a)$ and A .

Scenario	Details
1	$\epsilon \sim \text{Unif}(0, 1)$
$C(a)$: Cox	$C(a) = -\log(\epsilon)\exp(0.5 + 0.5a - Z_2 + 0.5Z_3)$
A : Logistic	$\text{logit}\{\pi(Z)\} = 0.5Z_1 - 0.5Z_2 - 0.5Z_3$
2	$\epsilon \sim \text{Unif}(0, 1)$
$C(a)$: Cox	$C(a) = -\log(\epsilon)\exp(0.5 + 0.5a - Z_2 + 0.5Z_3)$
A : Soft Partition	$\text{logit}\{\pi(Z)\} = -3 \cdot \mathbf{1}\{Z_2 < -0.5\} + 3 \cdot \mathbf{1}\{-0.5 \leq Z_2 < 0.5\} - 3 \cdot \mathbf{1}\{Z_2 \geq 0.5\}$
3	$\epsilon \sim \text{Unif}(0, 1)$
$C(a)$: Uniform-Cox	$C(0) = 1.05\epsilon, C(1) = -\log(\epsilon)\exp(3.3 + 3.5Z_3)$
A : Logistic	$\text{logit}\{\pi(Z)\} = 0.5Z_1 - 0.5Z_2 - 0.5Z_3$
4	$\epsilon \sim \text{Unif}(0, 1)$
$C(a)$: Uniform-Cox	$C(0) = 1.05\epsilon, C(1) = -\log(\epsilon)\exp(3.3 + 3.5Z_3)$
A : Soft Partition	$\text{logit}\{\pi(Z)\} = -3 \cdot \mathbf{1}\{Z_2 < -0.5\} + 3 \cdot \mathbf{1}\{-0.5 \leq Z_2 < 0.5\} - 3 \cdot \mathbf{1}\{Z_2 \geq 0.5\}$

We contrast the AIPW estimator, using different working models, with the IPW estimator, the partial likelihood estimator under the naive Cox model, and a full data estimator. We estimate the conditional distributions of T and C given A and Z using Cox regression and the random survival forest (Ishwaran et al., 2008, RSF) from the R package `randomForestSRC`. For A given Z , we used logistic regression and the gradient boosted models (GBM) from the R package `twang` (Ridgeway et al., 2022). RSF settings included the ‘`bs.gradient`’ split rule, while default settings were maintained for other hyperparameters in both `twang` and RSF. Five-fold cross-fitting was implemented.

For stability, values of $\hat{S}(t; a, z)$, $\hat{S}_c(t; a, z)$ were restricted to be at least 0.05, and $\hat{\pi}(z)$ between 0.1 and 0.9. For each dataset, we calculated model-based and bootstrap standard errors, the latter with 100 replicates, and constructed 95% confidence intervals using the normal approximation. For the full data estimator, the robust sandwich estimator was applied to account for potential intra-subject outcome correlations.

Tables 2 and 3 show the bias, standard deviation (SD), standard error (SE) and coverage probabilities of the estimators under Scenarios 1 – 4, respectively. Additional plots to visualize the results are provided in the Supplementary Material. We see that under Scenario 1 all eight AIPW estimators have small biases and good coverage probabilities, even when the conditional Cox model for T is wrong (marked in red). This is no longer the case under Scenarios 2 and 3 when both the conditional Cox model for T and one of the models for C or A is wrong. Note that under Scenario 2, when RSF is used for the conditional T model and logistic regression is incorrectly applied for the propensity score model, the biases are relatively substantial, with coverage only at around 80% in both cases. We think that this has to do with the fact that rate double robustness when machine learning is involved requires all nuisance estimates to be consistent, at least theoretically. Under Scenario 4 the RSF/RSF-GBM estimator using all machine learning methods has the smallest bias and is the only one with correct coverage. The IPW estimators perform well under Scenario 1 with correctly specified working models for C and A . However, their performance is generally poor in Scenarios 2 through 4, including the RSF-GBM estimator, which exhibits slower convergence when machine learning methods are used for weight estimation.

5.2 Honolulu-Asia Aging Study

We analyze data from the Honolulu-Asia Aging Study (HAAS), which began in 1991 as an extension of the Honolulu Heart Program project (HHP, 1965-1974). The objective is to examine the impact of various mid- and late-life exposures, on outcomes including cognitive and motor impairment, stroke, other common chronic conditions, and mortality. Both studies followed a cohort of Japanese men born between 1900 and 1919, residing in Hawaii. The dataset comprises 2079 participants, with 552 classified as heavy drinkers (> 2 drinks/day) at some point during mid-life. We consider covariates such as age, systolic blood pressure, heart rate at baseline, and years of education attained. The maximum follow-up duration is set at 13 years. In total, 47% of participants died, 21% were censored due to loss to follow-up, and the remaining 32% were alive at the 13-year mark. Our specific focus here is the impact of mid-life alcohol exposure on late-life mortality.

Figure 3 shows the point estimates and the corresponding 95% bootstrap-based confidence intervals for all 13 estimators; a corresponding table is also provided in the Supplementary Material. The naive Cox estimate yields the largest point estimate at 0.30, whereas the IPW estimates are smaller after adjusting for confounding and informative censoring. Notably, the AIPW estimates, particularly those employing machine learning methods, show considerably

Table 2: Scenarios 1 - 2 of simulation; true $\beta^o = -1$. **Red** indicates that the model is wrong.

Scenario	Estimator	<i>T/C-A</i> Models	Bias	SD	SE	Coverage
					Model/Boot	Model/Boot
1	AIPW	Cox/Cox-logit	0.002	0.059	0.060/0.059	0.95/0.94
		Cox/Cox-GBM	0.003	0.058	0.061/0.060	0.96/0.94
		Cox/RSF-logit	0.004	0.057	0.060/0.059	0.96/0.96
		Cox/RSF-GBM	0.003	0.056	0.062/0.060	0.97/0.96
		RSF/Cox-logit	0.002	0.053	0.053/0.053	0.95/0.94
		RSF/Cox-GBM	0.008	0.054	0.054/0.055	0.95/0.95
		RSF/RSF-logit	0.005	0.053	0.053/0.054	0.95/0.94
		RSF/RSF-GBM	0.011	0.054	0.055/0.056	0.95/0.95
	IPW	Cox-logit	0.000	0.067	- /0.066	- /0.94
		Cox-GBM	0.031	0.069	- /0.069	- /0.92
		RSF-logit	0.026	0.060	- /0.064	- /0.95
		RSF-GBM	0.005	0.062	- /0.068	- /0.97
	Naive Cox		0.496	0.100	0.100/0.101	0.00/0.00
	Full Data		0.001	0.029	0.028/ -	0.95/ -
	2	AIPW	Cox/Cox-logit	0.260	0.064	0.068/0.066
Cox/Cox-GBM			0.018	0.086	0.093/0.088	0.96/0.95
Cox/RSF-logit			0.268	0.063	0.069/0.066	0.02/0.02
Cox/RSF-GBM			0.033	0.080	0.090/0.084	0.95/0.94
RSF/Cox-logit			0.050	0.071	0.056/0.061	0.80/0.83
RSF/Cox-GBM			0.003	0.073	0.073/0.075	0.94/0.94
RSF/RSF-logit			0.052	0.071	0.056/0.061	0.80/0.83
RSF/RSF-GBM			0.009	0.073	0.073/0.075	0.95/0.94
IPW		Cox-logit	0.164	0.093	- /0.092	- /0.58
		Cox-GBM	0.103	0.118	- /0.106	- /0.83
		RSF-logit	0.177	0.084	- /0.088	- /0.48
		RSF-GBM	0.134	0.107	- /0.101	- /0.74
Naive Cox			0.579	0.119	0.125/0.125	0.00/0.00
Full Data			0.001	0.029	0.028/ -	0.95/ -

Table 3: Scenarios 3 - 4 of simulation; true $\beta^o = -1$. **Red** indicates that the model is wrong.

Scenario	Estimator	<i>T/C-A</i> Models	Bias	SD	SE	Coverage	
					Model/Boot	Model/Boot	
3	AIPW	Cox/Cox-logit	0.146	0.106	0.108/0.109	0.79/0.78	
		Cox/Cox-GBM	0.146	0.108	0.114/0.120	0.81/0.83	
		Cox/RSF-logit	0.015	0.103	0.122/0.118	0.98/0.97	
		Cox/RSF-GBM	0.014	0.104	0.126/0.125	0.98/0.98	
		RSF/Cox-logit	0.007	0.092	0.098/0.097	0.95/0.94	
		RSF/Cox-GBM	0.001	0.095	0.101/0.104	0.95/0.95	
		RSF/RSF-logit	0.019	0.097	0.102/0.104	0.96/0.95	
		RSF/RSF-GBM	0.026	0.098	0.103/0.111	0.96/0.97	
	IPW	Cox-logit	0.305	0.112	- /0.103	- /0.21	
		Cox-GBM	0.335	0.115	- /0.104	- /0.16	
		RSF-logit	0.077	0.078	- /0.079	- /0.84	
		RSF-GBM	0.109	0.082	- /0.082	- /0.73	
	Naive Cox		0.895	0.108	0.110/0.110	0.00/0.00	
	Full Data		0.001	0.029	0.028/ -	0.95/ -	
	4	AIPW	Cox/Cox-logit	0.347	0.120	0.138/0.143	0.14/0.24
			Cox/Cox-GBM	0.135	0.131	0.116/0.129	0.72/0.78
			Cox/RSF-logit	0.361	0.201	0.343/0.224	0.50/0.71
			Cox/RSF-GBM	0.084	0.140	0.149/0.157	0.88/0.90
RSF/Cox-logit			0.075	0.107	0.101/0.105	0.89/0.89	
RSF/Cox-GBM			0.026	0.105	0.096/0.106	0.90/0.92	
RSF/RSF-logit			0.143	0.137	0.174/0.155	0.88/0.93	
RSF/RSF-GBM			0.020	0.124	0.119/0.132	0.94/0.94	
IPW		Cox-logit	0.063	0.130	- /0.124	- /0.90	
		Cox-GBM	0.249	0.130	- /0.117	- /0.41	
		RSF-logit	0.163	0.112	- /0.104	- /0.66	
		RSF-GBM	0.005	0.129	- /0.112	- /0.91	
Naive Cox			0.562	0.120	0.132/0.132	0.00/0.00	
Full Data			0.001	0.028	0.028/ -	0.95/ -	




Figure 3: Forest plot of the (time-averaged) log hazard ratio estimates of the effect of mid-life alcohol exposure (heavy versus not heavy) on overall survival for the HAAS data.

smaller log hazard ratio estimates compared to the IPW estimates. All estimates confirm a statistically significant increased risk associated with mid-life alcohol exposure on mortality, although the precision of these estimates varies. We note also that the lack of validity of the IPW based inference renders the confidence intervals questionable. Additionally, our approach provides estimates of the risk difference $P(T(1) \leq t) - P(T(0) \leq t)$ and the risk ratio $P(T(1) \leq t)/P(T(0) \leq t)$; see a figure in the Supplementary Material for $t = 3, 4, \dots, 12$ years.

We would like to remind the reader that when we refer to the log hazard ratio above, we assume that the proportional hazards assumption holds. To date, there is a notable absence of diagnostic tools designed for assessing the marginal structural Cox model. Nevertheless, as expounded upon in the subsequent section, the development of such tools appears feasible with the aid of the AIPW estimators introduced in this paper, which would hold significant practical significance.

If there are concerns about the proportional hazards assumption, interpreting the estimand as the time-averaged log hazard ratio (Section 3) is a useful approach. This interpretation is always useful, as discussed in [Buja et al. \(2019b\)](#), where it is noted that testing the assumption on the same data set can lead to post-selection inference issues.

6 Discussion

We have derived an AIPW estimator for the log hazard ratio under the marginal structural Cox model, both with the proportional hazard assumption and allowing it to be violated. The estimator possesses rate doubly robust property which provides a solution to the challenge otherwise posed by the non-collapsibility of the Cox model. In this way it becomes possible to protect against misspecification of the propensity score model which would otherwise invalidate the Cox-IPW approach. We believe that in place of the Cox-IPW estimator commonly used in practice, the AIPW estimator should be routinely used. In addition, as indicated in Luo (2023) the explicit expression of the AIPW estimator can lead to diagnostics of the proportional hazard assumption in the marginal structural Cox model, and this would be of interest for future work.

The full data estimating equations involving martingale type increments considered in this paper are more broadly applicable to other semiparametric survival models, such as the additive hazards model (Lin and Ying, 1994) or the transformation cure model (Lu and Ying, 2004). We expect that the joint augmentation technique can be similarly applied, so that doubly robust approaches may be developed for these other marginal structural models besides the Cox one, for analyzing observational studies with survival outcomes.

In the context of model misspecification we could not agree more with Cox (1995) that models are simplifications and idealizations of reality. While it is important to carefully examine any estimation procedure under the model assumptions, it is also very useful to know, in the (often inevitable) situations when a model is misspecified, what we are estimating. Our development in this paper clearly established that the estimand β^* (and Λ^*), outside of the marginal structural Cox model, meets the criteria of well-specification (Buja et al., 2019c,b). That is, it is a functional of the potential outcome distributions only, and does not depend on the treatment assignment mechanism, or the covariate distribution, or the censoring mechanism. This is imperative for such an estimand, so that it remains interpretable in the absence of randomization, as well as not affected by specific recruitment patterns of any studies which translate to censoring mechanisms.

We note that among the discussion surrounding Buja et al. (2019a,c), Whitney et al. (2019) advocated for an estimand closely related to ours: $\int \beta(t)f(t)dt$. We speculate that it is possible to incorporate different weights into (12) through deconstruction of Lemma 1 together with the expression of $\omega(t)$ following it, although this is beyond the scope of the current paper. Vansteelandt et al. (2022) also focused on assumption-lean Cox regression. They considered an averaged log cumulative hazard ratio as the estimand, but the time interval on which the average is taken has to be bounded away from time zero. On the other hand, the proportional hazards assumption, if at all, is more likely satisfied before too much time has elapsed. In this sense the approach seems more like an alternative instead of assumption-lean.

Our AIPW approach with the saturated model may also offer a novel perspective for handling situations with a large number of covariates or effect modifiers, addressing both precise parameter identification and high-dimensionality. The concept of an average, also referred to as least-false, parameter introduces a fresh viewpoint with the potential for more efficient utilization of high-dimensional structures than precise models. While significant and promising, this extension falls beyond our study’s scope; nevertheless, our joint augmentation framework has laid the groundwork for future exploration.

Acknowledgement

This research was partially supported by NIH/NIA grant R03 AG062432 as well as NSF-DMS grant 1712481.

References

- Andersen, P. K. and Gill, R. D. (1982). Cox’s regression model for counting processes: a large sample study. The Annals of Statistics, 10:1100–1120.
- Bai, X., Tsiatis, A. A., Lu, W., and Song, R. (2017). Optimal treatment regimes for survival endpoints using a locally-efficient doubly-robust estimator from a classification perspective. Lifetime Data Analysis, 23(4):585–604.
- Bang, H. and Robins, J. M. (2005). Doubly robust estimation in missing data and causal inference models. Biometrics, 61(4):962–973.
- Belloni, A., Chernozhukov, V., and Hansen, C. (2013). Inference on treatment effects after selection among high-dimensional controls†. The Review of Economic Studies, 81(2):608–650.
- Bickel, P. J. (1982). On adaptive estimation. Annals of Statistics, 10(3):647–671.
- Bilodeau, B. (2022). Blair Bilodeau’s contribution to the discussion of ‘Assumption-lean inference for generalised linear model parameters’ by Vansteelandt and Dukes. Journal of the Royal Statistical Society, Series B, 84(3):701–702.
- Box, G. E. (1979). Robustness in the strategy of scientific model building. In Launer, R. L. and Wilkinson, G. N., editors, Robustness in statistics: Proceedings of a Workshop, pages 201–236. Academic Press (Elsevier), Amsterdam.
- Boyd, A. P., Kittelson, J. M., and Gillen, D. L. (2012). Estimation of treatment effect under non-proportional hazards and conditionally independent censoring. Statistics in medicine, 31(28):3504–3515.

- Buchanan, A. L., Hudgens, M. G., Cole, S. R., Lau, B., Adimora, A. A., and Women's Interagency HIV Study (2014). Worth the weight: using inverse probability weighted Cox models in AIDS research. AIDS research and human retroviruses, 30(12):1170–1177.
- Buja, A., Brown, L., Kuchibhotla, A. K., Berk, R., George, E., Pitkin, E., Traskin, M., Zhang, K., and Zhao, L. (2019a). Models as approximations I: Consequences illustrated with linear regression. Statistical Science, 34(4):523–544.
- Buja, A., Brown, L., Kuchibhotla, A. K., Berk, R., George, E., Tchetgen Tchetgen, E., and Zhao, L. (2019b). Models as approximations – rejoinder. Statistical Science, 34(4):606–620.
- Buja, A., Brown, L., Kuchibhotla, A. K., Berk, R., George, E., and Zhao, L. (2019c). Models as approximations II: A model-free theory of parametric regression. Statistical Science, 34(4):545–565.
- Campigotto, F. and Weller, E. (2014). Impact of informative censoring on the kaplan-meier estimate of progression-free survival in phase ii clinical trials. Journal of Clinical Oncology, 32(27):3068.
- Chernozhukov, V., Chetverikov, D., Demirer, M., Duflo, E., Hansen, C., Newey, W., and Robins, J. (2018). Double/debiased machine learning for treatment and structural parameters. The Econometrics Journal, 21(1):C1–C68.
- Cole, S. R., Hernán, M. A., Robins, J. M., Anastos, K., Chmiel, J., Detels, R., Ervin, C., Feldman, J., Greenblatt, R., Kingsley, L., et al. (2003). Effect of highly active antiretroviral therapy on time to acquired immunodeficiency syndrome or death using marginal structural models. American Journal of Epidemiology, 158(7):687–694.
- Cox, D. R. (1995). Discussion of Chatfield (1995). Journal of the Royal Statistical Society, Series A, 158:455–456.
- Czado, C. and Van Keilegom, I. (2023). Dependent censoring based on parametric copulas. Biometrika, 110(3):721–738.
- Deresa, N. W. and Van Keilegom, I. (2021). On semiparametric modelling, estimation and inference for survival data subject to dependent censoring. Biometrika, 108(4):965–979.
- Dukes, O., Martinussen, T., Tchetgen Tchetgen, E. J., and Vansteelandt, S. (2019). On doubly robust estimation of the hazard difference. Biometrics, 75(1):100–109.
- Feldman, H. I., Joffe, M., Robinson, B., Knauss, J., Cizman, B., Guo, W., Franklin-Becker, E., and Faich, G. (2004). Administration of parenteral iron and mortality among hemodialysis patients. Journal of the American Society of Nephrology, 15(6):1623–1632.
- Fleming, T. R. and Harrington, D. P. (1991). Counting processes and survival analysis. Wiley, New York.

- Ford, I., Norrie, J., and Ahmadi, S. (1995). Model inconsistency, illustrated by the Cox proportional hazards model. Statistics in Medicine, 14:735–746.
- Gail, M. H., Wieand, S., and Piantadosi, S. (1984). Biased estimates of treatment effect in randomized experiments with nonlinear regressions and omitted covariates. Biometrika, 71:431–444.
- Harrington, D. P. and Fleming, T. R. (1982). A class of rank test procedures for censored survival data. Biometrika, 69(3):553–566.
- Hasminskii, R. Z. and Ibragimov, I. A. (1979). On the nonparametric estimation of functionals. In Proceedings of the Second Prague Symposium on Asymptotic Statistics, pages 41–51. North-Holland, Amsterdam.
- Hattori, S. and Henmi, M. (2012). Estimation of treatment effects based on possibly misspecified Cox regression. Lifetime data analysis, 18(4):408–433.
- Havercroft, W. and Didelez, V. (2012). Simulating from marginal structural models with time-dependent confounding. Statistics in Medicine, 31(30):4190–4206.
- Hernán, M. A., Brumback, B., and Robins, J. M. (2001). Marginal structural models to estimate the joint causal effect of nonrandomized treatments. Journal of the American Statistical Association, 96(454):440–448.
- Hernán, M. A., Lanoy, E., Costagliola, D., and Robins, J. M. (2006). Comparison of dynamic treatment regimes via inverse probability weighting. Basic & Clinical Pharmacology & Toxicology, 98(3):237–242.
- Hernán, M. A. and Robins, J. M. (2020). Causal Inference: What If. Chapman & Hall/CRC, Boca Raton.
- Horvitz, D. G. and Thompson, D. J. (1952). Using the whole cohort in the analysis of case-cohort data. American Journal of Epidemiology, 169(11):1398–1405.
- Hou, J., Bradic, J., and Xu, R. (2023). Treatment effect estimation under additive hazards models with high-dimensional confounding. Journal of the American Statistical Association, 118(541):327–342.
- Ishwaran, H., Kogalur, U. B., Blackstone, E. H., Lauer, M. S., et al. (2008). Random survival forests. Annals of Applied Statistics, 2(3):841–860.
- Lancaster, T. and Nickell, S. (1980). The analysis of re-employment probabilities for the unemployed. Journal of the Royal Statistical Society, Series A, 143(2):141–165.
- Lin, D. Y. and Ying, Z. (1994). Semiparametric analysis of the additive risk model. Biometrika, 81:61–71.
- Lu, W. and Ying, Z. (2004). On semiparametric transformation cure models. Biometrika, 91(2):331–343.

- Luo, J. (2023). Statistical Robustness - Distributed Linear Regression, Informative Censoring, Causal Inference, and Non-Proportional Hazards. University of California, San Diego, Ph.D. Thesis.
- Luo, J. and Xu, R. (2022). Doubly robust inference for hazard ratio under informative censoring with machine learning. arXiv preprint arXiv:2206.02296.
- Martinussen, T. and Vansteelandt, S. (2013). On collapsibility and confounding bias in Cox and Aalen regression models. Lifetime Data Analysis, 19:279–296.
- Newey, W. K. (1994). The asymptotic variance of semiparametric estimators. Econometrica: Journal of the Econometric Society, pages 1349–1382.
- Neyman, J. (1959). Optimal asymptotic tests of composite statistical hypotheses. In Probability and Statistics, U. Grenander (Ed.), page 416–444.
- Nguyen, V. Q. and Gillen, D. L. (2017). Censoring-robust estimation in observational survival studies: Assessing the relative effectiveness of vascular access type on patency among end-stage renal disease patients. Statistics in biosciences, 9(2):406–430.
- Nuño, M. M. and Gillen, D. L. (2021). Censoring-robust time-dependent receiver operating characteristic curve estimators. Statistics in Medicine, 40(30):6885–6899.
- Ogburn, E. L., Cai, J., Kuchibhotla, A. K., Berk, R. A., and Buja, A. (2022). Elizabeth L Ogburn, Junhui Cai, Arun K Kuchibhotla, Richard A Berk and Andreas Buja’s contribution to the discussion of ‘Assumption-lean inference for generalised linear model parameters’ by Vansteelandt and Dukes. Journal of the Royal Statistical Society, Series B, 84(3):715–716.
- Olivier, T., Haslam, A., and Prasad, V. (2021). Informative censoring due to missing data in quality of life was inadequately assessed in most oncology randomized controlled trials. Journal of Clinical Epidemiology, 139:80–86.
- Petersen, M., Schwab, J., Gruber, S., Blaser, N., Schomaker, M., and Van Der Laan, M. (2014). Targeted maximum likelihood estimation for dynamic and static longitudinal marginal structural working models. Journal of Causal Inference, 2(2):147–185.
- Prentice, R. L. and Aragaki, A. K. (2022). Intention-to-treat comparisons in randomized trials. Statistical Science, 37(3):380–393.
- R Core Team (2021). R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria.

