

Data integration using covariate summaries from external sources

Facheng Yu

Department of Statistics, University of Washington

and

Yuqian Zhang*

Institute of Statistics and Big Data, Renmin University of China

Abstract

In modern data analysis, information is frequently collected from multiple sources, often leading to challenges such as data heterogeneity and imbalanced sample sizes across datasets. Robust and efficient data integration methods are crucial for improving the generalization and transportability of statistical findings. In this work, we address scenarios where, in addition to having full access to individualized data from a primary source, supplementary covariate information from external sources is also available. While traditional data integration methods typically require individualized covariates from external sources, such requirements can be impractical due to limitations related to accessibility, privacy, storage, and cost. Instead, we propose novel data integration techniques that rely solely on external summary statistics, such as sample means and covariances, to construct robust estimators for the mean outcome under both homogeneous and heterogeneous data settings. Additionally, we extend this framework to causal inference, enabling the estimation of average treatment effects for both generalizability and transportability.

Keywords: Data integration, Semi-supervised learning, Causal inference, Generalizability, Transportability, High-dimensional statistics

*yuqianzhang@ruc.edu.cn

1 Introduction

Data integration has become increasingly crucial in today’s data-rich environment, allowing researchers and practitioners to combine diverse data sources to enhance estimation accuracy and improve inference. In many applications, beyond having full access to individualized data in a primary dataset, additional covariate information can be obtained from external sources. However, due to concerns over accessibility, privacy, storage, or cost, individualized covariate data from these external sources may be unavailable. Instead, only summary statistics, such as sample means and covariances, can be easily collected.

For example, while Netflix has personal rating data from its users in regions like North America, in other countries where Netflix is less popular or subject to copyright restrictions, individual-level data from competing platforms may be difficult to access. However, platforms may provide average user ratings for movies and TV series, which Netflix can leverage to estimate the anticipated ratings of films that have not yet been released in those regions. Similarly, due to privacy concerns and regulations, hospitals often encounter significant challenges in sharing individual patient data. Causal conclusions drawn from randomized controlled trials conducted at a single hospital may not apply universally. However, integrating summary statistics from other hospitals, such as aggregate patient demographics or health metrics, can significantly enhance the effectiveness and generalizability of causal inference.

In this work, we concentrate on estimating the mean outcome for the entire population by leveraging individualized data from the primary source alongside covariate information from external datasets, a problem referred to as *generalizability*. We also investigate scenarios where the population of interest is exclusively the external population, focusing on estimating the mean outcome in this context, known as *transportability*. Furthermore, we

extend our framework to tackle causal inference problems, specifically aiming to estimate the average treatment effect (ATE) for both the entire and external populations. Our objective is to propose data integration methods that depend solely on summarized covariate information from external sources.

1.1 Related literature

Our considered setup is closely related to semi-supervised learning, where in addition to a labeled dataset (from the primary source), a large unlabeled dataset (from external sources) is available, containing rich individualized covariates. Previous studies have demonstrated that leveraging individualized information from unlabeled data can enhance estimation accuracy and efficiency across various inference tasks, including linear regression ([Azriel et al., 2022](#); [Chakraborty and Cai, 2018](#); [Chen and Zhang, 2023](#); [Deng et al., 2023](#)), mean estimation ([Zhang et al., 2019](#); [Zhang and Bradic, 2022](#)), explained variance estimation ([Cai and Guo, 2020](#)), M-estimation ([Angelopoulos et al., 2023](#); [Song et al., 2024](#); [Zrnic and Candès, 2024](#)), and treatment effect estimation ([Chakraborty et al., 2022](#); [Cheng et al., 2021](#)). While traditional semi-supervised methods often assume that data are missing completely at random (MCAR), requiring that labeled and unlabeled covariates share the same marginal distribution, recent advances ([Kallus and Mao, 2024](#); [Zhang et al., 2023a,b](#)) have extended these methods to contexts with selection bias or data heterogeneity. However, the works above necessitate individualized covariate information from the (external) unlabeled group, limiting the applicability of these data integration methods.

Data integration has also garnered significant attention in the field of causal inference. While randomized controlled trials (RCTs) are often regarded as the “gold standard” in establishing causality, they typically face challenges such as small sample sizes and limited

representativity due to inclusion criteria and ethical concerns. In contrast, observational studies tend to offer much larger sample sizes and greater representativity for the target population, but they often grapple with issues related to unmeasured confounding. The integration of RCTs and observational studies has become a popular approach, enabling the generalization or transport of RCT results to the target population while addressing unmeasured confounding issues inherent in observational studies; see some recent advances (Buchanan et al., 2018; Dahabreh et al., 2021; Ung et al., 2024) and reviews (Colnet et al., 2024; Degtiar and Rose, 2023; Shi et al., 2023). However, existing methods often require individualized covariate information from (external) observational studies, posing practical challenges related to accessibility, privacy, and storage concerns.

The use of summary statistics has been explored in various causal inference and data integration studies, such as Mendelian randomization in genome-wide association studies (GWAS) (Burgess et al., 2013; Morrison et al., 2020; Zhao et al., 2020) and data fusion in meta-analysis (Lin and Zeng, 2010; Liu et al., 2015; Zhu et al., 2015). These methods, however, generally require access to outcome-related information from external sources, such as least squares estimates or the covariance between outcomes and covariates. In contrast, our work addresses scenarios where only summary statistics of the external covariates are available, and the outcome of interest has not yet been generated by external sources. This commonly arises when a movie or TV series has not been released in certain regions or when clinical trials or policy interventions have not yet been conducted in other hospitals or areas. Our goal is to provide predictions for average ratings or causal effects in populations where the outcomes remain unseen, relying solely on summary information of the external covariates.

To our knowledge, only Chu et al. (2023) has investigated the use of external covariate

summaries, introducing a calibrated augmented inverse probability weighted (AIPW) estimator for the optimal treatment regime defined through a pseudo-population. However, their method is consistent for the parameter defined through the target (external) population only when the density ratio model for primary or external memberships is correctly specified, and it is restricted to low-dimensional settings. In contrast, we show that AIPW methods (Chernozhukov et al., 2017; Shi et al., 2023; Smucler et al., 2019; Tan, 2020) can be directly applied without requiring individualized external covariates, as long as a product indicator is treated as the “effective labeling indicator” and a specialized cross-fitting technique is employed; see Section 4. Furthermore, we establish that statistical inference for ATEs, defined for both the entire and external populations, is feasible in high-dimensional settings. This holds when either the outcome regression or the (joint) propensity score model is correctly specified. Unlike Chu et al. (2023), our approach ensures consistent and asymptotic normal (CAN) estimates for causal parameters defined through the true population of interest, even when the membership density ratio (or propensity score) model is misspecified, provided the outcome model is correctly specified.

1.2 Our contributions

We first examine a straightforward scenario devoid of heterogeneity between the primary and external sources under the MCAR condition. In this context, “generalizability” and “transportability” converge, as the mean outcomes across the entire, primary, and external populations are identical. Since the sample mean of outcomes from the primary source is already a CAN estimator for the population mean, our objective is to enhance efficiency by leveraging additional information from external sources. We propose an estimator that is at least as efficient as the sample mean from the primary source, even under model

misspecification. Additionally, our estimator achieves the same efficiency as the linear-regression-based semi-supervised estimators developed in [Zhang et al. \(2019\)](#) and [Zhang and Bradic \(2022\)](#), but without requiring access to individualized covariate information. Unlike [Zhang et al. \(2019\)](#), which is limited to low-dimensional covariates, our approach accommodates high-dimensional settings similar to [Zhang and Bradic \(2022\)](#). Furthermore, when individualized covariate information is partially accessible from external sources, we develop a mean estimator based on partial linear regression to further enhance estimation efficiency. The corresponding methods and results are included in [Section 2](#).

Since the MCAR condition typically assumes that researchers have full control over the assignment of individuals to either primary or external groups, we extend our investigation to a more realistic setting where data heterogeneity may occur; see [Section 3](#). We propose estimators for the mean response across both the entire and external populations under missing at random (MAR) conditions. In [Section 4](#), we further focus on estimating the ATE within causal frameworks, proposing estimators for ATEs in both the entire population (generalizability) and the external population (transportability). The proposed estimators are model doubly robust, ensuring they remain CAN as long as at least one nuisance model is correctly specified. When both nuisance models are correctly specified, our estimators achieve the same level of efficiency as existing works, such as [Bang and Robins \(2005\)](#); [Chernozhukov et al. \(2017\)](#); [Kallus and Mao \(2024\)](#), which require full access to individualized covariates.

Unlike existing methods that require access to and storage of the full external covariate matrix of size $n_E \times d$, our approach reduces this burden substantially. Under homogeneous settings, only a vector of size $O_p(s)$ is needed. For heterogeneous settings, point estimation requires a vector of size d , and statistical inference further involves a gram matrix with

$O_p(s^2)$ elements. Detailed discussions are provided in Remarks 1 and 3. Here, n_E denotes the sample size of the external group, which can be significantly larger than both the primary sample size n_P and the dimension d , while $s \ll d \wedge n_P$ represents the sparsity level of the outcome regression model. Our methods significantly reduce storage and data transmission requirements, especially when dealing with large external sample sizes.

1.3 Notation

For a random vector $X \in \mathbb{R}^d$, we denote the ψ_α -Orlicz norm of X for any $\alpha > 0$ by $\|X\|_{\psi_\alpha}$ and the ℓ_p -norm of X for any $p > 0$ by $\|X\|_p := (\sum_{j=1}^d X[j]^p)^{1/p}$, where $X[j]$ denotes the j -th coordinate of a vector X . For the sake of simplicity, we define $\|X\|_0 := \max\{1, \sum_{j=1}^d \mathbb{1}(X[j] \neq 0)\}$ to avoid degenerate situations with zero sparsity levels. For any integer $n > 0$, let $[n] := \{1, \dots, n\}$.

2 Mean estimation under data homogeneity

Suppose there exists underlying independent and identically distributed (i.i.d.) samples $(\Gamma_i, X_i, Y_i)_{i=1}^n$, with (Γ, X, Y) being an independent copy of these samples. Here, $X_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$ represents a vector of covariates, with its first coordinate set to one, corresponding to the intercept in the regression model. Let $Y_i \in \mathbb{R}$ be the outcome variable and $\Gamma_i \in \{0, 1\}$ be a binary indicator for membership in the primary dataset. For interpretability, we treat Γ_i as a random variable while considering the total sample size n as non-random. Due to accessibility constraints, individualized data (X_i, Y_i) are observed only when $\Gamma_i = 1$. For data from external sources, we assume access only to summary covariate statistics,

including the sample mean \bar{X}_0 and sample gram matrix $\bar{\Xi}_0$:

$$\bar{X}_0 = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n (1 - \Gamma_i) X_i}{\sum_{i=1}^n (1 - \Gamma_i)}, \quad \bar{\Xi}_0 = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n (1 - \Gamma_i) X_i X_i^\top}{\sum_{i=1}^n (1 - \Gamma_i)}. \quad (1)$$

Given the sample mean \bar{X}_0 , observing the sample gram matrix is equivalent to observing the sample covariance matrix $\hat{\Sigma}_0 = \sum_{i=1}^n (1 - \Gamma_i) (X_i - \bar{X}_0)(X_i - \bar{X}_0)^\top / \sum_{i=1}^n (1 - \Gamma_i)$, due to the one-to-one relationship: $\bar{\Xi}_0 = \hat{\Sigma}_0 + \bar{X}_0 \bar{X}_0^\top$. We also require access to the sample size from external sources, $n_E = \sum_{i=1}^n (1 - \Gamma_i)$, ensuring that the total sample size n is observable. Notably, since we only require access to summary statistics from external sources, the amount of information needed is significantly lower than in semi-supervised learning, which assumes access to individualized covariates.

Our procedure can be easily extended to situations involving multiple external sources by merging them together. The only requirement is access to the overall sample mean and gram matrix from all external sources, which can be obtained by collecting sample statistics and the respective sample size from each source. Since external summaries typically stem from large sample sizes, especially when integrating multiple sources, we propose a framework that accommodates a decaying probability $\gamma_n := \mathbb{P}(\Gamma = 1) \rightarrow 0$.

In this section, we focus on the scenario of data homogeneity, operating under the missing completely at random (MCAR) assumption, a common condition in semi-supervised learning literature (Azriel et al., 2022; Cai and Guo, 2017; Chakraborty and Cai, 2018; Zhang et al., 2019; Zhang and Bradic, 2022), where Γ_i serves as the labeling (or missing) indicator for the corresponding outcome Y_i .

Assumption 1 (MCAR). $\Gamma \perp (X, Y)$.

Our parameter of interest is the mean outcome, $\theta = \mathbb{E}[Y]$. Notably, under the MCAR condition, the mean outcomes across the entire, primary, and external populations are

identical: $\theta = \mathbb{E}[Y] = \mathbb{E}[Y | \Gamma = 1] = \mathbb{E}[Y | \Gamma = 0]$. Therefore, a straightforward approach is to consider $\bar{Y}_1 = \sum_{i=1}^n \Gamma_i Y_i / \sum_{i=1}^n \Gamma_i$, the sample mean over the primary source where outcome variables are observed. However, this approach may not be efficient as it ignores the rich information within the covariates. In the following, we propose methods that leverage additional covariate information to enhance estimation efficiency.

2.1 Methodology

In the following, we propose an estimator for the mean outcome $\theta = \mathbb{E}[Y]$, utilizing only the individualized information from the primary source $\mathcal{D}_n = \{(\Gamma_i, \Gamma_i X_i, \Gamma_i Y_i)\}_{i=1}^n$ and the sample mean of the covariates from the external source \bar{X}_0 .

Define the population slope $\beta^* = \underset{\beta \in \mathbb{R}^d}{\operatorname{argmin}} \mathbb{E}[(Y - X^\top \beta)^2]$, without requiring a correctly specified linear model. By utilizing the construction of β^* and the corresponding Karush–Kuhn–Tucker (KKT) conditions, we have $\theta = \mathbb{E}[Y] = \mathbb{E}[X]^\top \beta^*$, even when $\mathbb{E}[Y | X] \neq X^\top \beta^*$. Based on this representation, a natural approach is to estimate the linear slope β^* with some estimate $\hat{\beta}$ using labeled samples from the primal source, while estimating the mean covariate $\mathbb{E}[X]$ using the sample mean over the entire population, which can be represented as a function of \mathcal{D}_n and \bar{X}_0 : $\bar{X}_{\text{all}} = (1 - n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \Gamma_i) \bar{X}_0 + n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \Gamma_i X_i$. A plug-in estimate of θ can then be constructed as $\hat{\theta}_{\text{PI}} = \bar{X}_{\text{all}}^\top \hat{\beta}$. When the population slope is estimated via least squares, this approach aligns with the semi-supervised least squares (SSLS) estimator introduced by [Zhang et al. \(2019\)](#). Clearly, the construction of the SSLS estimator only requires summary statistics from external (unlabeled) data, although the authors did not emphasize such an aspect. In low dimensions, [Zhang et al. \(2019\)](#) demonstrated that the SSLS estimator is asymptotically normal and at least as efficient as the sample mean \bar{Y}_1 , provided the feature dimension satisfies $d = o(\sqrt{n_P})$, where $n_P = \sum_{i=1}^n \Gamma_i$

is the primary sample size.

As demonstrated by [Zhang et al. \(2019\)](#), the improved efficiency of SLS over supervised methods depends on the explained variance of the linear model, $\text{Var}(X_i^\top \beta^*)$. To increase such a quantity and enhance estimation efficiency, we would like to collect as many covariates (that are potentially related to the outcome) as possible. However, this approach also introduces new challenges to statistical analysis. When the feature dimension exceeds the number of labeled samples, the least squares solution becomes ill-defined, making regularized estimates, such as Lasso, preferable. The downside of regularization is the additional bias it introduces, often leading to slower convergence rates for plug-in estimators. To mitigate this issue, [Zhang and Bradic \(2022\)](#) proposed a debiasing procedure using cross-fitting techniques. However, their method relies on access to the sample means of covariates over each fold, which requires access to individualized covariate information from external sources.

To overcome this limitation, we propose a refined approach that imputes all external covariates using their sample mean, \bar{X}_0 , ensuring the method remains feasible without individualized covariate access. We introduce our proposal below.

Step 1: Divide the index set $[n]$ into K disjoint subsets $\mathcal{I}_1, \dots, \mathcal{I}_K$ with equal sizes such that $n_k := |\mathcal{I}_k| = n/K$ for $k \in [K]$. Let $\hat{\gamma}_k = n_k^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \Gamma_i$ and $\mathcal{I}_{-k} = [n] \setminus \mathcal{I}_k$.

Step 2: For each $k \in [K]$, compute the Lasso estimator $\hat{\beta}^{(-k)}$: with some $\lambda_n \geq 0$,

$$\hat{\beta}^{(-k)} = \underset{\beta \in \mathbb{R}^d}{\text{argmin}} \left\{ \frac{\sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{-k}} \Gamma_i (Y_i - X_i^\top \beta)^2}{\sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{-k}} \Gamma_i} + \lambda_n \|\beta\|_1 \right\}.$$

Step 3: The mean estimator is proposed as:

$$\hat{\theta} = n^{-1} \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} (\Gamma_i X_i + (1 - \Gamma_i) \bar{X}_0)^\top \hat{\beta}^{(-k)} + n^{-1} \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \frac{\Gamma_i}{\hat{\gamma}_k} (Y_i - X_i^\top \hat{\beta}^{(-k)}). \quad (2)$$

When the sample gram matrix $\bar{\Xi}_0$ is also observable, the corresponding asymptotic variance

estimator is defined as:

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\sigma}^2 = & n^{-1} \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} (1 - \Gamma_i) \widehat{\beta}^{(-k), \top} \bar{\Xi}_0 \widehat{\beta}^{(-k)} \\ & + n^{-1} \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \left\{ \Gamma_i X_i^\top \widehat{\beta}^{(-k)} + \frac{\Gamma_i}{\widehat{\gamma}_k} \left(Y_i - X_i^\top \widehat{\beta}^{(-k)} \right) \right\}^2 - \widehat{\theta}^2. \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

Remark 1 (Required summary statistics under data homogeneity). To construct a point estimate for θ , we only require access to the first-moment information from the external source, while statistical inference and asymptotic variance estimation additionally necessitate access to the second-moment information. Notably, we can collect the additional covariate information from external sources after obtaining the Lasso estimators in Step 2 above. Since the estimator (2) only involves the inner product $\bar{X}_0^\top \widehat{\beta}^{(-k)}$, it suffices to collect $\bar{X}_{0, \widehat{S}} = n_E^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (1 - \Gamma_i) X_{i, \widehat{S}}$, where $\widehat{S} = \cup_{k=1}^K \text{supp}(\widehat{\beta}^{(-k)})$ satisfies $|\widehat{S}| = O_p(\|\beta^*\|_0)$ following similar arguments as in Lemma C.16. The estimator (2) remains unchanged if we replace \bar{X}_0 with \tilde{X}_0 , where $\tilde{X}_{0, \widehat{S}} = \bar{X}_{0, \widehat{S}}$ and $\tilde{X}_{0, \widehat{S}^c} = \mathbf{0}$.

To construct the asymptotic variance estimator in (3), it suffices to compute $\bar{\Xi}_{0, \widehat{S}} = n_E^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (1 - \Gamma_i) X_{i, \widehat{S}} X_{i, \widehat{S}}^\top$. Furthermore, in scenarios where the sub-matrix $\bar{\Xi}_{0, \widehat{S}}$ is unavailable, the asymptotic variance can still be estimated using only the primary data under homogeneous settings:

$$\hat{\sigma}_P^2 = n^{-1} \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \left\{ \frac{\Gamma_i}{\widehat{\gamma}_k} \left(X_i^\top \widehat{\beta}^{(-k)} \right)^2 + \frac{\Gamma_i}{\widehat{\gamma}_k^2} \left(Y_i - X_i^\top \widehat{\beta}^{(-k)} \right)^2 \right\} - \widehat{\theta}^2.$$

The asymptotic normality results in Theorem 1 remain valid even when $\widehat{\sigma}^2$ is replaced by $\hat{\sigma}_P^2$. However, when second-moment information from external data is available, inference based on $\widehat{\sigma}^2$ is recommended, as incorporating additional information generally leads to improved finite-sample performance.

2.2 Asymptotic theory

To demonstrate the asymptotic behavior of the proposed method, we introduce the following regularity assumptions, which are standard in the high-dimensional linear regression literature; see, e.g., [Javanmard and Montanari \(2018\)](#); [van de Geer et al. \(2014\)](#); [Zhang and Bradic \(2022\)](#).

Assumption 2. *Let the following conditions hold with constants $\kappa_l, \sigma, \sigma_w, \delta_w > 0$: (a) X is a sub-Gaussian random vector with $\|X^\top v\|_{\psi_2} \leq \sigma \|v\|_2, \forall v \in \mathbb{R}^d$. In addition, $\|X^\top \beta^*\|_{\psi_2} \leq \sigma$ and $\inf_{v \in \mathbb{R}^d, \|v\|_2=1} \mathbb{E}[(X^\top v)^2] \geq \kappa_l$. (b) $w = Y - X^\top \beta^*$ is a sub-Gaussian random variable with $\|w\|_{\psi_2} \leq \sigma_w$ and $\mathbb{E}[w^2] \geq \delta_w$.*

The following theorem characterizes asymptotic properties of the mean estimator $\hat{\theta}$.

Theorem 1. *Suppose that Assumptions 1 and 2 hold. Choose $\lambda_n \asymp \sqrt{\log d / (n\gamma_n)}$. If $n\gamma_n \gg (\log n)^2 \log d$ and the sparsity level satisfies $s = \|\beta^*\|_0 = o(n\gamma_n / \log d)$, then as $n, d \rightarrow \infty$, $\hat{\theta} - \theta = O_p((n\gamma_n)^{-1/2})$, $\hat{\sigma}^2 = \sigma_n^2 \{1 + o_p(1)\}$, and $\hat{\sigma}^{-1} \sqrt{n}(\hat{\theta} - \theta) \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$, where $\sigma_n^2 = \text{Var}\left(X^\top \beta^* + \frac{\Gamma}{\gamma_n} (Y - X^\top \beta^*)\right) = \gamma_n^{-1} \text{Var}(Y) + (1 - \gamma_n^{-1}) \text{Var}(X^\top \beta^*)$.*

As observed in prior works ([Kallus and Mao, 2024](#); [Zhang et al., 2019](#); [Zhang and Bradic, 2022](#); [Zhang et al., 2023a,b](#)), the “effective sample size” of this problem is $n\gamma_n = \mathbb{E}(n_P)$, corresponding to the (expected) sample size within the primary source. The convergence rate established above depends on $n\gamma_n$, rather than the full sample size n .

In addition, Theorem 1 establishes that $\hat{\theta}$ remains consistent and asymptotically normal (CAN) even when the linear model is misspecified. The asymptotic variance σ_n^2 aligns with that of the linear regression-based methods from [Zhang et al. \(2019\)](#); [Zhang and Bradic \(2022\)](#) when Γ_i and $n_P = \sum_{i=1}^n \Gamma_i$ are treated as random. When external covariates are fully observable, [Zhang et al. \(2019\)](#) demonstrated that the oracle lower bound for the

asymptotic variance is $\sigma_{\text{oracle}}^2 = \gamma_n^{-1} \text{Var}(Y) + (1 - \gamma_n^{-1}) \text{Var}(\mu(X))$, where $\mu(X) = \mathbb{E}(Y | X)$ represents the true conditional mean function. If the linear model is correct, the asymptotic variance σ_n^2 from Theorem 1 matches this semi-supervised oracle lower bound, but notably, we achieve this without requiring individualized covariate data from external sources. In the presence of model misspecification, efficiency gains are possible when individualized covariates are partially observable; see further extensions in Section 2.3.

Remark 2 (Cross-fitting without access to individualized external covariates). The cross-fitting technique is widely recognized for its effectiveness in reducing bias from nuisance estimation, particularly in settings where nuisance parameters do not achieve a parametric convergence rate – common in high-dimensional or non-parametric scenarios. Methods that incorporate cross-fitting generally deliver faster convergence rates and enable valid inference under weaker sparsity assumptions; see, e.g., Chernozhukov et al. (2017); Qian et al. (2024); Zhang and Bradic (2022). In the context of mean estimation under data homogeneity, Zhang and Bradic (2022) pointed out that statistical inference typically requires an ultra-sparse condition $s = o(\sqrt{n_P}/\log d)$ when estimation is done without cross-fitting, assuming Γ_i and n_P are non-random. To relax this requirement, they applied cross-fitting across the entire dataset, resulting in an improved sparsity condition of $s = o(n_P/\log d)$.

Our findings suggest that cross-fitting is only necessary for the primary data, eliminating the need to apply it to external data. This is because the outcome regression estimate $\hat{\beta}^{(-k)}$ is constructed using only the primary data, ensuring that it is conditionally independent of the external summary \bar{X}_0 , given all Γ_i , even without performing cross-fitting on the external data. This observation allows for precise control over the impact of nuisance estimation error on the final mean estimation. In Theorem 1, we require a sparsity condition of $s = o(n\gamma_n/\log d)$, aligning with Zhang et al. (2023b) when Γ_i and n_P are treated as random,

since $n\gamma_n = \mathbb{E}(n_P)$. This refinement reduces the requirement for accessing individualized covariates from external sources, making the approach more feasible for large-scale data integration, where such access might be logistically challenging.

2.3 Improving efficiency with additional individualized features

In this section, we explore scenarios where individualized covariate information from external sources is partially available. Suppose that we have further access to $(Z_i)_{i=1}^n \in \mathbb{R}^r$, representing the fully observable covariates, and let Z be an independent copy of them. Building on this, we introduce an estimator using a partially linear model, designed to enhance estimation efficiency by incorporating this external individualized data.

Step 1: Divide the index set $[n]$ into K disjoint subsets $\mathcal{I}_1, \dots, \mathcal{I}_K$ with equal sizes such that $n_k := |\mathcal{I}_k| = n/K$ for $k \in [K]$. Let $\widehat{\gamma}_k = n_k^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \Gamma_i$ and $\mathcal{I}_{-k} = [n] \setminus \mathcal{I}_k$.

Step 2: For each $k \in [K]$, construct the doubly penalized least square estimator based on a partially linear model (Müller and Van de Geer, 2015):

$$\left(\widehat{\beta}_{plm}^{(-k)}, \widehat{f}^{(-k)} \right) = \underset{(\beta, f) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathcal{F}}{\operatorname{argmin}} \left\{ \frac{\sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{-k}} \Gamma_i (Y_i - X_i^\top \beta - f(Z_i))^2}{\sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{-k}} \Gamma_i} + \lambda_n \|\beta\|_1 + \eta_n \|f\|_{\mathcal{F}} \right\},$$

where \mathcal{F} is a pre-specified functional class, $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{F}}$ is an associated norm, and $\lambda_n, \eta_n \geq 0$ are regularization parameters.

Step 3: The mean estimator based on a partially linear model is defined as:

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\theta}_{plm} = & n^{-1} \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \left\{ (\Gamma_i X_i + (1 - \Gamma_i) \bar{X}_0)^\top \widehat{\beta}_{plm}^{(-k)} + \widehat{f}^{(-k)}(Z_i) \right\} \\ & + n^{-1} \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \frac{\Gamma_i}{\widehat{\gamma}_k} \left(Y_i - X_i^\top \widehat{\beta}_{plm}^{(-k)} - \widehat{f}^{(-k)}(Z_i) \right). \end{aligned}$$

When $\bar{\Xi}_0$ is also observable, the asymptotic variance can be estimated as:

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{\sigma}_{plm}^2 &= n^{-1} \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \left\{ \Gamma_i \left(X_i^\top \hat{\beta}_{plm}^{(-k)} + \hat{f}^{(-k)}(Z_i) \right) + \frac{\Gamma_i}{\hat{\gamma}_k} \left(Y_i - X_i^\top \hat{\beta}_{plm}^{(-k)} - \hat{f}^{(-k)}(Z_i) \right) \right\}^2 \\ &\quad + n^{-1} \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} (1 - \Gamma_i) \hat{\beta}_{plm}^{(-k), \top} \bar{\Xi}_0 \hat{\beta}_{plm}^{(-k)} + n^{-1} \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} (1 - \Gamma_i) \left(\hat{f}^{(-k)}(Z_i) \right)^2 \\ &\quad + 2n^{-1} \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} (1 - \Gamma_i) \left(\bar{X}_0^\top \hat{\beta}_{plm}^{(-k)} \right) \hat{f}^{(-k)}(Z_i) - \hat{\theta}_{plm}^2.\end{aligned}$$

Define $(\beta_{plm}^*, f^*) = \operatorname{argmin}_{(\beta, f) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathcal{F}} \mathbb{E} \left[(Y - X^\top \beta - f(Z))^2 \right]$, $\epsilon = Y - X^\top \beta_{plm}^* - f^*(Z)$, and $\tilde{X} = X - \mathbb{E}[X | Z]$. We assume the following high-level conditions for the partially linear model.

Assumption 3. (a) *There exist constants $\kappa_l, \kappa_u, \sigma, \sigma_f, \sigma_\epsilon, \delta_\epsilon > 0$ such that the following conditions hold: $\inf_{v \in \mathbb{R}^d, \|v\|_2=1} \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\tilde{X}^\top v \right)^2 \right] \geq \kappa_l$, $\sup_{v \in \mathbb{R}^d, \|v\|_2=1} \mathbb{E} \left[\left(X^\top v \right)^2 \right] \leq \kappa_u$, $\mathbb{E} \left[\left(X^\top \beta_{plm}^* \right)^4 \right] \leq \sigma^4$, $\mathbb{E} \left[\left(f^*(Z) \right)^4 \right] \leq \sigma_f^4$, $\mathbb{E} \left[\epsilon^4 \right] \leq \sigma_\epsilon^4$, and $\mathbb{E} \left[\epsilon^2 \right] \geq \delta_\epsilon$.* (b) *For each $k \in [K]$, as $n, d \rightarrow \infty$, $\mathbb{E}_Z \left[\left(\hat{f}^{(-k)}(Z) - f^*(Z) \right)^2 \right] = o_p(1)$ and $\left\| \hat{\beta}_{plm}^{(-k)} - \beta_{plm}^* \right\|_2 = o_p(1)$.*

Assumption 3(a) imposes standard regularity conditions; see similar requirements in, e.g., [Lv and Lian \(2022\)](#); [Xie and Huang \(2009\)](#); [Zhang et al. \(2016\)](#). Assumption 3(b) only requires the consistency of the nuisance estimators, which can be achieved when, e.g., f^* is a low-dimensional smooth function and the linear slope is sparse with $\|\beta_{plm}^*\|_0 = o(n\gamma_n/\log d)$ ([Müller and Van de Geer, 2015](#); [Zhu et al., 2019](#)).

Theoretical properties of the proposed estimator $\hat{\theta}_{plm}$ are summarized below.

Theorem 2. *Suppose that Assumptions 1 and 3 hold. Assume that $\Gamma \perp Z$ and $n\gamma_n \rightarrow \infty$.*

Then as $n, d \rightarrow \infty$, $\hat{\theta}_{plm} - \theta = O_p \left((n\gamma_n)^{-1/2} \right)$, $\hat{\sigma}_{plm}^2 = \sigma_{plm}^2 \{1 + o_p(1)\}$, and $\hat{\sigma}_{plm}^{-1} \sqrt{n} (\hat{\theta}_{plm} - \theta) \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$, where $\sigma_{plm}^2 = \operatorname{Var} \left(\mu^(W) + \frac{\Gamma}{\gamma_n} (Y - \mu^*(W)) \right) = \gamma_n^{-1} \operatorname{Var}(Y) + (1 - \gamma_n^{-1}) \operatorname{Var}(\mu^*(W))$, $\mu^*(W) = X^\top \beta_{plm}^* + f^*(Z)$, and $W = (X^\top, Z^\top)^\top$.*

In the following, we assess the efficiency of $\widehat{\theta}_{plm}$ compared to other approaches. One alternative is the linear-regression-based estimator $\widehat{\theta}$ proposed in (2), utilizing summary statistics of the entire vector $W_i = (X_i^\top, Z_i^\top)^\top$ from external sources. Besides, in cases where all individualized covariates are available, Zhang and Bradic (2022) extended their methodology beyond high-dimensional linear models to non-parametric models, offering an estimator for θ that achieves the oracle lower bound presented in Zhang et al. (2019) for fully observed covariates.

Let $\widetilde{\sigma}_n^2$ represent the asymptotic variance of $\widehat{\theta}$ as established in Theorem 1, when X_i is substituted with W_i , and $\widetilde{\sigma}_{\text{oracle}}^2$ represent the oracle lower bound for fully observed covariates, as reached by Zhang and Bradic (2022). The construction of (β_{plm}^*, f^*) guarantees that $\widetilde{\sigma}_{\text{oracle}}^2 \leq \sigma_{plm}^2 \leq \widetilde{\sigma}_n^2$. That is, the more individualized information we have access to, the higher the efficiency we can achieve. By leveraging partially available individualized information, $\widehat{\theta}_{plm}$ demonstrates improved efficiency over $\widehat{\theta}$, especially in cases where $f^*(Z)$ exhibits non-linearity. On the other hand, if the true model depends non-linearly on X , collecting individualized information can further enhance efficiency over $\widehat{\theta}_{plm}$. When all individualized covariates are accessible, our approach coincides with the non-parametric-regression-based method of Zhang and Bradic (2022). However, acquiring all individualized external covariates can be costly and practically limiting. Our results demonstrate that for covariates where the true model exhibits linear dependence, relying on external summaries is sufficient with minimal efficiency loss. However, for covariates with significant non-linearity, we recommend obtaining individualized covariates to enhance efficiency, provided the data collection costs are manageable. Our approach strikes a practical balance between maximizing estimation efficiency and managing data collection costs.

3 Correcting selection bias under data heterogeneity

In this section, we consider the mean estimation problem under data heterogeneity. While the methods and results provided in Section 2 rely on the MCAR condition, such a requirement might be restrictive in many practical applications. In the following, we consider the possibility of data heterogeneity between primary and external data and assume the following missing at random (MAR) condition instead.

Assumption 4 (MAR). $\Gamma \perp Y \mid X$ and $\gamma_n(X) := \mathbb{P}(\Gamma = 1 \mid X) > 0$ almost surely.

Assumption 4 essentially requires the measurement of all factors that jointly influence the outcome Y and the group assignment indicator Γ , commonly referred to as “no unmeasured confounding” or “ignorability” in the causal inference and missing data literature (Heitjan and Basu, 1996; Imai and Ratkovic, 2015; Rosenbaum and Rubin, 1983; Rubin, 1976). Under this MAR condition, we allow for potential dependence between Γ and (X, Y) . Thus, unlike in Section 2, the propensity score function $\gamma_n(X)$ is no longer a constant. Departing from the standard missing data literature, which typically enforces a positivity condition $\gamma_n(X) > c$ almost surely with a constant $c > 0$, we adopt a “decaying missing at random” framework proposed by Zhang et al. (2023a,b). Here, we only require $\gamma_n(X) > 0$ and allow for $\gamma_n = \mathbb{P}(\Gamma = 1) = \mathbb{E}[\gamma_n(X)] \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, thereby accommodating settings where the external data size vastly exceeds that of the primary data.

Given the data heterogeneity, the mean outcomes across different data sources are no longer identical. We define

$$\theta_g = \mathbb{E}[Y] \text{ (generalizability)} \quad \text{and} \quad \theta_t = \mathbb{E}[Y \mid \Gamma = 0] \text{ (transportability)},$$

where θ_g represents the mean outcome over the entire population, and θ_t denotes the mean outcome for the external sources. Without MCAR, it is likely that $\theta_g \neq \mathbb{E}[Y \mid \Gamma = 1] \neq \theta_t$.

Therefore, the sample mean over the primary source, \bar{Y}_1 , is typically a biased estimate for both θ_g and θ_t . As such, the goal shifts from improving efficiency for already consistent estimators based on primary data to correcting the bias caused by data heterogeneity. In Section 3.1, we introduce estimators for θ_g and θ_t by leveraging external summary statistics, with their theoretical properties detailed in Section 3.2.

3.1 Methodology

Since the outcome of interest Y_i is unavailable among the external sources, directly estimating θ_g and θ_t via empirical averages is not feasible – this constitutes a typical missing data problem. To address this, we define $m(X) := \mathbb{E}[Y | X]$ as the true outcome regression function. Let $m^*(\cdot)$ and $\gamma_n^*(\cdot)$ represent the working models for the outcome regression and propensity score, respectively. These can be viewed as approximations of the nuisance function at the population level. One common approach for robust estimation in this context is to utilize the doubly robust representations (Bang and Robins, 2005; Dukes et al., 2020; Funk et al., 2011; Shi et al., 2023): as long as either $m^*(\cdot) = m(\cdot)$ or $\gamma_n^*(\cdot) = \gamma_n(\cdot)$,

$$\begin{aligned}\theta_g &= \mathbb{E} \left[m^*(X) + \frac{\Gamma}{\gamma_n^*(X)} (Y - m^*(X)) \right], \\ \theta_t &= \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1 - \Gamma}{1 - \gamma_n} m^*(X) + \frac{\Gamma(1 - \gamma_n^*(X))}{\gamma_n^*(X)(1 - \gamma_n)} (Y - m^*(X)) \right].\end{aligned}$$

When a linear model is considered for the outcome regression, i.e., $m^*(X) = X^\top \beta_{OR}^*$ with some linear parameter $\beta_{OR}^* \in \mathbb{R}^d$, the above representations can also be expressed as:

$$\begin{aligned}\theta_g &= (1 - \gamma_n) \mathbb{E}[X | \Gamma = 0]^\top \beta_{OR}^* + \mathbb{E} \left[\Gamma X^\top \beta_{OR}^* + \frac{\Gamma}{\gamma_n^*(X)} (Y - X^\top \beta_{OR}^*) \right], \\ \theta_t &= \mathbb{E}[X | \Gamma = 0]^\top \beta_{OR}^* + \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\Gamma(1 - \gamma_n^*(X))}{\gamma_n^*(X)(1 - \gamma_n)} (Y - X^\top \beta_{OR}^*) \right].\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, given the nuisance models $m^*(\cdot)$ and $\gamma_n^*(\cdot)$, we can identify θ_g and θ_t using the observable individualized data $(\Gamma X, \Gamma Y)$ from the primary source and the mean covariates

among the external sources $\mathbb{E}[X \mid \Gamma = 0]$, without requiring the observation of individualized external covariates.

Estimation based on the doubly robust representations typically yields consistent estimates even when one nuisance model is misspecified. However, valid inference often requires both models to be correctly specified, especially with high-dimensional covariates (Chernozhukov et al., 2017; Farrell, 2015). To address the bias introduced by model misspecification, Dukes and Vansteelandt (2021); Ning et al. (2020); Smucler et al. (2019); Tan (2020) developed specialized loss functions for nuisance estimation, providing robust inference as long as one nuisance model is correctly specified. We adopt this strategy, demonstrating that constructing such nuisance estimates also does not require individualized external covariate information. Similar to our method in Section 2.1, we implement a cross-fitting technique after imputing external covariates using their sample mean \bar{X}_0 . Our proposed estimators for θ_g and θ_t are presented below.

Step 1: Divide the index set $[n]$ into K disjoint subsets $\mathcal{I}_1, \dots, \mathcal{I}_K$ with equal sizes such that $n_k := |\mathcal{I}_k| = n/K$ for $k \in [K]$. Let $\hat{\gamma}_k = n_k^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \Gamma_i$, $\mathcal{I}_{-k} = [n] \setminus \mathcal{I}_k$, and separate \mathcal{I}_{-k} into two disjoint subsets $\mathcal{I}_{-k,\alpha}, \mathcal{I}_{-k,\beta}$ with same sizes $M = |\mathcal{I}_{-k,\alpha}| = |\mathcal{I}_{-k,\beta}|$.

Step 2: For each $k \in [K]$, construct the propensity score estimator as:

$$\hat{\alpha}_{PS}^{(-k)} = \operatorname{argmin}_{\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^d} \left\{ M^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{-k,\alpha}} \{(1 - \Gamma_i) \bar{X}_0^\top \alpha + \Gamma_i \exp(-X_i^\top \alpha)\} + \lambda_\alpha \|\alpha\|_1 \right\}. \quad (4)$$

Step 3: For each $k \in [K]$, construct the outcome regression estimator as:

$$\hat{\beta}_{OR}^{(-k)} = \operatorname{argmin}_{\beta \in \mathbb{R}^d} \left\{ M^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{-k,\beta}} \Gamma_i \exp(-X_i^\top \hat{\alpha}_{PS}^{(-k)}) (Y_i - X_i^\top \beta)^2 + \lambda_\beta \|\beta\|_1 \right\}. \quad (5)$$

Step 4: Let $g(t) = e^t / (1 + e^t)$ be the logistic function. Estimators of θ_g and θ_t under

data heterogeneity are proposed as:

$$\widehat{\theta}_g = n^{-1} \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \left\{ (\Gamma_i X_i + (1 - \Gamma_i) \bar{X}_0)^\top \widehat{\beta}_{OR}^{(-k)} + \frac{\Gamma_i}{g(X_i^\top \widehat{\alpha}_{PS}^{(-k)})} (Y_i - X_i^\top \widehat{\beta}_{OR}^{(-k)}) \right\}, \quad (6)$$

$$\widehat{\theta}_t = n^{-1} \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \left\{ \frac{1 - \Gamma_i}{1 - \widehat{\gamma}_k} \bar{X}_0^\top \widehat{\beta}_{OR}^{(-k)} + \frac{\Gamma_i \exp(-X_i^\top \widehat{\alpha}_{PS}^{(-k)})}{1 - \widehat{\gamma}_k} (Y_i - X_i^\top \widehat{\beta}_{OR}^{(-k)}) \right\}. \quad (7)$$

When $\bar{\Xi}_0$ is further observed, we can construct the asymptotic variance estimators as:

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\sigma}_g^2 &= n^{-1} \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} (1 - \Gamma_i) \widehat{\beta}_{OR}^{(-k), \top} \bar{\Xi}_0 \widehat{\beta}_{OR}^{(-k)} - \widehat{\theta}_g^2 \\ &\quad + n^{-1} \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \left\{ \Gamma_i X_i^\top \widehat{\beta}_{OR}^{(-k)} + \frac{\Gamma_i}{g(X_i^\top \widehat{\alpha}_{PS}^{(-k)})} (Y_i - X_i^\top \widehat{\beta}_{OR}^{(-k)}) \right\}^2, \\ \widehat{\sigma}_t^2 &= n^{-1} \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \frac{1 - \Gamma_i}{(1 - \widehat{\gamma}_k)^2} \left(\widehat{\beta}_{OR}^{(-k), \top} \bar{\Xi}_0 \widehat{\beta}_{OR}^{(-k)} + \widehat{\theta}_t^2 - 2 \bar{X}_0^\top \widehat{\beta}_{OR}^{(-k)} \widehat{\theta}_t \right) \\ &\quad + n^{-1} \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \frac{\Gamma_i \exp(-2 X_i^\top \widehat{\alpha}_{PS}^{(-k)})}{(1 - \widehat{\gamma}_k)^2} (Y_i - X_i^\top \widehat{\beta}_{OR}^{(-k)})^2. \end{aligned}$$

Notably, the proposed algorithm differentiates itself from existing methods (Dukes and Vansteelandt, 2021; Ning et al., 2020; Smucler et al., 2019; Tan, 2020) – similar to the discussion in Remark 2 under data homogeneity, here we also employ cross-fitting exclusively on the primary data, avoiding it for the external data. Consequently, the nuisance estimates (4)-(5) and the final doubly robust estimators (6)-(7) rely solely on covariate summaries from the external data, eliminating the need to access individualized covariates.

Remark 3 (Required summary statistics under data heterogeneity). Unlike the scenario discussed in Remark 1, constructing robust estimators under data heterogeneity necessitates access to the entire sample mean vector \bar{X}_0 . This contrasts with the setup in Section 2, where the propensity score function $\gamma_n(X) = \mathbb{P}(\Gamma = 1 \mid X) = \mathbb{P}(\Gamma = 1)$ is constant under the MCAR assumption, allowing for straightforward estimation without requiring covariate information. In heterogeneous settings, however, estimating the propensity score

function requires access to \bar{X}_0 , as in (4). Notably, nuisance estimates (4)-(5) can also be constructed after variable screening. If the outcome regression model is correctly specified and all important features are retained post-screening, estimation accuracy can be preserved while reducing the requirement to collecting sample means for the selected features only. However, this approach is less robust, as it relies heavily on the correctness of the outcome regression model. In contrast, our current proposal is more flexible, accommodating potential misspecifications in the outcome regression model, provided that the propensity score function is correctly specified.

Efficient statistical inference under heterogeneous settings, based on the asymptotic normality in Theorem 3, requires access to a sub-matrix $\bar{\Xi}_{0,\bar{S}} = \sum_{i=1}^n (1-\Gamma_i) X_{i,\bar{S}} X_{i,\bar{S}}^\top / \sum_{i=1}^n (1-\Gamma_i)$, where $\bar{S} = \cup_{k=1}^K \text{supp}(\hat{\beta}_{OR}^{(-k)})$. However, in practice, such second-moment information is not always fully available, and only marginal sample second moments (or variances) for individual covariates, corresponding to the diagonal entries of $\bar{\Xi}_0$, may be accessible. Let $\bar{\Xi}_{0,\bar{S}}^{\text{diag}}$ represent a diagonal matrix constructed from the diagonal elements of $\bar{\Xi}_{0,\bar{S}}$, with off-diagonal elements set to zero. In such cases, confidence intervals with adequate coverage can still be constructed by replacing the quadratic term $\hat{\beta}_{OR}^{(-k),\top} \bar{\Xi}_0 \hat{\beta}_{OR}^{(-k)}$ in the definitions of $\hat{\sigma}_g^2$ and $\hat{\sigma}_t^2$ with a conservative estimate $\|\hat{\beta}_{OR}^{(-k)}\|_0 \hat{\beta}_{OR,\bar{S}}^{(-k),\top} \bar{\Xi}_{0,\bar{S}}^{\text{diag}} \hat{\beta}_{OR,\bar{S}}^{(-k)}$.

3.2 Asymptotic theory

Define the target nuisance parameters:

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_{PS}^* &= \operatorname{argmin}_{\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^d} \mathbb{E} \left[(1-\Gamma) X^\top \alpha + \Gamma \exp(-X^\top \alpha) \right], \\ \beta_{OR}^* &= \operatorname{argmin}_{\beta \in \mathbb{R}^d} \mathbb{E} \left[\Gamma \exp(-X^\top \alpha_{PS}^*) (Y - X^\top \beta)^2 \right]. \end{aligned}$$

The following assumption is required.

Assumption 5. Suppose that there exist constants $c_0, k_0 \in (0, 1)$ and $\sigma, \kappa_l, \sigma_w, \delta_w > 0$ such that the following conditions hold: (a) The propensity score model satisfies $k_0(1 - \gamma_n)/\gamma_n \leq (1 - g(X^\top \alpha_{PS}^*))/g(X^\top \alpha_{PS}^*) \leq k_0^{-1}(1 - \gamma_n)/\gamma_n$ almost surely, $\mathbb{P}(\Gamma = 0) \geq c_0$, and $\mathbb{E}[\gamma_n^q(X)] \leq \nu \gamma_n^q$ for some $q > 1$ and $\nu > 0$. (b) For each $j \in \{0, 1\}$, and conditional on $\Gamma = j$, X is a sub-Gaussian random vector and $X^\top \beta_{OR}^*$ be a sub-Gaussian random variable, both with parameter σ . In addition, $\inf_{v \in \mathbb{R}^d, \|v\|_2=1} \mathbb{E} \left[(X^\top v)^2 \mid \Gamma = 1 \right] \geq \kappa_l$. (c) The residual $w_{OR} = Y - X^\top \beta_{OR}^*$ is a sub-Gaussian random variable with parameter σ_w , $\mathbb{E}[w_{OR}^8 \mid \Gamma = 1] \leq \sigma_w^8$, and $\mathbb{E}[w_{OR}^2 \mid \Gamma = 1] \geq \delta_w$.

Assumption 5(a) extends the standard overlap condition to accommodate potential model misspecification and the decaying MAR setting. When the propensity score function is correctly specified as $\gamma_n(X) = g(X^\top \alpha_{PS}^*)$ and $\gamma_n \asymp 1$, this assumption simplifies to the usual overlap condition, $k_0 \leq \gamma_n(X) \leq 1 - k_0$ for some $k_0 \in (0, 1)$ (Crump et al., 2009; Khan and Tamer, 2010; Rothe, 2017). Assumptions 5(b)-(c) impose standard regularity conditions on the distributions of the covariate vector and the residual.

The following theorem demonstrates the asymptotic behavior of $\hat{\theta}_g$ and $\hat{\theta}_t$.

