

Influence Function: Local Robustness and Efficiency

Ruonan Xu and Xiye Yang

Department of Economics
Rutgers University

January, 2025

Abstract

We propose a direct approach to calculating influence functions based on the concept of functional derivatives. The relative simplicity of our direct method is demonstrated through well-known examples. Using influence functions as a key device, we examine the connection and difference between local robustness and efficiency in both joint and sequential identification/estimation procedures. We show that the joint procedure is associated with efficiency, while the sequential procedure is linked to local robustness. Furthermore, we provide conditions that are theoretically verifiable and empirically testable on when efficient and locally robust estimation for the parameter of interest in a semiparametric model can be achieved simultaneously. In addition, we present straightforward conditions for an adaptive procedure in the presence of nuisance parameters.

JEL classification: C13, C14.

Keywords: Semiparametrics, influence function, locally robust, efficiency.

1 Introduction

Efficiency and local robustness are fundamental concepts in statistics and econometrics. While efficiency primarily concerns variance, local robustness examines how estimators respond to minor perturbations or variations, particularly those caused by small biases in the nuisance estimator. Ideally, an estimator should exhibit both efficiency and local robustness, offering precise and stable estimates under diverse conditions and assumptions. The critical question then arises: How can one determine whether this is attainable? And if so, how to turn an estimator into a locally robust and efficient one?

The key is to examine the influence function, which is defined as the functional derivative of a parameter with respect to a small perturbation of the underlying probability measure (or distribution) P in the form of $P^\epsilon = (1 - \epsilon)P + \epsilon Q = P + \epsilon(Q - P)$, where ϵ is an arbitrarily small number and Q is another probability measure. The most well-known use of influence functions is perhaps validating asymptotic linear expansion and

deriving the semiparametric efficiency bound (Bickel et al., 1993). Recently, because of the popularity of machine learning methods, influence functions have also been used to construct orthogonal moment functions with a nonparametric first step. This leads to locally robust estimators that remove first-order regularization bias; see Chernozhukov et al. (2018) and Chernozhukov et al. (2022).

However, there has not been much attempt in the literature at integrating efficiency and local robustness using influence functions. For example, Chen and Santos (2018) outline methods to assess efficiency improvements, albeit without discussing local robustness explicitly. Conversely, the aforementioned papers on local robustness pay little attention to efficiency. Some exceptions in sequential semiparametric estimation include Newey (1994) and ?, where nuisance parameters can be concentrated out or a “least favorable curve” can be found to achieve both local robustness and efficiency.

In this paper, we contribute to the literature by providing a comprehensive analysis of the connections and differences between these two crucial concepts. We take a more general approach, considering both joint (one-step) and sequential (multi-step) identification and estimation procedures of the parameters of interest and nuisance parameters in a semiparametric model. Joint estimation has been studied in Bickel et al. (1993) to derive the semiparametric efficiency bound via the likelihood method. On the other hand, many semiparametric models adopt a sequential (plug-in) approach, estimating parameters in multiple steps. For example, in the case of the average treatment effect (ATE), the propensity score is defined under the conditional distribution $P_{(T|X)}$ and estimated first, then plugged into the identification function of the ATE, which is defined under the unconditional measure. This idea is so natural that most subsequent papers on semiparametric efficiency and/or local robustness adopt sequential estimation procedures (Andrews, 1994; Newey, 1994; Ai and Chen, 2003).

Based on this, we analyze the influence functions of both procedures with (conditional) moment restrictions and provide some criteria to assess if a sequential method performs just as well as joint estimation, thus guiding practitioners on whether joint estimation is worth the additional complexity caused by different probability measures. We outline key conditions when the parameter of interest can attain efficiency and local robustness simultaneously in a semiparametric setting. These conditions are theoretically verifiable, empirically testable, and satisfied by (nearly) all models.

Despite their importance and utility, deriving influence functions can pose a challenge. All current methods have certain limitations. Although natural and intuitive, the stochastic expansion method can be cumbersome. The method presented in Tsiatis (2006) is based on a detailed tangent space structure that can be abstract. The general approach outlined in Newey (1990, 1994) and Bickel et al. (1993) may sometimes require an educated guess in

practice; see, for instance, the application in [Hahn \(1998\)](#). [Hahn and Ridder \(2013\)](#) extend [Newey \(1994\)](#) to a three-step setting but limit their analysis to the case where functions must be differentiable (in the narrow sense). [Ichimura and Newey \(2022\)](#) take the approach of general Gâteaux derivative but eventually require solving a least squares projection problem.

Consequently, another goal of this paper is to provide a more accessible method to derive influence functions. We show that applying functional derivatives all at once can lead to a closed form of the influence function. We consider our approach more explicit and straightforward, as it only requires taking derivatives (in the general sense) and evaluating expectations of the identification function.

We start with the identification function of a parameter instead of any possible estimators. When both the parameter of interest and the nuisance parameter are just-identified, the joint and sequential procedures yield an identical influence function. However, when both types of parameter can be over-identified, the influence function of the parameter of interest may differ. Notably, the joint procedure is directly related to efficiency, whereas the sequential procedure is automatically locally robust. Regardless of the procedure adopted, we derive influence functions that are both efficient and locally robust under some mild conditions. Based on these directly derived influence functions, one can construct better estimators. Additionally, we provide straightforward conditions for constructing an adaptive procedure that is efficient without knowing the nuisance parameter.

The remainder of the paper is structured as follows. [Section 2](#) presents key concepts and definitions. The direct method of calculating influence functions is presented in [Section 3](#) with various examples. [Section 4](#) lays out the conditions for a locally robust and efficient identification strategy. Generalization and extension of our main results are collected in [Section 5](#). [Section 6](#) concludes. Technical details are delegated to the appendix.

2 Concepts and Definitions

2.1 Basic Notation

Consider a measure space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mu)$ where μ is a σ -finite measure. Denote by \mathcal{M}_μ the collection of all probability measures P on (Ω, \mathcal{F}) dominated by μ . We refer to a subset $\mathcal{P} \subseteq \mathcal{M}_\mu$ as the model.

The random variable associated with P will be denoted by Z , which defines a function from Ω to some measurable space \mathcal{Z} . Emphasizing how expectation is derived from the probability measure, we use the notation $P[h] := \int h dP$ instead of $\mathbb{E}[h]$ for any function h of Z with a finite mean. Whenever possible, we will ignore the random variable Z or its possible value z in such functions for simplicity.

We use $\mathcal{L}_2(\mu)$ or $\mathcal{L}_2(P)$ to denote the space of square integrable functions with respect to

μ or P , respectively. Furthermore, we denote by $\mathcal{L}_2^0(P)$ the subspace of $\mathcal{L}_2(P)$ that consists of zero-mean and square integrable functions with respect to P . Unless stated otherwise, all vectors and vector-valued functions are column ones. Let $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ be the covariance inner product on $\mathcal{L}_2(P)$.

We use the symbol \top to denote the transpose of a vector or a matrix. When taking the partial derivative of a (potentially matrix-valued) function h with respect to some vector (or matrix) θ , we use the representation $\partial h / \partial \theta \equiv \partial \text{vec}(h) / \partial \text{vec}(\theta)^\top$ among others, which is the Jacobian matrix and preserves the chain rule (see [Kollo and von Rosen \(2006\)](#)). We use M^+ to denote the Moore-Penrose inverse of any matrix M .

2.2 Differentiability and Regularity

Suppose the parameter of interest β depends on some nuisance parameter γ . We are interested in determining whether it is possible to construct an estimator of β that is both efficient and locally robust to the estimation of γ . The key to this question is the influence function.

There are two general approaches to deriving the influence function: the estimator-based and the parameter-based (or estimand-based) ones. Either way, it is necessary to assume certain types of differentiability and then expand the estimator or the parameter, where the leading term is the influence function. We adopt the second approach as it saves us from specifying the actual forms of the estimator, which leads to a neat presentation. As a result, we view efficiency and local robustness as properties of the parameter/estimand, rather than that of some specific estimator. Ultimately, if the stochastic equicontinuity condition ([Andrews, 1994](#); [Newey, 1994](#); [Newey and McFadden, 1994](#)) holds true, it is possible to find an asymptotically linear estimator for the parameter β . Hence, we start with the identification condition of β directly, a similar approach used by [Huber \(1984\)](#).

Following the literature ([Hampel, 1974](#); [Bickel et al., 1993](#)), we define functional derivatives (or differentials) based on pathwise differentiability.

Definition 2.1 (Functional Derivative). *The functional derivative $\dot{\nu}(P; Q - P)$ of ν at P along the direction $Q - P$ is defined as*

$$\dot{\nu}(P; Q - P) := \left. \frac{\partial}{\partial \epsilon} \nu(P + \epsilon(Q - P)) \right|_{\epsilon=0}. \quad (2.1)$$

Let \mathcal{S} be the collection of directions $Q - P$ such that the above derivative exists. Then different types of functional derivatives (Gâteaux, Hadamard, or Fréchet) correspond to different structures of the set \mathcal{S} (refer to [Appendix A.1](#) for more details).

To gain more mathematical tractability, it is often assumed that the derivative $\dot{\nu}(P; Q - P)$ is continuous linear in the argument $Q - P$. Under Gâteaux differentiability, [Huber \(1984\)](#) gives a simple proof of the following integral representation (Chapter 2.5 therein):

$$\dot{\nu}(P; Q - P) = \int \dot{\nu}(P)d(Q - P) = \int \dot{\nu}(P)dQ,$$

where $\dot{\nu}(P) \in \mathcal{L}_2^0(P)$. Without the zero mean condition $P[\dot{\nu}] = 0$, we would not have the second equality and there would be infinitely many functions (e.g., $\dot{\nu} + a$ for any finite vector a) satisfying the first equality. This is an application of the Riesz representation theorem (see, e.g., [Walter \(1987\)](#)), which guarantees the uniqueness of $\dot{\nu}(P)$. To put it differently, the Riesz representation in the current context serves as a projection from the space $\mathcal{L}_2(P)$ onto $\mathcal{L}_2^0(P)$.

Remark 2.2. *The relationship between $\dot{\nu}(P; Q - P)$ and $\dot{\nu}(P)$ mimics the relationship between directional derivative $\nabla_v f(x) = \nabla f(x) \cdot v$ (with respect to a vector v) and gradient $\nabla f(x)$. In fact, consider those measures Q dominated by P . There exists a unique scalar-valued function $g = d(Q - P)/dP$ up to a P -null set. Then we have $\dot{\nu}(P; Q - P) = \int \dot{\nu}gdP = \langle \dot{\nu}, g \rangle$ in the form of an inner product similar to $\nabla_v f(x) = \nabla f(x) \cdot v$ along a finite-dimensional direction v . In contrast, the unique function $\dot{\nu}(P)$ gives a direction in the functional space, just as the gradient $\nabla f(x)$ in the vector space.*

This unique function $\dot{\nu} = \dot{\nu}(P)$ is the influence function, or influence curve as introduced by [Hampel \(1968, 1974\)](#). Note that the function $\dot{\nu}$ is defined through an analysis of the parameter (i.e., the estimand), rather than a feasible estimator. However, one can often get a feasible estimator by replacing P with the empirical measure \mathbb{P}_n or some transformation of \mathbb{P}_n (refer to [Section 5.2](#) for more discussion). More generally, we focus on the analysis of regular parameters.

Definition 2.3 (Regular Parameter). *A parameter $\nu(P)$, which defines a functional $\nu : \mathcal{P} \rightarrow \mathbb{B}$, where \mathbb{B} is a Banach space, is regular at $P \in \mathcal{P}$ if the following conditions hold:*

(i) *Functional differentiability.* *The functional derivative $\dot{\nu}(P; Q - P)$ defined as in [Definition 2.1](#) exists for all $Q - P \in \mathcal{S}$, where \mathcal{S} is a sufficiently rich set.*

(ii) *Linearity.* *The derivative $\dot{\nu}(P; Q - P)$ is continuous linear in $Q - P$. Consequently, there exists a unique $\dot{\nu}(P) \in \mathcal{L}_2^0(P)$ satisfying [\(2.1\)](#).*

(iii) *Square-integrability and variance invertibility.* *The influence function $\dot{\nu}(P)$ is square integrable with respect to P , and the variance-covariance matrix $\langle \dot{\nu}, \dot{\nu}^\top \rangle$ is invertible.*

If ν is regular at all $P \in \mathcal{P}$ and the derivative $\dot{\nu}(P; Q - P)$ is also continuous in P , then we simply call ν a regular parameter (with respect to model \mathcal{P}). If all the conditions are

satisfied except that $\langle \dot{\nu}, \dot{\nu}^\top \rangle$ is invertible, we say ν is a pseudo-regular parameter and treat the Moore-Penrose inverse $\langle \dot{\nu}, \dot{\nu}^\top \rangle^+$ as its pseudo variance-covariance matrix.

Intuitively, the differentiability condition ensures that the parameter ν varies “smoothly” with P in the model \mathcal{P} . The linearity condition on its derivative makes it possible to be realized by an asymptotically linear estimator, under some additional commonly adopted assumptions on the model (skipped for simplicity). The square integrability condition further rules out the possibility that the asymptotically linear estimator has an infinite variance with the root- n rate. For nonparametric estimators, which has slower rates, this condition can be modified to accommodate such rate differences (refer to Section 5.2 for more details). The reason we introduce the concept of pseudo-regular parameter is to facilitate the discussion in Section 4.2.

2.3 Local Robustness

Early robustness literature focused primarily on robustness to outliers (see Tukey (1960)), primarily in one-step estimation contexts. With the rapid development of two-step estimation, the focus has been on the robustness to the specification and the estimation error of the nuisance parameter, for example, the double robustness (Robins and Rotnitzky, 2001) and the local robustness (Chernozhukov et al., 2022). In the former case, a second-order influence function is involved, while the latter is a property of a first-order influence function only. This paper focuses on local robustness. The second-order influence function is left for future research.

Definition 2.4 (Local Robustness to First-Step Parameter (Chernozhukov et al., 2022)). *Let β be a regular parameter that depends on another regular parameter γ . Suppose that β can be identified by the moment condition $P[m_\beta(\beta, \gamma(P))] = 0$. We say β (or the moment function m_β) is locally robust to the first-step parameter γ if*

$$\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{\epsilon} P[m_\beta(\beta, \gamma(P + \epsilon(Q - P))) - m_\beta(\beta, \gamma(P))] = 0 \quad (2.2)$$

for all $Q - P \in \mathcal{S}$. For simplicity, we may say that β is locally robust. Accordingly, we will call m_β a locally robust moment condition.

In the above definition, one can replace P and Q with conditional probability measures that define β and γ , respectively.

Lemma 2.5. *Suppose that the moment function m_β is differentiable with respect to γ , which is also a regular parameter. Thus, any element of $\dot{\gamma}(P)$ is different from zero. Suppose*

that expectation and differentiation can be switched. Assume also that we can change the integration order of $\partial m_\beta / \partial \gamma$ and $\dot{\gamma}$. Then β defined by $P[m_\beta(\beta, \gamma(P))] = 0$ is locally robust to the first-step parameter γ if and only if

$$P\left[\frac{\partial m_\beta}{\partial \gamma} \dot{\gamma}(P; Q - P)\right] = 0 \quad \forall Q - P \in \mathcal{S} \quad \iff \quad P\left[\frac{\partial m_\beta}{\partial \gamma}\right] \dot{\gamma}(P) = 0 \quad \iff \quad P\left[\frac{\partial m_\beta}{\partial \gamma}\right] = 0,$$

where 0 could be a zero vector or zero matrix.

The first equivalence is established by the requirement that

$$P\left[\frac{\partial m_\beta}{\partial \gamma} \dot{\gamma}(P; Q - P)\right] = \int \frac{\partial m_\beta}{\partial \gamma} \left(\int \dot{\gamma}(P) d(Q - P) \right) dP = \int P\left[\frac{\partial m_\beta}{\partial \gamma}\right] \dot{\gamma}(P) d(Q - P) = 0$$

for all admissible Q . Then the integrand must be identically zero.

3 Influence Function

3.1 The One-Step Case: A Toy Example

In this subsection, we demonstrate how to derive the influence function as a functional derivative using a simple model. Consider a parameter ν that can be indirectly identified by the following moment condition:

$$P[m(Z, \nu)] = 0, \tag{3.1}$$

where the dimension of m is no less than the dimension of ν , that is, $d_m \geq d_\nu$. If ν can be directly identified by $\nu = P[h]$, we can always define $m(\nu) = h - \nu$ as the moment function. Assume that we can change the order of integration and differentiation. Define $\overline{\partial_\nu m} := P[\partial m / \partial \nu]$ and assume that it has full column rank so that ν is identifiable from the above moment conditions.

We do not view (3.1) as a restriction on the distribution P unless m is completely known. Since m depends on unknown parameters, it is always possible to let the parameter vary with $P \in \mathcal{M}_\mu$ to satisfy the moment condition. Additionally, the subsequent analysis and results remain valid if the unconditional probability measures are replaced with conditional ones. This will be clarified in Section 3.2 below.

The idea then is to employ the implicit function theorem to solve ν as a function of P , which requires taking derivatives with respect to P .¹ Thus, we need to ensure that $\overline{\partial_\nu m}$ is

¹Two perspectives are available for employing the implicit function theorem, which distinguishes our approach from that of Newey (1994). One views ν as a function of P and the other views P as a function of ν . The first perspective is what we adopt here and it directly leads to $\dot{\nu}(P; Q - P)$ as shown below. The

invertible. If $d_m > d_\nu$, $\partial m/\partial \gamma$ is not even a square matrix. For any d_ν -by- d_m matrix A with full row rank, there exists some d_m -by- d_m symmetric matrix $\bar{\Xi}$ such that $A = \overline{\partial_\nu m}^\top \bar{\Xi}$ and that $A \overline{\partial_\nu m}$ is invertible. We thus have

$$P[\overline{\partial_\nu m}^\top \bar{\Xi} m(\nu)] = 0. \quad (3.2)$$

This can be equivalently formulated as solving the following minimum-distance estimation problem, whose first-order condition is (3.2):

$$\min_\nu P[m(\nu)^\top] \bar{\Xi} P[m(\nu)].$$

In general, this weighting matrix $\bar{\Xi}$ may depend on some unknown parameter, so it can be considered another nuisance parameter. For example, in the classic GMM setting, the optimal weighting matrix depends on unknown variance.