- Rava, D. and Xu, R. (2023). Doubly robust estimation of the hazard difference for competing risks data. Statistics in Medicine, 42(6):799–814.
- Ridgeway, G., McCaffrey, D. F., Morral, A. R., Cefalu, M., Burgette, L. F., Pane, J. D., and Griffin, B. A. (2022). Toolkit for weighting and analysis of nonequivalent groups: a tutorial for the R TWANG package. Rand Santa Monica, Calif.
- Robins, J. (1998). Marginal structural models. Proceedings of the American Statistical Association. Section on Bayesian Statistical Science, pages 1–10.
- Robins, J., Li, L., Tchetgen Tchetgen, E. J., and van der Vaart, A. (2008). Higher order influence functions and minimax estimation of nonlinear functionals. In Probability and statistics: essays in honor of David A. Freedman, volume 2, pages 335–421. Institute of Mathematical Statistics, Beachwood, OH.
- Robins, J. M. (2000). Marginal structural models versus structural nested models as tools for causal inference. In Statistical models in epidemiology, the environment, and clinical trials, pages 95–133. Springer, New York.
- Robins, J. M., Hernan, M. A., and Brumback, B. (2000a). Marginal structural models and causal inference in epidemiology. Epidemiology, 11:550–560.
- Robins, J. M. and Rotnitzky, A. (2001). Comment on “inference for semiparametric models: Some questions and an answer”. Statistical Science, 11(4):920–936.
- Robins, J. M., Rotnitzky, A., and van der Laan, M. (2000b). On profile likelihood: comment. Journal of the American Statistical Association, 95(450):477–482.
- Robins, J. M., Rotnitzky, A., and Zhao, L. P. (1995). Analysis of semiparametric regression models for repeated outcomes in the presence of missing data. Journal of the American Statistical Association, 90(429):106–121.
- Rotnitzky, A. and Robins, J. (2005). Inverse probability weighted estimation in survival analysis. Encyclopedia of Biostatistics, 4:2619–2625.
- Rotnitzky, A., Smucler, E., and Robins, J. (2021). Characterization of parameters with a mixed bias property. Biometrika, 108:231–238.
- Rytgaard, H. C. and van der Laan, M. J. (2022). Targeted maximum likelihood estimation for causal inference in survival and competing risks analysis. Lifetime Data Analysis. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10985-022-09576-2>.
- Scharfstein, D. O., Rotnitzky, A., and Robins, J. M. (1999). Adjusting for nonignorable drop-out using semiparametric nonresponse models. Journal of the American Statistical Association, 94(448):1096–1120.

- Sjölander, A. and Vansteelandt, S. (2017). Doubly robust estimation of attributable fractions in survival analysis. Statistical Methods in Medical Research, 26(2):948–969.
- Sterne, J. A., Hernán, M. A., Ledergerber, B., Tilling, K., Weber, R., Sendi, P., Rickenbach, M., Robins, J. M., Egger, M., Study, S. H. C., et al. (2005). Long-term effectiveness of potent antiretroviral therapy in preventing aids and death: a prospective cohort study. The Lancet, 366(9483):378–384.
- Tang, Y. (2022). Yanbo Tang’s contribution to the discussion of ‘Assumption-lean inference for generalised linear model parameters’ by Vansteelandt and Dukes. Journal of the Royal Statistical Society, Series B, 84(3):722–723.
- Tchetgen Tchetgen, E. J. and Robins, J. (2012). On parametrization, robustness and sensitivity analysis in a marginal structural cox proportional hazards model for point exposure. Statistics & Probability Letters, 82(5):907–915.
- Templeton, A. J., Amir, E., and Tannock, I. F. (2020). Informative censoring—a neglected cause of bias in oncology trials. Nature Reviews Clinical Oncology, 17(6):327–328.
- Tsiatis, A. A. (2006). Semiparametric theory and missing data. Springer, New York.
- Van der Laan, M. J. and Robins, J. M. (2003). Unified methods for censored longitudinal data and causality. Springer Science & Business Media.
- Van der Vaart, A. W. (2000). Asymptotic statistics, volume 3. Cambridge university press.
- Van Lancker, K., Dukes, O., and Vansteelandt, S. (2021). Principled selection of baseline covariates to account for censoring in randomized trials with a survival endpoint. Statistics in Medicine, 40(18):4108–4121.
- Vansteelandt, S., Dukes, O., Van Lancker, K., and Martinussen, T. (2022). Assumption-lean Cox regression. Journal of the American Statistical Association, page <https://doi.org/10.1080/01621459.2022.2126362>.
- Wang, Y., Ying, A., and Xu, R. (2022). Doubly robust estimation under covariate-induced dependent left truncation. arXiv preprint arXiv:2208.06836.
- Whitney, D., Shojaie, A., and Carone, M. (2019). Comment: Models as (deliberate) approximations. Statistical Science, 34(4):591–598.
- Xu, R. (1996). Inference for the Proportional Hazards Model. Ph.D. thesis, University of California, San Diego.
- Xu, R. and Harrington, D. P. (2001). A semiparametric estimate of treatment effects with censored data. Biometrics, 57(3):875–885.
- Xu, R. and O’Quigley, J. (2000). Estimating average regression effect under non-proportional hazards. Biostatistics, 1(4):423–439.

- Yang, S., Pieper, K., and Cools, F. (2020). Semiparametric estimation of structural failure time models in continuous-time processes. Biometrika, 107(1):123–136.
- Ying, A. and Xu, R. (2023). On defense of the hazard ratio. arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.11971.
- Zhang, M. and Schaubel, D. E. (2012a). Contrasting treatment-specific survival using double-robust estimators. Statistics in Medicine, 31(30):4255–4268.
- Zhang, M. and Schaubel, D. E. (2012b). Double-robust semiparametric estimator for differences in restricted mean lifetimes in observational studies. Biometrics, 68(4):999–1009.
- Zheng, W., Petersen, M., and Van Der Laan, M. J. (2016). Doubly robust and efficient estimation of marginal structural models for the hazard function. The International Journal of Biostatistics, 12(1):233–252.

Supplementary Materials

Summary

The Supplementary Material contains the following:

1. Notation and expressions;
2. Some results under misspecified Cox model;
3. Proof of identifiability and double robustness;
4. Additional plots;
5. Simulation under the $\beta(t)$ model;
6. Proof of asymptotic results.

A Notation and Expressions

For any random quantities a and b , we will use $a \lesssim b$ to denote that a is less than or equal to b up to a constant factor.

For $a = 0, 1$, $l = 0, 1$ and $i = 1, \dots, n$,

$$\begin{aligned}
N_{T_i}(t) &= I(T_i \leq t), & Y_{T_i}(t) &= I(T_i \geq t), \\
M_{T_i}(t; \beta, \Lambda) &= N_{T_i}(t) - \int_0^t Y_{T_i}(u) e^{\beta A_i} d\Lambda(u), \\
N_{c_i}(t) &= I(X_i \leq t, \Delta_i = 0), & Y_i(t) &= I(X_i \geq t), \\
M_{c_i}(t; a, S_c) &= N_{c_i}(t) - \int_0^t Y_i(u) d\Lambda_c(u; a, Z_i), \\
N^a(t) &= I\{X(a) \leq t, T(a) \leq C(a)\}, & Y^a(t) &= I\{X(a) \geq t\} \\
N_c^a(t) &= I\{X(a) \leq t, T(a) > C(a)\}, & \Delta^a(t) &= I\{\min(T(a), t) \leq C(a)\}, \\
J_i(t; a, S, S_c) &= \int_0^t \frac{dM_{c_i}(u; a, S_c)}{S(u; a, Z_i) S_c(u; a, Z_i)}, \\
D_{1_i}^w(t; \beta, \Lambda, \pi, S_c) &= \frac{dM_i(t; \beta, \Lambda)}{\pi(Z_i)_i^{A_i} \{1 - \pi(Z_i)\}^{1-A_i} S_c(t; A_i, Z_i)} \\
d\mathcal{N}_i^{(l)}(t; \pi, S, S_c) &= \frac{A_i^l dN_i(t)}{\pi(Z_i)^{A_i} \{1 - \pi(Z_i)\}^{1-A_i} S_c(t; A_i, Z_i)} + \frac{A_i^l dS(t; A_i, Z_i)}{\pi(Z_i)^{A_i} \{1 - \pi(Z_i)\}^{1-A_i}} \\
&\quad - \sum_{a=0,1} a^l \left\{ 1 + \frac{A_i^a (1 - A_i)^{1-a}}{\pi(Z_i)^a \{1 - \pi(Z_i)\}^{1-a}} J_i(t; a, S, S_c) \right\} dS(t; a, Z_i), \\
\Gamma_i^{(l)}(t; \beta, \pi, S, S_c) &= \frac{A_i^l Y_i(t) e^{\beta A_i}}{\pi(Z_i)^{A_i} \{1 - \pi(Z_i)\}^{1-A_i} S_c(t; A_i, Z_i)} - \frac{A_i^l S(t; A_i, Z_i) e^{\beta A_i}}{\pi(Z_i)^{A_i} \{1 - \pi(Z_i)\}^{1-A_i}} \\
&\quad + \sum_{a=0,1} a^l \left\{ 1 + \frac{A_i^a (1 - A_i)^{1-a}}{\pi(Z_i)^a \{1 - \pi(Z_i)\}^{1-a}} J_i(t; a, S, S_c) \right\} S(t; a, Z_i) e^{\beta a}, \\
D_{1_i}(t; \beta, \Lambda, \pi, S, S_c) &= d\mathcal{N}_i^{(0)}(t; \pi, S, S_c) - \Gamma_i^{(0)}(t; \beta, \pi, S, S_c) d\Lambda(t), \\
D_{2_i}(t; \beta, \Lambda, \pi, S, S_c) &= \int_0^t d\mathcal{N}_i^{(1)}(t; \pi, S, S_c) - \Gamma_i^{(1)}(t; \beta, \pi, S, S_c) d\Lambda(t), \\
s^{(1)}(t; \beta, \pi, S, S_c) &= \frac{\partial}{\partial \beta} s^{(0)}(t; \beta, \pi, S, S_c) = \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \beta^2} s^{(0)}(t; \beta, \pi, S, S_c), \\
\bar{\alpha}(t; \beta, \pi, S, S_c) &= \frac{s^{(1)}(t; \beta, \pi, S, S_c)}{s^{(0)}(t; \beta, \pi, S, S_c)}, \\
v(t; \beta, \pi, S, S_c) &= \bar{\alpha}(t; \beta, \pi, S, S_c) - \bar{\alpha}(t; \beta, \pi, S, S_c)^2, \\
\nu(\beta, \pi, S, S_c) &= \int_0^\tau v(t; \beta, \pi, S, S_c) s^{(0)}(t; \beta^*, \pi, S, S_c) d\Lambda^*(t) \\
\mu(\beta, \pi, S, S_c) &= \int_0^\tau \{\bar{\alpha}(t; \beta^*, \pi, S, S_c) - \bar{\alpha}(t; \beta, \pi, S, S_c)\} s^{(0)}(t; \beta^*, \pi, S, S_c) d\Lambda^*(t).
\end{aligned}$$

Note that the quantities in the last 4 lines are defined in the Additional Assumptions Section F.1 for the Proof of Asymptotics Results later.

Next, we define quantities evaluated over the entire sample of n observations:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{S}^{(l)}(t; \beta, \pi, S, S_c) &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \Gamma_i^{(l)}(t; \beta, \pi, S, S_c), \quad s^{(l)}(t; \beta, \pi, S, S_c) = E\{\mathcal{S}^{(l)}(t; \beta, \pi, S, S_c)\} \\ \bar{A}(t; \beta, \pi, S, S_c) &= \frac{\mathcal{S}^{(1)}(t; \beta, \pi, S, S_c)}{\mathcal{S}^{(0)}(t; \beta, \pi, S, S_c)}, \\ V(t; \beta, \pi, S, S_c) &= \bar{A}(t; \beta, \pi, S, S_c) - \bar{A}(t; \beta, \pi, S, S_c)^2, \\ \tilde{\Lambda}(t; \beta, \pi, S, S_c) &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \int_0^t \frac{d\mathcal{N}_i(u; \pi, S, S_c)}{\mathcal{S}^{(0)}(u; \beta, \pi, S, S_c)}, \\ U(\beta, \pi, S, S_c) &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \int_0^\tau d\mathcal{N}_i^{(1)}(t; \pi, S, S_c) - \bar{A}(t; \beta, \pi, S, S_c) d\mathcal{N}_i^{(0)}(t; \pi, S, S_c).\end{aligned}$$

Analogous to the quantities above, for each fold m , we define the fold-specific quantities:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{S}_m^{(l)}(t; \beta, \pi, S, S_c) &= \frac{1}{|\mathcal{I}_m|} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_m} \Gamma_i^{(l)}(t; \beta, \pi, S, S_c), \\ \bar{A}_m(t; \beta, \pi, S, S_c) &= \frac{\mathcal{S}_m^{(1)}(t; \beta, \pi, S, S_c)}{\mathcal{S}_m^{(0)}(t; \beta, \pi, S, S_c)}, \\ V_m(t; \beta, \pi, S, S_c) &= \bar{A}_m(t; \beta, \pi, S, S_c) - \bar{A}_m(t; \beta, \pi, S, S_c)^2, \\ \tilde{\Lambda}_m(t; \beta, \pi, S, S_c) &= \frac{1}{|\mathcal{I}_m|} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_m} \int_0^t \frac{d\mathcal{N}_i^{(0)}(u; \pi, S, S_c)}{\mathcal{S}_m^{(0)}(u; \beta, \pi, S, S_c)}, \\ \tilde{\psi}_{m,i}(\beta^*, \Lambda, \pi, S, S_c) &= D_{2i}(t; \beta, \Lambda, \pi, S, S_c) - \int_0^\tau \bar{A}_m(t; \beta, \pi, S, S_c) D_{1i}(t; \beta, \Lambda, \pi, S, S_c).\end{aligned}$$

The asymptotic variance of $\hat{\beta}$ in Theorems 3 is

$$\sigma^2 = E\{\psi(\beta^*, \Lambda^*, \pi^o, S^o, S_c^o)^2\} / \nu^2(\beta^*, \pi^o, S^o, S_c^o),$$

where

$$\psi(\beta^*, \Lambda, \pi, S, S_c) = D_2(\beta, \Lambda, \pi, S, S_c) - \int_0^\tau \bar{\alpha}(t; \beta, \pi, S, S_c) D_1(t; \beta, \Lambda, \pi, S, S_c).$$

The asymptotic variance σ^2 can be consistently estimated using

$$\hat{\sigma}^2(\hat{\beta}) = \frac{n \sum_{m=1}^k \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_m} \tilde{\psi}_{m,i}(\hat{\beta}, \tilde{\Lambda}_m(\cdot; \hat{\beta}, \hat{\pi}^{(-m)}, \hat{S}^{(-m)}, \hat{S}_c^{(-m)}), \hat{\pi}^{(-m)}, \hat{S}^{(-m)}, \hat{S}_c^{(-m)})^2}{\left\{ \sum_{m=1}^k \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_m} \int_0^\tau V_m(t; \hat{\beta}, \hat{\pi}^{(-m)}, \hat{S}^{(-m)}, \hat{S}_c^{(-m)}) d\mathcal{N}_i^{(0)}(t; \hat{\pi}^{(-m)}, \hat{S}^{(-m)}, \hat{S}_c^{(-m)}) \right\}^2}.$$

Without cross-fitting, and when all the working models are correctly specified (semi)parametrically, the asymptotic variance can be consistently estimated using

$$\hat{\sigma}^2(\hat{\beta}) = \frac{n \sum_{i=1}^n \tilde{\psi}_i(\hat{\beta}, \tilde{\Lambda}(\cdot; \hat{\beta}, \hat{\pi}, \hat{S}, \hat{S}_c), \hat{\pi}, \hat{S}, \hat{S}_c)^2}{\left\{ \sum_{i=1}^n \int_0^\tau V(t; \hat{\beta}, \hat{\pi}, \hat{S}, \hat{S}_c) d\mathcal{N}_i^{(0)}(t; \hat{\pi}, \hat{S}, \hat{S}_c) \right\}^2},$$

where $\hat{\pi}$, \hat{S} and \hat{S}_c are estimated using the same sample of n observations.

B Some results under misspecified Cox model

Proof of Lemma 1. First, we solve $E\{D_1^f(t; \beta, \Lambda)\} = 0$. By Leibniz integral rule, we may exchange the order of differentiation and integral and have

$$d\Lambda(t) = \frac{\sum_{a=0,1} dE\{I\{T(a) < t\}\}}{\sum_{a=0,1} e^{\beta a} E[I\{T(a) \geq t\}]} = \frac{\sum_{a=0,1} dF_a(t)}{\sum_{a=0,1} e^{\beta a} S_a(t)}. \quad (20)$$

Plugging it into $E\{D_2^f(\beta, \Lambda)\} = 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \int_0^\tau \sum_{a=0,1} a \cdot dE[I\{T(a) < t\}] - \frac{\sum_{a=0,1} a e^{\beta a} E[I\{T(a) \geq t\}] \cdot \sum_{a=0,1} dF_a(t)}{\sum_{a=0,1} e^{\beta a} S_a(t)} \\ &= \int_0^\tau \sum_{a=0,1} a \cdot f_a(t) dt - \frac{\sum_{a=0,1} a e^{\beta a} S_a(t)}{\sum_{a=0,1} e^{\beta a} S_a(t)} \sum_{a=0,1} f_a(t) dt, \\ &= \int_0^\tau \left\{ \frac{\sum_{a=0,1} a \cdot f_a(t)}{\sum_{a=0,1} f_a(t)} - \frac{\sum_{a=0,1} a e^{\beta a} S_a(t)}{\sum_{a=0,1} e^{\beta a} S_a(t)} \right\} \sum_{a=0,1} f_a(t) dt \\ &= \int_0^\tau \left\{ \frac{\sum_{a=0,1} a \cdot \Lambda(t) e^{\beta(t)a} S_a(t)}{\sum_{a=0,1} \Lambda(t) e^{\beta(t)a} S_a(t)} - \frac{\sum_{a=0,1} a e^{\beta a} S_a(t)}{\sum_{a=0,1} e^{\beta a} S_a(t)} \right\} \sum_{a=0,1} f_a(t) dt \\ &= \int_0^\tau \left\{ \frac{\sum_{a=0,1} a e^{\beta(t)a} S_a(t)}{\sum_{a=0,1} e^{\beta(t)a} S_a(t)} - \frac{\sum_{a=0,1} a e^{\beta a} S_a(t)}{\sum_{a=0,1} e^{\beta a} S_a(t)} \right\} \sum_{a=0,1} f_a(t) dt, \end{aligned}$$

which is equivalent to the definition of β^* defined in (13). In addition $v(\beta, t) > 0$. Therefore β^* is the unique solution to β in the full data estimating functions. Plugging β^* into (20), we also see that $\Lambda^*(t)$ as defined in (14) is also the solution to $\Lambda(t)$ in the full data estimating functions. \square

We next show that under 1:1 randomization, equation (15) is equivalent to (13).

By consistency we have

$$f(t) = P(A = 1)f(t; A = 1) + P(A = 0)f(t; A = 0) = \frac{1}{2}\{f_1(t) + f_0(t)\}.$$

Bayes' rule implies that for two random variables X and Y ,

$$E(X|Y = y) = \frac{E\{X f_{Y|X}(y|X)\}}{f_Y(y)}.$$

Applying this to $E_{\beta(t)}(A|T = t)$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} E_{\beta(t)}(A|T = t) &= \frac{E\{A f(t; A)\}}{f(t)} \\ &= \frac{\sum_{a=0,1} a f_a(t)}{\sum_{a=0,1} f_a(t)} \\ &= \frac{\sum_{a=0,1} a \lambda_{T(a)}(t) S_a(t)}{\sum_{a=0,1} \lambda_{T(a)}(t) S_a(t)} \\ &= \frac{\sum_{a=0,1} a e^{\beta(t)a} S_a(t)}{\sum_{a=0,1} e^{\beta(t)a} S_a(t)}. \end{aligned}$$

Replacing $\beta(t)$ in the above with a constant β we have

$$E_{\beta}(A|T = t) = \frac{\sum_{a=0,1} a e^{\beta a} S_a(t)}{\sum_{a=0,1} e^{\beta a} S_a(t)}.$$

Substituting these two quantities into (15) we have (13). □

C Proof of Identifiability and Double Robustness

We first state and prove some lemmas that will be used.

Lemma 2. *For any real-valued functions g and h , we have*

$$E\{g(A, Z)h(T, C, A, Z)\} = \sum_{a=0,1} E[g(a, Z)\pi^o(Z)^a\{(1 - \pi^o(Z))^{1-a}E\{h(T, C, A, Z)|A = a, Z\}]$$

Proof. By the law of total expectation we have

$$\begin{aligned} & E\{g(A, Z)h(T, C, A, Z)\} \\ &= E[E\{g(A, Z)h(T, C, A, Z)|A, Z\}] \\ &= E\left[\sum_{a=0,1} E\{g(A, Z)h(T, C, A, Z)|A = a, Z\}\pi^o(Z)^a\{1 - \pi^o(Z)\}^{1-a}\right] \\ &= \sum_{a=0,1} E[g(a, Z)\pi^o(Z)^a\{(1 - \pi^o(Z))^{1-a}E\{h(T, C, A, Z)|A = a, Z\}]. \end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma 3. *Denote $\Delta^a(t) = I\{\min(T(a), t) \leq C(a)\}$ for $a = 0, 1$. Then*

$$M(t; \beta, \Lambda) = A\Delta^1(t)M_T^1(t; \beta, \Lambda) + (1 - A)\Delta^0(t)M_T^0(t; \beta, \Lambda).$$

Proof. By definition $N^a(t) = I\{T(a) \leq C(a)\}I\{T(a) \leq t\}$. Meanwhile

$$N_T^a(t)\Delta^a(t) = I\{T(a) \leq t\}I\{\min(T(a), t) \leq C(a)\} = I\{T(a) \leq t\}I\{T(a) \leq C(a)\}.$$

Therefore $N^a(t) = N_T^a(t)\Delta^a(t)$.