Theorem 3. Suppose that Assumptions 4 and 5 hold. Choose $\lambda_\alpha \asymp \lambda_\beta \asymp \sqrt{\log d / (n\gamma_n)}$. Let $n\gamma_n \gg (\log n)^2 \log d$, $\|\alpha_{PS}^*\|_0 \|\beta_{OR}^*\|_0 = o(n\gamma_n / (\log n (\log d)^2))$, and either of the following conditions hold: (1) (Correct OR model) $\mu(X) = X^\top \beta_{OR}^*$ or (2) (Correct PS model) $\gamma_n(X) = g(X^\top \alpha_{PS}^*)$ and $\|\alpha_{PS}^*\|_0 = o(\sqrt{n\gamma_n} / \log d)$. Then as $n, d \rightarrow \infty$,

$$(a) \quad \hat{\theta}_g - \theta_g = O_p((n\gamma_n)^{-1/2}), \quad \hat{\sigma}_g^2 = \sigma_g^2 \{1 + o_p(1)\}, \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{\sigma}^{-1} \sqrt{n}(\hat{\theta}_g - \theta_g) \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(0, 1),$$

where $\sigma_g^2 = \text{Var} \left(X^\top \beta_{OR}^* + \frac{\Gamma}{g(X^\top \alpha_{PS}^*)} (Y - X^\top \beta_{OR}^*) \right)$.

$$(b) \quad \hat{\theta}_t - \theta_t = O_p((n\gamma_n)^{-1/2}), \quad \hat{\sigma}_t^2 = \sigma_t^2 \{1 + o_p(1)\}, \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{\sigma}_t^{-1} \sqrt{n}(\hat{\theta}_t - \theta_t) \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(0, 1), \quad \text{where}$$

$$\sigma_t^2 = \mathbb{E} \left[\left\{ \frac{1-\Gamma}{1-\gamma_n} (X^\top \beta_{OR}^* - \theta_t) + \frac{\Gamma(1-g(X^\top \alpha_{PS}^*))}{(1-\gamma_n)g(X^\top \alpha_{PS}^*)} (Y - X^\top \beta_{OR}^*) \right\}^2 \right].$$

Theorem 3 demonstrates that robust inference for both θ_g and θ_t can be achieved as long

as either the propensity score or the outcome regression model is correctly specified. When both models are specified correctly, the asymptotic variances match those in [Bang and Robins \(2005\)](#); [Zhang et al. \(2023a\)](#), aligning with the semi-parametric efficiency bounds for cases where individualized covariates are observable ([Kennedy, 2024](#); [Müller and Keilegom, 2012](#); [Tsiatis, 2007](#)). Notably, our method shows that this efficiency lower bound can be attained by leveraging only covariate summaries from external sources, provided the nuisance models are correctly specified.

Remark 4 (Technical challenges associated with the specialized cross-fitting). To achieve robust inference, we adopt the methods of [Dukes and Vansteelandt \(2021\)](#); [Ning et al. \(2020\)](#); [Smucler et al. \(2019\)](#); [Tan \(2020\)](#) to construct an outcome regression estimator $\widehat{\beta}_{OR}^{(-k)}$ using an initial propensity score estimate $\widehat{\alpha}_{PS}^{(-k)}$. In heterogeneous settings, estimating the propensity score model as a function of the covariates is essential for addressing bias introduced by confounding factors. However, as the construction of $\widehat{\alpha}_{PS}^{(-k)}$ involves external covariates, the conditional independence between the outcome regression estimate and the external summary \bar{X}_0 , as outlined in [Remark 2](#) for homogeneous data, no longer holds.

To resolve this dependency, we define an oracle estimator $\widetilde{\beta}_{OR}^{(-k)}$ as in [\(5\)](#), replacing $\widehat{\alpha}_{PS}^{(-k)}$ with the true parameter α_{PS}^* . Unlike $\widehat{\beta}_{OR}^{(-k)}$, $\widetilde{\beta}_{OR}^{(-k)}$ does not depend on external covariates, allowing us to exploit its conditional independence with \bar{X}_0 to manage the influence of the error $\widetilde{\beta}_{OR}^{(-k)} - \beta_{OR}^*$ on the final mean estimator. The effect of the remaining estimation error $\Delta = \widehat{\beta}_{OR}^{(-k)} - \widetilde{\beta}_{OR}^{(-k)}$, which inherently depends on \bar{X}_0 , is controlled using uniform-type results based on its ℓ_1 -norm, as Δ contributes linearly to the final estimation error. [Lemma C.19](#) establishes that $\|\Delta\|_1 = O_p\left(\sqrt{\|\alpha_{PS}^*\|_0 \|\beta_{OR}^*\|_0 \log d / (n\gamma_n)}\right)$, indicating that the error remains small as long as either $\|\alpha_{PS}^*\|_0$ or $\|\beta_{OR}^*\|_0$ is sufficiently low.

Building on the above analysis, we demonstrate that CAN estimation for the mean

is achieved under the product sparsity condition $\|\alpha_{PS}^*\|_0\|\beta_{OR}^*\|_0 = o(n\gamma_n/(\log n(\log d)^2))$ when both nuisance models are correctly specified. With $n\gamma_n$ interpreted as the effective sample size, this result aligns with existing doubly robust methods (Chernozhukov et al., 2017; Kallus and Mao, 2024; Smucler et al., 2019; Zhang et al., 2023a), differing only by an additional $\log n$ term. For scenarios where the outcome regression model is misspecified, an additional condition $\|\alpha_{PS}^*\|_0 = o(\sqrt{n\gamma_n}/\log d)$ is required, consistent with Smucler et al. (2019). Importantly, unlike existing approaches that apply cross-fitting across the entire dataset, our method confines this step to the primary (labeled) data, bypassing the need for individualized covariates from external (unlabeled) data. This adjustment improves practical applicability while maintaining robustness guarantees.

4 Applications in causal inference

In this section, we apply the proposed methods to causal inference, focusing on estimating treatment effects through data integration.

Consider the potential outcome framework (Imbens and Rubin, 2015; Rubin, 1974). Let the underlying random variables be $(\Gamma_i, A_i, X_i, Y_i(0), Y_i(1), Y_i)_{i=1}^n$, with $(\Gamma, A, X, Y(0), Y(1), Y)$ as an independent copy. Here, $\Gamma_i \in \{0, 1\}$ indicates group assignment, where $\Gamma_i = 1$ represents individuals from the primary source. The binary treatment indicator $A_i \in \{0, 1\}$ specifies treatment assignment, $X_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$ is the covariate vector, and $Y_i(a)$ is the potential outcome for treatment $a \in \{0, 1\}$. The observed outcome is $Y_i = Y_i(A_i)$. We observe individualized data $(\Gamma_i, \Gamma_i A_i, \Gamma_i X_i, \Gamma_i Y_i)_{i=1}^n$ from the primary source, along with external summary statistics \bar{X}_0 and $\bar{\Xi}_0$ as defined in (1).

Our framework is well-suited for integrating randomized controlled trials (RCTs) with external data, where RCTs are conducted on individuals with $\Gamma_i = 1$, and $\Gamma_i = 0$ de-

notes non-participants. This approach also extends to cases where the primary data come from observational studies. In such instances, ensuring the “no unmeasured confounding” condition (Assumption 6(b) below) often necessitates the collection of a large number of covariates, resulting in a high-dimensional problem.

Our parameters of interest are the average treatment effects (ATEs) defined through the entire population (generalizability) and the external population (transportability):

$$\tau_g = \mathbb{E}[Y(1) - Y(0)] \quad \text{and} \quad \tau_t = \mathbb{E}[Y(1) - Y(0) \mid \Gamma = 0]. \quad (8)$$

To identify the ATE parameters, we assume the following identification conditions.

Assumption 6. *The following conditions hold: (a) $\Gamma \perp \{Y(1), Y(0)\} \mid X$. (b) $A \perp \{Y(1), Y(0)\} \mid X, \Gamma = 1$. (c) $\eta_0 \leq \mathbb{P}(A = 1 \mid X, \Gamma = 1) \leq 1 - \eta_0$ for some constant $0 < \eta_0 < 1$.*

Assumption 6 includes standard identification conditions in causal inference and data integration (Dahabreh et al., 2020; Lesko et al., 2017; Shi et al., 2023). Specifically, Assumption 6(a) corresponds to “ignorability” or “selection exchangeability,” ensuring that the group assignment is independent of potential outcomes given covariates. Assumption 6(b), commonly known as “no unmeasured confounding” or “treatment exchangeability,” implies that all relevant confounders between treatments and potential outcomes have been accounted for. To satisfy Assumption 6(a)-(b), unless there is complete control over both group and treatment assignments, it is generally necessary to collect as many potentially relevant baseline covariates as possible. This often results in a high-dimensional scenario where the number of covariates, d , may exceed the labeled sample size, n_P . Our framework is designed to address such challenges, providing robust solutions even when the dimensionality surpasses the sample size, a common issue in modern causal inference tasks. Lastly,

Assumption 6(c), referred to as the “overlap” or “positivity” condition, ensures that each individual has a non-zero probability of receiving either treatment. Notably, Assumption 6 accommodates heterogeneity both across different data sources and between distinct treatment groups.

4.1 Achieving generalizability using external summaries

Since the potential outcome $Y(a)$ is observed only when both $\Gamma = 1$ and $A = a$, this creates a two-occasion missing data problem. To address this, we define $\Gamma_a := \Gamma \mathbb{1}_{\{A=a\}}$ as the “effective labeling indicator” for estimating the expected potential outcome $\tau_{a,g} = \mathbb{E}[Y(a)]$. Consequently, the estimation of the ATE parameter $\tau_g = \tau_{1,g} - \tau_{0,g}$ can be decomposed into two mean estimation problems. We employ the methods proposed in Section 3 to separately construct estimates for $\tau_{1,g}$ and $\tau_{0,g}$, with the ATE parameter estimated by their difference. We achieve generalizability by using covariate summaries from external sources.

Notably, since we have access to individualized information from the primary source, we can also compute the covariate sample average for the group with $\Gamma_{a,i} = \Gamma_i \mathbb{1}_{\{A_i=a\}} = 0$, which includes individuals who either (1) belong to the external source ($\Gamma_i = 0$) or (2) are from the primary source but received a different treatment ($\Gamma_i = 1$ and $A_i \neq a$):

$$\bar{X}_{a,0} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n (1 - \Gamma_{a,i}) X_i}{\sum_{i=1}^n (1 - \Gamma_{a,i})} = \frac{(n - \sum_{i=1}^n \Gamma_i) \bar{X}_0 + \sum_{i=1}^n \Gamma_i \mathbb{1}_{\{A_i \neq a\}} X_i}{n - \sum_{i=1}^n \Gamma_{a,i}}.$$

In the following, we extend the mean estimation method from Section 3 to the ATE estimation problem by replacing the original labeling indicator Γ_i with $\Gamma_{a,i}$ for each treatment arm $a \in \{0, 1\}$ and imputing the individualized covariates for the group with $\Gamma_{a,i} = 0$ using the sample mean $\bar{X}_{a,0}$. The detailed construction is outlined below.

Step 1: Divide the index set $[n]$ into K disjoint subsets $\mathcal{I}_1, \dots, \mathcal{I}_K$ with equal sizes such that $n_k := |\mathcal{I}_k| = n/K$ for $k \in [K]$. Let $\mathcal{I}_{-k} = [n] \setminus \mathcal{I}_k$ and separate \mathcal{I}_{-k} into two disjoint

subsets $\mathcal{I}_{-k,\alpha}, \mathcal{I}_{-k,\beta}$ with same sizes $M = |\mathcal{I}_{-k,\alpha}| = |\mathcal{I}_{-k,\beta}|$.

Step 2: For each $a \in \{0, 1\}$ and $k \in [K]$, construct the propensity score estimator as:

$$\widehat{\alpha}_{a,g}^{(-k)} = \operatorname{argmin}_{\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^d} \left\{ M^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{-k,\alpha}} \left\{ (1 - \Gamma_{a,i}) \bar{X}_{a,0}^\top \alpha + \Gamma_{a,i} \exp(-X_i^\top \alpha) \right\} + \lambda_\alpha \|\alpha\|_1 \right\}.$$

Step 3: For each $a \in \{0, 1\}$ and $k \in [K]$, construct the outcome regression estimator as:

$$\widehat{\beta}_{a,g}^{(-k)} = \operatorname{argmin}_{\beta \in \mathbb{R}^d} \left\{ M^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{-k,\beta}} \Gamma_{a,i} \exp(-X_i^\top \widehat{\alpha}_{a,g}^{(-k)}) (Y_i - X_i^\top \beta)^2 + \lambda_\beta \|\beta\|_1 \right\}.$$

Step 4: Let $g(t) = e^t / (1 + e^t)$ be the logistic function. For each $a \in \{0, 1\}$, define the cross-fitted estimator of $\tau_{a,g}$ as:

$$\widehat{\tau}_{a,g} = n^{-1} \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} (\Gamma_{a,i} X_i + (1 - \Gamma_{a,i}) \bar{X}_{a,0})^\top \widehat{\beta}_{a,g}^{(-k)} + n^{-1} \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \frac{\Gamma_{a,i} (Y_i - X_i^\top \widehat{\beta}_{a,g}^{(-k)})}{g(X_i^\top \widehat{\alpha}_{a,g}^{(-k)})}.$$

Step 5: We propose the estimator for the ATE over the entire population:

$$\widehat{\tau}_g = \widehat{\tau}_{1,g} - \widehat{\tau}_{0,g}. \quad (9)$$

When we have access to second-moment information from external sources, we can further estimate the corresponding asymptotic variance as:

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\Sigma}_g^2 &= n^{-1} \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} (1 - \Gamma_i) \left(\widehat{\beta}_{1,g}^{(-k)} - \widehat{\beta}_{0,g}^{(-k)} \right)^\top \Xi_0 \left(\widehat{\beta}_{1,g}^{(-k)} - \widehat{\beta}_{0,g}^{(-k)} \right) \\ &\quad + n^{-1} \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \Gamma_i A_i \left(X_i^\top \widehat{\beta}_{1,g}^{(-k)} - X_i^\top \widehat{\beta}_{0,g}^{(-k)} + \frac{Y_i - X_i^\top \widehat{\beta}_{1,g}^{(-k)}}{g(X_i^\top \widehat{\alpha}_{1,g}^{(-k)})} \right)^2 \\ &\quad + n^{-1} \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \Gamma_i (1 - A_i) \left(X_i^\top \widehat{\beta}_{1,g}^{(-k)} - X_i^\top \widehat{\beta}_{0,g}^{(-k)} - \frac{Y_i - X_i^\top \widehat{\beta}_{0,g}^{(-k)}}{g(X_i^\top \widehat{\alpha}_{0,g}^{(-k)})} \right)^2 - \widehat{\tau}_g^2. \end{aligned}$$

To establish the theoretical properties of the proposed methods, for each $a \in \{0, 1\}$, we define the target nuisance parameters as:

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_{a,g}^* &= \operatorname{argmin}_{\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^d} \mathbb{E} \left[(1 - \Gamma_a) X^\top \alpha + \Gamma_a \exp(-X^\top \alpha) \right], \\ \beta_{a,g}^* &= \operatorname{argmin}_{\beta \in \mathbb{R}^d} \mathbb{E} \left[\Gamma_a \exp(-X^\top \alpha_{a,g}^*) (Y - X^\top \beta)^2 \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Let $w_{a,g} = Y(a) - X^\top \beta_{a,g}^*$ be the residuals from the outcome regression models. The following theorem characterizes the asymptotic behavior of the proposed ATE estimator $\widehat{\tau}_g$ of τ_g .

Theorem 4. *Suppose that Assumption 6 holds, and that for each $a \in \{0, 1\}$, Assumption 5 holds with $(\alpha_{PS}^*, \beta_{OR}^*, w_{OR})$ replaced by $(\alpha_{a,g}^*, \beta_{a,g}^*, w_{a,g})$, $n\gamma_n \gg (\log n)^2 \log d$, $\|\alpha_{a,g}^*\|_0 \|\beta_{a,g}^*\|_0 = o(\sqrt{n\gamma_n}/(\log n(\log d)^2))$, and either of the following conditions hold: (1) (Correct OR model) $\mathbb{E}[Y(a) | X] = X^\top \beta_{a,g}^*$ or (2) (Correct PS model) $\mathbb{P}(\Gamma_a = 1 | X) = g(X^\top \alpha_{a,g}^*)$ and $\|\alpha_{a,g}^*\|_0 = o(\sqrt{n\gamma_n}/\log d)$. Then as $n, d \rightarrow \infty$, $\widehat{\tau}_g - \tau_g = O_p((n\gamma_n)^{-1/2})$, $\widehat{\Sigma}_g^2 = \Sigma_g^2\{1 + o_p(1)\}$, and $\widehat{\Sigma}_g^{-1} \sqrt{n}(\widehat{\tau}_g - \tau_g) \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$, where $\Sigma_g^2 = \text{Var}\left(X^\top \beta_{1,g}^* - X^\top \beta_{0,g}^* + \frac{\Gamma A}{g(X^\top \alpha_{1,g}^*)}(Y - X^\top \beta_{1,g}^*) - X^\top \beta_{0,g}^* - \frac{\Gamma(1-A)}{g(X^\top \alpha_{0,g}^*)}(Y - X^\top \beta_{0,g}^*)\right)$.*

Theorem 4 establishes robust inference for τ_g under the condition that at least one nuisance model is correctly specified for each treatment arm $a \in \{0, 1\}$. When all nuisance models are correctly specified, the asymptotic variance aligns with that of existing studies (e.g., Kallus and Mao (2024); Zhang et al. (2023a)), yet our approach does not necessitate full access to individualized covariates from external sources.

4.2 Reaching transportability using external summaries

We now shift our focus to the transport of findings from primary data to external sources to estimate the ATE parameter $\tau_t = \mathbb{E}[Y(1) - Y(0) | \Gamma = 0]$, commonly known as the transportability problem. We demonstrate that this estimation can also be achieved by extending the previously developed methods in Section 3.

Firstly, similar to Section 4.1, we can treat $\Gamma_a = \Gamma \mathbb{1}_{\{A=a\}}$ as the “effective labeling indicator” when estimating $\tau_{a,t} = \mathbb{E}[Y(a) | \Gamma = 0]$ for each $a \in \{0, 1\}$. In Section 3, the population is divided into two parts: (1) the primary population with $\Gamma_i = 1$, where

the outcome Y_i is observed, and (2) the target external population with $\Gamma_i = 0$, to which the findings are transported. In this causal setup, the “effective primary population” becomes the subgroup with $\Gamma_{a,i} = \Gamma_i \mathbb{1}_{\{A_i=a\}} = 1$ since our outcome of interest becomes the potential outcome $Y_i(a)$, which is observable only when $\Gamma_{a,i} = 1$. Hence, the “effective entire population” now consists of samples for which $\Omega_{a,i} = 1$, where we define $\Omega_{a,i} = 1 - \Gamma_i + \Gamma_{a,i}$. In other words, we exclude the samples with $\Omega_{a,i} = 0$ (i.e., $\Gamma_i = 1$ and $A_i \neq a$) when estimating $\tau_{a,t}$, as these samples do not provide information on $Y_i(a)$ and are outside the population of interest. After excluding these samples, estimating $\tau_{a,t}$ becomes a mean estimation problem for the external population. Below, we propose estimates for $\tau_{a,t}$ and $\tau_t = \tau_{1,t} - \tau_{0,t}$ using the procedure outlined in Section 3.

Step 1: Divide the index set $[n]$ into K disjoint subsets $\mathcal{I}_1, \dots, \mathcal{I}_K$ with equal sizes such that $n_k := |\mathcal{I}_k| = n/K$ for $k \in [K]$. Let let $\hat{\gamma}_k = n_k^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \Gamma_i$, $\mathcal{I}_{-k} = [n] \setminus \mathcal{I}_k$, and separate \mathcal{I}_{-k} into two disjoint subsets $\mathcal{I}_{-k,\alpha}, \mathcal{I}_{-k,\beta}$ with same sizes $M = |\mathcal{I}_{-k,\alpha}| = |\mathcal{I}_{-k,\beta}|$.

Step 2: For each $a \in \{0, 1\}$ and $k \in [K]$, construct the propensity score estimator as:

$$\hat{\alpha}_{a,t}^{(-k)} = \operatorname{argmin}_{\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^d} \left\{ M^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{-k,\alpha}} \left\{ (1 - \Gamma_i) \bar{X}_0^\top \alpha + \Gamma_{a,i} \exp(-X_i^\top \alpha) \right\} + \lambda_\alpha \|\alpha\|_1 \right\}.$$

Step 3: For each $a \in \{0, 1\}$ and $k \in [K]$, construct the outcome regression estimator as:

$$\hat{\beta}_{a,t}^{(-k)} = \operatorname{argmin}_{\beta \in \mathbb{R}^d} \left\{ M^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{-k,\beta}} \Gamma_{a,i} \exp(-X_i^\top \hat{\alpha}_{a,t}^{(-k)}) (Y_i - X_i^\top \beta)^2 + \lambda_\beta \|\beta\|_1 \right\}.$$

Step 4: For each $a \in \{0, 1\}$, define the cross-fitted estimator of $\tau_{a,t}$ as:

$$\hat{\tau}_{a,t} = K^{-1} \sum_{k=1}^K \bar{X}_0^\top \hat{\beta}_{a,t}^{(-k)} + n^{-1} \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \frac{\Gamma_{a,i} \exp(-X_i^\top \hat{\alpha}_{a,t}^{(-k)})}{1 - \hat{\gamma}_k} (Y_i - X_i^\top \hat{\beta}_{a,t}^{(-k)}).$$

Step 5: We propose the estimator for the ATE over the external population:

$$\hat{\tau}_t = \hat{\tau}_{1,t} - \hat{\tau}_{0,t}.$$

When we have access to the matrix $\bar{\Xi}_0$, the corresponding asymptotic variance can be estimated as:

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{\Sigma}_t^2 &= K^{-1} \sum_{k=1}^K \frac{\left(\hat{\beta}_{1,t}^{(-k)} - \hat{\beta}_{0,t}^{(-k)}\right)^\top \bar{\Xi}_0 \left(\hat{\beta}_{1,t}^{(-k)} - \hat{\beta}_{0,t}^{(-k)}\right) - 2\hat{\tau}_t \bar{X}_0^\top \left(\hat{\beta}_{1,t}^{(-k)} - \hat{\beta}_{0,t}^{(-k)}\right) + \hat{\tau}_t^2}{1 - \hat{\gamma}_k} \\ &\quad + n^{-1} \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \Gamma_i A_i (1 - \hat{\gamma}_k)^{-2} \exp\left(-2X_i^\top \hat{\alpha}_{1,t}^{(-k)}\right) \left(Y_i - X_i^\top \hat{\beta}_{1,t}^{(-k)}\right)^2 \\ &\quad + n^{-1} \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \Gamma_i (1 - A_i) (1 - \hat{\gamma}_k)^{-2} \exp\left(-2X_i^\top \hat{\alpha}_{0,t}^{(-k)}\right) \left(Y_i - X_i^\top \hat{\beta}_{0,t}^{(-k)}\right)^2.\end{aligned}$$

For each $a \in \{0, 1\}$, we define the target nuisance parameters as:

$$\begin{aligned}\alpha_{a,t}^* &= \operatorname{argmin}_{\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^d} \mathbb{E} \left[(1 - \Gamma) X^\top \alpha + \Gamma_a \exp(-X^\top \alpha) \right], \\ \beta_{a,t}^* &= \operatorname{argmin}_{\beta \in \mathbb{R}^d} \mathbb{E} \left[\Gamma_a \exp(-X^\top \alpha_{a,t}^*) (Y - X^\top \beta)^2 \right].\end{aligned}$$

Let $w_{a,t} = Y(a) - X^\top \beta_{a,t}^*$ be the corresponding residuals and $\Omega_a = 1 - \Gamma + \Gamma_a$ be an independent copy of $\Omega_{a,i}$. The following theorem demonstrates the properties of the proposed estimator $\hat{\tau}_t$ of τ_t .

Theorem 5. *Suppose that Assumption 6 holds, and that for each $a \in \{0, 1\}$, Assumption 5 holds with $(\alpha_{PS}^*, \beta_{OR}^*, w_{OR})$ replaced by $(\alpha_{a,t}^*, \beta_{a,t}^*, w_{a,t})$, $n\gamma_n \gg (\log n)^2 \log d$, $(\|\alpha_{a,t}^*\|_0 \|\beta_{a,t}^*\|_0) = o(\sqrt{n\gamma_n}/(\log n(\log d)^2))$, and either of the following conditions hold: (1) (Correct OR model) $\mathbb{E}[Y(a) | X] = X^\top \beta_{a,t}^*$ or (2) (Correct PS model) $\mathbb{P}(\Gamma_a = 1 | X, \Omega_a = 1) = g(X^\top \alpha_{a,t}^*)$ and $\|\alpha_{a,t}^*\|_0 = o(\sqrt{n\gamma_n}/\log d)$. Then as $n, d \rightarrow \infty$, $\hat{\tau}_t - \tau_t = O_p((n\gamma_n)^{-1/2})$, $\hat{\Sigma}_t^2 = \Sigma_t^2 \{1 + o_p(1)\}$, and $\hat{\Sigma}_t^{-1} \sqrt{n}(\hat{\tau}_t - \tau_t) \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$, where $\Sigma_t^2 = \operatorname{Var} \left(\frac{1-\Gamma}{1-\gamma_n} (X^\top \beta_{1,t}^* - X^\top \beta_{0,t}^* - \tau_t) + \frac{\Gamma_A \exp(-X^\top \alpha_{1,t}^*)}{1-\gamma_n} (Y - X^\top \beta_{1,t}^*) - \frac{\Gamma(1-A) \exp(-X^\top \alpha_{0,t}^*)}{1-\gamma_n} (Y - X^\top \beta_{0,t}^*) \right)$.*

5 Simulations

In this section, we assess the performance of our proposed estimator using simulated datasets. We illustrate the results focusing on evaluating the generalizability of causal

inference methods by estimating the average treatment effect (ATE) over the entire population, leveraging individualized data from a primary source and covariate summaries from an external source, as described in Section 4.1. We consider two data-generating processes (DGPs): (a) linear outcome regression (OR) models with non-logistic propensity score (PS) models, and (b) non-linear OR models with logistic PS models. Covariates are generated as i.i.d. truncated normal variables, where $X_i[1] = 1$ and $X_i[j] \stackrel{\text{i.i.d.}}{\sim} N_{\text{trun}, 2}$ for each $i \in [n]$ and $j \in \{2, \dots, d\}$. Here, $N_{\text{trun}, 2} \sim N \mid \{|N| \leq 2\}$ represents a truncated normal distribution conditioned on $|N| \leq 2$, with $N \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$.

(a) *Linear OR models & non-logistic PS models.* For $a \in \{0, 1\}$, the treatment A_i and group membership Γ_i are generated as Bernoulli random variables with the following PSs:

$$\mathbb{P}(A_i = 1 \mid X_i) = 0.3 \sin(X_i) + 0.5 \text{ and } \mathbb{P}(\Gamma_i = 1 \mid X_i, A = a) = g(X_i^\top \alpha_a^*).$$

The outcomes are generated through linear models:

$$Y_i(a) = X_i^\top \beta_a^* + \epsilon_i \text{ and } Y_i = Y_i(A_i), \text{ where } \epsilon_i \stackrel{\text{i.i.d.}}{\sim} \mathcal{N}(0, 1).$$

(b) *Non-linear OR models & logistic PS models.* Consider the following PSs:

$$\mathbb{P}(A_i = 1 \mid X_i) = \frac{g(X_i^\top \alpha_1^*) - g(X_i^\top \alpha_0^*) + 1}{2} \text{ and } \mathbb{P}(\Gamma_i = 1 \mid X_i, A_i = a) = \frac{g(X_i^\top \alpha_a^*)}{\mathbb{P}(A_i = a \mid X_i)},$$

where $g(t) = e^t / (1 + e^t)$ is the logistic function. This setup results in logistic models for the joint propensity scores: $\mathbb{P}(\Gamma_i \mathbb{1}_{\{A_i=a\}} = 1 \mid X_i) = g(X_i^\top \alpha_a^*)$. Define $X_i^2 := ((X_i[1])^2 \dots, (X_i[d])^2)^\top$. The outcomes are generated using quadratic models:

$$Y_i(a) = 5X_i^\top \beta_a^* + (X_i^2)^\top v_a^* + \epsilon_i \text{ and } Y_i = Y_i(A_i), \text{ where } \epsilon_i \stackrel{\text{i.i.d.}}{\sim} \mathcal{N}(0, 1).$$

The parameter values are chosen as: $\alpha_1^* = (\alpha_n, 1, \mathbf{1}_{s_\alpha-1} / (s_\alpha - 1), 0, \dots, 0)^\top \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $\alpha_0^* = (\alpha_n, -1, -\mathbf{1}_{s_\alpha-1} / (s_\alpha - 1), 0, \dots, 0)^\top \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $\beta_1^* = 3(1, 1, \mathbf{1}_{s_\beta-1} / \sqrt{s_\beta - 1}, 0, \dots, 0)^\top \in \mathbb{R}^d$,

$\beta_0^* = -\beta_1^*$, $v_1^* = 0.5(-24, 1, \mathbf{1}_{s_\beta-1}/(s_\beta - 1), 0, \dots, 0)^\top \in \mathbb{R}^d$, and $v_0^* = -v_1^*$, where $\mathbf{1}_s = (1, \dots, 1) \in \mathbb{R}^s$ for any $s \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ and α_n is chosen such that $\mathbb{P}(\Gamma = 1) = \gamma_n$.

The target parameter, τ_g , is defined in (8). We evaluate the performance of the proposed ATE estimator, $\hat{\tau}_g$ in (9), which relies solely on covariate summaries from the external data. For benchmarking, we compare it against several existing methods: (a) the double machine learning estimator $\hat{\tau}_{\text{DML}}$ of Chernozhukov et al. (2017), constructed using only the primary data; (b) the DR-DMAR SS estimator $\hat{\tau}_{\text{SS-Lasso}}$ of Zhang et al. (2023b); and (c) the bias-reduced SS estimator $\hat{\tau}_{\text{BRSS}}$ of Zhang et al. (2023b). For methods that permit customized cross-fitting, we partition the data into 5 folds. Nuisance parameters are estimated using ℓ_1 -regularized methods, with tuning parameters determined via 5-fold cross-validation. Notably, $\hat{\tau}_{\text{DML}}$ relies exclusively on primary data and disregards the external data entirely, often resulting in biased estimates under data heterogeneity. In contrast, although $\hat{\tau}_{\text{SS-Lasso}}$ and $\hat{\tau}_{\text{BRSS}}$ are designed to provide consistent estimates, their requirement for full access to individualized covariates from the external source renders them unsuitable when only summary-level external data are available.

Simulation results over 200 repetitions are presented in Tables 1 and 2. We summarize the empirical bias (Bias), root mean square error (RMSE), average length of the 95% confidence intervals (Length), and average coverage of the 95% confidence intervals (Coverage). To mitigate the influence of outliers, the reported values for Bias, RMSE, and Length are computed using medians.

Among all considered estimators, $\hat{\tau}_{\text{DML}}$ consistently demonstrates substantial biases and high RMSEs, as it relies solely on primary data and produces biased estimates under data heterogeneity. While $\hat{\tau}_{\text{SS-Lasso}}$ is theoretically consistent under data heterogeneity, its statistical inference is valid only when both nuisance models are correctly specified (Zhang

Table 1: Simulation results for DGP (a) with $d = 201$, $s_\alpha = 6$, and $s_\beta = 2$.

Estimator	Bias	RMSE	Length	Coverage	Bias	RMSE	Length	Coverage
	$n = 5000, \gamma_n = 0.2$				$n = 5000, \gamma_n = 0.5$			
$\widehat{\tau}_{\text{DML}}$	0.528	0.528	1.809	0.810	0.283	0.283	0.928	0.810
$\widehat{\tau}_{\text{SS-Lasso}}$	0.035	0.097	0.401	0.840	-0.037	0.468	2.616	0.975
$\widehat{\tau}_{\text{BRSS}}$	0.014	0.104	0.499	0.900	0.004	0.082	0.458	0.945
$\widehat{\tau}_g$	0.015	0.105	0.525	0.910	0.001	0.084	0.467	0.935
	$n = 10000, \gamma_n = 0.2$				$n = 10000, \gamma_n = 0.5$			
$\widehat{\tau}_{\text{DML}}$	0.452	0.452	1.326	0.735	0.234	0.234	0.668	0.725
$\widehat{\tau}_{\text{SS-Lasso}}$	0.002	0.091	0.311	0.845	0.046	0.424	2.300	0.965
$\widehat{\tau}_{\text{BRSS}}$	-0.002	0.071	0.381	0.910	-0.001	0.059	0.330	0.945
$\widehat{\tau}_g$	-0.005	0.079	0.395	0.895	-0.000	0.065	0.335	0.940

et al., 2023b). As shown in Tables 1 and 2, $\widehat{\tau}_{\text{SS-Lasso}}$ often achieves relatively low bias but occasionally suffers from large RMSEs compared to other methods. Furthermore, it fails to ensure robust and efficient inference, as the confidence intervals either exhibit inadequate coverage or are excessively wide.

The proposed estimator $\widehat{\tau}_g$ exhibits behavior similar to $\widehat{\tau}_{\text{BRSS}}$, with both estimators showing relatively low bias and RMSE. Their confidence intervals achieve accurate coverage as long as the effective sample size $n\gamma_n$ is sufficiently large, even when one nuisance model is misspecified. However, unlike $\widehat{\tau}_{\text{BRSS}}$, which requires individualized covariate data from external sources, $\widehat{\tau}_g$ depends only on external covariate summaries. Despite this limitation, $\widehat{\tau}_g$ achieves comparable performance to $\widehat{\tau}_{\text{BRSS}}$, underscoring the proposed method’s practicality, efficiency, and robustness across diverse settings.

Table 2: Simulation results for DGP (b) with $d = 201$, $s_\alpha = 6$, and $s_\beta = 6$.

Estimator	Bias	RMSE	Length	Coverage	Bias	RMSE	Length	Coverage
	$n = 3000, \gamma_n = 0.2$				$n = 3000, \gamma_n = 0.5$			
$\widehat{\tau}_{\text{DML}}$	0.353	1.301	8.563	0.945	0.281	0.745	4.887	0.980
$\widehat{\tau}_{\text{SS-Lasso}}$	-0.358	0.470	2.625	0.925	-0.171	0.629	3.426	0.980
$\widehat{\tau}_{\text{BRSS}}$	-0.154	0.416	2.685	0.955	-0.052	0.410	2.676	0.955
$\widehat{\tau}_g$	-0.200	0.423	2.704	0.945	-0.032	0.411	2.686	0.950
	$n = 10000, \gamma_n = 0.2$				$n = 10000, \gamma_n = 0.5$			
$\widehat{\tau}_{\text{DML}}$	0.316	0.801	5.139	0.965	0.166	0.482	2.841	0.960
$\widehat{\tau}_{\text{SS-Lasso}}$	-0.359	0.397	1.449	0.820	-0.112	0.706	3.085	0.970
$\widehat{\tau}_{\text{BRSS}}$	-0.075	0.272	1.479	0.955	-0.073	0.280	1.469	0.945
$\widehat{\tau}_g$	-0.064	0.271	1.483	0.955	-0.055	0.284	1.470	0.955

6 Discussion

In this work, we investigate the mean estimation problem and the average treatment effect estimation problem by leveraging additional covariate information from external sources. Our findings demonstrate that even without access to individualized covariates from external sources, robust and efficient estimation can be achieved solely by utilizing covariate summaries, which are typically straightforward to collect. Under conditions of data homogeneity, we observe that the collection of additional individualized covariates enhances estimation efficiency in the presence of non-linearity. We posit that similar improvements in efficiency and robustness are likely to apply in heterogeneous contexts, although further investigation is warranted. Given the varying collection costs associated with different covariates, it is essential to explore data-dependent approaches to identify which information

should be collected from external sources to optimally balance estimation efficiency with data collection costs. Additionally, beyond first-moment parameters, exploring the estimation of other parameters of interest, such as higher moments, quantiles, or regression slopes across various regression models, would be advantageous.

References

- Anastasios N Angelopoulos, Stephen Bates, Clara Fannjiang, Michael I Jordan, and Tijana Zrnica. Prediction-powered inference. *Science*, 382(6671):669–674, 2023.
- David Azriel, Lawrence D Brown, Michael Sklar, Richard Berk, Andreas Buja, and Linda Zhao. Semi-supervised linear regression. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 117(540):2238–2251, 2022.
- Heejung Bang and James M Robins. Doubly robust estimation in missing data and causal inference models. *Biometrics*, 61(4):962–973, 2005.
- Ashley L Buchanan, Michael G Hudgens, Stephen R Cole, Katie R Mollan, Paul E Sax, Eric S Daar, Adaora A Adimora, Joseph J Eron, and Michael J Mugavero. Generalizing evidence from randomized trials using inverse probability of sampling weights. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series A: Statistics in Society*, 181(4):1193–1209, 2018.
- Stephen Burgess, Adam Butterworth, and Simon G Thompson. Mendelian randomization analysis with multiple genetic variants using summarized data. *Genetic Epidemiology*, 37(7):658–665, 2013.
- T. Tony Cai and Zijian Guo. Confidence intervals for high-dimensional linear regression: Minimax rates and adaptivity. *The Annals of Statistics*, 45(2):615–646, 2017.

- T Tony Cai and Zijian Guo. Semisupervised inference for explained variance in high dimensional linear regression and its applications. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)*, 82(2):391–419, 2020.
- Abhishek Chakraborty and Tianxi Cai. Efficient and adaptive linear regression in semi-supervised settings. *The Annals of Statistics*, 46(4):1541–1572, 2018.
- Abhishek Chakraborty, Jiarui Lu, T Tony Cai, and Hongzhe Li. High dimensional m-estimation with missing outcomes: A semi-parametric framework. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1911.11345*, 2019.
- Abhishek Chakraborty, Guorong Dai, and Eric Tchetgen Tchetgen. A general framework for treatment effect estimation in semi-supervised and high dimensional settings. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2201.00468*, 2022.
- Kai Chen and Yuqian Zhang. Enhancing efficiency and robustness in high-dimensional linear regression with additional unlabeled data. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.17685*, 2023.
- David Cheng, Ashwin N Ananthakrishnan, and Tianxi Cai. Robust and efficient semi-supervised estimation of average treatment effects with application to electronic health records data. *Biometrics*, 77(2):413–423, 2021.
- Victor Chernozhukov, Denis Chetverikov, Mert Demirer, Esther Duflo, Christian Hansen, and Whitney Newey. Double/debiased/neyman machine learning of treatment effects. *American Economic Review*, 107(5):261–65, 2017.
- J Chu, W Lu, and S Yang. Targeted optimal treatment regime learning using summary statistics. *Biometrika*, 110(4):913–931, 2023.

- Bénédicte Colnet, Imke Mayer, Guanhua Chen, Awa Dieng, Ruohong Li, Gaël Varoquaux, Jean-Philippe Vert, Julie Josse, and Shu Yang. Causal inference methods for combining randomized trials and observational studies: a review. *Statistical Science*, 39(1):165–191, 2024.
- Richard K Crump, V Joseph Hotz, Guido W Imbens, and Oscar A Mitnik. Dealing with limited overlap in estimation of average treatment effects. *Biometrika*, 96(1):187–199, 2009.
- Issa J Dahabreh, Sarah E Robertson, Jon A Steingrímsson, Elizabeth A Stuart, and Miguel A Hernan. Extending inferences from a randomized trial to a new target population. *Statistics in Medicine*, 39(14):1999–2014, 2020.
- Issa J Dahabreh, Sebastien JP A Haneuse, James M Robins, Sarah E Robertson, Ashley L Buchanan, Elizabeth A Stuart, and Miguel A Hernán. Study designs for extending causal inferences from a randomized trial to a target population. *American Journal of Epidemiology*, 190(8):1632–1642, 2021.
- Irina Degtiar and Sherri Rose. A review of generalizability and transportability. *Annual Review of Statistics and Its Application*, 10(1):501–524, 2023.
- Siyi Deng, Yang Ning, Jiwei Zhao, and Heping Zhang. Optimal and safe estimation for high-dimensional semi-supervised learning. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, pages 1–12, 2023.
- Oliver Dukes and Stijn Vansteelandt. Inference for treatment effect parameters in potentially misspecified high-dimensional models. *Biometrika*, 108(2):321–334, 2021.

- Oliver Dukes, Vahe Avagyan, and Stijn Vansteelandt. Doubly robust tests of exposure effects under high-dimensional confounding. *Biometrics*, 76(4):1190–1200, 2020.
- Max H Farrell. Robust inference on average treatment effects with possibly more covariates than observations. *Journal of Econometrics*, 189(1):1–23, 2015.
- Michele Jonsson Funk, Daniel Westreich, Chris Wiesen, Til Stürmer, M Alan Brookhart, and Marie Davidian. Doubly robust estimation of causal effects. *American Journal of Epidemiology*, 173(7):761–767, 2011.
- Daniel F Heitjan and Srabashi Basu. Distinguishing “missing at random” and “missing completely at random”. *The American Statistician*, 50(3):207–213, 1996.
- Kosuke Imai and Marc Ratkovic. Robust estimation of inverse probability weights for marginal structural models. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 110(511):1013–1023, 2015.
- Guido W Imbens and Donald B Rubin. *Causal inference in statistics, social, and biomedical sciences*. Cambridge University Press, 2015.
- Adel Javanmard and Andrea Montanari. Debiasing the lasso: Optimal sample size for Gaussian designs. *The Annals of Statistics*, 46(6A):2593–2622, 2018.
- Nathan Kallus and Xiaojie Mao. On the role of surrogates in the efficient estimation of treatment effects with limited outcome data. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B: Statistical Methodology*, page qkae099, 2024.
- Edward H Kennedy. Semiparametric doubly robust targeted double machine learning: a review. *Handbook of Statistical Methods for Precision Medicine*, pages 207–236, 2024.

- Shakeeb Khan and Elie Tamer. Irregular identification, support conditions, and inverse weight estimation. *Econometrica*, 78(6):2021–2042, 2010.
- Arun Kumar Kuchibhotla and Abhishek Chakraborty. Moving beyond sub-gaussianity in high-dimensional statistics: Applications in covariance estimation and linear regression. *Information and Inference: A Journal of the IMA*, 11(4):1389–1456, 2022.
- Catherine R Lesko, Ashley L Buchanan, Daniel Westreich, Jessie K Edwards, Michael G Hudgens, and Stephen R Cole. Generalizing study results: a potential outcomes perspective. *Epidemiology (Cambridge, Mass.)*, 28(4):553, 2017.
- Dan-Yu Lin and Daniel Zeng. On the relative efficiency of using summary statistics versus individual-level data in meta-analysis. *Biometrika*, 97(2):321–332, 2010.
- Dungang Liu, Regina Y Liu, and Minge Xie. Multivariate meta-analysis of heterogeneous studies using only summary statistics: efficiency and robustness. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 110(509):326–340, 2015.
- Shaogao Lv and Heng Lian. Debiased distributed learning for sparse partial linear models in high dimensions. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 23(2):1–32, 2022.
- Jean Morrison, Nicholas Knoblauch, Joseph H Marcus, Matthew Stephens, and Xin He. Mendelian randomization accounting for correlated and uncorrelated pleiotropic effects using genome-wide summary statistics. *Nature Genetics*, 52(7):740–747, 2020.
- Patric Müller and Sara Van de Geer. The partial linear model in high dimensions. *Scandinavian Journal of Statistics*, 42(2):580–608, 2015.
- Ursula U. Müller and Ingrid Van Keilegom. Efficient parameter estimation in regression with missing responses. *Electronic Journal of Statistics*, 6(none):1200–1219, 2012.

- Yang Ning, Peng Sida, and Kosuke Imai. Robust estimation of causal effects via a high-dimensional covariate balancing propensity score. *Biometrika*, 107(3):533–554, 2020.
- Chengde Qian, Guanghui Wang, Zhaojun Wang, and Changliang Zou. Change-point detection in complex models: Cross-fitting is needed. *arXiv e-prints*, pages arXiv–2411, 2024.
- Paul R Rosenbaum and Donald B Rubin. The central role of the propensity score in observational studies for causal effects. *Biometrika*, 70(1):41–55, 1983.
- Christoph Rothe. Robust confidence intervals for average treatment effects under limited overlap. *Econometrica*, 85(2):645–660, 2017.
- Donald B Rubin. Estimating causal effects of treatments in randomized and nonrandomized studies. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 66(5):688, 1974.
- Donald B Rubin. Inference and missing data. *Biometrika*, 63(3):581–592, 1976.
- Xu Shi, Ziyang Pan, and Wang Miao. Data integration in causal inference. *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Computational Statistics*, 15(1):e1581, 2023.
- Ezequiel Smucler, Andrea Rotnitzky, and James M Robins. A unifying approach for doubly-robust ℓ_1 regularized estimation of causal contrasts. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1904.03737*, 2019.
- Shanshan Song, Yuanyuan Lin, and Yong Zhou. A general m-estimation theory in semi-supervised framework. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 119(546):1065–1075, 2024.
- Zhiqiang Tan. Model-assisted inference for treatment effects using regularized calibrated estimation with high-dimensional data. *The Annals of Statistics*, 48(2):811–837, 2020.

- Anastasios Tsiatis. *Semiparametric theory and missing data*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2007.
- Lawson Ung, Guanbo Wang, Sebastien Haneuse, Miguel A Hernan, and Issa J Dahabreh. Combining an experimental study with external data: study designs and identification strategies. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.03302*, 2024.
- Sara van de Geer, Peter Bühlmann, Ya’acov Ritov, and Ruben Dezeure. On asymptotically optimal confidence regions and tests for high-dimensional models. *The Annals of Statistics*, 42(3):1166–1202, 2014.
- Aad W Van der Vaart. *Asymptotic statistics*, volume 3. Cambridge University Press, 2000.
- Roman Vershynin. *High dimensional probability: An introduction with applications in data science*, volume 47. Cambridge University Press, 2018.
- Martin J Wainwright. *High-dimensional statistics: A non-asymptotic viewpoint*, volume 48. Cambridge University Press, 2019.
- Huiliang Xie and Jian Huang. SCAD-penalized regression in high-dimensional partially linear models. *The Annals of Statistics*, 37(2):673–696, 2009.
- Anru Zhang, Lawrence D Brown, and T Tony Cai. Semi-supervised inference: General theory and estimation of means. *The Annals of Statistics*, 47(5):2538–2566, 2019.
- Jun Zhang, Nanguang Zhou, Zipeng Sun, Gaorong Li, and Zhenghong Wei. Statistical inference on restricted partial linear regression models with partial distortion measurement errors. *Statistica Neerlandica*, 70(4):304–331, 2016.
- Yuqian Zhang and Jelena Bradic. High-dimensional semi-supervised learning: in search of optimal inference of the mean. *Biometrika*, 109(2):387–403, 2022.

- Yuqian Zhang, Weijie Ji, and Jelena Bradic. Dynamic treatment effects: high-dimensional inference under model misspecification. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2111.06818*, 2021.
- Yuqian Zhang, Abhishek Chakraborty, and Jelena Bradic. Double robust semi-supervised inference for the mean: Selection bias under mar labeling with decaying overlap. *Information and Inference: A Journal of the IMA*, 12(3):2066–2159, 2023a.
- Yuqian Zhang, Abhishek Chakraborty, and Jelena Bradic. The decaying missing-at-random framework: Doubly robust causal inference with partially labeled data. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.12789*, 2023b.
- Jia Zhao, Jingsi Ming, Xianghong Hu, Gang Chen, Jin Liu, and Can Yang. Bayesian weighted mendelian randomization for causal inference based on summary statistics. *Bioinformatics*, 36(5):1501–1508, 2020.
- Xiaofeng Zhu, Tao Feng, Bamidele O Tayo, Jingjing Liang, J Hunter Young, Nora Franceschini, Jennifer A Smith, Lisa R Yanek, Yan V Sun, Todd L Edwards, et al. Meta-analysis of correlated traits via summary statistics from gwass with an application in hypertension. *The American Journal of Human Genetics*, 96(1):21–36, 2015.
- Ying Zhu, Zhuqing Yu, and Guang Cheng. High dimensional inference in partially linear models. In *The 22nd International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 2760–2769. PMLR, 2019.
- Tijana Zrnica and Emmanuel J Candès. Cross-prediction-powered inference. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 121(15):e2322083121, 2024.

SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIAL

A Identifiability of target nuisance parameters

In this section, we discuss the indetifiability of target nuisance parameters of Section 2.1, Section 2.3, and Section 3.2.

Lemma A.1. *Suppose that Assumption 2 hold. It holds that $\beta^* = \mathbb{E}[XX^\top]^{-1}\mathbb{E}[X^\top Y]$ and for $w = Y - X^\top\beta^*$,*

$$\mathbb{E}[w] = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{E}[Xw] = \mathbf{0}. \quad (10)$$

Lemma A.1 follows from Lemma 1 of Zhang et al. (2019).