Let $F(\nu, \bar{\Xi}, P) := P[\overline{\partial_\nu m}^\top \bar{\Xi} m(\nu)]$. It is easy to see that under the moment restriction (3.2), we have

$$\frac{\partial F}{\partial \nu} = \overline{\partial_\nu m}^\top \bar{\Xi} \overline{\partial_\nu m} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{\partial F}{\partial \bar{\Xi}} = P[m(\nu)^\top \otimes \overline{\partial_\nu m}^\top] = 0.$$

Then for all admissible Q , we have the following result by taking derivatives with respect to P ,

$$\frac{\partial F}{\partial \nu} \dot{\nu}(P; Q - P) + (Q - P)[\overline{\partial_\nu m}^\top \bar{\Xi} m] = 0 \iff \int \left[\frac{\partial F}{\partial \nu} \dot{\nu}(P) + \overline{\partial_\nu m}^\top \bar{\Xi} m \right] d(Q - P) = 0.$$

Since this equality holds for many Q , the term within the bracket must be zero.

Proposition 3.1. *Assume that the parameter ν in the moment condition (3.1) is regular with $d_m \geq d_\nu$. Moreover, the matrix $\overline{\partial_\nu m} = P[\partial m/\partial \nu]$ has a full column rank. The matrix $\overline{\partial_\nu m}^\top \bar{\Xi} \overline{\partial_\nu m}$ is invertible. The rank of $\bar{V}_{\nu\nu} := \langle m, m^\top \rangle$ is no less than d_ν . Suppose that we can interchange the order of integration and differentiation. Then the influence function of ν is given by*

$$\dot{\nu}(P) = -\{\overline{\partial_\nu m}^\top \bar{\Xi} \overline{\partial_\nu m}\}^{-1} \overline{\partial_\nu m}^\top \bar{\Xi} m.$$

The optimal choice of $\bar{\Xi}$ is given by $\bar{\Xi}^ = \bar{V}_{\nu\nu}^+$ and the corresponding efficient variance is $\{\overline{\partial_\nu m}^\top \bar{V}_{\nu\nu}^+ \overline{\partial_\nu m}\}^{-1} =: \Sigma_{\nu\nu}^{-1}$. Regardless of the choice of $\bar{\Xi}$, we always have $P[\partial \dot{\nu}/\partial \nu] = -I$.*

latter gives rise to the score function, which is only used to derive the efficiency bound in Section 4.2 below. In our understanding, Newey (1994) combines both perspectives. This explains why both the influence function and the score function appear in (2.2) of Newey (1994) and (2.2) of Ichimura and Newey (2022).

Remark 3.2 (Over-identification). *In the literature, it is often assumed that the matrix $\bar{V}_{\nu\nu}$ is invertible. In this context, the meaning of over-identification (Anderson and Rubin, 1949; Sargan, 1958; Hansen, 1982) is unambiguous: $d_m > d_\nu$. In a recent paper, Chen and Santos (2018) extend this concept to a general infinite-dimensional model and define local over-identification by comparing tangent spaces. It is worth noting, however, that their discussion on just and over-identification in the GMM illustration example is based on the condition that the variance-covariance matrix of the moment conditions (i.e., $\bar{V}_{\nu\nu}$ in the current context) is full rank. Here, $\text{rank}(\bar{V}_{\nu\nu}) \geq d_\nu$ is sufficient for identification and its Moore-Penrose inverse is used instead because it may not be a full-rank matrix. This gives rise to the case where $d_m > d_\nu$ but $\text{rank}(\bar{V}_{\nu\nu}) = d_\nu$. To facilitate the analysis in Section 4 below, we need to distinguish this case from $\text{rank}(\bar{V}_{\nu\nu}) > d_\nu$ (which implies $d_m > d_\nu$). We will refer to the former case as “row over-identification” and the latter one as “rank over-identification” whenever needed. In case we do not need this distinction, we will only use “over-identification.”*

To connect with a sequential (e.g., two-step) procedure, consider the following partitions:

$$\nu = \begin{pmatrix} \beta \\ \gamma \end{pmatrix}, \quad m = \begin{pmatrix} m_\beta \\ m_\gamma \end{pmatrix}, \quad \overline{\partial_\nu m} = \begin{pmatrix} \overline{\partial_\beta m_\beta} & \overline{\partial_\gamma m_\beta} \\ \overline{\partial_\beta m_\gamma} & \overline{\partial_\gamma m_\gamma} \end{pmatrix}, \quad \bar{V}_{\nu\nu} = \begin{pmatrix} \bar{V}_{\beta\beta} & \bar{V}_{\beta\gamma} \\ \bar{V}_{\gamma\beta} & \bar{V}_{\gamma\gamma} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (3.3)$$

where the ranks of $\bar{V}_{\beta\beta} := \langle m_\beta, m_\beta^\top \rangle$ and $\bar{V}_{\gamma\gamma} := \langle m_\gamma, m_\gamma^\top \rangle$ are no less than d_β and d_γ , respectively. Therefore, if either of β or γ were known, the other could be identified by the corresponding part of m . Furthermore, we need

$$\overline{\partial_\beta m_\gamma} = 0 \quad (3.4)$$

to obtain a two-step procedure first identifying γ from m_γ and then plugging it into m_β .

Corollary 3.3. *Suppose that the assumptions of Proposition 3.1 and (3.4) hold. The influence functions of γ and β in a two-step procedure are given by*

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\gamma}(P) &= -\{\overline{\partial_\gamma m_\gamma}^\top \bar{\Xi}_{\gamma\gamma} \overline{\partial_\gamma m_\gamma}\}^{-1} \overline{\partial_\gamma m_\gamma}^\top \bar{\Xi}_{\gamma\gamma} m_\gamma, \\ \dot{\beta}(P) &= -\{\overline{\partial_\beta m_\beta}^\top \bar{\Xi}_{\beta\beta} \overline{\partial_\beta m_\beta}\}^{-1} \overline{\partial_\beta m_\beta}^\top \bar{\Xi}_{\beta\beta} (m_\beta + \overline{\partial_\gamma m_\beta} \dot{\gamma}). \end{aligned} \quad (3.5)$$

Define $m_\beta^{LR} := m_\beta + \overline{\partial_\gamma m_\beta} \dot{\gamma}$. Since $P[\partial \dot{\gamma} / \partial \gamma] = -I$, we have $\overline{\partial_\gamma m_\beta^{LR}} = 0$.

Moreover, if both $\overline{\partial_\beta m_\beta}$ and $\overline{\partial_\gamma m_\gamma}$ are invertible, then the choices of $\bar{\Xi}_{\beta\beta}$ and $\bar{\Xi}_{\gamma\gamma}$ no longer matter. Accordingly, the above influence functions reduce to

$$\dot{\gamma}(P) = -\overline{\partial_\gamma m_\gamma}^{-1} m_\gamma \quad \text{and} \quad \dot{\beta}(P) = -\overline{\partial_\beta m_\beta}^{-1} (m_\beta - \overline{\partial_\gamma m_\beta} \overline{\partial_\gamma m_\gamma}^{-1} m_\gamma).$$

Furthermore, if both γ and β can be directly identified, that is, $m_\gamma = h_\gamma - \gamma$ and $m_\beta = h_\beta - \beta$, we have $h_\beta^{\text{LR}} := h_\beta + \overline{\partial_\gamma h_\beta} \dot{\gamma}$ and

$$\dot{\gamma}(P) = h_\gamma - \gamma = h_\gamma - P[h_\gamma] \quad \text{and} \quad \dot{\beta}(P) = h_\beta - P[h_\beta] + \overline{\partial_\gamma h_\beta}(h_\gamma - P[h_\gamma]) = h_\beta^{\text{LR}} - P[h_\beta].$$

The results for other cases (only one of β and γ can be directly identified) can be easily derived from the above.

According to the principle outlined in Chernozhukov et al. (2022), one should use m_β^{LR} instead of m_β to identify β in such a two-step procedure for local robustness. It is easy to see the benefit when both β and γ can be directly identified. Suppose the first-step suffers from a small perturbation so that we have $\gamma^\epsilon = P^\epsilon[h_\gamma]$. The raw and adjusted identification strategies would respectively yield

$$\beta^{\text{raw}}(\epsilon) = P[h_\beta(\gamma^\epsilon)] \quad \text{and} \quad \beta^{\text{LR}}(\epsilon) = P[h_\beta^{\text{LR}}(\gamma^\epsilon)] = P\left\{h_\beta(\gamma^\epsilon) + P\left[\frac{\partial h_\beta}{\partial \gamma}(\gamma^\epsilon)\right](h_\gamma - \gamma^\epsilon)\right\}.$$

It can be verified that $\beta^{\text{raw}}(0) = \beta^{\text{LR}}(0)$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \beta^{\text{raw}}(\epsilon) - \beta^{\text{raw}}(0) &= P\left[\frac{\partial h_\beta}{\partial \gamma}\right] \times (Q - P)[h_\gamma] \times \epsilon + o(\epsilon). \\ \beta^{\text{LR}}(\epsilon) - \beta^{\text{LR}}(0) &= -\frac{1}{2}P\left[\frac{\partial^2 h_\beta}{\partial \gamma^2}\right] \left((Q - P)[h_\gamma]\right)^2 \times \epsilon^2 + o(\epsilon^2). \end{aligned}$$

That is, the adjusted identification strategy can reduce the impact of the possible first-step local misspecification bias or non-parametric bias from first-order to second-order.

When both β and γ can be exact/just-identified (i.e., $\text{rank}(\overline{V}_{\beta\beta}) = d_\beta$ and $\text{rank}(\overline{V}_{\gamma\gamma}) = d_\gamma$), it is not hard to verify that the sequential and joint estimation procedures are equivalent (see Corollary A.2 in the appendix). The discussion of the general case where $\langle m, m^\top \rangle$ can be singular is deferred to Section 4 below. In such cases, the comparison requires a closed form expression of the Moore-Penrose inverse of a block matrix.

With over-identification (in the sense of either row or rank), however, it remains unclear whether the sequential procedure is as efficient as the joint procedure. Intuitively, the two-step (or multi-step in general) procedure solves the optimization/estimation problem sequentially, which may or may not yield the same results as the joint procedure. We look into this issue in Section 4.1 below.

3.2 The Multi-Step Plug-in Estimation

In many econometric problems, parameters are defined/identified under different conditional probability measures, making joint estimation a challenge. Therefore, the sequential plug-in

estimation procedure becomes a natural choice. In this subsection, we show how to derive influence functions from a multi-step estimation procedure. We argue that one may still face the joint-versus-sequential problem under any given conditional probability.

Suppose that the d -dimensional random vector Z generated from P can be written as $Z = (Z^{(1)\top}, \dots, Z^{(l)\top})^\top$, where each $Z^{(j)}$ is d_j -dimensional and $d_1 + \dots + d_l = d$. Intuitively, one can always choose to keep Z as a whole ($l = 1$) or decompose it as much as possible ($l = d$). Here, we decompose in a way that adequately reflects the “exogeneity” level of different variables. For example, in a linear regression model without endogenous regressors, it is appropriate to have $Z^{(1)} = X$ and $Z^{(2)} = Y$. In IV estimation with instruments W , we would write $Z^{(1)} = W$ and $Z^{(2)} = (X, Y)$, rather than having $Z^{(2)} = X$ and $Z^{(3)} = Y$. Treatment effect estimation has $Z^{(1)} = X$, $Z^{(2)} = T$ (binary treatment assignment), and $Z^{(3)} = Y$. Accordingly, many parameters will be identified under some conditional probability measure, rather than the unconditional one studied in Section 3.1.

For any i and j , let $Z^{(j:i)} = (Z^{(i)\top}, \dots, Z^{(j)\top})^\top$ when $i \leq j$ and $Z^{(j:i)}$ be the empty set if $i > j$. Let $P_{(1)}$ be the marginal probability measure of $Z^{(1)}$. For $j = 1, \dots, l$, let $P_{(j|j-1:1)}$ be the conditional distribution of $Z^{(j)}$ given $Z^{(j-1:1)}$. We denote $P_{(j|j-1:1)}$ by $P_{(j|:)}$ for simplicity. Additionally, denote by $P_{(l:j|:)}$ the joint probability measure of $Z^{(l:j)}$ conditional on $Z^{(j-1:1)}$.

Under each conditional probability measure $P_{(j|:)}$, one can potentially identify a vector-valued function γ_j . In contrast, the parameter of interest β is often identified under the unconditional probability measure P . It is thus quite likely that the identification of γ_j does not involve β , making multi-step plug-in estimation a natural approach. To make the key results more accessible, we first show the case where β can be directly identified.

Theorem 3.4. *Suppose a regular finite-dimensional parameter β can be identified by*

$$\beta(P) = P[h_\beta(\gamma_1(P_{(1)}), \gamma_2(P_{(2|:)}), \dots, \gamma_l(P_{(l|:)}))], \quad (3.6)$$

where h_β is a known function of all the γ_j 's and each γ_j depends on Z only through $Z^{(j:1)}$. For $j' < j$, the function $\gamma_{j'}$ could be an input to γ_j .

Assume that h_β is continuously differentiable with respect to $\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_l$. Then the influence function is given by

$$\dot{\beta} = \sum_{j=1}^l \dot{\beta}_j = \sum_{j=1}^l \left\{ (P_{(l:j+1|:)} - P_{(l:j|:)})[h_\beta] + P_{(l:j|:)} \left[\frac{\partial h_\beta}{\partial \gamma_j} \right] \times \dot{\gamma}_j \right\}, \quad (3.7)$$

where $P_{(l:l+1|:)}[h_\beta] = h_\beta$ and $P_{(l:1|:)} = P$.

If each γ_j can be directly identified as $\gamma_j(P_{(j|:)}) = P_{(j|:)}[h_{\gamma_j}]$ with some function h_{γ_j} , for

$j = 1, \dots, l$, where h_{γ_j} depends on z only through $z^{(j:1)}$. Then the influence function of β is given by

$$\dot{\beta} = \sum_{j=1}^l \dot{\beta}_j = \sum_{j=1}^l \left\{ (P_{(l:j+1|:)} - P_{(l:j|:)})[h_\beta] + P_{(l:j|:)} \left[\frac{\partial h_\beta}{\partial \gamma_j} \right] \times (h_{\gamma_j} - P_{(j|:)}[h_{\gamma_j}]) \right\}. \quad (3.8)$$

For $j = 1, \dots, l$, let $h_{\beta,j} := P_{(l:j+1|:)}[h_\beta]$ so that it only depends on $Z^{(j:1)}$. Then we can introduce an auxiliary parameter $\beta_j := P_{(j|:)}[h_{\beta,j}]$. It is clear that the parameter $\nu_j = (\beta_j^\top, \gamma_j^\top)^\top$ can be jointly identified under the conditional measure $P_{(j|:)}$. Hence, we can see that $\dot{\beta}_j$ has the same structure as Corollary 3.3, with P replaced by $P_{(j|:)}$, h_β by $h_{\beta,j}$, and h_γ by h_{γ_j} . This implies that the joint-versus-sequential problem remains implicit under every conditional measure $P_{(j|:)}$.

The influence function can be rewritten as $\dot{\beta} = h_\beta^{\text{LR}} - \beta$, where

$$h_\beta^{\text{LR}} = h_\beta + \sum_{j=1}^l P_{(l:j|:)} \left[\frac{\partial h_\beta}{\partial \gamma_j} \right] \times \dot{\gamma}_j. \quad (3.9)$$

It can be shown that $P[\partial_{\gamma_j} h_\beta^{\text{LR}}] = 0$ for each j . Consequently, after obtaining the influence function, one can employ h_β^{LR} in place of h_β to identify β , thereby achieving local robustness.

Newey (1994) derives the influence function in a semiparametric two-step setting. The correction term therein corresponds to the second term on the right hand side of (3.9), i.e., the difference $h_\beta^{\text{LR}} - h_\beta$. To see this, let $Z = (X, Y)$ with $l = 2$, $\gamma_1 \equiv 0$, and $\gamma_2 \equiv P_{(Y|X)}[Y] = E(Y|X)$ so that $\dot{\gamma}_2 = Y - E(Y|X)$. However, the multiplier of $\dot{\gamma}_2$ given in (4.7) therein involves a general but complicated partial derivative, whose calculation may not be that straightforward. Hahn and Ridder (2013) extend Newey (1994) to a three-step setting. Similarly, the general expressions of the influence function given by Hahn and Ridder (2013) often involve second-order derivatives (e.g., Theorems 1, 2 and 7 as well as equations (4) and (7) therein). Nevertheless, the above theorem shows that our approach relies only on first-order partial derivatives, which are easy to calculate.

Besides, Hahn and Ridder (2013) do not cover the case where the derivative does not exist (refer to the statement preceding Lemma 1 therein). By employing the idea of a generalized derivative, we can also deal with non-differentiable identification moments whose derivatives can be represented by the Dirac delta function.