In addition,

$$\begin{aligned} Y_T^a(t)\Delta^a(t) &= I(T(a) \geq t)I\{\min(T(a), t) \leq C(a)\} \\ &= I(T(a) \geq t)I\{C(a) \geq t\} = I(X(a) \geq t) = Y^a(t). \end{aligned}$$

Then by the consistency Assumption 2, we have

$$\begin{aligned} N(t) &= AN^1(t) + (1 - A)N^0(t) \\ &= AN_T^1(t)\Delta^1(t) + (1 - A)N_T^0(t)\Delta^0(t). \end{aligned} \tag{23}$$

Similarly,

$$Y(t) = AY_T^1(t)\Delta^1(t) + (1 - A)Y_T^0(t)\Delta^0(t). \quad (24)$$

Combining (23) and (24) completes the proof. \square

Lemma 4. For $a = 0, 1$,

$$\frac{\Delta^a(t)dM_T^a(t; \beta, \Lambda)}{S_c(t; a, Z)} = dM_T^a(t; \beta, \Lambda) - dM_T^a(t; \beta, \Lambda) \int_0^t \frac{dM_c(u; a, S_c)}{S_c(u; a, Z)}.$$

Proof. We prove the result for $a = 1$, and the same arguments can be made for $a = 0$.

The following is a potential outcome version of Lemma 1 from Luo and Xu (2022). Note that

$$\int_0^t \frac{dN_c^1(u)}{S_c(u; 1, Z)} = \frac{N_c^1(t-)}{S_c(X; 1, Z)}. \quad (25)$$

Because $\Lambda_c(u; 1, Z) = -\log\{S_c(u; 1, Z)\}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_0^t \frac{-Y^1(u)d\Lambda_c(u; 1, Z)}{S_c(u; 1, Z)} \\ &= I\{X(1) \geq t\} \int_0^t \frac{dS_c(u; 1, Z)}{S_c(u; 1, Z)^2} + I\{X(1) < t\} \int_0^{X(1)} \frac{dS_c(u; 1, Z)}{S_c(u; 1, Z)^2} \\ &= I\{X(1) \geq t\} \{-S_c(u; 1, Z)^{-1}\}_{u=0}^{u=t} + I\{X(1) < t\} \{-S_c(u; 1, Z)^{-1}\}_{u=0}^{u=X(1)} \\ &= \frac{I\{X(1) \geq t\}}{S_c(0; 1, Z)} + \frac{I\{X(1) < t\}}{S_c(0; 1, Z)} - \frac{I\{X(1) \geq t\}}{S_c(t; 1, Z)} - \frac{I\{X(1) < t\}}{S_c(X(1); 1, Z)}, \\ &= 1 - \frac{Y^1(t)}{S_c(t; 1, Z)} - \frac{I\{X(1) < t\}}{S_c(X(1); 1, Z)}. \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

Since $I\{X(1) < t\} = N^1(t-) + N_c^1(t-)$, (25) + (26) gives

$$\int_0^t \frac{dM_c(u; 1, S_c)}{S_c(u; 1, Z)} = 1 - \frac{Y^1(t)}{S_c(t; 1, Z)} - \frac{N^1(t-)}{S_c(X(1); 1, Z)}. \quad (27)$$

The rest of the proof is analogous to part (b) of the proof of Theorem 1 from Luo and Xu (2022). Note that $Y^1(t)dN_T^1(t) = dN^1(t)$, and $dN_T^1(t)N^1(t-) = Y_T^1(t)N^1(t-) = 0$. Multiplying (27) by $dM_T^1(t; \beta, \Lambda) = dN_T^1(t) -$

$Y_T^1(t)e^\beta d\Lambda(t)$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& dM_T^1(t; \beta, \Lambda) \int_0^t \frac{dM_c(u; 1, S_c)}{S_c(u; 1, Z)} \\
&= dN_T^1(t) \int_0^t \frac{dM_c(u; 1, S_c)}{S_c(u; 1, Z)} - Y_T^1(t)e^\beta d\Lambda(t) \int_0^t \frac{dM_c(u; 1, S_c)}{S_c(u; 1, Z)} \\
&= dN_T^1(t) - \frac{dN_T^1(t)Y^1(t)}{S_c(t; 1, Z)} - \frac{dN_T^1(t)N^1(t-)}{S_c(X(1); 1, Z)} - Y_T^1(t)e^\beta d\Lambda(t) + \frac{Y^1(t)e^\beta d\Lambda(t)}{S_c(t; 1, Z)} + \frac{Y_T^1(t)N^1(t-)e^{\beta^*} d\Lambda^*(t)}{S_c(X(1); 1, Z)}. \\
&= dN_T^1(t) - Y_T^1(t)e^\beta d\Lambda(t) - \frac{dN^1(t)}{S_c(t; 1, Z)} + \frac{Y^1(t)e^\beta d\Lambda(t)}{S_c(t; 1, Z)} \\
&= dM_T^1(t; \beta, \Lambda) - \frac{dN^1(t) - Y^1(t)e^\beta d\Lambda(t)}{S_c(t; 1, Z)} \\
&= dM_T^1(t; \beta, \Lambda) - \frac{\Delta^1(t)dN_T^1(t) - \Delta^1(t)Y_T^1(t)e^\beta d\Lambda(t)}{S_c(t; 1, Z)} \\
&= dM_T^1(t; \beta, \Lambda) - \frac{\Delta^1(t)dM_T^1(t; \beta, \Lambda)}{S_c(t; 1, Z)}.
\end{aligned}$$

□

C.1 Identifiability via IPW

Lemma 5. *Under Assumptions 1-5, for $t \in [0, \tau]$,*

$$E\{D_1^w(t; \beta^*, \Lambda^*, \pi, S_c)\} = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad E\{D_2^w(\beta^*, \Lambda^*, \pi, S_c)\} = 0.$$

Proof. Using Lemma 2 and Lemma 3, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& E \left[\frac{A^l dM(t; \beta^*, \Lambda^*)}{\pi(Z)^A \{1 - \pi(Z)\}^{1-A} S_c(t; A, Z)} \right] \\
&= \sum_{a=0,1} E \left[\frac{a^l}{S_c(t; a, Z)} E \{dM(t; \beta^*, \Lambda^*) | A = a, Z\} \right] \\
&= \sum_{a=0,1} E \left[\frac{a^l}{S_c(t; a, Z)} E \{ \Delta^a(t) dM_T^a(t; \beta^*, \Lambda^*) | Z \} \right] \\
&= \sum_{a=0,1} E \left(\frac{a^l}{S_c(t; a, Z)} E [E \{ \Delta^a(t) dM_T^a(t; \beta^*, \Lambda^*) | T(a) = t, Z \} | Z] \right) \\
&= \sum_{a=0,1} E \left\{ \frac{a^l}{S_c(t; a, Z)} E \left(E \left[\{ dN_T^a(t) I(C(a) \geq t) - Y_T^a(t) I(C(a) \geq t) e^{\beta^* a} d\Lambda^*(t) \} | T(a) = t, Z \right] | Z \right) \right\} \\
&= \sum_{a=0,1} E \left\{ \frac{a^l E \{ I(C(a) \geq t) | Z \}}{S_c(t; a, Z)} E \left(E \left[\{ dN_T^a(t) - Y_T^a(t) e^{\beta^* a} d\Lambda^*(t) \} | T(a) = t, Z \right] | Z \right) \right\}
\end{aligned} \tag{29}$$

$$= \sum_{a=0,1} a^l dE \{ M_T^a(t; \beta^*, \Lambda^*) \} \tag{30}$$

$$= 0,$$

where (29) makes use of the informative censoring Assumption 5, and (30) uses the consistency Assumption 2 and the tower property. This then gives both $E\{D_1^w(t; \beta^*, \Lambda^*, \pi, S_c)\} = 0$ and $E\{D_2^w(\beta^*, \Lambda^*, \pi, S_c)\} = 0$.

C.2 Proof of Theorem 1' (double robustness)

Note that

$$\begin{aligned} D_1(t; \beta^*, \Lambda^*, \pi, S, S_c) &= d\mathcal{N}_i^{(0)}(t; \pi, S, S_c) - \Gamma_i^{(0)}(t; \beta^*, \pi, S, S_c)d\Lambda^*(t), \\ D_2(\beta^*, \Lambda^*, \pi, S, S_c) &= \int_0^\tau d\mathcal{N}_i^{(1)}(t; \pi, S, S_c) - \Gamma_i^{(1)}(t; \beta^*, \pi, S, S_c)d\Lambda^*(t). \end{aligned}$$

By Fubini's theorem, in obvious short-hand notation it suffices to show that $E\{d\mathcal{N}_i^{(l)}(t) - \Gamma_i^{(l)}(t)d\Lambda^*(t)\} = 0$ for $l = 0, 1$ and any $t \in [0, \tau]$.

a) Assume $(\pi, S_c) = (\pi^o, S_c^o)$. We can write $E\{d\mathcal{N}_i^{(l)}(t) - \Gamma_i^{(l)}(t)d\Lambda^*(t)\} = R_1 + R_2 - R_3$, where

$$\begin{aligned} R_1 &= E \left[\frac{A^l dM(t; \beta^*, \Lambda^*)}{\pi^o(Z)^A \{1 - \pi^o(Z)\}^{1-A} S_c^o(t; A, Z)} \right], \\ R_2 &= E \left[\frac{A^l \{dS(t; A, Z) + S(t; A, Z)e^{\beta^* A} d\Lambda^*(t)\}}{\pi^o(Z)^A \{1 - \pi^o(Z)\}^{1-A}} - \sum_{a=0,1} a^l \{dS(t; a, Z) + S(t; a, Z)e^{\beta^* a} d\Lambda^*(t)\} \right], \\ R_3 &= E \left[\sum_{a=0,1} a^l \frac{A^a (1-A)^{1-a}}{\pi^o(Z)^a \{1 - \pi^o(Z)\}^{1-a}} J(t; a, S, S_c^o) \{dS(t; a, Z) + S(t; a, Z)e^{\beta^* a} d\Lambda^*(t)\} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

$R_1 = 0$ follows directly from the identifiability Lemma 5.

Applying Lemma 2 to R_2 , we have

$$\begin{aligned} R_2 &= E \left[\sum_{a=0,1} a^l \{dS(t; a, Z) + S(t; a, Z)e^{\beta^* a} d\Lambda^*(t)\} - \sum_{a=0,1} a^l \{dS(t; a, Z) + S(t; a, Z)e^{\beta^* a} d\Lambda^*(t)\} \right] \\ &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

Finally, again applying Lemma 2, we have

$$\begin{aligned} R_3 &= \sum_{a=0,1} \sum_{\alpha=0,1} a^l E \left[\frac{\alpha^a (1-\alpha)^{1-a} \pi^o(Z)^\alpha \{1 - \pi^o(Z)\}^{1-\alpha}}{\pi^o(Z)^a \{1 - \pi^o(Z)\}^{1-a}} \{dS(t; a, Z) + S(t; a, Z)e^{\beta^* a} d\Lambda^*(t)\} \right. \\ &\quad \left. \times E\{J(t; a, S, S_c^o) | A = \alpha, Z\} \right] \\ &= \sum_{a=0,1} a^l E \left[\{dS(t; a, Z) + S(t; a, Z)e^{\beta^* a} d\Lambda^*(t)\} E\{J(t; a, S, S_c^o) | A = a, Z\} \right] \end{aligned} \tag{31}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &= \sum_{a=0,1} a^l E \left[\{dS(t; a, Z) + S(t; a, Z)e^{\beta^* a} d\Lambda^*(t)\} \int_0^t \frac{dE\{M_c(u; a, S_c^o) | A = a, Z\}}{S(u; a, Z) S_c^o(u; a, Z)} \right] \\ &= 0, \end{aligned} \tag{32}$$

where (31) comes from $\alpha^a (1-\alpha)^{1-a} = I(a = \alpha)$, and (32) uses the fact that for each $A = a$, $M_c(t; a, S_c^o)$ given Z is a martingale when $S_c = S_c^o$.

b) Assume $S = S^\circ$. We have $E\{d\mathcal{N}_i^{(l)}(t) - \Gamma_i^{(l)}(t)d\Lambda^*(t)\} = R_4 + R_5 + R_6$, where

$$\begin{aligned} R_4 &= E \left[\frac{A^l dM(t; \beta^*, \Lambda^*)}{\pi(Z)^A \{1 - \pi(Z)\}^{1-A} S_c(t; A, Z)} \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \sum_{a=0,1} a^l \frac{A^a (1-A)^{1-a}}{\pi(Z)^a \{1 - \pi(Z)\}^{1-a}} J(t; a, S^\circ, S_c) \{dS^\circ(t; a, Z) + S^\circ(t; a, Z) e^{\beta^* a} d\Lambda^*(t)\} \right], \\ R_5 &= E \left[\frac{A^l \{dS^\circ(t; A, Z) + S^\circ(t; A, Z) e^{\beta^* A} d\Lambda^*(t)\}}{\pi(Z)^A \{1 - \pi(Z)\}^{1-A}} \right], \\ R_6 &= - \sum_{a=0,1} a^l E \{dS^\circ(t; a, Z) + S^\circ(t; a, Z) e^{\beta^* a} d\Lambda^*(t)\}, \end{aligned}$$

We first make use of the fact that under $S = S^\circ$,

$$E\{dM_T(t; \beta, \Lambda) | T \geq u, A, Z\} = - \frac{dS(t; A, Z) + S(t; A, Z) e^{\beta A} d\Lambda(t)}{S(u|A, Z)}.$$

Therefore

$$R_4 = E \left[\frac{A^l dM(t; \beta^*, \Lambda^*)}{\pi(Z)^A \{1 - \pi(Z)\}^{1-A} S_c(t; A, Z)} \right] \quad (33)$$

$$+ \sum_{a=0,1} a^l \frac{A^a (1-A)^{1-a}}{\pi(Z)^a \{1 - \pi(Z)\}^{1-a}} \int_0^t \frac{dM_c(u; a, S_c)}{S_c(u; a, Z)} E\{dM_T(t; \beta^*, \Lambda^*) | T \geq u, A = a, Z\} \Big]. \quad (34)$$

Applying Lemma 2 to both (33) and (34), we have

$$\begin{aligned} R_4 &= \sum_{a=0,1} a^l E \left[\frac{\pi^\circ(Z)^a \{1 - \pi^\circ(Z)\}^{1-a}}{\pi(Z)^a \{1 - \pi(Z)\}^{1-a}} \frac{E\{dM(t; \beta^*, \Lambda^*) | A = a, Z\}}{S_c(t; a, Z)} \right] \\ &\quad + \sum_{a=0,1} \sum_{\alpha=0,1} a^l E \left(\frac{\alpha^a (1-\alpha)^{1-a} \pi^\circ(Z)^\alpha \{1 - \pi^\circ(Z)\}^{1-\alpha}}{\pi(Z)^a \{1 - \pi(Z)\}^{1-a}} \right. \\ &\quad \times E \left[\int_0^t \frac{dM_c(u; a, S_c)}{S_c(u; a, Z)} E\{dM_T(t; \beta^*, \Lambda^*) | T \geq u, A = a, Z\} \Big| A = \alpha, Z \right] \Big) \\ &= \sum_{a=0,1} a^l E \left[\frac{\pi^\circ(Z)^a \{1 - \pi^\circ(Z)\}^{1-a}}{\pi(Z)^a \{1 - \pi(Z)\}^{1-a}} \frac{\Delta^a(t) dM_T^a(t; \beta^*, \Lambda^*)}{S_c(t; a, Z)} \right] \quad (35) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &+ \sum_{a=0,1} a^l E \left(\frac{\pi^\circ(Z)^a \{1 - \pi^\circ(Z)\}^{1-a}}{\pi(Z)^a \{1 - \pi(Z)\}^{1-a}} \right. \\ &\quad \times E \left[\int_0^t \frac{dM_c(u; a, S_c)}{S_c(u; a, Z)} E\{dM_T^a(t; \beta^*, \Lambda^*) | T(a) \geq u, A = a, Z\} \Big| A = a, Z \right] \Big) \quad (36) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &= \sum_{a=0,1} a^l E \left[\frac{\pi^\circ(Z)^a \{1 - \pi^\circ(Z)\}^{1-a}}{\pi(Z)^a \{1 - \pi(Z)\}^{1-a}} \left(\frac{\Delta^a(t) dM_T^a(t; \beta^*, \Lambda^*)}{S_c(t; a, Z)} \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. + E \left[\int_0^t \frac{dM_c(u; a, S_c)}{S_c(u; a, Z)} E\{dM_T^a(t; \beta^*, \Lambda^*) | T(a) \geq u, A = a, Z\} \Big| A = a, Z \right] \right) \right] \\ &= \sum_{a=0,1} a^l E \left[\frac{\pi^\circ(Z)^a \{1 - \pi^\circ(Z)\}^{1-a}}{\pi(Z)^a \{1 - \pi(Z)\}^{1-a}} dM_T^a(t; \beta^*, \Lambda^*) \right] + R_7, \quad (37) \end{aligned}$$

where (35) uses Lemma 3 and the tower property, (36) makes use of the fact that $\alpha^a (1-\alpha)^{1-a} = I(a = \alpha)$ and the

consistency Assumption 2, (37) makes use of Lemma 4, and

$$\begin{aligned}
R_7 &= \sum_{a=0,1} a^l E \left[\frac{\pi^o(Z)^a \{1 - \pi^o(Z)\}^{1-a}}{\pi(Z)^a \{1 - \pi(Z)\}^{1-a}} \right. \\
&\quad \times \left\{ E \left[\int_0^t \frac{dM_c(u; a, S_c)}{S_c(u; a, Z)} E \{ dM_T^a(t; \beta^*, \Lambda^*) | T(a) \geq u, A = a, Z \} \right] \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left. - \int_0^t \frac{dM_c(u; a, S_c)}{S_c(u; a, Z)} dM_T^a(t; \beta^*, \Lambda^*) \right\} \right] \\
&= \sum_{a=0,1} a^l E \left[\frac{\pi^o(Z)^a \{1 - \pi^o(Z)\}^{1-a}}{\pi(Z)^a \{1 - \pi(Z)\}^{1-a}} \right. \\
&\quad \left. \times E \left\{ \int_0^t \frac{dM_c(u; a, S_c)}{S_c(u; a, Z)} [E \{ dM_T^a(t; \beta^*, \Lambda^*) | T(a) \geq u, A = a, Z \} - dM_T^a(t; \beta^*, \Lambda^*)] \right\} \right].
\end{aligned}$$

We show that $R_7 = 0$ by showing that the inner conditional expectation is zero:

$$\begin{aligned}
&E \left\{ \int_0^t \frac{dM_c(u; a, S_c)}{S_c(u; a, Z)} [E \{ dM_T^a(t; \beta^*, \Lambda^*) | T(a) \geq u, A = a, Z \} - dM_T^a(t; \beta^*, \Lambda^*)] \right\} \Big| A = a, Z \\
&= E \left[E \left\{ \int_0^t \frac{dN_c(u)}{S_c(u; a, Z)} \right. \right. \\
&\quad \times [E \{ dM_T^a(t; \beta^*, \Lambda^*) | T(a) \geq u, A = a, Z \} - dM_T^a(t; \beta^*, \Lambda^*)] \Big| A = a, Z, T \geq u, C = u \Big\} \Big| A = a, Z \\
&\quad - E \left[E \left\{ \int_0^t \frac{Y(u) d\Lambda_c(u; a, Z)}{S_c(u; a, Z)} \right. \right. \\
&\quad \times [E \{ dM_T^a(t; \beta^*, \Lambda^*) | T(a) \geq u, A = a, Z \} - dM_T^a(t; \beta^*, \Lambda^*)] \Big| A = a, Z, T \geq u, C = u \Big\} \Big| A = a, Z \\
&= E \left\{ \int_0^t \frac{dN_c^a(u)}{S_c(u; a, Z)} \right. \\
&\quad \times [E \{ dM_T^a(t; \beta^*, \Lambda^*) | T(a) \geq u, A = a, Z \} - E \{ dM_T^a(t; \beta^*, \Lambda^*) | T(a) \geq u, A = a, Z \}] \Big| A = a, Z \Big\} \quad (38) \\
&\quad - E \left\{ \int_0^t \frac{Y^a(u) d\Lambda_c(u; a, Z)}{S_c(u; a, Z)} \right. \\
&\quad \times [E \{ dM_T^a(t; \beta^*, \Lambda^*) | T(a) \geq u, A = a, Z \} - E \{ dM_T^a(t; \beta^*, \Lambda^*) | T(a) \geq u, A = a, Z \}] \Big| A = a, Z \Big\} \quad (39)
\end{aligned}$$

=0,

where (38) and (39) uses consistency and informative censoring from Assumptions 2 and 5.