Lemma A.2. *Suppose that Assumption 3 holds. For $\tilde{X} = X - \mathbb{E}[X | Z]$ and $\tilde{Y} = Y - \mathbb{E}[Y | Z]$, it holds that*

$$\beta_{plm}^* = \mathbb{E} \left[\tilde{X}\tilde{X}^\top \right]^{-1} \mathbb{E} \left[X\tilde{Y} \right] \quad \text{and} \quad f^*(Z) = \mathbb{E} \left[Y - X^\top\beta_{plm}^* \mid Z \right]. \quad (11)$$

In addition, for $\epsilon = Y - X^\top\beta_{plm}^* - f^*(Z)$, it holds that

$$\mathbb{E}[\epsilon \mid Z] = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{E}[X\epsilon] = \mathbf{0}. \quad (12)$$

Proof. Note that $(\beta_{plm}^*, f^*) = \operatorname{argmin}_{(\beta, f) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathcal{F}} \mathbb{E} \left[(Y - X^\top\beta - f(Z))^2 \right]$. Then

$$f^* = \operatorname{argmin}_{f \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathcal{F}} \mathbb{E} \left[(Y - X^\top\beta_{plm}^* - f(Z))^2 \right].$$

By bias-variance decomposition, we have $f^*(Z) = \mathbb{E} \left[Y - X^\top\beta_{plm}^* \mid Z \right]$. On the other hand,

$$\beta_{plm}^* = \operatorname{argmin}_{\beta \in \mathbb{R}^d} \mathbb{E} \left[(Y - X^\top\beta - f^*(Z))^2 \right].$$

By first order optimality, we have $\beta_{plm}^* = \mathbb{E}[\tilde{X}\tilde{X}^\top]^{-1}\mathbb{E}[X\tilde{Y}]$, where $\tilde{X} = X - \mathbb{E}[X | Z]$ and $\tilde{Y} = Y - \mathbb{E}[Y | Z]$. Then it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}[\epsilon | Z] &= \mathbb{E}[Y - X^\top \beta_{plm}^* - f^*(Z) | Z] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[Y - X^\top \beta_{plm}^* | Z] - f^*(Z) = 0,\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}[X\epsilon] &= \mathbb{E}\left[\left(\tilde{X} + \mathbb{E}[X | Z]\right) \left(\tilde{Y} + \mathbb{E}[Y | Z] - \left(\tilde{X} + \mathbb{E}[X | Z]\right)^\top \beta_{plm}^* - f^*(Z)\right)\right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}\left[\left(\tilde{X} + \mathbb{E}[X | Z]\right) \left(\tilde{Y} - \tilde{X}^\top \beta_{plm}^*\right)\right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}\left[\tilde{X} \left(\tilde{Y} - \tilde{X}^\top \beta_{plm}^*\right)\right] + \mathbb{E}\left[\mathbb{E}[X | Z] \left(\tilde{Y} - \tilde{X}^\top \beta_{plm}^*\right)\right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}\left[\tilde{X}\tilde{Y}\right] - \mathbb{E}\left[X\tilde{Y}\right] + \mathbb{E}\left[\mathbb{E}[X | Z] \mathbb{E}\left[\tilde{Y} - \tilde{X}^\top \beta_{plm}^* | Z\right]\right] \\ &= -\mathbb{E}\left[\mathbb{E}[X | Z] \mathbb{E}\left[\tilde{Y} | Z\right]\right] + \mathbb{E}\left[\mathbb{E}[X | Z] \mathbb{E}\left[\tilde{Y} - \tilde{X}^\top \beta_{plm}^* | Z\right]\right] \\ &= \mathbf{0},\end{aligned}$$

where the last equation comes from the fact that $\mathbb{E}[\tilde{X} | Z] = \mathbf{0}$ and $\mathbb{E}[\tilde{Y} | Z] = 0$. \square

Lemma A.3. *Suppose that Assumption 5 holds. It holds that*

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\Gamma \exp(-X^\top \alpha_{PS}^*) X X^\top\right] \succcurlyeq k_0 c_0 \kappa_l \mathbf{I}_d, \quad (13)$$

which implies the identifiability of α_{PS}^* and β_{OR}^* .

Proof. By Assumption 5,

$$\exp(-X^\top \alpha_{PS}^*) = \frac{1 - g(X^\top \alpha_{PS}^*)}{g(X^\top \alpha_{PS}^*)} \geq k_0 \frac{1 - \gamma_n}{\gamma_n} \geq k_0 c_0 \gamma_n^{-1}.$$

Thus,

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\Gamma \exp(-X^\top \alpha_{PS}^*) X X^\top\right] \succcurlyeq k_0 c_0 \gamma_n^{-1} \mathbb{E}\left[\Gamma X X^\top\right] = k_0 c_0 \mathbb{E}\left[X X^\top | \Gamma = 1\right] \succcurlyeq k_0 c_0 \kappa_l \mathbf{I}_d.$$

Thus, the strongly convex optimization guarantees the identifiability of α_{PS}^* and β_{OR}^* . \square

B Consistency of nuisance estimators

In this section, we discuss the consistency of nuisance estimators in Section 2.1 and Section 3.1. Let the sparsity levels of β^* , α_{PS}^* , and β_{OR}^* be s , s_α , and s_β , respectively. Proposition B.1 and Proposition B.2 below characterizes the convergence rates of the Lasso estimator $\widehat{\beta}^{(-k)}$ and nuisance estimators $\widehat{\alpha}_{PS}^{(-k)}$ and $\widehat{\beta}_{OR}^{(-k)}$.

The proposition below demonstrates the convergence rate of the Lasso estimator under MCAR.

Proposition B.1. *Suppose that Assumptions 1 and 2 hold. Choose $\lambda_n \asymp \sqrt{\log d / (n\gamma_n)}$. If $n\gamma_n \gg \max\{s, (\log n)^2\} \log d$, then as $n, d \rightarrow \infty$, $\left\| \widehat{\beta}^{(-k)} - \beta^* \right\|_2 = O_p\left(\sqrt{s \log d / (n\gamma_n)}\right)$.*

To obtain the product sparsity condition under MAR, we define the oracle outcome estimator as

$$\widetilde{\beta}_{OR}^{(-k)} = \operatorname{argmin}_{\beta \in \mathbb{R}^d} \left\{ M^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{-k, \beta}} \Gamma_i \exp(-X_i^\top \alpha_{PS}^*) (Y_i - X_i^\top \beta)^2 + \lambda_\beta \|\beta\|_1 \right\}.$$

The following proposition gives the convergence rate for nuisance estimators under MAR.

Proposition B.2. *Suppose that Assumption 5 holds. Then as $n, d \rightarrow \infty$, it holds that*

(a) *Choose $\lambda_\alpha \asymp \sqrt{\log d / (n\gamma_n)}$. If $n\gamma_n \gg \max\{s_\alpha, \log n\} \log d$, then*

$$\left\| \widehat{\alpha}_{PS}^{(-k)} - \alpha_{PS}^* \right\|_1 = O_p\left(s_\alpha \sqrt{\frac{\log d}{n\gamma_n}}\right) \quad \text{and} \quad \left\| \widehat{\alpha}_{PS}^{(-k)} - \alpha_{PS}^* \right\|_2 = O_p\left(\sqrt{\frac{s_\alpha \log d}{n\gamma_n}}\right).$$

(b) *Choose $\lambda_\beta \asymp \sqrt{\log d / (n\gamma_n)}$. If $n\gamma_n \gg \max\{s_\beta, (\log n)^2\} \log d$, then*

$$\left\| \widetilde{\beta}_{OR}^{(-k)} - \beta_{OR}^* \right\|_2 = O_p\left(\sqrt{\frac{s_\beta \log d}{n\gamma_n}}\right) \quad \text{and} \quad \left\| \widetilde{\beta}_{OR}^{(-k)} - \beta_{OR}^* \right\|_1 = O_p\left(s_\beta \sqrt{\frac{\log d}{n\gamma_n}}\right).$$

(c) *Choose $\lambda_\alpha \asymp \lambda_\beta \asymp \sqrt{\log d / (n\gamma_n)}$. If $n\gamma_n \gg \max\{s_\alpha, s_\beta \log n, (\log n)^2\} \log d$ and $s_\alpha s_\beta \ll (n\gamma_n)^{3/2} / (\log n (\log d)^2)$, then*

$$\left\| \widehat{\beta}_{OR}^{(-k)} - \widetilde{\beta}_{OR}^{(-k)} \right\|_1 = O_p\left(\sqrt{\frac{s_\alpha s_\beta \log d}{n\gamma_n}}\right) \quad \text{and} \quad \left\| \widehat{\beta}_{OR}^{(-k)} - \widetilde{\beta}_{OR}^{(-k)} \right\|_2 = O_p\left(\sqrt{\frac{s_\alpha \log d}{n\gamma_n}}\right).$$

C Proof of propositions in Section B

C.1 Auxiliary lemmas for Proposition B.1

Lemma C.1. *The following are some useful properties regarding the ψ_α -norms.*

(a) *Let $X, Y \in \mathbb{R}$ be random variables. If $|X| \leq |Y|$ a.s., then $\|X\|_{\psi_2} \leq \|Y\|_{\psi_2}$. If $|X| \leq C$ a.s. for some constant $C > 0$, then $\|X\|_{\psi_2} \leq \{\log(2)\}^{-1/2}C$.*

(b) *Let $X \in \mathbb{R}$ be a random variable. If $\|X\|_{\psi_2} \leq \sigma$, then $\mathbb{P}(|X| > t) \leq 2 \exp(-t^2/\sigma^2)$ for all $t \geq 0$.*

(c) *Let $X \in \mathbb{R}$ be a random variable. If $\|X\|_{\psi_\alpha} \leq \sigma$ for some $(\alpha, \sigma) > 0$, then $\mathbb{E}(|X|^m) \leq C_\alpha^m \sigma^m m^{m/\alpha}$ for all $m \geq 1$, for some constant C_α depending only on α . In particular, if $\|X\|_{\psi_2} \leq \sigma$, $\mathbb{E}(|X|^m) \leq 2\sigma^m \Gamma(m/2 + 1)$, for all $m \geq 1$, where $\Gamma(a) := \int_0^\infty x^{a-1} \exp(-x) dx$ denotes the Gamma function. Hence, $\mathbb{E}(|X|) \leq \sigma\sqrt{\pi}$ and $\mathbb{E}(|X|^m) \leq 2\sigma^m (m/2)^{m/2}$ for $m \geq 2$.*

(d) *Let $X, Y \in \mathbb{R}$ be random variables. For any $\alpha, \beta > 0$, let $\gamma := (\alpha^{-1} + \beta^{-1})^{-1}$. Then, for any X, Y with $\|X\|_{\psi_\alpha} < \infty$ and $\|Y\|_{\psi_\beta} < \infty$, $\|XY\|_{\psi_\gamma} < \infty$ and $\|XY\|_{\psi_\gamma} < \|X\|_{\psi_\alpha} \|Y\|_{\psi_\beta}$.*

(e) *Let $X \in \mathbb{R}^d$ be a random vector with $\sup_{1 \leq j \leq d} \|X[j]\|_{\psi_\alpha} \leq \sigma$. Then, $\|X\|_\infty \|X\|_{\psi_\alpha} \leq \sigma \{\log(d) + 2\}^{1/\alpha}$.*

(f) *Let $X \in \mathbb{R}$ be a random variable. If $\|X\|_{\psi_2} \leq \sigma$, then $\mathbb{E}[\exp(tX)] \leq \exp(C\sigma^2 t^2)$ for some constant C and any $t \in \mathbb{R}$.*

Lemma C.1(a)-(e) follow from Lemma D.1 of [Chakraborty et al. \(2019\)](#), and Lemma C.1(f) follows from Proposition 2.5.2 of [Vershynin \(2018\)](#).

Lemma C.2. *Let $(X_N)_{N \geq 1}$ and $(Y_N)_{N \geq 1}$ be sequences of random variables in \mathbb{R} . If*

$$\mathbb{E}(|X_N|^r | Y_N) = O_p(1) \quad \text{for some } r \geq 1,$$

then $X_N = O_p(1)$.

Lemma C.2 follows from Lemma D.1 of Zhang et al. (2023a).

Lemma C.3. For $\Gamma_i \stackrel{i.i.d.}{\sim} \text{Bernoulli}(\gamma_n)$, it holds that

(a) For any $t > 0$, we have that

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\left| n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \Gamma_i - \gamma_n \right| \leq 2\sqrt{\frac{t\gamma_n}{n}} + \frac{t}{n} \right) \leq 1 - 2e^{-t}.$$

(b) Specifically, for $0 < t < 0.01n\gamma_n$, we have that

$$0.79\gamma_n \leq n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \Gamma_i \leq 1.21\gamma_n,$$

with probability at least $1 - 2e^{-t}$.

In addition, (a) and (b) hold for $1 - \Gamma_i$ with γ_n replaced by $1 - \gamma_n$.

Lemma C.3 follows from Lemma F.2 of Zhang et al. (2023b).

Lemma C.4. Suppose X_1, \dots, X_n are independent mean zero random vectors in \mathbb{R}^d such that for some $\alpha > 0$ and $K_{n,d} > 0$,

$$\max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \max_{1 \leq j \leq d} \|X_i(j)\|_{\psi_\alpha} \leq K_{n,d} \text{ and } \Gamma_{n,d} := \max_{1 \leq j \leq d} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E} [X_i^2(j)].$$

Then for any $t \geq 0$, with probability at least $1 - 3e^{-t}$,

$$\left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n X_i \right\|_\infty \leq 7\sqrt{\frac{\Gamma_{n,d}(t + \log d)}{n}} + \frac{C_\alpha K_{n,d} (\log(2n))^{1/\alpha} (t + \log d)^{1/\alpha^*}}{n},$$

where $\alpha^* := \min\{\alpha, 1\}$ and $C_\alpha > 0$ is some constant depending only on α .

Lemma C.4 follows from Theorem 3.4 of Kuchibhotla and Chakraborty (2022).

Lemma C.5. Suppose that Assumptions 1 and 2 hold. Then, there exist some constants $\kappa_1, \kappa_2, C_1, C_2, c_1, c_2 > 0$ such that for any $\Delta \in \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}$, if $n\gamma_n > \max\{C_1, C_2 \log n \log d\}$,

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\frac{n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \Gamma_i (X_i^\top \Delta)^2}{n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \Gamma_i} \geq \kappa_1 \|\Delta\|_2^2 - \kappa_2 \frac{\log d}{n\gamma_n} \|\Delta\|_1^2 \right) \geq 1 - c_1 e^{-c_2 n\gamma_n}.$$

Proof. By Lemma F.1 of Zhang et al. (2023b), for $a = 1, v = 0, \phi(\cdot) \equiv 1$, there exists some constant $\kappa_0, \kappa'_1, \kappa'_2, C_1, c'_1, c'_2 > 0$ such that when $n\gamma_n > C_1 \max\{1, \log n \log d\}$, for any $\Delta \in \mathbb{R}^d$ with $\|\Delta\|_2 \leq \kappa_0$,

$$n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \Gamma_i (X_i^\top \Delta)^2 \geq \gamma_n \left(\kappa'_1 \|\Delta\|_2^2 - \kappa'_2 \frac{\log d}{n\gamma_n} \|\Delta\|_1^2 \right),$$

with probability at least $1 - c'_1 e^{-c'_2 n\gamma_n}$.

Let $c_2 = \min\{0.01, c'_2\}$. Together with Lemma C.3, it holds that

$$\frac{n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \Gamma_i (X_i^\top \Delta)^2}{n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \Gamma_i} \geq \frac{\kappa'_1}{1.21} \|\Delta\|_2^2 - \frac{\kappa'_2 \log d}{0.79 n\gamma_n} \|\Delta\|_1^2,$$

with probability at least $1 - (c'_1 + 2)e^{-c_2 n\gamma_n}$.

Since for any $\Delta \in \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}$, we have $\left\| \frac{\kappa_0 \Delta}{\|\Delta\|_2} \right\|_2 \leq \kappa_0$. Let $\kappa_1 = \kappa'_1/1.21$, $\kappa_2 = \kappa'_2/0.79$, and $c_1 = c'_1 + 2$. Thus, for any $\Delta \in \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}$,

$$\frac{n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \Gamma_i (X_i^\top \Delta)^2}{n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \Gamma_i} \geq \kappa_1 \|\Delta\|_2^2 - \kappa_2 \frac{\log d}{n\gamma_n} \|\Delta\|_1^2,$$

with probability at least $1 - c_1 e^{-c_2 n\gamma_n}$. □

Lemma C.6. *Suppose that Assumptions 1 and 2 hold. If $d > 1$ and $n\gamma_n > (\log n)^2 \log d$, then for any $0 < t < \frac{n\gamma_n}{100 + (\log n)^2 \log d}$, there exists some constants $\kappa_3 > 0$ such that*

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\left\| \frac{n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \Gamma_i w_i X_i}{n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \Gamma_i} \right\|_\infty > \kappa_3 \sqrt{\frac{t + \log d}{n\gamma_n}} \right) \leq 5e^{-t}.$$

Proof. By Lemma A.1, we have $\mathbb{E}[X_i w_i] = \mathbf{0} \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Then, under Assumption 1, we have $\mathbb{E}[\Gamma_i X_i w_i] = \mathbf{0}$. Under Assumption 2, by Lemma C.1(a) and (d), we have

$$\sup_{j=1, \dots, d} \|\Gamma_i w_i X_i[j]\|_{\psi_1} \leq \sup_{j=1, \dots, d} \|w_i\|_{\psi_2} \|X_i[j]\|_{\psi_2} \leq \sigma \sigma_w.$$

Then by Lemma C.1(c), there exists some constant C_1 such that

$$\sup_{j=1, \dots, d} \mathbb{E}[(\Gamma_i w_i X_i[j])^2] \leq C_1 \sigma^2 \sigma_w^2 \gamma_n.$$

Thus, by Lemma C.4, for some constants $C_2 > 0$,

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\left\| n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \Gamma_i w_i X_i \right\|_{\infty} > 7C_1 \sigma \sigma_w \sqrt{\frac{\gamma_n(t + \log d)}{n}} + C_2 \sigma \sigma_w \frac{(t + \log d) \log n}{n} \right) \leq 3e^{-t}.$$

Together with Lemma C.3, for $0 < t < \frac{n\gamma_n}{100 + (\log n)^2 \log d}$, we have

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\left\| \frac{n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \Gamma_i w_i X_i}{n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \Gamma_i} \right\|_{\infty} > \kappa_1 \sqrt{\frac{t + \log d}{n\gamma_n}} + \kappa_2 \frac{(t + \log d) \log n}{n\gamma_n} \right) \leq 5e^{-t},$$

where $\kappa_1 = 7C_1 \sigma \sigma_w / 0.79$ and $\kappa_2 = C_2 \sigma \sigma_w / 0.79$.

In addition, if $n\gamma_n > (\log n)^2 \log d$, we have

$$\frac{(t + \log d) \log n}{n\gamma_n} < \sqrt{\frac{t + \log d}{n\gamma_n}} \sqrt{\frac{(\log n)^2}{100 + (\log n)^2 \log d} + \frac{(\log n)^2 \log d}{n\gamma_n}}.$$

Let $\kappa_3 = \kappa_1 + \kappa_2 \sqrt{(\log 2)^{-1} + 1}$, we have

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\left\| \frac{n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \Gamma_i w_i X_i}{n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \Gamma_i} \right\|_{\infty} > \kappa_3 \sqrt{\frac{t + \log d}{n\gamma_n}} \right) \leq 5e^{-t}.$$

□

C.2 Proof of Proposition B.1

Proof. Define the Lagrangian function

$$\mathcal{L}(\beta; \mathcal{I}_{-k}, \mathcal{D}_n) = \frac{\sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{-k}} \Gamma_i (Y_i - X_i^\top \beta)^2}{\sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{-k}} \Gamma_i} + \lambda_n \|\beta\|_1.$$

By definition, we have $\mathcal{L}(\widehat{\beta}^{(-k)}; \mathcal{I}_{-k}, \mathcal{D}_n) \leq \mathcal{L}(\beta^*; \mathcal{I}_{-k}, \mathcal{D}_n)$, i.e.,

$$\frac{\sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{-k}} \Gamma_i (Y_i - X_i^\top \widehat{\beta}^{(-k)})^2}{\sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{-k}} \Gamma_i} + \lambda_n \|\widehat{\beta}^{(-k)}\|_1 \leq \frac{\sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{-k}} \Gamma_i (Y_i - X_i^\top \beta^*)^2}{\sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{-k}} \Gamma_i} + \lambda_n \|\beta^*\|_1.$$

Rearranging it and let $\widehat{\Delta}^{(-k)} = \widehat{\beta}^{(-k)} - \beta^*$, we have

$$\frac{\sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{-k}} \Gamma_i (X_i^\top \widehat{\Delta}^{(-k)})^2}{\sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{-k}} \Gamma_i} \leq \frac{2 \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{-k}} \Gamma_i w_i X_i^\top \widehat{\Delta}^{(-k)}}{\sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{-k}} \Gamma_i} + \lambda_n \left(\|\beta^*\|_1 - \|\widehat{\beta}^{(-k)}\|_1 \right).$$

Note that

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\beta^*\|_1 - \|\widehat{\beta}^{(-k)}\|_1 &= \|\beta^*\|_1 - \|\widehat{\Delta}^{(-k)} + \beta^*\|_1 \\
&= \|\beta^*\|_1 - \|\widehat{\Delta}_S^{(-k)} + \beta^*\|_1 - \|\widehat{\Delta}_{S^c}^{(-k)}\|_1 \\
&\leq \|\widehat{\Delta}_S^{(-k)}\|_1 - \|\widehat{\Delta}_{S^c}^{(-k)}\|_1.
\end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

Thus,

$$\frac{\sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{-k}} \Gamma_i \left(X_i^\top \widehat{\Delta}^{(-k)} \right)^2}{\sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{-k}} \Gamma_i} \leq 2 \left\| \frac{\sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{-k}} \Gamma_i w_i X_i}{\sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{-k}} \Gamma_i} \right\|_\infty \left(\|\widehat{\Delta}^{(-k)}\|_1 + \lambda_n \left(\|\widehat{\Delta}_S^{(-k)}\|_1 - \|\widehat{\Delta}_{S^c}^{(-k)}\|_1 \right) \right). \tag{15}$$

By Lemma C.5 and Lemma C.6, there exist some constants $\kappa_1, \kappa_2, \kappa_3, C_1, C_2, c'_1, c'_2 > 0$ such that if $|\mathcal{I}_{-k}| \gamma_n > \max \{ C_1, C_2 \log |\mathcal{I}_{-k}| \log d, (\log |\mathcal{I}_{-k}|)^2 \log d \}$, for any $0 < t < \frac{|\mathcal{I}_{-k}| \gamma_n}{100 + (\log |\mathcal{I}_{-k}|)^2 \log d}$, with probability at least $1 - c'_1 e^{-c'_2 |\mathcal{I}_{-k}| \gamma_n} - 5e^{-t}$, the following statements hold simultaneously:

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{|\mathcal{I}_{-k}|^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{-k}} \Gamma_i (X_i^\top \widehat{\Delta}^{(-k)})^2}{|\mathcal{I}_{-k}|^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{-k}} \Gamma_i} &\geq \kappa_1 \|\widehat{\Delta}^{(-k)}\|_2^2 - \kappa_2 \frac{\log d}{|\mathcal{I}_{-k}| \gamma_n} \|\widehat{\Delta}^{(-k)}\|_1^2, \\
\left\| \frac{|\mathcal{I}_{-k}|^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{-k}} \Gamma_i w_i X_i}{|\mathcal{I}_{-k}|^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{-k}} \Gamma_i} \right\|_\infty &\leq \kappa_3 \sqrt{\frac{t + \log d}{|\mathcal{I}_{-k}| \gamma_n}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Let $\lambda_n = 4\kappa_3 \sqrt{\frac{t + \log d}{|\mathcal{I}_{-k}| \gamma_n}}$. Then we have

$$\frac{\sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{-k}} \Gamma_i (X_i^\top \widehat{\Delta}^{(-k)})^2}{\sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{-k}} \Gamma_i} \geq \kappa_1 \|\widehat{\Delta}^{(-k)}\|_2^2 - \kappa_2 \frac{\log d}{|\mathcal{I}_{-k}| \gamma_n} \|\widehat{\Delta}^{(-k)}\|_1^2, \tag{16}$$

$$\lambda_n = 4\kappa_3 \sqrt{\frac{t + \log d}{|\mathcal{I}_{-k}| \gamma_n}} \geq 4 \left\| \frac{\sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{-k}} \Gamma_i w_i X_i}{\sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{-k}} \Gamma_i} \right\|_\infty. \tag{17}$$

By (15) and (17),

$$0 \leq \frac{\lambda_n}{2} \left(3 \|\widehat{\Delta}_S^{(-k)}\|_1 - \|\widehat{\Delta}_{S^c}^{(-k)}\|_1 \right),$$

which implies that $\|\widehat{\Delta}_{S^c}^{(-k)}\|_1 \leq 3 \|\widehat{\Delta}_S^{(-k)}\|_1$. Then,

$$\|\widehat{\Delta}^{(-k)}\|_1 \leq 4 \|\widehat{\Delta}_S^{(-k)}\|_1 \leq 4\sqrt{s} \|\widehat{\Delta}^{(-k)}\|_2.$$

By (15), (16), and (17), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \widehat{\Delta}^{(-k)} \right\|_2^2 &\leq \frac{6\kappa_3}{\kappa_1} \sqrt{\frac{t + \log d}{|\mathcal{I}_{-k}| \gamma_n}} \left\| \widehat{\Delta}_S^{(-k)} \right\|_1 + \frac{\kappa_2}{\kappa_1} \frac{\log d}{|\mathcal{I}_{-k}| \gamma_n} \left\| \widehat{\Delta}^{(-k)} \right\|_1^2 \\ &\leq \frac{6\kappa_3}{\kappa_1} \sqrt{\frac{st + s \log d}{|\mathcal{I}_{-k}| \gamma_n}} \left\| \widehat{\Delta}^{(-k)} \right\|_2 + \frac{16\kappa_2}{\kappa_1} \frac{s \log d}{|\mathcal{I}_{-k}| \gamma_n} \left\| \widehat{\Delta}^{(-k)} \right\|_2^2. \end{aligned}$$

Then if $|\mathcal{I}_{-k}| \gamma_n > \max \{32(\kappa_1)^{-1} \kappa_2 s \log d, C_1, C_2 \log |\mathcal{I}_{-k}| \log d, (\log |\mathcal{I}_{-k}|)^2 \log d\}$, for any $0 < t < \frac{|\mathcal{I}_{-k}| \gamma_n}{100 + (\log |\mathcal{I}_{-k}|)^2 \log d}$, it holds that with probability at least $1 - c'_1 e^{-c'_2 |\mathcal{I}_{-k}| \gamma_n} - 5e^{-t}$,

$$\left\| \widehat{\Delta}^{(-k)} \right\|_2 \leq \frac{12\kappa_3}{\kappa_1} \sqrt{\frac{st + s \log d}{|\mathcal{I}_{-k}| \gamma_n}}.$$

It follows that, if $n\gamma_n \gg (s \vee (\log n)^2) \log d$ and $\lambda_n \asymp \sqrt{\log d / (n\gamma_n)}$, as $n, d \rightarrow \infty$,

$$\left\| \widehat{\beta}^{(-k)} - \beta^* \right\|_2 = O_p \left(\sqrt{\frac{s \log d}{n\gamma_n}} \right).$$

□

C.3 Auxiliary lemmas for Proposition B.2

Define

$$\begin{aligned} l_{1,i}(\alpha) &:= (1 - \Gamma_i) \bar{X}_0^\top \alpha + \Gamma_i \exp(-X_i^\top \alpha), \\ l_{2,i}(\alpha, \beta) &:= \Gamma_i \exp(-X_i^\top \alpha) (Y_i - X_i^\top \beta)^2. \end{aligned}$$

We define the empirical summations of $l_{1,i}(\alpha)$ and $l_{2,i}(\alpha, \beta)$ as

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{l}_1^{(-k)}(\alpha) &:= M^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{-k, \alpha}} l_{1,i}(\alpha), \\ \bar{l}_2^{(-k)}(\alpha, \beta) &:= M^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{-k, \beta}} l_{2,i}(\alpha, \beta). \end{aligned}$$

In addition, for any $\Delta \in \mathbb{R}^d$, we define

$$\begin{aligned} \delta \bar{l}_1^{(-k)}(\alpha, \Delta) &:= \bar{l}_1^{(-k)}(\alpha + \Delta) - \bar{l}_1^{(-k)}(\alpha) - \nabla_\alpha \bar{l}_1^{(-k)}(\alpha)^\top \Delta, \\ \delta \bar{l}_2^{(-k)}(\alpha, \beta, \Delta) &:= \bar{l}_2^{(-k)}(\alpha, \beta + \Delta) - \bar{l}_2^{(-k)}(\alpha, \beta) - \nabla_\beta \bar{l}_2^{(-k)}(\alpha, \beta)^\top \Delta. \end{aligned}$$

Lemma C.7. For any index set $A \subseteq [n]$, let $\mathcal{M}_A := \{(1 - \Gamma_j)X_j \mid j \in A\}$, $\mathcal{D}_A := \{(\Gamma_j, \Gamma_j X_j, \Gamma_j Y_j) \mid j \in A\}$, and $\Gamma_A := \{\Gamma_j \mid j \in A\}$. It holds that

- (a) For any $A_1, A_2 \subseteq [n]$ and $B_1 \subseteq [n] \setminus A_1$, $\mathcal{D}_{A_1} \perp \mathcal{M}_{A_2} \mid \Gamma_{A_1}$ and $\mathcal{D}_{A_1} \perp \mathcal{D}_{B_1} \mid \Gamma_{A_1}$.
- (b) Let f_1 be any function of $\mathcal{M}_{[n]}$ and $\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{I}-k}$, then $f_1(\mathcal{M}_{[n]}, \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{I}-k}) \perp \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{I}k} \mid \Gamma_{\mathcal{I}k}$.
- (c) Let f_2 be any function of $\mathcal{M}_{[n]}$ and $\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{I}-k,\alpha}$, then $f_2(\mathcal{M}_{[n]}, \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{I}-k,\alpha}) \perp \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{I}-k,\beta} \mid \Gamma_{\mathcal{I}-k,\beta}$.
- (d) Let f_3 be any function of $\mathcal{M}_{[n]}$, $\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{I}-k,\alpha}$, and $\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{I}-k,\beta}$, then $f_3(\mathcal{M}_{[n]}, \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{I}-k,\alpha}, \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{I}-k,\beta}) \perp \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{I}k} \mid \Gamma_{\mathcal{I}k}$.

Proof. (a) For $\mathcal{D}_{A_1} \perp \mathcal{M}_{A_2} \mid \Gamma_{A_1}$, it suffices to prove that for each $i \in [n]$, $(1 - \Gamma_i)X_i \perp \mathcal{D}_n \mid \Gamma_i$. If $\Gamma_i = 1$, $(1 - \Gamma_i)X_i = 0$, which is conditional independent of \mathcal{D}_n . If $\Gamma_i = 0$, then $\mathcal{D}_n = \{(\Gamma_j, \Gamma_j X_j, \Gamma_j Y_j) \mid j \in [n] \setminus \{i\}\} \cup \{(0, 0, 0)\}$, which is conditionally independent of $(1 - \Gamma_i)X_i$. Thus, $(1 - \Gamma_i)X_i \perp \mathcal{D}_n \mid \Gamma_i$ for any $i = 1, \dots, n$. In addition, since $\Gamma_{A_1} \subset \mathcal{D}_{A_1}$ and $\mathcal{D}_{A_1} \perp \mathcal{D}_{B_1}$ when $A_1 \cap B_1 = \emptyset$, we have that $\mathcal{D}_{A_1} \perp \mathcal{D}_{B_1} \mid \Gamma_{A_1}$ holds true.

(b), (c), (d) follow directly from (a). \square

Lemma C.8. Suppose that $\mathbf{S}' = (\mathbf{U}_i)_{i \in \mathcal{J}}$ are independent and identically distributed sub-Gaussian random vectors, i.e., $\|\mathbf{a}^\top \mathbf{U}\|_{\psi_2} \leq \sigma_{\mathbf{U}} \|\mathbf{a}\|_2$ for all $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ with some constant $\sigma_{\mathbf{U}} > 0$. Additionally, suppose the smallest eigenvalue of $\mathbb{E}(\mathbf{U}\mathbf{U}^\top)$ is bounded below by some constant $\lambda_{\mathbf{U}} > 0$. Let $M = |\mathcal{J}|$. For any continuous function $\phi : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow (0, \infty)$, $v \in [0, 1]$, and $\boldsymbol{\eta} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ satisfying $\mathbb{E}\{|\mathbf{U}^\top \boldsymbol{\eta}|^c\} < C$ with some constants $c, C > 0$, there exists constants $\kappa_1, \kappa_2, c_1, c_2 > 0$, such that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{S}'} \left(M^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{J}} \phi(\mathbf{U}_i^\top (\boldsymbol{\eta} + v \boldsymbol{\Delta})) (\mathbf{U}_i^\top \boldsymbol{\Delta})^2 \geq \kappa_1 \|\boldsymbol{\Delta}\|_2^2 - \kappa_2 \frac{\log d}{M} \|\boldsymbol{\Delta}\|_1^2, \quad \forall \|\boldsymbol{\Delta}\|_2 \leq 1 \right) \\ \geq 1 - c_1 \exp -c_2 M. \end{aligned}$$

Lemma C.8 follows from Lemma C.5 of [Zhang et al. \(2021\)](#).

Lemma C.9. *Suppose that Assumption 5 holds. Then there exist some constants $\kappa_1, \kappa_2, c_1, c_2 > 0$ such that*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P} \left(\delta \bar{l}_1(\alpha^*, \Delta) \geq \kappa_1 \|\Delta\|_2^2 - \kappa_2 \frac{\log d}{M\gamma_n} \|\Delta\|_1^2, \forall \|\Delta\|_2 \leq 1 \right) \\ \geq 1 - c_1 \exp(-c_2 M\gamma_n). \end{aligned}$$

Proof. By Taylor's theorem, with some $t_1 \in (0, 1)$,

$$\delta \bar{l}_1(\alpha^*, \Delta) = \frac{1}{2} M^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{-k, \alpha}} \Gamma_i \exp(-X_i^\top \alpha^* - t_1 X_i^\top \Delta) (X_i^\top \Delta)^2. \quad (18)$$

Let $\hat{\gamma}_{-k, \alpha} = M^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{-k, \alpha}} \Gamma_i$ and

$$L_1 = M^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{-k, \alpha}} \Gamma_i \exp(-t_1 X_i^\top \Delta) (X_i^\top \Delta)^2.$$

Under Assumption 5(a), since $\exp(-X_i^\top \alpha^*) = (1 - g(X_i^\top \alpha^*)) / g(X_i^\top \alpha^*)$, we have

$$k_0 c_0 \gamma_n^{-1} \leq k_0 \frac{1 - \gamma_n}{\gamma_n} \leq \exp(-X_i^\top \alpha^*) \leq k_0^{-1} \frac{1 - \gamma_n}{\gamma_n} \leq k_0^{-1} \gamma_n^{-1}, \quad (19)$$

which implies

$$\delta \bar{l}_1(\alpha^*, \Delta) \geq \frac{k_0 c_0}{2} \gamma_n^{-1} L_1. \quad (20)$$

By Lemma C.8,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P} \left(\hat{\gamma}_{-k, \alpha}^{-1} L_1 \geq \kappa_1 \|\Delta\|_2^2 - \kappa_2 \frac{\log d}{M \hat{\gamma}_{-k, \alpha}} \|\Delta\|_1^2, \forall \|\Delta\|_2 \leq 1 \mid \Gamma_{\mathcal{I}_{-k, \alpha}} \right) \\ \geq 1 - c_1 \exp(-c_2 M \hat{\gamma}_{-k, \alpha}). \end{aligned}$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{P} \left(\widehat{\gamma}_{-k,\alpha}^{-1} L_1 < \kappa_1 \|\Delta\|_2^2 - \kappa_2 \frac{\log d}{M \widehat{\gamma}_{-k,\alpha}} \|\Delta\|_1^2, \forall \|\Delta\|_2 \leq 1 \right) \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{P} \left(\widehat{\gamma}_{-k,\alpha}^{-1} L_1 < \kappa_1 \|\Delta\|_2^2 - \kappa_2 \frac{\log d}{M \widehat{\gamma}_{-k,\alpha}} \|\Delta\|_1^2, \forall \|\Delta\|_2 \leq 1 \mid \Gamma_{\mathcal{I}_{-k,\alpha}} \right) \right] \\
&\leq \mathbb{E} [c_1 \exp(-c_2 M \widehat{\gamma}_{-k,\alpha})] \\
&\stackrel{(i)}{=} c_1 (1 - \gamma_n + \gamma_n e^{-c_2})^M \\
&\stackrel{(ii)}{\leq} c_1 \exp \{ - (1 - e^{-c_2}) M \gamma_n \},
\end{aligned}$$

where (i) uses the fact that the moment generating function of binomial distribution $B(n, p)$ is $(1 - p + pe^t)^n$, and (ii) uses the inequality $1 - t \leq e^{-t}$. By Lemma C.3, for $0 < t < 0.01M\gamma_n$,

$$\mathbb{P}(0.79\gamma_n \leq \widehat{\gamma}_{-k,\alpha} \leq 1.21\gamma_n) \geq 1 - 2e^{-t}.$$

Together we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{P} \left(L_1 < 0.79\gamma_n \left\{ \kappa_1 \|\Delta\|_2^2 - \kappa_2 \frac{\log d}{0.79M\gamma_n} \|\Delta\|_1^2 \right\}, \forall \|\Delta\|_2 \leq 1 \right) \\
&\leq \mathbb{P} \left(\widehat{\gamma}_{-k,\alpha}^{-1} L_1 < \kappa_1 \|\Delta\|_2^2 - \kappa_2 \frac{\log d}{M \widehat{\gamma}_{-k,\alpha}} \|\Delta\|_1^2, \forall \|\Delta\|_2 \leq 1 \right) \\
&\quad + \mathbb{P} \left(\left| \frac{\widehat{\gamma}_{-k,\alpha}}{\gamma_n} - 1 \right| > 0.21 \right) \\
&\leq c_1 \exp \{ - (1 - e^{-c_2}) M \gamma_n \} + 2 \exp(-0.009M\gamma_n).
\end{aligned}$$

Let $\kappa'_1 = 2 \cdot 0.79\kappa_1$, $\kappa'_2 = 2\kappa_2$, $c'_1 = c_1 + 2$, $c'_2 = (1 - e^{-c_2}) \wedge 0.009$, we have

$$\mathbb{P} \left(L_1 \geq \frac{\gamma_n}{2} \left\{ \kappa'_1 \|\Delta\|_2^2 - \kappa'_2 \frac{\log d}{M\gamma_n} \|\Delta\|_1^2 \right\}, \forall \|\Delta\|_2 \leq 1 \right) \geq 1 - c'_1 \exp(-c'_2 M \gamma_n).$$

With (20), it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{P} \left(\delta \bar{l}_1(\alpha^*, \Delta) \geq \frac{k_0 c_0}{4} \left\{ \kappa'_1 \|\Delta\|_2^2 - \kappa'_2 \frac{\log d}{M\gamma_n} \|\Delta\|_1^2 \right\}, \forall \|\Delta\|_2 \leq 1 \right) \\
&\geq 1 - c'_1 \exp(-c'_2 M \gamma_n).
\end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma C.10. *Suppose that Assumption 5 holds. Then there exist some constants $c_1, C_1, C_2 > 0$ such that if $M\gamma_n > C_1 \log M \log d$, for any $0 < t < C_2 M\gamma_n / \log M$,*

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\left\| \nabla_{\alpha} \bar{l}_1(\alpha^*) \right\|_{\infty} \leq c \sqrt{\frac{t + \log d}{M\gamma_n}} \right) \geq 1 - 13 \exp(-t).$$

Proof. Define

$$l_{1,i}^*(\alpha) = (1 - \Gamma_i) X_i^{\top} \alpha + \Gamma_i \exp(-X_i^{\top} \alpha),$$

$$\bar{l}_1^*(\alpha) = M^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{-k,\alpha}} l_{1,i}^*(\alpha).$$

Then

$$\nabla_{\alpha} \bar{l}_1^*(\alpha^*) = M^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{-k,\alpha}} \{1 - \Gamma_i - \Gamma_i \exp(-X_i^{\top} \alpha^*)\} X_i.$$

First, we show that there exists some constant $c > 0$ such that if $M\gamma_n > \log M \log d$, for any $0 < t < 0.01 M\gamma_n / \log M$,

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\left\| \nabla_{\alpha} \bar{l}_1^*(\alpha^*) \right\|_{\infty} > c \sqrt{\frac{t + \log d}{M\gamma_n}} \right) \leq 3 \exp(-t).$$

Since $\alpha^* = \operatorname{argmin}_{\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^d} \mathbb{E}[l_{1,i}^*(\alpha^*)]$, by first order optimality we have

$$\mathbb{E} [\{1 - \Gamma_i - \Gamma_i \exp(-X_i^{\top} \alpha^*)\} X_i] = \mathbf{0}.$$

Denote the k -th element of X_i by $X_i^{\top} e_k$, then by (19),

$$|\{1 - \Gamma_i - \Gamma_i \exp(-X_i^{\top} \alpha^*)\} X_i^{\top} e_k| \leq (1 + k_0^{-1} \gamma_n^{-1}) |X_i^{\top} e_k|.$$

By Lemma C.1(a),

$$\begin{aligned} & \max_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{-k,\alpha}} \max_{1 \leq k \leq d} \left\| \left\{ 1 - \Gamma_i (g(X_i^{\top} \alpha^*))^{-1} \right\} X_i^{\top} e_k \right\|_{\psi_2} \\ & \leq \max_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{-k,\alpha}} \max_{1 \leq k \leq d} \left(1 + k_0^{-1} \frac{1 - \gamma_n}{\gamma_n} \right) \|X_i^{\top} e_k\|_{\psi_2} \leq (1 + k_0^{-1} \gamma_n^{-1}) \sigma. \end{aligned}$$

By (19),

$$k_0^2 c_0^2 \gamma_n^{-2} \leq \exp(-2X_i^\top \alpha^*) \leq k_0^{-2} \gamma_n^{-2}. \quad (21)$$

Thus, by Assumption 5(b) and Lemma C.1 (c),

$$\begin{aligned} &= \mathbb{E} \left[\left\{ 1 - \Gamma_i - \Gamma_i \exp(-X_i^\top \alpha^*) \right\}^2 (X_i^\top e_k)^2 \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\left\{ 1 - \Gamma_i + \Gamma_i \exp(-2X_i^\top \alpha^*) \right\} (X_i^\top e_k)^2 \right] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E} \left[(X_i^\top e_k)^2 \right] + k_0^{-2} \gamma_n^{-2} \mathbb{E} \left[\Gamma_i (X_i^\top e_k)^2 \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[(X_i^\top e_k)^2 \right] + k_0^{-2} \gamma_n^{-1} \mathbb{E} \left[(X_i^\top e_k)^2 \mid \Gamma_i = 1 \right] \\ &\leq 2(1 + k_0^{-2} \gamma_n^{-1}) \sigma^2, \end{aligned}$$

which implies

$$\max_{1 \leq k \leq d} M^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{-k, \alpha}} \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\left\{ 1 - \Gamma_i (g(X_i^\top \alpha^*))^{-1} \right\} X_i^\top e_k \right)^2 \right] \leq 2(1 + k_0^{-2} \gamma_n^{-1}) \sigma^2.$$

By Lemma C.4, for some constant $C > 0$, with probability at least $1 - 3 \exp(-t)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla_{\alpha} \bar{l}_1^*(\alpha^*)\|_{\infty} &\leq 7 \sqrt{\frac{2(1 + k_0^{-2} \gamma_n^{-1}) \sigma^2 (t + \log d)}{M}} \\ &\quad + \frac{C(1 + k_0^{-1} \gamma_n^{-1}) \sigma (t + \log d) \sqrt{\log(2M)}}{M}. \end{aligned}$$

Let $c_1 = 7 \sqrt{2(1 + k_0^{-2}) \sigma^2}$ and $c_2 = C(1 + k_0^{-1}) \sigma \sqrt{2}$. Then with probability at least $1 - 3 \exp(-t)$,

$$\|\nabla_{\alpha} \bar{l}_1^*(\alpha^*)\|_{\infty} \leq c_1 \sqrt{\frac{t + \log d}{M \gamma_n}} + c_2 \frac{(t + \log d) \sqrt{\log M}}{M \gamma_n}.$$

If $M\gamma_n > \log M \log d$ and $0 < t < 0.01M\gamma_n/\log M$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& c_1 \sqrt{\frac{t + \log d}{M\gamma_n}} + c_2 \frac{(t + \log d) \sqrt{\log M}}{M\gamma_n} \\
&= c_1 \sqrt{\frac{t + \log d}{M\gamma_n}} + c_2 \sqrt{\frac{t + \log d}{M\gamma_n}} \sqrt{\frac{t \log M}{M\gamma_n} + \frac{\log d \log M}{M\gamma_n}} \\
&\leq c_1 \sqrt{\frac{t + \log d}{M\gamma_n}} + c_2 \sqrt{\frac{t + \log d}{M\gamma_n}} \sqrt{\frac{0.01M\gamma_n \log M}{M\gamma_n \log M}} + 1 \\
&\leq c_3 \sqrt{\frac{t + \log d}{M\gamma_n}}, \tag{22}
\end{aligned}$$

where $c_3 = \max\{c_1, c_2\sqrt{1.01}\}$. Thus, we have

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\|\nabla_{\alpha} \bar{l}_1^*(\alpha^*)\|_{\infty} > c_3 \sqrt{\frac{t + \log d}{M\gamma_n}}\right) \leq 3 \exp(-t).$$

Now we back to this lemma. Note that

$$\begin{aligned}
\nabla_{\alpha} \bar{l}_1(\alpha^*) - \nabla_{\alpha} \bar{l}_1^*(\alpha^*) &= M^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{-k, \alpha}} (1 - \Gamma_i) (\bar{X}_0 - X_i) \\
&= (1 - \hat{\gamma}_{-k, \alpha}) (\bar{X}_0 - \mathbb{E}[X_i | \Gamma_i = 0]) \\
&\quad - M^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{-k, \alpha}} (1 - \Gamma_i) (X_i - \mathbb{E}[X_i | \Gamma_i = 0]) \\
&= B_1 - B_2,
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$B_1 = (1 - \hat{\gamma}_{-k, \alpha}) (1 - \hat{\gamma})^{-1} n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (1 - \Gamma_i) (X_i - \mathbb{E}[X_i | \Gamma_i = 0]),$$

$$B_2 = M^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{-k, \alpha}} (1 - \Gamma_i) (X_i - \mathbb{E}[X_i | \Gamma_i = 0]).$$

For B_2 ,

$$\mathbb{E}[(1 - \Gamma_i) (X_i - \mathbb{E}[X_i | \Gamma_i = 0])] = (1 - \gamma_n) \mathbb{E}[(X_i - \mathbb{E}[X_i | \Gamma_i = 0]) | \Gamma_i = 0] = \mathbf{0}.$$

By Lemma C.1(a) and (c), there exists some constant C_1 such that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \max_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{-k, \alpha}} \max_{1 \leq k \leq d} \left\| (1 - \Gamma_i) (X_i^\top e_k - \mathbb{E} [X_i^\top e_k \mid \Gamma_i = 0]) \right\|_{\psi_2} \\
& \leq \max_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{-k, \alpha}} \max_{1 \leq k \leq d} \left\| X_i^\top e_k - \mathbb{E} [X_i^\top e_k \mid \Gamma_i = 0] \right\|_{\psi_2} \\
& \leq \max_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{-k, \alpha}} \max_{1 \leq k \leq d} \left\| X_i^\top e_k \right\|_{\psi_2} + \left\| \mathbb{E} [X_i^\top e_k \mid \Gamma_i = 0] \right\|_{\psi_2} \leq C_1 \sigma.
\end{aligned}$$

Also by Lemma C.1(c), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} \left[\left\{ (1 - \Gamma_i) (X_i^\top e_k - \mathbb{E} [X_i^\top e_k \mid \Gamma_i = 0]) \right\}^2 \right] \\
& = \mathbb{E} \left[(1 - \Gamma_i) (X_i^\top e_k - \mathbb{E} [X_i^\top e_k \mid \Gamma_i = 0])^2 \right] \\
& = (1 - \gamma_n) \mathbb{E} \left[(X_i^\top e_k - \mathbb{E} [X_i^\top e_k \mid \Gamma_i = 0])^2 \mid \Gamma_i = 0 \right] \\
& \leq \mathbb{E} \left[(X_i^\top e_k)^2 \mid \Gamma_i = 0 \right] \leq 2\sigma^2,
\end{aligned}$$

which implies

$$\max_{1 \leq k \leq d} M^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{-k, \alpha}} \mathbb{E} \left[\left\{ (1 - \Gamma_i) (X_i^\top e_k - \mathbb{E} [X_i^\top e_k \mid \Gamma_i = 0]) \right\}^2 \right] \leq 2\sigma^2.$$

By Lemma C.4, with probability at least $1 - 3 \exp(-t)$,

$$\|B_2\|_\infty \leq 7 \sqrt{\frac{2\sigma^2 (t + \log d)}{M}} + \frac{CC_1 \sigma (t + \log d) \sqrt{\log(2M)}}{M}.$$

If $M > \log M \log d$ and $0 < t < 0.01M / \log M$, with identical analysis to (22), there exists some constant $c_4 > 0$ such that

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\|B_2\|_\infty > c_4 \sqrt{\frac{t + \log d}{M}} \right) \leq 3 \exp(-t).$$

For B_1 , let

$$B_{1a} = n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (1 - \Gamma_i) (X_i - \mathbb{E} [X_i \mid \Gamma_i = 0]).$$