Remark 3.5 (Generated Regressor(s)). *The plug-in estimation approach inherently involves the use of generated regressor(s), which introduces an additional layer of complexity to the asymptotic analysis. The example of generated regressors considered in Section 4.1 of*

Hahn and Ridder (2013) is given by (in the original notation therein):

$$\hat{\beta} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (\hat{\gamma}_1(\psi(x_i, \hat{\alpha})) - \hat{\gamma}_2(\psi(x_i, \hat{\alpha}))),$$

where ψ is the propensity score (we will use π in our following examples). In Section 4.2 therein, the authors also consider the case where this propensity score is nonparametrically estimated. Regardless of how one would estimate ψ , let us denote it by γ_3 instead. Denote by \mathbb{P}_n the empirical measure such that $\mathbb{P}_n[f(Z)] = 1/n \sum_{i=1}^n f(Z_i)$ for any $f(\cdot)$. Then the above estimator and the true parameter are

$$\hat{\beta} = \mathbb{P}_n[\hat{\gamma}_1(\hat{\gamma}_3) - \hat{\gamma}_2(\hat{\gamma}_3)] \quad \text{and} \quad \beta = P[\gamma_1(\gamma_3) - \gamma_2(\gamma_3)].$$

This is a special case of (3.6) with $h_\beta(\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \gamma_3) = \gamma_1(\gamma_3) - \gamma_2(\gamma_3)$ (subject to re-labeling these γ 's according to which conditional probabilities they depend on). The fact that one is able to construct these estimators implies that one knows (either explicitly or implicitly) the functional form of each $\gamma_j(P_{(j|\cdot)})$. See Examples 1 to 3 below. Moreover, refer to Section 5.2 to see how one can construct an estimator from knowing the form of $\gamma_j(P_{(j|\cdot)})$. We also derive what we called “nonparametric influence function” for kernel-based nonparametric estimators therein.

Our method also differs from that of Ichimura and Newey (2022). While they consider a two-step plug-in estimation procedure (see equation (3.2) in their work), which bears similarities to our setup, a key distinction lies in the derivation of the influence function. Specifically, their approach requires solving a least squares projection problem (as outlined in Proposition 1), whereas our method relies solely on taking derivatives of composite functions.

Below, we demonstrate how our method works in practice using different identification strategies for the ATE, making it easier to compare our method with existing ones. As well-documented in the literature, the various widely-used strategies lead to the same influence function for ATE. That is, they are equally efficient. However, not all of them are locally robust. This partly motivates the exploration of the relationship between local robustness and efficiency in the next section.

Example 1 (ATE: the inverse probability weighted (IPW) case). We first apply Theorem 3.4 to the IPW estimand (Horvitz and Thompson, 1952) of the ATE, which is also known as the HIR estimand (Hirano et al., 2003).

Under the unconfoundedness assumption, the IPW method identifies the ATE as

$$\tau_{\text{IPW}} = P\left(\frac{TY}{\pi(X)} - \frac{(1-T)Y}{1-\pi(X)}\right) =: P[h_{\text{IPW}}(Z, P_{(T|X)}[T])], \quad (3.10)$$

where $\pi(X) = \mathbb{E}[T|X] = P_{(T|X)}[T]$ is the propensity score function. This is a relatively simple case since the identification function h_{IPW} only depends on one nuisance parameter $\pi(\cdot)$. Let $h_{1Y} = TY/\pi(X)$ and $h_{0Y} = (1-T)Y/(1-\pi(X))$. We have

$$P_{(Y,T|X)}\left[\frac{\partial h_{1Y}}{\partial \pi}\right] = P_{(Y,T|X)}\left(-\frac{TY}{\pi(X)^2}\right) = -\frac{\tau_1(X)}{\pi(X)} \text{ and } P_{(Y,T|X)}\left[\frac{\partial h_{0Y}}{\partial \pi}\right] = \frac{\tau_0(X)}{1-\pi(X)},$$

where $\tau_i(X) = P_{(Y|T=i,X)}[Y(i)]$, for $i = 1, 2$. It is easy to see that $P_{(Y,T|X)}[\partial h_{\text{IPW}}/\partial \pi] \neq 0$, which is in line with the well-known result that the IPW estimator is not locally robust.

The influence function of the propensity score is given by $T - P_{(T|X)}[T] = T - \pi(X)$. The influence function of the IPW estimand thus readily follows from (3.8):

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\tau}_{\text{IPW}} &= h_{\text{AIPW}} - \tau = \frac{TY}{\pi(X)} - \frac{(1-T)Y}{1-\pi(X)} - \left(\frac{\tau_1(X)}{\pi(X)} + \frac{\tau_0(X)}{1-\pi(X)}\right)(T - \pi(X)) - \tau \\ &= \frac{T}{\pi(X)}(Y - \tau_1(X)) - \frac{1-T}{1-\pi(X)}(Y - \tau_0(X)) + \tau_1(X) - \tau_0(X) - \tau, \end{aligned}$$

which is the identification function of the augmented IPW estimand minus τ ; see, for instance, [Robins et al. \(1994\)](#); [Bang and Robins \(2005\)](#); [Cao et al. \(2009\)](#). Note that this is a sequential procedure. If one were to consider a joint procedure, one would need to estimate the conditional ATE with the propensity score jointly. This of course is more burdensome. We will outline in [Section 4](#) when the sequential procedure is as efficient as the joint one.

Example 2 (ATE: normalized IPW). The normalized IPW is another illustrative yet simple example, since its identification relies on ratios of unconditional expectations:

$$\tau_{\text{nIPW}} = \frac{P[TY/\pi(X)]}{P[T/\pi(X)]} - \frac{P[(1-T)Y/(1-\pi(X))]}{P[(1-T)/(1-\pi(X))]} =: \frac{P[h_{1Y}]}{P[h_{1T}]} - \frac{P[h_{0Y}]}{P[h_{0T}]},$$

where $h_{1T} = T/\pi(X)$ and $h_{0T} = (1-T)/(1-\pi(X))$. We have analyzed the influence functions of $P[h_{1Y}]$ and $P[h_{0Y}]$ in [Example 1](#). Similar analyses can be made for $P[h_{1T}]$ and $P[h_{0T}]$, which are special cases of the former with $Y \equiv 1$. The influence function $\dot{\tau}_{\text{nIPW}}$ writes as

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{1}{P[h_{1T}]} \left(h_{1Y} + P_{(Y,T|X)}\left[\frac{\partial h_{1Y}}{\partial \pi}\right](T - \pi) \right) - \frac{P[h_{1Y}]}{P[h_{1T}]^2} \left(h_{1T} + P_{(Y,T|X)}\left[\frac{\partial h_{1T}}{\partial \pi}\right](T - \pi) \right) \\ &- \frac{1}{P[h_{0T}]} \left(h_{0Y} + P_{(Y,T|X)}\left[\frac{\partial h_{0Y}}{\partial \pi}\right](T - \pi) \right) + \frac{P[h_{0Y}]}{P[h_{0T}]^2} \left(h_{0T} + P_{(Y,T|X)}\left[\frac{\partial h_{0T}}{\partial \pi}\right](T - \pi) \right) \end{aligned}$$

$$= \frac{T}{\pi(X)}(Y - \tau_1(X)) - \frac{1-T}{1-\pi(X)}(Y - \tau_0(X)) + \tau_1(X) - \tau_0(X) - P[\tau_1] + P[\tau_0] = \dot{\eta}_{\text{IPW}}.$$

Therefore, normalization of the IPW estimand does not change the first-order influence function.

Example 3 (ATE: the regression-based case). Next, we discuss the regression-based estimand, also known as the Hahn estimand (Oaxaca, 1973; Hahn, 1998; Imbens et al., 2005). In this case, the parameter τ can be identified by

$$\tau_{\text{Reg}} = P[\tau_1(X) - \tau_0(X)] = P\left[\frac{P_{(Y,T|X)}[TY]}{P_{(T|X)}[T]} - \frac{P_{(Y,T|X)}[(1-T)Y]}{1 - P_{(T|X)}[T]}\right] =: P[h_{\text{Reg}}].$$

Since the identification function h_{Reg} only directly depends on x , but not on y and t , we can also write $P[h_{\text{Reg}}]$ as $P_{(X)}[h_{\text{Reg}}]$.

Note that we can write $h_{\text{Reg}} = \gamma_{1T}/\gamma_T - \gamma_{0T}/(1 - \gamma_T)$, where

$$\gamma_Y = P_{(Y|T,X)}[Y], \quad \gamma_T = P_{(T|X)}[T], \quad \gamma_{1T} = P_{(T|X)}[T\gamma_Y], \quad \gamma_{0T} = P_{(T|X)}[(1-T)\gamma_Y].$$

This is an illustrative example in that h_{Reg} depends on γ_Y only indirectly through γ_{1T} and γ_{0T} . Moreover, the former nuisance parameter γ_Y is identified under the measure $P_{(Y|T,X)}$, while the latter two are identified under a different measure $P_{(T|X)}$. Hence, our method requires taking first-order derivatives of such composite functions. As a comparison, Hahn (1998) starts the derivation from the likelihood function, but does not show explicitly how the key function F_β therein is obtained.

The intuition is that, when evaluating $P_{(Y|T,X)}[\partial h_{\text{Reg}}/\partial \gamma_Y]$ (a concrete example of $P_{(i:j)}[\partial h_\beta/\partial \gamma_j]$ in Theorem 3.4), one can integrate out the part that is related to Y , but should keep T and X intact:

$$P_{(Y|T,X)}\left[\frac{\partial h_{\text{Reg}}}{\partial \gamma_Y}\right] \times (Y - P_{(Y|T,X)}[Y]) = \frac{T(Y - \tau_1(X))}{\pi(X)} - \frac{(1-T)(Y - \tau_0(X))}{1 - \pi(X)} \quad (3.11)$$

Refer to the math appendix for a more detailed and rigorous calculation.

Next, there are three terms that involve $P_{(T|X)}$, but with different g functions:

$$g_{1T} = TP_{(Y|T,X)}[Y], \quad g_{0T} = (1-T)P_{(Y|T,X)}[Y], \quad g_T = T.$$

In this case, we only need to treat X as given when evaluating conditional expectations under $P_{(T|X)}$. The sum of the three adjustment terms is given by

$$P_{(T|X)}\left[\frac{\partial h_{\text{Reg}}}{\partial \gamma_T}\right](T - P_{(T|X)}[T]) + P_{(T|X)}\left[\frac{\partial h_{\text{Reg}}}{\partial \gamma_{1T}}\right]\left(TP_{(Y|T,X)}[Y] - P_{(T|X)}[TP_{(Y|T,X)}[Y]]\right)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + P_{(T|X)} \left[\frac{\partial h_{\text{Reg}}}{\partial \gamma_{0T}} \right] \left((1-T)P_{(Y|T,X)}[Y] - P_{(T|X)}[(1-T)P_{(Y|T,X)}[Y]] \right) \\
& = - \left(\frac{\tau_1(X)}{\pi(X)} + \frac{\tau_0(X)}{1-\pi(X)} \right) (T - \pi(X)) + \frac{T - \pi(X)}{\pi(X)} \tau_1(X) + \frac{T - \pi(X)}{1 - \pi(X)} \tau_0(X) \equiv 0.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, the influence function of the regression-based estimand is given by

$$\dot{\tau}_{\text{Reg}} = h_{\text{Reg}} - P[h_{\text{Reg}}] + P_{(Y|T,X)} \left[\frac{\partial h_{\text{Reg}}}{\partial \gamma_Y} \right] \times (Y - P_{(Y|T,X)}[Y]) = h_{\text{AIPW}} - \tau,$$

which is the same as in the IPW case.

When β can only be indirectly identified from some moment functions, we will have a more complicated expression for $\dot{\beta}$. We state the results with unconditional moment restrictions for the parameter of interest β here. The influence function for β with conditional moment restrictions is given in Section 5.3 below.

Theorem 3.6. *Assume that the parameter of interest β satisfies the following unconditional moment conditions:*

$$P[m_\beta(\beta, \gamma_1(P_{(1)}), \gamma_2(P_{(2|\cdot)}), \dots, \gamma_l(P_{(l|\cdot)}))] = 0,$$

where m_β is a known vector-valued function and each γ_j is a regular parameter that depends on z only through $z^{(j:1)}$.

Suppose that each γ_j has its own source of identification, from which we can derive its influence function. For example, if γ_j can be directly identified as $\gamma_j(P_{(j|\cdot)}) = P_{(j|\cdot)}[h_{\gamma_j}]$ for some function h_{γ_j} , then we have $\dot{\gamma}_j = h_{\gamma_j} - P_{(j|\cdot)}[h_{\gamma_j}]$. Let $\bar{\Xi}_{\beta\beta}$ be a conformable symmetric and positive semi-definite matrix. Then the influence function of $\dot{\beta}$ is given by

$$\dot{\beta} = \{ \overline{\partial_\beta m_\beta}^\top \bar{\Xi}_{\beta\beta} \overline{\partial_\beta m_\beta} \}^{-1} \overline{\partial_\beta m_\beta}^\top \bar{\Xi}_{\beta\beta} \left(m_\beta + \sum_{j=1}^l P_{(l:j|\cdot)} \left[\frac{\partial m_\beta}{\partial \gamma_j} \right] \dot{\gamma}_j \right). \quad (3.12)$$

The locally robust version of the moment function is

$$m_\beta^{LR} = \sum_{j=1}^l \left\{ (P_{(l:j+1|\cdot)} - P_{(l:j|\cdot)})[m_\beta] + P_{(l:j|\cdot)} \left[\frac{\partial m_\beta}{\partial \gamma_j} \right] \times \dot{\gamma}_j \right\}. \quad (3.13)$$

Both [Ai and Chen \(2003\)](#) and [Ichimura and Newey \(2022\)](#) focus on semiparametric models with (conditional) moment restrictions. In deriving the influence function, they require solving a projection (or minimal distance) problem (see Equation (15) in the former and Proposition 1 in the latter). Our approach avoids this step, making the process less

complex and potentially easier to implement.

Similarly to the interpretation we gave for Theorem 3.4, one can also project m_β^{LR} onto each subspace $\mathcal{L}_2^0(P_{(j|\cdot)})$. For illustration purposes, let β_j be the projection of β onto $\mathcal{L}_2(P_{(j|\cdot)})$. Then under any conditional measure $P_{(j|\cdot)}$, it remains a problem to estimate β_j and γ_j jointly or sequentially (one-step or multi-step). The following section discusses the relationship between local robustness and efficiency resulting from sequential or joint estimation. We focus on the simpler case with unconditional moment restrictions to make the exposition intuitive.

4 Local Robustness and Efficiency

As evident in the previous section, the influence function from the sequential (or multi-step) identification/estimation procedure leads to the locally robust identification moment conditions. As will be shown later, the joint (or one-step) procedure would yield the efficient identification moments under rather mild conditions. Hence, a key question to be answered in this section is when these two seemingly different procedures are equivalent. It turns out that whenever this happens, we will obtain locally robust and efficient identification moments. These moments can be used in place of the original ones to achieve a better estimator.

4.1 Identification: Joint versus Sequential

In this subsection, we will examine equivalence between joint and sequential identification/estimation procedures in the general case where $\bar{V}_{\nu\nu}$, in particular, its component $\bar{V}_{\gamma\gamma}$, may not be invertible. In such cases, we will consider the Moore-Penrose inverse, which is uniquely defined. Therefore, it would be helpful to present some well-established results relevant here. Ultimately, our goal is to write the optimal joint variance $\Sigma_{\nu\nu}^{-1} = \{\bar{\partial}_\nu m^\top \bar{V}_{\nu\nu}^+ \bar{\partial}_\nu m\}^{-1}$ as a block diagonal matrix where the diagonal elements reflect the asymptotic variances of β and γ , respectively. To do so, it is essential to find good partitions/representations of $\bar{V}_{\nu\nu}$ and $\bar{V}_{\nu\nu}^+$ first.

Since $\bar{V}_{\nu\nu}$ is positive semi-definite, the well-established results on Moore-Penrose inverse (see pp. 436 of Gallier (2011)) readily yields

$$\bar{V}_{\nu\nu} = \begin{pmatrix} \bar{V}_{\beta\beta} & \bar{V}_{\beta\gamma} \\ \bar{V}_{\gamma\beta} & \bar{V}_{\gamma\gamma} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} I & \bar{V}_{\beta\gamma} \bar{V}_{\gamma\gamma}^+ \\ 0 & I \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \bar{S}_{\beta\beta} & 0 \\ 0 & \bar{V}_{\gamma\gamma} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} I & 0 \\ \bar{V}_{\gamma\gamma}^+ \bar{V}_{\gamma\beta} & I \end{pmatrix},$$

where $\bar{S}_{\beta\beta} := \bar{V}_{\beta\beta} - \bar{V}_{\beta\gamma} \bar{V}_{\gamma\gamma}^+ \bar{V}_{\gamma\beta}$ is known as the Schur complement of $\bar{V}_{\gamma\gamma}$ in $\bar{V}_{\nu\nu}$ in the literature on generalized inverse. To proceed, we need the following property.

Definition 4.1 (Pavlíková and Ševčovič (2023)). Let $\bar{V}_{\beta\beta}$ and $\bar{V}_{\gamma\gamma}$ be two symmetric square matrices. A matrix $\bar{V}_{\beta\gamma}$ is $(\bar{V}_{\beta\beta}, \bar{V}_{\gamma\gamma})$ -compatible if the following two conditions are satisfied:

$$\bar{V}_{\beta\gamma}(I - \bar{V}_{\gamma\gamma}^+ \bar{V}_{\gamma\gamma}) = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad (I - \bar{S}_{\beta\beta} \bar{S}_{\beta\beta}^+) \bar{V}_{\beta\gamma} = 0,$$

where $\bar{S}_{\beta\beta} := \bar{V}_{\beta\beta} - \bar{V}_{\beta\gamma} \bar{V}_{\gamma\gamma}^+ \bar{V}_{\gamma\beta}$. Similarly, one can also define $(\bar{V}_{\gamma\gamma}, \bar{V}_{\beta\beta})$ -compatibility.

When both $\bar{V}_{\gamma\gamma}$ and $\bar{S}_{\beta\beta}$ are invertible, their Moore-Penrose inverses become regular inverses. Hence, both conditions in the above definition are automatically satisfied. This explains why we do not see these conditions in the invertible case. As a variance-covariance matrix, all matrices $\bar{V}_{\nu\nu}$, $\bar{V}_{\beta\beta}$, and $\bar{V}_{\gamma\gamma}$ must be positive semi-definite. Accordingly, the first condition is met by Theorem 16.1 of Gallier (2011). However, it is unclear to us whether the second one holds under positive semi-definiteness.