Next, using Lemma 2, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
R_5 &= \sum_{a=0,1} a^l E \left[\frac{\pi^o(Z)^a \{1 - \pi^o(Z)\}^{1-a}}{\pi(Z)^a \{1 - \pi(Z)\}^{1-a}} \{ dS^o(t; a, Z) + S^o(t; a, Z) e^{\beta^* a} d\Lambda^*(t) \} \right] \\
&= \sum_{a=0,1} a^l E \left[\frac{\pi^o(Z)^a \{1 - \pi^o(Z)\}^{1-a}}{\pi(Z)^a \{1 - \pi(Z)\}^{1-a}} E \{ -dN_T^a(t) + Y_T^a(t) e^{\beta^* a} d\Lambda^*(t) | Z \} \right] \\
&= - \sum_{a=0,1} a^l E \left[E \left\{ \frac{\pi^o(Z)^a \{1 - \pi^o(Z)\}^{1-a}}{\pi(Z)^a \{1 - \pi(Z)\}^{1-a}} dM_T^a(t; \beta^*, \Lambda^*) \right\} \right] \\
&= - \sum_{a=0,1} a^l E \left[\frac{\pi^o(Z)^a \{1 - \pi^o(Z)\}^{1-a}}{\pi(Z)^a \{1 - \pi(Z)\}^{1-a}} dM_T^a(t; \beta^*, \Lambda^*) \right].
\end{aligned}$$

Lastly,

$$\begin{aligned}
R_6 &= - \sum_{a=0,1} a^l E(E[\{dS^o(t; a, Z) + S^o(t; a, Z)e^{\beta^* a} d\Lambda^*(t)\}|Z]) \\
&= - \sum_{a=0,1} a^l E(E[\{-dN_T^a(t) + Y_T^a(t)e^{\beta^* a} d\Lambda^*(t)\}|Z]) \\
&= \sum_{a=0,1} a^l E\{dM_T^a(t; \beta^*, \Lambda^*)\} \\
&= 0.
\end{aligned}$$

The above gives $R_4 + R_5 + R_6 = 0$ as desired. □

D Additional plots and tables

Table 4: The (time-averaged) log hazard ratio estimated for the HAAS data as in Fig. 3

Estimator	T/C-PS Models	Estimate	Boot SE	95% Boot CI
AIPW	Cox/Cox-logit	0.27	0.07	(0.13, 0.40)
	Cox/Cox-GBM	0.25	0.07	(0.11, 0.38)
	Cox/RSF-logit	0.27	0.07	(0.13, 0.40)
	Cox/RSF-GBM	0.25	0.07	(0.12, 0.39)
	RSF/Cox-logit	0.23	0.07	(0.09, 0.36)
	RSF/Cox-GBM	0.22	0.07	(0.07, 0.36)
	RSF/RSF-logit	0.23	0.07	(0.09, 0.37)
	RSF/RSF-GBM	0.22	0.07	(0.08, 0.37)
IPW	Cox-logit	0.27	0.07	(0.14, 0.40)
	Cox-GBM	0.25	0.06	(0.13, 0.38)
	RSF-logit	0.27	0.07	(0.14, 0.40)
	RSF-GBM	0.25	0.06	(0.14, 0.37)
Naive Cox		0.30	0.07	(0.17, 0.44)




Figure 4: Plots of bias, SD, and bootstrap coverage for each of the four Scenarios considered in the main paper Simulation under the marginal structural Cox model. Top-left, top-right, bottom-left, and bottom-right in landscape view correspond to Scenario 1 to Scenario 4, respectively.

Table 5: Estimated risk difference and risk ratio for mortality at a given year since 1991 between the mid-life heavy and the not-heavy drinkers using the RSF/RSF-GBM estimator, in () are the bootstrapped 95% confidence intervals.

Year	Risk Difference	Risk Ratio
3	0.001 (-0.0001,0.003)	1.249 (1.070,1.429)
4	0.012 (0.004,0.021)	1.242 (1.068,1.417)
5	0.022 (0.007,0.036)	1.236 (1.067,1.404)
6	0.033 (0.011,0.055)	1.227 (1.065,1.388)
7	0.044 (0.015,0.073)	1.217 (1.063,1.371)
8	0.054 (0.018,0.089)	1.207 (1.061,1.352)
9	0.062 (0.021,0.103)	1.196 (1.059,1.334)
10	0.069 (0.024,0.115)	1.186 (1.057,1.315)
11	0.074 (0.025,0.122)	1.177 (1.055,1.298)
12	0.078 (0.027,0.129)	1.166 (1.052,1.280)

E Simulation under the $\beta(t)$ model

In this section, similar to the simulation under the marginal structural Cox model (1), we simulated under the general $\beta(t)$ model (11). Since the model is saturated, the non-collapsibility of the Cox model is no longer an issue, and it is possible that the conditional T model given A and Z is correctly specified parametrically or semiparametrically.

The data generation process is summarized in Fig. 5. We simulate 1000 datasets with $n = 1000$, and 5-fold cross-fitting is used. We set $\tau = 1$ and first simulate the covariate $Z \sim \text{Unif}(-1, 1)$. We then simulate $T(a)$, $C(a)$ and A given Z under four different scenarios described in Table 6. After simulating the potential outcomes and A , we obtain $T = AT(1) + (1 - A)T(0)$ and $C = AC(1) + (1 - A)C(0)$.




Figure 5: DAG for simulation

All four scenarios have an event rate between 30–50%, censoring rate between 30–50% and administrative censoring rate ($X > \tau$) between 10 – 30%. True $\beta^* = 1.014$ and 0.503 when $T(a)$ follows the Cox model and the Mixture setting, respectively. Since there is no analytical solution for β^* , the true value is calculated using a simulated sample of one million full data points. Fig. 6 shows a smoothed plot of how $\beta(t)$ changes over time under the Mixture setting for $T(a)$, created using the 'cox.zph' function from the 'survival' package applied to the simulated full data.

We consider the same estimators as in the main paper, with the exception that the Cox/Cox-logit estimator is not cross-fitted, and is discussed in more details below.

Tables 7 and 8 show the bias, standard deviation (SD), and bootstrap-based coverage probability of the estimators under Scenarios 1 – 4 respectively. Additional visualization are plotted in Figures 7. We see that the Cox/Cox-logit estimator performs well as long as one of the working models is correctly specified (Scenarios 1, 2, 3). This is the

Table 6: Data-generating mechanisms for $T(a)$, $C(s)$ and A in the simulation

	Scenario	Details
1	$T(a)$: Cox	$\lambda_{T(a)}(t; Z) = \exp(2 - 1.12a - 2Z)$.
	$C(a)$: Cox	$\lambda_{C(a)}(t; Z) = \exp(3.5 - 2a - 2.5Z)$.
	A : Logistic	$\text{logit}\{\pi(Z)\} = 2Z$
2	$T(a)$: Cox	$\lambda_{T(a)}(t; Z) = \exp(2 - 1.12a - 2Z)$.
	$C(a)$: Mixture	$Z \leq 0$: $\lambda_{C(a)}(t; Z) = \exp(3.5 - 3a - 0.5Z)$, $Z > 0$: $C(a) \sim \text{Unif}(0, 1.05)$.
	A : Soft Partition	$\text{logit}\{\pi(Z)\} = 2 \cdot \mathbf{1}\{Z < -1/3\} - 2 \cdot \mathbf{1}\{-1/3 \leq Z < 1/3\}$ $+ 2 \cdot \mathbf{1}\{Z \geq 1/3\}$
3	$T(a)$: Mixture	$Z \leq 0$: $\lambda_{T(a)}(t; Z) = \exp(5 - 3.4a + 2.5Z)$, $Z > 0$: $T \sim \text{Unif}(0, 1.05)$.
	$C(a)$: Cox	$\lambda_{C(a)}(t; Z) = \exp(3.5 - 2a - 2.5Z)$.
	A : Logistic	$\text{logit}\{\pi(Z)\} = 2Z$
4	$T(a)$: Mixture	$Z \leq 0$: $\lambda_{T(a)}(t; Z) = \exp(5 - 3.4a + 2.5Z)$, $Z > 0$: $T(a) \sim \text{Unif}(0, 1.05)$.
	$C(a)$: Mixture	$Z \leq 0$: $\lambda_{C(a)}(t; Z) = \exp(3.5 - 3a - 0.5Z)$, $Z > 0$: $C(a) \sim \text{Unif}(0, 1.05)$.
	A : Soft Partition	$\text{logit}\{\pi(Z)\} = 2 \cdot \mathbf{1}\{Z < -1/3\} - 2 \cdot \mathbf{1}\{-1/3 \leq Z < 1/3\}$ $+ 2 \cdot \mathbf{1}\{Z \geq 1/3\}$

classical model doubly robust behavior, with (semi)parametric working models. There is no theoretical guarantee for the AIPW estimators when some of the (semi)parametric working models is wrong and machine learning methods are used for the rest of the working models; in Scenario 3 for example, there appears to be slight over coverage of the confidence intervals. The RSF/RSF-GBM estimator continues to perform well under all four scenarios. along with excellent model coverage and bootstrap coverage.

The IPW Cox-logit estimator performs well under Scenarios 1 and 3 when both the C and A models are correctly specified, but performs poorly otherwise (Scenarios 2 and 4). The other IPW estimators with machine learning has no theoretical guarantees and performs less satisfactorily even when no model is ‘wrong’.

Finally, it’s worth noting that in all four scenarios, the naive Cox estimator lies outside the whole range of




Figure 6: True $\beta(t)$ plot for Scenarios 1 and 2 (top), and 3 and 4 (bottom). True β^* is also shown in red.

$\beta(t)$ (Fig. 6). This is different from the regression setting considered in Xu and O'Quigley (2000), where neither confounding nor informative censoring was present.




Figure 7: Plots of bias, bootstrap SD and bootstrap coverage for all four scenarios under the $\beta(t)$ simulation. Top-left, top-right, bottom-left, and bottom-right in the landscape view correspond to Scenario 1 to Scenario 4, respectively.

Table 7: Simulation based on 1000 data sets for Scenarios 1 and 2, each with 1000 observations. True $\beta^* = 1.014$.

Red indicates that the working model or the approach is invalid.

Scenario	Estimator	T/C-PS Models	Bias	SD	SE		Coverage	
					Model/Boot	Model/Boot	Model/Boot	Model/Boot
1	AIPW	Cox/Cox-logit	0.002	0.151	0.151/0.151	0.95/0.95		
		Cox/Cox-GBM	0.002	0.157	0.164/0.168	0.95/0.96		
		Cox/RSF-logit	0.001	0.151	0.154/0.157	0.95/0.95		
		Cox/RSF-GBM	0.003	0.156	0.165/0.167	0.96/0.96		
		RSF/Cox-logit	0.000	0.154	0.155/0.159	0.95/0.96		
		RSF/Cox-GBM	0.000	0.156	0.166/0.175	0.96/0.97		
		RSF/RSF-logit	0.004	0.153	0.156/0.159	0.95/0.95		
		RSF/RSF-GBM	0.004	0.155	0.167/0.175	0.96/0.97		
	IPW	Cox-logit	0.002	0.155	- /0.153	- /0.95		
		Cox-GBM	0.040	0.155	- /0.144	- /0.92		
		RSF-logit	0.001	0.154	- /0.153	- /0.94		
		RSF-GBM	0.039	0.154	- /0.144	- /0.92		
	Naive Cox		0.470	0.152	0.151/0.151	0.11/0.11		
	Full Data		0.001	0.061	0.063/0.063	0.96/0.96		
2	AIPW	Cox/Cox-logit	0.009	0.188	0.175/0.189	0.94/0.95		
		Cox/Cox-GBM	0.023	0.338	0.314/0.338	0.94/0.96		
		Cox/RSF-logit	0.008	0.205	0.189/0.209	0.93/0.96		
		Cox/RSF-GBM	0.017	0.320	0.308/0.318	0.96/0.95		
		RSF/Cox-logit	0.145	0.250	0.176/0.208	0.74/0.81		
		RSF/Cox-GBM	0.028	0.366	0.337/0.373	0.91/0.94		
		RSF/RSF-logit	0.152	0.258	0.189/0.219	0.76/0.83		
		RSF/RSF-GBM	0.040	0.365	0.352/0.390	0.94/0.95		
	IPW	Cox-logit	0.494	0.181	- /0.180	- /0.20		
		Cox-GBM	0.170	0.302	- /0.227	- /0.79		
		RSF-logit	0.269	0.184	- /0.181	- /0.67		
		RSF-GBM	0.052	0.280	- /0.223	- /0.89		
	Naive Cox		0.245	0.164	0.167/0.166	0.71/0.70		
	Full Data		0.001	0.061	0.063/0.063	0.96/0.96		

Table 8: Simulation based on 1000 data sets for Scenarios 3 and 4, each with 1000 observations. True $\beta^* = 0.503$.

Red indicates that the working model or the approach is invalid.

Scenario	Estimator	T/C-PS Models	Bias	SD	SE		Coverage	
					Model/Boot	Model/Boot	Model/Boot	Model/Boot
3	AIPW	Cox/Cox-logit	0.001	0.082	0.086/0.083	0.96/0.96		
		Cox/Cox-GBM	0.012	0.077	0.094/0.088	0.98/0.98		
		Cox/RSF-logit	0.005	0.085	0.089/0.091	0.96/0.96		
		Cox/RSF-GBM	0.010	0.078	0.095/0.089	0.98/0.97		
		RSF/Cox-logit	0.004	0.071	0.072/0.074	0.95/0.95		
		RSF/Cox-GBM	0.010	0.073	0.077/0.081	0.96/0.96		
		RSF/RSF-logit	0.007	0.072	0.074/0.076	0.95/0.96		
		RSF/RSF-GBM	0.013	0.075	0.079/0.083	0.96/0.97		
	IPW	Cox-logit	0.001	0.081	- /0.082	- /0.95		
		Cox-GBM	0.021	0.074	- /0.070	- /0.93		
		RSF-logit	0.022	0.088	- /0.085	- /0.93		
		RSF-GBM	0.001	0.081	- /0.073	- /0.93		
	Naive Cox		0.518	0.097	0.099/0.099	0.00/0.00		
	Full Data		0.001	0.035	0.034/0.034	0.95/0.94		
4	AIPW	Cox/Cox-logit	0.469	0.125	0.110/0.117	0.02/0.03		
		Cox/Cox-GBM	0.224	0.157	0.154/0.153	0.70/0.70		
		Cox/RSF-logit	0.180	0.138	0.180/0.183	0.83/0.92		
		Cox/RSF-GBM	0.010	0.210	0.276/0.218	0.97/0.97		
		RSF/Cox-logit	0.044	0.085	0.077/0.085	0.88/0.92		
		RSF/Cox-GBM	0.010	0.113	0.104/0.112	0.94/0.95		
		RSF/RSF-logit	0.036	0.116	0.116/0.130	0.94/0.97		
		RSF/RSF-GBM	0.008	0.156	0.160/0.177	0.94/0.97		
	IPW	Cox-logit	0.592	0.119	- /0.112	- /0.00		
		Cox-GBM	0.308	0.159	- /0.131	- /0.37		
		RSF-logit	0.218	0.105	- /0.105	- /0.44		
		RSF-GBM	0.047	0.152	- /0.127	- /0.89		
	Naive Cox		0.431	0.117	0.111/0.112	0.03/0.03		
	Full Data		0.001	0.035	0.035/0.035	0.94/0.94		

F Proof of Asymptotic Results

F.1 Additional Assumptions

We remind the reader that the notations below can be found at the start of the Supplementary Material. We assume that the nuisance function estimates $\hat{\pi}, \hat{S}, \hat{S}_c$ and their limits π^*, S^*, S_c^* only take values in $[0, 1]$. In addition, \hat{S} and \hat{S}_c are non-increasing in t .

Assumption 8. *There exists a neighbourhood \mathcal{B} of β^* such that $\sup_{t \in [0, \tau], \beta \in \mathcal{B}} |\mathcal{S}^{(l)}(t; \beta, \pi^*, S^*, S_c^*) - s^{(l)}(t; \beta, \pi^*, S^*, S_c^*)| = o_p(1)$.*

Assumption 9. *For $l = 0, 1$, $s^{(l)}(t; \beta, \pi^*, S^*, S_c^*)$ are continuous functions of $\beta \in \mathcal{B}$, uniformly in $t \in [0, \tau]$ and are bounded on $\mathcal{B} \times [0, \tau]$. $s^{(0)}(t; \beta, \pi^*, S^*, S_c^*)$ is bounded away from zero on $\mathcal{B} \times [0, \tau]$. For all $\beta \in \mathcal{B}$, $t \in [0, \tau]$:*

$$s^{(1)}(t; \beta, \pi, S, S_c) = \frac{\partial}{\partial \beta} s^{(0)}(t; \beta, \pi, S, S_c) = \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \beta^2} s^{(0)}(t; \beta, \pi, S, S_c).$$

In addition, let $\bar{\alpha} = s^{(1)}/s^{(0)}$ and $v = \bar{\alpha} - \bar{\alpha}^2$. We have

$$\nu(\beta^*, \pi^*, S^*, S_c^*) = \int_0^\tau v(t; \beta^*, \pi^*, S^*, S_c^*) s^{(0)}(t; \beta^*, \pi^*, S^*, S_c^*) d\Lambda^*(t) > 0.$$

Assumptions 8 and 9 are the typical regularity assumptions that are made under the Cox type models similar to those in [Andersen and Gill \(1982\)](#).

Assumption 10. *There exist unique zeros to both the estimating equation $U_{cf}(\beta) = 0$ and the equation $\mu(\beta) = 0$.*

This assumption is needed for showing the consistency of $\hat{\beta}$ since our estimating function $U_{cf}(\beta)$ is not monotone in general. The uniqueness also agrees with what we observe in the simulation.

Assumption 11. *For $\pi = \hat{\pi}$ or π^* , $S = \hat{S}$ or S^* , and $S_c = \hat{S}_c$ or S_c^* below, where $\hat{\pi}$, \hat{S} and \hat{S}_c are estimated using an independent sample, we have*

$$E \left\{ \left[\sup_{t \in [0, \tau]} \left| s^{(l)}(t; \beta, \pi, S, S_c) - s^{(l)}(t; \beta, \pi^*, S^*, S_c^*) \right| \right]^2 \right\} = o(1), \quad (40)$$

and

$$\sup_{t \in [0, \tau]} |\mathcal{S}^{(l)}(t; \beta, \pi, S, S_c) - s^{(l)}(t; \beta, \pi, S, S_c)| = O_p(n^{-1/2}), \quad (41)$$

for $\beta \in \mathcal{B}$ and $l = 0, 1$. Moreover,

$$\int_0^\tau \{\bar{A}(t; \beta^*, \pi, S, S_c) - \bar{\alpha}(t; \beta^*, \pi, S, S_c)\} \cdot \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n D_{1i}(t; \beta^*, \Lambda^*, \pi^o, S^o, S_c^o) = o_p(1). \quad (42)$$

Assumption 11 is required due to the involvement of the time-dependent nuisance functions as well as the risk sets that are specific to the possibly misspecified Cox MSM. Condition (40) simply states that the convergence of $\hat{\pi}, \hat{S}, \hat{S}_c$ carries over to $s^{(l)}(t; \beta^*, \pi, S, S_c)$; an example might be: $E \left\{ \left[\sup_{t \in [0, \tau]} \left| s^{(l)}(t; \beta, \hat{\pi}, S^*, \hat{S}_c) - s^{(l)}(t; \beta, \pi^*, S^*, S_c^*) \right| \right]^2 \right\} = o(1)$. An example of (41) might be: $\sup_{t \in [0, \tau]} |S^{(l)}(t; \beta, \hat{\pi}, S^*, \hat{S}_c) - s^{(l)}(t; \beta, \pi^*, S^*, S_c^*)| = O_p(n^{-1/2})$. Condition (41) should hold for most functions with simple structures even though the estimates of the nuisance function may converge at a slower than root- n rate. For example, if we have $G(t; h) = n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n A_i/h(t)$ and its limit $g(t; h) = E(A)/h(t)$, then

$$\sup_{t \in [0, \tau]} |G(t; \hat{h}) - g(t; \hat{h})| \leq \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n A_i - E(A) \right| \cdot \sup_{t \in [0, \tau]} \left| \frac{1}{\hat{h}(t)} \right| = O_p(n^{-1/2})$$

for any out-of-sample estimates $\hat{h}(t)$ that are bounded away from zero. Condition (42) is required for the same reason the integral terms \mathcal{D}_1^\dagger and \mathcal{D}_2^\dagger in Assumption 7 are required. Although we have $\sqrt{n}\{\bar{A}(t; \beta^*, \pi, S, S_c) - \bar{\alpha}(t; \beta^*, \pi, S, S_c)\} = O_p(1)$ from (41), and $n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \int_0^\tau D_{1i}(t; \beta^*, \Lambda^*, \pi^o, S^o, S_c^o) = o(1)$ from Theorem 1' and the law of large numbers, no existing tools allow us to generalize this product rate to increments within an integral, which is specific to our problem.

F.2 Proof of Main Results

We prove in this section the consistency and asymptotic normality of the cross-fitted AIPW estimator $\hat{\beta}$. The proof of the main results is intentionally kept short and easy to follow, while the tedious details are put into the Lemmas 7 and 8. The proof of Lemma 7 involves standard convergence in probability arguments, regardless of whether we use cross-fitting or not. On the other hand, the proof of Lemma 8 makes use of the independence induced by cross-fitting and the rate condition Assumption 7, which we will elaborate on in more details later.

Here, we first state Lemma 5.10 from Van der Vaart (2000), which will be used in the consistency proof.

Lemma 6. *Let Θ be a subset of the real line and let Ψ_n be random functions and Ψ a fixed function of θ such that $\Psi_n(\theta) \rightarrow \Psi(\theta)$ in probability for every θ . Assume that each map $\theta \rightarrow \Psi_n(\theta)$ is continuous and has exactly one zero $\hat{\theta}_n$, or is non-decreasing with $\Psi_n(\hat{\theta}_n) = o_p(1)$. Let θ_0 be a point such that $\Psi(\theta_0 - \epsilon) < 0 < \Psi(\theta_0 + \epsilon)$ for every $\epsilon > 0$. Then $\hat{\theta}_n \xrightarrow{P} \theta_0$.*

Lemma 7. *Under Assumptions 4, 6 and 8-11, if either $S^* = S^o$ or $(\pi^*, S_c^*) = (\pi^o, S_c^o)$, then for $\beta \in \mathcal{B}$,*

$$U_{cf}(\beta) \xrightarrow{P} \mu(\beta, \pi^*, S^*, S_c^*), \quad (43)$$

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \beta} U_{cf}(\beta) \xrightarrow{P} -\nu(\beta, \pi^*, S^*, S_c^*), \quad (44)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}\mu(\beta, \pi, S, S_c) &= \int_0^\tau \{\bar{\alpha}(t; \beta^*, \pi, S, S_c) - \bar{\alpha}(t; \beta, \pi, S, S_c)\} s^{(0)}(t; \beta^*, \pi, S, S_c) d\Lambda^*(t), \\ \nu(\beta, \pi, S, S_c) &= \int_0^\tau v(t; \beta, \pi, S, S_c) s^{(0)}(t; \beta^*, \pi, S, S_c) d\Lambda^*(t).\end{aligned}$$

Lemma 8. *Under Assumptions 4, 6-7 and 8-11,*

$$\sqrt{n}U_{cf}(\beta^*) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n \psi_i(\beta^*, \Lambda^*, \pi^o, S^o, S_c^o) + o_p(1).$$

Proof of Theorem 2

To show consistency, we make use of Lemma 6. Equation (43) of Lemma 7 states that

$$U_{cf}(\beta) \xrightarrow{P} \mu(\beta, \pi^*, S^*, S_c^*),$$

for β in a neighbourhood \mathcal{B} of β^* .