Similar to B_2 , if $n > \log n \log d$ and $0 < t < 0.01n / \log n$, there exists some constant $c_5 > 0$ such that

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\|B_{1a}\|_\infty > c_5 \sqrt{\frac{t + \log d}{n}} \right) \leq 3 \exp(-t).$$

By Lemma C.3, for any $0 < t < 0.01M\gamma_n$, we have

$$\mathbb{P}(0.79(1 - \gamma_n) \leq 1 - \widehat{\gamma}_{-k,\alpha} \leq 1.21(1 - \gamma_n)) \geq 1 - 2\exp(-t),$$

and for any $0 < t < 0.01n\gamma_n$, we have

$$\mathbb{P}(0.79(1 - \gamma_n) \leq 1 - \widehat{\gamma} \leq 1.21(1 - \gamma_n)) \geq 1 - 2\exp(-t).$$

Define events $\mathcal{A}_1(t)$, $\mathcal{A}_2(t)$, $\mathcal{A}_3(t)$ as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A}_1(t) &:= \left\{ \|B_{1a}\|_\infty \leq c_5 \sqrt{\frac{t + \log d}{n}} \right\}, \\ \mathcal{A}_2(t) &:= \{0.79(1 - \gamma_n) \leq 1 - \widehat{\gamma}_{-k,\alpha} \leq 1.21(1 - \gamma_n)\}, \\ \mathcal{A}_3(t) &:= \{0.79(1 - \gamma_n) \leq 1 - \widehat{\gamma} \leq 1.21(1 - \gamma_n)\}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $M = (K - 1)n / (2K)$, there exists some constant $C'_1 > 0$ and $0 < C'_2 \leq 0.01$ such that if $M > C'_1 \log M \log d$, we have $M > \log M \log d$ and $n > \log n \log d$, which implies $C'_2 M \gamma_n / \log M < 0.01n\gamma_n / \log n$. Since

$$B_1 = (1 - \widehat{\gamma}_{-k,\alpha})(1 - \widehat{\gamma})^{-1} n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (1 - \Gamma_i)(X_i - \mathbb{E}[X_i | \Gamma_i = 0]),$$

If $M > C'_1 \log M \log d$, for any $0 < t < C'_2 M \gamma_n / \log M$, on event $\mathcal{A}_1(t) \cap \mathcal{A}_2(t) \cap \mathcal{A}_3(t)$, we have

$$\|B_1\|_\infty \leq \frac{1.21(1 - \gamma_n)}{0.79(1 - \gamma_n)} c_5 \sqrt{\frac{t + \log d}{n}}.$$

Let $c_6 = \frac{1.21}{0.79} c_5$. Thus, if $M > C'_1 \log M \log d$, for any $0 < t < C'_2 M \gamma_n / \log M$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\left(\|B_1\|_\infty \leq c_6 \sqrt{\frac{t + \log d}{n}}\right) &\geq \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A}_1 \cap \mathcal{A}_2 \cap \mathcal{A}_3) \\ &\geq 1 - \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A}_1^c) - \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A}_2^c) - \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A}_3^c) \\ &\geq 1 - 7\exp(-t). \end{aligned}$$

In addition, define events $\mathcal{B}_1(t), \mathcal{B}_2(t), \mathcal{B}_3(t)$ as

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{B}_1(t) &:= \left\{ \|\nabla_{\alpha} \bar{l}_1(\alpha^*)\|_{\infty} \leq c_3 \sqrt{\frac{t + \log d}{M\gamma_n}} \right\}, \\ \mathcal{B}_2(t) &:= \left\{ \|B_2\|_{\infty} \leq c_4 \sqrt{\frac{t + \log d}{M}} \right\}, \\ \mathcal{B}_3(t) &:= \left\{ \|B_1\|_{\infty} \leq c_6 \sqrt{\frac{t + \log d}{n}} \right\}.\end{aligned}$$

Note that

$$\begin{aligned}\nabla_{\alpha} \bar{l}_1(\alpha^*) &= \nabla_{\alpha} \bar{l}_1(\alpha^*) - \nabla_{\alpha} \bar{l}_1^*(\alpha^*) + \nabla_{\alpha} \bar{l}_1^*(\alpha^*) \\ &= B_1 - B_2 + \nabla_{\alpha} \bar{l}_1^*(\alpha^*).\end{aligned}$$

If $M > C'_1 \log M \log d$, for any $0 < t < C'_2 M\gamma_n / \log M$, on event $\mathcal{B}_1(t) \cap \mathcal{B}_2(t) \cap \mathcal{B}_3(t)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\|\nabla_{\alpha} \bar{l}_1(\alpha^*)\|_{\infty} &\leq \|B_1\|_{\infty} + \|B_2\|_{\infty} + \|\nabla_{\alpha} \bar{l}_1^*(\alpha^*)\|_{\infty} \\ &\leq c_6 \sqrt{\frac{t + \log d}{n}} + c_4 \sqrt{\frac{t + \log d}{M}} + c_3 \sqrt{\frac{t + \log d}{M\gamma_n}} \\ &\leq c_6 \frac{K-1}{2K} \sqrt{\frac{t + \log d}{M\gamma_n}} + c_4 \sqrt{\frac{t + \log d}{M\gamma_n}} + c_3 \sqrt{\frac{t + \log d}{M\gamma_n}} \\ &\leq c'_1 \sqrt{\frac{t + \log d}{M\gamma_n}},\end{aligned}$$

where $c'_1 = c_6/2 + c_4 + c_3$. Thus, if $M\gamma_n > C'_1 \log M \log d$, for any $0 < t < C'_2 M\gamma_n / \log M$,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\|\nabla_{\alpha} \bar{l}_1(\alpha^*)\|_{\infty} \leq c'_1 \sqrt{\frac{t + \log d}{M\gamma_n}}\right) \geq 1 - 13 \exp(-t).$$

□

Lemma C.11. *Suppose that Assumption 5 holds. For any $0 < t < 0.01M\gamma_n / \log M$, choose $\lambda_{\alpha} \asymp \sqrt{\frac{t + \log d}{M\gamma_n}}$. If $M\gamma_n > C \max\{s_{\alpha}, \log M\} (t + \log d)$ for some constant $C > 0$, then there exist some constants $c_1, c_2 > 0$ such that*

$$\mathbb{P}(\|\hat{\alpha} - \alpha^*\|_2 \leq 1) \geq 1 - c_1 \exp(-c_2 M\gamma_n) - 13 \exp(-t).$$

Proof. By the construction of $\widehat{\alpha}$, we have

$$\bar{l}_1(\widehat{\alpha}) + \lambda_\alpha \|\widehat{\alpha}\|_1 \leq \bar{l}_1(\alpha^*) + \lambda_\alpha \|\alpha^*\|_1.$$

Let $\widehat{\Delta}_\alpha = \widehat{\alpha} - \alpha^*$. Then we have

$$\bar{l}_1(\alpha^* + \widehat{\Delta}_\alpha) - \bar{l}_1(\alpha^*) - \nabla_\alpha \bar{l}_1(\alpha^*)^\top \widehat{\Delta}_\alpha + \nabla_\alpha \bar{l}_1(\alpha^*)^\top \widehat{\Delta}_\alpha + \lambda_\alpha (\|\widehat{\alpha}\|_1 - \|\alpha^*\|_1) \leq 0,$$

which implies

$$\delta \bar{l}_1(\alpha^*, \widehat{\Delta}_\alpha) + \lambda_\alpha \left(\|\alpha^* + \widehat{\Delta}_\alpha\|_1 - \|\alpha^*\|_1 \right) \leq -\nabla_\alpha \bar{l}_1(\alpha^*)^\top \widehat{\Delta}_\alpha.$$

Since

$$\begin{aligned} \|\alpha^* + \widehat{\Delta}_\alpha\|_1 &= \|\alpha^* + \widehat{\Delta}_{\alpha, S_\alpha}\|_1 + \|\widehat{\Delta}_{\alpha, S_\alpha^c}\|_1 \\ &\geq \|\alpha^*\|_1 - \|\widehat{\Delta}_{\alpha, S_\alpha}\|_1 + \|\widehat{\Delta}_{\alpha, S_\alpha^c}\|_1 \\ &= \|\alpha^*\|_1 - 2\|\widehat{\Delta}_{\alpha, S_\alpha}\|_1 + \|\widehat{\Delta}_\alpha\|_1 \\ &\geq \|\alpha^*\|_1 - 2\sqrt{s_\alpha} \|\widehat{\Delta}_{\alpha, S_\alpha}\|_2 + \|\widehat{\Delta}_\alpha\|_1 \\ &\geq \|\alpha^*\|_1 - 2\sqrt{s_\alpha} \|\widehat{\Delta}_\alpha\|_2 + \|\widehat{\Delta}_\alpha\|_1, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$-\nabla_\alpha \bar{l}_1(\alpha^*)^\top \widehat{\Delta}_\alpha \leq \|\nabla_\alpha \bar{l}_1(\alpha^*)\|_\infty \|\widehat{\Delta}_\alpha\|_1,$$

we have

$$\delta \bar{l}_1(\alpha^*, \widehat{\Delta}_\alpha) \leq (\|\nabla_\alpha \bar{l}_1(\alpha^*)\|_\infty - \lambda_\alpha) \|\widehat{\Delta}_\alpha\|_1 + 2\lambda_\alpha \sqrt{s_\alpha} \|\widehat{\Delta}_\alpha\|_2.$$

Define events $\mathcal{C}_1, \mathcal{C}_2(t)$ as

$$\mathcal{C}_1 := \left\{ \delta \bar{l}_1(\alpha^*, \Delta) \geq \kappa_1 \|\Delta\|_2^2 - \kappa_2 \frac{\log d}{M\gamma_n} \|\Delta\|_1^2, \forall \|\Delta\|_2 \leq 1 \right\}, \quad (23)$$

$$\mathcal{C}_2(t) := \left\{ \|\nabla_\alpha \bar{l}_1(\alpha^*)\|_\infty \leq c \sqrt{\frac{t + \log d}{M\gamma_n}} \right\}. \quad (24)$$

For $0 < t < C_1 M \gamma_n / \log M$, if $M \gamma_n > C_2 \log M \log d$ for some constant $C_1, C_2 > 0$, By Lemma C.9 and Lemma C.10, we have

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{C}_1 \cap \mathcal{C}_2(t)) \geq 1 - c_1 \exp(-c_2 M \gamma_n) - 13 \exp(-t). \quad (25)$$

Choose $\lambda_\alpha \geq 2c \sqrt{\frac{t + \log d}{M \gamma_n}}$. On event $\mathcal{C}_2(t)$, we have

$$\|\nabla_\alpha \bar{l}_1(\alpha^*)\|_\infty \leq \frac{\lambda_\alpha}{2},$$

which implies

$$\delta \bar{l}_1(\alpha^*, \widehat{\Delta}_\alpha) + \frac{\lambda_\alpha}{2} \|\widehat{\Delta}_\alpha\|_1 - 2\lambda_\alpha \sqrt{s_\alpha} \|\widehat{\Delta}_\alpha\|_2 \leq 0.$$

Define

$$F(\Delta; \alpha^*) = \delta \bar{l}_1(\alpha^*, \Delta) + \frac{\lambda_\alpha}{2} \|\Delta\|_1 - 2\lambda_\alpha \sqrt{s_\alpha} \|\Delta\|_2. \quad (26)$$

Then $F(\widehat{\Delta}_\alpha; \alpha^*) \leq 0$ on event $\mathcal{C}_2(t)$.

Now we show by contradiction that when n is large enough, $\|\widehat{\Delta}_\alpha\|_2 \leq 1$ on event $\mathcal{C}_1 \cap \mathcal{C}_2(t)$. Suppose that $\eta_\alpha^{-1} = \|\widehat{\Delta}_\alpha\|_2 > 1$. Let

$$\widetilde{\Delta}_\alpha = \widehat{\Delta}_\alpha / \|\widehat{\Delta}_\alpha\|_2 = \eta_\alpha \widehat{\Delta}_\alpha + (1 - \eta_\alpha) \mathbf{0}.$$

Then $\|\widetilde{\Delta}_\alpha\|_2 = 1$. By (18), $\delta \bar{l}_1(\alpha^*, \widetilde{\Delta}_\alpha) \geq 0$. Since $\delta \bar{l}_1(\alpha^*, \Delta) = \bar{l}_1(\alpha^* + \Delta) - \bar{l}_1(\alpha^*) - \nabla_\alpha \bar{l}_1(\alpha^*)^\top \Delta$ is a convex function of Δ , it is clear that $F(\Delta; \alpha^*)$ is also a convex function of Δ . Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\lambda_\alpha}{2} \|\widetilde{\Delta}_\alpha\|_1 - 2\lambda_\alpha \sqrt{s_\alpha} \|\widetilde{\Delta}_\alpha\|_2 &\leq F(\widetilde{\Delta}_\alpha; \alpha^*) = F(\eta_\alpha \widehat{\Delta}_\alpha + (1 - \eta_\alpha) \mathbf{0}; \alpha^*) \\ &\leq \eta_\alpha F(\widehat{\Delta}_\alpha; \alpha^*) + (1 - \eta_\alpha) F(\mathbf{0}; \alpha^*) \\ &= \eta_\alpha F(\widehat{\Delta}_\alpha; \alpha^*) \leq 0. \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

It follows that

$$\left\| \tilde{\Delta}_\alpha \right\|_1 \leq 4\sqrt{s_\alpha} \left\| \tilde{\Delta}_\alpha \right\|_2 = 4\sqrt{s_\alpha}. \quad (28)$$

Therefore, on event \mathcal{C}_1 we have

$$\begin{aligned} F\left(\tilde{\Delta}_\alpha; \alpha^*\right) &= \delta \bar{l}_1\left(\alpha^*, \tilde{\Delta}_\alpha\right) + \frac{\lambda_\alpha}{2} \left\| \tilde{\Delta}_\alpha \right\|_1 - 2\lambda_\alpha \sqrt{s_\alpha} \left\| \tilde{\Delta}_\alpha \right\|_2 \\ &\geq \kappa_1 \left\| \tilde{\Delta}_\alpha \right\|_2^2 - \kappa_2 \frac{\log d}{M\gamma_n} \left\| \tilde{\Delta}_\alpha \right\|_1^2 + \frac{\lambda_\alpha}{2} \left\| \tilde{\Delta}_\alpha \right\|_1 - 2\lambda_\alpha \sqrt{s_\alpha} \left\| \tilde{\Delta}_\alpha \right\|_2 \\ &\geq \kappa_1 - 2\lambda_\alpha \sqrt{s_\alpha} - \kappa_2 \frac{\log d}{M\gamma_n} \left\| \tilde{\Delta}_\alpha \right\|_1^2 \\ &\geq \frac{\kappa_1}{2} - 2\lambda_\alpha \sqrt{s_\alpha} - 16\kappa_2 \frac{s_\alpha \log d}{M\gamma_n}. \end{aligned}$$

Choose $\lambda_\alpha = 2c\sqrt{\frac{t+\log d}{M\gamma_n}}$. For any $0 < t < C_1 M\gamma_n / \log M$, if

$$\frac{M\gamma_n}{s_\alpha(t+\log d)} > \max\left\{128\frac{\kappa_2}{\kappa_1}, 128\frac{c^2}{\kappa_1}\right\},$$

then

$$F\left(\tilde{\Delta}_\alpha; \alpha^*\right) \geq \frac{\kappa_1}{2} - 4c\sqrt{\frac{s_\alpha(t+\log d)}{M\gamma_n}} - 16\kappa_2 \frac{s_\alpha \log d}{M\gamma_n} \geq \frac{\kappa_1}{2} - \frac{\kappa_1}{8} - \frac{\kappa_1}{8} = \frac{\kappa_1}{4} > 0,$$

which contradicts with (27). It follows that $\left\| \hat{\Delta}_\alpha \right\|_2 \leq 1$ on event $\mathcal{C}_1 \cap \mathcal{C}_2(t)$ and

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\left\| \hat{\Delta}_\alpha \right\|_2 \leq 1\right) \geq \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{C}_1 \cap \mathcal{C}_2(t)) \geq 1 - c_1 \exp(-c_2 M\gamma_n) - 13 \exp(-t). \quad (29)$$

□

Lemma C.12. *Suppose that Assumption 5 holds. Then there exist some constants $\kappa'_1, \kappa'_2, c'_1, c'_2 > 0$ such that for any $\beta \in \mathbb{R}^d$,*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\left(\delta \bar{l}_2(\alpha^*, \beta, \Delta) \geq \kappa'_1 \|\Delta\|_2^2 - \kappa'_2 \frac{\log d}{M\gamma_n} \|\Delta\|_1^2, \forall \|\Delta\|_2 \in \mathbb{R}^d\right) \\ \geq 1 - c'_1 \exp(-c'_2 M\gamma_n). \end{aligned}$$

Proof. By Taylor's theorem,

$$\delta\bar{l}_2(\alpha^*, \beta, \Delta) = M^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{-k, \beta}} \Gamma_i \exp(-X_i^\top \alpha^*) (X_i^\top \Delta)^2. \quad (30)$$

Then by (19),

$$\delta\bar{l}_2(\alpha^*, \beta, \Delta) \geq k_0 c_0 \gamma_n^{-1} L_2, \quad (31)$$

where

$$L_2 = M^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{-k, \beta}} \Gamma_i (X_i^\top \Delta)^2.$$

Let $\hat{\gamma}_{-k, \beta} = M^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{-k, \beta}} \Gamma_i$. Under Assumption 5(b), by Lemma C.8 we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P} \left(\hat{\gamma}_{-k, \beta}^{-1} L_2 \geq \kappa_1 \|\Delta\|_2^2 - \kappa_2 \frac{\log d}{M \hat{\gamma}_{-k, \beta}} \|\Delta\|_1^2, \forall \|\Delta\|_2 \in \mathbb{R}^d \mid \Gamma_{\mathcal{I}_{-k, \beta}} \right) \\ \geq 1 - c_1 \exp(-c_2 M \hat{\gamma}_{-k, \beta}). \end{aligned}$$

With identical analysis to (20), we have that for some constants $\kappa'_1, \kappa'_2, c'_1, c'_2 > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P} \left(\delta\bar{l}_2(\alpha^*, \beta, \Delta) \geq \frac{k_0 c_0}{2} \left\{ \kappa'_1 \|\Delta\|_2^2 - \kappa'_2 \frac{\log d}{M \gamma_n} \|\Delta\|_1^2 \right\}, \forall \|\Delta\|_2 \in \mathbb{R}^d \right) \\ \geq 1 - c'_1 \exp(-c'_2 M \gamma_n). \end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma C.13. *Suppose that Assumption 5 holds. If $M\gamma_n > (\log M)^2 \log d$, then for any $0 < t < 0.01M\gamma_n / (\log M)^2$, there exists some constant $c > 0$ such that*

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\left\| \nabla_{\beta} \bar{l}_2(\alpha^*, \beta_{OR}^*) \right\|_{\infty} \leq c \sqrt{\frac{t + \log d}{M \gamma_n}} \right) \geq 1 - 3 \exp(-t).$$

Proof. Let $w_{OR, i} = Y_i - X_i^\top \beta_{OR}^*$. For simplicity, we ignore the subscript OR in this proof.

Then

$$\nabla_{\beta} \bar{l}_2(\alpha^*, \beta^*) = -2M^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{-k, \beta}} \Gamma_i \exp(-X_i^\top \alpha^*) w_i X_i.$$

First, by the construction of β^* we have

$$\mathbb{E} [\Gamma_i \exp(-X_i^\top \alpha^*) w_i X_i] = \mathbf{0}.$$

Under Assumption 5, by (19) and Lemma C.1(d), for any $1 \leq k \leq d$,

$$\| -2\Gamma_i \exp(-X_i^\top \alpha^*) w_i X_i^\top e_k \|_{\psi_1} \leq 2k_0^{-1} \frac{1-\gamma_n}{\gamma_n} \|w_i\|_{\psi_2} \|X_i^\top e_k\|_{\psi_2} \leq 2k_0^{-1} \frac{1-\gamma_n}{\gamma_n} \sigma_w \sigma,$$

which implies

$$\max_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{-k, \beta}} \max_{1 \leq k \leq d} \| -2\Gamma_i \exp(-X_i^\top \alpha^*) w_i X_i^\top e_k \|_{\psi_1} \leq 2k_0^{-1} \frac{1-\gamma_n}{\gamma_n} \sigma_w \sigma.$$

Moreover, by (21) and Lemma C.1 (c),

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[\left\{ -2\Gamma_i \exp(-X_i^\top \alpha^*) w_i X_i^\top e_k \right\}^2 \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[4\Gamma_i \exp(-2X_i^\top \alpha^*) (w_i X_i^\top e_k)^2 \right] \\ &\leq 4k_0^{-2} \left(\frac{1-\gamma_n}{\gamma_n} \right)^2 \mathbb{E} \left[\Gamma_i (w_i X_i^\top e_k)^2 \right] \\ &= 4k_0^{-2} \frac{(1-\gamma_n)^2}{\gamma_n} \mathbb{E} \left[(w_i X_i^\top e_k)^2 \mid \Gamma_i = 1 \right] \\ &\leq 4k_0^{-2} \frac{(1-\gamma_n)^2}{\gamma_n} \mathbb{E} [w_i^4 \mid \Gamma_i = 1]^{1/2} \mathbb{E} \left[(X_i^\top e_k)^4 \mid \Gamma_i = 1 \right]^{1/2} \\ &\leq 4k_0^{-2} C_2 \sigma_w^2 \sigma^2 \frac{(1-\gamma_n)^2}{\gamma_n}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$\max_{1 \leq k \leq d} M^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{-k, \beta}} \mathbb{E} \left[\left\{ -2\Gamma_i \exp(-X_i^\top \alpha^*) w_i X_i^\top e_k \right\}^2 \right] \leq 4k_0^{-2} C_2 \sigma_w^2 \sigma^2 \frac{(1-\gamma_n)^2}{\gamma_n}.$$

By Lemma C.4, there exist some constants $c_1, c_2 > 0$ such that with probability at least

$1 - 3 \exp(-t)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla_{\beta} \bar{l}_2(\alpha^*, \beta^*)\|_\infty &\leq (1-\gamma_n) \left\{ c_1 \sqrt{\frac{t + \log d}{M\gamma_n}} + c_2 \frac{(t + \log d) \log M}{M\gamma_n} \right\} \\ &\leq c_0 \left\{ c_1 \sqrt{\frac{t + \log d}{M\gamma_n}} + c_2 \frac{(t + \log d) \log M}{M\gamma_n} \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

If $M\gamma_n > (\log M)^2 \log d$, then for any $0 < t < 0.01M\gamma_n/(\log M)^2$,

$$\begin{aligned} c_1 \sqrt{\frac{t + \log d}{M\gamma_n}} + c_2 \frac{(t + \log d) \log M}{M\gamma_n} &= \left(c_1 + c_2 \sqrt{\frac{t (\log M)^2}{M\gamma_n} + \frac{\log d (\log M)^2}{M\gamma_n}} \right) \sqrt{\frac{t + \log d}{M\gamma_n}} \\ &\leq (c_1 + c_2 \sqrt{2}) \sqrt{\frac{t + \log d}{M\gamma_n}}. \end{aligned}$$

Let $c_3 = c_0(c_1 + c_2\sqrt{2})$, we have

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\left\| \nabla_{\beta} \bar{l}_2(\alpha^*, \beta^*) \right\|_{\infty} \leq c_3 \sqrt{\frac{t + \log d}{M\gamma_n}} \right) \geq 1 - 3 \exp(-t).$$

□

Lemma C.14. *If $\lambda_{\beta} > \max \left\{ 2 \left\| \nabla_{\beta} \bar{l}_2(\alpha^*, \beta^*) \right\|_{\infty}, 2 \left\| \nabla_{\beta} \bar{l}_2(\hat{\alpha}, \tilde{\beta}) \right\|_{\infty} \right\}$, then*

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \tilde{\beta}_{OR} - \beta_{OR}^* \right\|_1 &\leq 4\sqrt{s_{\beta}} \left\| \tilde{\beta}_{OR} - \beta_{OR}^* \right\|_2, \\ \left\| \hat{\beta}_{OR} - \tilde{\beta}_{OR} \right\|_1 &\leq 4\sqrt{s_{\tilde{\beta}}} \left\| \hat{\beta}_{OR} - \tilde{\beta}_{OR} \right\|_2, \end{aligned}$$

where $s_{\tilde{\beta}} = \left\| \tilde{\beta}_{OR} \right\|_0$.

Proof. For simplicity, we ignore the subscript OR in this proof. By the construction of $\tilde{\beta}$,

$$\bar{l}_2(\alpha^*, \tilde{\beta}) + \lambda_{\beta} \left\| \tilde{\beta} \right\|_1 \leq \bar{l}_2(\alpha^*, \beta^*) + \lambda_{\beta} \left\| \beta^* \right\|_1.$$

Let $\tilde{\Delta}_{\beta} = \tilde{\beta} - \beta^*$ and $w_i = Y_i - X_i^{\top} \beta^*$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} M^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{-k, \beta}} \Gamma_i \exp(-X_i^{\top} \alpha^*) \left(X_i^{\top} \tilde{\Delta}_{\beta} \right)^2 &\leq 2M^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{-k, \beta}} \Gamma_i \exp(-X_i^{\top} \alpha^*) w_i \left(X_i^{\top} \tilde{\Delta}_{\beta} \right) \\ &\quad + \lambda_{\beta} \left(\left\| \beta^* \right\|_1 - \left\| \tilde{\beta} \right\|_1 \right). \end{aligned} \tag{32}$$

Let S_{β} be the support of β^* . Similar to (14), we have

$$\left\| \beta^* \right\|_1 - \left\| \tilde{\beta} \right\|_1 \leq \left\| \tilde{\Delta}_{\beta, S_{\beta}} \right\|_1 - \left\| \tilde{\Delta}_{\beta, S_{\beta}^c} \right\|_1.$$

If $\lambda_\beta \geq 2 \left\| \nabla_{\beta} \bar{l}_2(\alpha^*, \beta^*) \right\|_\infty$, then

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &\leq 2M^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{-k, \beta}} \Gamma_i \exp(-X_i^\top \alpha^*) w_i \left(X_i^\top \tilde{\Delta}_\beta \right) + \lambda_\beta \left(\|\beta^*\|_1 - \left\| \tilde{\beta} \right\|_1 \right) \\
&\leq \left\| \nabla_{\beta} \bar{l}_2(\alpha^*, \beta^*) \right\|_\infty \left\| \tilde{\Delta}_\beta \right\|_1 + \lambda_\beta \left(\left\| \tilde{\Delta}_{\beta, S_\beta} \right\|_1 - \left\| \tilde{\Delta}_{\beta, S_\beta^c} \right\|_1 \right) \\
&\leq \frac{\lambda_\beta}{2} \left\| \tilde{\Delta}_\beta \right\|_1 + \lambda_\beta \left(\left\| \tilde{\Delta}_{\beta, S_\beta} \right\|_1 - \left\| \tilde{\Delta}_{\beta, S_\beta^c} \right\|_1 \right) \\
&= \frac{3\lambda_\beta}{2} \left\| \tilde{\Delta}_{\beta, S_\beta} \right\|_1 - \frac{\lambda_\beta}{2} \left\| \tilde{\Delta}_{\beta, S_\beta^c} \right\|_1,
\end{aligned}$$

which implies $\left\| \tilde{\Delta}_{\beta, S_\beta^c} \right\|_1 \leq 3 \left\| \tilde{\Delta}_{\beta, S_\beta} \right\|_1$. Thus,

$$\left\| \tilde{\Delta}_\beta \right\|_1 = \left\| \tilde{\Delta}_{\beta, S_\beta^c} \right\|_1 + \left\| \tilde{\Delta}_{\beta, S_\beta} \right\|_1 \leq 4 \left\| \tilde{\Delta}_{\beta, S_\beta} \right\|_1 \leq 4\sqrt{s_\beta} \left\| \tilde{\Delta}_\beta \right\|_2.$$

In addition, for (32), by the analysis above we also have

$$\begin{aligned}
M^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{-k, \beta}} \Gamma_i \exp(-X_i^\top \alpha^*) \left(X_i^\top \tilde{\Delta}_\beta \right)^2 &\leq \frac{3\lambda_\beta}{2} \left\| \tilde{\Delta}_{\beta, S_\beta} \right\|_1 - \frac{\lambda_\beta}{2} \left\| \tilde{\Delta}_{\beta, S_\beta^c} \right\|_1 \\
&\leq \frac{3\lambda_\beta}{2} \left\| \tilde{\Delta}_{\beta, S_\beta} \right\|_1 \leq \frac{3\lambda_\beta \sqrt{s_\beta}}{2} \left\| \tilde{\Delta}_\beta \right\|_2. \tag{33}
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, for $\Delta = \hat{\beta} - \tilde{\beta}$, consider the construction of $\hat{\beta}$. If $\lambda_\beta \geq 2 \left\| \nabla_{\beta} \bar{l}_2(\hat{\alpha}, \tilde{\beta}) \right\|_\infty$, then

$$\|\Delta\|_1 \leq 4\sqrt{s_{\tilde{\beta}}} \|\Delta\|_2.$$

□

Lemma C.15. *Suppose that Assumption 5 holds. Then as $n, d \rightarrow \infty$, it holds that*

(a) *Choose $\lambda_\alpha \asymp \sqrt{\log d / (n\gamma_n)}$. If $n\gamma_n \gg \max\{s_\alpha, \log n\} \log d$, then*

$$\left\| \hat{\alpha}_{PS} - \alpha_{PS}^* \right\|_2 = O_p \left(\sqrt{\frac{s_\alpha \log d}{n\gamma_n}} \right) \quad \text{and} \quad \left\| \hat{\alpha}_{PS} - \alpha_{PS}^* \right\|_1 = O_p \left(s_\alpha \sqrt{\frac{\log d}{n\gamma_n}} \right).$$

(b) *Choose $\lambda_\beta \asymp \sqrt{\log d / (n\gamma_n)}$. If $n\gamma_n \gg \max\{s_\beta, (\log n)^2\} \log d$, then*

$$\left\| \tilde{\beta}_{OR} - \beta_{OR}^* \right\|_2 = O_p \left(\sqrt{\frac{s_\beta \log d}{n\gamma_n}} \right) \quad \text{and} \quad \left\| \tilde{\beta}_{OR} - \beta_{OR}^* \right\|_1 = O_p \left(s_\beta \sqrt{\frac{\log d}{n\gamma_n}} \right).$$

Proof. (a) follows by Lemma C.9, Lemma C.10, and Corollary 9.20 of Wainwright (2019).

(b) follows by Lemma C.12, Lemma C.13, and Corollary 9.20 of Wainwright (2019). \square

Lemma C.16. *Suppose that Assumption 5 holds. Choose $\lambda_\beta \asymp \sqrt{\log d / (n\gamma_n)}$. If $n\gamma_n \gg \max\{s_\beta, \log n\} \log n \log d$, then as $n, d \rightarrow \infty$, $s_{\tilde{\beta}} = O_p(s_\beta)$.*

Proof. For simplicity, we ignore the subscript OR in this proof. By the construction of $\tilde{\beta}$, with the first order optimality, we have

$$\nabla_{\beta} \bar{l}_2(\alpha^*, \tilde{\beta}) + \lambda_\beta \tilde{\xi} = \mathbf{0},$$

where $\tilde{\xi} \in \partial \|\tilde{\beta}\|_1$ such that

$$\tilde{\xi}_j = \begin{cases} \text{sign}(\tilde{\beta}_j), & \text{if } \tilde{\beta}_j \neq 0, \\ \xi \in [-1, 1], & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Let $w_i = Y_i - X_i^\top \beta^*$ and $\tilde{\Delta}_\beta = \tilde{\beta} - \beta^*$. Denote e_j a vector whose j -th coordinate is one while all other coordinates are zeros and $\tilde{e}_j = \tilde{\xi}_j e_j$. Define the support of $\tilde{\beta}$ as $\tilde{S} = \{j \in [d] : \tilde{\beta}_j \neq 0\}$. Then for any $j \in \tilde{S}$, by Taylor's theorem, for some $t \in (0, 1)$ and $\bar{\beta} = t\tilde{\beta} + (1-t)\beta^*$,

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_\beta &= -\nabla_{\beta} \bar{l}_2(\alpha^*, \tilde{\beta})^\top \tilde{e}_j \\ &= -\nabla_{\beta} \bar{l}_2(\alpha^*, \beta^*)^\top \tilde{e}_j - \tilde{\Delta}_\beta^\top \nabla_{\beta}^2 \bar{l}_2(\alpha^*, \bar{\beta}) \tilde{e}_j, \end{aligned}$$

Let $\tilde{e}_{\tilde{S}} = \sum_{j \in \tilde{S}} \tilde{e}_j$, then $\|\tilde{e}_{\tilde{S}}\|_1 = \|\tilde{e}_{\tilde{S}}\|_2^2 = s_{\tilde{\beta}}$. Choose $\lambda_\beta \geq 2 \|\nabla_{\beta} \bar{l}_2(\alpha^*, \beta^*)\|_\infty$. It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\Delta}_\beta^\top \nabla_{\beta}^2 \bar{l}_2(\alpha^*, \bar{\beta}) \tilde{e}_{\tilde{S}} &= s_{\tilde{\beta}} \lambda_\beta + \nabla_{\beta} \bar{l}_2(\alpha^*, \beta^*)^\top \tilde{e}_{\tilde{S}} \\ &\geq s_{\tilde{\beta}} \lambda_\beta - \|\nabla_{\beta} \bar{l}_2(\alpha^*, \beta^*)\|_\infty \|\tilde{e}_{\tilde{S}}\|_1 \geq \frac{s_{\tilde{\beta}} \lambda_\beta}{2}. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, by Hölder inequality,

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{\Delta}_\beta^\top \nabla_{\bar{\beta}}^2 \bar{l}_2(\alpha^*, \bar{\beta}) \tilde{e}_{\bar{S}} &= 2M^{-1} \sum_{\mathcal{I}_{-k, \beta}} \Gamma_i \exp(-X_i^\top \alpha^*) \left(X_i^\top \tilde{\Delta}_\beta \right) (X_i^\top \tilde{e}_{\bar{S}}) \\ &\leq 2(Q_1 Q_2)^{1/2},\end{aligned}$$

where by (30),

$$\begin{aligned}Q_1 &= M^{-1} \sum_{\mathcal{I}_{-k, \beta}} \Gamma_i \exp(-X_i^\top \alpha^*) \left(X_i^\top \tilde{\Delta}_\beta \right)^2 = \delta \bar{l}_2(\alpha^*, \beta^*, \tilde{\Delta}_\beta), \\ Q_2 &= M^{-1} \sum_{\mathcal{I}_{-k, \beta}} \Gamma_i \exp(-X_i^\top \alpha^*) \left(X_i^\top \tilde{e}_{\bar{S}} \right)^2.\end{aligned}$$

For Q_1 , by (33), we have

$$Q_1 \leq \frac{3\lambda_\beta \sqrt{s_\beta}}{2} \left\| \tilde{\Delta}_\beta \right\|_2. \quad (34)$$

For Q_2 , by (19), we have

$$Q_2 \leq k_0^{-1} (M\gamma_n)^{-1} \sum_{\mathcal{I}_{-k, \beta}} \Gamma_i \left(X_i^\top \tilde{e}_{\bar{S}} \right)^2.$$

Then by Lemma E.6(d) of Zhang et al. (2023b), with probability at least $1 - 2\exp(-t)$, for some constant $c_1 > 0$, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}Q_2 &\leq c_1 \left(s_{\bar{\beta}}^{-1} \|\tilde{e}_{\bar{S}}\|_1^2 + \|\tilde{e}_{\bar{S}}\|_2^2 \right) \left(1 + \sqrt{\frac{s_{\bar{\beta}} \log d}{M\gamma_n}} + \frac{s_{\bar{\beta}} \log M \log d}{M\gamma_n} \right) \\ &= 2c_1 s_{\bar{\beta}} \left(1 + \sqrt{\frac{s_{\bar{\beta}} \log d}{M\gamma_n}} + \frac{s_{\bar{\beta}} \log M \log d}{M\gamma_n} \right).\end{aligned}$$

In conclusion, when $\lambda_\beta \geq 2 \left\| \nabla_{\bar{\beta}} \bar{l}_2(\alpha^*, \beta^*) \right\|_\infty$, with probability at least $1 - 2\exp(-t)$,

$$\frac{s_{\bar{\beta}} \lambda_\beta}{2} \leq 2 \left(3c_1 \lambda_\beta \sqrt{s_{\bar{\beta}}} \left\| \tilde{\Delta}_\beta \right\|_2 s_{\bar{\beta}} \left(1 + \sqrt{\frac{s_{\bar{\beta}} \log d}{M\gamma_n}} + \frac{s_{\bar{\beta}} \log M \log d}{M\gamma_n} \right) \right)^{1/2},$$

which implies that for $c_n = 36c_1 \lambda_\beta^{-1} \sqrt{s_{\bar{\beta}}} \left\| \tilde{\Delta}_\beta \right\|_2$, $b_n = c_n \sqrt{\frac{\log d}{M\gamma_n}}$, and $a_n = c_n \frac{\log M \log d}{M\gamma_n}$,

$$(1 - a_n) s_{\bar{\beta}} - b_n \sqrt{s_{\bar{\beta}}} - c_n \leq 0.$$

If $1 - a_n > 0$, we have

$$s_{\bar{\beta}} \leq \left(\frac{b_n + \sqrt{b_n^2 + 4(1 - a_n)c_n}}{2(1 - a_n)} \right)^2.$$

For any $0 < t < 0.01M\gamma_n/(\log M)^2$, choose $\lambda_\beta = 2c\sqrt{(t + \log d)/(M\gamma_n)}$. By Lemma C.13, if $M\gamma_n > (\log M)^2 \log d$, then with probability at least $1 - 3\exp(-t)$, we have

$$\lambda_\beta \geq 2 \left\| \nabla_{\beta} \bar{l}_2(\alpha^*, \beta^*) \right\|_{\infty}.$$

When $n\gamma_n \gg \max\{s_\beta, \log n\} \log n \log d$, we have $\lambda_\beta \asymp \sqrt{\log d/(n\gamma_n)}$, and by Lemma C.15,

$$\left\| \tilde{\Delta}_\beta \right\|_2 = O_p \left(\sqrt{\frac{s_\beta \log d}{n\gamma_n}} \right),$$

which implies $c_n = O_p(s_\beta)$, $b_n = o_p(\sqrt{s_\beta})$, and $a_n = o_p(1)$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} s_{\bar{\beta}} &= O_p \left(s_\beta \left(\frac{s_\beta^{-1/2} b_n + \sqrt{s_\beta^{-1} b_n^2 + 4s_\beta^{-1} (1 - a_n) c_n}}{2(1 - a_n)} \right)^2 \right) \\ &= O_p(s_\beta). \end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma C.17. *Suppose that Assumption 5 holds. Then for any $p > 1$, $u \in \mathbb{R}$, and $\Delta \in \mathbb{R}^d$, there exist some constant $c, c_p > 0$ such that*

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\exp(u |X_i^\top \Delta|) (X_i^\top \Delta)^p \mid \Gamma_i \right] \leq c_p \exp(cu^2 \|\Delta\|_2^2) \|\Delta\|_2^p \text{ almost surely.}$$

In addition, choose $\lambda_\alpha \asymp \sqrt{\frac{t + \log d}{M\gamma_n}}$. If $M\gamma_n > C \max\{s_\alpha, \log M\} (t + \log d)$ for some constant $C > 0$, there exist some constants $c_1, c_2, c_{u,p} > 0$ such that for any $0 < t < 0.01M\gamma_n/\log M$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P} \left(M^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{-k, \beta}} \Gamma_i \exp(u |X_i^\top (\hat{\alpha}_{PS} - \alpha_{PS}^*)|) (X_i^\top (\hat{\alpha}_{PS} - \alpha_{PS}^*))^p \leq c_{u,p} t \gamma_n \|\hat{\alpha}_{PS} - \alpha_{PS}^*\|_2^p \right) \\ \geq 1 - t^{-1} - c_1 \exp(-c_2 M \gamma_n) - 15 \exp(-t). \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Let $\tilde{\Delta} = \Delta / \|\Delta\|_2$. By Lemma C.1(c) and (f), for any $p > 1$ and $t \in \mathbb{R}$, there exists some constant $C_{1,p}, C_2 > 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E} \left[\left| (X_i^\top \Delta)^{2p} \right| \mid \Gamma_i \right] &= \|\Delta\|_2^{2p} \mathbb{E} \left[\left| (X_i^\top \tilde{\Delta})^{2p} \right| \mid \Gamma_i \right] \leq C_{1,p}^2 \|\Delta\|_2^{2p} \sigma^{2p}, \\ \mathbb{E} \left[\exp \left(2t \|\Delta\|_2 \left| X_i^\top \tilde{\Delta} \right| \right) \mid \Gamma_i \right] &\leq \exp \left(4C_2 t^2 \sigma^2 \|\Delta\|_2^2 \right).\end{aligned}$$

Thus, by Hölder inequality, for any $p > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E} \left[\exp \left(u \left| X_i^\top \Delta \right| \right) \left(X_i^\top \Delta \right)^p \mid \Gamma_i \right] &\leq \mathbb{E} \left[\exp \left(2u \left| X_i^\top \Delta \right| \right) \mid \Gamma_i \right]^{1/2} \mathbb{E} \left[\left(X_i^\top \Delta \right)^{2p} \mid \Gamma_i \right]^{1/2} \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\exp \left(2u \|\Delta\|_2 \left| X_i^\top \tilde{\Delta} \right| \right) \mid \Gamma_i \right]^{1/2} \mathbb{E} \left[\left(X_i^\top \Delta \right)^{2p} \mid \Gamma_i \right]^{1/2} \\ &\leq \left\{ \exp \left(4C_2 u^2 \sigma^2 \|\Delta\|_2^2 \right) \right\}^{1/2} \mathbb{E} \left[\left(X_i^\top \Delta \right)^{2p} \mid \Gamma_i \right]^{1/2} \\ &\leq \exp \left(2C_2 u^2 \sigma^2 \|\Delta\|_2^2 \right) C_{1,p} \sigma^p \|\Delta\|_2^p.\end{aligned}\tag{35}$$

Let $G = M^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{-k,\beta}} \Gamma_i \exp \left(u \left| X_i^\top \hat{\Delta}_\alpha \right| \right) \left(X_i^\top \hat{\Delta}_\alpha \right)^p$ where $\hat{\Delta}_\alpha = \hat{\alpha} - \alpha^*$. Then by Lemma C.7, for $i \in \mathcal{I}_{-k,\beta}$, $\Gamma_i X_i \perp \hat{\alpha} \mid \Gamma_i$ and

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E} \left[G \mid \Gamma_{\mathcal{I}_{-k,\beta}}, \hat{\alpha} \right] &= M^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{-k,\beta}} \Gamma_i \mathbb{E} \left[\exp \left(u \left| X_i^\top \hat{\Delta}_\alpha \right| \right) \left(X_i^\top \hat{\Delta}_\alpha \right)^p \mid \Gamma_{\mathcal{I}_{-k,\beta}}, \hat{\alpha} \right] \\ &= M^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{-k,\beta}} \Gamma_i \mathbb{E} \left[\exp \left(u \left| X_i^\top \hat{\Delta}_\alpha \right| \right) \left(X_i^\top \hat{\Delta}_\alpha \right)^p \mid \Gamma_i, \hat{\alpha} \right] \\ &\leq M^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{-k,\beta}} \Gamma_i \exp \left(2C_2 u^2 \sigma^2 \left\| \hat{\Delta}_\alpha \right\|_2^2 \right) C_{1,p} \sigma^p \left\| \hat{\Delta}_\alpha \right\|_2^p.\end{aligned}$$

Define events $\mathcal{E}_1(t), \mathcal{E}_2(t)$ as

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{E}_1(t) &:= \left\{ \left\| \hat{\Delta}_\alpha \right\|_2 \leq 1 \right\}, \\ \mathcal{E}_2(t) &:= \left\{ 0.79\gamma_n \leq M^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{-k,\beta}} \Gamma_i \leq 1.21\gamma_n \right\}.\end{aligned}$$

Choose $\lambda_\alpha \asymp \sqrt{\frac{t + \log d}{M\gamma_n}}$. If $M\gamma_n > C \max \{s_\alpha, \log M\} (t + \log d)$ for some constant $C > 0$, then by Lemma C.11 and Lemma C.3, there exist some constants $c_1, c_2 > 0$ such that for

any $0 < t < 0.01M\gamma_n/\log M$,

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_1(t)) \geq 1 - c_1 \exp(-c_2M\gamma_n) - 13 \exp(-t),$$

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_2(t)) \geq 1 - 2 \exp(-t).$$

Let $c_{u,p} = \exp(2C_2u^2\sigma^2)C_{1,p}\sigma^p$. Then by Markov inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}\left(G \geq c_p t \gamma_n \left\| \widehat{\Delta}_\alpha \right\|_2^p\right) \\ &= \mathbb{E}\left[\mathbb{1}_{\{G \geq c_p t \gamma_n \left\| \widehat{\Delta}_\alpha \right\|_2^p\}}\right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}\left[\mathbb{1}_{\{G \geq c_p t \gamma_n \left\| \widehat{\Delta}_\alpha \right\|_2^p\}} \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{E}_1(t) \cap \mathcal{E}_2(t)}\right] + \mathbb{E}\left[\mathbb{1}_{\{G \geq c_p t \gamma_n \left\| \widehat{\Delta}_\alpha \right\|_2^p\}} \mathbb{1}_{\{\mathcal{E}_1(t) \cap \mathcal{E}_2(t)\}^c}\right] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}\left[\mathbb{1}_{\{G \geq c_p t \gamma_n \left\| \widehat{\Delta}_\alpha \right\|_2^p\}} \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{E}_1(t) \cap \mathcal{E}_2(t)}\right] + \mathbb{E}\left[\mathbb{1}_{\{\mathcal{E}_1(t) \cap \mathcal{E}_2(t)\}^c}\right] \\ &\leq t^{-1} + c_1 \exp(-c_2M\gamma_n) + 15 \exp(-t). \end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma C.18. *Suppose that Assumption 5 holds. Then for any $1 \leq p \leq 8$ and some constant $C > 0$, with probability at least $1 - t^{-1}$,*

$$M^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{-k,\beta}} \Gamma_i \exp(-X_i^\top \alpha^*) w_i^p \leq C.$$

Proof. Under Assumption 5(c) and by (19),

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\left[\Gamma_i \exp(-X_i^\top \alpha^*) w_i^p\right] &\leq k_0^{-1} \gamma_n^{-1} \mathbb{E}\left[\Gamma_i w_i^p\right] \\ &= k_0^{-1} \mathbb{E}\left[w_i^p \mid \Gamma = 1\right] \\ &\leq k_0^{-1} \sigma_w^p \leq k_0^{-1} \max_{1 \leq p \leq 8} \sigma_w^p. \end{aligned}$$

By Markov inequality, we finished the proof. □

Lemma C.19. *Suppose that Assumption 5 holds. Choose $\lambda_\alpha \asymp \lambda_\beta \asymp \sqrt{\log d / (n\gamma_n)}$. If $n\gamma_n \gg \max\{s_\alpha, s_\beta \log n, (\log n)^2\} \log d$ and $s_\alpha s_\beta \ll (n\gamma_n)^{3/2} / (\log n (\log d)^2)$, then as $n, d \rightarrow$*

∞ ,

$$\left\| \widehat{\beta}_{OR} - \widetilde{\beta}_{OR} \right\|_1 = O_p \left(\sqrt{\frac{s_\alpha s_\beta \log d}{n \gamma_n}} \right) \text{ and } \left\| \widehat{\beta}_{OR} - \widetilde{\beta}_{OR} \right\|_2 = O_p \left(\sqrt{\frac{s_\alpha \log d}{n \gamma_n}} \right).$$

Proof. For simplicity, we ignore the subscript OR in this proof. By the definition of $\widehat{\beta}$ and $\widetilde{\beta}$, with the first order optimality, we have

$$\nabla_{\beta} \bar{l}_2(\widehat{\alpha}, \widehat{\beta}) + \lambda_{\beta} \widehat{\xi} = \mathbf{0}, \quad (36)$$

$$\nabla_{\beta} \bar{l}_2(\alpha^*, \widetilde{\beta}) + \lambda_{\beta} \widetilde{\xi} = \mathbf{0}, \quad (37)$$

where $\widehat{\xi} \in \partial \|\widehat{\beta}\|_1$ and $\widetilde{\xi} \in \partial \|\widetilde{\beta}\|_1$ such that

$$\widehat{\xi}_j = \begin{cases} \text{sign}(\widehat{\beta}_j), & \text{if } \widehat{\beta}_j \neq 0, \\ \xi \in [-1, 1], & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad \text{and} \quad \widetilde{\xi}_j = \begin{cases} \text{sign}(\widetilde{\beta}_j), & \text{if } \widetilde{\beta}_j \neq 0, \\ \xi \in [-1, 1], & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Let $\Delta = \widehat{\beta} - \widetilde{\beta}$. By the definition of $\widehat{\xi}$ and $\widetilde{\xi}$, it is clear that

$$\begin{aligned} (\widehat{\xi} - \widetilde{\xi})^\top \Delta &= \widehat{\xi}^\top \widehat{\beta} - \widehat{\xi}^\top \widetilde{\beta} - \widetilde{\xi}^\top \widehat{\beta} + \widetilde{\xi}^\top \widetilde{\beta} \\ &= \|\widehat{\beta}\|_1 + \|\widetilde{\beta}\|_1 - \widehat{\xi}^\top \widetilde{\beta} - \widetilde{\xi}^\top \widehat{\beta} \\ &\geq \|\widehat{\beta}\|_1 + \|\widetilde{\beta}\|_1 - \|\widetilde{\beta}\|_1 - \|\widehat{\beta}\|_1 = 0. \end{aligned}$$