The first condition permits an orthogonal projection within \mathcal{L}_2^0 , which will be very useful in subsequent discussion. For any $f, g \in \mathcal{L}_2^0$, define

$$\Pi(f|g) = \langle f, g^\top \rangle \langle g, g^\top \rangle^+ g \quad \text{and} \quad \Pi^\perp(f|g) = f - \Pi(f|g).$$

It is easy to see that the variances of $(f^\top, g^\top)^\top$ and g are both positive semi-definite. Then Theorem 16.1 of Gallier (2011) implies that $\langle \Pi^\perp(f|g), \Pi(f|g)^\top \rangle = 0$.

When $\bar{V}_{\beta\gamma}$ is $(\bar{V}_{\beta\beta}, \bar{V}_{\gamma\gamma})$ -compatible, the Moore-Penrose inverse of $\bar{V}_{\nu\nu}$ is:

$$\bar{V}_{\nu\nu}^+ = \begin{pmatrix} I & 0 \\ -\bar{V}_{\gamma\gamma}^+ \bar{V}_{\gamma\beta} & I \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \bar{S}_{\beta\beta}^+ & 0 \\ 0 & \bar{V}_{\gamma\gamma}^+ \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} I & -\bar{V}_{\beta\gamma} \bar{V}_{\gamma\gamma}^+ \\ 0 & I \end{pmatrix}.$$

Then the optimal joint variance matrix becomes:

$$\Sigma_{\nu\nu}^{-1} = \left\{ M^\top \begin{pmatrix} \bar{S}_{\beta\beta}^+ & 0 \\ 0 & \bar{V}_{\gamma\gamma}^+ \end{pmatrix} M \right\}^{-1}, \quad \text{where } M = \begin{pmatrix} I & -\bar{V}_{\beta\gamma} \bar{V}_{\gamma\gamma}^+ \\ 0 & I \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \overline{\partial_\beta m_\beta} & \overline{\partial_\gamma m_\beta} \\ \overline{\partial_\beta m_\gamma} & \overline{\partial_\gamma m_\gamma} \end{pmatrix}.$$

In addition, if $\overline{\partial_\beta m_\gamma} = 0$, M becomes an upper triangle matrix:

$$M = \begin{pmatrix} \overline{\partial_\beta m_\beta} & \overline{\partial_\gamma m_\beta} - \bar{V}_{\beta\gamma} \bar{V}_{\gamma\gamma}^+ \overline{\partial_\gamma m_\gamma} \\ 0 & \overline{\partial_\gamma m_\gamma} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \overline{\partial_\beta m_\beta^{\text{eff}}} & \overline{\partial_\gamma m_\beta^{\text{eff}}} \\ 0 & \overline{\partial_\gamma m_\gamma} \end{pmatrix} = \frac{\partial}{\partial \nu} \begin{pmatrix} m_\beta^{\text{eff}} \\ m_\gamma \end{pmatrix},$$

where

$$m_\beta^{\text{eff}} := m_\beta - \bar{V}_{\beta\gamma} \bar{V}_{\gamma\gamma}^+ m_\gamma = m_\beta - \Pi(m_\beta | m_\gamma) = \Pi(m_\beta | m_\gamma)^\perp \quad (4.1)$$

It is easy to see that m_β^{eff} is uncorrelated with m_γ and that $\bar{S}_{\beta\beta} = \langle m_\beta^{\text{eff}}, (m_\beta^{\text{eff}})^\top \rangle$. Define

$$\Sigma_{\beta\beta} = (\overline{\partial_\beta m_\beta^{\text{eff}}})^\top \bar{S}_{\beta\beta}^+ (\overline{\partial_\beta m_\beta^{\text{eff}}}), \quad \Sigma_{\beta\gamma} = (\overline{\partial_\beta m_\beta^{\text{eff}}})^\top \bar{S}_{\beta\beta}^+ (\overline{\partial_\gamma m_\beta^{\text{eff}}}), \quad \Sigma_{\gamma\gamma} = (\overline{\partial_\gamma m_\gamma})^\top \bar{V}_{\gamma\gamma}^+ (\overline{\partial_\gamma m_\gamma}).$$

Using well-established results on the inverse of block matrices, we can obtain

$$\Sigma_{\nu\nu}^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} (\Sigma_{\beta\beta} - \Sigma_{\beta\gamma} \Sigma_{\gamma\gamma}^{-1} \Sigma_{\beta\gamma}^\top)^{-1} & -(\Sigma_{\beta\beta} - \Sigma_{\beta\gamma} \Sigma_{\gamma\gamma}^{-1} \Sigma_{\beta\gamma}^\top)^{-1} \Sigma_{\beta\gamma} \Sigma_{\gamma\gamma}^{-1} \\ -\Sigma_{\beta\gamma}^\top \Sigma_{\beta\beta}^{-1} (\Sigma_{\gamma\gamma} - \Sigma_{\beta\gamma}^\top \Sigma_{\beta\beta}^{-1} \Sigma_{\beta\gamma})^{-1} & (\Sigma_{\gamma\gamma} - \Sigma_{\beta\gamma}^\top \Sigma_{\beta\beta}^{-1} \Sigma_{\beta\gamma})^{-1} \end{pmatrix} \quad (4.2)$$

provided that ν is regular. When the moment function m_β^{eff} is not locally robust, that is, $\overline{\partial_\gamma m_\beta^{\text{eff}}} \neq 0$, the off-diagonal elements are generally non-zero and more importantly

$$(\Sigma_{\beta\beta} - \Sigma_{\beta\gamma} \Sigma_{\gamma\gamma}^{-1} \Sigma_{\beta\gamma}^\top)^{-1} - \Sigma_{\beta\beta}^{-1} \geq 0 \quad \text{and} \quad (\Sigma_{\gamma\gamma} - \Sigma_{\beta\gamma}^\top \Sigma_{\beta\beta}^{-1} \Sigma_{\beta\gamma})^{-1} - \Sigma_{\gamma\gamma}^{-1} \geq 0,$$

where $A \geq 0$ means A is positive semi-definite. When m_β^{eff} is locally robust, the estimation of both β and γ can achieve smaller variances, as summarized in the following theorem. We will wait until Section 4.2 to show that $\langle m_\beta^{\text{LR}}, (m_\beta^{\text{LR}})^\top \rangle \geq \langle m_\beta^{\text{eff}}, (m_\beta^{\text{eff}})^\top \rangle$, where we also discuss efficiency bound.

Theorem 4.2. *Suppose that the assumptions of Proposition 3.1 and the decomposition (3.3) hold. Assume $\overline{\partial_\beta m_\gamma} = 0$ so that it is possible to turn the one-step estimation into a two-step one.*

(i) *Assume that $\bar{V}_{\beta\gamma}$ is $(\bar{V}_{\beta\beta}, \bar{V}_{\gamma\gamma})$ -compatible. If m_β^{eff} is locally robust in the sense that*

$$\overline{\partial_\gamma m_\beta^{\text{eff}}} = \overline{\partial_\gamma m_\beta} - \bar{V}_{\beta\gamma} \bar{V}_{\gamma\gamma}^+ \overline{\partial_\gamma m_\gamma} = 0, \quad (4.3)$$

then the joint influence function is:

$$\begin{pmatrix} \dot{\beta}^* \\ \dot{\gamma}^* \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} ((\overline{\partial_\beta m_\beta^{\text{eff}}})^\top \bar{S}_{\beta\beta}^+ (\overline{\partial_\beta m_\beta^{\text{eff}}}))^{-1} (\overline{\partial_\beta m_\beta^{\text{eff}}})^\top \bar{S}_{\beta\beta}^+ m_\beta^{\text{eff}} \\ (\overline{\partial_\gamma m_\gamma}^\top \bar{V}_{\gamma\gamma}^+ \overline{\partial_\gamma m_\gamma})^{-1} \overline{\partial_\gamma m_\gamma}^\top \bar{V}_{\gamma\gamma}^+ m_\gamma \end{pmatrix}. \quad (4.4)$$

The optimal variances of the estimation of β and γ are given by $\Sigma_{\beta\beta}^{-1}$ and $\Sigma_{\gamma\gamma}^{-1}$, respectively.

(ii) *If the following condition holds for some symmetric matrix $\bar{\Xi}_{\gamma\gamma} \geq 0$:*

$$\Psi_{\beta\gamma} m_\gamma \equiv 0, \quad \text{where } \Psi_{\beta\gamma} = \bar{V}_{\beta\gamma} \bar{V}_{\gamma\gamma}^+ - \overline{\partial_\gamma m_\beta} (\overline{\partial_\gamma m_\gamma}^\top \bar{\Xi}_{\gamma\gamma} \overline{\partial_\gamma m_\gamma})^{-1} \overline{\partial_\gamma m_\gamma}^\top \bar{\Xi}_{\gamma\gamma}, \quad (4.5)$$

then we have $m_\beta^{\text{LR}} \equiv m_\beta^{\text{eff}}$, upon noticing $m_\beta^{\text{LR}} = m_\beta^{\text{eff}} + \Psi_{\beta\gamma} m_\gamma$. Consequently, the matrix $\bar{S}_{\beta\beta}^+$ is the optimal second-step weighting matrix and produces the same influence function for β as given in (4.4). Hence, the moment function m_β^{LR} is also efficient under condition (4.5).

In addition, if condition (4.5) holds with $\Xi_{\gamma\gamma} = \bar{V}_{\gamma\gamma}^+$, then the influence function for γ that optimizes the variance of β in sequential estimation is the same as the optimal influence function in joint estimation.

If the nuisance parameter γ and the parameter of interest β can be estimated jointly, we can check condition (4.3) to see whether the efficient moment condition for β is also locally robust. Nevertheless, as stated in Section 3.2, the parameters γ and β are often identified under different probability measures. In the example of treatment effect estimation, the propensity scores and the conditional means of the outcome are identified using (different) conditional probability measures, but the ATE is identified using an unconditional probability measure. When this is the case, sequential estimation is more appealing than joint estimation. In sequential estimation, condition (4.5) becomes the key to checking whether locally robust moment conditions are also efficient moments.

Solving (4.5) for $\Xi_{\gamma\gamma}$ is highly challenging in general. Instead of reinterpreting condition (4.5) possibly as a projection (or minimum distance) problem, we discuss two scenarios where (4.5) is easily satisfied, which we believe cover almost all practical cases. We will further investigate the third scenario of Lemma 4.3 below in Section 5.3 and argue that it is highly improbable in practice.

Lemma 4.3. *Suppose that the assumptions of Theorem 4.2 are satisfied. If (4.3) also holds, we have the following results.*

(i) *If γ is regular and can be directly identified, that is, $m_\gamma = h_\gamma - \gamma$ (hence $\bar{V}_{\gamma\gamma}^+ = \bar{V}_{\gamma\gamma}^{-1}$), then (4.3) readily implies*

$$\Psi_{\beta\gamma} = \bar{V}_{\beta\gamma} \bar{V}_{\gamma\gamma}^{-1} - \overline{\partial_\gamma m_\beta} \overline{\partial_\gamma m_\gamma}^{-1} = 0.$$

(ii) *When $d_{m_\gamma} \geq d_\gamma$, let $\Xi_{\gamma\gamma} = \bar{V}_{\gamma\gamma}^+ = \bar{F}_{\gamma\gamma} \bar{F}_{\gamma\gamma}^\top$ be a full-rank factorization of $\bar{V}_{\gamma\gamma}^+$ (see pp. 26 of Ben-Israel and Greville (2003)). That is, the matrix $\bar{F}_{\gamma\gamma}$ has full column rank. If $\overline{\partial_\gamma m_\gamma}^\top \bar{F}_{\gamma\gamma}$ is an invertible matrix, it is easy to verify that condition (4.5) is satisfied. This is the case where γ could be row-overidentified but not rank-overidentified.*

(iii) *More generally, it is also possible that γ is rank over-identified. Note that all terms in $\Psi_{\beta\gamma}$ are observable/estimable except the unknown weight $\Xi_{\gamma\gamma}$. One can check if (4.5) holds by plugging $\Xi_{\gamma\gamma} = \bar{V}_{\gamma\gamma}^+$ into $\Psi_{\beta\gamma}$.*

The first scenario in Lemma 4.3 covers all semiparametric models in which the first-step nuisance parameter is directly identified. For example, the functions π , τ_0 and τ_1 in the examples of ATE all fall into this category. Consequently, the widely used sequential estimation of ATE is as efficient as the joint one (which is much more tedious to implement).

The second scenario covers the first as a special case. It allows γ to be identified from a moment function m_γ with a dimension greater than d_γ . The conditions required in part (ii) imply $\text{rank}(\bar{V}_{\gamma\gamma}) = d_\gamma$, which means that γ is not rank-overidentified. However, whenever $\text{rank}(\bar{V}_{\gamma\gamma}) = d_\gamma$ it is desirable to find the d_γ number of linearly independent moment functions so that potential computation issues with calculating the generalized inverse can be avoided. With just-identified nuisance parameters, we can pick the optimal second-step weighting matrix to make semiparametric two-step estimation both locally robust and efficient. According to Theorem 4.2, sequential estimation is also as efficient as joint estimation.

Theoretically speaking, it is possible to have $\text{rank}(\bar{V}_{\gamma\gamma}) > d_\gamma$ (i.e., the nuisance parameter γ is rank-overidentified), which goes beyond the first two scenarios and is the most challenging case. Even so, condition (4.5) can be checked analytically or tested empirically. It is not uncommon to see $\text{rank}(\bar{V}_{\beta\beta}) > d_\beta$, which is in line with over-identification of the parameter of interest β in many models. Nevertheless, it is rare to find models with $\text{rank}(\bar{V}_{\gamma\gamma}) > d_\gamma$. Take instrumental variable regression as an example. The parameter of interest β is over-identified if the number of effective instruments is larger than d_β . However, in the first-stage regression of the endogenous explanatory variable(s) on the instruments, the dimension of the coefficients is the same as the number of instruments (refer to Example 7 for a heuristic discussion). In Section 5.3, we examine a widely adopted specification that can lead to over-identification of parameters, which hopefully provides further clarification.

Last but not least, if it is difficult to verify condition (4.5), one can always check condition (4.3). If it holds (or is assumed to be true), one can proceed with adaptive estimation implied by the one-step result (refer to Section 4.3 for more details).

4.2 Efficiency Bound

We discussed the connection between efficiency and local robustness for both joint and sequential estimation above. However, we have not explained what we mean by efficiency in our context yet. In the discussion of efficiency bound, semiparametric literature often considers a regular parametric submodel, from which the tangent space is defined. Since the variance of the moment function may not be invertible in an over-identified GMM-type model, we need to extend this concept accordingly.

Definition 4.4 ((Pseudo-)Regular Parametric Submodel). *Let Θ be a subset of a finite-dimensional vector space. For any $\theta \in \Theta$, there is an associated probability measure $Q_\theta \in \mathcal{M}_\mu$. The model $\mathcal{Q}_\theta = \{Q_\theta : \theta \in \Theta\}$ is a parametric submodel of \mathcal{P} if $\mathcal{Q}_\theta \subset \mathcal{P}$. It is a parametric submodel through P if $\mathcal{Q}_\theta \subset \mathcal{P}$ and $P \in \mathcal{Q}_\theta$. If, in addition, the auxiliary parameter θ is (pseudo-)regular within \mathcal{Q}_θ , we call it a (pseudo-)regular parametric submodel*

through P .

As shown in Example 1 in Section 3.2 of [Bickel et al. \(1993\)](#) and Example 25.16 of [van der Vaart \(1998\)](#), there are various ways to construct a regular parametric submodel \mathcal{Q}_θ at $P \in \mathcal{P}$. The key point is that it is possible to construct a regular parametric submodel \mathcal{Q}_θ from any vector-valued function $g \in \mathcal{L}_2^0(P)$ so that the score function of \mathcal{Q}_θ at $Q_0 = P$ is exactly g .

More specifically, consider the following parametric submodel through P :

$$\mathcal{Q}_\theta(g) = \begin{cases} \{Q_\theta : dQ_\theta := (1 + g^\top \theta) dP, |g^\top \theta| < 1\} & \text{for bounded } g \in \mathcal{L}_2^0(P), \\ \{Q_\theta : dQ_\theta := \frac{\kappa(g^\top \theta)}{P[\kappa(g^\top \theta)]} dP, \theta \in \mathbb{R}^{d_\theta}\} & \text{for unbounded } g \in \mathcal{L}_2^0(P), \end{cases}$$

where κ is a bounded and continuous differentiable function with bounded derivative κ' such that $\kappa(0) = \kappa'(0) = 1$ and κ'/κ bounded. For example, one can set $\kappa(x) = 2(1 + e^{-2x})^{-1}$.

The score function $\dot{\ell}(\theta)$ of the auxiliary parameter θ is defined as

$$\dot{\ell}(\theta) = \frac{\dot{q}(\theta)}{q(\theta)} \mathbb{1}_{\{q(\theta) > 0\}}, \text{ where } q(\theta) = \frac{dQ_\theta}{d\mu} = \frac{dQ_\theta}{dP} \frac{dP}{d\mu} \text{ and } \dot{q}(\theta) = \partial_\theta q(\theta)$$

We can verify that $\dot{\ell}_0 = \partial \ell_\theta / \partial \theta |_{\theta=0} = g^\top$. In other words, any $g \in \mathcal{L}_2^0(P)$ can be a score function of θ . Correspondingly, the Fisher information matrix for the auxiliary parameter θ is given by $I(\theta) = \langle \dot{\ell}_0^\top, \dot{\ell}_0 \rangle = \langle g, g^\top \rangle$. Hence, the above submodel is regular if $\langle g, g^\top \rangle$ is invertible. Otherwise, it is a pseudo-regular submodel.