Since $U_{cf}(\hat{\beta}) = 0$ and $\mu(\beta^*) = 0$, it follows from Assumption 10 that $\hat{\beta}$ is a unique zero of $U_{cf}(\beta)$ and β^* is a unique zero of $\mu(\beta, \pi^*, S^*, S_c^*)$. Using Assumption 9, we have $\partial\mu(\beta, \pi^*, S^*, S_c^*)/\partial\beta|_{\beta=\beta^*} = -\nu(\beta^*, \pi^*, S^*, S_c^*) < 0$, and that $\mu(\beta, \pi^*, S^*, S_c^*)$ is continuous for $\beta \in \mathcal{B}$. These conditions together imply that

$$\mu(\beta - \epsilon, \pi^*, S^*, S_c^*) > 0 > \mu(\beta + \epsilon, \pi^*, S^*, S_c^*)$$

for any $\epsilon > 0$.

Lastly, by noting that $U_{cf}(\beta)$ is also continuous in β , we have $\hat{\beta} \xrightarrow{P} \beta^*$ from applying Lemma 6. □

Proof of Theorem 3 Applying the mean value theorem to $U_{cf}(\beta^*)$ around β^* , we have

$$\sqrt{n}(\hat{\beta} - \beta^*) = \frac{-\sqrt{n}U_{cf}(\beta^*)}{U_{cf}(\tilde{\beta})/\partial\beta},$$

where $\tilde{\beta}$ is some value between $\hat{\beta}$ and β^* . From Theorem 2 then $\tilde{\beta} \xrightarrow{P} \beta^*$.

By (44) of Lemma 7, we have $\partial U_{cf}(\beta^*)/\partial\beta \xrightarrow{P} -\nu(\beta^*, \pi^o, S^o, S_c^o)$. Using the same arguments as those in the proof of Lemma 7, we also have $\partial U_{cf}(\tilde{\beta})/\partial\beta - \partial U_{cf}(\beta^*)/\partial\beta = o_p(1)$, so

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial\beta} U_{cf}(\tilde{\beta}) \xrightarrow{P} -\nu(\beta^*, \pi^o, S^o, S_c^o).$$

The asymptotic expansion of $\sqrt{n}U_{cf}(\beta^*)$ is derived in Lemma 8:

$$\sqrt{n}U_{cf}(\beta^*) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n \psi_i(\beta^*, \Lambda^*, \pi^o, S^o, S_c^o) + o_p(1).$$

By Assumptions 4 and 9, it's easy to see that $|\psi(\beta^*, \Lambda^*, \pi^o, S^o, S_c^o)|$ is bounded a.s., so by the central limit theorem,

$$\sqrt{n}U_{cf}(\beta^*) \xrightarrow{d} N(0, E\{\psi(\beta^*, \Lambda^*, \pi^o, S^o, S_c^o)^2\}).$$

Applying Slutsky's Theorem, we therefore have

$$\sqrt{n}(\hat{\beta} - \beta^*) \xrightarrow{d} N(0, \sigma^2),$$

where $\sigma^2 = E\{\psi(\beta^*, \Lambda^*, \pi^o, S^o, S_c^o)^2\} / \nu^2(\beta^*, \pi^o, S^o, S_c^o)$.

Lastly, to show that $\hat{\sigma}^2$ is a consistent estimator of σ^2 , we show separately the convergence of its numerator and its denominator in probability:

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{n} \sum_{m=1}^k \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \tilde{\psi}_{m,i}(\hat{\beta}, \tilde{\Lambda}_m(\cdot; \hat{\beta}, \hat{\pi}^{(-m)}, \hat{S}^{(-m)}, \hat{S}_c^{(-m)}), \hat{\pi}^{(-m)}, \hat{S}^{(-m)}, \hat{S}_c^{(-m)})^2 \xrightarrow{p} E\{\psi(\beta^*, \Lambda^*, \pi^o, S^o, S_c^o)^2\}, \\ & \left\{ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{m=1}^k \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \int_0^\tau V_m(t; \hat{\beta}, \hat{\pi}^{(-m)}, \hat{S}^{(-m)}, \hat{S}_c^{(-m)}) d\mathcal{N}_i(t; \hat{\pi}^{(-m)}, \hat{S}^{(-m)}, \hat{S}_c^{(-m)}) \right\}^2 \xrightarrow{p} \nu^2(\beta^*, \pi^o, S^o, S_c^o). \end{aligned}$$

These can be shown using the same arguments as used in Lemma 7, so we omit the proof here. Applying Slutsky's theorem again, we have

$$\hat{\sigma}^{-1} \sqrt{n}(\hat{\beta} - \beta^*) \xrightarrow{d} N(0, 1).$$

□

F.3 Proof of lemmas

Since the number of folds k is fixed as $n \rightarrow \infty$, to show that results in Lemma 7 hold for the cross-fitted estimating equations U_{cf} , it is sufficient to show that they hold for sample-splitting. Therefore, in the proof of Lemma 7 below, we will show that

$$\begin{aligned} U(\beta, \hat{\pi}, \hat{S}, \hat{S}_c) & \xrightarrow{p} \mu(\beta, \pi^*, S^*, S_c^*), \\ \frac{\partial}{\partial \beta} U(\beta, \hat{\pi}, \hat{S}, \hat{S}_c) & \xrightarrow{p} -\nu(\beta, \pi^*, S^*, S_c^*), \end{aligned}$$

where with a slight abuse of notation, we let $\hat{\pi}, \hat{S}, \hat{S}_c$ denote nuisance functions estimated using a different set of data independent from but with the same distribution as the dataset that U is evaluated on. Similarly, in the proof of Lemma 8 below, we will show that

$$\sqrt{n}U(\beta^*, \hat{\pi}, \hat{S}, \hat{S}_c) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n \psi_i(\beta^*, \Lambda^*, \pi^o, S^o, S_c^o) + o_p(1).$$

Before we begin the proof of the lemmas, note from the strict positivity Assumption 4 that $S^*(t; a, z)$ is bounded away from zero. By the uniform convergence Assumption 6, $\hat{S}(t; a, z)$ converges to $S^*(t; a, z)$ in probability uniformly in t , so the probability that $\hat{S}(t; a, z)$ is bounded away from zero goes to one. Same argument also applies to $\hat{S}_c(t; a, z)$, $\hat{\pi}(z)$, and $1 - \hat{\pi}(z)$. We can also derive from (40) and (41) of Assumption 11 that for nuisance functions π, S, S_c that

are either the estimates $\hat{\pi}, \hat{S}, \hat{S}_c$ or their limits, and for $\beta \in \mathcal{B}$, $\mathcal{S}^{(l)}(t; \beta, \pi, S, S_c)$ converges to $s^{(l)}(t; \beta, \pi^*, S^*, S_c^*)$ in probability uniformly in t . Since assumption 9 states that $s^{(l)}(t; \beta, \pi^*, S^*, S_c^*)$ and $1/s^{(0)}(t; \beta, \pi^*, S^*, S_c^*)$ are bounded, so $\mathcal{S}^{(l)}(t; \beta, \pi, S, S_c)$ and $1/\mathcal{S}^{(0)}(t; \beta, \pi, S, S_c)$ are bounded with probability going to one. In the following to simplify the proofs, we will assume WLOG that the quantities are bounded almost surely, and this is due to the conditioning event argument below.

Both Lemmas 7 and 8 claim convergence in probability results. To prove them, we want to show that for some random quantity (i.e. remainder term) X_n and for any $\epsilon > 0$, $P(|X_n| < \epsilon) \rightarrow 1$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Let \mathcal{G}_n denote the event that all those terms above are bounded. From Assumptions 4, 6, 9, and 11, we showed earlier that $P(\mathcal{G}_n) \rightarrow 1$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. In our approach we first show that $E(|X_n| | \mathcal{G}_n) \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, which by Markov' inequality implies that

$$P(|X_n| < \epsilon | \mathcal{G}_n) > 1 - \frac{E(|X_n| | \mathcal{G}_n)}{\epsilon} \rightarrow 1$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$. This leads to

$$P(|X_n| < \epsilon) = P(|X_n| < \epsilon \cap \mathcal{G}_n) + P(|X_n| < \epsilon \cap \mathcal{G}_n^c) \geq P(|X_n| < \epsilon \cap \mathcal{G}_n) = P(|X_n| < \epsilon | \mathcal{G}_n)P(\mathcal{G}_n) \rightarrow 1$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Proof of Lemma 7 First, we have

$$U(\beta, \hat{\pi}, \hat{S}, \hat{S}_c) = U(\beta, \pi^*, S^*, S_c^*) + Q_1 + Q_2 + Q_3,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} Q_1 &= U(\beta, \hat{\pi}, \hat{S}, \hat{S}_c) - U(\beta, \pi^*, \hat{S}, \hat{S}_c) \\ Q_2 &= U(\beta, \pi^*, \hat{S}, \hat{S}_c) - U(\beta, \pi^*, S^*, \hat{S}_c) \\ Q_3 &= U(\beta, \pi^*, S^*, \hat{S}_c) - U(\beta, \pi^*, S^*, S_c^*). \end{aligned}$$

We now show that Q_1, Q_2 , and Q_3 are $o_p(1)$.

Consider Q_1 . We write

$$Q_1 = Q_{11} - Q_{12} - Q_{13}$$

$$\begin{aligned} Q_{11} &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \int_0^\tau d\mathcal{N}_i^{(1)}(t; \hat{\pi}, \hat{S}, \hat{S}_c) - d\mathcal{N}_i^{(1)}(t; \pi^*, \hat{S}, \hat{S}_c) \\ Q_{12} &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \int_0^\tau \left\{ \bar{A}(t; \beta, \hat{\pi}, \hat{S}, \hat{S}_c) - \bar{A}(t; \beta, \pi^*, \hat{S}, \hat{S}_c) \right\} d\mathcal{N}_i^{(0)}(t; \hat{\pi}, \hat{S}, \hat{S}_c) \\ Q_{13} &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \int_0^\tau \bar{A}(t; \beta, \pi^*, \hat{S}, \hat{S}_c) \left\{ d\mathcal{N}_i^{(0)}(t; \hat{\pi}, \hat{S}, \hat{S}_c) - d\mathcal{N}_i^{(0)}(t; \pi^*, \hat{S}, \hat{S}_c) \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

First, we note that $dN_i^{(1)}(t; \pi, S, S_c)$ is a sum of several terms, each term is a product of a term that is bounded a.s. and an increment of a monotone function. Specifically, we have

$$\begin{aligned} Q_{11} &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left[\frac{1}{\hat{\pi}(Z_i)^{A_i} \{1 - \hat{\pi}(Z_i)\}^{1-A_i}} - \frac{1}{\pi^*(Z_i)^{A_i} \{1 - \pi^*(Z_i)\}^{1-A_i}} \right] \int_0^\tau \frac{A_i}{\hat{S}_c(t; A_i, Z_i)} dN_i(t) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left[\frac{1}{\hat{\pi}(Z_i)^{A_i} \{1 - \hat{\pi}(Z_i)\}^{1-A_i}} - \frac{1}{\pi^*(Z_i)^{A_i} \{1 - \pi^*(Z_i)\}^{1-A_i}} \right] \int_0^\tau A_i d\hat{S}(t; A_i, Z_i) \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n A_i \left\{ \frac{1}{\hat{\pi}(Z_i)} - \frac{1}{\pi^*(Z_i)} \right\} \int_0^\tau J_i(t; 1, \hat{S}, \hat{S}_c) d\hat{S}(t; 1, Z_i). \end{aligned}$$

This allows us to make use of the following property: for any function $f(t)$, and any monotone function $G(t)$ defined on $[a, b]$, we have

$$\left| \int_a^b f(t) dG(t) \right| \leq \sup_{t \in [a, b]} |f(t)| \cdot |G(b) - G(a)|. \quad (45)$$

Since $N(t)$ and $\hat{S}(t; a, z)$ are monotone in t , we apply (45) to each of the 3 terms in Q_{11} above and have

$$\begin{aligned} &|Q_{11}| \\ &\leq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left| \frac{1}{\hat{\pi}(Z_i)^{A_i} \{1 - \hat{\pi}(Z_i)\}^{1-A_i}} - \frac{1}{\pi^*(Z_i)^{A_i} \{1 - \pi^*(Z_i)\}^{1-A_i}} \right| \cdot \sup_{t \in [0, \tau]} \left| \frac{A_i}{\hat{S}_c(t; A_i, Z_i)} \right| \cdot |N_i(\tau) - N_i(0)| \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left| \frac{1}{\hat{\pi}(Z_i)^{A_i} \{1 - \hat{\pi}(Z_i)\}^{1-A_i}} - \frac{1}{\pi^*(Z_i)^{A_i} \{1 - \pi^*(Z_i)\}^{1-A_i}} \right| \cdot |A_i| \cdot \left| \hat{S}(\tau; A_i, Z_i) - \hat{S}(0; A_i, Z_i) \right| \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n |A_i| \left| \frac{1}{\hat{\pi}(Z_i)} - \frac{1}{\pi^*(Z_i)} \right| \cdot \sup_{t \in [0, \tau]} |J_i(t; 1, \hat{S}, \hat{S}_c)| \cdot \left| \hat{S}(\tau; 1, Z_i) - \hat{S}(0; 1, Z_i) \right|. \\ &\leq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{|\hat{\pi}(Z_i) - \pi^*(Z_i)|}{|\{\hat{\pi}(Z_i)\pi^*(Z_i)\}^{A_i} \{1 - \hat{\pi}(Z_i)\} \{1 - \pi^*(Z_i)\}^{1-A_i}|} \cdot \sup_{t \in [0, \tau]} \left| \frac{A_i}{\hat{S}_c(t; A_i, Z_i)} \right| \cdot |N_i(\tau) - N_i(0)| \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{|\hat{\pi}(Z_i) - \pi^*(Z_i)|}{|\{\hat{\pi}(Z_i)\pi^*(Z_i)\}^{A_i} \{1 - \hat{\pi}(Z_i)\} \{1 - \pi^*(Z_i)\}^{1-A_i}|} \cdot |A_i| \cdot \left| \hat{S}(\tau; A_i, Z_i) - \hat{S}(0; A_i, Z_i) \right| \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n |A_i| \frac{|\hat{\pi}(Z_i) - \pi^*(Z_i)|}{|\hat{\pi}(Z_i)\pi^*(Z_i)|} \cdot \sup_{t \in [0, \tau]} |J_i(t; 1, \hat{S}, \hat{S}_c)| \cdot \left| \hat{S}(\tau; 1, Z_i) - \hat{S}(0; 1, Z_i) \right|. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\hat{S}(t; a, z)$ and $\hat{S}_c(t; a, z)$ are bounded away from zero a.s., we can again apply (45) to

$$J_i(t; 1, \hat{S}, \hat{S}_c) = \int_0^t \frac{dN_{ci}(u) + Y_i(u) d \log \{ \hat{S}_c(u; 1, Z_i) \}}{\hat{S}(u; 1, Z_i) \hat{S}_c(u; 1, Z_i)},$$

and have

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{t \in [0, \tau]} |J_i(t; 1, \hat{S}, \hat{S}_c)| &\leq \sup_{t \in [0, \tau]} \left\{ \sup_{u \in [0, t]} \left| \frac{1}{\hat{S}(u; 1, Z_i) \hat{S}_c(u; 1, Z_i)} \right| \cdot |N_{ci}(t) - N_{ci}(0)| \right\} \\ &\quad + \sup_{t \in [0, \tau]} \left\{ \sup_{u \in [0, t]} \left| \frac{Y_i(u)}{\hat{S}(u; 1, Z_i) \hat{S}_c(u; 1, Z_i)} \right| \cdot \left| \log \{ \hat{S}_c(t; 1, Z_i) \} - \log \{ \hat{S}_c(0; 1, Z_i) \} \right| \right\} \\ &\lesssim 1. \end{aligned} \quad (46)$$

In addition, since $\hat{\pi}(z)$ and $1 - \hat{\pi}(z)$ are bounded away from zero a.s., we have

$$|Q_{11}| \lesssim \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n |\hat{\pi}(Z_i) - \pi^*(Z_i)|.$$

As a reminder, E^\dagger denotes expectations taken with respect to a sample O^\dagger of n observations, and E denotes expectations taken with respect to an independent data O conditional on O^\dagger . O is used for constructing U , while O^\dagger is used to estimate $(\hat{\pi}, \hat{S}, \hat{S}_c)$. Using this notation, we have

$$E(|Q_{11}|) \lesssim E^\dagger [E\{|\hat{\pi}(Z) - \pi^*(Z)|\}] \leq \|\hat{\pi} - \pi^*\|_{\dagger} = o(1),$$

where the last inequality follows from Jensen's inequality, and the last equality follows from Assumption 6. So we have $Q_{11} = o_p(1)$ from Markov's inequality.

Consider Q_{12} . We again break $d\mathcal{N}_i^{(0)}(t; \pi, S, S_c)$ into a sum of terms, each being a product of a term that is bounded a.s. and an increment of a monotone function.

$$\begin{aligned} Q_{12} &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \int_0^\tau \left\{ \bar{A}(t; \beta, \hat{\pi}, \hat{S}, \hat{S}_c) - \bar{A}(t; \beta, \pi^*, \hat{S}, \hat{S}_c) \right\} \cdot \frac{1}{\hat{\pi}(Z_i)^{A_i} \{1 - \hat{\pi}(Z_i)\}^{1-A_i} \hat{S}_c(t; A_i, Z_i)} dN_i(t) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \int_0^\tau \left\{ \bar{A}(t; \beta, \hat{\pi}, \hat{S}, \hat{S}_c) - \bar{A}(t; \beta, \pi^*, \hat{S}, \hat{S}_c) \right\} \cdot \frac{1}{\hat{\pi}(Z_i)^{A_i} \{1 - \hat{\pi}(Z_i)\}^{1-A_i}} d\hat{S}(t; A_i, Z_i) \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \int_0^\tau \left\{ \bar{A}(t; \beta, \hat{\pi}, \hat{S}, \hat{S}_c) - \bar{A}(t; \beta, \pi^*, \hat{S}, \hat{S}_c) \right\} \\ &\quad \cdot \sum_{a=0,1} \left\{ 1 + \frac{A_i^a (1 - A_i)^{1-a}}{\hat{\pi}(Z_i)^a \{1 - \hat{\pi}(Z_i)\}^{1-a}} J_i(t; a, \hat{S}, \hat{S}_c) \right\} d\hat{S}(t; a, Z_i). \end{aligned}$$

Applying (45) and similar arguments as the above, also recall that $\mathcal{S}^{(0)}(t; \beta, \hat{\pi}, \hat{S}, \hat{S}_c)$ and $\mathcal{S}^{(0)}(t; \beta, \pi^*, \hat{S}, \hat{S}_c)$ are

bounded away from zero a.s. and $\mathcal{S}^{(l)}(t; \beta, \hat{\pi}, \hat{S}, \hat{S}_c)$ is bounded a.s., we have

$$\begin{aligned}
|Q_{12}| &\lesssim \sup_{t \in [0, \tau]} \left| \bar{A}(t; \beta, \hat{\pi}, \hat{S}, \hat{S}_c) - \bar{A}(t; \beta, \pi^*, \hat{S}, \hat{S}_c) \right| \\
&= \sup_{t \in [0, \tau]} \left| \frac{\mathcal{S}^{(0)}(t; \beta, \hat{\pi}, \hat{S}, \hat{S}_c) \mathcal{S}^{(1)}(t; \beta, \pi^*, \hat{S}, \hat{S}_c) - \mathcal{S}^{(1)}(t; \beta, \hat{\pi}, \hat{S}, \hat{S}_c) \mathcal{S}^{(0)}(t; \beta, \pi^*, \hat{S}, \hat{S}_c)}{\mathcal{S}^{(0)}(t; \beta, \hat{\pi}, \hat{S}, \hat{S}_c) \mathcal{S}^{(0)}(t; \beta, \pi^*, \hat{S}, \hat{S}_c)} \right| \\
&\lesssim \sup_{t \in [0, \tau]} \left| \mathcal{S}^{(0)}(t; \beta, \hat{\pi}, \hat{S}, \hat{S}_c) \mathcal{S}^{(1)}(t; \beta, \pi^*, \hat{S}, \hat{S}_c) - \mathcal{S}^{(1)}(t; \beta, \hat{\pi}, \hat{S}, \hat{S}_c) \mathcal{S}^{(0)}(t; \beta, \pi^*, \hat{S}, \hat{S}_c) \right| \\
&\leq \sup_{t \in [0, \tau]} \left| \mathcal{S}^{(0)}(t; \beta, \hat{\pi}, \hat{S}, \hat{S}_c) \{ \mathcal{S}^{(1)}(t; \beta, \pi^*, \hat{S}, \hat{S}_c) - \mathcal{S}^{(1)}(t; \beta, \hat{\pi}, \hat{S}, \hat{S}_c) \} \right| \\
&\quad + \sup_{t \in [0, \tau]} \left| \mathcal{S}^{(1)}(t; \beta, \hat{\pi}, \hat{S}, \hat{S}_c) \{ \mathcal{S}^{(0)}(t; \beta, \pi^*, \hat{S}, \hat{S}_c) - \mathcal{S}^{(0)}(t; \beta, \hat{\pi}, \hat{S}, \hat{S}_c) \} \right| \\
&\lesssim \sum_{l=0,1} \sup_{t \in [0, \tau]} \left| \mathcal{S}^{(l)}(t; \beta, \hat{\pi}, \hat{S}, \hat{S}_c) - \mathcal{S}^{(l)}(t; \beta, \pi^*, \hat{S}, \hat{S}_c) \right| \\
&\leq \sum_{l=0,1} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \sup_{t \in [0, \tau]} \left| \Gamma_i^{(l)}(t; \beta, \hat{\pi}, \hat{S}, \hat{S}_c) - \Gamma_i^{(l)}(t; \beta, \pi^*, \hat{S}, \hat{S}_c) \right| \\
&\lesssim \sum_{l=0,1} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left| \frac{1}{\hat{\pi}(Z_i)^{A_i} \{1 - \hat{\pi}(Z_i)\}^{1-A_i}} - \frac{1}{\pi^*(Z_i)^{A_i} \{1 - \pi^*(Z_i)\}^{1-A_i}} \right| \\
&\quad + \sum_{l=0,1} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{a=0,1} a^l \left| \frac{1}{\hat{\pi}(Z_i)^a \{1 - \hat{\pi}(Z_i)\}^{1-a}} - \frac{1}{\pi^*(Z_i)^a \{1 - \pi^*(Z_i)\}^{1-a}} \right| \tag{47} \\
&\lesssim \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n |\hat{\pi}(Z_i) - \pi^*(Z_i)|,
\end{aligned}$$

where (47) follows since $\hat{S}_c(t; A_i, Z_i)$ is bounded away from zero a.s. and $J_i(t; a, \hat{S}, \hat{S}_c)$ is bounded a.s. following (46).

Therefore, we again have $E(|Q_{12}|) = o(1)$ from Assumption 6, so $Q_{12} = o_p(1)$ by Markov's inequality.

$Q_{13} = o_p(1)$ can be shown using exactly the same arguments. We therefore have $Q_1 = o_p(1)$.