By (36) and (37) and Taylor's theorem, we have

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\geq -\lambda_{\beta} (\widehat{\xi} - \widetilde{\xi})^\top \Delta \\ &= \left(\nabla_{\beta} \bar{l}_2(\widehat{\alpha}, \widehat{\beta}) - \nabla_{\beta} \bar{l}_2(\alpha^*, \widehat{\beta}) + \nabla_{\beta} \bar{l}_2(\alpha^*, \widehat{\beta}) - \nabla_{\beta} \bar{l}_2(\alpha^*, \widetilde{\beta}) \right)^\top \Delta \\ &= \left(\nabla_{\beta} \bar{l}_2(\widehat{\alpha}, \widehat{\beta}) - \nabla_{\beta} \bar{l}_2(\alpha^*, \widehat{\beta}) \right)^\top \Delta + \Delta^\top \nabla_{\beta}^2 \bar{l}_2(\alpha^*, \widetilde{\beta}) \Delta \\ &= \left(\nabla_{\beta} \bar{l}_2(\widehat{\alpha}, \widehat{\beta}) - \nabla_{\beta} \bar{l}_2(\alpha^*, \widehat{\beta}) \right)^\top \Delta + 2M^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{-k, \beta}} \Gamma_i \exp(-X_i^\top \alpha^*) (X_i^\top \Delta)^2 \\ &= \left(\nabla_{\beta} \bar{l}_2(\widehat{\alpha}, \widehat{\beta}) - \nabla_{\beta} \bar{l}_2(\alpha^*, \widehat{\beta}) \right)^\top \Delta + 2\delta \bar{l}_2(\alpha^*, \widetilde{\beta}, \Delta). \end{aligned}$$

Let $\widehat{\Delta}_\alpha = \widehat{\alpha} - \alpha^*$, $\widetilde{\Delta}_\beta = \widetilde{\beta} - \beta^*$, and $w_i = Y_i - X_i^\top \beta^*$. By Taylor's theorem, for some $t \in (0, 1)$ and $\bar{\alpha} = t\widehat{\alpha} + (1-t)\alpha^*$,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \delta \bar{l}_2(\alpha^*, \widetilde{\beta}, \Delta) \\
& \leq -\frac{1}{2} \left(\nabla_{\beta} \bar{l}_2(\widehat{\alpha}, \widehat{\beta}) - \nabla_{\beta} \bar{l}_2(\alpha^*, \widetilde{\beta}) \right)^\top \Delta \\
& = -\frac{1}{2} \left(\nabla_{\alpha} \nabla_{\beta} \bar{l}_2(\alpha^*, \widehat{\beta})^\top \widehat{\Delta}_\alpha + \nabla_{\alpha}^2 \nabla_{\beta} \bar{l}_2(\bar{\alpha}, \widehat{\beta}) \widehat{\Delta}_\alpha \right)^\top \Delta \\
& = M^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{-k, \beta}} \Gamma_i \exp(-X_i^\top \alpha^*) \left(X_i^\top \widehat{\Delta}_\alpha \right) \left(Y_i - X_i^\top \widehat{\beta} \right) X_i^\top \Delta \\
& \quad - M^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{-k, \beta}} \Gamma_i \exp(-X_i^\top \bar{\alpha}) \left(X_i^\top \widehat{\Delta}_\alpha \right)^2 \left(Y_i - X_i^\top \widehat{\beta} \right) X_i^\top \Delta \\
& = A_1 - A_2 - A_3,
\end{aligned}$$

where we use $Y_i - X_i^\top \widehat{\beta} = w_i - X_i^\top \widetilde{\Delta}_\beta - X_i^\top \Delta$, leading to

$$\begin{aligned}
A_1 &= M^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{-k, \beta}} \Gamma_i \exp(-X_i^\top \alpha^*) \left(X_i^\top \widehat{\Delta}_\alpha \right) w_i \left(X_i^\top \Delta \right), \\
A_2 &= M^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{-k, \beta}} \Gamma_i \exp(-X_i^\top \alpha^*) \left(X_i^\top \widehat{\Delta}_\alpha \right) \left(X_i^\top \widetilde{\Delta}_\beta + X_i^\top \Delta \right) \left(X_i^\top \Delta \right), \\
A_3 &= M^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{-k, \beta}} \Gamma_i \exp(-X_i^\top \bar{\alpha}) \left(X_i^\top \widehat{\Delta}_\alpha \right)^2 \left(w_i - X_i^\top \widetilde{\Delta}_\beta - X_i^\top \Delta \right) \left(X_i^\top \Delta \right).
\end{aligned}$$

For A_1 , by Hölder inequality and (19),

$$\begin{aligned}
A_1 &= M^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{-k, \beta}} \Gamma_i \exp(-X_i^\top \alpha^*) \left(X_i^\top \widehat{\Delta}_\alpha \right) w_i \left(X_i^\top \Delta \right) \\
&\leq \left\{ M^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{-k, \beta}} \Gamma_i \exp(-X_i^\top \alpha^*) \left(X_i^\top \widehat{\Delta}_\alpha \right)^4 \right\}^{1/4} \\
&\quad \times \left\{ M^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{-k, \beta}} \Gamma_i \exp(-X_i^\top \alpha^*) w_i^4 \right\}^{1/4} \left(\delta \bar{l}_2(\alpha^*, \widetilde{\beta}, \Delta) \right)^{1/2} \\
&\leq k_0^{-1/2} \gamma_n^{-1/2} \left\{ M^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{-k, \beta}} \Gamma_i \left(X_i^\top \widehat{\Delta}_\alpha \right)^4 \right\}^{1/4} \left\{ M^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{-k, \beta}} \Gamma_i w_i^4 \right\}^{1/4} \left(\delta \bar{l}_2(\alpha^*, \widetilde{\beta}, \Delta) \right)^{1/2}.
\end{aligned}$$

By Lemma C.7, $\widehat{\Delta}_\alpha \perp \Gamma_i X_i \mid \Gamma_i$ for $i \in \mathcal{I}_{-k,\beta}$. Then by Assumption 5(b) and Lemma C.1(c), for some constant $K_1 > 0$,

$$\mathbb{E} \left[M^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{-k,\beta}} \Gamma_i \left(X_i^\top \widehat{\Delta}_\alpha \right)^4 \mid \Gamma_{\mathcal{I}_{-k,\beta}}, \widehat{\alpha} \right] \leq K_1 \left\| \widehat{\Delta}_\alpha \right\|^4 M^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{-k,\beta}} \Gamma_i.$$

By Lemma C.3, with probability at least $1 - 0.01M\gamma_n$,

$$M^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{-k,\beta}} \Gamma_i \leq 1.21\gamma_n.$$

Similar to Lemma C.17, we can show that with probability at least $1 - t^{-1} - 0.01M\gamma_n$,

$$M^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{-k,\beta}} \Gamma_i \left(X_i^\top \widehat{\Delta}_\alpha \right)^4 \leq 1.21tK_1\gamma_n \left\| \widehat{\Delta}_\alpha \right\|^4. \quad (38)$$

Note that $\|w_i\|_{\psi_2} \leq \sigma_w$. Similarly, for some $K_2 > 0$, we have with probability at least $1 - t^{-1} - 0.01M\gamma_n$,

$$M^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{-k,\beta}} \Gamma_i w_i^4 \leq tK_2\gamma_n.$$

Thus, with probability at least $1 - 2t^{-1} - 0.02M\gamma_n$, for some constant K_3

$$A_1 \leq K_3 t^{1/2} \left\| \widehat{\Delta}_\alpha \right\| \left(\delta \bar{l}_2(\alpha^*, \tilde{\beta}, \Delta) \right)^{1/2}.$$

For A_2 , by (19) and Hölder inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} A_2 &\leq k_0^{-1/2} \gamma_n^{-1/2} M^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{-k,\beta}} \Gamma_i \exp \left(-\frac{1}{2} X_i^\top \alpha^* \right) \left(X_i^\top \widehat{\Delta}_\alpha \right) \left(X_i^\top \tilde{\Delta}_\beta + X_i^\top \Delta \right) \left(X_i^\top \Delta \right) \\ &\leq k_0^{-1/2} \gamma_n^{-1/2} \left\{ M^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{-k,\beta}} \Gamma_i \left(X_i^\top \widehat{\Delta}_\alpha \right)^4 \right\}^{1/4} \\ &\quad \times \left\{ M^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{-k,\beta}} \Gamma_i \left(X_i^\top \tilde{\Delta}_\beta + X_i^\top \Delta \right)^4 \right\}^{1/4} \left(\delta \bar{l}_2(\alpha^*, \tilde{\beta}, \Delta) \right)^{1/2} \\ &\leq k_0^{-1/2} \gamma_n^{-1/2} \left\{ M^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{-k,\beta}} \Gamma_i \left(X_i^\top \widehat{\Delta}_\alpha \right)^4 \right\}^{1/4} \\ &\quad \times \left(\left\{ M^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{-k,\beta}} \Gamma_i \left(X_i^\top \tilde{\Delta}_\beta \right)^4 \right\}^{1/4} + \left\{ M^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{-k,\beta}} \Gamma_i \left(X_i^\top \Delta \right)^4 \right\}^{1/4} \right) \left(\delta \bar{l}_2(\alpha^*, \tilde{\beta}, \Delta) \right)^{1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma E.6(d) of [Zhang et al. \(2023b\)](#), with probability at least $1 - 4 \exp(-t)$, for some $K_3 > 0$,

$$M^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{-k, \beta}} \Gamma_i \left(X_i^\top \tilde{\Delta}_\beta \right)^4 \leq K_3 \gamma_n \left(1 + \sqrt{\frac{s_\beta \log d}{M \gamma_n}} + \frac{(s_\beta \log M \log d)^2}{M \gamma_n} \right) \left(s_\beta^{-2} \left\| \tilde{\Delta}_\beta \right\|_1^4 + \left\| \tilde{\Delta}_\beta \right\|_2^4 \right),$$

$$M^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{-k, \beta}} \Gamma_i \left(X_i^\top \Delta \right)^4 \leq K_3 \gamma_n \left(1 + \sqrt{\frac{s_{\tilde{\beta}} \log d}{M \gamma_n}} + \frac{(s_{\tilde{\beta}} \log M \log d)^2}{M \gamma_n} \right) \left(s_{\tilde{\beta}}^{-2} \left\| \Delta \right\|_1^4 + \left\| \Delta \right\|_2^4 \right).$$

Let

$$a_n = 1 + \sqrt{\frac{s_\beta \log d}{M \gamma_n}} + \frac{(s_\beta \log M \log d)^2}{M \gamma_n},$$

$$\tilde{a}_n = 1 + \sqrt{\frac{s_{\tilde{\beta}} \log d}{M \gamma_n}} + \frac{(s_{\tilde{\beta}} \log M \log d)^2}{M \gamma_n}.$$

Together with (38), we have for some $K_4 > 0$, with probability at least $1 - t^{-1} - 4 \exp(-t)$,

$$A_2 \leq K_4 \left(a_n \left(s_\beta^{-2} \left\| \tilde{\Delta}_\beta \right\|_1^4 + \left\| \tilde{\Delta}_\beta \right\|_2^4 \right) + \tilde{a}_n \left(s_{\tilde{\beta}}^{-2} \left\| \Delta \right\|_1^4 + \left\| \Delta \right\|_2^4 \right) \right)^{1/4} \left(\delta_{\tilde{l}_2}(\alpha^*, \tilde{\beta}, \Delta) \right)^{1/2}.$$

For A_3 , by Hölder inequality and Minkowski's inequality, we have

$$A_3 \leq \left\{ M^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{-k, \beta}} \Gamma_i \frac{\exp(-2X_i^\top \tilde{\alpha})}{\exp(-X_i^\top \alpha^*)} \left(X_i^\top \hat{\Delta}_\alpha \right)^4 \left(w_i - X_i^\top \tilde{\Delta}_\beta - X_i^\top \Delta \right)^2 \right\}^{1/2} \left(\delta_{\tilde{l}_2}(\alpha^*, \tilde{\beta}, \Delta) \right)^{1/2}$$

$$\leq \left\{ P_1^{1/2} + P_2^{1/2} + P_3^{1/2} \right\} \left(\delta_{\tilde{l}_2}(\alpha^*, \tilde{\beta}, \Delta) \right)^{1/2},$$

where

$$P_1 = M^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{-k, \beta}} \Gamma_i \frac{\exp(-2X_i^\top \tilde{\alpha})}{\exp(-X_i^\top \alpha^*)} \left(X_i^\top \hat{\Delta}_\alpha \right)^4 w_i^2,$$

$$P_2 = M^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{-k, \beta}} \Gamma_i \frac{\exp(-2X_i^\top \tilde{\alpha})}{\exp(-X_i^\top \alpha^*)} \left(X_i^\top \hat{\Delta}_\alpha \right)^4 \left(X_i^\top \tilde{\Delta}_\beta \right)^2,$$

$$P_3 = M^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{-k, \beta}} \Gamma_i \frac{\exp(-2X_i^\top \tilde{\alpha})}{\exp(-X_i^\top \alpha^*)} \left(X_i^\top \hat{\Delta}_\alpha \right)^4 \left(X_i^\top \Delta \right)^2.$$

For P_1 , by Hölder inequality, we have

$$P_1 \leq \left(M^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{-k, \beta}} \Gamma_i \frac{\exp(-4X_i^\top \tilde{\alpha})}{\exp(-3X_i^\top \alpha^*)} \left(X_i^\top \hat{\Delta}_\alpha \right)^8 \right)^{1/2} \left(M^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{-k, \beta}} \Gamma_i \exp(-X_i^\top \alpha^*) w_i^4 \right)^{1/2}.$$

By (19) and Lemma C.17, for any $0 < t < 0.01M\gamma_n/\log M$, with probability at least $1 - t^{-1} - c_1 \exp(-c_2M\gamma_n) - 15 \exp(-t)$, we have for some $c > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}
& M^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{-k,\beta}} \Gamma_i \frac{\exp(-4X_i^\top \bar{\alpha})}{\exp(-3X_i^\top \alpha^*)} \left(X_i^\top \widehat{\Delta}_\alpha \right)^8 \\
&= M^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{-k,\beta}} \Gamma_i \exp\left(-4tX_i^\top \widehat{\Delta}_\alpha - X_i^\top \alpha^*\right) \left(X_i^\top \widehat{\Delta}_\alpha \right)^8 \\
&\leq k_0^{-1} \gamma_n^{-1} M^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{-k,\beta}} \Gamma_i \exp\left(4 \left| X_i^\top \widehat{\Delta}_\alpha \right| \right) \left(X_i^\top \widehat{\Delta}_\alpha \right)^8 \\
&\leq tck_0^{-1} \left\| \widehat{\Delta}_\alpha \right\|_2^8.
\end{aligned}$$

Together with Lemma C.18, it follows that for any $0 < t < 0.01M\gamma_n/\log M$, with probability at least $1 - 2t^{-1} - c_1 \exp(-c_2M\gamma_n) - 15 \exp(-t)$, for some constant $C_2 > 0$,

$$P_1 \leq tC_2 \left\| \widehat{\Delta}_\alpha \right\|_2^4.$$

For P_2 , by Hölder inequality, for some constant $r > 0$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}
P_2 &\leq \left(M^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{-k,\beta}} \Gamma_i \frac{\exp(-4X_i^\top \bar{\alpha})}{\exp(-2X_i^\top \alpha^*)} \left(X_i^\top \widehat{\Delta}_\alpha \right)^8 \right)^{1/2} \\
&\quad \times \left(M^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{-k,\beta}} \Gamma_i \left(X_i^\top \widetilde{\Delta}_\beta \right)^4 \right)^{1/2}.
\end{aligned}$$

By Lemma E.6(d) of Zhang et al. (2023b), with probability at least $1 - 2 \exp(-t)$, for some constant $c_3 > 0$, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
& M^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{-k,\beta}} \Gamma_i \left(X_i^\top \widetilde{\Delta}_\beta \right)^4 \\
&\leq c_3 \gamma_n \left(1 + \sqrt{\frac{s_\beta \log d}{M\gamma_n}} + \frac{(s_\beta \log M \log d)^2}{M\gamma_n} \right) \left(\left\| s_\beta^{-1/2} \widetilde{\Delta}_\beta \right\|_1^4 + \left\| \widetilde{\Delta}_\beta \right\|_2^4 \right) \\
&\leq c_3 \gamma_n \left(1 + \sqrt{\frac{s_\beta \log d}{M\gamma_n}} + \frac{(s_\beta \log M \log d)^2}{M\gamma_n} \right) \left(\left\| s_\beta^{-1/2} \widetilde{\Delta}_\beta \right\|_1^2 + \left\| \widetilde{\Delta}_\beta \right\|_2^2 \right)^2
\end{aligned}$$

By Lemma C.17, with probability at least $1 - 2t^{-1} - c_1 \exp(-c_2 M \gamma_n) - 15 \exp(-t)$, for some $c_r > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}
& M^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{-k, \beta}} \Gamma_i \frac{\exp(-4X_i^\top \hat{\alpha})}{\exp(-2X_i^\top \alpha^*)} \left(X_i^\top \hat{\Delta}_\alpha \right)^8 \\
&= M^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{-k, \beta}} \Gamma_i \exp\left(-4tX_i^\top \hat{\Delta}_\alpha - 2X_i^\top \alpha^*\right) \left(X_i^\top \hat{\Delta}_\alpha \right)^8 \\
&\leq k_0^{-2} \gamma_n^{-2} M^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{-k, \beta}} \Gamma_i \exp\left(4 \left| X_i^\top \hat{\Delta}_\alpha \right| \right) \left(X_i^\top \hat{\Delta}_\alpha \right)^8 \\
&= k_0^{-2} \gamma_n^{-1} c_r t \left\| \hat{\Delta}_\alpha \right\|_2^8.
\end{aligned}$$

Then for any $0 < t < 0.01M\gamma_n/\log M$, with probability at least $1 - 2t^{-1} - c_1 \exp(-c_2 M \gamma_n) - 17 \exp(-t)$, for some constant $C_r > 0$,

$$P_2 \leq t C_r a_n^{1/2} \left\| \hat{\Delta}_\alpha \right\|_2^4 \left(\left\| s_\beta^{-1/2} \tilde{\Delta}_\beta \right\|_1^2 + \left\| \tilde{\Delta}_\beta \right\|_2^2 \right).$$

For P_3 , by identical analysis to P_2 , we have that for any $0 < t < 0.01M\gamma_n/\log M$, with probability at least $1 - 2t^{-1} - c_1 \exp(-c_2 M \gamma_n) - 17 \exp(-t)$, for some constant $C_r > 0$,

$$P_3 \leq t C_r \tilde{a}_n^{1/2} \left\| \hat{\Delta}_\alpha \right\|_2^4 \left(\left\| s_{\tilde{\beta}}^{-1/2} \Delta \right\|_1^2 + \left\| \Delta \right\|_2^2 \right).$$

It follows that, with probability at least $1 - 6t^{-1} - 3c_1 \exp(-c_2 M \gamma_n) - 49 \exp(-t)$, for some constant $K_5 > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}
A_3 &\leq K_5 t^{1/2} \left\| \hat{\Delta}_\alpha \right\|_2^2 \left(1 + a_n^{1/4} \sqrt{\left\| s_\beta^{-1/2} \tilde{\Delta}_\beta \right\|_1^2 + \left\| \tilde{\Delta}_\beta \right\|_2^2} + \tilde{a}_n^{1/4} \sqrt{\left\| s_{\tilde{\beta}}^{-1/2} \Delta \right\|_1^2 + \left\| \Delta \right\|_2^2} \right) \\
&\quad \times \left(\delta \bar{l}_2(\alpha^*, \tilde{\beta}, \Delta) \right)^{1/2}.
\end{aligned}$$

Together A_1, A_2, A_3 , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta \bar{l}_2(\alpha^*, \tilde{\beta}, \Delta)^{1/2} &\leq K_3 t^{1/2} \left\| \hat{\Delta}_\alpha \right\| \\
&\quad + K_4 \left(a_n \left(s_\beta^{-2} \left\| \tilde{\Delta}_\beta \right\|_1^4 + \left\| \tilde{\Delta}_\beta \right\|_2^4 \right) + \tilde{a}_n \left(s_{\tilde{\beta}}^{-2} \left\| \Delta \right\|_1^4 + \left\| \Delta \right\|_2^4 \right) \right)^{1/4} \\
&\quad + K_5 t^{1/2} \left\| \hat{\Delta}_\alpha \right\|_2^2 \left(1 + a_n^{1/4} \sqrt{\left\| s_\beta^{-1/2} \tilde{\Delta}_\beta \right\|_1^2 + \left\| \tilde{\Delta}_\beta \right\|_2^2} + \tilde{a}_n^{1/4} \sqrt{\left\| s_{\tilde{\beta}}^{-1/2} \Delta \right\|_1^2 + \left\| \Delta \right\|_2^2} \right),
\end{aligned}$$

which implies that for some constant $K_6 > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} K_6 \delta \bar{l}_2(\alpha^*, \tilde{\beta}, \Delta) &\leq t \left\| \widehat{\Delta}_\alpha \right\|_2^2 + t \left\| \widehat{\Delta}_\alpha \right\|_2^4 + a_n^{1/2} \left\| \widehat{\Delta}_\alpha \right\|_2^4 \left(s_\beta^{-1} \left\| \widetilde{\Delta}_\beta \right\|_1^2 + \left\| \widetilde{\Delta}_\beta \right\|_2^2 \right) \\ &\quad + \tilde{a}_n^{1/2} \left\| \widehat{\Delta}_\alpha \right\|_2^4 \left(s_\beta^{-1} \|\Delta\|_1^2 + \|\Delta\|_2^2 \right). \end{aligned}$$

In addition, by Lemma C.12, with probability at least $1 - c'_1 \exp(-c'_2 M \gamma_n)$,

$$\delta \bar{l}_2(\alpha^*, \tilde{\beta}, \Delta) \geq \kappa'_1 \|\Delta\|_2^2 - \kappa'_2 \frac{\log d}{M \gamma_n} \|\Delta\|_1^2.$$

By Lemma C.14, if $\lambda_\beta > \max \left\{ 2 \|\nabla_{\beta} \bar{l}_2(\alpha^*, \beta^*)\|_\infty, 2 \|\nabla_{\beta} \bar{l}_2(\widehat{\alpha}, \tilde{\beta})\|_\infty \right\}$, we have

$$s_\beta^{-1} \left\| \widetilde{\Delta}_\beta \right\|_1^2 \leq 16 \left\| \widetilde{\Delta}_\beta \right\|_2^2 \quad \text{and} \quad s_\beta^{-1} \|\Delta\|_1^2 \leq 16 \|\Delta\|_2^2.$$

Then for any $0 < t < 0.01 M \gamma_n / \log M$, with probability at least $1 - c'_1 t^{-1} - c'_2 \exp(-c'_3 M \gamma_n) - c'_4 \exp(-t)$, with some $K_7, K_8, K_9 > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} K_7 \|\Delta\|_2^2 - K_8 \frac{s_\beta \log d}{M \gamma_n} \|\Delta\|_2^2 &\leq t \left\| \widehat{\Delta}_\alpha \right\|_2^2 + t \left\| \widehat{\Delta}_\alpha \right\|_2^4 + K_9 a_n^{1/2} \left\| \widehat{\Delta}_\alpha \right\|_2^4 \left\| \widetilde{\Delta}_\beta \right\|_2^2 \\ &\quad + K_9 \tilde{a}_n^{1/2} \left\| \widehat{\Delta}_\alpha \right\|_2^4 \|\Delta\|_2^2. \end{aligned}$$

Let

$$\begin{aligned} b_n &= K_7 - K_8 \frac{s_\beta \log d}{M \gamma_n} - K_9 \tilde{a}_n^{1/2} \left\| \widehat{\Delta}_\alpha \right\|_2^4, \\ c_n &= t + t \left\| \widehat{\Delta}_\alpha \right\|_2^2 + K_9 a_n^{1/2} \left\| \widehat{\Delta}_\alpha \right\|_2^2 \left\| \widetilde{\Delta}_\beta \right\|_2^2, \end{aligned}$$

then

$$b_n \|\Delta\|_2^2 \leq c_n \left\| \widehat{\Delta}_\alpha \right\|_2^2.$$

If $\lambda_\alpha \asymp \lambda_\beta \asymp \sqrt{\log d / (n \gamma_n)}$ and $n \gamma_n \gg \max \{s_\alpha, s_\beta \log n, (\log n)^2\} \log d$, by Lemma C.15

and Lemma C.16, as $n, d \rightarrow \infty$, it follows that $s_{\tilde{\beta}} = O_p(s_\beta)$,

$$\begin{aligned} a_n^{1/2} \left\| \widehat{\Delta}_\alpha \right\|_2^2 \left\| \widetilde{\Delta}_\beta \right\|_2^2 &= O_p \left(\left(1 + \frac{s_\beta \log n \log d}{(n \gamma_n)^{1/2}} \right) \frac{s_\alpha s_\beta (\log d)^2}{(n \gamma_n)^2} \right) \\ &= O_p \left(\frac{s_\alpha s_\beta (\log d)^2}{(n \gamma_n)^2} + \frac{s_\alpha s_\beta^2 \log n (\log d)^3}{(n \gamma_n)^{5/2}} \right), \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\tilde{a}_n^{1/2} \left\| \widehat{\Delta}_\alpha \right\|_2^4 = O_p \left(\frac{s_\alpha^2 (\log d)^2}{(n\gamma_n)^2} + \frac{s_\alpha^2 s_\beta \log n (\log d)^3}{(n\gamma_n)^{5/2}} \right).$$

Since $s_\alpha \ll n\gamma_n / \log d$ and $s_\beta \ll n\gamma_n / (\log n \log d)$,

$$\begin{aligned} b_n - K_7 &= o_p(1) + o_p \left(\frac{s_\alpha s_\beta (\log d)^2}{(n\gamma_n)^{3/2}} \right), \\ c_n &= o_p(1) + O_p \left(1 + \frac{s_\alpha s_\beta \log n (\log d)^2}{(n\gamma_n)^{3/2}} \right). \end{aligned}$$

In addition, suppose that $s_\alpha s_\beta \ll (n\gamma_n)^{3/2} / (\log n (\log d)^2)$, then

$$b_n - K_7 = o_p(1) \text{ and } c_n = O_p(1).$$

which implies

$$\|\Delta\|_2 = O_p \left(\left\| \widehat{\Delta}_\alpha \right\|_2 \right) = O_p \left(\sqrt{\frac{s_\alpha \log d}{n\gamma_n}} \right).$$

Finally, by Lemma C.14 and Lemma C.16,

$$\|\Delta\|_1 = O_p \left(\sqrt{\frac{s_\alpha s_\beta \log d}{n\gamma_n}} \right).$$

□

C.4 Proof of Proposition B.2

Proof. Proposition B.2 follows directly from Lemma C.15 and Lemma C.19.

□

D Proof of results in Section 2

D.1 Auxiliary lemmas for Theorem 1

Lemma D.1. *Suppose that $\Gamma_i \stackrel{i.i.d.}{\sim} \text{Bernoulli}(\gamma_n)$. It follows that*

$$\frac{\gamma_n}{n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \Gamma_i} - 1 = O_p \left((n\gamma_n)^{-1/2} (1 - \gamma_n)^{1/2} \right).$$

Proof. Let $\hat{\gamma} = n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \Gamma_i$. Then

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\left\{ \frac{\hat{\gamma} - \gamma_n}{\gamma_n} \right\}^2 \right] = \gamma_n^{-2} n^{-1} \mathbb{E} [(\Gamma_i - \gamma_n)^2] = n^{-1} \gamma_n^{-1} (1 - \gamma_n) = O((n\gamma_n)^{-1} (1 - \gamma_n)).$$

by Chebyshev's inequality, we have

$$\frac{\hat{\gamma} - \gamma_n}{\gamma_n} = O_p \left((n\gamma_n)^{-1/2} (1 - \gamma_n)^{1/2} \right).$$

By the fact that

$$\frac{\hat{\gamma} - \gamma_n}{\hat{\gamma}} \left\{ 1 + \frac{\hat{\gamma} - \gamma_n}{\gamma_n} \right\} = \frac{\hat{\gamma} - \gamma_n}{\gamma_n},$$

we have

$$-\frac{\hat{\gamma} - \gamma_n}{\hat{\gamma}} = - \left\{ 1 + \frac{\hat{\gamma} - \gamma_n}{\gamma_n} \right\}^{-1} \frac{\hat{\gamma} - \gamma_n}{\gamma_n} = O_p \left((n\gamma_n)^{-1/2} (1 - \gamma_n)^{1/2} \right).$$

□

Lemma D.2. *Suppose that Assumptions 1 and 2 hold. Then $\sigma_n^2 \asymp \gamma_n^{-1}$ and*

$$\sigma_n^{-1} \sqrt{n}(\tilde{\theta} - \theta) \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(0, 1),$$

where $\tilde{\theta} = n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \left\{ X_i^\top \beta^* + \frac{\Gamma_i}{\gamma_n} (Y_i - X_i^\top \beta^*) \right\}$.

Proof. Let $U_i = X_i^\top \beta^* + \frac{\Gamma_i}{\gamma_n} (Y_i - X_i^\top \beta^*)$. Then under Assumption 1,

$$\mathbb{E}[U_i] = \mathbb{E} [X_i^\top \beta^*] + \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\Gamma_i}{\gamma_n} \right] \mathbb{E}[(Y_i - X_i^\top \beta^*)] = \mathbb{E}[Y_i] = \theta.$$

Observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_n^2 &= \text{Var}[U_i] = \mathbb{E} \left[\left(X_i^\top \beta^* + \frac{\Gamma_i}{\gamma_n} w_i - \theta \right)^2 \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[(X_i^\top \beta^* - \theta)^2 + \frac{1}{\gamma_n} w_i^2 + 2 (X_i^\top \beta^* - \theta) w_i \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[(X_i^\top \beta^* - \theta)^2 + \frac{1}{\gamma_n} w_i^2 \right], \end{aligned}$$

where the last equation comes from Lemma A.1. Thus, by Lemma C.1 (c), we have

$$\sigma_n^2 \asymp \gamma_n^{-1}. \quad (39)$$

In addition, by Lemma C.1 (c), there exist some constants $C_1, C_2 > 0$ such that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[|X_i^\top \beta^*|^{2+c} \right] \leq (C_1 \sigma)^{2+c} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{E} [|w_i|^{2+c}] \leq (C_2 \sigma_w)^{2+c}.$$

Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \|U_i - \theta\|_{\mathbb{P}, 2+c} &= \left\| X_i^\top \beta^* - \theta + \frac{\Gamma_i}{\gamma_n} w_i \right\|_{\mathbb{P}, 2+c} \\ &\leq \|X_i^\top \beta^*\|_{\mathbb{P}, 2+c} + \theta + \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\Gamma_i}{\gamma_n^{2+c}} w_i^{2+c} \right]^{\frac{1}{2+c}} \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[|X_i^\top \beta^*|^{2+c} \right]^{\frac{1}{2+c}} + \theta + \gamma_n^{\frac{1}{2+c}-1} \mathbb{E} [|w_i|^{2+c}]^{\frac{1}{2+c}} \\ &\leq C_1 \sigma + \theta + C_2 \sigma_w \gamma_n^{\frac{1}{2+c}-1}, \end{aligned}$$

which implies

$$\begin{aligned} n^{-\frac{c}{2}} \gamma_n^{1+\frac{c}{2}} \mathbb{E} [|U_i - \theta|^{2+c}] &\leq n^{-\frac{c}{2}} \gamma_n^{1+\frac{c}{2}} \left(C_1 \sigma + \theta + C_2 \sigma_w \gamma_n^{\frac{1}{2+c}-1} \right)^{2+c} \\ &= n^{-\frac{c}{2}} \gamma_n^{1+\frac{c}{2}} O(\gamma_n^{-1-c}). \end{aligned}$$

That is,

$$n^{-\frac{c}{2}} \gamma_n^{1+\frac{c}{2}} \mathbb{E} [|U_i - \theta|^{2+c}] = O((n\gamma_n)^{-\frac{c}{2}}) = o(1). \quad (40)$$

Then for any $\delta > 0$, as $N, d \rightarrow \infty$,

$$\gamma_n \mathbb{E} \left[(U_i - \theta)^2 \mathbb{1}_{\{|U_i - \theta| > \delta \sqrt{n/\gamma_n}\}} \right] \leq \delta^{-c} n^{-\frac{c}{2}} \gamma_n^{1+\frac{c}{2}} \mathbb{E} [(U_i - \theta)^{2+c}] = o(1).$$

By Proposition 2.27 (Lindeberg-Feller theorem) of Van der Vaart (2000), we have

$$\sigma_n^{-1} \sqrt{n}(\tilde{\theta} - \theta) \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(0, 1).$$

□

Lemma D.3. *Suppose that Assumptions 1 and 2 hold. if $n\gamma_n \gg (s \vee (\log n)^2) \log d$ and choose some $\lambda_n \asymp \sqrt{\log d / (n\gamma_n)}$, then as $n, d \rightarrow \infty$,*

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{\theta} - \tilde{\theta} &= O_p \left(\sqrt{\frac{s \log d}{n^2 \gamma_n^2}} \right), \\ \hat{\theta} - \theta &= O_p \left((n\gamma_n)^{-1/2} \right).\end{aligned}$$

Proof. Note that $\tilde{\theta}$ can be written as

$$\tilde{\theta} = n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \left\{ (\Gamma_i X_i + (1 - \Gamma_i) \bar{X}_0)^\top \beta^* + \frac{\Gamma_i}{\gamma_n} (Y_i - X_i^\top \beta^*) \right\}.$$

Let $\hat{\Delta}^{(-k)} = \hat{\beta}^{(-k)} - \beta^*$ and $\hat{\gamma}^{(k)} = n_k^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \Gamma_i$.

Observe that $\hat{\theta}$ can be decomposed as

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{\theta} &= n^{-1} \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \left\{ (\Gamma_i X_i + (1 - \Gamma_i) \bar{X}_0)^\top \hat{\beta}^{(-k)} + \frac{\Gamma_i}{\hat{\gamma}^{(k)}} (Y_i - X_i^\top \hat{\beta}^{(-k)}) \right\} \\ &= \tilde{\theta} + I_1 + I_2 + I_3 + I_4,\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}I_1 &= K^{-1} \sum_{k=1}^K n_k^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \left(\Gamma_i - \frac{\Gamma_i}{\gamma_n} \right) \left(X_i^\top \hat{\Delta}^{(-k)} - \mathbb{E} [X_i]^\top \hat{\Delta}^{(-k)} \right), \\ I_2 &= K^{-1} \sum_{k=1}^K \left(\frac{1}{\gamma_n} - \frac{1}{\hat{\gamma}^{(k)}} \right) n_k^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \Gamma_i \left(X_i^\top \hat{\Delta}^{(-k)} - \mathbb{E} [X_i]^\top \hat{\Delta}^{(-k)} \right), \\ I_3 &= K^{-1} \sum_{k=1}^K \left(\frac{1}{\hat{\gamma}^{(k)}} - \frac{1}{\gamma_n} \right) n_k^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \Gamma_i w_i, \\ I_4 &= K^{-1} \sum_{k=1}^K n_k^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} (1 - \Gamma_i) \left(\bar{X}_0^\top \hat{\Delta}^{(-k)} - \mathbb{E} [X_i]^\top \hat{\Delta}^{(-k)} \right).\end{aligned}$$

For I_1 , let

$$I_{1k} = n_k^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \left(\Gamma_i - \frac{\Gamma_i}{\gamma_n} \right) \left(X_i^\top \hat{\Delta}^{(-k)} - \mathbb{E} [X_i]^\top \hat{\Delta}^{(-k)} \right).$$

Define $\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{I}_{-k}} = \{(\Gamma_i, \Gamma_i X_i, \Gamma_i Y_i) \in \mathcal{D}_n \mid i \in \mathcal{I}_{-k}\}$. Then

$$\mathbb{E}[I_{1k} \mid \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{I}_{-k}}] = n_k^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \mathbb{E} \left[\Gamma_i - \frac{\Gamma_i}{\gamma_n} \right] \mathbb{E} \left[X_i^\top \hat{\Delta}^{(-k)} - \mathbb{E} [X_i]^\top \hat{\Delta}^{(-k)} \mid \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{I}_{-k}} \right] = 0,$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E} [I_{1k}^2 \mid \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{I}_{-k}}] &= \mathbb{E} \left[\left\{ n_k^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \left(\Gamma_i - \frac{\Gamma_i}{\gamma_n} \right) \left(X_i^\top \widehat{\Delta}^{(-k)} - \mathbb{E} [X_i]^\top \widehat{\Delta}^{(-k)} \right) \right\}^2 \mid \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{I}_{-k}} \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left[n_k^{-2} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \left(\Gamma_i - \frac{\Gamma_i}{\gamma_n} \right)^2 \left(X_i^\top \widehat{\Delta}^{(-k)} - \mathbb{E} [X_i]^\top \widehat{\Delta}^{(-k)} \right)^2 \mid \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{I}_{-k}} \right] \\
&\leq n_k^{-2} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\Gamma_i - \frac{\Gamma_i}{\gamma_n} \right)^2 \right] \mathbb{E} \left[\left(X_i^\top \widehat{\Delta}^{(-k)} \right)^2 \mid \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{I}_{-k}} \right] \\
&= n_k^{-1} \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\Gamma_i - \frac{\Gamma_i}{\gamma_n} \right)^2 \right] \mathbb{E} \left[\left(X_i^\top \widehat{\Delta}^{(-k)} \right)^2 \mid \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{I}_{-k}} \right] \\
&= (1 - \gamma_n)^2 (n_k \gamma_n)^{-1} \widehat{\Delta}^{(-k), \top} \mathbb{E} [X_i X_i^\top] \widehat{\Delta}^{(-k)}
\end{aligned}$$

By Lemma C.1(c) and Proposition B.1,

$$\Delta^{(-k), \top} \mathbb{E} [X_i X_i^\top] \widehat{\Delta}^{(-k)} \leq 2\sigma^2 \left\| \widehat{\Delta}^{(-k)} \right\|_2^2 = O_p \left(\frac{s \log d}{n \gamma_n} \right). \quad (41)$$

Then by Lemma C.2,

$$I_{1k} = O_p \left((n \gamma_n)^{-1/2} \sqrt{\frac{s \log d}{n \gamma_n}} \right).$$

Thus,

$$I_1 = K^{-1} \sum_{k=1}^K I_{1k} = O_p \left(\sqrt{\frac{s \log d}{n^2 \gamma_n^2}} \right).$$

For I_2 , let

$$I_{2k} = n_k^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \Gamma_i \left(X_i^\top \widehat{\Delta}^{(-k)} - \mathbb{E} [X_i]^\top \widehat{\Delta}^{(-k)} \right).$$

Then we have

$$\mathbb{E} [I_{2k} \mid \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{I}_{-k}}] = n_k^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \mathbb{E} [\Gamma_i] \mathbb{E} \left[\left(X_i^\top \widehat{\Delta}^{(-k)} - \mathbb{E} [X_i]^\top \widehat{\Delta}^{(-k)} \right) \mid \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{I}_{-k}} \right] = 0,$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[I_{2k}^2 | \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{I}_{-k}}] &= n_k^{-2} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \mathbb{E}[\Gamma_i] \mathbb{E} \left[\left(X_i^\top \widehat{\Delta}^{(-k)} - \mathbb{E}[X_i]^\top \widehat{\Delta}^{(-k)} \right)^2 | \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{I}_{-k}} \right] \\
&= n_k^{-1} \gamma_n \left\{ \mathbb{E} \left[\left(X_i^\top \widehat{\Delta}^{(-k)} \right)^2 | \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{I}_{-k}} \right] - \mathbb{E} \left[X_i^\top \widehat{\Delta}^{(-k)} | \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{I}_{-k}} \right]^2 \right\} \\
&\leq n_k^{-1} \gamma_n \mathbb{E} \left[\left(X_i^\top \widehat{\Delta}^{(-k)} \right)^2 | \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{I}_{-k}} \right] \\
&= n_k^{-1} \gamma_n \Delta^{(-k), \top} \mathbb{E} [X_i X_i^\top] \widehat{\Delta}^{(-k)}.
\end{aligned}$$

Then by (41), and Lemma C.2, we have

$$I_{2k} = O_p \left(n^{-1/2} \gamma_n^{1/2} \sqrt{\frac{s \log d}{n \gamma_n}} \right).$$

Together with Lemma D.1, we have $\frac{1}{\gamma_n} - \frac{1}{\widehat{\gamma}^{(k)}} = O_p \left(n^{-1/2} \gamma_n^{-3/2} \right)$, then

$$I_2 = K^{-1} \sum_{k=1}^K \left(\frac{1}{\gamma_n} - \frac{1}{\widehat{\gamma}^{(k)}} \right) I_{2k} = O_p \left(\sqrt{\frac{s \log d}{n^3 \gamma_n^3}} \right).$$

For I_3 , let $I_{3k} = n_k^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \Gamma_i w_i$. By Lemma A.1,

$$\mathbb{E}[I_{3k} | \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{I}_{-k}}] = n_k^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \mathbb{E}[\Gamma_i w_i | \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{I}_{-k}}] = n_k^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \mathbb{E}[\Gamma_i] \mathbb{E}[w_i] = 0,$$

and

$$\mathbb{E}[I_{3k}^2 | \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{I}_{-k}}] = n_k^{-2} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \mathbb{E}[\Gamma_i w_i^2] = n_k^{-1} \gamma_n \mathbb{E}[w_i^2].$$

By Lemma C.1(c), we have

$$\mathbb{E}[w_i^2] \leq 2\sigma_w^2. \tag{42}$$

Thus, by Chebyshev's inequality,

$$I_{3k} = O_p \left(\sqrt{\frac{\gamma_n}{n}} \right).$$

Similarly, with Lemma D.1, it follows that

$$I_3 = K^{-1} \sum_{k=1}^K \left(\frac{1}{\widehat{\gamma}^{(k)}} - \frac{1}{\gamma_n} \right) I_{3k} = O_p \left((n \gamma_n)^{-1} \right).$$

For I_4 , let $\hat{\gamma} = n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \Gamma_i$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E} [((1 - \hat{\gamma}) - (1 - \gamma_n))^2] &= \mathbb{E} [(\hat{\gamma} - \gamma_n)^2] \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left[\left\{ n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (\Gamma_i - \gamma_n) \right\}^2 \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left[n^{-2} \sum_{i=1}^n (\Gamma_i - \gamma_n)^2 \right] \\
&= n^{-1} \gamma_n (1 - \gamma_n),
\end{aligned}$$

which implies that

$$(1 - \hat{\gamma}) - (1 - \gamma_n) = O_p \left(n^{-1/2} \gamma_n^{1/2} (1 - \gamma_n)^{1/2} \right). \quad (43)$$

Similarly,

$$(1 - \hat{\gamma}^{(k)}) - (1 - \gamma_n) = O_p \left(n^{-1/2} \gamma_n^{1/2} (1 - \gamma_n)^{1/2} \right).$$

Since Lemma D.1 can also be applied to $1 - \Gamma_i$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1 - \gamma_n}{1 - \hat{\gamma}^{(k)}} - 1 &= O_p \left((n(1 - \gamma_n))^{-1/2} \gamma_n^{1/2} \right), \\
\frac{1 - \gamma_n}{1 - \hat{\gamma}} - 1 &= O_p \left((n(1 - \gamma_n))^{-1/2} \gamma_n^{1/2} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1 - \hat{\gamma}^{(k)}}{1 - \hat{\gamma}} - 1 &= (1 - \gamma_n)^{-1} \left(\frac{1 - \gamma_n}{1 - \hat{\gamma}} - 1 \right) ((1 - \hat{\gamma}^{(k)}) - (1 - \gamma_n)) \\
&\quad + \left(\frac{1 - \gamma_n}{1 - \hat{\gamma}} - 1 \right) + \left(\frac{1 - \hat{\gamma}^{(k)}}{1 - \gamma_n} - 1 \right) \\
&= O_p \left(\gamma_n (n(1 - \gamma_n))^{-1} \right) + O_p \left(\gamma_n^{1/2} (n(1 - \gamma_n))^{-1/2} \right). \quad (44)
\end{aligned}$$

Let

$$I_{4k} = (1 - \hat{\gamma}) \left(\bar{X}_0^\top \hat{\Delta}^{(-k)} - \mathbb{E}[X_i]^\top \hat{\Delta}^{(-k)} \right) = n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (1 - \Gamma_i) \left(X_i^\top \hat{\Delta}^{(-k)} - \mathbb{E}[X_i]^\top \hat{\Delta}^{(-k)} \right).$$

By Lemma C.7, $(1 - \Gamma_i)X_i \perp \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{I}_{-k}} \mid \Gamma_{1:n}$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$. Then under Assumption 1, for $i = 1, \dots, n$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[(1 - \Gamma_i) \left(X_i^\top \widehat{\Delta}^{(-k)} - \mathbb{E}[X_i]^\top \widehat{\Delta}^{(-k)} \right) \mid \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{I}_{-k}}, \Gamma_{1:n} \right] \\ &= (1 - \Gamma_i) \mathbb{E} [X_i - \mathbb{E}[X_i] \mid \Gamma_{1:n}]^\top \widehat{\Delta}^{(-k)} \\ &= (1 - \Gamma_i) \mathbb{E} [(X_i - \mathbb{E}[X_i])]^\top \widehat{\Delta}^{(-k)} = 0. \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} [I_{4k}^2 \mid \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{I}_{-k}}, \Gamma_{1:n}] &= \mathbb{E} \left[\left\{ n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (1 - \Gamma_i) \left(X_i^\top \widehat{\Delta}^{(-k)} - \mathbb{E}[X_i]^\top \widehat{\Delta}^{(-k)} \right) \right\}^2 \mid \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{I}_{-k}}, \Gamma_{1:n} \right] \\ &= n^{-2} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E} \left[\left((1 - \Gamma_i) (X_i - \mathbb{E}[X_i])^\top \widehat{\Delta}^{(-k)} \right)^2 \mid \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{I}_{-k}}, \Gamma_{1:n} \right] \\ &\leq n^{-2} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E} \left[(1 - \Gamma_i) \left(X_i^\top \widehat{\Delta}^{(-k)} \right)^2 \mid \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{I}_{-k}}, \Gamma_{1:n} \right] \\ &= n^{-2} \sum_{i=1}^n \widehat{\Delta}^{(-k), \top} \mathbb{E} [(1 - \Gamma_i) X_i X_i^\top \mid \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{I}_{-k}}, \Gamma_{1:n}] \widehat{\Delta}^{(-k)} \\ &= n^{-2} \sum_{i=1}^n (1 - \Gamma_i) \widehat{\Delta}^{(-k), \top} \mathbb{E} [X_i X_i^\top \mid \Gamma_{1:n}] \widehat{\Delta}^{(-k)} \\ &= \left(n^{-2} \sum_{i=1}^n (1 - \Gamma_i) \right) \widehat{\Delta}^{(-k), \top} \mathbb{E} [X_i X_i^\top] \widehat{\Delta}^{(-k)} \\ &\leq \left(n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (1 - \Gamma_i) \right)^2 \widehat{\Delta}^{(-k), \top} \mathbb{E} [X_i X_i^\top] \widehat{\Delta}^{(-k)} \\ &= (1 - \widehat{\gamma})^2 \widehat{\Delta}^{(-k), \top} \mathbb{E} [X_i X_i^\top] \widehat{\Delta}^{(-k)}, \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality comes from the fact $\sum_{i=1}^n (1 - \Gamma_i) = 0$ or $\sum_{i=1}^n (1 - \Gamma_i) \geq 1$. By

(41), (43), and Lemma C.2, we have

$$I_{4k} = O_p \left((1 - \gamma_n) \sqrt{\frac{s \log d}{n \gamma_n}} \right).$$

From above, we also have another rate for I_{4k} :

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E} [I_{4k}^2 \mid \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{I}_{-k}}, \Gamma_{1:n}] &\leq \left(n^{-2} \sum_{i=1}^n (1 - \Gamma_i) \right) \widehat{\Delta}^{(-k), \top} \mathbb{E} [X_i X_i^\top] \widehat{\Delta}^{(-k)} \\ &\leq n^{-1} \widehat{\Delta}^{(-k), \top} \mathbb{E} [X_i X_i^\top] \widehat{\Delta}^{(-k)}.\end{aligned}$$