The generic regular parameter ν can be identified as a function of θ as $\nu(\theta) \equiv \nu(Q_\theta)$. The derivative of ν with respect to θ is the functional derivative of $\nu(Q_\theta)$ along the direction g :

$$\dot{\nu}(\theta) = \left. \frac{\partial \nu(Q_\theta)}{\partial \theta} \right|_{\theta=0} = \langle \dot{\nu}, \dot{\ell}_0 \rangle = \langle \dot{\nu}, g^\top \rangle = \left. \frac{\partial \nu(P; Q_\theta - P)}{\partial \theta} \right|_{\theta=0}.$$

Hence, the parameter ν can be identified within this submodel if the rank of $\langle \dot{\nu}, g^\top \rangle$ is no less than d_ν . Then we can use the Delta method to calculate the variance of $\nu(\theta)$ in this submodel as:

$$\Sigma(\nu | \mathcal{Q}_\theta(g))^{-1} = \langle \dot{\nu}, g^\top \rangle \langle g, g^\top \rangle^+ \langle g, \dot{\nu}^\top \rangle = \langle \Pi(\dot{\nu} | g), \Pi(\dot{\nu} | g)^\top \rangle.$$

If we interpret the influence function as the one whose variance is the variance of the parameter within a given model, then $\Pi(\dot{\nu} | g)$ gives the influence function of ν within the submodel $\mathcal{Q}_\theta(g)$. Recall the toy example and its influence function given in [Proposition 3.1](#).

We have

$$\Sigma(\nu|\mathcal{Q}_\theta(g))^{-1} = \{\overline{\partial_\nu m}^\top \Xi \overline{\partial_\nu m}\}^{-1} \overline{\partial_\nu m}^\top \Xi \langle \Pi(m|g), \Pi(m|g)^\top \rangle \Xi \overline{\partial_\nu m} \{\overline{\partial_\nu m}^\top \Xi \overline{\partial_\nu m}\}^{-1}.$$

The optimal choice of Ξ is thus $\langle \Pi(m|g), \Pi(m|g)^\top \rangle^+$, which yields the following variance

$$\Sigma^*(\nu|m, \mathcal{Q}_\theta(g))^{-1} = \{\overline{\partial_\nu m}^\top \langle \Pi(m|g), \Pi(m|g)^\top \rangle^+ \overline{\partial_\nu m}\}^{-1}.$$

Following the definition of the semiparametric information bound as the supremum of the information of all regular parametric submodels adopted by [Bickel et al. \(1993\)](#), we introduce the following definition.

Definition 4.5 (*m*-efficiency bound). *Let ν be a regular parameter satisfying the moment condition (3.1). The *m*-efficiency bound for ν within the model \mathcal{P} is*

$$\Sigma^*(\nu|m, \mathcal{P})^{-1} := \sup\{\Sigma^*(\nu|m, \mathcal{Q}_\theta(g))^{-1} : \text{rank}(\langle m, g^\top \rangle) \geq d_\nu, \forall g \in \mathcal{L}_2^0(P)\}.$$

Intuitively, *m*-efficiency bound depends on the moment function *m*. As demonstrated in [Example 7](#) in [Section 5.3](#) below, the conditional zero mean assumption induces the degeneracy of the parameter of interest β . This enlarges the space for potential moment functions and eventually leads to an efficiency improvement of generalized least squares over OLS under heteroskedasticity.

In the GMM literature, a key question is whether GMM can attain the Cramér-Rao lower bound. [Godambe \(1960\)](#) has shown that when the true score function of ν (not the above one for θ), denoted by $\dot{\ell}_\nu$, is used as the moment function, the methods of moment can attain the Cramér-Rao lower bound, denoted by $I(\nu|P)^{-1} := \langle \dot{\ell}_\nu^\top, \dot{\ell}_\nu \rangle^{-1}$. As demonstrated by [Carrasco and Florens \(2014\)](#), for the GMM estimator to achieve the same efficiency as the maximum likelihood estimation (MLE), it is both sufficient and necessary that the true score is contained within the closure of the linear space spanned by the moments.

The framework we adopt here serves as a concise recap and extends the existing conclusion to the general case where $\langle m, m^\top \rangle$ may not be invertible. Since $\langle m, m^\top \rangle - \langle \Pi(m|g), \Pi(m|g)^\top \rangle$ is always positive semi-definite, we immediately have

$$\Sigma^*(\nu|m, \mathcal{Q}_\theta(g))^{-1} \leq \{\overline{\partial_\nu m}^\top \langle m, m^\top \rangle^+ \overline{\partial_\nu m}\}^{-1} = \Sigma^*(\nu|m, \mathcal{Q}_\theta(m))^{-1}, \forall g \in \mathcal{L}_2^0(P).$$

The inequality holds in the matrix sense: $A \leq B$ iff $B - A$ is positive semi-definite. The moment condition (3.1) indicates that $m \in \mathcal{L}_2^0(P)$ can also be used to construct a pseudo-regular parametric submodel. Therefore, the *m*-efficiency bound is given by the right-hand-side term. We extend the exact-identification case in [Chamberlain \(1987\)](#) (the proof of

which is mainly based on the use of multinomial distributions as approximations) to the potentially over-identified case allowing for non-invertible variance of the moment function.

Recall that we use the implicit function theorem in Section 3.1 to derive the influence function for ν . Alternatively, we can also use the same trick to solve the probability measure P , more precisely, its density $\mathfrak{p} := dP/d\mu$, as a function of ν . The first step is to take derivatives with respect to ν on the moment condition $P[m(\nu)] = \int m(\nu)\mathfrak{p}d\mu = 0$ while treating \mathfrak{p} as a function of ν . Then a simple change of measure from μ back to P yields the following lemma.

Lemma 4.6. *Suppose the model \mathcal{P} is regular. Let $\dot{\ell}_\nu$ be the true score function of the regular parameter ν , which can be identified from the moment condition (3.1). We have the following equality:*

$$P[\partial_\nu m] + P[m \dot{\ell}_\nu] = 0 \iff \overline{\partial_\nu m} = -P[m \dot{\ell}_\nu] = -\langle m, \dot{\ell}_\nu \rangle. \quad (4.6)$$

Under the partition of ν given in (3.3), the above equality is equivalent to

$$\begin{pmatrix} \overline{\partial_\beta m_\beta} & \overline{\partial_\gamma m_\beta} \\ \overline{\partial_\beta m_\gamma} & \overline{\partial_\gamma m_\gamma} \end{pmatrix} = - \begin{pmatrix} \langle m_\beta, \dot{\ell}_\beta \rangle & \langle m_\beta, \dot{\ell}_\gamma \rangle \\ \langle m_\gamma, \dot{\ell}_\beta \rangle & \langle m_\gamma, \dot{\ell}_\gamma \rangle \end{pmatrix},$$

where $\dot{\ell}_\nu$ is partitioned as $(\dot{\ell}_\beta, \dot{\ell}_\gamma)$.

When $m = \dot{\ell}_\nu^\top$, (4.6) reduces to the well-known equality $P[\ddot{\ell}_{\nu\nu}] = -P[\dot{\ell}_\nu^\top \dot{\ell}_\nu]$ in the MLE literature. Thus, we come to the following theorem.²

Theorem 4.7. *For any moment m function that can be used to identify a regular parameter ν by the condition (3.1), we have*

$$\begin{aligned} \Sigma^*(\nu|m, \mathcal{P})^{-1} &= \{\overline{\partial_\nu m}^\top \langle m, m^\top \rangle + \overline{\partial_\nu m}\}^{-1} = \{\langle \dot{\ell}_\nu^\top, m^\top \rangle \langle m, m^\top \rangle + \langle m, \dot{\ell}_\nu \rangle\}^{-1} \\ &= \{\langle \Pi(\dot{\ell}_\nu^\top|m), \Pi(\dot{\ell}_\nu^\top|m)^\top \rangle\}^{-1} \geq \langle \dot{\ell}_\nu^\top, \dot{\ell}_\nu \rangle^{-1} = I(\nu|P)^{-1}. \end{aligned}$$

The equality holds iff $\Pi(\dot{\ell}_\nu^\top|m) = \dot{\ell}_\nu^\top$, or equivalently, $m = A\dot{\ell}_\nu^\top$, where A is a d_m -by- d_ν full column rank matrix.

For simplicity, the analysis so far is based on the unconditional probability measure. The same argument would also work under the conditional probability, where the inner

²Recall the discussion in Section 3.1 on the difference between our method of calculating the influence function and the methods of Newey (1994) and Ichimura and Newey (2022). Our method does not involve the true score function. We only use $\dot{\ell}_\nu$ in Lemma 4.6 and in the derivation of the efficiency bound.

product should be evaluated under the same conditional probability. For example, consider the estimation of the propensity score of a binary treatment, that is, $\pi(X) = P_{(T|X)}[T]$. It is easy to see that $m_\pi(X) = \pi(X) - T$ and $\dot{\ell}_\pi = (D - \pi)/[\pi(1 - \pi)]$. Accordingly, we have $\langle \dot{\ell}_\pi, m \rangle_X = P_{(T|X)}[\dot{\ell}_\pi, m] = -1$ and $\langle m, m \rangle_X = P_{(T|X)}[m^2] = \pi(1 - \pi)$. It thus readily follows that $\Pi_X(\dot{\ell}_\pi | m_\pi) = \langle \dot{\ell}_\pi, m \rangle_X \langle m, m \rangle_X^{-1} m_\pi = \dot{\ell}_\pi$, where Π_X is the projection under $P_{(T|X)}$. However, this is a quite special case where the conditional likelihood is simply a function of π and T , that is, $\ell_\pi = \pi^T(1 - \pi)^{1-T}$.

In general, it would be more challenging to show $\Pi(\dot{\ell}_\nu^\top | m) = \dot{\ell}_\nu^\top$. It is beyond the scope of this paper to explore it. We conjecture that if one can find additional moment functions that are not linear combinations of the existing ones, the projection $\Pi(\dot{\ell}_\nu^\top | m)$ should be relatively closer to $\dot{\ell}_\nu^\top$, hence improving GMM efficiency. However, this often requires extra knowledge and/or restriction on the model to find such additional moment functions, which is not always the case.

Another important implication of Lemma 4.6 is the following proposition, which partially justifies the naming of m_β^{eff} .

Proposition 4.8. *Under the assumptions of Theorem 4.2, if m_β^{eff} is also locally robust, that is, condition (4.3) holds, we have*

$$\langle m_\beta^{\text{LR}}, (m_\beta^{\text{LR}})^\top \rangle \geq \langle m_\beta^{\text{eff}}, (m_\beta^{\text{eff}})^\top \rangle,$$

where $\bar{\Xi}_{\gamma\gamma} = \bar{V}_{\gamma\gamma}^+$ in m_β^{LR} . Hence, when $\bar{V}_{\gamma\gamma}^+$ is the optimal first-step weighting matrix for the estimation of β , the sequential procedure will not produce a smaller variance than the joint procedure. The equality holds when any of the conditions in Lemma 4.3 is satisfied.

4.3 Adaptive Estimation

The seminal work by Sargan (1958) stimulates the study of adaptive estimation. The key question asked was ‘‘When can one estimate the parameter of interest as well asymptotically not knowing the nuisance parameter as knowing it.’’ Bickel (1982) provide sufficient and necessary conditions in the context of MLE. A simple definition of adaptive estimation is given and the key requirement is that an estimator $\hat{\beta}_n$ can attain the semiparametric efficiency bound in the presence of nuisance parameters (cf. pp. 29 therein). Newey (1988) extends the concept of adaptive estimation to regression models using GMM estimators. However, the analysis is limited to the independent (the disturbance is independent of the regressors) and symmetric cases (the disturbance is conditionally symmetrically distributed). In the following, we introduce the relevant definition in the GMM context without such restrictions and provide the necessary conditions for the existence of adaptive estimation.

Definition 4.9 (Adaptive m -estimation). *We say that $\hat{\beta}_n$ is an adaptive m -estimate of β in the presence of γ if β is regular at P and $\hat{\beta}_n$ can reach the m -efficiency bound for β .*

Corollary 4.10. *Suppose that the assumptions of Proposition 3.1 and the partition given in (3.3) hold. The necessary conditions for an adaptive m -estimate of β in the presence of γ (alt. an adaptive m -estimate of γ in the presence of β) are*

$$\overline{\partial_\beta m_\gamma} = 0 \text{ and } \overline{\partial_\gamma m_\beta} - \overline{V_{\beta\gamma}} \overline{V_{\gamma\gamma}^+} \overline{\partial_\gamma m_\gamma} = 0 \text{ (alt. } \overline{\partial_\gamma m_\beta} = 0 \text{ and } \overline{\partial_\beta m_\gamma} - \overline{V_{\gamma\beta}} \overline{V_{\beta\beta}^+} \overline{\partial_\beta m_\beta} = 0).$$

This corollary follows directly from the calculations preceding Theorem 4.2. If γ were known, the most efficient way to estimate β would be to substitute the true value for γ in m_β^{eff} . This not only ensures optimality, but also justifies the naming of m_β^{eff} , provided that no superior moment function is available. The corresponding asymptotic variance in this case is $\Sigma_{\beta\beta}^{-1}$.

When γ is unknown and neither of the two conditions is satisfied, it is not possible to achieve the simplified asymptotic variance $\Sigma_{\nu\nu}^{-1}$ as described in Theorem 4.2. Furthermore, the asymptotic variance for the estimation of β without knowledge of γ will necessarily exceed $\Sigma_{\beta\beta}^{-1}$ (cf. (4.2)), highlighting the need for the two conditions.

In the MLE context, m_β and m_γ are the true score functions for β and γ , respectively. Hence, adaptive estimation only requires $\overline{\partial_\beta m_\gamma} = 0$ (alt. $\overline{\partial_\gamma m_\beta} = 0$), since the other condition always holds according to Lemma 4.6. In addition, Lemma 4.3 implies that condition (4.5) is also satisfied in this case. As a result, the adaptive MLE estimation simultaneously achieves efficiency and local robustness, despite not being explicitly discussed in the literature.

The GMM case is a bit more involved. The two conditions imply that the joint procedure can be adaptive. Whenever a joint estimator is available, it simultaneously achieves efficiency and local robustness as in the MLE case. For a sequential procedure, it is still necessary to verify condition (4.5) for local robustness (which is very likely to be true according to Section 5.3).

5 Discussions on Some Important Issues

5.1 Interchangeability of Differentiation and Integration

In the previous analysis, we have been using quantities like $P[\partial_\nu m]$ which is obtained after interchanging the expectation and differential operators. This causes no problem when m is differentiable with respect to ν . However, even if this is not the case, we can use the generalized derivative, which was first introduced by Sobolev (see, e.g., a recent translation

of his work [Sobolev \(2008\)](#)), to interchange differentiation with integration for a broader family of functions (e.g., functions that are right continuous with left limit). The following examples demonstrate how we can move the differentiation operator inside the expectation operator with the help of the Dirac delta function.

Example 4 (Quantile). Denote by β_q the q -th quantile of random variable Z , for some real number $q \in [0, 1]$. It is defined by the moment condition $P[\mathbb{1}_{\{Z \leq \beta_q\}} - q] = 0$.

In this example, we have $m(z, \nu) = m(z, \beta_q) = \mathbb{1}_{\{z \leq \beta_q\}} - q$, which is not differentiable with respect to β in the classical sense. On the one hand, we have $P[m] = \int_{-\infty}^{\beta_q} \mathfrak{p}(z) dz - q$, resulting in $\partial_{\beta_q} P[m] = \mathfrak{p}(\beta_q)$. On the other hand, consider the Heaviside function $H(x) = \mathbb{1}_{\{x \geq 0\}}$ and its generalized derivative the Dirac delta “function” $\delta(x) = dH(x)/dx$. Then we have $m(z, \beta_q) = H(\beta_q - z) - q$ and $P[\partial_{\beta_q} m] = P[\delta(\beta_q - Z)] = \mathfrak{p}(\beta_q)$. That is, we have $\partial_{\beta_q} P[m] = P[\partial_{\beta_q} m]$ in this case. Provided that $\mathfrak{p}(\beta_q)$ is non-zero, the influence function of the q -th quantile at z is given by

$$\dot{\beta}_q(z, P) = -\left(P\left[\frac{\partial m}{\partial \beta_q}\right](\beta_q)\right)^{-1} m(z, \beta_q) = \frac{q - \mathbb{1}_{\{z \leq \beta_q\}}}{\mathfrak{p}(\beta_q)}.$$

[Hahn and Ridder \(2013\)](#) do not address cases where the derivative of m is undefined. Using generalized derivatives allows us to handle both differentiable and certain non-differentiable identification moments, extending the applicability of our methods beyond classical cases. Generalized derivatives can be conceptualized as the inverse of integration. For instance, while Brownian motion has almost surely continuous but non-differentiable paths and jump processes exhibit step-function-like behavior, both can still be expressed in differential form in stochastic calculus.

Moreover, the way we define γ may make it appear as a finite-dimensional parameter. This is not always the case, as shown in the following example. Furthermore, it shows that the order of integration can be interchanged under quite general conditions (recall [Lemma 2.5](#)).

Example 5 (Average Density). The average density parameter β is usually defined by $\beta(P) = P[\mathfrak{p}]$, where the nuisance parameter is $\gamma \equiv \mathfrak{p}$. What makes it tricky is that the functional relation between \mathfrak{p} and P involves a generalized function:

$$\beta(P) = P[P\delta(\cdot - \cdot)] = \int \int \delta(z_2 - z_1) dP(z_2) dP(z_1),$$

where $\delta(\cdot)$ is the Dirac delta function as introduced in the previous example, which is concentrated at 0.

We can also write $\delta(z_2 - z_1)$ as $\delta_{z_1}(z_2)$, where $\delta_{z_1}(\cdot)$ is concentrated at z_1 . Moreover, since $\delta(\cdot)$ is symmetric around zero, we also have $\delta_{z_1}(z_2) = \delta_{z_2}(z_1)$. Then for any admissible Q , it can be shown that

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{\beta}(P; Q - P) &= \int \int \delta(z_2 - z_1) [dP(z_2)d(Q(z_1) - P(z_1)) + d(Q(z_2) - P(z_2))dP(z_1)] \\ &= \int \mathfrak{p}(z_1)d(Q(z_1) - P(z_1)) + \int \int \delta(z_2 - z_1)dP(z_1)d(Q(z_2) - P(z_2)) \\ &= 2(Q - P)[\mathfrak{p}].\end{aligned}$$

Thus, direct calculation yields $\dot{\beta}(P) = 2(\mathfrak{p} - P[\mathfrak{p}])$ as the influence function of the average density parameter, the same as documented in the literature.