Next, we show $Q_2 = o_p(1)$. First, we write

$$Q_2 = Q_{21} - Q_{22} - Q_{23}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
Q_{21} &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \int_0^\tau d\mathcal{N}_i^{(1)}(t; \pi^*, \hat{S}, \hat{S}_c) - d\mathcal{N}_i^{(1)}(t; \pi^*, S^*, \hat{S}_c) \\
Q_{22} &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \int_0^\tau \left\{ \bar{A}(t; \beta, \pi^*, \hat{S}, \hat{S}_c) - \bar{A}(t; \beta, \pi^*, S^*, \hat{S}_c) \right\} d\mathcal{N}_i^{(0)}(t; \pi^*, \hat{S}, \hat{S}_c) \\
Q_{23} &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \int_0^\tau \bar{A}(t; \beta, \pi^*, S^*, \hat{S}_c) \left\{ d\mathcal{N}_i^{(0)}(t; \pi^*, \hat{S}, \hat{S}_c) - d\mathcal{N}_i^{(0)}(t; \pi^*, S^*, \hat{S}_c) \right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Consider Q_{21} . We have

$$Q_{21} = Q_{211} - Q_{212} - Q_{213},$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
Q_{211} &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{A_i \{\hat{S}(\tau; A_i, Z_i) - S^*(\tau; A_i, Z_i)\}}{\pi^*(Z_i)^{A_i} \{1 - \pi^*(Z_i)\}^{1-A_i}} + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{a=0,1} a \{\hat{S}(\tau; a, Z_i) - S^*(\tau; a, Z_i)\}, \\
Q_{212} &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{a=0,1} \frac{a A_i^a (1 - A_i)^{1-a}}{\pi^*(Z_i)^a \{1 - \pi^*(Z_i)\}^{1-a}} \int_0^\tau J_i(t; a, \hat{S}, \hat{S}_c) \{d\hat{S}(t; a, Z_i) - dS^*(t; a, Z_i)\}, \\
Q_{213} &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{a=0,1} \frac{a A_i^a (1 - A_i)^{1-a}}{\pi^*(Z_i)^a \{1 - \pi^*(Z_i)\}^{1-a}} \\
&\quad \times \int_0^\tau \left[\int_0^t \left\{ \frac{1}{\hat{S}(u; a, Z_i)} - \frac{1}{S^*(u; a, Z_i)} \right\} \frac{dM_{ci}(u; a, \hat{S}_c)}{\hat{S}_c(u; a, Z_i)} \right] dS^*(t; a, Z_i).
\end{aligned}$$

For Q_{211} , we can easily see that

$$|Q_{211}| \lesssim \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{a=0,1} |\{\hat{S}(\tau; a, Z_i) - S^*(\tau; a, Z_i)\}| \lesssim \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \sup_{t \in [0, \tau], a \in \{0,1\}} |\{\hat{S}(t; a, Z_i) - S^*(t; a, Z_i)\}|,$$

so $E(|Q_{211}|) = o(1)$ by Assumption 6 and $Q_{211} = o_p(1)$ by Markov's inequality.

Term Q_{212} involves a difference in increments $d\hat{S}(t; a, Z_i) - dS^*(t; a, Z_i)$. Applying integration by parts to the integral term we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_0^\tau J_i(t; a, \hat{S}, \hat{S}_c) \{d\hat{S}(t; a, Z_i) - dS^*(t; a, Z_i)\} \\
&= \left[J_i(t; a, \hat{S}, \hat{S}_c) \{\hat{S}(t; a, Z_i) - S^*(t; a, Z_i)\} \right] \Big|_0^\tau - \int_0^\tau \frac{\{\hat{S}(t; a, Z_i) - S^*(t; a, Z_i)\} dM_{ci}(t; a, \hat{S}_c)}{\hat{S}(t; a, Z_i) \hat{S}_c(t; a, Z_i)}, \tag{48}
\end{aligned}$$

So

$$\begin{aligned}
Q_{212} &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{a=0,1} \frac{a A_i^a (1 - A_i)^{1-a}}{\pi^*(Z_i)^a \{1 - \pi^*(Z_i)\}^{1-a}} \left[J_i(t; a, \hat{S}, \hat{S}_c) \{\hat{S}(t; a, Z_i) - S^*(t; a, Z_i)\} \right] \Big|_0^\tau \\
&\quad - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{a=0,1} \frac{a A_i^a (1 - A_i)^{1-a}}{\pi^*(Z_i)^a \{1 - \pi^*(Z_i)\}^{1-a}} \int_0^\tau \frac{\{\hat{S}(t; a, Z_i) - S^*(t; a, Z_i)\} dM_{ci}(t; a, \hat{S}_c)}{\hat{S}(t; a, Z_i) \hat{S}_c(t; a, Z_i)}.
\end{aligned}$$

Note that $dM_{ci}(t; a, \hat{S}_c) = dN_{ci}(t) - Y_i(t) d\hat{\Lambda}_c(t; a, Z_i)$. Since both $N_{ci}(t)$ and $\hat{\Lambda}_c(t; a, Z_i)$ are monotone functions, we may again apply (45) on the second term above. The nuisance functions are bounded away from zero a.s., so we have

$$|Q_{212}| \lesssim \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \sup_{t \in [0, \tau], a \in \{0,1\}} |\{\hat{S}(t; a, Z_i) - S^*(t; a, Z_i)\}|,$$

so $E(|Q_{212}|) = o(1)$ from Assumption 6 and $Q_{212} = o_p(1)$ by Markov's inequality.

By applying (45) twice on each of the double integrals in Q_{213} , we can show $Q_{213} = o_p(1)$ in exactly the same way.

Same approach used for Q_{21} also gives $Q_{22} = o_p(1)$ and $Q_{23} = o_p(1)$. We hence have $Q_2 = o_p(1)$.

$Q_3 = o_p(1)$ can again be shown using the same techniques we use for Q_2 , so we omit the details.

Lastly, we show that $U(\beta, \pi^*, S^*, S_c^*) = \mu(\beta, \pi^*, S^*, S_c^*) + o_p(1)$ for $\beta \in \mathcal{B}$.

From the definition of the AIPW estimating functions $D_{1i}(t; \beta^*, \Lambda^*, \pi, S, S_c)$ and $D_{2i}(\beta^*, \Lambda^*, \pi, S, S_c)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} d\mathcal{N}_i^{(0)}(t; \pi, S, S_c) &= D_{1i}(t; \beta^*, \Lambda^*, \pi, S, S_c) + \Gamma_i^{(0)}(t; \beta^*, \pi, S, S_c) d\Lambda^*(t), \\ \int_0^\tau d\mathcal{N}_i^{(1)}(t; \pi, S, S_c) &= D_{2i}(\beta^*, \Lambda^*, \pi, S, S_c) + \int_0^\tau \Gamma_i^{(1)}(t; \beta^*, \pi, S, S_c) d\Lambda^*(t). \end{aligned}$$

For $\beta \in \mathcal{B}$, we apply this to $U(\beta, \pi^*, S^*, S_c^*)$ and have

$$\begin{aligned} &U(\beta, \pi^*, S^*, S_c^*) \\ &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \int_0^\tau d\mathcal{N}_i^{(1)}(t; \pi^*, S^*, S_c^*) - \bar{A}(t; \beta, \pi^*, S^*, S_c^*) d\mathcal{N}_i^{(0)}(t; \pi^*, S^*, S_c^*) \\ &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left[D_{2i}(\beta^*, \Lambda^*, \pi^*, S^*, S_c^*) + \int_0^\tau \Gamma_i^{(1)}(t; \beta^*, \pi^*, S^*, S_c^*) d\Lambda^*(t) \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \int_0^\tau \bar{A}(t; \beta, \pi^*, S^*, S_c^*) \{ \Gamma_i^{(0)}(t; \beta^*, \pi^*, S^*, S_c^*) d\Lambda^*(t) + D_{1i}(t; \beta^*, \Lambda^*, \pi^*, S^*, S_c^*) \} \right] \\ &= \int_0^\tau \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \{ \Gamma_i^{(1)}(t; \beta^*, \pi^*, S^*, S_c^*) - \bar{A}(t; \beta, \pi^*, S^*, S_c^*) \Gamma_i^{(0)}(t; \beta^*, \pi^*, S^*, S_c^*) \} d\Lambda^*(t) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n D_{2i}(\beta^*, \Lambda^*, \pi^*, S^*, S_c^*) \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \int_0^\tau \bar{A}(t; \beta, \pi^*, S^*, S_c^*) D_{1i}(t; \beta^*, \Lambda^*, \pi^*, S^*, S_c^*) \\ &= \int_0^\tau \{ \mathcal{S}^{(1)}(t; \beta^*, \pi^*, S^*, S_c^*) - \bar{A}(t; \beta, \pi^*, S^*, S_c^*) \mathcal{S}^{(0)}(t; \beta^*, \pi^*, S^*, S_c^*) \} d\Lambda^*(t) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n D_{2i}(\beta^*, \Lambda^*, \pi^*, S^*, S_c^*) \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \int_0^\tau \bar{A}(t; \beta, \pi^*, S^*, S_c^*) D_{1i}(t; \beta^*, \Lambda^*, \pi^*, S^*, S_c^*) \\ &= \int_0^\tau \{ \bar{A}(t; \beta^*, \pi^*, S^*, S_c^*) - \bar{A}(t; \beta, \pi^*, S^*, S_c^*) \} \mathcal{S}^{(0)}(t; \beta^*, \pi^*, S^*, S_c^*) d\Lambda^*(t) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n D_{2i}(\beta^*, \Lambda^*, \pi^*, S^*, S_c^*) \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \int_0^\tau \bar{A}(t; \beta, \pi^*, S^*, S_c^*) D_{1i}(t; \beta^*, \Lambda^*, \pi^*, S^*, S_c^*). \end{aligned}$$

Next, for each of \bar{A} and $\mathcal{S}^{(0)}$, we add and subtract its limits and have

$$\begin{aligned}
& U(\beta, \pi^*, S^*, S_c^*) \\
&= \mu(\beta, \pi^*, S^*, S_c^*) \\
&+ \int_0^\tau \{\bar{A}(t; \beta^*, \pi^*, S^*, S_c^*) - \bar{A}(t; \beta, \pi^*, S^*, S_c^*) - \bar{\alpha}(t; \beta^*, \pi^*, S^*, S_c^*) + \bar{\alpha}(t; \beta, \pi^*, S^*, S_c^*)\} \\
&\quad \times \mathcal{S}^{(0)}(t; \beta^*, \pi^*, S^*, S_c^*) d\Lambda^*(t) \tag{49}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&+ \int_0^\tau \{\bar{\alpha}(t; \beta^*, \pi^*, S^*, S_c^*) - \bar{\alpha}(t; \beta, \pi^*, S^*, S_c^*)\} \\
&\quad \times \{\mathcal{S}^{(0)}(t; \beta^*, \pi^*, S^*, S_c^*) - \mathcal{S}^{(0)}(t; \beta, \pi^*, S^*, S_c^*)\} d\Lambda^*(t) \tag{50}
\end{aligned}$$

$$+ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n D_{2i}(\beta^*, \Lambda^*, \pi^*, S^*, S_c^*) \tag{51}$$

$$- \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \int_0^\tau \bar{\alpha}(t; \beta, \pi^*, S^*, S_c^*) D_{1i}(t; \beta^*, \Lambda^*, \pi^*, S^*, S_c^*) \tag{52}$$

$$+ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \int_0^\tau \{\bar{\alpha}(t; \beta, \pi^*, S^*, S_c^*) - \bar{A}(t; \beta, \pi^*, S^*, S_c^*)\} D_{1i}(t; \beta^*, \Lambda^*, \pi^*, S^*, S_c^*). \tag{53}$$

For (49), since $\Lambda^*(t)$ is an increasing function and $\mathcal{S}^{(0)}(t; \beta^*, \pi^*, S^*, S_c^*)$ is bounded a.s., we can apply (45) to it and have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left| \int_0^\tau \{\bar{A}(t; \beta^*, \pi^*, S^*, S_c^*) - \bar{A}(t; \beta, \pi^*, S^*, S_c^*) - \bar{\alpha}(t; \beta^*, \pi^*, S^*, S_c^*) + \bar{\alpha}(t; \beta, \pi^*, S^*, S_c^*)\} \right. \\
& \quad \left. \times \mathcal{S}^{(0)}(t; \beta^*, \pi^*, S^*, S_c^*) d\Lambda^*(t) \right| \\
& \lesssim \sup_{t \in [0, \tau]} |\bar{A}(t; \beta^*, \pi^*, S^*, S_c^*) - \bar{A}(t; \beta, \pi^*, S^*, S_c^*) - \bar{\alpha}(t; \beta^*, \pi^*, S^*, S_c^*) + \bar{\alpha}(t; \beta, \pi^*, S^*, S_c^*)|,
\end{aligned}$$

which is $o_p(1)$ from Assumption 8. Similarly, (50) is $o_p(1)$.

Next, we note that the increments in $D_{1i}(t; \beta^*, \Lambda^*, \pi^*, S^*, S_c^*)$ are $dN_i(t)$, $dS^*(t; A_i, Z_i)$, $dS^*(t; a, Z_i)$ and $d\Lambda(t)$, all of which are increments of monotone functions. So similar to (49) and (50), we can apply (45), the strict positivity Assumptions 4 and Assumption 8 to show that (53) is $o_p(1)$.

Since we have $S^* = S^o$ or $(\pi^*, S_c^*) = (\pi^o, S_c^o)$, Theorem 1' gives that both (51) and (52) are sums of i.i.d. mean zero terms. The strict positivity Assumption 4 ensures that these i.i.d. mean zero terms are also bounded, hence having bounded variance. So (51) = $o_p(1)$ and (52) = $o_p(1)$ by the weak law of large numbers.

The second part of the Lemma,

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \beta} U(\beta, \hat{\pi}, \hat{S}, \hat{S}_c) \xrightarrow{p} -\nu(\beta, \pi^*, S^*, S_c^*),$$

can be shown using exactly the same arguments as how we proved $U(\beta, \hat{\pi}, \hat{S}, \hat{S}_c) \xrightarrow{p} \mu(\beta, \pi^*, S^*, S_c^*)$ above, which completes the proof.

□

Proof of Lemma 8 First, write

$$\sqrt{n}U(\beta^*, \hat{\pi}, \hat{S}, \hat{S}_c) = \sqrt{n}U(\beta^*, \pi^o, S^o, S_c^o) + Q_4 + Q_5 + Q_6,$$

where

$$Q_4 = \sqrt{n}\{U(\beta^*, \hat{\pi}, \hat{S}, \hat{S}_c) - U(\beta^*, \pi^o, \hat{S}, S_c^o)\} - \sqrt{n}\{U(\beta^*, \hat{\pi}, S^o, \hat{S}_c) - U(\beta^*, \pi^o S^o, S_c^o)\},$$

$$Q_5 = \sqrt{n}\{U(\beta^*, \hat{\pi}, S^o, \hat{S}_c) - U(\beta^*, \pi^o, S^o, S_c^o)\},$$

$$Q_6 = \sqrt{n}\{U(\beta^*, \pi^o, \hat{S}, S_c^o) - U(\beta^*, \pi^o, S^o, S_c^o)\}.$$

The structure of the proof is as follows: we first show that using the rate condition Assumption 7 among other assumptions that Q_4 , which is a difference in differences, is $o_p(1)$. Next, we show that Q_5 and Q_6 are $o_p(1)$, which uses, among other assumptions, the independence between in-fold and out-of-fold data induced by cross-fitting. Finally, we show that $\sqrt{n}U(\beta^*, \pi^o, S^o, S_c^o)$ is asymptotically equivalent to a sum of i.i.d. terms.

We first show that $Q_4 = o_p(1)$. For any fixed nuisance function S , we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \sqrt{n}\{U_1(\beta^*, \hat{\pi}, S, \hat{S}_c) - U_1(\beta^*, \pi^o, S, S_c^o)\} \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n \int_0^\tau d\mathcal{N}_i^{(1)}(t; \hat{\pi}, S, \hat{S}_c) - d\mathcal{N}_i^{(1)}(t; \pi^o, S, S_c^o) \\ & \quad - \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n \int_0^\tau \bar{A}(t; \beta^*, \pi^o, S, S_c^o) \{d\mathcal{N}_i^{(0)}(t; \hat{\pi}, S, \hat{S}_c) - d\mathcal{N}_i^{(0)}(t; \pi^o, S, S_c^o)\} \\ & \quad - \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n \int_0^\tau \{\bar{A}(t; \beta^*, \hat{\pi}, S, \hat{S}_c) - \bar{A}(t; \beta^*, \pi^o, S, S_c^o)\} d\mathcal{N}_i^{(0)}(t; \hat{\pi}, S, \hat{S}_c). \end{aligned}$$

So we can write

$$Q_4 = Q_{41} - Q_{42} - Q_{43} - Q_{44},$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
Q_{41} &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n \int_0^\tau d\mathcal{N}_i^{(1)}(t; \hat{\pi}, \hat{S}, \hat{S}_c) - d\mathcal{N}_i^{(1)}(t; \pi^o, \hat{S}, S_c^o) - d\mathcal{N}_i^{(1)}(t; \hat{\pi}, S^o, \hat{S}_c) + d\mathcal{N}_i^{(1)}(t; \pi^o, S^o, S_c^o) \\
&\quad - \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n \int_0^\tau \bar{A}(t; \beta^*, \pi^o, S^o, S_c^o) \\
&\quad \times \{d\mathcal{N}_i^{(0)}(t; \hat{\pi}, \hat{S}, \hat{S}_c) - d\mathcal{N}_i^{(0)}(t; \pi^o, \hat{S}, S_c^o) - d\mathcal{N}_i^{(0)}(t; \hat{\pi}, S^o, \hat{S}_c) + d\mathcal{N}_i^{(0)}(t; \pi^o, S^o, S_c^o)\} \\
Q_{42} &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n \int_0^\tau \{\bar{A}(t; \beta^*, \hat{\pi}, S^o, \hat{S}_c) - \bar{A}(t; \beta^*, \pi^o, S^o, S_c^o)\} \{d\mathcal{N}_i^{(0)}(t; \hat{\pi}, \hat{S}, \hat{S}_c) - d\mathcal{N}_i^{(0)}(t; \hat{\pi}, S^o, \hat{S}_c)\} \\
Q_{43} &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n \int_0^\tau \{\bar{A}(t; \beta^*, \pi^o, \hat{S}, S_c^o) - \bar{A}(t; \beta^*, \pi^o, S^o, S_c^o)\} \{d\mathcal{N}_i^{(0)}(t; \hat{\pi}, \hat{S}, \hat{S}_c) - d\mathcal{N}_i^{(0)}(t; \pi^o, \hat{S}, S_c^o)\} \\
Q_{44} &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n \int_0^\tau d\mathcal{N}_i^{(0)}(t; \hat{\pi}, \hat{S}, \hat{S}_c) \\
&\quad \times \{\bar{A}(t; \beta^*, \hat{\pi}, \hat{S}, \hat{S}_c) - \bar{A}(t; \beta^*, \pi^o, \hat{S}, S_c^o) - \bar{A}(t; \beta^*, \hat{\pi}, S^o, \hat{S}_c) + \bar{A}(t; \beta^*, \pi^o, S^o, S_c^o)\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Consider Q_{41} , which can be written as $Q_{41} = -Q_{411} + Q_{412} - Q_{413} - Q_{414}$, where

$$\begin{aligned}
Q_{411} &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{a=0,1} \frac{A_i^a (1 - A_i)^{1-a}}{\pi^o(Z_i)^a \{1 - \pi^o(Z_i)\}^{1-a}} \int_0^\tau \left[\{a - \bar{A}(t; \beta^*, \pi^o, S^o, S_c^o)\} \right. \\
&\quad \times \left. \int_0^t \left\{ \frac{d\hat{S}(t; a, Z_i)}{\hat{S}(u; a, Z_i)} - \frac{dS^o(t; a, Z_i)}{S^o(u; a, Z_i)} \right\} \left\{ \frac{dM_{ci}(u; a, \hat{S}_c)}{\hat{S}_c(u; a, Z_i)} - \frac{dM_{ci}(u; a, S_c^o)}{S_c^o(u; a, Z_i)} \right\} \right] \\
Q_{412} &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n \{A_i - \bar{A}(\tau; \beta^*, \pi^o, S^o, S_c^o)\} \left\{ \frac{1}{\hat{\pi}(Z_i)^{A_i} \{1 - \hat{\pi}(Z_i)\}^{1-A_i}} - \frac{1}{\pi^o(Z_i)^{A_i} \{1 - \pi^o(Z_i)\}^{1-A_i}} \right\} \\
&\quad \times \left\{ \hat{S}(\tau; A_i, Z_i) - S^o(\tau; A_i, Z_i) \right\} \\
Q_{413} &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{a=0,1} A_i^a (1 - A_i)^{1-a} \left\{ \frac{1}{\hat{\pi}(Z_i)^a \{1 - \hat{\pi}(Z_i)\}^{1-a}} - \frac{1}{\pi^o(Z_i)^a \{1 - \pi^o(Z_i)\}^{1-a}} \right\} \\
&\quad \times \int_0^\tau dS^o(t; a, Z_i) \{a - \bar{A}(t; \beta^*, \pi^o, S^o, S_c^o)\} \int_0^t \left\{ \frac{1}{\hat{S}(u; a, Z_i)} - \frac{1}{S^o(u; a, Z_i)} \right\} \frac{dM_{ci}(u; a, \hat{S}_c)}{\hat{S}_c(u; a, Z_i)} \\
Q_{414} &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{a=0,1} A_i^a (1 - A_i)^{1-a} \left\{ \frac{1}{\hat{\pi}(Z_i)^a \{1 - \hat{\pi}(Z_i)\}^{1-a}} - \frac{1}{\pi^o(Z_i)^a \{1 - \pi^o(Z_i)\}^{1-a}} \right\} \\
&\quad \times \int_0^\tau \{d\hat{S}(t; a, Z_i) - dS^o(t; a, Z_i)\} \{a - \bar{A}(t; \beta^*, \pi^o, S^o, S_c^o)\} J_i(t; a, \hat{S}, \hat{S}_c).
\end{aligned} \tag{54}$$

For Q_{411} , we first notice that by the strict positivity Assumption 4, $A_i^a (1 - A_i)^{1-a} / \{\pi^o(Z_i)^a \{1 - \pi^o(Z_i)\}^{1-a}\}$ is bounded a.s.. The expectation of the absolute value of the double integral in Q_{411} can be bounded directly using \mathcal{D}_1^\dagger defined in Assumption 7, which leads to

$$E(|Q_{411}|) \lesssim \sqrt{n} \mathcal{D}_1^\dagger = o(1),$$

where the last equality follows from rate condition Assumption 7.