By (41) and Lemma C.2, we also have

$$I_{4k} = O_p \left(n^{-1/2} \sqrt{\frac{s \log d}{n \gamma_n}} \right).$$

Therefore, by (44),

$$\begin{aligned}I_4 &= n^{-1} \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} (1 - \Gamma_i) \left(\bar{X}_0^\top \widehat{\Delta}^{(-k)} - \mathbb{E} [X_i]^\top \widehat{\Delta}^{(-k)} \right) \\ &= K^{-1} \sum_{k=1}^K \left(\frac{1 - \widehat{\gamma}^{(k)}}{1 - \widehat{\gamma}} - 1 \right) I_{4k} + K^{-1} \sum_{k=1}^K I_{4k} \\ &= O_p \left(n^{-1/2} (\gamma_n (1 - \gamma_n))^{1/2} \sqrt{\frac{s \log d}{n \gamma_n}} \right) + O_p \left(n^{-1/2} \sqrt{\frac{s \log d}{n \gamma_n}} \right) \\ &= O_p \left(\sqrt{\frac{s \log d}{n^2 \gamma_n}} \right).\end{aligned}$$

In conclusion,

$$\widehat{\theta}^{(k)} - \widetilde{\theta}^{(k)} = O_p \left(\sqrt{\frac{s \log d}{n^2 \gamma_n^2}} \right) + O_p \left(\sqrt{\frac{s \log d}{n^3 \gamma_n^3}} \right) + O_p \left(\sqrt{\frac{s \log d}{n^2 \gamma_n}} \right) + O_p \left((n \gamma_n)^{-1} \right),$$

which implies

$$\widehat{\theta} = \widetilde{\theta} + O_p \left(\sqrt{\frac{s \log d}{n^2 \gamma_n^2}} \right).$$

Together with Lemma D.2, we have

$$\widehat{\theta} - \theta = O_p \left((n \gamma_n)^{-1/2} \right).$$

□

Lemma D.4. *Suppose that Assumptions 1 and 2 hold. Choose $\lambda_n \asymp \sqrt{\log d / (n \gamma_n)}$. If $n \gamma_n \gg (s \vee (\log n)^2) \log d$, then as $n, d \rightarrow \infty$,*

$$\widehat{\sigma}^2 = \sigma_n^2 \left\{ 1 + O_p \left(\sqrt{\frac{s \log d}{n \gamma_n}} \right) \right\}.$$

Proof. Let $\hat{\gamma}^{(k)} = n_k^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \Gamma_i$ and

$$g_i^{(-k)} = \Gamma_i X_i^\top \hat{\beta}^{(-k)} + \frac{\Gamma_i}{\hat{\gamma}^{(k)}} \left(Y_i - X_i^\top \hat{\beta}^{(-k)} \right),$$

$$g_i = \Gamma_i X_i^\top \beta^* + \frac{\Gamma_i}{\gamma_n} \left(Y_i - X_i^\top \beta^* \right).$$

Thus, we have

$$\hat{\sigma}^2 = n^{-1} \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \left(g_i^{(-k)} \right)^2 + n^{-1} \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} (1 - \Gamma_i) \hat{\beta}^{(-k), \top} \bar{\Xi}_0 \hat{\beta}^{(-k)} - \left(\hat{\theta} \right)^2.$$

Define $\tilde{\sigma}^2$ as

$$\tilde{\sigma}^2 = n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (g_i)^2 + n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (1 - \Gamma_i) (X_i^\top \beta^*)^2 - \theta^2.$$

Then we can do the following decomposition:

$$\hat{\sigma}^2 - \tilde{\sigma}^2 = B_1 + B_2 - B_3,$$

where

$$B_1 = n^{-1} \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \left(g_i^{(-k)} \right)^2 - n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (g_i)^2,$$

$$B_2 = n^{-1} \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} (1 - \Gamma_i) \hat{\beta}^{(-k), \top} \bar{\Xi}_0 \hat{\beta}^{(-k)} - n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (1 - \Gamma_i) (X_i^\top \beta^*)^2,$$

$$B_3 = \left(\hat{\theta} \right)^2 - \theta^2.$$

Let $\hat{\gamma} = n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \Gamma_i$, $\hat{\gamma}^{(-k)} = |\mathcal{I}_{-k}|^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{-k}} \Gamma_i$, and $\hat{\Delta}^{(-k)} = \hat{\beta}^{(-k)} - \beta^*$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \left(g_i^{(-k)} - g_i \right)^2 &= \left\{ \left(\Gamma_i - \frac{\Gamma_i}{\gamma_n} \right) X_i^\top \hat{\Delta}^{(-k)} + \left(\frac{\Gamma_i}{\gamma_n} - \frac{\Gamma_i}{\hat{\gamma}^{(k)}} \right) X_i^\top \hat{\Delta}^{(-k)} + \left(\frac{\Gamma_i}{\hat{\gamma}^{(k)}} - \frac{\Gamma_i}{\gamma_n} \right) w_i \right\}^2 \\ &\leq 2 \left\{ \left(\Gamma_i - \frac{\Gamma_i}{\gamma_n} \right) X_i^\top \hat{\Delta}^{(-k)} + \left(\frac{\Gamma_i}{\gamma_n} - \frac{\Gamma_i}{\hat{\gamma}^{(k)}} \right) X_i^\top \hat{\Delta}^{(-k)} \right\}^2 + 2 \left\{ \left(\frac{\Gamma_i}{\hat{\gamma}^{(k)}} - \frac{\Gamma_i}{\gamma_n} \right) w_i \right\}^2 \\ &\leq 4 \left\{ \left(\Gamma_i - \frac{\Gamma_i}{\gamma_n} \right)^2 + \left(\frac{\Gamma_i}{\hat{\gamma}^{(k)}} - \frac{\Gamma_i}{\gamma_n} \right)^2 \right\} \left(X_i^\top \hat{\Delta}^{(-k)} \right)^2 + 2 \left(\frac{\Gamma_i}{\hat{\gamma}^{(k)}} - \frac{\Gamma_i}{\gamma_n} \right)^2 w_i^2 \\ &\leq \frac{4\Gamma_i}{\gamma_n^2} \left\{ 1 + \left(\frac{\gamma_n}{\hat{\gamma}^{(k)}} - 1 \right)^2 \right\} \left(X_i^\top \hat{\Delta}^{(-k)} \right)^2 + \frac{2\Gamma_i}{\gamma_n^2} \left(\frac{\gamma_n}{\hat{\gamma}^{(k)}} - 1 \right)^2 w_i^2. \end{aligned}$$

For the summation, we have

$$\begin{aligned} n_k^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \left(g_i^{(-k)} - g_i \right)^2 &\leq 4 \left\{ 1 + \left(\frac{\gamma_n}{\widehat{\gamma}^{(k)}} - 1 \right)^2 \right\} n_k^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \frac{\Gamma_i}{\gamma_n^2} \left(X_i^\top \widehat{\Delta}^{(-k)} \right)^2 \\ &\quad + 2 \left(\frac{\gamma_n}{\widehat{\gamma}^{(k)}} - 1 \right)^2 n_k^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \frac{\Gamma_i}{\gamma_n^2} w_i^2. \end{aligned}$$

With (41) and (42), it is clear that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[n_k^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \frac{\Gamma_i}{\gamma_n^2} \left(X_i^\top \widehat{\Delta}^{(-k)} \right)^2 \mid \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{I}_{-k}} \right] &= (n_k \gamma_n)^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \mathbb{E} \left[\left(X_i^\top \widehat{\Delta}^{(-k)} \right)^2 \mid \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{I}_{-k}} \right] = O_p \left(\frac{s \log d}{n \gamma_n^2} \right), \\ \mathbb{E} \left[n_k^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \frac{\Gamma_i}{\gamma_n^2} w_i^2 \mid \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{I}_{-k}} \right] &= (n_k \gamma_n)^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \mathbb{E} [w_i^2] = O_p(\gamma_n^{-1}). \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma D.1, we have $(\gamma_n / \widehat{\gamma}^{(k)}) - 1 = O_p((n \gamma_n)^{-1/2})$. Together with Lemma C.2, we have

$$n_k^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \left(g_i^{(-k)} - g_i \right)^2 = O_p \left(\frac{s \log d}{n \gamma_n^2} \right) + O_p(\gamma_n^{-1} (n \gamma_n)^{-1}) = O_p \left(\frac{s \log d}{n \gamma_n^2} \right). \quad (45)$$

In addition, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (g_i)^2 \right] &= n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\Gamma_i X_i^\top \beta^* + \frac{\Gamma_i}{\gamma_n} w_i \right)^2 \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\Gamma_i (X_i^\top \beta^*)^2 + \frac{\Gamma_i}{\gamma_n^2} w_i^2 + \frac{2\Gamma_i}{\gamma_n} (X_i^\top \beta^*) w_i \right] \\ &= \gamma_n \mathbb{E} \left[(X_i^\top \beta^*)^2 \right] + \gamma_n^{-1} \mathbb{E} [w_i^2] \\ &\leq 2\gamma_n \sigma^2 + 2\gamma_n^{-1} \sigma_w^2. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, by Markov inequality,

$$n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (g_i)^2 = O_p(\gamma_n^{-1}). \quad (46)$$

For B_1 , since $a^2 - b^2 = (a - b)^2 - 2b(a - b)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
|B_1| &= \left| n^{-1} \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \left\{ \left(g_i^{(-k)} \right)^2 - \left(g_i \right)^2 \right\} \right| \\
&\leq n^{-1} \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \left(g_i^{(-k)} - g_i \right)^2 + 2n^{-1} \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \left| g_i \left(g_i^{(-k)} - g_i \right) \right| \\
&\leq n^{-1} \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \left(g_i^{(-k)} - g_i \right)^2 \\
&\quad + 2 \left\{ n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(g_i \right)^2 \right\}^{1/2} \left\{ n^{-1} \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \left(g_i^{(-k)} - g_i \right)^2 \right\}^{1/2}.
\end{aligned}$$

By (45) and (46), we have

$$B_1 = O_p \left(\frac{s \log d}{n \gamma_n^2} \right) + O_p \left(\gamma_n^{-1/2} \sqrt{\frac{s \log d}{n \gamma_n^2}} \right) = O_p \left(\gamma_n^{-1} \sqrt{\frac{s \log d}{n \gamma_n}} \right).$$

For B_2 , define

$$B_{2k} := n_k^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} (1 - \Gamma_i) \widehat{\beta}^{(-k), \top} \bar{\Xi}_0 \widehat{\beta}^{(-k)} - n_k^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} (1 - \Gamma_i) (X_i^\top \beta^*)^2.$$

Then we have

$$\begin{aligned}
B_{2k} &= \left(\frac{1 - \widehat{\gamma}^{(k)}}{1 - \widehat{\gamma}} \right) n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (1 - \Gamma_i) \left(X_i^\top \widehat{\Delta}^{(-k)} + X_i^\top \beta^* \right)^2 - n_k^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} (1 - \Gamma_i) (X_i^\top \beta^*)^2 \\
&= \left(\frac{1 - \widehat{\gamma}^{(k)}}{1 - \widehat{\gamma}} - 1 \right) (B_{2k,1} + B_{2k,2} + B_{2k,3}) + B_{2k,1} + B_{2k,3} + B_{2k,4} + B_{2k,5}
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
B_{2k,1} &= n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (1 - \Gamma_i) \left(X_i^\top \widehat{\Delta}^{(-k)} \right)^2, \\
B_{2k,2} &= n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (1 - \Gamma_i) \left(X_i^\top \beta^* \right)^2, \\
B_{2k,3} &= 2n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (1 - \Gamma_i) \left(X_i^\top \widehat{\Delta}^{(-k)} \right) \left(X_i^\top \beta^* \right), \\
B_{2k,4} &= n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (1 - \Gamma_i) \left(X_i^\top \beta^* \right)^2 - \mathbb{E} \left[(1 - \Gamma_i) \left(X_i^\top \beta^* \right)^2 \right], \\
B_{2k,5} &= \mathbb{E} \left[(1 - \Gamma_i) \left(X_i^\top \beta^* \right)^2 \right] - n_k^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} (1 - \Gamma_i) \left(X_i^\top \beta^* \right)^2.
\end{aligned}$$

By Lemma C.7, $(1 - \Gamma_i)X_i \perp \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{I}_{-k}} \mid \Gamma_{1:n}$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$. Thus, by (41), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E} [B_{2k,1} \mid \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{I}_{-k}}, \Gamma_{1:n}] &= \mathbb{E} \left[n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (1 - \Gamma_i) \left(X_i^\top \widehat{\Delta}^{(-k)} \right)^2 \mid \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{I}_{-k}}, \Gamma_{1:n} \right] \\
&= n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (1 - \Gamma_i) \widehat{\Delta}^{(-k), \top} \mathbb{E} [X_i X_i^\top \mid \Gamma_{1:n}] \widehat{\Delta}^{(-k)} \\
&= (1 - \widehat{\gamma}) \widehat{\Delta}^{(-k), \top} \mathbb{E} [X_i X_i^\top] \widehat{\Delta}^{(-k)} \\
&= O_p \left((1 - \gamma_n) \frac{s \log d}{n \gamma_n} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

By Lemma C.2 we have

$$B_{2k,1} = O_p \left((1 - \gamma_n) \frac{s \log d}{n \gamma_n} \right). \quad (47)$$

Since

$$\mathbb{E} \left[(1 - \Gamma_i) (X_i^\top \beta^*)^2 \right] = (1 - \gamma_n) \mathbb{E} \left[(X_i^\top \beta^*)^2 \right] \leq 2\sigma^2 (1 - \gamma_n),$$

by Markov inequality, we have

$$B_{2k,2} = n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (1 - \Gamma_i) (X_i^\top \beta^*)^2 = O_p (1 - \gamma_n). \quad (48)$$

Then with (47), (48), and by Cauchy-Schwarz inequality,

$$\begin{aligned}
|B_{2k,3}| &\leq n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \left| (1 - \Gamma_i) \left(X_i^\top \widehat{\Delta}^{(-k)} \right) (X_i^\top \beta^*) \right| \\
&\leq \left\{ n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (1 - \Gamma_i) \left(X_i^\top \widehat{\Delta}^{(-k)} \right)^2 \right\}^{1/2} \left\{ n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (1 - \Gamma_i) (X_i^\top \beta^*)^2 \right\}^{1/2} \\
&= O_p \left((1 - \gamma_n) \sqrt{\frac{s \log d}{n \gamma_n}} \right).
\end{aligned} \quad (49)$$

Moreover, by Lemma C.1(c),

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} \left[\left\{ n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (1 - \Gamma_i) (X_i^\top \beta^*)^2 - \mathbb{E} \left[(1 - \Gamma_i) (X_i^\top \beta^*)^2 \right] \right\}^2 \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left[n^{-2} \sum_{i=1}^n \left\{ (1 - \Gamma_i) (X_i^\top \beta^*)^2 - \mathbb{E} \left[(1 - \Gamma_i) (X_i^\top \beta^*)^2 \right] \right\}^2 \right] \\
&= n^{-1} \text{Var} \left[(1 - \Gamma_i) (X_i^\top \beta^*)^2 \right] \\
&\leq n^{-1} \mathbb{E} \left[(1 - \Gamma_i) (X_i^\top \beta^*)^4 \right] \\
&= n^{-1} (1 - \gamma_n) \mathbb{E} \left[(X_i^\top \beta^*)^4 \right] \leq 4\sigma^4 n^{-1} (1 - \gamma_n).
\end{aligned}$$

By Chebyshev's inequality, we have

$$B_{2k,4} = n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (1 - \Gamma_i) (X_i^\top \beta^*)^2 - \mathbb{E} \left[(1 - \Gamma_i) (X_i^\top \beta^*)^2 \right] = O_p \left(n^{-1/2} (1 - \gamma_n)^{1/2} \right). \quad (50)$$

Identically, we have

$$B_{2k,5} = n_k^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} (1 - \Gamma_i) (X_i^\top \beta^*)^2 - \mathbb{E} \left[(1 - \Gamma_i) (X_i^\top \beta^*)^2 \right] = O_p \left(n^{-1/2} (1 - \gamma_n)^{1/2} \right). \quad (51)$$

Let $\hat{\gamma}^{(k)} = n_k^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \Gamma_i$. By (44) we have

$$\frac{1 - \hat{\gamma}^{(k)}}{1 - \hat{\gamma}} - 1 = O_p \left(\gamma_n (n(1 - \gamma_n))^{-1} \right) + O_p \left(\gamma_n^{1/2} (n(1 - \gamma_n))^{-1/2} \right). \quad (52)$$

Together with (47)-(51), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
B_{2k} &= O_p \left(\left\{ \gamma_n (n(1 - \gamma_n))^{-1} + \gamma_n^{1/2} (n(1 - \gamma_n))^{-1/2} \right\} (1 - \gamma_n) \frac{s \log d}{n\gamma_n} \right) \\
&\quad + O_p \left(\left\{ \gamma_n (n(1 - \gamma_n))^{-1} + \gamma_n^{1/2} (n(1 - \gamma_n))^{-1/2} \right\} (1 - \gamma_n) \right) \\
&\quad + O_p \left(\left\{ \gamma_n (n(1 - \gamma_n))^{-1} + \gamma_n^{1/2} (n(1 - \gamma_n))^{-1/2} \right\} (1 - \gamma_n) \sqrt{\frac{s \log d}{n\gamma_n}} \right) \\
&\quad + O_p \left((1 - \gamma_n) \frac{s \log d}{n\gamma_n} \right) + O_p \left((1 - \gamma_n) \sqrt{\frac{s \log d}{n\gamma_n}} \right) \\
&\quad + O_p \left(n^{-1/2} (1 - \gamma_n)^{1/2} \right) + O_p \left(n^{-1/2} (1 - \gamma_n)^{1/2} \right) \\
&= O_p \left((1 - \gamma_n) \sqrt{\frac{s \log d}{n\gamma_n}} \right) + O_p \left(n^{-1} \gamma_n \right) + O_p \left(n^{-1/2} (1 - \gamma_n)^{1/2} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$B_2 = K^{-1} \sum_{k=1}^K B_{2k} = O_p \left((1 - \gamma_n) \sqrt{\frac{s \log d}{n\gamma_n}} \right).$$

For B_3 , by Lemma D.3, it follows that

$$B_3 = (\hat{\theta})^2 - \theta^2 = (\hat{\theta} - \theta)^2 + 2\theta(\hat{\theta} - \theta) = O_p \left((n\gamma_n)^{-1/2} \right).$$

In conclusion, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\sigma}^2 - \tilde{\sigma}^2 &= O_p \left(\gamma_n^{-1} \sqrt{\frac{s \log d}{n\gamma_n}} \right) + O_p \left((1 - \gamma_n) \sqrt{\frac{s \log d}{n\gamma_n}} \right) + O_p \left((n\gamma_n)^{-1/2} \right) \\ &= O_p \left(\gamma_n^{-1} \sqrt{\frac{s \log d}{n\gamma_n}} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Note that $\tilde{\sigma}^2$ can be written as

$$\tilde{\sigma}^2 = n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(X_i^\top \beta^* + \frac{\Gamma_i}{\gamma_n} (Y_i - X_i^\top \beta^*) \right)^2 - \theta^2 = n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(X_i^\top \beta^* + \frac{\Gamma_i}{\gamma_n} w_i \right)^2 - \theta^2.$$

Since $\mathbb{E} \left[X_i^\top \beta^* + \frac{\Gamma_i}{\gamma_n} (Y_i - X_i^\top \beta^*) \right] = \theta$, we have

$$\sigma_n^2 = \text{Var} \left(X_i^\top \beta^* + \frac{\Gamma_i}{\gamma_n} (Y_i - X_i^\top \beta^*) \right) = \mathbb{E} \left[\left(X_i^\top \beta^* + \frac{\Gamma_i}{\gamma_n} w_i \right)^2 \right] - \theta^2.$$

Note that

$$\tilde{\sigma}^2 - \sigma_n^2 = n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(X_i^\top \beta^* + \frac{\Gamma_i}{\gamma_n} w_i \right)^2 - \mathbb{E} \left[\left(X_i^\top \beta^* + \frac{\Gamma_i}{\gamma_n} w_i \right)^2 \right].$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[(\tilde{\sigma}^2 - \sigma_n^2)^2 \right] &= \mathbb{E} \left[\left(n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \left\{ \left(X_i^\top \beta^* + \frac{\Gamma_i}{\gamma_n} w_i \right)^2 - \mathbb{E} \left[\left(X_i^\top \beta^* + \frac{\Gamma_i}{\gamma_n} w_i \right)^2 \right] \right\} \right)^2 \right] \\ &= n^{-2} \sum_{i=1}^n \text{Var} \left[\left(X_i^\top \beta^* + \frac{\Gamma_i}{\gamma_n} w_i \right)^2 \right] \\ &\leq n^{-1} \mathbb{E} \left[\left(X_i^\top \beta^* + \frac{\Gamma_i}{\gamma_n} w_i \right)^4 \right] \\ &\leq 8n^{-1} \mathbb{E} \left[\left(X_i^\top \beta^* \right)^4 + \left(\frac{\Gamma_i}{\gamma_n} w_i \right)^4 \right], \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality comes from Hölder inequality. By Lemma C.1 (c), we have

$$\mathbb{E} \left[(X_i^\top \beta^*)^4 \right] \leq 4\sigma^4 \text{ and } \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\frac{\Gamma_i}{\gamma_n} w_i \right)^4 \right] = \gamma_n^{-3} \mathbb{E} [w_i^4] \leq 4\sigma_w^4 \gamma_n^{-3}.$$

It follows that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[(\tilde{\sigma}^2 - \sigma_n^2)^2 \right] \leq 32 (\sigma^4 + \sigma_w^4 \gamma_n^{-3}) n^{-1}.$$

By Chebyshev's inequality, it holds that

$$\tilde{\sigma}^2 - \sigma_n^2 = O_p \left(\gamma_n^{-1} (n\gamma_n)^{-1/2} \right).$$

Together with $\sigma_n^2 \asymp \gamma_n^{-1}$ from Lemma D.2, we have

$$\hat{\sigma}^2 = \hat{\sigma}^2 - \tilde{\sigma}^2 + \tilde{\sigma}^2 - \sigma_n^2 + \sigma_n^2 = \sigma_n^2 + O_p \left(\gamma_n^{-1} (n\gamma_n)^{-1/2} \right) + O_p \left(\gamma_n^{-1} \sqrt{\frac{s \log d}{n\gamma_n}} \right),$$

which implies that

$$\hat{\sigma}^2 = \sigma_n^2 \left\{ 1 + O_p \left(\sqrt{\frac{s \log d}{n\gamma_n}} \right) \right\}.$$

□

D.2 Proof of Theorem 1

Proof. $\hat{\theta} - \theta = O_p \left((n\gamma_n)^{-1/2} \right)$ and $\hat{\sigma}^2 = \sigma_n^2 \{1 + o_p(1)\}$ follow from Lemma D.3 and D.4.

In addition, by Lemma D.2, Lemma D.3, and Lemma D.4,

$$\hat{\sigma}^{-1} \sqrt{n}(\hat{\theta} - \tilde{\theta}) = O_p \left((n\gamma_n)^{1/2} \sqrt{\frac{s \log d}{n^2 \gamma_n^2}} \right) = o_p(1).$$

Then by Lemma D.2 and Slutsky's theorem, we have that

$$\hat{\sigma}^{-1} \sqrt{n}(\hat{\theta} - \theta) = \frac{\sigma_n}{\hat{\sigma}} \cdot \sigma_n^{-1} \sqrt{n}(\tilde{\theta} - \theta) + \hat{\sigma}^{-1} \sqrt{n}(\hat{\theta} - \tilde{\theta}) \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(0, 1).$$

□

D.3 Auxiliary lemmas for Theorem 2

Lemma D.5. *Suppose that Assumptions 1 and 3 hold. Then $\sigma_{plm}^2 \asymp \gamma_n^{-1}$ and as $n, d \rightarrow \infty$,*

$$\sigma_{plm}^{-1} \sqrt{n} (\tilde{\theta}_{plm} - \theta) \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(0, 1),$$

where $\tilde{\theta}_{plm} = n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \left\{ X_i^\top \beta_{plm}^* + f^*(Z_i) + \frac{\Gamma_i}{\gamma_n} \epsilon_i \right\}$.

Proof. Let $V_i = X_i^\top \beta_{plm}^* + f^*(Z_i) + \frac{\Gamma_i}{\gamma_n} \epsilon_i$. Then

$$\mathbb{E}[V_i] = \mathbb{E} \left[X_i^\top \beta_{plm}^* + f^*(Z_i) \right] + \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\Gamma_i}{\gamma_n} \right] \mathbb{E} \left[(Y_i - X_i^\top \beta_{plm}^* - f^*(Z_i)) \right] = \mathbb{E}[Y_i] = \theta.$$

Observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_{plm}^2 &= \text{Var}[V_i] = \mathbb{E} \left[\left(X_i^\top \beta_{plm}^* + f^*(Z_i) + \frac{\Gamma_i}{\gamma_n} \epsilon_i - \theta \right)^2 \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\left(X_i^\top \beta_{plm}^* + f^*(Z_i) - \theta \right)^2 + \frac{1}{\gamma_n} \epsilon_i^2 + 2 \left(X_i^\top \beta_{plm}^* + f^*(Z_i) - \theta \right) \epsilon_i \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\left(X_i^\top \beta_{plm}^* + f^*(Z_i) - \theta \right)^2 + \frac{1}{\gamma_n} \epsilon_i^2 \right] \\ &\quad + 2 \mathbb{E} \left[\epsilon_i X_i \right]^\top \beta_{plm}^* + 2 \mathbb{E} \left[(f^*(Z_i) - \theta) \mathbb{E}[\epsilon_i | Z_i] \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\left(X_i^\top \beta_{plm}^* + f^*(Z_i) - \theta \right)^2 + \frac{1}{\gamma_n} \epsilon_i^2 \right], \end{aligned}$$

where we use Lemma A.2 to obtain the last equation. Under Assumption 3, the second moments of $X_i^\top \beta_{plm}^*$, $f^*(Z_i)$, and ϵ_i are bounded, then by Minkowski's inequality, we have that the second moment of $X_i^\top \beta_{plm}^* + f^*(Z_i) - \theta$ is bounded. In addition, the second moment of ϵ_i is assumed to be lower bounded. Then it follows that

$$\sigma_{plm}^2 \asymp \gamma_n^{-1}. \tag{53}$$

Take $c = 2$ and we have

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\left| X_i^\top \beta_{plm}^* \right|^{2+c} \right] \leq \sigma^{2+c}, \quad \mathbb{E} \left[\left| f^*(Z_i) \right|^{2+c} \right] \leq \sigma_f^{2+c}, \quad \mathbb{E} \left[\left| \epsilon_i \right|^{2+c} \right] \leq \sigma_\epsilon^{2+c}.$$

Then,

$$\begin{aligned}
\|V_i - \theta\|_{\mathbb{P}, 2+c} &= \left\| X_i^\top \beta_{plm}^* + f^*(Z_i) - \theta + \frac{\Gamma_i}{\gamma_n} \epsilon_i \right\|_{\mathbb{P}, 2+c} \\
&\leq \|X_i^\top \beta_{plm}^*\|_{\mathbb{P}, 2+c} + \|f^*(Z_i)\|_{\mathbb{P}, 2+c} + \theta + \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\Gamma_i}{\gamma_n^{2+c}} \epsilon_i^{2+c} \right]^{\frac{1}{2+c}} \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left[|X_i^\top \beta_{plm}^*|^{2+c} \right]^{\frac{1}{2+c}} + \mathbb{E} \left[|f^*(Z_i)|^{2+c} \right]^{\frac{1}{2+c}} + \theta + \gamma_n^{\frac{1}{2+c}-1} \mathbb{E} \left[|\epsilon_i|^{2+c} \right]^{\frac{1}{2+c}} \\
&\leq \sigma + \sigma_f + \theta + \sigma_\epsilon \gamma_n^{\frac{1}{2+c}-1},
\end{aligned}$$

which implies that

$$\begin{aligned}
n^{-\frac{c}{2}} \gamma_n^{1+\frac{c}{2}} \mathbb{E} \left[|V_i - \theta|^{2+c} \right] &\leq n^{-\frac{c}{2}} \gamma_n^{1+\frac{c}{2}} \left(\sigma + \sigma_f + \theta + \sigma_\epsilon \gamma_n^{\frac{1}{2+c}-1} \right)^{2+c} \\
&= n^{-\frac{c}{2}} \gamma_n^{1+\frac{c}{2}} O(\gamma_n^{-1-c}).
\end{aligned}$$

That is,

$$n^{-\frac{c}{2}} \gamma_n^{1+\frac{c}{2}} \mathbb{E} \left[|V_i - \theta|^{2+c} \right] = O((n\gamma_n)^{-\frac{c}{2}}) = o(1). \quad (54)$$

Then for any $\delta > 0$, as $N, d \rightarrow \infty$,

$$\gamma_n \mathbb{E} \left[(V_i - \theta)^2 \mathbb{1}_{\{|V_i - \theta| > \delta \sqrt{n/\gamma_n}\}} \right] \leq \delta^{-c} n^{-\frac{c}{2}} \gamma_n^{1+\frac{c}{2}} \mathbb{E} \left[(V_i - \theta)^{2+c} \right] = o(1).$$

By Proposition 2.27 (Lindeberg-Feller theorem) of [Van der Vaart \(2000\)](#), we have

$$\sigma_{plm}^{-1} \sqrt{n} (\tilde{\theta}_{plm} - \theta) \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(0, 1).$$

□

Lemma D.6. *Suppose that Assumptions 1 and 3 hold. If $n\gamma_n \gg 1$, then as $n \rightarrow \infty$,*

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{\theta}_{plm} - \tilde{\theta}_{plm} &= o_p \left((n\gamma_n)^{-1/2} \right), \\
\hat{\theta}_{plm} - \theta &= O_p \left((n\gamma_n)^{-1/2} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Proof. Let $\hat{\gamma} = n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \Gamma_i$, $\hat{\gamma}^{(k)} = n_k^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \Gamma_i$, $\hat{\Delta}_{plm}^{(-k)} = \hat{\beta}_{plm}^{(-k)} - \beta_{plm}^*$, and $\hat{D}^{(-k)} = \hat{f}^{(-k)} - f^*$. Note that $\hat{\theta}_{plm} = K^{-1} \sum_{k=1}^K \hat{\theta}_{plm}^{(-k)}$, where

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\theta}_{plm}^{(k)} &= n_k^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \left\{ (\Gamma_i X_i + (1 - \Gamma_i) \bar{X}_0)^\top \hat{\beta}^{(-k)} + \hat{f}^{(-k)}(Z_i) \right\} \\ &\quad + n_k^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \frac{\Gamma_i}{\hat{\gamma}^{(k)}} \left(Y_i - X_i^\top \hat{\beta}^{(-k)} - \hat{f}^{(-k)}(Z_i) \right), \end{aligned}$$

and that

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\theta}_{plm} &= n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \left\{ X_i^\top \beta_{plm}^* + f^*(Z_i) + \frac{\Gamma_i}{\gamma_n} \epsilon_i \right\} \\ &= n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \left\{ (\Gamma_i X_i + (1 - \Gamma_i) \bar{X}_0)^\top \beta_{plm}^* + f^*(Z_i) + \frac{\Gamma_i}{\gamma_n} \epsilon_i \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\epsilon_i = Y_i - X_i^\top \beta_{plm}^* - f^*(Z_i)$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} &\hat{\theta}_{plm} - \tilde{\theta}_{plm} \\ &= n^{-1} \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \left(\Gamma_i - \frac{\Gamma_i}{\hat{\gamma}^{(k)}} \right) \left(X_i^\top \hat{\Delta}_{plm}^{(-k)} + \hat{D}^{(-k)}(Z_i) \right) \\ &\quad + n^{-1} \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} (1 - \Gamma_i) \left(\bar{X}_0^\top \hat{\Delta}_{plm}^{(-k)} + \hat{D}^{(-k)}(Z_i) \right) + (\hat{\gamma}^{-1} - \gamma_n^{-1}) n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \Gamma_i \epsilon_i \\ &= T_1 + T_2 + T_3, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} T_1 &= n^{-1} \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \left(\Gamma_i - \frac{\Gamma_i}{\hat{\gamma}^{(k)}} \right) \left\{ (X_i - \mathbb{E}[X_i])^\top \hat{\Delta}_{plm}^{(-k)} + \hat{D}^{(-k)}(Z_i) - \mathbb{E}_Z \left[\hat{D}^{(-k)}(Z) \right] \right\}, \\ T_2 &= n^{-1} \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} (1 - \Gamma_i) \left\{ (\bar{X}_0 - \mathbb{E}[X_i])^\top \hat{\Delta}_{plm}^{(-k)} + \hat{D}^{(-k)}(Z_i) - \mathbb{E}_Z \left[\hat{D}^{(-k)}(Z) \right] \right\}, \\ T_3 &= (\hat{\gamma}^{-1} - \gamma_n^{-1}) n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \Gamma_i \epsilon_i. \end{aligned}$$

For T_1 , define

$$T_{1k} = n_k^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \Gamma_i \left\{ (X_i - \mathbb{E}[X_i])^\top \hat{\Delta}_{plm}^{(-k)} + \hat{D}^{(-k)}(Z_i) - \mathbb{E}_Z \left[\hat{D}^{(-k)}(Z) \right] \right\}.$$

Let $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{I}_{-k}} = \{(Z_i, \Gamma_i, \Gamma_i X_i, \Gamma_i Y_i) : i \in \mathcal{I}_{-k}\}$. For any $i \in \mathcal{I}_k$, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} \left[(X_i - \mathbb{E}[X_i])^\top \widehat{\Delta}_{plm}^{(-k)} + \widehat{D}^{(-k)}(Z_i) - \mathbb{E}_Z \left[\widehat{D}^{(-k)}(Z) \right] \mid \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{I}_{-k}} \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left[(X_i - \mathbb{E}[X_i])^\top \widehat{\Delta}_{plm}^{(-k)} \mid \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{I}_{-k}} \right] + \mathbb{E} \left[\widehat{D}^{(-k)}(Z_i) - \mathbb{E}_Z \left[\widehat{D}^{(-k)}(Z) \right] \mid \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{I}_{-k}} \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E} [X_i - \mathbb{E}[X_i] \mid \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{I}_{-k}}]^\top \widehat{\Delta}_{plm}^{(-k)} \\
&= \mathbb{E} [X_i - \mathbb{E}[X_i]]^\top \widehat{\Delta}_{plm}^{(-k)} = 0,
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} [T_{1k}^2 \mid \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{I}_{-k}}] \\
&= n_k^{-2} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \mathbb{E} \left[\Gamma_i \left\{ (X_i - \mathbb{E}[X_i])^\top \widehat{\Delta}_{plm}^{(-k)} + \widehat{D}^{(-k)}(Z_i) - \mathbb{E}_Z \left[\widehat{D}^{(-k)}(Z) \right] \right\}^2 \mid \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{I}_{-k}} \right] \\
&= n_k^{-1} \mathbb{E} [\Gamma_i] \mathbb{E} \left[\left\{ (X_i - \mathbb{E}[X_i])^\top \widehat{\Delta}_{plm}^{(-k)} + \widehat{D}^{(-k)}(Z_i) - \mathbb{E}_Z \left[\widehat{D}^{(-k)}(Z) \right] \right\}^2 \mid \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{I}_{-k}} \right] \\
&\leq 2\gamma_n n_k^{-1} \mathbb{E} \left[\left((X_i - \mathbb{E}[X_i])^\top \widehat{\Delta}_{plm}^{(-k)} \right)^2 \mid \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{I}_{-k}} \right] \\
&\quad + 2\gamma_n n_k^{-1} \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\widehat{D}^{(-k)}(Z_i) - \mathbb{E}_Z \left[\widehat{D}^{(-k)}(Z) \right] \right)^2 \mid \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{I}_{-k}} \right] \\
&\leq 2\gamma_n n_k^{-1} \mathbb{E} \left[\left(X_i^\top \widehat{\Delta}_{plm}^{(-k)} \right)^2 \mid \widehat{\Delta}_{plm}^{(-k)} \right] + 2\gamma_n n_k^{-1} \mathbb{E}_Z \left[\widehat{D}^{(-k)}(Z) \right].
\end{aligned}$$

Since for any $i \in \mathcal{I}_k$, $X_i \perp \widehat{\Delta}_{plm}^{(-k)}$, we have

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\left(X_i^\top \widehat{\Delta}_{plm}^{(-k)} \right)^2 \mid \widehat{\Delta}_{plm}^{(-k)} \right] = \Delta_{plm}^{(-k), \top} \mathbb{E} [X_i X_i^\top] \widehat{\Delta}_{plm}^{(-k)} \leq \tilde{\kappa}_u \left\| \widehat{\Delta}_{plm}^{(-k)} \right\|_2^2. \quad (55)$$

Thus,

$$\mathbb{E} [T_{1k}^2 \mid \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{I}_{-k}}] \leq 2\tilde{\kappa}_u \gamma_n n_k^{-1} \left\| \widehat{\Delta}_{plm}^{(-k)} \right\|_2^2 + 2\gamma_n n_k^{-1} \mathbb{E}_Z \left[\widehat{D}^{(-k)}(Z) \right] = o_p(n^{-1} \gamma_n).$$

By Lemma C.2, it follows that

$$T_{1k} = o_p \left(\gamma_n (n \gamma_n)^{-1/2} \right).$$

Since by Lemma D.1,

$$\begin{aligned} 1 - \frac{1}{\widehat{\gamma}^{(k)}} &= 1 - \frac{1}{\gamma_n} + \frac{1}{\gamma_n} - \frac{1}{\widehat{\gamma}^{(k)}} \\ &= O_p(\gamma_n^{-1}) + O_p\left(\gamma_n^{-1} (n\gamma_n)^{-1/2} (1 - \gamma_n)^{1/2}\right) = O_p(\gamma_n^{-1}), \end{aligned} \quad (56)$$

we have

$$T_1 = K^{-1} \sum_{k=1}^K \left(1 - \frac{1}{\widehat{\gamma}^{(k)}}\right) T_{1k} = o_p\left((n\gamma_n)^{-1/2}\right).$$

For T_2 , we have

$$T_2 = K^{-1} \sum_{k=1}^k T_{2ak} + K^{-1} \sum_{k=1}^k T_{2bk},$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} T_{2ak} &= n_k^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} (1 - \Gamma_i) (\bar{X}_0 - \mathbb{E}[X_i])^\top \widehat{\Delta}_{plm}^{(-k)}, \\ T_{2bk} &= n_k^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} (1 - \Gamma_i) \left(\widehat{D}^{(-k)}(Z_i) - \mathbb{E}_Z \left[\widehat{D}^{(-k)}(Z) \right] \right). \end{aligned}$$

Since $\bar{X}_0 = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n (1 - \Gamma_i) X_i}{\sum_{i=1}^n (1 - \Gamma_i)}$, T_{2ak} can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} T_{2ak} &= (1 - \widehat{\gamma}^{(k)}) (\bar{X}_0 - \mathbb{E}[X_i])^\top \widehat{\Delta}_{plm}^{(-k)} \\ &= \frac{1 - \widehat{\gamma}^{(k)}}{1 - \widehat{\gamma}} \left\{ n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (1 - \Gamma_i) (X_i - \mathbb{E}[X_i])^\top \widehat{\Delta}_{plm}^{(-k)} \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

For $\mathcal{D}'_{\mathcal{I}_{-k}} = \{(\Gamma_j, \Gamma_i Z_j, \Gamma_j X_j, \Gamma_j Y_j) \mid j \in \mathcal{I}_{-k}\}$, by Lemma C.7, for any $i = 1, \dots, n$,

$$(1 - \Gamma_i) X_i \perp \mathcal{D}'_{\mathcal{I}_{-k}} \mid \Gamma_{1:n}. \quad (57)$$

Then for any $i \in [n]$, under Assumption 1,

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E} \left[(1 - \Gamma_i) (X_i - \mathbb{E}[X_i])^\top \widehat{\Delta}_{plm}^{(-k)} \mid \mathcal{D}'_{\mathcal{I}_{-k}}, \Gamma_{1:n} \right] \\ &= (1 - \Gamma_i) \mathbb{E} [X_i - \mathbb{E}[X_i] \mid \Gamma_{1:n}]^\top \widehat{\Delta}_{plm}^{(-k)} \\ &= (1 - \Gamma_i) \mathbb{E} [X_i - \mathbb{E}[X_i]]^\top \widehat{\Delta}_{plm}^{(-k)} = 0. \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} \left[\left\{ n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (1 - \Gamma_i) (X_i - \mathbb{E}[X_i])^\top \widehat{\Delta}_{plm}^{(-k)} \right\}^2 \mid \mathcal{D}'_{\mathcal{I}_{-k}}, \Gamma_{1:n} \right] \\
&= n^{-2} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E} \left[\left((1 - \Gamma_i) (X_i - \mathbb{E}[X_i])^\top \widehat{\Delta}_{plm}^{(-k)} \right)^2 \mid \mathcal{D}'_{\mathcal{I}_{-k}}, \Gamma_{1:n} \right] \\
&\leq n^{-2} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E} \left[(1 - \Gamma_i) \left(X_i^\top \widehat{\Delta}_{plm}^{(-k)} \right)^2 \mid \mathcal{D}'_{\mathcal{I}_{-k}}, \Gamma_{1:n} \right] \\
&= n^{-2} \sum_{i=1}^n \widehat{\Delta}_{plm}^{(-k), \top} \mathbb{E} \left[(1 - \Gamma_i) X_i X_i^\top \mid \mathcal{D}'_{\mathcal{I}_{-k}}, \Gamma_{1:n} \right] \widehat{\Delta}_{plm}^{(-k)} \\
&= n^{-2} \sum_{i=1}^n (1 - \Gamma_i) \widehat{\Delta}_{plm}^{(-k), \top} \mathbb{E} [X_i X_i^\top \mid \Gamma_{1:n}] \widehat{\Delta}_{plm}^{(-k)} \\
&= \left(n^{-2} \sum_{i=1}^n (1 - \Gamma_i) \right) \widehat{\Delta}_{plm}^{(-k), \top} \mathbb{E} [X_i X_i^\top] \widehat{\Delta}_{plm}^{(-k)} \\
&\leq \left(n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (1 - \Gamma_i) \right)^2 \widehat{\Delta}_{plm}^{(-k), \top} \mathbb{E} [X_i X_i^\top] \widehat{\Delta}_{plm}^{(-k)} \\
&= (1 - \widehat{\gamma})^2 \widehat{\Delta}_{plm}^{(-k), \top} \mathbb{E} [X_i X_i^\top] \widehat{\Delta}_{plm}^{(-k)},
\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality comes from the fact $\sum_{i=1}^n (1 - \Gamma_i) = 0$ or $\sum_{i=1}^n (1 - \Gamma_i) \geq 1$.

From above, we also have another bound:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} \left[\left\{ n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (1 - \Gamma_i) (X_i - \mathbb{E}[X_i])^\top \widehat{\Delta}_{plm}^{(-k)} \right\}^2 \mid \mathcal{D}'_{\mathcal{I}_{-k}}, \Gamma_{1:n} \right] \\
&\leq \left(n^{-2} \sum_{i=1}^n (1 - \Gamma_i) \right) \widehat{\Delta}_{plm}^{(-k), \top} \mathbb{E} [X_i X_i^\top] \widehat{\Delta}_{plm}^{(-k)} \\
&= n^{-1} (1 - \widehat{\gamma}) \widehat{\Delta}_{plm}^{(-k), \top} \mathbb{E} [X_i X_i^\top] \widehat{\Delta}_{plm}^{(-k)}.
\end{aligned}$$

That is, by (43) and (55), we have two different rates:

$$n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (1 - \Gamma_i) (X_i - \mathbb{E}[X_i])^\top \widehat{\Delta}_{plm}^{(-k)} = o_p(1 - \gamma_n),$$

and

$$n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (1 - \Gamma_i) (X_i - \mathbb{E}[X_i])^\top \widehat{\Delta}_{plm}^{(-k)} = o_p \left(n^{-1/2} (1 - \gamma_n)^{1/2} \right).$$

By (44), we have

$$\frac{1 - \widehat{\gamma}^{(k)}}{1 - \widehat{\gamma}} - 1 = O_p(\gamma_n (n(1 - \gamma_n))^{-1}) + O_p(\gamma_n^{1/2} (n(1 - \gamma_n))^{-1/2}),$$

then

$$\begin{aligned} T_{2ak} &= \left(\frac{1 - \widehat{\gamma}^{(k)}}{1 - \widehat{\gamma}} - 1 \right) \left\{ n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (1 - \Gamma_i) (X_i - \mathbb{E}[X_i])^\top \widehat{\Delta}_{plm}^{(-k)} \right\} \\ &\quad + n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (1 - \Gamma_i) (X_i - \mathbb{E}[X_i])^\top \widehat{\Delta}_{plm}^{(-k)} \\ &= o_p(\{\gamma_n (n(1 - \gamma_n))^{-1}\} (1 - \gamma_n)) + o_p(\{\gamma_n^{1/2} (n(1 - \gamma_n))^{-1/2}\} (1 - \gamma_n)) \\ &\quad + o_p(n^{-1/2} (1 - \gamma_n)^{1/2}) \\ &= o_p((\gamma_n \vee (1 - \gamma_n))^{1/2} n^{-1/2}) \\ &= o_p(n^{-1/2}). \end{aligned}$$

Consider T_{2bk} , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[T_{2bk} \mid \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{I}_{-k}}] &= n_k^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \mathbb{E} \left[(1 - \Gamma_i) \left(\widehat{D}^{(-k)}(Z_i) - \mathbb{E}_Z \left[\widehat{D}^{(-k)}(Z) \right] \right) \mid \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{I}_{-k}} \right] \\ &= n_k^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \mathbb{E}[(1 - \Gamma_i)] \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\widehat{D}^{(-k)}(Z_i) - \mathbb{E}_Z \left[\widehat{D}^{(-k)}(Z) \right] \right) \mid \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{I}_{-k}} \right] = 0, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[T_{2bk}^2 \mid \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{I}_{-k}}] &= n_k^{-2} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \mathbb{E} \left[(1 - \Gamma_i) \left(\widehat{D}^{(-k)}(Z_i) - \mathbb{E}_Z \left[\widehat{D}^{(-k)}(Z) \right] \right)^2 \mid \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{I}_{-k}} \right] \\ &\leq n_k^{-2} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \mathbb{E}[(1 - \Gamma_i)] \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\widehat{D}^{(-k)}(Z_i) \right)^2 \mid \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{I}_{-k}} \right] \\ &= (1 - \gamma_n) n_k^{-1} \mathbb{E}_Z \left[\left(\widehat{D}^{(-k)}(Z) \right)^2 \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, under Assumption 3(b),

$$T_{2bk} = o_p\left((1 - \gamma_n)^{1/2} n^{-1/2}\right).$$

Together with $T_{2ak} = o_p(n^{-1/2})$, we have

$$T_2 = K^{-1} \sum_{k=1}^k T_{2ak} + K^{-1} \sum_{k=1}^k T_{2bk} = o_p(n^{-1/2}).$$

For T_3 , since $\mathbb{E}[\epsilon_i] = 0$ by Lemma A.2, we have

$$\mathbb{E} \left[n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \Gamma_i \epsilon_i \right] = n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[\Gamma_i \epsilon_i] = \mathbb{E}[\Gamma_i] \mathbb{E}[\epsilon_i] = 0,$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[\left(n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \Gamma_i \epsilon_i \right)^2 \right] &= n^{-2} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[\Gamma_i \epsilon_i^2] \\ &= n^{-1} \mathbb{E}[\Gamma_i] \mathbb{E}[\epsilon_i^2] \\ &= n^{-1} \gamma_n \mathbb{E}[\epsilon_i^2] \\ &\leq C \sigma_\epsilon^2 n^{-1} \gamma_n. \end{aligned}$$

Then by Chebyshev's inequality,

$$n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \Gamma_i \epsilon_i = O_p(n^{-1/2} \gamma_n^{1/2}).$$

By Lemma D.1, we have $\widehat{\gamma}^{-1} - \gamma_n^{-1} = O_p(\gamma_n^{-1} (n\gamma_n)^{-1/2} (1 - \gamma_n)^{1/2})$, then

$$T_3 = (\widehat{\gamma}^{-1} - \gamma_n^{-1}) n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \Gamma_i \epsilon_i = O_p\left((1 - \gamma_n)^{1/2} (n\gamma_n)^{-1}\right).$$

In conclusion, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\theta}_{plm} - \widetilde{\theta}_{plm} &= T_1 + T_2 + T_3 \\ &= o_p\left((n\gamma_n)^{-1/2}\right) + o_p(n^{-1/2}) + O_p\left((1 - \gamma_n)^{1/2} (n\gamma_n)^{-1}\right) \\ &= o_p\left((n\gamma_n)^{-1/2}\right). \end{aligned}$$

In addition, by Lemma D.5, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\theta}_{plm} - \theta &= \widehat{\theta}_{plm} - \widetilde{\theta}_{plm} + \widetilde{\theta}_{plm} - \theta \\ &= o_p\left((n\gamma_n)^{-1/2}\right) + O_p\left((n\gamma_n)^{-1/2}\right) \\ &= O_p\left((n\gamma_n)^{-1/2}\right). \end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma D.7. *Suppose that Assumptions 1 and 3 hold. If $n\gamma_n \gg 1$, then as $n, d \rightarrow \infty$,*

$$\widehat{\sigma}_{plm}^2 = \sigma_{plm}^2 \{1 + o_p(1)\}.$$

Proof. Let $\epsilon_i = Y_i - X_i^\top \beta_{plm}^* - f^*(Z_i)$ and

$$\begin{aligned} g_{i,plm}^{(-k)} &= \Gamma_i \left(X_i^\top \widehat{\beta}_{plm}^{(-k)} + \widehat{f}^{(-k)}(Z_i) \right) + \frac{\Gamma_i \left(Y_i - X_i^\top \widehat{\beta}_{plm}^{(-k)} - \widehat{f}^{(-k)}(Z_i) \right)}{\sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \Gamma_i}, \\ g_{i,plm}^* &= \Gamma_i \left(X_i^\top \beta_{plm}^* + f^*(Z_i) \right) + \frac{\Gamma_i}{\gamma_n} \epsilon_i, \\ \widetilde{\sigma}_{plm}^2 &= n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(X_i^\top \beta_{plm}^* + f^*(Z_i) + \frac{\Gamma_i}{\gamma_n} \epsilon_i \right)^2 - \theta^2. \end{aligned}$$

Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \widetilde{\sigma}_{plm}^2 &= n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (g_{i,plm}^*)^2 + n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (1 - \Gamma_i) \left(X_i^\top \beta_{plm}^* + f^*(Z_i) \right)^2 - \theta^2 \\ &= n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (g_{i,plm}^*)^2 + n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (1 - \Gamma_i) \left(X_i^\top \beta_{plm}^* \right)^2 + n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (1 - \Gamma_i) \left(f^*(Z_i) \right)^2 \\ &\quad + 2n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (1 - \Gamma_i) \left(X_i^\top \beta_{plm}^* \right) f^*(Z_i) - \theta^2. \end{aligned}$$

Note that

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\sigma}_{plm}^2 &= n^{-1} \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \left\{ \Gamma_i \left(X_i^\top \widehat{\beta}_{plm}^{(-k)} + \widehat{f}^{(-k)}(Z_i) \right) + \frac{\Gamma_i \left(Y_i - X_i^\top \widehat{\beta}_{plm}^{(-k)} - \widehat{f}^{(-k)}(Z_i) \right)}{\sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \Gamma_i} \right\}^2 \\ &\quad + n^{-1} \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} (1 - \Gamma_i) \widehat{\beta}_{plm}^{(-k), \top} \Xi_0 \widehat{\beta}_{plm}^{(-k)} + n^{-1} \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} (1 - \Gamma_i) \left(\widehat{f}^{(-k)}(Z_i) \right)^2 \\ &\quad + 2n^{-1} \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} (1 - \Gamma_i) \left(X_i^\top \widehat{\beta}_{plm}^{(-k)} \right) \widehat{f}^{(-k)}(Z_i) - \left(\widehat{\theta}_{plm} \right)^2. \end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$\widehat{\sigma}_{plm}^2 - \widetilde{\sigma}_{plm}^2 = R_1 + R_2 - R_3 + R_4 + 2R_5,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
R_1 &= n^{-1} \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \left\{ \left(g_{i,plm}^{(-k)} \right)^2 - \left(g_{i,plm}^* \right)^2 \right\}, \\
R_2 &= n^{-1} \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} (1 - \Gamma_i) \left\{ \left(\widehat{f}^{(-k)}(Z_i) \right)^2 - \left(f^*(Z_i) \right)^2 \right\}, \\
R_3 &= \left(\widehat{\theta}_{plm} \right)^2 - \theta^2, \\
R_4 &= n^{-1} \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} (1 - \Gamma_i) \left(\widehat{\beta}_{plm}^{(-k), \top} \Xi_0 \widehat{\beta}_{plm}^{(-k)} - \left(X_i^\top \beta_{plm}^* \right)^2 \right), \\
R_5 &= n^{-1} \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} (1 - \Gamma_i) \left\{ \left(\bar{X}_0^\top \widehat{\beta}_{plm}^{(-k)} \right) \widehat{f}^{(-k)}(Z_i) - \left(X_i^\top \beta_{plm}^* \right) f^*(Z_i) \right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Let $\widehat{\gamma} = n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \Gamma_i$, $\widehat{\gamma}^{(k)} = n_k^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \Gamma_i$, $\widehat{\Delta}_{plm}^{(-k)} = \widehat{\beta}_{plm}^{(-k)} - \beta_{plm}^*$, and $\widehat{D}^{(-k)} = \widehat{f}^{(-k)} - f^*$.