In this example, we can write $\beta = P[h_\beta(\mathfrak{p})]$, where $h_\beta(\mathfrak{p}) \equiv \mathfrak{p}$. Then Corollary 3.3 implies that the locally robust identification function is $h_\beta^{\text{LR}}(\mathfrak{p}) = \mathfrak{p} + [\mathfrak{p} - P[\mathfrak{p}]]$. Note that the influence of estimating γ on β is summarized by $\mathfrak{p} - P[\mathfrak{p}]$, which is the adjustment term in h_β^{LR} . Refer to Section 5.2 below if one is interested in the nonparametric influence function of γ .

As shown in Example 5, the Dirac delta function naturally permits an interchange of integrations. Since it can reduce a double integral to a single one, the order is no longer important. In Section 5.2, we explore the role the Dirac delta function/measure plays in nonparametric estimation.

5.2 From Identification to Estimation

So far, our analysis has focused on identification, where only true parameters/functions are used. In this subsection, we briefly show how to transition from identification to estimation. Once again, the Dirac delta function plays a crucial role. Such transition in the parametric case has already been covered by the empirical process theory (van der Vaart and Wellner, 1996). It is well known that the empirical measure $\mathbb{P}_n = n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \delta_{Z_i}$ is a linear combination of the Dirac delta measures in all observations. As for infinite-dimensional parameters, Newey et al. (1998) have shown how the kernel and power series estimators can be represented by certain smooth transformations of the empirical measure \mathbb{P}_n and discussed their distinct properties. The cited work focuses more on correcting nonparametric bias. We are instead more interested in the part that determines the asymptotic variance. After sketching a general approach to constructing an estimator from the identification function, we derive the influence function of a generic kernel-based nonparametric estimator for the nuisance parameter. It offers a new perspective on the differences as well as similarities between nonparametric and semiparametric estimators.

We begin with identification and nonparametric kernel estimation of density as an example of a nuisance parameter. Let $k_b(\cdot) = K(\cdot/b)/b^{d_z}$ be the scaled kernel, where b is the bandwidth. We have

$$\gamma(z) = \mathfrak{p}(z) = P[\delta_z] = P[\delta(z - Z)] \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{\mathfrak{p}}(z) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n k_b(z - Z_i) = \mathbb{P}_n[k_b(z - Z)].$$

We can identify the density function by P and δ . Moving to estimation, replace P with the empirical measure \mathbb{P}_n and approximate the infeasible Dirac delta function δ by a scaled kernel function k_b : from $\mathfrak{p}(z) = \mathfrak{p}(P, \delta_z)$ to $\hat{\mathfrak{p}}(z) = \mathfrak{p}(\mathbb{P}_n, k_{b,z})$, where $k_{b,z}(\cdot) = k_b(z - \cdot)$.

It is a bit tricky to see what the influence function of \mathfrak{p} is in this nonparametric setting. If δ were a regular function, our previous result would suggest $\dot{\mathfrak{p}}(\cdot) = \delta(z - \cdot) - P[\delta(z - \cdot)]$, which does not make much sense from a practical point of view. Nevertheless, based on the way we transition from \mathfrak{p} to $\hat{\mathfrak{p}}$, a reasonable guess would be

$$\dot{\mathfrak{p}}(\cdot) = k_b(z - \cdot) - P[k_b(z - \cdot)].$$

This informal approach is equivalent to first taking the functional derivative as usual and then replacing δ by k_b .

A more formal derivation is as follows. In an asymptotic analysis, we would have

$$\hat{\mathfrak{p}}(z) - \mathfrak{p}(z) = (\mathbb{P}_n - P)[k_b(z - Z)] + P[k_b(z - Z) - \delta(z - Z)].$$

The first term determines the asymptotic variance and the convergence rate, while the second term is an asymptotic bias (aka. the smoothing bias). We can replace \mathbb{P}_n in the first term with P^ϵ and calculate the functional derivative of $\gamma^b(z) := P[k_b(z - Z)]$. It is easy to see that $\dot{\gamma}^b(z) = k_b(z - \cdot) - P[k_b(z - \cdot)]$, which is the same as the above guess. This calculation makes sense since the influence function must have a zero mean (otherwise, the integral representation is not unique). As a result, the bias part $\gamma^b(z) - \gamma(z)$ should not be considered when calculating the influence function.

Compared with the classic empirical process theory, the complication here comes from the fact that we require b to shrink to zero to achieve consistency, because the kernel function k_b only serves as an adequate approximation for δ when b is sufficiently small. This adds another layer of complexity because $P[k_b^2(z - Z_i)] = b^{-d_z} \int K^2(u) du (1 + o(1))$ will diverge to infinity as $b \rightarrow 0$. This divergence conflicts with the typical requirement that the influence function is square-integrable.

However, it is important to note that the square-integrability condition is inherently linked to the classical root- n rate. In contrast, the convergence rate of a kernel-based nonparametric estimator is $(nb^{d_z})^{1/2}$. Despite this discrepancy, the asymptotic variance of

the estimator is determined by the probability limit of $b^{dz}\langle\dot{\gamma}^b, (\dot{\gamma}^b)^\top\rangle$.

Thus, if we interpret the influence function as a measure of the impact of a single observation on the estimator — after appropriate rescaling — then the function $\dot{\gamma}^b$ provides the desired characterization. For simplicity, we refer to it as the nonparametric influence function in this context.

However, the influence of estimating \mathfrak{p} on some finite-dimensional parameter (that is, in a semiparametric setting) is different. Recall the average density discussed in Example 5. The parameter of interest is $\beta = P[\mathfrak{p}] = P[P[\delta]]$. In the calculation, the double integral is reduced to a single integral by the Dirac delta function, which itself also disappears in this reduction (from $P[P[\delta]]$ to $P[\mathfrak{p}]$). As a result, we have $\dot{\beta} = 2(\mathfrak{p} - P[\mathfrak{p}])$ without any infeasible function. With some abuse of notation, the locally robust identification and estimation of the average density can be symbolically written as

$$\beta^{\text{LR}} = P[P[\delta] + (P[\delta] - P[P[\delta]])] \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{\beta}_n^{\text{LR}} = \mathbb{P}_n[\mathbb{P}_n[k_b] + (\mathbb{P}_n[k_b] - \mathbb{P}_n[\mathbb{P}_n[k_b]])].$$

In the identification equation, it may seem that the adjustment term makes no practical sense because it has a mean of zero. As we shift to estimation, however, it becomes clear that the adjustment term reduces bias. In fact, Newey et al. (2004) show that the locally robust kernel-based semiparametric estimator is equivalent to using a twicing kernel, which has a small bias.

Example 6. To gain more insights into the nonparametric and semiparametric influence functions, consider a nonparametric regression model:

$$Y = \gamma(X) + \epsilon, \quad \mathbb{E}[\epsilon|X] = P_{(Y|X)}[Y - \gamma(X)] = 0.$$

It is intuitive to identify the unknown function as $\gamma(x) = \mathbb{E}[Y|X = x]$. To draw more similarities to the nonparametric estimator, e.g., the Nadaraya-Watson (NW) estimator, we identify and estimate γ respectively as

$$\gamma(x) = \frac{P[P_{(Y|X)}[Y\delta_x(X)]]}{P[\delta_x(X)]} = \frac{P[Y\delta(x - X)]}{P[\delta(x - X)]} \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{\gamma}^{\text{NW}}(x) = \frac{\mathbb{P}_n[Yk_b(x - X)]}{\mathbb{P}_n[k_b(x - X)]}.$$

Again, we obtain an estimator by replacing P with \mathbb{P}_n and δ by k_b . This can be summarized as a mapping from $\gamma(P, \delta_x)$ to $\hat{\gamma} = \gamma(\mathbb{P}_n, k_{b,x})$.

Once again, we use the following decomposition in asymptotic analysis

$$\hat{\gamma}^{\text{NW}}(x) - \gamma(x) = \hat{\gamma}^{\text{NW}}(x) - P[\hat{\gamma}^{\text{NW}}(x)] + P[\hat{\gamma}^{\text{NW}}(x)] - \gamma(x),$$

To get the nonparametric influence function, first note that

$$P[\hat{\gamma}^{\text{NW}}(x)] - \gamma^b(x) = O\left(\frac{1}{nh^{d_x-1}}\right), \text{ where } \gamma^b(x) = \frac{P[Yk_b(x-X)]}{P[k_b(x-X)]}.$$

This difference is rather small compared with $\hat{\gamma}^{\text{NW}}(x) - \gamma^b(x)$. Hence, we can replace $P[\hat{\gamma}^{\text{NW}}(x)]$ by $\gamma^b(x)$ in the above decomposition of the estimation error and treat $\hat{\gamma}^{\text{NW}}(x) - \gamma^b(x)$ as the term that determines the asymptotic variance. Accordingly, the nonparametric influence function can be calculated as the functional derivative of γ^b with respect to P :

$$\dot{\gamma}^b = \frac{Yk_b}{P[k_b]} - \frac{k_b\gamma^b}{P[k_b]} = \frac{k_b}{P[k_b]}(Y - \gamma^b) \text{ and } b^{d_x}\langle \dot{\gamma}^b, (\dot{\gamma}^b)^\top \rangle \longrightarrow \frac{\sigma^2(x)}{p(x)} \int K^2(u)du,$$

where $\sigma^2(x) = \text{Var}(Y|X=x)$. The limit on the right-hand side is the same as the asymptotic variance of the NW estimator. Together with the root- n rate associated with $\mathbb{P}_n - P$, the above result is in line with the fact that the convergence rate is $(nb^{d_x})^{1/2}$ in this case. Alternatively, one can first take the functional derivative of γ as if δ is a regular function and then replace δ with k_b (the informal approach). The result will be the same.

Notably, the local polynomial estimator replaces δ with a more complicated kernel function (Fan and Gijbels, 1996). Newey et al. (1998) also provide a representation of the power series based estimator. The above analysis can, therefore, be extended to these cases, but will be omitted here to save space. The following corollary summarizes the relationship between the nonparametric and the corresponding semiparametric influence function in the direct identification case.

Corollary 5.1. *Suppose that a regular infinite-dimensional parameter β can be directly identified as a function of $z^{(1)} \in \mathbb{R}^{d_1}$*

$$\beta(z^{(1)}) = P[h_\beta(\gamma_1(P_{(1)}), \gamma_2(P_{(2|:)}), \dots, \gamma_l(P_{(l|:)})) | Z^{(1)} = z^{(1)}] = \frac{P[h_\beta \delta_{z^{(1)}}]}{P[\delta_{z^{(1)}}]},$$

where h_β satisfies the same set of conditions as in Theorem 3.4.

Moreover, suppose that one can estimate this function by replacing P and δ in the above identification equation with \mathbb{P}_n and some scaled kernel function k_b , respectively. Let $\beta^b(z^{(1)}) := P[h_\beta k_b]/P[k_b]$ and $\bar{\beta} := P[h_\beta]$ be the associated infinite- and finite-dimensional parameters, respectively.

Then the leading term in the asymptotic bias of estimating β at $z^{(1)}$ is $\beta^b(z^{(1)}) - \beta(z^{(1)})$.

The (nonparametric) influence function of β is the same as that of β^b at any point

$$\dot{\beta} \equiv \dot{\beta}^b \equiv \frac{k_b}{P[k_b]} (h_\beta^{\text{LR}} - \beta^b) \quad (\text{cf. } \dot{\beta} = h_\beta^{\text{LR}} - \bar{\beta}),$$

where h_β^{LR} is the locally robust version of h_β as given in Theorem 3.4.

In the above corollary, we omit the inputs of most functions for notation simplicity. One should treat h_β^{LR} as a random vector, that is, a function of Z . In the direct identification case, both associated parameters are defined as a certain type of mean of $h_\beta(Z)$, which remains (asymptotically) the same when we replace h_β with h_β^{LR} . Hence, it is a straightforward extension of mean estimation. The variance of the random vector $h_\beta^{\text{LR}}(Z)$ determines the asymptotic variance of the parameter of interest. In the semiparametric case, the influence from any possible deviation $h_\beta^{\text{LR}}(Z) - \bar{\beta}$ is treated the same. In the nonparametric case, however, one needs to re-weight the deviation $h_\beta^{\text{LR}}(Z) - \beta^b$ according to k_b : those realizations closer to the point of interest $z^{(1)}$ receive higher weights.

5.3 Conditional Moment Restrictions and Degeneracy of Parameter

As discussed in Section 4.1, we may not be able to rule out the possibility of having $\text{rank}(\bar{V}_{\gamma\gamma}) > d_\gamma$ theoretically. However, we are going to examine a widely used trick to yield over-identification of parameters and demonstrate that it is more often used for β than γ . That is, many classic over-identified models are about β and we can still have $\text{rank}(\bar{V}_{\gamma\gamma}) = d_\gamma$. Correspondingly, these models still fall into the first two scenarios in Lemma 4.3.

This subsection also serves as a more detailed discussion of conditional moment restrictions, which covers many models in statistics and econometrics. In our view, what makes it special is that it provides a simple mechanism for expanding the space of identification (moment) functions, typically from a Euclidean space to a Banach space. To see this, consider a regular parameter ν_j satisfying

$$P_{(\cdot|j)}[m(Z, \nu_j)] = 0, \quad \text{where } P_{(\cdot|j)} := P_{(t:j+1|j:1)}.$$

Typically, one would expect the solution $\nu_j(P_{(\cdot|j)})$ to be a function of $Z^{(j:1)}$. However, in many applications, ν_j reduces to a function of $Z^{(j':1)}$, where $0 \leq j' < j$. When $j' = 0$, the term $Z^{(0:1)}$ is understood as a constant and therefore ν_j is just a vector. Otherwise, the parameter ν_j is a vector-valued function. Such reduction or degeneracy will substantially enlarge the space for moment functions.

Using a similar argument as in Section 3.1, for any square-integrable function A of

$Z^{(j:1)}$, there exists a symmetric and positive semi-definite matrix function Ξ of $Z^{(j:1)}$ such that $A = P_{(:,j)}[\partial_\nu m]^\top \Xi$. The law of iterated expectation implies that

$$P_{(:,j')} [P_{(:,j)}[\partial_\nu m]^\top \Xi m(Z, \nu_j)] = P_{(:,j')} [P_{(:,j)}[\partial_\nu m]^\top \Xi P_{(:,j)}[m(Z, \nu_j)]] = 0.$$

Whenever such degeneracy occurs, the dimension of the vector-valued function m is no longer that important. Even when the matrix function $P_{(:,j)}[\partial_\nu m]^\top \Xi P_{(:,j)}[\partial_\nu m]$ is singular at any single point $z^{(j:1)}$, it is still possible that the integral $P_{(:,j')} [P_{(:,j)}[\partial_\nu m]^\top \Xi P_{(:,j)}[\partial_\nu m]]$ is invertible. In principle, there are unaccountably many choices for this Ξ function. We can employ the implicit function theorem to solve ν as a function of $P_{(:,j')}$ as we did before. The influence function in this case becomes

$$\dot{\nu}_j = - \left[P_{(:,j')} (P_{(:,j)}[\partial_\nu m]^\top \Xi P_{(:,j)}[\partial_\nu m]) \right]^{-1} P_{(:,j)}[\partial_\nu m]^\top \Xi m.$$

Let $\Sigma_{\nu\nu,j} = P_{(:,j)}[mm^\top]$. The conditional variance $P_{(:,j')} [\dot{\nu}_j \dot{\nu}_j^\top]$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned} & \left[P_{(:,j')} (P_{(:,j)}[\partial_\nu m]^\top \Xi P_{(:,j)}[\partial_\nu m]) \right]^{-1} \left[P_{(:,j')} (P_{(:,j)}[\partial_\nu m]^\top \Xi \Sigma_{\nu\nu,j} \Xi^\top P_{(:,j)}[\partial_\nu m]) \right] \\ & \left[P_{(:,j')} (P_{(:,j)}[\partial_\nu m]^\top \Xi P_{(:,j)}[\partial_\nu m]) \right]^{-1}. \end{aligned}$$

The above expression resembles the classic sandwich form under conditional probability. It is not hard to see that different choices of Ξ could lead to different variances. [Chen and Santos \(2018\)](#) provide a general characterization of over-identification for regular models. A key conclusion is that over-identification can lead to efficiency improvement. Based on this criterion, the above model is clearly over-identified.

In such a setting, it remains to be seen whether $\text{rank}(\bar{V}_{\gamma\gamma}) > d_\gamma$. As it is not easy to discuss this at a purely abstract level, we demonstrate by using a simple yet classic example that we can still end up with $\text{rank}(\bar{V}_{\gamma\gamma}) = d_\gamma$ in over-identified models that researchers encounter in practice.

Example 7 (IV regression). Consider a simple IV model as follows:

$$\begin{cases} Y_1 = Y_2\beta + u \\ Y_2 = W^\top\gamma + e_2 \end{cases} \implies \begin{cases} Y_1 = W^\top\gamma\beta + e_1 \\ Y_2 = W^\top\gamma + e_2 \end{cases}, \text{ where } e_1 = u + e_2\beta.$$

Without much loss of generality, we set Y_1 and Y_2 to be both one-dimensional, while the dimension of the instrument W is higher. The random vector Z can be decomposed as $Z^{(1)} = W$ and $Z^{(2)} = (Y_1, Y_2)^\top$. Additional exogenous regressors are omitted for simplicity. Let $m = (m_\beta, m_\gamma)^\top$, where $m_\beta = Y_1 - W^\top\gamma\beta = e_1$ and $m_\gamma = Y_2 - W^\top\gamma = e_2$. It is easy to

see that m_γ is scalar-valued, while γ is a vector.