As discussed in the Asymptotic Properties Section, integral remainders \mathcal{D}_1^\dagger is specific to our case because both nuisance functions $S(t; a, z)$ and $S_c(t; a, z)$ are time-dependent, which can lead to a product between the differences $\hat{S}_c - S_c$ and differences of increments $d\hat{S} - dS^o$, like in (54). To the best of our knowledge, remainder terms like this can not be sufficiently controlled using existing tools, which requires us to make additional assumptions, such as $\mathcal{D}_1^\dagger(\hat{S}, \hat{S}_c; S^o, S_c^o) = o(n^{-1/2})$ in the rate condition Assumption 7.

For Q_{412} , recall that $A_i - \bar{A}(\tau; \beta^*, \pi^o, S^o, S_c^o)$ is bounded a.s. and $\hat{\pi}(Z_i)$, $\pi^o(Z_i)$, $1 - \hat{\pi}(Z_i)$ and $1 - \pi^o(Z_i)$ are bounded away from zero a.s., so we have

$$\begin{aligned} |Q_{412}| &\leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n |A_i - \bar{A}(\tau; \beta^*, \pi^o, S^o, S_c^o)| \cdot \frac{|\hat{\pi}(Z_i) - \pi^o(Z_i)| \cdot \left| \hat{S}(\tau; A_i, Z_i) - S^o(\tau; A_i, Z_i) \right|}{|\hat{\pi}(Z_i)^{A_i} \{1 - \hat{\pi}(Z_i)\}^{1-A_i} \pi^o(Z_i)^{A_i} \{1 - \pi^o(Z_i)\}^{1-A_i}|} \\ &\lesssim \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n |\hat{\pi}(Z_i) - \pi^o(Z_i)| \cdot \sup_{t \in [0, \tau], a \in \{0, 1\}} \left| \hat{S}(t; a, Z_i) - S^o(t; a, Z_i) \right|. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} E(|Q_{412}|) &\lesssim \sqrt{n} E^\dagger \left\{ E \left[|\hat{\pi}(Z) - \pi^o(Z)| \cdot \sup_{t \in [0, \tau], a \in \{0, 1\}} \left| \hat{S}(t; a, Z) - S^o(t; a, Z) \right| \right] \right\} \\ &\leq \sqrt{n} \|\hat{\pi} - \pi^o\|_{\dagger} \cdot \left\| \hat{S} - S^o \right\|_{\dagger} \end{aligned} \tag{55}$$

$$= o(1), \tag{56}$$

where (55) follows from the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality $|E(AB)|^2 \leq E(A^2)E(B^2)$, while (56) uses the rate condition Assumption 7.

Q_{413} can be bounded similarly with the help of (45). First we note that $S^o(t; a, Z_i)$ is a monotone function by assumption. Recall that $dM_{ci}(u; a, \hat{S}_c) = dN_{ci}(u) - Y_i(u) d\hat{\Lambda}_c(u; a, Z_i)$ is also a sum of two terms, each being the product of a term bounded a.s. and an increment of a monotone function. We therefore apply (45) twice to each of the double integral in Q_{413} and have

$$\begin{aligned} |Q_{413}| &\lesssim \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{a=0,1} \frac{|\hat{\pi}(Z_i) - \pi^o(Z_i)|}{|\hat{\pi}(Z_i)^a \{1 - \hat{\pi}(Z_i)\}^{1-a} \pi^o(Z_i)^a \{1 - \pi^o(Z_i)\}^{1-a}|} \\ &\quad \times \sup_{t \in [0, \tau]} \left| \{a - \bar{A}(t; \beta^*, \pi^o, S^o, S_c^o)\} \int_0^t \left\{ \frac{1}{\hat{S}(u; a, Z_i)} - \frac{1}{S^o(u; a, Z_i)} \right\} \frac{dM_{ci}(u; a, \hat{S}_c)}{\hat{S}_c(u; a, Z_i)} \right| \\ &\lesssim \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n |\hat{\pi}(Z_i) - \pi^o(Z_i)| \\ &\quad \times \sup_{t \in [0, \tau], a \in \{0, 1\}} \left\{ \sup_{u \in [0, t]} \left| \frac{\hat{S}(u; a, Z_i) - S^o(u; a, Z_i)}{\hat{S}(u; a, Z_i) S^o(u; a, Z_i) \hat{S}_c(u; a, Z_i)} \right| \right\} \\ &\lesssim \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n |\hat{\pi}(Z_i) - \pi^o(Z_i)| \cdot \sup_{t \in [0, \tau], a \in \{0, 1\}} \left| \hat{S}(t; a, Z_i) - S^o(t; a, Z_i) \right|. \end{aligned}$$

So we again have

$$\begin{aligned}
E(|Q_{413}|) &\lesssim \sqrt{n} E^\dagger \left\{ E \left[|\hat{\pi}(Z) - \pi^o(Z)| \cdot \sup_{t \in [0, \tau], a \in \{0, 1\}} \left| \hat{S}(t; a, Z) - S^o(t; a, Z) \right| \right] \right\} \\
&\leq \sqrt{n} \|\hat{\pi} - \pi^o\|_{\dagger} \cdot \left\| \hat{S} - S^o \right\|_{\dagger} \\
&= o(1)
\end{aligned}$$

from the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality and the rate condition Assumption 7.

The integral in Q_{414} involves a difference in increments $d\hat{S}(t; a, Z_i) - dS^o(t; a, Z_i)$, so we apply integration by parts and have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_0^\tau \{d\hat{S}(t; a, Z_i) - dS^o(t; a, Z_i)\} \{a - \bar{A}(t; \beta^*, \pi^o, S^o, S_c^o)\} J_i(t; a, \hat{S}, \hat{S}_c) \\
&= \left[\{\hat{S}(t; a, Z_i) - S^o(t; a, Z_i)\} \{a - \bar{A}(t; \beta^*, \pi^o, S^o, S_c^o)\} J_i(t; a, \hat{S}, \hat{S}_c) \right] \Big|_0^\tau \\
&\quad - \int_0^\tau \{\hat{S}(t; a, Z_i) - S^o(t; a, Z_i)\} \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \left[\{a - \bar{A}(t; \beta^*, \pi^o, S^o, S_c^o)\} J_i(t; a, \hat{S}, \hat{S}_c) \right] \\
&= \{\hat{S}(\tau; a, Z_i) - S^o(\tau; a, Z_i)\} \{a - \bar{A}(\tau; \beta^*, \pi^o, S^o, S_c^o)\} J_i(\tau; a, \hat{S}, \hat{S}_c) \\
&\quad - \int_0^\tau \{\hat{S}(t; a, Z_i) - S^o(t; a, Z_i)\} \{a - \bar{A}(t; \beta^*, \pi^o, S^o, S_c^o)\} \cdot \frac{dM_{ci}(t; a, \hat{S}_c)}{\hat{S}(t; a, Z_i) \hat{S}_c(t; a, Z_i)} \\
&\quad + \int_0^\tau \{\hat{S}(t; a, Z_i) - S^o(t; a, Z_i)\} \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \left[\frac{S^{(1)}(t; \beta^*, \pi^o, S^o, S_c^o)}{S^{(0)}(t; \beta^*, \pi^o, S^o, S_c^o)} \right] \cdot J_i(t; a, \hat{S}, \hat{S}_c) \\
&= \{\hat{S}(\tau; a, Z_i) - S^o(\tau; a, Z_i)\} \{a - \bar{A}(\tau; \beta^*, \pi^o, S^o, S_c^o)\} J_i(\tau; a, \hat{S}, \hat{S}_c) \\
&\quad + \int_0^\tau \{\hat{S}(t; a, Z_i) - S^o(t; a, Z_i)\} \{a - \bar{A}(t; \beta^*, \pi^o, S^o, S_c^o)\} \cdot \frac{dM_{ci}(t; a, \hat{S}_c)}{\hat{S}(t; a, Z_i) \hat{S}_c(t; a, Z_i)} \\
&\quad + \int_0^\tau \{\hat{S}(t; a, Z_i) - S^o(t; a, Z_i)\} J_i(t; a, \hat{S}, \hat{S}_c) \frac{1}{S^{(0)}(t; \beta^*, \pi^o, S^o, S_c^o)} \cdot \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n d\Gamma_j^{(1)}(t; \beta^*, \pi^o, S^o, S_c^o) \\
&\quad - \int_0^\tau \{\hat{S}(t; a, Z_i) - S^o(t; a, Z_i)\} J_i(t; a, \hat{S}, \hat{S}_c) \frac{S^{(1)}(t; \beta^*, \pi^o, S^o, S_c^o)}{S^{(0)}(t; \beta^*, \pi^o, S^o, S_c^o)^2} \cdot \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n d\Gamma_j^{(0)}(t; \beta^*, \pi^o, S^o, S_c^o), \quad (57)
\end{aligned}$$

where the last two equalities follow from the product rule. For $l = 0, 1$, we again apply the product rule and have

$$\begin{aligned}
&d\Gamma_j^{(l)}(t; \beta^*, \pi^o, S^o, S_c^o) \quad (58) \\
&= \frac{A_j^l e^{\beta^* A_j}}{\pi^o(Z_j)^{A_j} \{1 - \pi^o(Z_j)\}^{1-A_j} S_c^o(t; A_j, Z_j)} dY_j(t) \\
&\quad - \frac{A_j^l Y_j(t) e^{\beta^* A_j}}{\pi^o(Z_j)^{A_j} \{1 - \pi^o(Z_j)\}^{1-A_j} S_c^o(t; A_j, Z_j)^2} dS_c^o(t; A_j, Z_j) - \frac{A_j^l e^{\beta^* A_j}}{\pi^o(Z_j)^{A_j} \{1 - \pi^o(Z_j)\}^{1-A_j}} dS^o(t; A_j, Z_j) \\
&\quad + \sum_{a=0,1} a^l \left\{ 1 + \frac{A_j^a (1 - A_j)^{1-a}}{\pi^o(Z_j)^a \{1 - \pi^o(Z_j)\}^{1-a}} J_j(t; a, S^o, S_c^o) \right\} e^{\beta^* a} dS^o(t; a, Z_j) \\
&\quad + \sum_{a=0,1} a^l \frac{A_j^a (1 - A_j)^{1-a}}{\pi^o(Z_j)^a \{1 - \pi^o(Z_j)\}^{1-a}} \frac{S^o(t; a, Z_j) e^{\beta^* a}}{S^o(t; a, Z_j) S_c^o(t; a, Z_j)} dM_{cj}(u; a, S_c^o).
\end{aligned}$$

Since $dM_{c_j}(u; a, S_c^o) = dN_{c_j}(u) - Y_j(u)d\Lambda_c^o(u; a, Z_j)$, we can now see that $d\Gamma_j^{(l)}(t; \beta^*, \pi^o, S^o, S_c^o)$ is once again a sum of terms, each being a product between a term that is bounded a.s. and an increment of a monotone function.

Therefore, applying (45), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left| \int_0^\tau \{d\hat{S}(t; a, Z_i) - dS^o(t; a, Z_i)\} \{a - \bar{A}(t; \beta^*, \pi^o, S^o, S_c^o)\} J_i(t; a, \hat{S}, \hat{S}_c) \right| \\
& \lesssim |\hat{S}(\tau; a, Z_i) - S^o(\tau; a, Z_i)| \\
& \quad + \sup_{t \in [0, \tau], a \in \{0, 1\}} \left| \hat{S}(t; a, Z_i) - S^o(t; a, Z_i) \right| \\
& \quad + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n \sup_{t \in [0, \tau], a \in \{0, 1\}} \left| \hat{S}(t; a, Z_i) - S^o(t; a, Z_i) \right| \\
& \quad + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n \sup_{t \in [0, \tau], a \in \{0, 1\}} \left| \hat{S}(t; a, Z_i) - S^o(t; a, Z_i) \right| \\
& \lesssim \sup_{t \in [0, \tau], a \in \{0, 1\}} \left| \hat{S}(t; a, Z_i) - S^o(t; a, Z_i) \right|.
\end{aligned}$$

So

$$|Q_{414}| \lesssim \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n |\hat{\pi}(Z_i) - \pi^o(Z_i)| \cdot \sup_{t \in [0, \tau], a \in \{0, 1\}} \left| \hat{S}(t; a, Z_i) - S^o(t; a, Z_i) \right|,$$

and we again have

$$\begin{aligned}
E(|Q_{414}|) & \lesssim \sqrt{n} E^\dagger \left\{ E \left[|\hat{\pi}(Z) - \pi^o(Z)| \cdot \sup_{t \in [0, \tau], a \in \{0, 1\}} \left| \hat{S}(t; a, Z) - S^o(t; a, Z) \right| \right] \right\} \\
& \leq \sqrt{n} \|\hat{\pi} - \pi^o\|_{\dagger} \cdot \left\| \hat{S} - S^o \right\|_{\dagger} \\
& = o(1),
\end{aligned}$$

from the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality and the rate condition Assumption 7.

Therefore, we have

$$E(|Q_{41}|) \leq E(|Q_{411}|) + E(|Q_{412}|) + E(|Q_{413}|) + E(|Q_{414}|) \lesssim o(1),$$

so $Q_{41} = o_p(1)$ by Markov's inequality.

Next, we bound Q_{42} , which involves the use of \mathcal{D}_2^\dagger . First, we let $Q_{42} = Q_{421} + Q_{422}$, where

$$\begin{aligned}
Q_{421} & = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n \int_0^\tau \{\bar{A}(t; \beta^*, \hat{\pi}, S^o, \hat{S}_c) - \bar{A}(t; \beta^*, \pi^o, S^o, \hat{S}_c)\} \{d\mathcal{N}_i^{(0)}(t; \hat{\pi}, \hat{S}, \hat{S}_c) - d\mathcal{N}_i^{(0)}(t; \hat{\pi}, S^o, \hat{S}_c)\} \\
Q_{422} & = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n \int_0^\tau \{\bar{A}(t; \beta^*, \pi^o, S^o, \hat{S}_c) - \bar{A}(t; \beta^*, \pi^o, S^o, S_c^o)\} \{d\mathcal{N}_i^{(0)}(t; \hat{\pi}, \hat{S}, \hat{S}_c) - d\mathcal{N}_i^{(0)}(t; \hat{\pi}, S^o, \hat{S}_c)\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Note that like how we bounded $|Q_{12}|$ earlier, we also have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \bar{A}(t; \beta^*, \hat{\pi}, S^o, \hat{S}_c) - \bar{A}(t; \beta^*, \pi^o, S^o, \hat{S}_c) \\
&= \frac{\mathcal{S}^{(1)}(t; \beta^*, \hat{\pi}, S^o, \hat{S}_c) \mathcal{S}^{(0)}(t; \beta^*, \pi^o, S^o, \hat{S}_c) - \mathcal{S}^{(1)}(t; \beta^*, \pi^o, S^o, \hat{S}_c) \mathcal{S}^{(0)}(t; \beta^*, \hat{\pi}, S^o, \hat{S}_c)}{\mathcal{S}^{(0)}(t; \beta^*, \hat{\pi}, S^o, \hat{S}_c) \mathcal{S}^{(0)}(t; \beta^*, \pi^o, S^o, \hat{S}_c)} \\
&= \frac{\{\mathcal{S}^{(1)}(t; \beta^*, \hat{\pi}, S^o, \hat{S}_c) - \mathcal{S}^{(1)}(t; \beta^*, \pi^o, S^o, \hat{S}_c)\} \mathcal{S}^{(0)}(t; \beta^*, \pi^o, S^o, \hat{S}_c)}{\mathcal{S}^{(0)}(t; \beta^*, \hat{\pi}, S^o, \hat{S}_c) \mathcal{S}^{(0)}(t; \beta^*, \pi^o, S^o, \hat{S}_c)} \\
&\quad - \frac{\mathcal{S}^{(1)}(t; \beta^*, \pi^o, S^o, \hat{S}_c) \{\mathcal{S}^{(0)}(t; \beta^*, \hat{\pi}, S^o, \hat{S}_c) - \mathcal{S}^{(0)}(t; \beta^*, \pi^o, S^o, \hat{S}_c)\}}{\mathcal{S}^{(0)}(t; \beta^*, \hat{\pi}, S^o, \hat{S}_c) \mathcal{S}^{(0)}(t; \beta^*, \pi^o, S^o, \hat{S}_c)} \\
&= \frac{\mathcal{S}^{(0)}(t; \beta^*, \pi^o, S^o, \hat{S}_c)}{\mathcal{S}^{(0)}(t; \beta^*, \hat{\pi}, S^o, \hat{S}_c) \mathcal{S}^{(0)}(t; \beta^*, \pi^o, S^o, \hat{S}_c)} \cdot \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n \{\Gamma_j^{(1)}(t; \beta^*, \hat{\pi}, S^o, \hat{S}_c) - \Gamma_j^{(1)}(t; \beta^*, \pi^o, S^o, \hat{S}_c)\} \\
&\quad - \frac{\mathcal{S}^{(1)}(t; \beta^*, \pi^o, S^o, \hat{S}_c)}{\mathcal{S}^{(0)}(t; \beta^*, \hat{\pi}, S^o, \hat{S}_c) \mathcal{S}^{(0)}(t; \beta^*, \pi^o, S^o, \hat{S}_c)} \cdot \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n \{\Gamma_j^{(0)}(t; \beta^*, \hat{\pi}, S^o, \hat{S}_c) - \Gamma_j^{(0)}(t; \beta^*, \pi^o, S^o, \hat{S}_c)\} \\
&= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n C_j(t) \{\hat{\pi}(Z_j) - \pi^o(Z_j)\},
\end{aligned}$$

where $C_j(t)$ are some functions bounded a.s.. Similarly, we have

$$\{\bar{A}(t; \beta^*, \pi^o, S^o, \hat{S}_c) - \bar{A}(t; \beta^*, \pi^o, S^o, S_c^o)\} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n C'_j(t) \{\hat{S}_c(t; a, Z_i) - S_c^o(t; a, Z_i)\}, \quad (59)$$

where $C'_j(t)$ are some other functions bounded a.s..

Next, let $d\mathcal{N}_i^{(0)}(t; \hat{\pi}, \hat{S}, \hat{S}_c) - d\mathcal{N}_i^{(0)}(t; \hat{\pi}, S^o, \hat{S}_c) = K_{1i} + K_{2i}$, where

$$\begin{aligned}
K_{1i} &= \frac{d\hat{S}(t; A_i, Z_i) - dS^o(t; A_i, Z_i)}{\hat{\pi}(Z_i)^{A_i} \{1 - \hat{\pi}(Z_i)\}^{1-A_i}} \\
&\quad - \sum_{a=0,1} \left\{ 1 + \frac{A_i^a (1 - A_i)^{1-a}}{\hat{\pi}(Z_i)^a \{1 - \hat{\pi}(Z_i)\}^{1-a}} J_i(t; a, S^o, \hat{S}_c) \right\} \{d\hat{S}(t; a, Z_i) - dS^o(t; a, Z_i)\} \\
K_{2i} &= - \sum_{a=0,1} \frac{A_i^a (1 - A_i)^{1-a}}{\hat{\pi}(Z_i)^a \{1 - \hat{\pi}(Z_i)\}^{1-a}} \int_0^t \left\{ \frac{1}{\hat{S}(u; a, Z_i)} - \frac{1}{S^o(u; a, Z_i)} \right\} \frac{dM_{ci}(u; a, Z_i)}{\hat{S}_c(u; a, Z_i)} \cdot d\hat{S}(t; a, Z_i).
\end{aligned}$$

We now have $Q_{421} = Q_{4211} + Q_{4212}$, where

$$\begin{aligned}
Q_{4211} &= \frac{1}{n^{3/2}} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n \{\hat{\pi}(Z_j) - \pi^o(Z_j)\} \int_0^\tau C_j(t) K_{1i} \\
Q_{4212} &= \frac{1}{n^{3/2}} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n \{\hat{\pi}(Z_j) - \pi^o(Z_j)\} \int_0^\tau C_j(t) K_{2i}.
\end{aligned}$$

For Q_{4212} , we can apply (45), the rate Condition Assumption 7 and the boundedness of appropriate terms to show that

$$E(|Q_{4212}|) \lesssim \sqrt{n} \|\hat{\pi} - \pi^o\|_{\dagger} \cdot \left\| \hat{S} - S^o \right\|_{\dagger} = o(1).$$

$\int_0^\tau C_j(t) K_{1i}$ in Q_{4211} involves stochastic differences $d\hat{S}(t; a, Z_i) - dS^o(t; a, Z_i)$, so like in (48) and (57) we first apply integration by parts to turn $d\hat{S} - dS^o$ into $\hat{S} - S^o$. Like (58), the $dC_j(t)$ term we have as a result of integration

by parts can again be shown to be a sum of terms, each being a product between a term that is bounded a.s. and an increment of a monotone function. This allows us to apply (45), the rate Condition Assumption 7 and the boundedness of appropriate terms, which leads to $E(|Q_{421}|) \lesssim \sqrt{n} \|\hat{\pi} - \pi^o\|_{\dagger} \cdot \left\| \hat{S} - S^o \right\|_{\dagger} = o(1)$. We therefore have $E(|Q_{421}|) = o(1)$ and $Q_{421} = o_p(1)$ by Markov's inequality.

For term Q_{422} , we first write $Q_{422} = Q_{4221} + Q_{4222}$, where

$$Q_{4221} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n \int_0^{\tau} \{\bar{A}(t; \beta^*, \pi^o, S^o, \hat{S}_c) - \bar{A}(t; \beta^*, \pi^o, S^o, S_c^o)\} K_{1i},$$

$$Q_{4222} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n \int_0^{\tau} \{\bar{A}(t; \beta^*, \pi^o, S^o, \hat{S}_c) - \bar{A}(t; \beta^*, \pi^o, S^o, S_c^o)\} K_{2i}.$$

$E(|Q_{4221}|)$ involves a product between $d\hat{S}(t; a, Z_i) - dS^o(t; a, Z_i)$ and $\hat{S}_c(t; a, Z_i) - S_c^o(t; a, Z_i)$, which can not be bounded using any existing tools we have. Therefore, we directly bound it using \mathcal{D}_2^{\dagger} in Assumption 7, which gives

$$E(|Q_{4221}|) \lesssim \sqrt{n} \mathcal{D}_2^{\dagger} = o(1).$$

Next, using (59), we have

$$Q_{4222} = \frac{1}{n^{3/2}} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n \int_0^{\tau} C'_j(t) \{\hat{S}_c(t; a, Z_i) - S_c^o(t; a, Z_i)\} K_{2i}.$$

By again applying (45), the rate condition Assumption 7 and the boundedness of appropriate terms to Q_{4222} , we have

$$E(|Q_{4222}|) \lesssim \sqrt{n} \left\| \hat{S}_c - S_c^o \right\|_{\dagger} \cdot \left\| \hat{S} - S^o \right\|_{\dagger} = o(1).$$

Therefore, $E(|Q_{422}|) = o(1)$ from rate condition Assumption 7.