Since

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left(g_{i,plm}^{(-k)} - g_{i,plm}^* \right)^2 \\
&= \Gamma_i \left\{ \left(1 - \frac{1}{\widehat{\gamma}^{(k)}} \right) \left(X_i^\top \widehat{\Delta}_{plm}^{(-k)} + \widehat{D}^{(-k)}(Z_i) \right) + \left(\frac{1}{\widehat{\gamma}^{(k)}} - \frac{1}{\gamma_n} \right) \epsilon_i \right\}^2 \\
&\leq 3\Gamma_i \left(1 - \frac{1}{\widehat{\gamma}^{(k)}} \right)^2 \left(X_i^\top \widehat{\Delta}_{plm}^{(-k)} \right)^2 + 3\Gamma_i \left(1 - \frac{1}{\widehat{\gamma}^{(k)}} \right)^2 \left(\widehat{D}^{(-k)}(Z_i) \right)^2 + 3\Gamma_i \left(\frac{1}{\widehat{\gamma}^{(k)}} - \frac{1}{\gamma_n} \right)^2 \epsilon_i^2,
\end{aligned}$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned}
n_k^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \left(g_{i,plm}^{(-k)} - g_{i,plm}^* \right)^2 &\leq 3 \left(1 - \frac{1}{\widehat{\gamma}^{(k)}} \right)^2 n_k^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \Gamma_i \left(X_i^\top \widehat{\Delta}_{plm}^{(-k)} \right)^2 \\
&\quad + 3 \left(1 - \frac{1}{\widehat{\gamma}^{(k)}} \right)^2 n_k^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \Gamma_i \left(\widehat{D}^{(-k)}(Z_i) \right)^2 \\
&\quad + 3 \left(\frac{1}{\widehat{\gamma}^{(k)}} - \frac{1}{\gamma_n} \right)^2 n_k^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \Gamma_i \epsilon_i^2.
\end{aligned}$$

By (55), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E} \left[n_k^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \Gamma_i \left(X_i^\top \widehat{\Delta}_{plm}^{(-k)} \right)^2 \mid \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{I}-k} \right] &= n_k^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \mathbb{E}[\Gamma_i] \mathbb{E} \left[\left(X_i^\top \widehat{\Delta}_{plm}^{(-k)} \right)^2 \mid \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{I}-k} \right] \\
&\leq \gamma_n \sigma \left\| \widehat{\Delta}_{plm}^{(-k)} \right\|_2^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, by Assumption 3(b) and Lemma C.2,

$$n_k^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \Gamma_i \left(X_i^\top \widehat{\Delta}_{plm}^{(-k)} \right)^2 = o_p(\gamma_n).$$

Similarly, since

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[n_k^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \Gamma_i \left(\widehat{D}^{(-k)}(Z_i) \right)^2 \mid \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{I}_k} \right] &= n_k^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \mathbb{E}[\Gamma_i] \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\widehat{D}^{(-k)}(Z_i) \right)^2 \mid \widehat{D}^{(-k)} \right] \\ &= \gamma_n \mathbb{E}_Z \left[\left(\widehat{f}^{(-k)}(Z) - f^*(Z) \right)^2 \right], \end{aligned}$$

by Assumption 3(b) and Lemma C.2,

$$n_k^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \Gamma_i \left(\widehat{D}^{(-k)}(Z_i) \right)^2 = o_p(\gamma_n).$$

Under Assumption 3(a), for some constant $C_1 > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[n_k^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \Gamma_i \epsilon_i^2 \right] &= n_k^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \mathbb{E}[\Gamma_i] \mathbb{E}[\epsilon_i^2] \\ &\leq C_1 \sigma_\epsilon^2 \gamma_n. \end{aligned}$$

Then by Markov inequality,

$$n_k^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \Gamma_i \epsilon_i^2 = O_p(\gamma_n).$$

By Lemma D.1, we have

$$\frac{1}{\gamma_n} - \frac{1}{\widehat{\gamma}^{(k)}} = O_p \left(\gamma_n^{-1} (n\gamma_n)^{-1/2} (1 - \gamma_n)^{1/2} \right),$$

which implies

$$1 - \frac{1}{\widehat{\gamma}^{(k)}} = 1 - \frac{1}{\gamma_n} + \frac{1}{\gamma_n} - \frac{1}{\widehat{\gamma}^{(k)}} = O_p(\gamma_n^{-1}) + O_p \left(\gamma_n^{-1} (n\gamma_n)^{-1/2} (1 - \gamma_n)^{1/2} \right) = O_p(\gamma_n^{-1}).$$

Combine all the rates together,

$$\begin{aligned} n_k^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \left(g_{i,plm}^{(-k)} - g_{i,plm}^* \right)^2 &= o_p(\gamma_n^{-2} \gamma_n) + O_p \left(\gamma_n^{-2} (n\gamma_n)^{-1} (1 - \gamma_n) \gamma_n \right) \\ &= o_p(\gamma_n^{-1}), \end{aligned}$$

which implies

$$\begin{aligned}
n^{-1} \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \left(g_{i,plm}^{(-k)} - g_{i,plm}^* \right)^2 &= K^{-1} \sum_{k=1}^K n_k^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \left(g_{i,plm}^{(-k)} - g_{i,plm}^* \right)^2 \\
&= o_p \left(\gamma_n^{-1} \right). \tag{58}
\end{aligned}$$

Moreover, since $X_i^\top \beta_{plm}^*$, $f^*(Z_i)$, and ϵ_i have bounded second moments, there exists some constant $C_2 > 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E} \left[n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(g_{i,plm}^* \right)^2 \right] &= n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E} [\Gamma_i] \mathbb{E} \left[\left(X_i^\top \beta_{plm}^* + f^*(Z_i) + \gamma_n^{-1} \epsilon_i \right)^2 \right] \\
&\leq \gamma_n n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \left\{ 3\mathbb{E} \left[\left(X_i^\top \beta_{plm}^* \right)^2 \right] + 3\mathbb{E} \left[\left(f^*(Z_i) \right)^2 \right] + 3\mathbb{E} \left[\left(\gamma_n^{-1} \epsilon_i \right)^2 \right] \right\} \\
&\leq \gamma_n \left(3C_2 \sigma^2 + 3C_2 \sigma_f^2 + 3C_2 \gamma_n^{-2} \sigma_\epsilon^2 \right),
\end{aligned}$$

then by Markov inequality,

$$n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(g_{i,plm}^* \right)^2 = O_p \left(\gamma_n^{-1} \right).$$

For R_1 , note that $a^2 - b^2 = (a - b)^2 + 2b(a - b)$, then

$$\begin{aligned}
R_1 &= n^{-1} \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \left(g_{i,plm}^{(-k)} - g_{i,plm}^* \right)^2 + 2n^{-1} \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} g_{i,plm}^* \left(g_{i,plm}^{(-k)} - g_{i,plm}^* \right) \\
&\leq n^{-1} \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \left(g_{i,plm}^{(-k)} - g_{i,plm}^* \right)^2 \\
&\quad + 2 \left\{ n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(g_{i,plm}^* \right)^2 \right\}^{1/2} \left\{ n^{-1} \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \left(g_{i,plm}^{(-k)} - g_{i,plm}^* \right)^2 \right\}^{1/2} \\
&= o_p \left(\gamma_n^{-1} \right) + o_p \left(\gamma_n^{-1/2} \gamma_n^{-1/2} \right) \\
&= o_p \left(\gamma_n^{-1} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

For R_2 , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
R_2 &= n^{-1} \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} (1 - \Gamma_i) \left\{ \left(\widehat{f}^{(-k)}(Z_i) \right)^2 - \left(f^*(Z_i) \right)^2 \right\} \\
&= n^{-1} \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} (1 - \Gamma_i) \left(\widehat{f}^{(-k)}(Z_i) - f^*(Z_i) \right)^2 \\
&\quad + 2n^{-1} \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} (1 - \Gamma_i) f^*(Z_i) \left(\widehat{f}^{(-k)}(Z_i) - f^*(Z_i) \right) \\
&\leq n^{-1} \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} (1 - \Gamma_i) \left(\widehat{f}^{(-k)}(Z_i) - f^*(Z_i) \right)^2 \\
&\quad + 2 \left\{ n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (1 - \Gamma_i) \left(f^*(Z_i) \right)^2 \right\}^{1/2} \left\{ n^{-1} \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} (1 - \Gamma_i) \left(\widehat{f}^{(-k)}(Z_i) - f^*(Z_i) \right)^2 \right\}^{1/2}.
\end{aligned}$$

Since

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E} \left[n_k^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} (1 - \Gamma_i) \left(\widehat{f}^{(-k)}(Z_i) - f^*(Z_i) \right)^2 \mid \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{I}_k} \right] \\
&= n_k^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \mathbb{E} [1 - \Gamma_i] \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\widehat{f}^{(-k)}(Z_i) - f^*(Z_i) \right)^2 \mid \widehat{f}^{(-k)} \right] \\
&= (1 - \gamma_n) \mathbb{E}_Z \left[\left(\widehat{f}^{(-k)}(Z) - f^*(Z) \right)^2 \right],
\end{aligned}$$

under Assumption 3(b), by Lemma C.2, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
&n^{-1} \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} (1 - \Gamma_i) \left(\widehat{f}^{(-k)}(Z_i) - f^*(Z_i) \right)^2 \\
&= K^{-1} \sum_{k=1}^K n_k^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} (1 - \Gamma_i) \left(\widehat{f}^{(-k)}(Z_i) - f^*(Z_i) \right)^2 = o_p(1 - \gamma_n).
\end{aligned}$$

Since $f^*(Z_i)$ has the bounded second moment, we have

$$\mathbb{E} \left[n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (1 - \Gamma_i) \left(f^*(Z_i) \right)^2 \right] = n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E} [1 - \Gamma_i] \mathbb{E} \left[\left(f^*(Z_i) \right)^2 \right] \leq C_2 \sigma_f^2 (1 - \gamma_n),$$

then by Markov inequality,

$$n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (1 - \Gamma_i) \left(f^*(Z_i) \right)^2 = O_p(1 - \gamma_n).$$

Thus,

$$R_2 = o_p(1 - \gamma_n) + o_p\left(\left(1 - \gamma_n\right)^{1/2} \left(1 - \gamma_n\right)^{1/2}\right) = o_p(1 - \gamma_n).$$

For R_3 , by Lemma D.6 we have

$$\begin{aligned} R_3 &= \left(\widehat{\theta}_{plm}\right)^2 - \theta^2 \\ &= \left(\widehat{\theta}_{plm} - \theta\right)^2 + 2\theta \left(\widehat{\theta}_{plm} - \theta\right) \\ &= O_p\left(\left(n\gamma_n\right)^{-1/2}\right), \end{aligned}$$

For R_4 , define

$$R_{4k} := n_k^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} (1 - \Gamma_i) \widehat{\beta}_{plm}^{(-k), \top} \Xi_0 \widehat{\beta}_{plm}^{(-k)} - n_k^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} (1 - \Gamma_i) \left(X_i^\top \beta_{plm}^*\right)^2.$$

Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} R_{4k} &= \left(\frac{1 - \widehat{\gamma}^{(k)}}{1 - \widehat{\gamma}}\right) n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (1 - \Gamma_i) \left(X_i^\top \widehat{\Delta}_{plm}^{(-k)} + X_i^\top \beta_{plm}^*\right)^2 - n_k^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} (1 - \Gamma_i) \left(X_i^\top \beta_{plm}^*\right)^2 \\ &= \left(\frac{1 - \widehat{\gamma}^{(k)}}{1 - \widehat{\gamma}} - 1\right) (R_{4k,1} + R_{4k,2} + R_{4k,3}) + R_{4k,1} + R_{4k,3} + R_{4k,4} + R_{4k,5}, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} R_{4k,1} &= n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (1 - \Gamma_i) \left(X_i^\top \widehat{\Delta}_{plm}^{(-k)}\right)^2, \\ R_{4k,2} &= n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (1 - \Gamma_i) \left(X_i^\top \beta_{plm}^*\right)^2, \\ R_{4k,3} &= 2n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (1 - \Gamma_i) \left(X_i^\top \widehat{\Delta}_{plm}^{(-k)}\right) \left(X_i^\top \beta_{plm}^*\right), \\ R_{4k,4} &= n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (1 - \Gamma_i) \left(X_i^\top \beta_{plm}^*\right)^2 - \mathbb{E} \left[(1 - \Gamma_i) \left(X_i^\top \beta_{plm}^*\right)^2 \right], \\ R_{4k,5} &= \mathbb{E} \left[(1 - \Gamma_i) \left(X_i^\top \beta_{plm}^*\right)^2 \right] - n_k^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} (1 - \Gamma_i) \left(X_i^\top \beta_{plm}^*\right)^2. \end{aligned}$$

With (55) and (57), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E} \left[R_{4k,1} \mid \mathcal{D}'_{\mathcal{I}_{-k}}, \Gamma_{1:n} \right] &= \mathbb{E} \left[n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (1 - \Gamma_i) \left(X_i^\top \widehat{\Delta}_{plm}^{(-k)} \right)^2 \mid \mathcal{D}'_{\mathcal{I}_{-k}}, \Gamma_{1:n} \right] \\
&= n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (1 - \Gamma_i) \widehat{\Delta}_{plm}^{(-k), \top} \mathbb{E} \left[X_i X_i^\top \mid \Gamma_{1:n} \right] \widehat{\Delta}_{plm}^{(-k)} \\
&= n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (1 - \Gamma_i) \widehat{\Delta}_{plm}^{(-k), \top} \mathbb{E} \left[X_i X_i^\top \right] \widehat{\Delta}_{plm}^{(-k)} \\
&\leq \tilde{\kappa}_u (1 - \widehat{\gamma}) \left\| \widehat{\Delta}_{plm}^{(-k)} \right\|_2^2.
\end{aligned}$$

By (43), $1 - \widehat{\gamma} = O_p(1 - \gamma_n)$, then under Assumption 3(b) and by Lemma C.2, we have

$$R_{4k,1} = n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (1 - \Gamma_i) \left(X_i^\top \widehat{\Delta}_{plm}^{(-k)} \right)^2 = o_p(1 - \gamma_n). \quad (59)$$

Since

$$\mathbb{E} \left[(1 - \Gamma_i) \left(X_i^\top \beta_{plm}^* \right)^2 \right] = (1 - \gamma_n) \mathbb{E} \left[\left(X_i^\top \beta_{plm}^* \right)^2 \right] \leq C_2 \sigma^2 (1 - \gamma_n),$$

by Markov inequality, we have

$$R_{4k,2} = n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (1 - \Gamma_i) \left(X_i^\top \beta_{plm}^* \right)^2 = O_p(1 - \gamma_n). \quad (60)$$

Then with (59), (60), and by Cauchy-Schwarz inequality,

$$\begin{aligned}
|R_{4k,3}| &\leq n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \left| (1 - \Gamma_i) \left(X_i^\top \widehat{\Delta}_{plm}^{(-k)} \right) \left(X_i^\top \beta_{plm}^* \right) \right| \\
&\leq \left\{ n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (1 - \Gamma_i) \left(X_i^\top \widehat{\Delta}_{plm}^{(-k)} \right)^2 \right\}^{1/2} \left\{ n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (1 - \Gamma_i) \left(X_i^\top \beta_{plm}^* \right)^2 \right\}^{1/2} \\
&= o_p(1 - \gamma_n).
\end{aligned} \quad (61)$$

Moreover, under Assumption 3(a) the fourth moment of $X_i^\top \beta^*$ is bounded, then

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} \left[\left\{ n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (1 - \Gamma_i) (X_i^\top \beta_{plm}^*)^2 - \mathbb{E} \left[(1 - \Gamma_i) (X_i^\top \beta_{plm}^*)^2 \right] \right\}^2 \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left[n^{-2} \sum_{i=1}^n \left\{ (1 - \Gamma_i) (X_i^\top \beta_{plm}^*)^2 - \mathbb{E} \left[(1 - \Gamma_i) (X_i^\top \beta_{plm}^*)^2 \right] \right\}^2 \right] \\
&= n^{-1} \text{Var} \left[(1 - \Gamma_i) (X_i^\top \beta_{plm}^*)^2 \right] \\
&\leq n^{-1} \mathbb{E} \left[(1 - \Gamma_i) (X_i^\top \beta_{plm}^*)^4 \right] \\
&= n^{-1} (1 - \gamma_n) \mathbb{E} \left[(X_i^\top \beta_{plm}^*)^4 \right] \leq \sigma^4 n^{-1} (1 - \gamma_n).
\end{aligned}$$

By Chebyshev's inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
R_{4k,4} &= n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (1 - \Gamma_i) (X_i^\top \beta_{plm}^*)^2 - \mathbb{E} \left[(1 - \Gamma_i) (X_i^\top \beta_{plm}^*)^2 \right] \\
&= O_p \left(n^{-1/2} (1 - \gamma_n)^{1/2} \right).
\end{aligned} \tag{62}$$

Similarly, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
R_{4k,5} &= n_k^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} (1 - \Gamma_i) (X_i^\top \beta_{plm}^*)^2 - \mathbb{E} \left[(1 - \Gamma_i) (X_i^\top \beta_{plm}^*)^2 \right] \\
&= O_p \left(n^{-1/2} (1 - \gamma_n)^{1/2} \right).
\end{aligned} \tag{63}$$

By (44) we have

$$\frac{1 - \widehat{\gamma}^{(k)}}{1 - \widehat{\gamma}} - 1 = O_p \left(\gamma_n (n (1 - \gamma_n))^{-1} \right) + O_p \left(\gamma_n^{1/2} (n (1 - \gamma_n))^{-1/2} \right).$$

Together with (59)-(63), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
R_{4k} &= o_p \left(\left\{ \gamma_n (n(1-\gamma_n))^{-1} + \gamma_n^{1/2} (n(1-\gamma_n))^{-1/2} \right\} (1-\gamma_n) \right) \\
&\quad + O_p \left(\left\{ \gamma_n (n(1-\gamma_n))^{-1} + \gamma_n^{1/2} (n(1-\gamma_n))^{-1/2} \right\} (1-\gamma_n) \right) \\
&\quad + o_p \left(\left\{ \gamma_n (n(1-\gamma_n))^{-1} + \gamma_n^{1/2} (n(1-\gamma_n))^{-1/2} \right\} (1-\gamma_n) \right) \\
&\quad + o_p(1-\gamma_n) + o_p(1-\gamma_n) \\
&\quad + O_p \left(n^{-1/2} (1-\gamma_n)^{1/2} \right) + O_p \left(n^{-1/2} (1-\gamma_n)^{1/2} \right) \\
&= o_p(1-\gamma_n) + O_p(n^{-1}\gamma_n) + O_p \left(n^{-1/2} (1-\gamma_n)^{1/2} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$R_4 = K^{-1} \sum_{k=1}^K R_{4k} = o_p(1-\gamma_n) + O_p(n^{-1}\gamma_n) + O_p \left(n^{-1/2} (1-\gamma_n)^{1/2} \right).$$

For R_5 , note that $ab - cd = (a - c)(b - d) + d(a - c) + c(b - d)$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
R_5 &= n^{-1} \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} (1 - \Gamma_i) \left\{ \left(\bar{X}_0^\top \hat{\beta}_{plm}^{(-k)} \right) \hat{f}^{(-k)}(Z_i) - \left(\bar{X}_0^\top \beta_{plm}^* \right) f^*(Z_i) \right\} \\
&= K^{-1} \sum_{k=1}^K (1 - \hat{\gamma}^{(k)}) \left\{ \bar{X}_0^\top \hat{\Delta}_{plm}^{(-k)} \hat{D}^{(-k)}(Z_i) + \bar{X}_0^\top \hat{\Delta}_{plm}^{(-k)} f^*(Z_i) + \bar{X}_0^\top \beta^* \hat{D}^{(-k)}(Z_i) \right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Observe that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\bar{X}_0^\top \hat{\Delta}_{plm}^{(-k)} \hat{D}^{(-k)}(Z_i) + \bar{X}_0^\top \hat{\Delta}_{plm}^{(-k)} f^*(Z_i) + \bar{X}_0^\top \beta^* \hat{D}^{(-k)}(Z_i) \\
&= (1 - \hat{\gamma}) n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (1 - \Gamma_i) \left(X_i^\top \hat{\Delta}_{plm}^{(-k)} \hat{D}^{(-k)}(Z_i) + X_i^\top \hat{\Delta}_{plm}^{(-k)} f^*(Z_i) + X_i^\top \beta^* \hat{D}^{(-k)}(Z_i) \right).
\end{aligned}$$

By Minkowski's inequality and Hölder inequality,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left\| (1 - \Gamma_i) \left(X_i^\top \widehat{\Delta}_{plm}^{(-k)} \widehat{D}^{(-k)}(Z_i) + X_i^\top \widehat{\Delta}_{plm}^{(-k)} f^*(Z_i) + X_i^\top \beta^* \widehat{D}^{(-k)}(Z_i) \right) \right\|_{\mathbb{P},1} \\
& \leq \left\| (1 - \Gamma_i) X_i^\top \widehat{\Delta}_{plm}^{(-k)} \widehat{D}^{(-k)}(Z_i) \right\|_{\mathbb{P},1} + \left\| (1 - \Gamma_i) X_i^\top \widehat{\Delta}_{plm}^{(-k)} f^*(Z_i) \right\|_{\mathbb{P},1} \\
& \quad + \left\| (1 - \Gamma_i) X_i^\top \beta^* \widehat{D}^{(-k)}(Z_i) \right\|_{\mathbb{P},1} \\
& \leq \left\| (1 - \Gamma_i) X_i^\top \widehat{\Delta}_{plm}^{(-k)} \right\|_{\mathbb{P},2} \left\| \widehat{D}^{(-k)}(Z_i) \right\|_{\mathbb{P},2} + \left\| (1 - \Gamma_i) X_i^\top \widehat{\Delta}_{plm}^{(-k)} \right\|_{\mathbb{P},2} \left\| f^*(Z_i) \right\|_{\mathbb{P},2} \\
& \quad + \left\| X_i^\top \beta^* \right\|_{\mathbb{P},2} \left\| \widehat{D}^{(-k)}(Z_i) \right\|_{\mathbb{P},2} \\
& \stackrel{(i)}{\leq} C\sigma \left\| (1 - \Gamma_i) \left\| \widehat{\Delta}_{plm}^{(-k)} \right\|_2 \right\|_{\mathbb{P},2} \left(\left\| \widehat{D}^{(-k)}(Z_i) \right\|_{\mathbb{P},2} + \left\| f^*(Z_i) \right\|_{\mathbb{P},2} \right) + C\sigma \left\| \widehat{D}^{(-k)}(Z_i) \right\|_{\mathbb{P},2} \\
& \stackrel{(ii)}{=} o_p(1),
\end{aligned}$$

where in (i) we use $\mathbb{E} \left[(1 - \Gamma_i) \left(X_i^\top \widehat{\Delta}_{plm}^{(-k)} \right)^2 \mid \Gamma_i \right] = (1 - \Gamma_i) \widehat{\Delta}_{plm}^{(-k),\top} \mathbb{E} [X_i X_i^\top] \widehat{\Delta}_{plm}^{(-k)} \leq C\sigma^2 \left\| \widehat{\Delta}_{plm}^{(-k)} \right\|_2^2$ by (57), and in (ii) we use Assumption 3(b). By Markov inequality, it follows that

$$R_5 = o_p(1).$$

In conclusion, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\widehat{\sigma}_{plm}^2 - \widetilde{\sigma}_{plm}^2 &= R_1 - R_2 - R_3 + R_4 + R_5 \\
&= o_p(\gamma_n^{-1}) + o_p(1 - \gamma_n) + O_p\left((n\gamma_n)^{-1/2}\right) \\
&\quad + o_p(1 - \gamma_n) + O_p(n^{-1}\gamma_n) + O_p\left(n^{-1/2}(1 - \gamma_n)^{1/2}\right) + o_p(1) \\
&= o_p(\gamma_n^{-1}).
\end{aligned}$$

Since $\sigma_{plm}^2 = \mathbb{E} \left[\left(X_i^\top \beta_{plm}^* + f^*(Z_i) + \frac{\Gamma_i}{\gamma_n} \epsilon_i \right)^2 \right] - \theta^2$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} [\widetilde{\sigma}_{plm}^2 - \sigma_{plm}^2] \\
&= n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E} \left[\left(X_i^\top \beta_{plm}^* + f^*(Z_i) + \frac{\Gamma_i}{\gamma_n} \epsilon_i \right)^2 \right] - E \left[\left(X_i^\top \beta_{plm}^* + f^*(Z_i) + \frac{\Gamma_i}{\gamma_n} \epsilon_i \right)^2 \right] \\
&= 0,
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E} \left[(\tilde{\sigma}_{plm}^2 - \sigma_{plm}^2)^2 \right] &= n^{-2} \sum_{i=1}^n \text{Var} \left[\left(X_i^\top \beta_{plm}^* + f^*(Z_i) + \frac{\Gamma_i}{\gamma_n} \epsilon_i \right)^2 \right] \\
&\leq n^{-1} \mathbb{E} \left[\left(X_i^\top \beta_{plm}^* + f^*(Z_i) + \frac{\Gamma_i}{\gamma_n} \epsilon_i \right)^4 \right] \\
&\leq 27n^{-1} \mathbb{E} \left[(X_i^\top \beta_{plm}^*)^4 \right] + 27n^{-1} \mathbb{E} \left[(f^*(Z_i))^4 \right] + 27n^{-1} \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\frac{\Gamma_i}{\gamma_n} \epsilon_i \right)^4 \right],
\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality comes from Hölder inequality. Note that $\mathbb{E} \left[(X_i^\top \beta_{plm}^*)^4 \right] \leq \sigma^4$, $\mathbb{E} \left[(f^*(Z_i))^4 \right] \leq \sigma_f^4$, and

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\left(\frac{\Gamma_i}{\gamma_n} \epsilon_i \right)^4 \right] = \gamma_n^{-4} \mathbb{E} [\Gamma_i] \mathbb{E} [\epsilon_i^4] \leq \gamma_n^{-3} \sigma_\epsilon^4.$$

Thus,

$$\mathbb{E} \left[(\tilde{\sigma}_{plm}^2 - \sigma_{plm}^2)^2 \right] = O_p \left(\gamma_n^{-2} (n\gamma_n)^{-1} \right).$$

By Chebyshev's inequality, we have

$$\tilde{\sigma}_{plm}^2 - \sigma_{plm}^2 = O_p \left(\gamma_n^{-1} (n\gamma_n)^{-1/2} \right).$$

By Lemma D.5, we have $\sigma_{plm}^2 \asymp \gamma_n^{-1}$, then it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{\sigma}_{plm}^2 - \sigma_{plm}^2 &= \hat{\sigma}_{plm}^2 - \tilde{\sigma}_{plm}^2 + \tilde{\sigma}_{plm}^2 - \sigma_{plm}^2 \\
&= o_p \left(\gamma_n^{-1} \right) + O_p \left(\gamma_n^{-1} (n\gamma_n)^{-1/2} \right) \\
&= \sigma_{plm}^2 o_p(1).
\end{aligned}$$

□

D.4 Proof of Theorem 2

Proof. $\hat{\theta}_{plm} - \theta = O_p \left((n\gamma_n)^{-1/2} \right)$ and $\hat{\sigma}_{plm}^2 = \sigma_{plm}^2 \{1 + o_p(1)\}$ directly follow from and Lemma D.6 and Lemma D.7.

In addition, by Lemma D.5, Lemma D.6, and Lemma D.7, we have $\widehat{\sigma}_{plm}^2 \asymp \gamma_n^{-1}$ and

$$\widehat{\sigma}_{plm}^{-1} \sqrt{n} (\widehat{\theta}_{plm} - \widetilde{\theta}_{plm}) = o_p \left(\gamma_n^{1/2} n^{1/2} (n\gamma_n)^{1/2} \right) = o_p(1).$$

Then by Lemma D.5 and Slutsky's theorem, we have that

$$\widehat{\sigma}_{plm}^{-1} \sqrt{n} (\widehat{\theta}_{plm} - \theta) = \frac{\sigma_{plm}}{\widehat{\sigma}_{plm}} \cdot \sigma_n^{-1} \sqrt{n} (\widetilde{\theta}_{plm} - \theta) + \widehat{\sigma}_{plm}^{-1} \sqrt{n} (\widehat{\theta}_{plm} - \widetilde{\theta}_{plm}) \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(0, 1).$$

□

E Proof of results in Section 3

For simplicity, throughout this section, we ignore the superscript $(-k)$ and subscripts PS , OR in the proof when the context is clear.

E.1 Auxiliary lemmas for generalizability

Lemma E.1. *Suppose that Assumptions 4 and 5 hold. Assume either $\gamma_n(X) = g(X^\top \alpha_{PS}^*)$ or $\mu(X) = X^\top \beta_{OR}^*$ holds. If $n\gamma_n \gg 1$, then as $n, d \rightarrow \infty$, $\sigma_g^2 \asymp \gamma_n^{-1}$ and*

$$\sigma^{-1} \sqrt{n} (\widetilde{\theta}_g - \theta_g) \rightarrow \mathcal{N}(0, 1),$$

where $\widetilde{\theta}_g = n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \left\{ X_i^\top \beta_{OR}^* + \frac{\Gamma_i}{g(X_i^\top \alpha_{PS}^*)} (Y_i - X_i^\top \beta_{OR}^*) \right\}$.

Proof. Let $w_i = Y_i - X_i^\top \beta^*$. Define

$$V_i = X_i^\top \beta^* + \frac{\Gamma_i}{g(X_i^\top \alpha^*)} w_i = X_i^\top \beta^* + \Gamma_i (1 + \exp(-X_i^\top \alpha^*)) w_i.$$

When either $\gamma_n(X) = g(X^\top \alpha^*)$ or $\mu(X) = X^\top \beta^*$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[V_i] - \theta_g &= \mathbb{E} \left[\left(1 - \frac{\Gamma_i}{g(X_i^\top \alpha^*)} \right) (X_i^\top \beta^* - Y_i) \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{E} \left[\left(1 - \frac{\Gamma_i}{g(X_i^\top \alpha^*)} \right) (X_i^\top \beta^* - Y_i) \mid X_i \right] \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left[\left(1 - \frac{\mathbb{E}[\Gamma_i \mid X_i]}{g(X_i^\top \alpha^*)} \right) (X_i^\top \beta^* - \mathbb{E}[Y_i \mid X_i]) \right] \\
&= 0.
\end{aligned}$$

By Lyapunov's central limit theorem, it suffices to prove for some $\delta > 0$ and $C > 0$,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} n^{-\delta/2} \sigma^{-(2+\delta)} \mathbb{E} \left[|V_i - \theta_g|^{2+\delta} \right] = 0. \quad (64)$$

If $\mathbb{E}[Y_i \mid X_i] = X_i^\top \beta^*$, i.e., $\mathbb{E}[w_i \mid X_i] = 0$, then

$$\begin{aligned}
\sigma_g^2 &= \mathbb{E}[(V_i - \theta_g)^2] = \mathbb{E} \left[\left\{ (X_i^\top \beta^* - \theta_g) + \frac{\Gamma_i}{g(X_i^\top \alpha^*)} w_i \right\}^2 \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E}[(X_i^\top \beta^* - \theta_g)^2] + \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\frac{\Gamma_i}{g(X_i^\top \alpha^*)} w_i \right)^2 \right] + 2 \mathbb{E} \left[(X_i^\top \beta^* - \theta_g) \frac{\Gamma_i}{g(X_i^\top \alpha^*)} w_i \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E}[(X_i^\top \beta^* - \theta_g)^2] + \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\frac{\Gamma_i}{g(X_i^\top \alpha^*)} w_i \right)^2 \right] \\
&\quad + 2 \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{E} \left[(X_i^\top \beta^* - \theta_g) \frac{\Gamma_i}{g(X_i^\top \alpha^*)} \mid X_i \right] \mathbb{E}[w_i \mid X_i] \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E}[(X_i^\top \beta^* - \theta_g)^2] + \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\Gamma_i}{(g(X_i^\top \alpha^*))^2} w_i^2 \right] \stackrel{(i)}{\asymp} \gamma_n^{-1},
\end{aligned}$$

where (i) uses $g(X_i^\top \alpha^*) \asymp \gamma_n$ by Assumption 5(a). By Lemma C.1(c) and Minkowski's inequality,

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\| (X_i^\top \beta^* - \theta_g)^2 \right\|_{\mathbb{P},2} &\leq \left\| (X_i^\top \beta^*)^2 \right\|_{\mathbb{P},2} + |\theta_g| \leq C_1 \sigma + |\theta_g|, \\
\gamma_n \delta_w &\leq \mathbb{E}[\Gamma_i w_i^2] = \gamma_n \mathbb{E}[w_i^2 \mid \Gamma_i = 1] \leq \gamma_n \sigma_w^2.
\end{aligned}$$

If $\mathbb{P}(\Gamma_i = 1 \mid X_i) = g(X_i^\top \alpha^*)$, then

$$\begin{aligned}
\sigma_g^2 &= \mathbb{E}[(V_i - \theta_g)^2] = \mathbb{E}\left[\left\{(Y_i - \theta_g) + \left(\frac{\Gamma_i}{g(X_i^\top \alpha^*)} - 1\right)w_i\right\}^2\right] \\
&= \text{Var}(Y_i) + \mathbb{E}\left[\left(\frac{\Gamma_i}{g(X_i^\top \alpha^*)} - 1\right)^2 w_i^2\right] + \mathbb{E}\left[(Y_i - \theta_g) \left(\frac{\Gamma_i}{g(X_i^\top \alpha^*)} - 1\right)w_i\right] \\
&= \text{Var}(Y_i) + \mathbb{E}\left[\left(\frac{\Gamma_i}{g(X_i^\top \alpha^*)} - 1\right)^2 w_i^2\right] + 2\mathbb{E}\left[\mathbb{E}\left[\frac{\Gamma_i}{g(X_i^\top \alpha^*)} - 1 \mid X_i\right] \mathbb{E}[(Y_i - \theta_g)w_i \mid X_i]\right] \\
&= \text{Var}(Y_i) + \mathbb{E}\left[\left(\frac{\Gamma_i}{g(X_i^\top \alpha^*)} - 1\right)^2 w_i^2\right] \\
&= \text{Var}(Y_i) + \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{\Gamma_i}{(g(X_i^\top \alpha^*))^2} w_i^2\right] - 2\mathbb{E}\left[\frac{\Gamma_i}{g(X_i^\top \alpha^*)} w_i^2\right] + \mathbb{E}[w_i^2] \asymp \gamma_n^{-1}.
\end{aligned}$$

By Lemma C.1(c), we have $\mathbb{E}[\Gamma_i w_i^2] \asymp \gamma_n$, $\mathbb{E}[w_i^2] \leq \sigma_w^2$, and by Minkowski's inequality,

$$\text{Var}(Y_i)^{1/2} \leq \|X_i^\top \beta^* + w_i\|_{\mathbb{P},2} \leq \|X_i^\top \beta^*\|_{\mathbb{P},2} + \|w_i\|_{\mathbb{P},2} \leq C_2 \sigma + \sigma_w.$$

Thus, when either $\gamma_n(X) = g(X^\top \alpha^*)$ or $\mu(X) = X^\top \beta^*$, it holds that

$$\sigma_g^2 \asymp \gamma_n^{-1}. \quad (65)$$

On the other hand, by Minkowski's inequality,

$$\|V_i - \theta_g\|_{\mathbb{P},2+\delta} \leq \|X_i^\top \beta^*\|_{\mathbb{P},2+\delta} + \left\| \frac{\Gamma_i}{g(X_i^\top \alpha^*)} w_i \right\|_{\mathbb{P},2+\delta} + |\theta_g|.$$

Choose $\delta = 2$. By Lemma C.1(c), we have $\|X_i^\top \beta^*\|_{\mathbb{P},2+\delta} \leq C_3 \sigma$ and

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\| \frac{\Gamma_i}{g(X_i^\top \alpha^*)} w_i \right\|_{\mathbb{P},2+\delta} &= \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{\Gamma_i}{(g(X_i^\top \alpha^*))^4} w_i^4\right]^{1/4} \\
&\leq k_0^{-1} \gamma_n^{-1} \mathbb{E}[\Gamma_i w_i^4]^{1/4} \\
&= k_0^{-1} \gamma_n^{-1} \gamma_n^{1/4} \mathbb{E}[w_i^4 \mid \Gamma_i = 1]^{1/4} \\
&\leq k_0^{-1} \sigma_w \gamma_n^{-3/4}.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E} \left[|V_i - \theta_g|^{2+\delta} \right] &= \|V_i - \theta\|_{\mathbb{P}, 2+\delta}^{2+\delta} \\
&\leq \left(\|X_i^\top \beta^*\|_{\mathbb{P}, 2+\delta} + \left\| \frac{\Gamma_i}{g(X_i^\top \alpha^*)} w_i \right\|_{\mathbb{P}, 2+\delta} + |\theta_g| \right)^{2+\delta} \\
&\leq (|\theta_g| + C_3 \sigma + k_0^{-1} \sigma_w \gamma_n^{-3/4})^4 \\
&= \gamma_n^{-3} ((|\theta_g| + C_3 \sigma) \gamma_n^{3/4} + k_0^{-1} \sigma_w)^4 \\
&\leq ((|\theta_g| + C_3 \sigma) + k_0^{-1} \sigma_w)^4 \gamma_n^{-3}.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, there exists some $C > 0$ such that for $\delta = 2$,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} n^{-\delta/2} \sigma^{-(2+\delta)} \mathbb{E} \left[|V_i - \theta_g|^{2+\delta} \right] \leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} n^{-1} C \gamma_n^2 \gamma_n^{-3} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} C (n \gamma_n)^{-1} = 0.$$

□

Lemma E.2. *Suppose that Assumption 5 holds. If $n \gamma_n \gg \log n \log d$, then as $n, d \rightarrow \infty$, it holds that*

$$\left\| n_k^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \left\{ \left(1 - \frac{\Gamma_i}{g(X_i^\top \alpha^*)} \right) X_i \right\} \right\|_\infty = O_p \left(\sqrt{\frac{\log d}{n \gamma_n}} \right).$$

Proof. Let

$$U_i = \left(1 - \frac{\Gamma_i}{g(X_i^\top \alpha^*)} \right) X_i.$$

By the construction of α^* , we have

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\left(1 - \frac{\Gamma_i}{g(X_i^\top \alpha^*)} \right) X_i \right] = \mathbf{0},$$

which implies $\mathbb{E}[U_i] = \mathbf{0}$. By Lemma C.1(c), for any $1 \leq j \leq d$, we have

$$|U_i^\top e_j| \leq k_0^{-1} \gamma_n^{-1} |X_i^\top e_j| \leq k_0^{-1} \gamma_n^{-1} |X_i^\top e_j|,$$

which implies

$$\sup_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \sup_{1 \leq j \leq d} \|U_i^\top e_j\|_{\psi_2} \leq k_0^{-1} \gamma_n^{-1} \sigma.$$

In addition, by (21),

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[(U_i^\top e_j)^2 \right] &= \mathbb{E} \left[\left\{ \left(1 - \frac{\Gamma_i}{g(X_i^\top \alpha^*)} \right) X_i^\top e_j \right\}^2 \right] \\ &= (1 - \gamma_n) \mathbb{E} \left[(X_i^\top e_j)^2 \mid \Gamma_i = 0 \right] + \gamma_n \mathbb{E} \left[\left(1 - \frac{1}{g(X_i^\top \alpha^*)} \right)^2 (X_i^\top e_j)^2 \mid \Gamma_i = 1 \right] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E} \left[(X_i^\top e_j)^2 \mid \Gamma_i = 0 \right] + k_0^{-2} \gamma_n^{-1} \mathbb{E} \left[(X_i^\top e_j)^2 \mid \Gamma_i = 1 \right] \\ &\leq 2 (1 + k_0^{-2} \gamma_n^{-1}) \sigma^2, \end{aligned}$$

which implies

$$\sup_{1 \leq j \leq d} \frac{1}{n_k} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \mathbb{E} \left[(U_i^\top e_j)^2 \right] \leq 2 (1 + k_0^{-2} \gamma_n^{-1}) \sigma^2.$$

Then by Lemma C.4, when $n\gamma_n \gg \log n \log d$, we have

$$\left\| \frac{1}{n_k} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} U_i \right\|_\infty = O_p \left(\sqrt{\frac{\log d}{n_k \gamma_n}} + \frac{\log d \sqrt{\log n_k}}{n_k \gamma_n} \right) = O_p \left(\sqrt{\frac{\log d}{n \gamma_n}} \right).$$

□

Lemma E.3. *Suppose that Assumption 5 holds. If $n\gamma_n \gg (\log n)^2 \log d$, then as $n, d \rightarrow \infty$,*

it holds that

$$\left\| n_k^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \Gamma_i \exp(-X_i^\top \alpha^*) w_i X_i \right\|_\infty = O_p \left(\sqrt{\frac{\log d}{n \gamma_n}} \right).$$

Proof. Let

$$J_i = \Gamma_i \exp(-X_i^\top \alpha^*) w_i X_i.$$

By the construction of β^* ,

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\Gamma_i \exp(-X_i^\top \alpha^*) w_i X_i \right] = \mathbf{0},$$

which implies $\mathbb{E}[J_i] = \mathbf{0}$. By (19), for any $1 \leq j \leq d$, we have

$$|J_i^\top e_j| \leq k_0^{-1} \gamma_n^{-1} w_i X_i^\top e_j.$$

By Lemma C.1(d),

$$\sup_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \sup_{1 \leq j \leq d} \|J_i^\top e_j\|_{\psi_1} \leq k_0^{-1} \gamma_n^{-1} \|w_i\|_{\psi_2} \|X_i^\top e_j\|_{\psi_2} \leq k_0^{-1} \gamma_n^{-1} \sigma_w \sigma.$$

In addition, by (21) and Lemma C.1(c), for some $C > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[(J_i^\top e_j)^2 \right] &= \mathbb{E} \left[\Gamma_i \exp(-2X_i^\top \alpha^*) w_i^2 (X_i^\top e_j)^2 \right] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E} \left[\Gamma_i \exp(-2X_i^\top \alpha^*) w_i^2 (X_i^\top e_j)^2 \right] \\ &\leq k_0^{-2} \gamma_n^{-2} \mathbb{E} \left[\Gamma_i w_i^2 (X_i^\top e_j)^2 \right] \\ &= k_0^{-2} \gamma_n^{-1} \mathbb{E} \left[w_i^2 (X_i^\top e_j)^2 \mid \Gamma_i = 1 \right] \\ &\leq k_0^{-2} \gamma_n^{-1} \mathbb{E} [w_i^4 \mid \Gamma_i = 1]^{1/2} \mathbb{E} \left[(X_i^\top e_j)^4 \mid \Gamma_i = 1 \right]^{1/2} \\ &\leq C \sigma_w^2 \sigma^2 k_0^{-2} \gamma_n^{-1}. \end{aligned}$$

which implies

$$\sup_{1 \leq j \leq d} \frac{1}{n_k} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \mathbb{E} \left[(J_i^\top e_j)^2 \right] \leq C \sigma_w^2 \sigma^2 k_0^{-2} \gamma_n^{-1}.$$

Then by Lemma C.4, when $n\gamma_n \gg (\log n)^2 \log d$, we have

$$\left\| \frac{1}{n_k} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} J_i \right\|_\infty = O_p \left(\sqrt{\frac{\log d}{n_k \gamma_n}} + \frac{\log n_k \log d}{n_k \gamma_n} \right) = O_p \left(\sqrt{\frac{\log d}{n \gamma_n}} \right).$$

□

Lemma E.4. *Suppose that Assumption 5 holds. If $n\gamma_n \gg \log n \log d$, then as $n, d \rightarrow \infty$, it holds that*

$$\left\| n_k^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} (1 - \Gamma_i) (X_i - \mathbb{E}[X_i \mid \Gamma_i = 0]) \right\|_\infty = O_p \left(\sqrt{\frac{\log d}{n}} \right).$$

Proof. First we have

$$\mathbb{E}[(1 - \Gamma_i)(X_i - \mathbb{E}[X_i | \Gamma_i = 0])] = (1 - \gamma_n)\mathbb{E}[X_i - \mathbb{E}[X_i | \Gamma_i = 0] | \Gamma_i = 0] = \mathbf{0},$$

For each $1 \leq j \leq d$, by Lemma C.1(c), $\mathbb{E}[X_i^\top e_j | \Gamma_i = 0] \leq C_1\sigma$ for some $C_1 > 0$. Then by Lemma C.1(a), for some $C_2 > 0$,

$$\|(1 - \Gamma_i)(X_i - \mathbb{E}[X_i | \Gamma_i = 0])^\top e_j\|_{\psi_2} \leq \|X_i^\top e_j\|_{\psi_2} + \|\mathbb{E}[X_i^\top e_j | \Gamma_i = 0]\|_{\psi_2} \leq C_2\sigma,$$

which implies

$$\max_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \max_{1 \leq j \leq d} \|(1 - \Gamma_i)(X_i - \mathbb{E}[X_i | \Gamma_i = 0])^\top e_j\|_{\psi_2} \leq C_2\sigma.$$