One can adopt a sequential estimation procedure: first obtain $\hat{\gamma}$, which yields a generated regressor \hat{Y}_2 , and then plug it into the first equation to get $\hat{\beta}$. Alternatively, one can estimate γ and β jointly by GMM.

If we use unconditional moment condition, for example, $P[W \otimes m] = 0$, where \otimes stands for Kronecker product, the nuisance parameter γ is exact/just-identified. Accordingly, Lemma 4.3 shows that the sequential method can be as efficient as the joint one.

Alternatively, we can also consider the conditional moment condition $P_{(\cdot|1)}[m] = \mathbb{E}[m|W] = 0$, which is a degeneracy case as illustrated above. The first step in the sequential procedure is essentially a linear regression model with zero-conditional mean. It is well-established in the literature that the generalized least squares (GLS) method gives the most efficient estimator of γ . This is equivalent to using the following unconditional moment function for γ :

$$m_\gamma^u = WV_{22}^{-1}(Y_2 - W^\top \gamma), \text{ where } V_{22} = P_{(\cdot|1)}[m_\gamma^2].$$

It is easy to see that $\text{rank}(\bar{V}_{\gamma\gamma}) = \text{rank}(\langle m_\gamma^u, (m_\gamma^u)^\top \rangle) = d_\gamma$. In other words, the parameter γ is not rank over-identified. Accordingly, the sequential method (e.g., using GLS in both steps) can be made as efficient as the joint one.

In summary, the degeneracy of the parameter substantially enlarges the space for moment functions. Thus, one may wonder whether the optimal weight function for γ (locally optimal) is also the optimal weight function for β (globally optimal). As argued and demonstrated above, it is still quite likely that we will have $\text{rank}(\bar{V}_{\gamma\gamma}) = d_\gamma$ in such over-identified cases, ensuring that the local optimum coincides with the global optimum.

6 Conclusion

In this paper, we first propose a more direct method of calculating the influence function, following its definition as a functional derivative. A key step is the application of the implicit function theorem to the identification condition. Unlike the existing methods, our approach circumvents incorporating the true score function into the calculations, sidestepping potential conceptual or technical difficulties. We further illustrate this direct approach through various examples, covering joint and sequential estimation procedures, as well as identification under conditional and unconditional probability measures.

Based on such a direct calculation, we next explore how to find the best identification strategy that achieves both local robustness and efficiency. This is also when joint and sequential procedures coincide. By applying the implicit function theorem in a conjugate

way, we also provide a more concise proof of the relation between the GMM-type efficiency bound and the MLE efficiency bound. Furthermore, we give easy-to-check conditions for when adaptive estimation could be implemented.

References

- AI, C. AND X. CHEN (2003): “Efficient estimation of models with conditional moment restrictions containing unknown functions,” *Econometrica*, 71, 1795–1843.
- ANDERSON, T. W. AND H. RUBIN (1949): “Estimation of the Parameters of a Single Equation in a Complete System of Stochastic Equations,” *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, 20, 46–63.
- ANDREWS, D. W. K. (1994): “Asymptotics for Semiparametric Econometric Models via Stochastic Equicontinuity,” *Econometrica*, 62, 43–72.
- BANG, H. AND J. M. ROBINS (2005): “Doubly robust estimation in missing data and causal inference models,” *Biometrics*, 61, 962–973.
- BEN-ISRAEL, A. AND T. N. GREVILLE (2003): *Generalized Inverses: Theory and Applications*, no. 15 in CMS Books in Mathematics, Springer, 2nd ed.
- BICKEL, P. J. (1982): “On adaptive estimation,” *The Annals of Statistics*, 647–671.
- BICKEL, P. J., C. A. KLAASSEN, Y. RITOV, AND J. A. WELLNER (1993): *Efficient and Adaptive Estimation for Semiparametric Models*, Johns Hopkins University Press.
- CAO, W., A. A. TSIATIS, AND M. DAVIDIAN (2009): “Improving efficiency and robustness of the doubly robust estimator for a population mean with incomplete data,” *Biometrika*, 96, 723–734.
- CARRASCO, M. AND J.-P. FLORENS (2014): “On the Asymptotic Efficiency of GMM,” *Econometric Theory*, 30, 372–406.
- CHAMBERLAIN, G. (1987): “Asymptotic efficiency in estimation with conditional moment restrictions,” *Journal of econometrics*, 34, 305–334.
- CHEN, X. AND A. SANTOS (2018): “Overidentification in regular models,” *Econometrica*, 86, 1771–1817.

- CHERNOZHUKOV, V., D. CHETVERIKOV, M. DEMIRER, E. DUFLO, C. HANSEN, W. NEWEY, AND J. ROBINS (2018): “Double/Debiased Machine Learning for Treatment and Structural Parameters,” *The Econometrics Journal*, 21, C1–C68.
- CHERNOZHUKOV, V., J. C. ESCANCIANO, H. ICHIMURA, W. K. NEWEY, AND J. M. ROBINS (2022): “Locally Robust Semiparametric Estimation,” *Econometrica*, 90, 1501–1535.
- FAN, J. AND I. GIJBELS (1996): *Local Polynomial Modelling and Its Applications*, vol. 66 of *Monographs on Statistics and Applied Probability*, 1st ed.
- GALLIER, J. (2011): *Geometric Methods and Applications: for Computer Science and Engineering*, vol. 38, Springer Science & Business Media.
- GODAMBE, V. P. (1960): “An Optimum Property of Regular Maximum Likelihood Estimation,” *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, 31, 1208–1211.
- HAHN, J. (1998): “On the Role of the Propensity Score in Efficient Semiparametric Estimation of Average Treatment Effects,” *Econometrica*, 66, 315–331.
- HAHN, J. AND G. RIDDER (2013): “Asymptotic variance of semiparametric estimators with generated regressors,” *Econometrica*, 81, 315–340.
- HAMPEL, F. R. (1968): “Contributions to the Theory of Robust Estimation,” Ph.D. thesis.
- (1974): “The Influence Curve And Its Role In Robust Estimation,” *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 69, 383–393.
- HANSEN, L. P. (1982): “Large Sample Properties of Generalized Method of Moments Estimators,” *Econometrica*, 50, 1029–54.
- HIRANO, K., G. W. IMBENS, AND G. RIDDER (2003): “Efficient Estimation of Average Treatment Effects Using the Estimated Propensity Score,” *Econometrica*, 71, 1161–1189.
- HORVITZ, D. G. AND D. J. THOMPSON (1952): “A generalization of sampling without replacement from a finite universe,” *Journal of the American statistical Association*, 47, 663–685.
- HUBER, P. J. (1984): *Robust Statistics*, John Wiley & Sons, 1st ed.
- ICHIMURA, H. AND W. K. NEWEY (2022): “The Influence Function of Semiparametric Estimators,” *Quantitative Economics*, 13, 29–61.

- IMBENS, G. W., W. K. NEWEY, AND G. RIDDER (2005): “Mean-square-error Calculations for Average Treatment Effects,” .
- KOLLO, T. AND D. VON ROSEN (2006): *Advanced multivariate statistics with matrices*, vol. 579, Springer Science & Business Media.
- NEWEY, W. K. (1988): “Adaptive estimation of regression models via moment restrictions,” *Journal of Econometrics*, 38, 301–339.
- (1990): “Semiparametric Efficiency Bounds,” *Journal of Applied Econometrics*, 5, 99–135.
- (1994): “The Asymptotic Variance of Semiparametric Estimators,” *Econometrica*, 1349–1382.
- NEWEY, W. K., F. HSIEH, AND J. M. ROBINS (1998): “Undersmoothing and Bias-corrected Functional Estimation,” Tech. rep.
- (2004): “Twicing Kernels and A Small Bias Property of Semiparametric Estimators,” *Econometrica*, 72, 947–962.
- NEWEY, W. K. AND D. MCFADDEN (1994): “Large Sample Estimation and Hypothesis Testing,” in *Handbook of Econometrics*, ed. by R. F. Engle and D. L. McFadden, Elsevier, vol. 4, 2111–2245.
- OAXACA, R. (1973): “Male-female wage differentials in urban labor markets,” *International economic review*, 693–709.
- PAVLÍKOVÁ, S. AND D. ŠEVČOVIČ (2023): “On the Moore-Penrose pseudo-inversion of block symmetric matrices and its application in the graph theory,” *Linear Algebra and its Applications*, 673, 280–303.
- ROBINS, J. M. AND A. ROTNITZKY (2001): “Comment on Inference for semiparametric models: Some questions and an answer, by P. J. Bickel and K. Kwon,” *Statistica Sinica*, 11, 920–936.
- ROBINS, J. M., A. ROTNITZKY, AND L. P. ZHAO (1994): “Estimation of regression coefficients when some regressors are not always observed,” *Journal of the American statistical Association*, 89, 846–866.
- SARGAN, J. D. (1958): “The estimation of economic relationships using instrumental variables,” *Econometrica: Journal of the econometric society*, 393–415.

- SOBOLEV, S. L. (2008): *Some applications of functional analysis in mathematical physics*, vol. 90, American Mathematical Society, (Translated from Russian).
- TSIATIS, A. A. (2006): *Semiparametric theory and missing data*, Springer.
- TUKEY, J. W. (1960): “A Survey of Sampling From Contaminated Distributions,” *Contributions to Probability and Statistics*, 448–485.
- VAN DER VAART, A. W. (1998): *Asymptotic Statistics*, Cambridge University Press.
- VAN DER VAART, A. W. AND J. A. WELLNER (1996): *Weak Convergence and Empirical Processes*, Springer Series in Statistics, Springer, 1st ed.
- WALTER, R. (1987): *Real and Complex Analysis*, McGraw-Hill Book Company, 3rd ed.

A Mathematical Appendix

A.1 Functional Derivative

Below we adopt (with some modification) the definition used in the seminal book by [Bickel et al. \(1993\)](#) (refer to Section A.5 therein for more details). As in the cited book, the main focus here is not to provide the most rigorous mathematical formulation. Rather, it is intended to give a sufficient description for subsequent analysis.

Definition A.1 (\mathcal{S} -Differentiability). *Let $T : \mathbb{V} \mapsto \mathbb{W}$ be a function from a normed vector space to another. Let \mathcal{S} be a collection of subsets of \mathbb{V} . For any $f, g \in \mathbb{V}$, define*

$$\text{Rem}(T, f, g) := T(f + g) - T(f) - \dot{T}(f; g).$$

Then T is \mathcal{S} -differentiable at f with derivative $\dot{T}(f; g)$ along the direction g if for all $S \in \mathcal{S}$,

$$\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{\epsilon} \text{Rem}(T, f, \epsilon g) = 0 \quad \text{uniformly in } g \in S,$$

where ϵ is a scalar.

As summarized by [Bickel et al. \(1993\)](#), when \mathcal{S} is the set of all bounded subsets, compact subsets, and singletons of \mathcal{P} , the above \mathcal{S} -differentiability is equivalent to Fréchet, Hadamard, and Gâteaux differentiability, respectively. In particular, when \mathbb{V} is a Banach space, continuous Gâteaux differentiability is equivalent to continuous Hadamard differentiability. Following, we assume whatever type of differentiability that is appropriate for our analysis.

There is a technical issue with applying the differentiability defined above to characterize parameter regularity: the set \mathcal{M}_μ only forms a convex cone rather than a vector space. Let $\mathbb{V}(\mathcal{P})$ be the collection of finite signed measures generated by linear combinations of the probability measures $\in \mathcal{P}$. Ideally, it would be more convenient if we could generalize the definition of the parameter ν from \mathcal{P} to $\mathbb{V}(\mathcal{P})$. However, this may not be necessary. Ultimately, the object of analysis is the difference $\nu(P^\epsilon) - \nu(P)$, where $P^\epsilon = (1 - \epsilon)P + \epsilon Q = P + \epsilon(Q - P)$ with some positive but small number ϵ . For any $Q \in \mathcal{M}_\mu$, one can always find a $\bar{\epsilon} > 0$ such that $P^\epsilon \in \mathcal{M}_\mu$ for any $\epsilon \in [0, \bar{\epsilon})$. In light of this, unless the model \mathcal{P} is not “good” enough, one does not have to worry that $\nu(P^\epsilon)$ might not be well-defined for sufficiently small ϵ . Besides, the direction of perturbation $Q - P$ always belongs to $\mathbb{V}(\mathcal{P})$. Hence, the above definition of differentiability is applicable.

A.2 Technical Details on the Conditional Probability Case

In the conditional case, for any i and j , let $Z^{(j:i)} = (Z^{(i)\top}, \dots, Z^{(j)\top})^\top$ when $i \leq j$ and $Z^{(j:i)}$ be the empty set if $i > j$. Let $P_{(1)}$ be the marginal probability measure of $Z^{(1)}$. For $j = 1, \dots, l$, let $P_{(j|j-1:1)}$ be the mapping from $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^{d_j}) \times \Sigma \rightarrow [0, 1]$ such that

$$P_{(j|j-1:1)}(B, \omega) = P([Z^{(j)}]^{-1}(B) | \sigma(Z^{(j-1:1)}))(\omega)$$

for each $B \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^{d_j})$ and $\omega \in \Sigma$. Then $P_{(j|1:j-1)}$ is a probability measure on $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^{d_j})$ for almost all $\omega \in \Sigma$. We denote $P_{(j|j-1:1)}$ by $P_{(j|\cdot)}$ to simplify the notation. Moreover, denote by $P_{(l:j|\cdot)}$ the joint probability measure of $Z^{(l:j)}$ given $Z^{(j-1:1)}$.

To facilitate the calculation of the influence function in the conditional case, it is helpful to illustrate how the perturbed conditional distribution is characterized. We start with the characterization of the perturbed unconditional (or joint) distribution. More specifically, we have

$$\begin{aligned} dP_{(j:1)}^\epsilon &= dP_{(j:1)} + \epsilon(dQ_{(j:1)} - dP_{(j:1)}) = dP_{(j:1)} + \epsilon(dQ_{(j|\cdot)}dQ_{(j-1:1)} - dP_{(j|\cdot)}P_{(j-1:1)}) \\ &= dP_{(j:1)} + \epsilon(dQ_{(j|\cdot)}dQ_{(j-1:1)} - dP_{(j|\cdot)}dQ_{(j-1:1)} + dP_{(j|\cdot)}dQ_{(j-1:1)} - dP_{(j|\cdot)}dP_{(j-1:1)}) \\ &= dP_{(j|\cdot)}dP_{(j-1:1)} + \epsilon dP_{(j|\cdot)}(dQ_{(j-1:1)} - dP_{(j-1:1)}) + \epsilon(dQ_{(j|\cdot)} - dP_{(j|\cdot)})dQ_{(j-1:1)} \\ &= dP_{(j|\cdot)}dP_{(j-1:1)}^\epsilon + \epsilon(dQ_{(j|\cdot)} - dP_{(j|\cdot)})dQ_{(j-1:1)}, \end{aligned}$$

for all $j = 1, \dots, l$. Restricted to the set $\{dP_{(j-1:1)}^\epsilon \neq 0\}$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} dP_{(j|\cdot)}^\epsilon &= \frac{dP_{(j:1)}^\epsilon}{dP_{(j-1:1)}^\epsilon} = \frac{dP_{(j|\cdot)}dP_{(j-1:1)}^\epsilon + \epsilon(dQ_{(j|\cdot)} - dP_{(j|\cdot)})dQ_{(j-1:1)}}{dP_{(j-1:1)}^\epsilon} \\ &= dP_{(j|\cdot)} + \epsilon(dQ_{(j|\cdot)} - dP_{(j|\cdot)})\frac{dQ_{(j-1:1)}}{dP_{(j-1:1)}^\epsilon} \end{aligned} \tag{A.1}$$

Note that the ratio in the last term serves as a change of measure. This is the key to obtaining the main results. In fact, as shown in the proof in [A.3](#) below, the conditional expectation under $dP_{(j|\cdot)}^\epsilon$ will be further evaluated under the joint measure $dP_{(j-1:1)}$. Then with the change of measure in the second term above, the perturbation effect due to $\epsilon(dQ_{(j|\cdot)} - dP_{(j|\cdot)})$ will eventually be evaluated under the measure $dQ_{(j-1:1)}$. Refer to [Example 3](#) for an illustration.