Combining our results, we have

$$E(|Q_{42}|) \leq E(|Q_{421}|) + E(|Q_{422}|) = o(1).$$

Using the same techniques we used for Q_{41} and Q_{42} above, with the rate condition Assumption 7 and without using \mathcal{D}^{\dagger} , we can show that $E(|Q_{43}|) = o(1)$ and $E(|Q_{44}|) = o(1)$.

Hence we conclude that $E(|Q_4|) \leq E(|Q_{41}|) + E(|Q_{42}|) + E(|Q_{43}|) + E(|Q_{44}|) = o(1)$. Then by Markov's inequality, $Q_4 = o_p(1)$.

Next, we show that $Q_5 = o_p(1)$.

Using the definition of $D_{1i}(\beta, \Lambda, \pi, S, S_c)$, $D_{2i}(\beta, \Lambda, \pi, S, S_c)$ defined in Supplementary Material A, it can be verified that

$$U(\beta^*, \pi, S, S_c) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left[D_{2i}(\beta^*, \Lambda^*, \pi, S, S_c) - \int_0^{\tau} \bar{A}(t; \beta^*, \pi, S, S_c) D_{1i}(t; \beta^*, \Lambda^*, \pi, S, S_c) \right]. \quad (60)$$

So we have $Q_5 = Q_{51} - Q_{52} - Q_{53} - Q_{54}$, where

$$\begin{aligned}
Q_{51} &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n \{D_{2i}(\beta^*, \Lambda^*, \hat{\pi}, S^o, \hat{S}_c) - D_{2i}(\beta^*, \Lambda^*, \pi^o, S^o, S_c^o)\} \\
Q_{52} &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n \int_0^\tau \bar{\alpha}(t; \beta^*, \hat{\pi}, S^o, \hat{S}_c) \{D_{1i}(t; \beta^*, \Lambda^*, \hat{\pi}, S^o, \hat{S}_c) - D_{1i}(t; \beta^*, \Lambda^*, \pi^o, S^o, S_c^o)\} \\
Q_{53} &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n \int_0^\tau \{\bar{A}(t; \beta^*, \hat{\pi}, S^o, \hat{S}_c) - \bar{\alpha}(t; \beta^*, \hat{\pi}, S^o, \hat{S}_c)\} \\
&\quad \times \{D_{1i}(t; \beta^*, \Lambda^*, \hat{\pi}, S^o, \hat{S}_c) - D_{1i}(t; \beta^*, \Lambda^*, \pi^o, S^o, S_c^o)\} \\
Q_{54} &= \int_0^\tau \{\bar{A}(t; \beta^*, \hat{\pi}, S^o, \hat{S}_c) - \bar{A}(t; \beta^*, \pi^o, S^o, S_c^o)\} \cdot \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n D_{1i}(t; \beta^*, \Lambda^*, \pi^o, S^o, S_c^o).
\end{aligned}$$

First, consider Q_{51} . By the law of total variance, we have

$$\text{Var}(Q_{51}) = \text{Var}\{E(Q_{51}|O^\dagger)\} + E\{\text{Var}(Q_{51}|O^\dagger)\}.$$

We note from Theorem 1' that $E\{D_{2i}(\beta^*, \Lambda^*, \hat{\pi}, S^o, \hat{S}_c) - D_{2i}(\beta^*, \Lambda^*, \pi^o, S^o, S_c^o)|O^\dagger\} = 0$ for each i , where O^\dagger is the sample independent from O that is used for estimating the nuisance functions, so $E(Q_{51}|O^\dagger) = 0$. Moreover, when conditional on O^\dagger , Q_{51} is a sample average of mean-zero i.i.d terms, so we have

$$\text{Var}(Q_{51}|O^\dagger) = \frac{n}{n} E \left[\{D_2(\beta^*, \Lambda^*, \hat{\pi}, S^o, \hat{S}_c) - D_2(\beta^*, \Lambda^*, \pi^o, S^o, S_c^o)\}^2 | O^\dagger \right].$$

Expand $D_2(\beta^*, \Lambda^*, \hat{\pi}, S^o, \hat{S}_c) - D_2(\beta^*, \Lambda^*, \pi^o, S^o, S_c^o)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&D_2(\beta^*, \Lambda^*, \hat{\pi}, S^o, \hat{S}_c) - D_2(\beta^*, \Lambda^*, \pi^o, S^o, S_c^o) \tag{61} \\
&= - \int_0^\tau \frac{A\{\hat{\pi}(Z) - \pi^o(Z)\}}{\hat{\pi}(Z)\pi^o(Z)} \cdot \{dS^o(t; A, Z) + S^o(t; A, Z)e^{\beta^* A} d\Lambda^*(t)\} \\
&\quad + \int_0^\tau \frac{AS_c^o(t; A, Z)\{\pi^o(Z) - \hat{\pi}(Z)\}}{\hat{\pi}(Z)S_c^o(t; A, Z)\hat{S}_c(t; A, Z)\pi^o(Z)^A\{1 - \pi^o(Z)\}^{1-A}} \cdot \{dN(t) - Y(t)e^{\beta^*} d\Lambda^*(t)\} \\
&\quad + \int_0^\tau \frac{A\hat{\pi}(Z)\{S_c^o(t; A, Z) - \hat{S}_c(t; A, Z)\}}{\hat{\pi}(Z)S_c^o(t; A, Z)\hat{S}_c(t; A, Z)\pi^o(Z)^A\{1 - \pi^o(Z)\}^{1-A}} \cdot \{dN(t) - Y(t)e^{\beta^*} d\Lambda^*(t)\} \\
&\quad - \int_0^\tau \frac{AJ(t; 1, S^o, S_c^o)\{\hat{\pi}(Z) - \pi^o(Z)\}}{\hat{\pi}(Z)\pi^o(Z)} \cdot \{dS^o(t; 1, Z) + S^o(t; 1, Z)e^{\beta^*} d\Lambda^*(t)\} \\
&\quad + \int_0^\tau \frac{A\{J(t; 1, S^o, \hat{S}_c) - J(t; 1, S^o, S_c^o)\}}{\hat{\pi}(Z)} \cdot \{dS^o(t; 1, Z) + S^o(t; 1, Z)e^{\beta^*} d\Lambda^*(t)\}.
\end{aligned}$$

We now see that $D_2(\beta^*, \Lambda^*, \hat{\pi}, S^o, \hat{S}_c) - D_2(\beta^*, \Lambda^*, \pi^o, S^o, S_c^o)$ consists of several terms, where each term is an integral of a difference in nuisance functions with respect to a monotone function. This allows us to apply (45) to each of the terms and have

$$|D_2(\beta^*, \Lambda^*, \hat{\pi}, S^o, \hat{S}_c) - D_2(\beta^*, \Lambda^*, \pi^o, S^o, S_c^o)| \lesssim |\hat{\pi}(Z) - \pi^o(Z)| + \sup_{t \in [0, \tau], a \in \{0, 1\}} |S_c^o(t; a, Z) - \hat{S}_c(t; a, Z)|.$$

From the inequality $(a + b)^2 \leq 2a^2 + 2b^2$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Var}(Q_{51}|O^\dagger) &\lesssim E \left[\left(|\hat{\pi}(Z) - \pi^o(Z)| + \sup_{t \in [0, \tau], a \in \{0, 1\}} |S_c^o(t; a, Z) - \hat{S}_c(t; a, Z)| \right)^2 \middle| O^\dagger \right] \\ &\leq 2E[\{\hat{\pi}(Z) - \pi^o(Z)\}^2 | O^\dagger] + 2E \left[\left\{ \sup_{t \in [0, \tau], a \in \{0, 1\}} |S_c^o(t; a, Z) - \hat{S}_c(t; a, Z)| \right\}^2 \middle| O^\dagger \right]. \end{aligned}$$

So

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{Var}(Q_{51}) \\ &= \text{Var}^\dagger\{E(Q_{51}|O^\dagger)\} + E^\dagger\{\text{Var}(Q_{51}|O^\dagger)\} \\ &\lesssim 0 + E^\dagger(E[\{\hat{\pi}(Z) - \pi^o(Z)\}^2 | O^\dagger]) + E^\dagger \left(E \left[\left\{ \sup_{t \in [0, \tau], a \in \{0, 1\}} |S_c^o(t; a, Z) - \hat{S}_c(t; a, Z)| \right\}^2 \middle| O^\dagger \right] \right) \\ &= \|\hat{\pi} - \pi^o\|_\dagger^2 + \|\hat{S}_c - S_c^o\|_\dagger^2 \\ &= o(1). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, $Q_{51} = o_p(1)$ by Chebyshev's inequality.

Conditional on O^\dagger , we also have from Theorem 1' that $E\{D_{1i}(t; \beta^*, \Lambda^*, \hat{\pi}, S^o, \hat{S}_c) - D_{1i}(t; \beta^*, \Lambda^*, \pi^o, S^o, S_c^o) | O^\dagger\} = 0$ for each t and i , so Q_{52} is again a sample average of i.i.d. mean-zero terms when conditional on O^\dagger , and we can show $Q_{52} = o_p(1)$ in the same way as for Q_{51} above.

Consider Q_{53} . Just like the expansion of $D_2(\beta^*, \Lambda^*, \hat{\pi}, S^o, \hat{S}_c) - D_2(\beta^*, \Lambda^*, \pi^o, S^o, S_c^o)$ in (61) above, we also have $D_{1i}(t; \beta^*, \Lambda^*, \hat{\pi}, S^o, \hat{S}_c) - D_{1i}(t; \beta^*, \Lambda^*, \pi^o, S^o, S_c^o)$ as a sum of terms, where each term is a product between a difference in nuisance functions and an increment of a monotone function. So same as in Q_{51} , we apply (45) to each of the terms and have

$$\begin{aligned} |Q_{53}| &\lesssim \sqrt{n} \sup_{t \in [0, \tau]} \left| \bar{A}(t; \beta^*, \hat{\pi}, S^o, \hat{S}_c) - \bar{\alpha}(t; \beta^*, \hat{\pi}, S^o, \hat{S}_c) \right| \\ &\quad \cdot \left\{ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n |\hat{\pi}(Z_i) - \pi^o(Z_i)| + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \sup_{t \in [0, \tau], a \in \{0, 1\}} |S_c^o(t; a, Z_i) - \hat{S}_c(t; a, Z_i)| \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

From the uniform convergence Assumption 6 and the Markov's inequality, we have

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n |\hat{\pi}(Z_i) - \pi^o(Z_i)| + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \sup_{t \in [0, \tau], a \in \{0, 1\}} |S_c^o(t; a, Z_i) - \hat{S}_c(t; a, Z_i)| = o_p(1).$$

From (41) of Assumption 11, we have

$$\sqrt{n} \sup_{t \in [0, \tau]} \left| \bar{A}(t; \beta^*, \hat{\pi}, S^o, \hat{S}_c) - \bar{\alpha}(t; \beta^*, \hat{\pi}, S^o, \hat{S}_c) \right| = O_p(1).$$

We therefore have $Q_{53} = o_p(1)$.

For Q_{54} , we have $Q_{54} = Q_{541} - Q_{542} + Q_{543}$, where

$$\begin{aligned} Q_{541} &= \int_0^\tau \{\bar{A}(t; \beta^*, \hat{\pi}, S^o, \hat{S}_c) - \bar{\alpha}(t; \beta^*, \hat{\pi}, S^o, \hat{S}_c)\} \cdot \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n D_{1i}(t; \beta^*, \Lambda^*, \pi^o, S^o, S_c^o), \\ Q_{542} &= \int_0^\tau \{\bar{A}(t; \beta^*, \pi^o, S^o, S_c^o) - \bar{\alpha}(t; \beta^*, \pi^o, S^o, S_c^o)\} \cdot \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n D_{1i}(t; \beta^*, \Lambda^*, \pi^o, S^o, S_c^o), \\ Q_{543} &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n \int_0^\tau \{\bar{\alpha}(t; \beta^*, \hat{\pi}, S^o, \hat{S}_c) - \bar{\alpha}(t; \beta^*, \pi^o, S^o, S_c^o)\} D_{1i}(t; \beta^*, \Lambda^*, \pi^o, S^o, S_c^o) \end{aligned}$$

By (42) of Assumption 11, we have $Q_{541} = o_p(1)$ and $Q_{542} = o_p(1)$. Q_{543} is again a sample average of i.i.d. terms when conditional on O^\dagger , and each of the increments in $D_{1i}(t; \beta^*, \Lambda^*, \pi^o, S^o, S_c^o)$ is an increment of a monotone function. So like Q_{51} , we apply (45), followed by the law of total variance and have

$$\text{Var}(Q_{543}) \lesssim 0 + \frac{n}{n} E^\dagger \left(E \left[\left\{ \sup_{t \in [0, \tau]} \left| \bar{\alpha}(t; \beta^*, \hat{\pi}, S^o, \hat{S}_c) - \bar{\alpha}(t; \beta^*, \pi^o, S^o, S_c^o) \right| \right\}^2 \right] \right) = o(1),$$

where $o(1)$ follows from (40) of Assumption 11. Therefore, $Q_{543} = o_p(1)$ by Chebyshev's inequality and $Q_{54} = o_p(1)$.

Combining our results on Q_{51} to Q_{54} , we have $Q_5 = o_p(1)$.

Same as how we dealt with Q_5 , we can decompose Q_6 in a similar way and show that each of the terms is $o_p(1)$, so we omit the details here.

Lastly, we consider $\sqrt{n}U(\beta^*, \pi^o, S^o, S_c^o)$. Using (60), we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\sqrt{n}U(\beta^*, \pi^o, S^o, S_c^o) \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n \left[D_{2i}(\beta^*, \Lambda^*, \pi^o, S^o, S_c^o) - \int_0^\tau \bar{A}(t; \beta^*, \pi^o, S^o, S_c^o) D_{1i}(t; \beta^*, \Lambda^*, \pi^o, S^o, S_c^o) \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n \psi_i(\beta^*, \Lambda^*, \pi^o, S^o, S_c^o) \\ &\quad + \int_0^\tau \{\bar{\alpha}(t; \beta^*, \pi^o, S^o, S_c^o) - \bar{A}(t; \beta^*, \pi^o, S^o, S_c^o)\} \cdot \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n D_{1i}(t; \beta^*, \Lambda^*, \pi^o, S^o, S_c^o). \end{aligned} \tag{62}$$

From (42) of Assumption 11, we have (62) = $o_p(1)$, so we have

$$\sqrt{n}U(\beta^*, \pi^o, S^o, S_c^o) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n \psi_i(\beta^*, \Lambda^*, \pi^o, S^o, S_c^o) + o_p(1).$$

□

F.4 Consistency of $\hat{\Lambda}(t)$

Given the consistency of $\hat{\beta}$, Assumptions 1-6 and C1-C3 from Cox MSM, when either $S = S^o$, or $(\pi, S_c) = (\pi^o, S_c^o)$, we show that for each t ,

$$\hat{\Lambda}(t; \hat{\beta}, \hat{\pi}, \hat{S}, \hat{S}_c) \xrightarrow{p} \Lambda^*(t),$$

where

$$\hat{\Lambda}(t; \beta, \pi, S, S_c) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \int_0^t \frac{d\mathcal{N}_i^{(0)}(u; \pi, S, S_c)}{\mathcal{S}^{(0)}(u; \beta, \pi, S, S_c)}.$$

and

$$\Lambda^*(t) = \int_0^t \frac{\sum_{a=0,1} dF_a(t)}{\sum_{a=0,1} S_a(t) e^{\beta^* a}} = - \int_0^t \frac{\sum_{a=0,1} dS_a(t)}{\sum_{a=0,1} S_a(t) e^{\beta^* a}}$$

Proof.

Let $\hat{\Lambda}(t; \hat{\beta}, \hat{\pi}, \hat{S}, \hat{S}_c) - \Lambda^*(t) = L_1 + L_2 + L_3$, where

$$L_1 = \hat{\Lambda}(t; \hat{\beta}, \hat{\pi}, \hat{S}, \hat{S}_c) - \hat{\Lambda}(t; \beta^*, \hat{\pi}, \hat{S}, \hat{S}_c)$$

$$L_2 = \hat{\Lambda}(t; \beta^*, \hat{\pi}, \hat{S}, \hat{S}_c) - \hat{\Lambda}(t; \beta^*, \pi^*, S^*, S_c^*)$$

$$L_3 = \hat{\Lambda}(t; \beta^*, \pi^*, S^*, S_c^*) - \Lambda^*(t).$$

Consider L_1 , which can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} L_1 &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \int_0^t \frac{d\mathcal{N}_i^{(0)}(u; \hat{\pi}, \hat{S}, \hat{S}_c)}{\mathcal{S}^{(0)}(u; \hat{\beta}, \hat{\pi}, \hat{S}, \hat{S}_c) \mathcal{S}^{(0)}(u; \beta^*, \hat{\pi}, \hat{S}, \hat{S}_c)} \cdot \{\mathcal{S}^{(0)}(u; \beta^*, \hat{\pi}, \hat{S}, \hat{S}_c) - \mathcal{S}^{(0)}(u; \hat{\beta}, \hat{\pi}, \hat{S}, \hat{S}_c)\} \\ &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \int_0^t \frac{d\mathcal{N}_i^{(0)}(u; \hat{\pi}, \hat{S}, \hat{S}_c)}{\mathcal{S}^{(0)}(u; \hat{\beta}, \hat{\pi}, \hat{S}, \hat{S}_c) \mathcal{S}^{(0)}(u; \beta^*, \hat{\pi}, \hat{S}, \hat{S}_c)} \\ &\quad \times \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n \left[\frac{A_j^l Y_j(t) \{e^{\beta^* A_j} - e^{\hat{\beta} A_j}\}}{\pi(Z_j)^{A_j} \{1 - \pi(Z_j)\}^{1-A_j} S_c(t; A_j, Z_j)} - \frac{A_j^l S(t; A_j, Z_j) \{e^{\beta^* A_j} - e^{\hat{\beta} A_j}\}}{\pi(Z_j)^{A_j} \{1 - \pi(Z_j)\}^{1-A_j}} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \sum_{a=0,1} a^l \left\{ 1 + \frac{A_j^a (1 - A_j)^{1-a}}{\pi(Z_j)^a \{1 - \pi(Z_j)\}^{1-a}} J_j(t; a, S, S_c) \right\} S(t; a, Z_j) \{e^{\beta^* a} - e^{\hat{\beta} a}\} \right] \end{aligned}$$

Since $e^{\beta^* a} - e^{\hat{\beta} a} = o_p(1)$ and $e^{\beta^* A_j} - e^{\hat{\beta} A_j} = o_p(1)$, while the other terms are bounded a.s., we can apply the inequality

$$\left| \int_a^b f(t) dG(t) \right| \leq \sup_{t \in [a, b]} |f(t)| \cdot |G(b) - G(a)|$$

and have $L_1 = o_p(1)$.

Consider L_2 , which can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} L_2 &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \int_0^t \frac{d\mathcal{N}_i^{(0)}(u; \hat{\pi}, \hat{S}, \hat{S}_c) - d\mathcal{N}_i^{(0)}(u; \pi^*, S^*, S_c^*)}{\mathcal{S}^{(0)}(u; \beta^*, \hat{\pi}, \hat{S}, \hat{S}_c)} \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \int_0^t \frac{d\mathcal{N}_i^{(0)}(u; \pi^*, S^*, S_c^*)}{\mathcal{S}^{(0)}(u; \beta^*, \hat{\pi}, \hat{S}, \hat{S}_c) \mathcal{S}^{(0)}(u; \beta^*, \pi^*, S^*, S_c^*)} \cdot \{\mathcal{S}^{(0)}(u; \beta^*, \hat{\pi}, \hat{S}, \hat{S}_c) - \mathcal{S}^{(0)}(u; \beta^*, \pi^*, S^*, S_c^*)\}. \end{aligned}$$

As we can see, we are dealing with differences between $\hat{\pi}, \hat{S}, \hat{S}_c$ and π^*, S^*, S_c^* , which is the same as in Proof of Lemma 7, so we omit the details for showing $L_2 = o_p(1)$ here.

Lastly, for L_3 , we first note that from the definition of D_1 , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
L_3 &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \int_0^t \frac{d\mathcal{N}_i^{(0)}(u; \pi^*, S^*, S_c^*)}{\mathcal{S}^{(0)}(u; \beta^*, \pi^*, S^*, S_c^*)} - \Lambda^*(t) \\
&= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \int_0^t \frac{d\mathcal{N}_i^{(0)}(u; \pi^*, S^*, S_c^*)}{\mathcal{S}^{(0)}(u; \beta^*, \pi^*, S^*, S_c^*)} - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \int_0^t \frac{\Gamma_i^{(0)}(u; \beta^*, \pi^*, S^*, S_c^*)}{\mathcal{S}^{(0)}(u; \beta^*, \pi^*, S^*, S_c^*)} d\Lambda^*(t) \\
&= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \int_0^t \frac{D_{1i}(u; \beta^*, \Lambda^*, \pi^*, S^*, S_c^*)}{\mathcal{S}^{(0)}(u; \beta^*, \pi^*, S^*, S_c^*)} \\
&= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \int_0^t \frac{D_{1i}(u; \beta^*, \Lambda^*, \pi^*, S^*, S_c^*)}{s^{(0)}(u; \beta^*, \pi^*, S^*, S_c^*)} \tag{63} \\
&+ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \int_0^t \frac{D_{1i}(u; \beta^*, \Lambda^*, \pi^*, S^*, S_c^*)}{\mathcal{S}^{(0)}(u; \beta^*, \pi^*, S^*, S_c^*) s^{(0)}(u; \beta^*, \pi^*, S^*, S_c^*)} \cdot \{s^{(0)}(u; \beta^*, \pi^*, S^*, S_c^*) - \mathcal{S}^{(0)}(u; \beta^*, \pi^*, S^*, S_c^*)\}. \tag{64}
\end{aligned}$$

From the Theorem of DR, $D_{1i}(u; \beta^*, \Lambda^*, \pi^*, S^*, S_c^*)$ is mean-zero, while $s^{(0)}(u; \beta^*, \pi^*, S^*, S_c^*)$ is a fixed function, so the entire integral in (63) is mean-zero, and by the weak law of large numbers (63) is $o_p(1)$. (64) is $o_p(1)$ because $\sup_{t \in [0, \tau]} |s^{(0)}(u; \beta^*, \pi^*, S^*, S_c^*) - \mathcal{S}^{(0)}(u; \beta^*, \pi^*, S^*, S_c^*)| = o_p(1)$. So $L_3 = o_p(1)$.

□