Putting this into perspective, consider $Z^{(1)} = X$ and $Z^{(2)} = Y$. [\(A.1\)](#) implies that

$$dP_{(Y|X)}^\epsilon = dP_{(Y|X)} + \epsilon(dQ_{(Y|X)} - dP_{(Y|X)})\frac{dQ_{(X)}}{dP_{(X)}^\epsilon},$$

or equivalently, using densities

$$p_{(Y|X)}^\epsilon(y|x) = p_{(Y|X)}(y|x) + \epsilon [\mathbf{q}_{(Y|X)}(y|x) - p_{(Y|X)}(y|x)] \frac{\mathbf{q}_{(X)}(x)}{p_{(X)}^\epsilon(x)}.$$

A.3 More Details on the Hahn (regression-based) estimator

To illustrate how we get (3.11), consider the impact of a perturbation of $P_{(Y|T,X)}$ on γ_{1T} . We evaluate the expectation with respect to \tilde{Z} , which is an independent copy of Z , and then consider a perturbation towards Z (the following derivation serves as a proof of (3.7) in this special case):

$$\begin{aligned} & P_{(\tilde{T}|\tilde{X})}[\tilde{T}P_{(\tilde{Y}|\tilde{T},\tilde{X})}^\epsilon[\tilde{Y}]] - P_{(\tilde{T}|\tilde{X})}[\tilde{T}P_{(\tilde{Y}|\tilde{T},\tilde{X})}[\tilde{Y}]] \\ &= \int \int \tilde{t}\tilde{y} d[P_{(\tilde{Y}|\tilde{T},\tilde{X})}^\epsilon - P_{(\tilde{Y}|\tilde{T},\tilde{X})}](\tilde{y}|\tilde{t}, \tilde{x}) dP_{(\tilde{T}|\tilde{X})}(\tilde{t}|\tilde{x}) \\ &= \epsilon \int \int \tilde{t}\tilde{y} d[Q_{(\tilde{Y}|\tilde{T},\tilde{X})} - P_{(\tilde{Y}|\tilde{T},\tilde{X})}](\tilde{y}|\tilde{t}, \tilde{x}) \frac{dQ_{(\tilde{T}|\tilde{X})}}{dP_{(\tilde{T}|\tilde{X})}}(\tilde{t}|\tilde{x}) dP_{(\tilde{T}|\tilde{X})}(\tilde{t}|\tilde{x}) + o_p(\epsilon) \\ &= \epsilon \int \int \tilde{t}\tilde{y} d[Q_{(\tilde{Y}|\tilde{T},\tilde{X})} - P_{(\tilde{Y}|\tilde{T},\tilde{X})}](\tilde{y}|\tilde{t}, \tilde{x}) dQ_{(\tilde{T}|\tilde{X})}(\tilde{t}|\tilde{x}) + o_p(\epsilon) \\ &= \epsilon \int \tilde{t} \left(\int \tilde{y} dQ_{(\tilde{Y}|\tilde{T},\tilde{X})} - \tau_1(\tilde{x}) \right) dQ_{(\tilde{T}|\tilde{X})}(\tilde{t}|\tilde{x}) + o_p(\epsilon) \end{aligned}$$

To get the influence function, consider the distribution Q that puts all mass at a point z . This is effectively the same as removing the integral sign and evaluating the integrand at z . Here, the point is to demonstrate that the conditional expectation in the adjustment term associated with $P_{(Y|T,X)}$ should be evaluated at the point (T, X) , as if both T and X are known.

The change of measure part dQ/dP in (A.1) effectively replaces the joint probability measure $P_{(T,X)}$ (or more specifically, $P_{(T,X)}^\epsilon$) with the Dirac delta measure Q that puts all probability mass on (T, X) . This is the key, and the proof of the Theorem 3.4 follows the same logic.

A.4 Joint vs Sequential: The Invertible Case

When all relevant matrices are invertible, it is straightforward to establish equivalence between joint and sequential identifications.

Corollary A.2. *Suppose that assumptions of Proposition 3.1 hold. In addition, assume that*

$d_m = d_\nu$ and $\overline{\partial_\nu m}$, $\overline{\partial_\beta m_\beta}$, and $\overline{\partial_\gamma m_\gamma}$ are all invertible. Define

$$M_\beta = \overline{\partial_\beta m_\beta} - \overline{\partial_\gamma m_\beta} \overline{\partial_\gamma m_\gamma}^{-1} \overline{\partial_\beta m_\gamma} \text{ and } M_\gamma = \overline{\partial_\gamma m_\gamma} - \overline{\partial_\beta m_\gamma} \overline{\partial_\beta m_\beta}^{-1} \overline{\partial_\gamma m_\beta}.$$

Then the one-step estimation yields

$$\begin{pmatrix} \dot{\beta} \\ \dot{\gamma} \end{pmatrix} = - \begin{pmatrix} M_\beta^{-1} & 0 \\ 0 & M_\gamma^{-1} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} m_\beta - \overline{\partial_\gamma m_\beta} \overline{\partial_\gamma m_\gamma}^{-1} m_\gamma \\ m_\gamma - \overline{\partial_\beta m_\gamma} \overline{\partial_\beta m_\beta}^{-1} m_\beta \end{pmatrix}.$$

Moreover, if $\overline{\partial_\beta m_\gamma} = 0$ we have

$$\begin{pmatrix} \dot{\beta} \\ \dot{\gamma} \end{pmatrix} = - \begin{pmatrix} \overline{\partial_\beta m_\beta}^{-1} (m_\beta - \overline{\partial_\gamma m_\beta} \overline{\partial_\gamma m_\gamma}^{-1} m_\gamma) \\ \overline{\partial_\gamma m_\gamma}^{-1} m_\gamma \end{pmatrix},$$

which is the same as the two-step case.

B Proofs

The proofs of many results have already been sketched in the main text. Here, we first sketch the proof for Theorem 3.4. Theorem 3.6 can be proved in the same way. We then provide more details on Proposition 4.8.

B.1 Proof of Theorem 3.4

Huber (1984) observe that “the Gâteaux derivative is, after all, nothing but the ordinary derivative of the real function $\nu(P^\epsilon)$ function with respect to the real parameter ϵ (we change the notation to what we use here).” Besides, when ν is a regular parameter, the influence function $\dot{\nu}(P)$ is continuous in P . Accordingly, we can get the following approximation (with some abuse of notation)

$$\nu(P^\epsilon) - \nu(P) = \int_0^\epsilon \int \dot{\nu}(P^\eta) d(P^\eta - P) d\eta = \int \dot{\nu}(P) d(P^\epsilon - P) (1 + o_p(1)).$$

A more rigorous representation would necessitate a more precise definition of $o_p(1)$. However, to enhance the intuitiveness of our exposition, we choose to forgo some mathematical rigor. When it comes to a more concrete asymptotic analysis, the counterpart of $\dot{\nu}(P^\eta)$ would be a consistent estimator of $\dot{\nu}$.

The same conclusion holds if we replace the unconditional probability measures P^ϵ and P with respect to conditional ones, such as $P_{(j|\cdot)}^\epsilon$ and $P_{(j|\cdot)}$, respectively. The only difference

lies in

$$dP^\epsilon - dP = \epsilon d(Q - P) \quad \text{and} \quad dP_{(j|\cdot)}^\epsilon - dP_{(j|\cdot)} = \epsilon(dQ_{(j|\cdot)} - dP_{(j|\cdot)}) \frac{dQ_{(j-1:1)}}{dP_{(j-1:1)}^\epsilon}.$$

For $j = 1, \dots, l-1$, define

$$H_j^\epsilon \equiv h_\beta(\gamma_1(P_1^\epsilon), \dots, \gamma_j(P_{(j|\cdot)}^\epsilon), \gamma_{j+1}(P_{(j+1|\cdot)}), \dots, \gamma_l(P_{(l|\cdot)})).$$

If we interpret j as the number of perturbed probability measures in each term, j can include both 0 and l :

$$H_0^\epsilon \equiv h_\beta(\gamma_1(P_1), \dots, \gamma_l(P_{(l|\cdot)})) \quad \text{and} \quad H_l^\epsilon \equiv h_\beta(\gamma_1(P_{(1:1)}^\epsilon), \dots, \gamma_l(P_{(l:1)}^\epsilon)).$$

With abuse of notation, let $P_{(0)}^\epsilon = P_{(1)}$ and $P_{(l:l+1|\cdot)}$ be the measure such that $P_{(l:l+1)}[f] = f$ for any function f . We can write the perturbation effect as

$$\begin{aligned} \beta(P^\epsilon) - \beta(P) &= P^\epsilon[H_l^\epsilon] - P[H_0^\epsilon] = \int \int H_l^\epsilon dP_{(l|\cdot)}^\epsilon dP_{(l-1:1)}^\epsilon - \int \int H_0^\epsilon dP_{(l:2|\cdot)} dP_{(1)} \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^l \left(\int \int \int H_j^\epsilon dP_{(l:j+1|\cdot)} dP_{(j|\cdot)}^\epsilon dP_{(j-1:1)}^\epsilon - \int \int \int H_{j-1}^\epsilon dP_{(l:j+1|\cdot)} dP_{(j|\cdot)} dP_{(j-1:1)}^\epsilon \right) \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^l \left(\int \int P_{(l:j+1|\cdot)}[H_j^\epsilon] dP_{(j|\cdot)}^\epsilon dP_{(j-1:1)}^\epsilon - \int \int P_{(l:j+1|\cdot)}[H_{j-1}^\epsilon] dP_{(j|\cdot)} dP_{(j-1:1)}^\epsilon \right) \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^l \left(\int \int P_{(l:j+1|\cdot)}[H_j^\epsilon] dP_{(j|\cdot)}^\epsilon dP_{(j-1:1)}^\epsilon - \int \int P_{(l:j+1|\cdot)}[H_j^\epsilon] dP_{(j|\cdot)} dP_{(j-1:1)}^\epsilon \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \int \int P_{(l:j+1|\cdot)}[H_j^\epsilon] dP_{(j|\cdot)} dP_{(j-1:1)}^\epsilon - \int \int P_{(l:j+1|\cdot)}[H_{j-1}^\epsilon] dP_{(j|\cdot)} dP_{(j-1:1)}^\epsilon \right). \end{aligned}$$

The first difference can be re-written as

$$\begin{aligned} &\int \int P_{(l:j+1|\cdot)}[H_j^\epsilon] dP_{(j|\cdot)}^\epsilon dP_{(j-1:1)}^\epsilon - \int \int P_{(l:j+1|\cdot)}[H_j^\epsilon] dP_{(j|\cdot)} dP_{(j-1:1)}^\epsilon \\ &= \epsilon \int \int P_{(l:j+1|\cdot)}[H_j^\epsilon] (dQ_{(j|\cdot)} - dP_{(j|\cdot)}) \frac{dQ_{(j-1:1)}}{dP_{(j-1:1)}^\epsilon} dP_{(j-1:1)}^\epsilon \\ &= \epsilon \int \int P_{(l:j+1|\cdot)}[H_j^\epsilon] (dQ_{(j|\cdot)} - dP_{(j|\cdot)}) dQ_{(j-1:1)} \\ &= \epsilon \int \int P_{(l:j+1|\cdot)}[h_\beta] (dQ_{(j|\cdot)} - dP_{(j|\cdot)}) dQ_{(j-1:1)} (1 + o_p(1)), \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality follows from the assumption that $P_{(l:j+1|\cdot)}[h_\beta]$ is continuous in the relevant γ_j 's.

Continuous differentiability of $P_{(l:j|:)}[h_\beta]$ implies

$$\begin{aligned}
& P_{(l:j|:)}[H_j^\epsilon - H_{j-1}^\epsilon] \\
&= P_{(l:j|:)}\left[h_\beta(\gamma_1(P_1^\epsilon), \dots, \gamma_j(P_{(j-1|:)}^\epsilon), \gamma_j(P_{(j|:)}^\epsilon), \gamma_{j+1}(P_{(j+1|:)}^\epsilon), \dots, \gamma_l(P_{(l|:)}^\epsilon))\right. \\
&\quad \left.- h_\beta(\gamma_1(P_1), \dots, \gamma_j(P_{(j-1|:)}), \gamma_j(P_{(j|:)}), \gamma_{j+1}(P_{(j+1|:)}), \dots, \gamma_l(P_{(l|:)}))\right] \\
&= P_{(l:j|:)}\left[h_\beta(\gamma_1(P_1), \dots, \gamma_j(P_{(j-1|:)}), \gamma_j(P_{(j|:)}^\epsilon), \gamma_{j+1}(P_{(j+1|:)}), \dots, \gamma_l(P_{(l|:)}))\right. \\
&\quad \left.- h_\beta(\gamma_1(P_1), \dots, \gamma_j(P_{(j-1|:)}), \gamma_j(P_{(j|:)}), \gamma_{j+1}(P_{(j+1|:)}), \dots, \gamma_l(P_{(l|:)}))\right](1 + o_p(1)) \\
&= P_{(l:j|:)}\left[\frac{\partial h_\beta}{\partial \gamma_j}(\gamma_j(P_{(j|:)}^\epsilon) - \gamma_j(P_{(j|:)}))\right](1 + o_p(1)),
\end{aligned}$$

where the partial derivative is evaluated at $(\gamma_1(P_1), \dots, \gamma_l(P_{(l|:)}))$. Following the same argument as in Lemma 2.5 and discarding the $o_p(1)$ term,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int \int P_{(l:j+1|:)}[H_j^\epsilon] dP_{(j|:)} dP_{(j-1:1)}^\epsilon - \int \int P_{(l:j+1|:)}[H_{j-1}^\epsilon] dP_{(j|:)} dP_{(j-1:1)}^\epsilon \\
&= \int P_{(l:j|:)}[H_j^\epsilon - H_{j-1}^\epsilon] dP_{(j-1:1)}^\epsilon = \int P_{(l:j|:)}\left[\frac{\partial h_\beta}{\partial \gamma_j}(\gamma_j(P_{(j|:)}^\epsilon) - \gamma_j(P_{(j|:)}))\right] dP_{(j-1:1)}^\epsilon \\
&= \int P_{(l:j|:)}\left[\frac{\partial h_\beta}{\partial \gamma_j}\left(\int \dot{\gamma}_j(P_{(j|:)})(dP_{(j|:)}^\epsilon - dP_{(j|:)})\right)\right] dP_{(j-1:1)}^\epsilon (1 + o_p(\epsilon)) \quad (\text{Then use (A.1)}) \\
&= \epsilon \int \int P_{(l:j|:)}\left[\frac{\partial h_\beta}{\partial \gamma_j} \dot{\gamma}_j(P_{(j|:)})(dQ_{(j|:)} - dP_{(j|:)})\frac{dQ_{(j-1:1)}}{dP_{(j-1:1)}^\epsilon}\right] dP_{(j-1:1)}^\epsilon (1 + o_p(\epsilon)) \\
&= \epsilon \int \int P_{(l:j|:)}\left[\frac{\partial h_\beta}{\partial \gamma_j}\right] \dot{\gamma}_j(P_{(j|:)})(dQ_{(j|:)} - dP_{(j|:)}) dQ_{(j-1:1)} (1 + o_p(\epsilon)).
\end{aligned}$$

With Q as the measure that puts point mass on z , we get the influence function

$$\dot{\beta}(P) = \sum_{j=1}^l \left((P_{(l:j+1|:)} - P_{(j|:)})[h_\beta] + P_{(l:j|:)}\left[\frac{\partial h_\beta}{\partial \gamma_j}\right] \dot{\gamma}_j \right).$$

B.2 More details on Proposition 4.8

When $\bar{\Xi}_{\gamma\gamma} = \bar{V}_{\gamma\gamma}^+$, Lemma 4.6 yields

$$\begin{aligned}
m_\beta^{\text{LR}} &= m_\beta - \overline{\partial_\gamma m_\beta} (\overline{\partial_\gamma m_\gamma}^\top \bar{V}_{\gamma\gamma}^+ \overline{\partial_\gamma m_\gamma})^{-1} \overline{\partial_\gamma m_\gamma}^\top \bar{V}_{\gamma\gamma}^+ m_\gamma \\
&= m_\beta - \overline{\partial_\gamma m_\beta} (\langle \dot{\ell}_\gamma^\top, m_\gamma^\top \rangle \langle m_\gamma, m_\gamma^\top \rangle^+ \langle m_\gamma, \dot{\ell}_\gamma \rangle)^{-1} \langle \dot{\ell}_\gamma^\top, m_\gamma^\top \rangle \langle m_\gamma, m_\gamma^\top \rangle^+ m_\gamma \\
&= m_\beta - \overline{\partial_\gamma m_\beta} \langle \Pi(\dot{\ell}_\gamma^\top | m_\gamma), \Pi(\dot{\ell}_\gamma^\top | m_\gamma)^\top \rangle^{-1} \Pi(\dot{\ell}_\gamma^\top | m_\gamma).
\end{aligned}$$

Together with condition (4.3), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
m_\beta^{\text{LR}} &= m_\beta - \langle m_\beta, m_\gamma^\top \rangle \langle m_\gamma, m_\gamma \rangle^+ \langle m_\gamma, \dot{\ell}_\gamma \rangle \langle \Pi(\dot{\ell}_\gamma^\top | m_\gamma), \Pi(\dot{\ell}_\gamma^\top | m_\gamma)^\top \rangle^{-1} \Pi(\dot{\ell}_\gamma^\top | m_\gamma) \\
&= m_\beta - \langle \Pi(m_\beta | m_\gamma), \dot{\ell}_\gamma \rangle \langle \Pi(\dot{\ell}_\gamma^\top | m_\gamma), \Pi(\dot{\ell}_\gamma^\top | m_\gamma)^\top \rangle^{-1} \Pi(\dot{\ell}_\gamma^\top | m_\gamma) \\
&= m_\beta - \langle \Pi(m_\beta | m_\gamma), \Pi(\dot{\ell}_\gamma^\top | m_\gamma)^\top \rangle \langle \Pi(\dot{\ell}_\gamma^\top | m_\gamma), \Pi(\dot{\ell}_\gamma^\top | m_\gamma)^\top \rangle^{-1} \Pi(\dot{\ell}_\gamma^\top | m_\gamma) \\
&= m_\beta - \Pi(m_\beta | m_\gamma) + \Pi(m_\beta | m_\gamma) - \Pi(\Pi(m_\beta | m_\gamma) | \Pi(\dot{\ell}_\gamma^\top | m_\gamma)) \\
&= \Pi(m_\beta | m_\gamma)^\perp + \left(\Pi(m_\beta | m_\gamma) - \Pi(\Pi(m_\beta | m_\gamma) | \Pi(\dot{\ell}_\gamma^\top | m_\gamma)) \right),
\end{aligned}$$

where these two components are orthogonal to each other since the first is orthogonal to the linear space spanned by m_γ , whereas the second lies on this space. Furthermore, we have the third equality because $\dot{\ell}_\gamma^\top$ can be decomposed as $\dot{\ell}_\gamma^\top = \Pi(\dot{\ell}_\gamma^\top | m_\gamma) + \Pi(\dot{\ell}_\gamma^\top | m_\gamma)^\perp$, where $\Pi(\dot{\ell}_\gamma^\top | m_\gamma)^\perp$ is orthogonal to $\Pi(m_\beta | m_\gamma)$.

On the other hand, we have

$$m_\beta^{\text{eff}} = m_\beta - \bar{V}_{\beta\gamma} \bar{V}_{\gamma\gamma}^+ m_\gamma = m_\beta - \Pi(m_\beta | m_\gamma) = \Pi(m_\beta | m_\gamma)^\perp.$$

The above statement implies the desired result.