In addition, by Lemma C.1(c),

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[\left((1 - \Gamma_i)(X_i - \mathbb{E}[X_i | \Gamma_i = 0])^\top e_j \right)^2 \right] \\ &= (1 - \gamma_n) \mathbb{E} \left[\left((X_i - \mathbb{E}[X_i | \Gamma_i = 0])^\top e_j \right)^2 | \Gamma_i = 0 \right] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E} \left[(X_i^\top e_j)^2 | \Gamma_i = 0 \right] \\ &\leq 2\sigma^2. \end{aligned}$$

Then we have

$$\max_{1 \leq j \leq d} n_k^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \mathbb{E} \left[\left((1 - \Gamma_i)(X_i - \mathbb{E}[X_i | \Gamma_i = 0])^\top e_j \right)^2 \right] \leq 2\sigma^2.$$

By Lemma C.4, when $n \gg \log n \log d$, as $n, d \rightarrow \infty$,

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| n_k^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} (1 - \Gamma_i)(X_i - \mathbb{E}[X_i | \Gamma_i = 0]) \right\|_{\infty} &= O_p \left(\sqrt{\frac{\log d}{n_k}} + \frac{\log d \sqrt{\log n_k}}{n_k} \right) \\ &= O_p \left(\sqrt{\frac{\log d}{n}} \right). \end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma E.5. *Suppose that Assumption 5 holds. Choose $\lambda_\alpha \asymp \lambda_\beta \asymp \sqrt{\log d / (n\gamma_n)}$. If $n\gamma_n \gg \max\{s_\alpha, s_\beta \log n, (\log n)^2\} \log d$ and $s_\alpha s_\beta \ll (n\gamma_n)^{3/2} / (\log n (\log d)^2)$, then as $n, d \rightarrow \infty$,*

$$\widehat{\theta}_g - \widetilde{\theta}_g = O_p \left(\frac{(s_\alpha + \sqrt{s_\alpha s_\beta}) \log d}{n\gamma_n} \right),$$

In addition, suppose that Assumption 4 holds. Assume that $\mu(X) = X^\top \beta_{OR}^$ holds. Then as $n, d \rightarrow \infty$,*

$$\widehat{\theta}_g - \widetilde{\theta}_g = O_p \left(\frac{\sqrt{s_\alpha \log d}}{n\gamma_n} + \frac{\sqrt{s_\alpha s_\beta} \log d}{n\gamma_n} \right).$$

Proof. Let

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi_i(\alpha, \beta) &= \Gamma_i X_i^\top \beta + \frac{\Gamma_i}{g(X_i^\top \alpha)} (Y_i - X_i^\top \beta), \\ \widetilde{\theta}_g^{(k)} &= n_k^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} ((1 - \Gamma_i) \bar{X}_0^\top \beta^* + \Psi_i(\alpha^*, \beta^*)). \end{aligned}$$

Then $\widehat{\theta}_g - \widetilde{\theta}_g = K^{-1} \sum_{k=1}^K (\widehat{\theta}_g^{(k)} - \widetilde{\theta}_g^{(k)})$. Note that

$$\widehat{\theta}_g^{(k)} = n_k^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \left((1 - \Gamma_i) \bar{X}_0^\top \widehat{\beta}^{(-k)} + \Psi_i(\widehat{\alpha}^{(-k)}, \widehat{\beta}^{(-k)}) \right).$$

Let $\widehat{\gamma}_k = n_k^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \Gamma_i$, $\widehat{\gamma} = n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \Gamma_i$, $w_i = Y_i - X_i^\top \beta^*$, $\widehat{\Delta}_\alpha^{(-k)} = \widehat{\alpha}^{(-k)} - \alpha^*$, and $\widehat{\Delta}_\beta^{(-k)} = \widehat{\beta}^{(-k)} - \beta^*$, $\widetilde{\Delta}_\beta^{(-k)} = \widetilde{\beta}^{(-k)} - \beta^*$, and $\Delta^{(-k)} = \widehat{\beta}^{(-k)} - \widetilde{\beta}^{(-k)}$. Then for each $1 \leq k \leq K$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\theta}_g^{(k)} - \widetilde{\theta}_g^{(k)} &= n_k^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \left\{ \Psi_i(\widehat{\alpha}^{(-k)}, \widehat{\beta}^{(-k)}) - \Psi_i(\alpha^*, \beta^*) \right\} + n_k^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} (1 - \Gamma_i) \bar{X}_0^\top \widehat{\Delta}_\beta^{(-k)} \\ &= n_k^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \left\{ \Gamma_i X_i^\top \widehat{\Delta}_\beta^{(-k)} - \frac{\Gamma_i}{g(X_i^\top \widehat{\alpha}^{(-k)})} (w_i - X_i^\top \widehat{\Delta}_\beta^{(-k)}) - \frac{\Gamma_i}{g(X_i^\top \alpha^*)} w_i \right\} \\ &\quad + n_k^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} (1 - \Gamma_i) \bar{X}_0^\top \widehat{\Delta}_\beta^{(-k)} \\ &= r_1 - r_2 + r_3 - r_4 + r_5, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
r_1 &= n_k^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \left(1 - \frac{\Gamma_i}{g(X_i^\top \alpha^*)} \right) X_i^\top \widehat{\Delta}_\beta^{(-k)}, \\
r_2 &= n_k^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \left(\frac{\Gamma_i}{g(X_i^\top \widehat{\alpha}^{(-k)})} - \frac{\Gamma_i}{g(X_i^\top \alpha^*)} \right) X_i^\top \widehat{\Delta}_\beta^{(-k)}, \\
r_3 &= n_k^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \left(\frac{\Gamma_i}{g(X_i^\top \widehat{\alpha}^{(-k)})} - \frac{\Gamma_i}{g(X_i^\top \alpha^*)} \right) w_i, \\
r_4 &= n_k^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} (1 - \Gamma_i) (X_i - \mathbb{E}[X_i | \Gamma_i = 0])^\top \widehat{\Delta}_\beta^{(-k)}, \\
r_5 &= (1 - \widehat{\gamma}_k) (1 - \widehat{\gamma})^{-1} n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (1 - \Gamma_i) (X_i - \mathbb{E}[X_i | \Gamma_i = 0])^\top \widehat{\Delta}_\beta^{(-k)}.
\end{aligned}$$

For r_1 , we have $r_1 = r_{11} + r_{12}$ where

$$\begin{aligned}
r_{11} &= n_k^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \left(1 - \frac{\Gamma_i}{g(X_i^\top \alpha^*)} \right) X_i^\top \Delta^{(-k)}, \\
r_{12} &= n_k^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \left(1 - \frac{\Gamma_i}{g(X_i^\top \alpha^*)} \right) X_i^\top \widetilde{\Delta}_\beta^{(-k)}.
\end{aligned}$$

By Lemma E.2, we have

$$r_{11} \leq \left\| n_k^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \left(1 - \frac{\Gamma_i}{g(X_i^\top \alpha^*)} \right) X_i \right\|_\infty \|\Delta^{(-k)}\|_1 = O_p \left(\|\Delta^{(-k)}\|_1 \sqrt{\frac{\log d}{n\gamma_n}} \right).$$

Since $\widetilde{\Delta}_\beta^{(-k)} \perp \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{I}_k}$, by first order optimal of α^* , for any $i \in \mathcal{I}_k$, we have

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\left(1 - \frac{\Gamma_i}{g(X_i^\top \alpha^*)} \right) X_i^\top \widetilde{\Delta}_\beta^{(-k)} \mid \widetilde{\beta}^{(-k)} \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[(1 - \Gamma_i - \Gamma_i \exp(-X_i^\top \alpha^*)) X_i \right]^\top \widetilde{\Delta}_\beta^{(-k)} = 0.$$

Then we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E} \left[r_{12}^2 \mid \widetilde{\beta}^{(-k)} \right] &= n_k^{-1} \mathbb{E} \left[\left\{ \left(1 - \frac{\Gamma_i}{g(X_i^\top \alpha^*)} \right) X_i^\top \widetilde{\Delta}_\beta^{(-k)} \right\}^2 \mid \widetilde{\beta}^{(-k)} \right] \\
&= n_k^{-1} (1 - \gamma_n) \mathbb{E} \left[\left(X_i^\top \widetilde{\Delta}_\beta^{(-k)} \right)^2 \mid \Gamma_i = 0, \widetilde{\beta}^{(-k)} \right] \\
&\quad + n_k^{-1} \gamma_n \mathbb{E} \left[\left(1 - \frac{1}{g(X_i^\top \alpha^*)} \right)^2 \left(X_i^\top \widetilde{\Delta}_\beta^{(-k)} \right)^2 \mid \Gamma_i = 1, \widetilde{\beta}^{(-k)} \right].
\end{aligned}$$

By Assumption 5(a), we have $1 - (g(X_i^\top \alpha^*))^{-1} \leq k_0^{-1} \gamma_n^{-1}$. By Lemma C.1(c),

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\left(X_i^\top \tilde{\Delta}_\beta^{(-k)} \right)^2 \mid \Gamma_i, \tilde{\beta}^{(-k)} \right] \leq 2\sigma^2 \left\| \tilde{\Delta}_\beta^{(-k)} \right\|_2^2.$$

Thus, by Lemma C.2,

$$r_{12} = O_p \left((n\gamma_n)^{-1/2} \left\| \tilde{\Delta}_\beta^{(-k)} \right\|_2 \right).$$

It follows that

$$r_1 = O_p \left(\left\| \Delta^{(-k)} \right\|_1 \sqrt{\frac{\log d}{n\gamma_n}} + (n\gamma_n)^{-1/2} \left\| \tilde{\Delta}_\beta^{(-k)} \right\|_2 \right).$$

For r_2 , by Hölder inequality, we have

$$r_2 \leq \left\{ n_k^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \Gamma_i \left(\frac{1}{g(X_i^\top \hat{\alpha}^{(-k)})} - \frac{1}{g(X_i^\top \alpha^*)} \right)^2 \right\}^{1/2} \left\{ n_k^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \Gamma_i \left(X_i^\top \hat{\Delta}_\beta^{(-k)} \right)^2 \right\}^{1/2}$$

By Taylor's theorem and (19), for some $t \in (0, 1)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\frac{1}{g(X_i^\top \hat{\alpha}^{(-k)})} - \frac{1}{g(X_i^\top \alpha^*)} \right)^2 &= \left(\exp \left(-t X_i^\top \hat{\Delta}_\alpha^{(-k)} - X_i^\top \alpha^* \right) X_i^\top \hat{\Delta}_\alpha^{(-k)} \right)^2 \\ &\leq k_0^{-2} \gamma_n^{-2} \exp \left(-2 \left| X_i^\top \hat{\Delta}_\alpha^{(-k)} \right| \right) \left(X_i^\top \hat{\Delta}_\alpha^{(-k)} \right)^2. \end{aligned}$$

Then by Lemma C.17,

$$n_k^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \Gamma_i \left(\frac{1}{g(X_i^\top \hat{\alpha}^{(-k)})} - \frac{1}{g(X_i^\top \alpha^*)} \right)^2 = O_p \left(\gamma_n^{-1} \left\| \hat{\Delta}_\alpha^{(-k)} \right\|_2^2 \right).$$

By Lemma C.7, we have $\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{I}_k} \perp \hat{\Delta}_\beta^{(-k)} \mid \Gamma_{\mathcal{I}_k}$, then for any $i \in \mathcal{I}_k$, by Lemma C.1(c),

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\left(X_i^\top \hat{\Delta}_\beta^{(-k)} \right)^2 \mid \Gamma_{\mathcal{I}_k}, \hat{\Delta}_\beta^{(-k)} \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[\left(X_i^\top \hat{\Delta}_\beta^{(-k)} \right)^2 \mid \Gamma_i, \hat{\Delta}_\beta^{(-k)} \right] \leq 2\sigma^2 \left\| \hat{\Delta}_\beta^{(-k)} \right\|_2^2.$$

Since $\hat{\gamma}_k = O_p(\gamma_n)$ due to Lemma C.3, then

$$n_k^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \Gamma_i \left(X_i^\top \hat{\Delta}_\beta^{(-k)} \right)^2 = O_p \left(\gamma_n \left\| \hat{\Delta}_\beta^{(-k)} \right\|_2^2 \right).$$

Thus,

$$r_2 = O_p \left(\left\| \widehat{\Delta}_\alpha^{(-k)} \right\|_2 \left\| \widehat{\Delta}_\beta^{(-k)} \right\|_2 \right).$$

For r_3 , by Taylor's theorem, there exists $\tilde{\alpha}$ between $\widehat{\alpha}^{(-k)}$ and α^* such that

$$\begin{aligned} r_3 &= n_k^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \Gamma_i \left\{ -\exp(-X_i^\top \alpha^*) \left(X_i^\top \widehat{\Delta}_\alpha^{(-k)} \right) + \exp(-X_i^\top \tilde{\alpha}) \left(X_i^\top \widehat{\Delta}_\alpha^{(-k)} \right)^2 \right\} w_i \\ &= -r_{31} + r_{32}, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} r_{31} &= n_k^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \Gamma_i \exp(-X_i^\top \alpha^*) w_i \left(X_i^\top \widehat{\Delta}_\alpha^{(-k)} \right), \\ r_{32} &= n_k^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \Gamma_i \exp(-X_i^\top \tilde{\alpha}) w_i \left(X_i^\top \widehat{\Delta}_\alpha^{(-k)} \right)^2. \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma E.3, we have

$$r_{31} \leq \left\| n_k^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \Gamma_i \exp(-X_i^\top \alpha^*) w_i X_i \right\|_\infty \left\| \widehat{\Delta}_\alpha^{(-k)} \right\|_1 = O_p \left(\left\| \widehat{\Delta}_\alpha^{(-k)} \right\|_1 \sqrt{\frac{\log d}{n \gamma_n}} \right).$$

In addition, by (19),

$$\exp(-X_i^\top \tilde{\alpha}) \leq \exp \left(\left| X_i^\top \widehat{\Delta}_\alpha^{(-k)} \right| - X_i^\top \alpha^* \right) \leq k_0^{-1} \gamma_n^{-1} \exp \left(X_i^\top \left| \widehat{\Delta}_\alpha^{(-k)} \right| \right).$$

By Hölder inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned} r_{32} &\leq k_0^{-1} \gamma_n^{-1} n_k^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \Gamma_i \exp \left(\left| X_i^\top \widehat{\Delta}_\alpha^{(-k)} \right| \right) w_i \left(X_i^\top \widehat{\Delta}_\alpha^{(-k)} \right)^2 \\ &\leq k_0^{-1} \gamma_n^{-1} \left\{ n_k^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \Gamma_i w_i^2 \right\}^{1/2} \left\{ n_k^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \Gamma_i \exp \left(2 \left| X_i^\top \widehat{\Delta}_\alpha^{(-k)} \right| \right) \left(X_i^\top \widehat{\Delta}_\alpha^{(-k)} \right)^4 \right\}^{1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\mathbb{E}[\Gamma_i w_i^2] = \gamma_n \mathbb{E}[w_i^2 \mid \Gamma_i = 1] \leq \gamma_n \sigma_w^2$, then

$$n_k^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \Gamma_i w_i^2 = O_p(\gamma_n).$$

By Lemma C.17, we have

$$n_k^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \Gamma_i \exp \left(2 \left| X_i^\top \widehat{\Delta}_\alpha^{(-k)} \right| \right) \left(X_i^\top \widehat{\Delta}_\alpha^{(-k)} \right)^4 = O_p \left(\gamma_n \left\| \widehat{\Delta}_\alpha^{(-k)} \right\|_2^4 \right).$$

Thus, we have

$$n_k^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \Gamma_i \exp \left(-X_i^\top \tilde{\alpha} \right) w_i \left(X_i^\top \widehat{\Delta}_\alpha^{(-k)} \right)^2 = O_p \left(\left\| \widehat{\Delta}_\alpha^{(-k)} \right\|_2^2 \right).$$

It follows that

$$r_3 = O_p \left(\left\| \widehat{\Delta}_\alpha^{(-k)} \right\|_1 \sqrt{\frac{\log d}{n \gamma_n}} + \left\| \widehat{\Delta}_\alpha^{(-k)} \right\|_2 \right).$$

For r_4 , we have $r_4 = r_{41} + r_{42}$, where

$$\begin{aligned} r_{41} &= n_k^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} (1 - \Gamma_i) (X_i - \mathbb{E}[X_i | \Gamma_i = 0])^\top \Delta^{(-k)}, \\ r_{42} &= n_k^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} (1 - \Gamma_i) (X_i - \mathbb{E}[X_i | \Gamma_i = 0])^\top \tilde{\Delta}_\beta^{(-k)}. \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma E.4,

$$r_{41} \leq \left\| n_k^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} (1 - \Gamma_i) (X_i - \mathbb{E}[X_i | \Gamma_i = 0]) \right\|_\infty \left\| \Delta^{(-k)} \right\|_1 = O_p \left(\left\| \Delta^{(-k)} \right\|_1 \sqrt{\frac{\log d}{n}} \right).$$

Since $\tilde{\Delta}_\beta^{(-k)} \perp (1 - \Gamma_i) X_i$ for $i \in \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{I}_k}$, then

$$\mathbb{E} \left[r_{42} \mid \tilde{\Delta}_\beta^{(-k)} \right] = n_k^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \mathbb{E} \left[(1 - \Gamma_i) (X_i - \mathbb{E}[X_i | \Gamma_i = 0])^\top \tilde{\Delta}_\beta^{(-k)} \mid \tilde{\Delta}_\beta^{(-k)} \right] = 0,$$

and for $i \in \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{I}_k}$, by Lemma C.1(c),

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[r_{42}^2 \mid \tilde{\Delta}_\beta^{(-k)} \right] &= n_k^{-1} \mathbb{E} \left[(1 - \Gamma_i) \left((X_i - \mathbb{E}[X_i | \Gamma_i = 0])^\top \tilde{\Delta}_\beta^{(-k)} \right)^2 \mid \tilde{\Delta}_\beta^{(-k)} \right] \\ &= n_k^{-1} (1 - \gamma_n) \mathbb{E} \left[\left((X_i - \mathbb{E}[X_i | \Gamma_i = 0])^\top \tilde{\Delta}_\beta^{(-k)} \right)^2 \mid \Gamma_i = 0, \tilde{\Delta}_\beta^{(-k)} \right] \\ &\leq n_k^{-1} \mathbb{E} \left[\left(X_i^\top \tilde{\Delta}_\beta^{(-k)} \right)^2 \mid \Gamma_i = 0, \tilde{\Delta}_\beta^{(-k)} \right] \\ &\leq 2\sigma^2 n_k^{-1} \left\| \tilde{\Delta}_\beta^{(-k)} \right\|_2^2. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, $r_{42} = O_p \left(n^{-1/2} \left\| \tilde{\Delta}_\beta^{(-k)} \right\|_2 \right)$. It follows that

$$r_4 = O_p \left(\left\| \Delta^{(-k)} \right\|_1 \sqrt{\frac{\log d}{n}} + n^{-1/2} \left\| \tilde{\Delta}_\beta^{(-k)} \right\|_2 \right).$$

For r_5 , we have $r_5 = (1 - \hat{\gamma}_k) (1 - \hat{\gamma})^{-1} (r_{51} + r_{52})$, where

$$\begin{aligned} r_{51} &= n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (1 - \Gamma_i) (X_i - \mathbb{E}[X_i | \Gamma_i = 0])^\top \Delta^{(-k)}, \\ r_{52} &= n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (1 - \Gamma_i) (X_i - \mathbb{E}[X_i | \Gamma_i = 0])^\top \tilde{\Delta}_\beta^{(-k)}. \end{aligned}$$

Similar to r_{41} , we have

$$r_{51} = O_p \left(\left\| \Delta^{(-k)} \right\|_1 \sqrt{\frac{\log d}{n}} \right).$$

By Lemma C.7, we have $\tilde{\Delta}_\beta^{(-k)} \perp (1 - \Gamma_i) X_i | \Gamma_{1:n}$ for $i \in [n]$. Since

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E} \left[(1 - \Gamma_i) (X_i - \mathbb{E}[X_i | \Gamma_i = 0])^\top \tilde{\Delta}_\beta^{(-k)} | \Gamma_{1:n}, \tilde{\Delta}_\beta^{(-k)} \right] \\ &= (1 - \Gamma_i) \mathbb{E} \left[(X_i - \mathbb{E}[X_i | \Gamma_i = 0])^\top \tilde{\Delta}_\beta^{(-k)} | \Gamma_i = 0, \tilde{\Delta}_\beta^{(-k)} \right] = 0, \end{aligned}$$

and for $i \neq j$,

$$(1 - \Gamma_i) (X_i - \mathbb{E}[X_i | \Gamma_i = 0]) \perp (1 - \Gamma_j) (X_j - \mathbb{E}[X_j | \Gamma_j = 0]) | (\Gamma_i, \Gamma_j, \tilde{\Delta}_\beta^{(-k)}),$$

then by Lemma C.1(c),

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[r_{52}^2 | \Gamma_{1:n}, \tilde{\Delta}_\beta^{(-k)} \right] &= n^{-2} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E} \left[(1 - \Gamma_i) \left((X_i - \mathbb{E}[X_i | \Gamma_i = 0])^\top \tilde{\Delta}_\beta^{(-k)} \right)^2 | \Gamma_{1:n}, \tilde{\Delta}_\beta^{(-k)} \right] \\ &\leq n^{-2} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E} \left[(1 - \Gamma_i) \left(X_i^\top \tilde{\Delta}_\beta^{(-k)} \right)^2 | \Gamma_i = 0, \tilde{\Delta}_\beta^{(-k)} \right] \\ &\leq n^{-2} \sum_{i=1}^n (1 - \Gamma_i) 2\sigma^2 \left\| \tilde{\Delta}_\beta^{(-k)} \right\|_2^2 \\ &= 2\sigma^2 n^{-1} (1 - \hat{\gamma}) \left\| \tilde{\Delta}_\beta^{(-k)} \right\|_2^2, \end{aligned}$$

which implies

$$r_{52} = O_p \left(n^{-1/2} \left\| \tilde{\Delta}_\beta^{(-k)} \right\|_2 \right).$$

Thus,

$$r_5 = O_p \left(\|\Delta^{(-k)}\|_1 \sqrt{\frac{\log d}{n}} + n^{-1/2} \|\tilde{\Delta}_\beta^{(-k)}\|_2 \right)$$

In conclusion, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\theta}_g^{(k)} - \tilde{\theta}_g^{(k)} &= O_p \left(\|\Delta^{(-k)}\|_1 \sqrt{\frac{\log d}{n\gamma_n}} + (n\gamma_n)^{-1/2} \|\tilde{\Delta}_\beta^{(-k)}\|_2 \right) + O_p \left(\|\hat{\Delta}_\alpha^{(-k)}\|_2 \|\hat{\Delta}_\beta^{(-k)}\|_2 \right) \\ &\quad + O_p \left(\|\hat{\Delta}_\alpha^{(-k)}\|_1 \sqrt{\frac{\log d}{n\gamma_n}} + \|\hat{\Delta}_\alpha^{(-k)}\|_2^2 \right) \\ &\quad + O_p \left(\|\Delta^{(-k)}\|_1 \sqrt{\frac{\log d}{n}} + n^{-1/2} \|\tilde{\Delta}_\beta^{(-k)}\|_2 \right) \\ &\quad + O_p \left(\|\Delta^{(-k)}\|_1 \sqrt{\frac{\log d}{n}} + n^{-1/2} \|\tilde{\Delta}_\beta^{(-k)}\|_2 \right). \end{aligned}$$

By Proposition B.2 and Lemma C.19, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\theta}_g^{(k)} - \tilde{\theta}_g^{(k)} &= O_p \left(\|\hat{\Delta}_\alpha^{(-k)}\|_2^2 + \|\hat{\Delta}_\alpha^{(-k)}\|_2 \|\hat{\Delta}_\beta^{(-k)}\|_2 + \left(\|\Delta^{(-k)}\|_1 + \|\hat{\Delta}_\alpha^{(-k)}\|_1 \right) \sqrt{\frac{\log d}{n\gamma_n}} \right) \\ &= O_p \left(\frac{(s_\alpha + \sqrt{s_\alpha s_\beta}) \log d}{n\gamma_n} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Suppose that $\mathbb{E}[Y_i | X_i] = X_i^\top \beta^*$ holds. For r_3 , by Lemma C.7, $(\Gamma_i X_i, \Gamma_i Y_i) \perp \hat{\alpha}^{(-k)} | \Gamma_i$ for $i \in \mathcal{I}_k$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E} \left[\left(\frac{\Gamma_i}{g(X_i^\top \hat{\alpha}^{(-k)})} - \frac{\Gamma_i}{g(X_i^\top \alpha^*)} \right) w_i \mid \hat{\alpha}^{(-k)}, \Gamma_i, X_i \right] \\ &= \left(\frac{1}{g(X_i^\top \hat{\alpha}^{(-k)})} - \frac{1}{g(X_i^\top \alpha^*)} \right) \mathbb{E}[\Gamma_i w_i \mid \Gamma_i, X_i] \\ &\stackrel{(i)}{=} \Gamma_i \left(\frac{1}{g(X_i^\top \hat{\alpha}^{(-k)})} - \frac{1}{g(X_i^\top \alpha^*)} \right) \mathbb{E}[w_i \mid X_i] = 0, \end{aligned}$$

where we use Assumption 4 in (i). Then by mean value theorem and (19), for some

$t \in (0, 1)$,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} [r_3^2 \mid \Gamma_{1:n}, \widehat{\alpha}^{(-k)}] \\
&= n_k^{-2} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\frac{\Gamma_i}{g(X_i^\top \widehat{\alpha}^{(-k)})} - \frac{\Gamma_i}{g(X_i^\top \alpha^*)} \right)^2 w_i^2 \mid \Gamma_i = 1, \widehat{\alpha}^{(-k)} \right] \\
&= n_k^{-2} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \Gamma_i \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\exp(-2t \widehat{\Delta}_\alpha^{(-k)} - 2X_i^\top \alpha^*) \right) \left(X_i^\top \widehat{\Delta}_\alpha^{(-k)} \right)^2 w_i^2 \mid \Gamma_i = 1, \widehat{\alpha}^{(-k)} \right] \\
&\leq k_0^{-2} \gamma_n^{-2} n_k^{-2} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \Gamma_i \mathbb{E} \left[\exp \left(2 \left| \widehat{\Delta}_\alpha^{(-k)} \right| \right) \left(X_i^\top \widehat{\Delta}_\alpha^{(-k)} \right)^2 w_i^2 \mid \Gamma_i = 1, \widehat{\alpha}^{(-k)} \right] \\
&\leq k_0^{-2} \gamma_n^{-2} n_k^{-2} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \Gamma_i \mathbb{E} \left[\exp \left(4 \left| \widehat{\Delta}_\alpha^{(-k)} \right| \right) \left(X_i^\top \widehat{\Delta}_\alpha^{(-k)} \right)^4 \mid \Gamma_i = 1, \widehat{\alpha}^{(-k)} \right]^{1/2} \mathbb{E} [w_i^4 \mid \Gamma_i = 1]^{1/2}.
\end{aligned}$$

By Lemma C.3 and Lemma C.17, we have

$$r_3 = O_p \left((n\gamma_n)^{-1/2} \left\| \widehat{\Delta}_\alpha^{(-k)} \right\|_2 \right).$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
\widehat{\theta}_g^{(k)} - \widetilde{\theta}_g^{(k)} &= O_p \left((n\gamma_n)^{-1/2} \left\| \widehat{\Delta}_\alpha^{(-k)} \right\|_2 + \left\| \widehat{\Delta}_\alpha^{(-k)} \right\|_2 \left\| \widehat{\Delta}_\beta^{(-k)} \right\|_2 + \left\| \Delta^{(-k)} \right\|_1 \sqrt{\frac{\log d}{n\gamma_n}} \right) \\
&= O_p \left(\frac{\sqrt{s_\alpha \log d}}{n\gamma_n} + \frac{\sqrt{s_\alpha s_\beta \log d}}{n\gamma_n} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma E.6. *Suppose $(\mathbf{X}_i)_{i=1}^m$ are i.i.d. sub-Gaussian random vectors. Then, for any (possibly random) $\Delta \in \mathbb{R}^d$, as $m, d \rightarrow \infty$,*

$$\sup_{\Delta \in \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}} \frac{m^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^m (\mathbf{X}_i^\top \Delta)^2}{\left\| \Delta \right\|_1^2 m^{-1} \log d + \left\| \Delta \right\|_2^2} = O_p(1).$$

Lemma E.6 follows from Lemma C.7 of Zhang et al. (2021).

Lemma E.7. *Suppose that Assumption 5 holds. Choose $\lambda_\alpha \asymp \sqrt{\log d / (n\gamma_n)}$. If $n\gamma_n \gg \max \{s_\alpha, \log n\} \log d$, then*

$$n_k^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \left(\Psi_i \left(\widehat{\alpha}^{(-k)}, \widehat{\beta}^{(-k)} \right) - \Psi_i \left(\alpha^*, \beta^* \right) \right)^2 = O_p \left(\gamma_n^{-1} \left\{ \left\| \widehat{\Delta}_\alpha^{(-k)} \right\|_2^2 + \left\| \widehat{\Delta}_\beta^{(-k)} \right\|_2^2 \right\} \right).$$

Proof. From Lemma E.5,

$$\begin{aligned}\Psi_i(\widehat{\alpha}^{(-k)}, \widehat{\beta}^{(-k)}) - \Psi_i(\alpha^*, \beta^*) &= \Gamma_i \left(1 - \frac{1}{g(X_i^\top \alpha^*)} \right) X_i^\top \widehat{\Delta}_\beta^{(-k)} \\ &\quad + \left(\frac{\Gamma_i}{g(X_i^\top \widehat{\alpha}^{(-k)})} - \frac{\Gamma_i}{g(X_i^\top \alpha^*)} \right) X_i^\top \widehat{\Delta}_\beta^{(-k)} \\ &\quad + \left(\frac{\Gamma_i}{g(X_i^\top \widehat{\alpha}^{(-k)})} - \frac{\Gamma_i}{g(X_i^\top \alpha^*)} \right) w_i.\end{aligned}$$

Then by Cauchy-Schwarz inequality,

$$n_k^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \left(\Psi_i(\widehat{\alpha}^{(-k)}, \widehat{\beta}^{(-k)}) - \Psi_i(\alpha^*, \beta^*) \right)^2 \leq 3(R_1 + R_2 + R_3),$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}R_1 &= n_k^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \Gamma_i \left(1 - \frac{1}{g(X_i^\top \alpha^*)} \right)^2 \left(X_i^\top \widehat{\Delta}_\beta^{(-k)} \right)^2, \\ R_2 &= n_k^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \left(\frac{\Gamma_i}{g(X_i^\top \widehat{\alpha}^{(-k)})} - \frac{\Gamma_i}{g(X_i^\top \alpha^*)} \right)^2 \left(X_i^\top \widehat{\Delta}_\beta^{(-k)} \right)^2, \\ R_3 &= n_k^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \left(\frac{\Gamma_i}{g(X_i^\top \widehat{\alpha}^{(-k)})} - \frac{\Gamma_i}{g(X_i^\top \alpha^*)} \right)^2 w_i^2\end{aligned}$$

By mean value theorem and (19), for some $t \in (0, 1)$,

$$\begin{aligned}\left(\frac{1}{g(X_i^\top \widehat{\alpha}^{(-k)})} - \frac{1}{g(X_i^\top \alpha^*)} \right)^2 &= \left(\exp\left(-t X_i^\top \widehat{\Delta}_\alpha^{(-k)} - X_i^\top \alpha^*\right) \left(X_i^\top \widehat{\Delta}_\alpha^{(-k)} \right) \right)^2 \\ &\leq k_0^{-2} \gamma_n^{-2} \exp\left(2 \left| X_i^\top \widehat{\Delta}_\alpha^{(-k)} \right| \right) \left(X_i^\top \widehat{\Delta}_\alpha^{(-k)} \right)^2.\end{aligned}$$

Since $\left(1 - \frac{1}{g(X_i^\top \alpha^*)} \right) \leq k_0^{-1} \gamma_n^{-1}$, by Hölder inequality,

$$\begin{aligned}R_1 &\leq k_0^{-2} \gamma_n^{-2} \left(n_k^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \Gamma_i \right)^{1/2} R_a^{1/2}, \\ R_2 &\leq k_0^{-2} \gamma_n^{-2} R_a^{1/2} R_b^{1/2}, \\ R_3 &\leq k_0^{-2} \gamma_n^{-2} R_b^{1/2} R_x^{1/2},\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} R_a &= n_k^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \Gamma_i \left(X_i^\top \widehat{\Delta}_\beta^{(-k)} \right)^4, \\ R_b &= n_k^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \Gamma_i \exp \left(4 \left| X_i^\top \widehat{\Delta}_\alpha^{(-k)} \right| \right) \left(X_i^\top \widehat{\Delta}_\alpha^{(-k)} \right)^4, \\ R_c &= n_k^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \Gamma_i w_i^4. \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma C.7, $\Gamma_i X_i \perp \widehat{\Delta}_\beta^{(-k)} \mid \Gamma_i$ for $i \in \mathcal{I}_k$. By Lemma C.1(c), for some $C_1 > 0$,

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\Gamma_i \left(X_i^\top \widehat{\Delta}_\beta^{(-k)} \right)^4 \mid \Gamma_i, \widetilde{\beta}^{(-k)} \right] \leq \Gamma_i C_1 \sigma^2 \left\| \widehat{\Delta}_\beta^{(-k)} \right\|_2^4.$$

Since

$$\mathbb{E} \left[R_a \mid \Gamma_{1:n}, \widetilde{\beta}^{(-k)} \right] = n_k^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \mathbb{E} \left[\Gamma_i \left(X_i^\top \widehat{\Delta}_\beta^{(-k)} \right)^4 \mid \Gamma_i, \widetilde{\beta}^{(-k)} \right] \leq n_k^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \Gamma_i C_1 \sigma^2 \left\| \widehat{\Delta}_\beta^{(-k)} \right\|_2^4,$$

by Lemma C.3, $n_k^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \Gamma_i = O_p(\gamma_n)$ and

$$R_a = O_p \left(\gamma_n \left\| \widehat{\Delta}_\beta^{(-k)} \right\|_2^2 \right).$$

By Lemma C.17, if $\lambda_\alpha \asymp \sqrt{\log d / (n\gamma_n)}$ and $n\gamma_n \gg \max \{s_\alpha, \log n\} \log d$, we have

$$R_b = O_p \left(\gamma_n \left\| \widehat{\Delta}_\alpha^{(-k)} \right\|_2^4 \right).$$

Note that

$$\mathbb{E} [R_c] = \mathbb{E} [\Gamma_i w_i^4] = \gamma_n \mathbb{E} [w_i^4 \mid \Gamma_i = 1] \leq \gamma_n \sigma_w^4,$$

we have

$$R_c = O_p(\gamma_n).$$

In conclusion,

$$n_k^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \left(\Psi_i \left(\widehat{\alpha}^{(-k)}, \widehat{\beta}^{(-k)} \right) - \Psi_i(\alpha^*, \beta^*) \right)^2 = O_p \left(\gamma_n^{-1} \left\{ \left\| \widehat{\Delta}_\alpha^{(-k)} \right\|_2^2 + \left\| \widehat{\Delta}_\beta^{(-k)} \right\|_2^2 \right\} \right).$$

□

Lemma E.8. *Suppose that Assumptions 4 and 5 hold. Assume either $\gamma_n(X) = g(X^\top \alpha_{PS}^*)$ or $\mu(X) = X^\top \beta_{OR}^*$ holds. Choose $\lambda_\alpha \asymp \lambda_\beta \asymp \sqrt{\log d / (n\gamma_n)}$. If $n\gamma_n \gg \max\{s_\alpha, s_\beta \log n, (\log n)^2\} \log d$ and $s_\alpha s_\beta \ll (n\gamma_n)^{3/2} / (\log n (\log d)^2)$, then as $n, d \rightarrow \infty$,*

$$\widehat{\sigma}_g^2 = \sigma_g^2 \left\{ 1 + O_p \left(\sqrt{\frac{(s_\alpha + s_\beta) \log d}{n\gamma_n}} \right) \right\}.$$

Proof. Let $\widetilde{\sigma}_g^2 = n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (1 - \Gamma_i) \beta^{*,\top} \bar{\Xi}_0 \beta^* + n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \Psi(\alpha^*, \beta^*, W_i)^2 - \theta_g^2$. Then

$$\widehat{\sigma}_g^2 - \widetilde{\sigma}_g^2 = K^{-1} \sum_{k=1}^K (s_{k1} - s_{k2} + s_{k3}),$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} s_{k1} &= n_k^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \left\{ \Psi_i(\widehat{\alpha}^{(-k)}, \widehat{\beta}^{(-k)})^2 - \Psi_i(\alpha^*, \beta^*)^2 \right\}, \\ s_{k2} &= n_k^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} (1 - \Gamma_i) \left(\widehat{\beta}^{(-k),\top} \bar{\Xi}_0 \widehat{\beta}^{(-k)} - \beta^{*,\top} \bar{\Xi}_0 \beta^* \right), \\ s_{k3} &= \widehat{\theta}_g^2 - \theta_g^2. \end{aligned}$$

For s_{k1} , note that $a^2 - b^2 = (a - b)^2 + 2b(a - b)$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} s_{k1} &= n_k^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \left(\Psi_i(\widehat{\alpha}^{(-k)}, \widehat{\beta}^{(-k)}) - \Psi_i(\alpha^*, \beta^*) \right)^2 \\ &\quad + 2n_k^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \left(\Psi_i(\widehat{\alpha}^{(-k)}, \widehat{\beta}^{(-k)}) - \Psi_i(\alpha^*, \beta^*) \right) \Psi_i(\alpha^*, \beta^*) \\ &\leq n_k^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \left(\Psi_i(\widehat{\alpha}^{(-k)}, \widehat{\beta}^{(-k)}) - \Psi_i(\alpha^*, \beta^*) \right)^2 \\ &\quad + 2 \left\{ n_k^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \left(\Psi_i(\widehat{\alpha}^{(-k)}, \widehat{\beta}^{(-k)}) - \Psi_i(\alpha^*, \beta^*) \right)^2 \right\}^{1/2} \left\{ n_k^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} (\Psi_i(\alpha^*, \beta^*))^2 \right\}^{1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

By (19) and Lemma C.1(c),

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E} [(\Psi_i(\alpha^*, \beta^*))^2] &= \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\Gamma_i X_i^\top \beta^* + \frac{\Gamma_i}{g(X_i^\top \alpha^*)} w_i \right)^2 \right] \\
&= 2\mathbb{E} \left[\Gamma_i (X_i^\top \beta^*)^2 \right] + 2\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\Gamma_i}{(g(X_i^\top \alpha^*))^2} w_i^2 \right] \\
&\leq 2\mathbb{E} \left[(X_i^\top \beta^*)^2 \right] + 2(1 + k_0^{-1} \gamma_n^{-1})^2 \mathbb{E} [\Gamma_i w_i^2] \\
&= 2\mathbb{E} \left[(X_i^\top \beta^*)^2 \right] + 2(1 + k_0^{-1} \gamma_n^{-1})^2 \gamma_n \mathbb{E} [w_i^2 \mid \Gamma_i = 1] \\
&\leq C \gamma_n^{-1}.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$n_k^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} (\Psi_i(\alpha^*, \beta^*))^2 = O_p(\gamma_n^{-1}).$$

By Lemma E.7, we have

$$s_{k1} = O_p \left(\gamma_n^{-1} \sqrt{\|\widehat{\Delta}_\alpha^{(-k)}\|_2^2 + \|\widehat{\Delta}_\beta^{(-k)}\|_2^2} \right). \quad (66)$$

For s_{k2} ,

$$\begin{aligned}
s_{k2} &= n_k^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} (1 - \Gamma_i) \left(\widehat{\beta}^{(-k), \top} \widehat{\Xi}_0 \widehat{\beta}^{(-k)} - \beta^{*, \top} \widehat{\Xi}_0 \beta^* \right) \\
&= n_k^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} (1 - \Gamma_i) \widehat{\Delta}_\beta^{(-k), \top} \widehat{\Xi}_0 \widehat{\Delta}_\beta^{(-k)} + 2n_k^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} (1 - \Gamma_i) \beta^{*, \top} \widehat{\Xi}_0 \widehat{\Delta}_\beta^{(-k)} \\
&= (1 - \widehat{\gamma}_k) (1 - \widehat{\gamma})^{-1} \{s_{k21} + 2s_{k22}\},
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
s_{k21} &= n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (1 - \Gamma_i) \left(X_i^\top \widehat{\Delta}_\beta^{(-k)} \right)^2, \\
s_{k22} &= n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (1 - \Gamma_i) \left(X_i^\top \widehat{\Delta}_\beta^{(-k)} \right) \left(X_i^\top \beta^* \right).
\end{aligned}$$

By Lemma E.6, given $\Gamma_{1:n}$,

$$\begin{aligned} n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (1 - \Gamma_i) (X_i^\top \Delta^{(-k)})^2 &= (1 - \hat{\gamma}) (n(1 - \hat{\gamma}))^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (1 - \Gamma_i) (X_i^\top \Delta^{(-k)})^2 \\ &= O_p \left((1 - \hat{\gamma}) \left\{ \|\Delta^{(-k)}\|_1^2 \frac{\log d}{n(1 - \hat{\gamma})} + \|\Delta^{(-k)}\|_2^2 \right\} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Since $\tilde{\beta}^{(-k)} \perp (1 - \Gamma_i)X_i \mid \Gamma_i$ for any $i \in [n]$ due to Lemma C.7, we have

$$\mathbb{E} \left[(1 - \Gamma_i) \left(X_i^\top \tilde{\Delta}_\beta^{(-k)} \right)^2 \mid \Gamma_{1:n}, \tilde{\beta}^{(-k)} \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[(1 - \Gamma_i) \left(X_i^\top \tilde{\Delta}_\beta^{(-k)} \right)^2 \mid \Gamma_i, \tilde{\beta}^{(-k)} \right] \leq 2\sigma^2 \left\| \hat{\Delta}_\beta^{(-k)} \right\|_2^2.$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} s_{k21} &\leq 2n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (1 - \Gamma_i) (X_i^\top \Delta)^2 + 2n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (1 - \Gamma_i) \left(X_i^\top \tilde{\Delta}_\beta^{(-k)} \right)^2 \\ &= O_p \left(\left\| \Delta^{(-k)} \right\|_1^2 \frac{\log d}{n} + \left\| \Delta^{(-k)} \right\|_2^2 + \left\| \hat{\Delta}_\beta^{(-k)} \right\|_2^2 \right). \end{aligned}$$

Since

$$\mathbb{E} \left[(1 - \Gamma_i) (X_i^\top \beta^*)^2 \right] = (1 - \gamma_n) \mathbb{E} \left[(X_i^\top \beta^*)^2 \mid \Gamma_i = 0 \right] \leq (1 - \gamma_n) C\sigma^2,$$

we have

$$n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (1 - \Gamma_i) (X_i^\top \beta^*)^2 = O_p(1 - \gamma_n).$$

By Cauchy-Schwarz inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} s_{k22} &= n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (1 - \Gamma_i) \left(X_i^\top \hat{\Delta}_\beta^{(-k)} \right) (X_i^\top \beta^*) \\ &\leq \left\{ n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (1 - \Gamma_i) \left(X_i^\top \hat{\Delta}_\beta^{(-k)} \right)^2 \right\}^{1/2} \left\{ n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (1 - \Gamma_i) (X_i^\top \beta^*)^2 \right\}^{1/2} \\ &= O_p \left(\left\| \Delta^{(-k)} \right\|_1 \sqrt{\frac{\log d}{n}} + \left\| \Delta^{(-k)} \right\|_2 + \left\| \hat{\Delta}_\beta^{(-k)} \right\|_2 \right). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, with $\hat{\gamma}_k - \gamma_n = o_p(1)$ and $\hat{\gamma} - \gamma_n = o_p(1)$,

$$s_{k2} = O_p \left(\left\| \Delta^{(-k)} \right\|_1 \sqrt{\frac{\log d}{n}} + \left\| \Delta^{(-k)} \right\|_2 + \left\| \hat{\Delta}_\beta^{(-k)} \right\|_2 \right). \quad (67)$$

For s_{k3} , use the fact

$$a^2 - b^2 = (a - b)^2 + 2b(a - b)$$

again and we have

$$s_{k3} = \widehat{\theta}_g^2 - \theta_g^2 = \left(\widehat{\theta}_g - \theta_g\right)^2 + 2\theta_g \left(\widehat{\theta}_g - \theta_g\right).$$

By Lemma E.1 and Lemma E.5, we have

$$s_{k3} = O_p \left(\widehat{\theta}_g - \theta_g\right) = O_p \left(\frac{(s_\alpha + \sqrt{s_\alpha s_\beta}) \log d}{n\gamma_n} + (n\gamma_n)^{-1/2} \right). \quad (68)$$

Together with (66) and (67), by Proposition B.2, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\sigma}_g^2 - \widetilde{\sigma}_g^2 &= O_p \left(\gamma_n^{-1} \sqrt{\left\| \widehat{\Delta}_\alpha^{(-k)} \right\|_2^2 + \left\| \widehat{\Delta}_\beta^{(-k)} \right\|_2^2} \right) \\ &\quad + O_p \left(\left\| \Delta^{(-k)} \right\|_1 \sqrt{\frac{\log d}{n}} + \left\| \Delta^{(-k)} \right\|_2 + \left\| \widehat{\Delta}_\beta^{(-k)} \right\|_2 \right) \\ &\quad + O_p \left(\frac{(s_\alpha + \sqrt{s_\alpha s_\beta}) \log d}{n\gamma_n} + (n\gamma_n)^{-1/2} \right) \\ &= O_p \left(\gamma_n^{-1} \sqrt{\frac{(s_\alpha + s_\beta) \log d}{n\gamma_n}} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (69)$$

Note that

$$\begin{aligned} \widetilde{\sigma}_g^2 &= n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (1 - \Gamma_i) \beta^{*,\top} \Xi_0 \beta^* + n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \Psi(\alpha^*, \beta^*, W_i)^2 - \theta^2 \\ &= n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(X_i^\top \beta^* + \frac{\Gamma_i}{g(X_i^\top \alpha^*)} w_i \right)^2 - \theta^2. \end{aligned}$$

Then

$$\widehat{\sigma}_g^2 - \sigma_g^2 = n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \left\{ \left(X_i^\top \beta^* + \frac{\Gamma_i}{g(X_i^\top \alpha^*)} w_i \right)^2 - \mathbb{E} \left[\left(X_i^\top \beta^* + \frac{\Gamma_i}{g(X_i^\top \alpha^*)} w_i \right)^2 \right] \right\},$$

and $\mathbb{E} [\tilde{\sigma}_g^2] = \sigma_g^2$. Thus, by Assumption 5, for some constant $C > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E} \left[(\tilde{\sigma}_g^2 - \sigma_g^2)^2 \right] &= n^{-1} \mathbb{E} \left[\left\{ \left(X_i^\top \beta^* + \frac{\Gamma_i}{g(X_i^\top \alpha^*)} w_i \right)^2 - \mathbb{E} \left[\left(X_i^\top \beta^* + \frac{\Gamma_i}{g(X_i^\top \alpha^*)} w_i \right)^2 \right] \right\}^2 \right] \\
&\leq n^{-1} \mathbb{E} \left[\left(X_i^\top \beta^* + \frac{\Gamma_i}{g(X_i^\top \alpha^*)} w_i \right)^4 \right] \\
&\leq 8n^{-1} \mathbb{E} \left[(X_i^\top \beta^*)^4 \right] + 8n^{-1} \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\Gamma_i}{(g(X_i^\top \alpha^*))^4} w_i^4 \right] \\
&\leq 8n^{-1} \mathbb{E} \left[(X_i^\top \beta^*)^4 \right] + 8(1 + k_0^{-1} \gamma_n^{-1})^4 n^{-1} \mathbb{E} [\Gamma_i w_i^4] \\
&\leq 8n^{-1} \mathbb{E} \left[(X_i^\top \beta^*)^4 \right] + 8(1 + k_0^{-1} \gamma_n^{-1})^4 n^{-1} \gamma_n \mathbb{E} [w_i^4 | \Gamma_i = 1] \\
&\leq Cn^{-1} \gamma_n^{-3},
\end{aligned}$$

which implies $\tilde{\sigma}_g^2 - \sigma_g^2 = O_p \left(\gamma_n^{-1} (n\gamma_n)^{-1/2} \right)$. Together with (69),

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{\sigma}_g^2 - \sigma_g^2 &= \hat{\sigma}_g^2 - \tilde{\sigma}_g^2 + \tilde{\sigma}_g^2 - \sigma_g^2 \\
&= O_p \left(\gamma_n^{-1} \left(\sqrt{\frac{(s_\alpha + s_\beta) \log d}{n\gamma_n}} + (n\gamma_n)^{-1/2} \right) \right).
\end{aligned}$$

By Lemma E.1, $\sigma_g^2 \asymp \gamma_n^{-1}$, then

$$\hat{\sigma}_g^2 = \sigma_g^2 \left\{ 1 + O_p \left(\sqrt{\frac{(s_\alpha + s_\beta) \log d}{n\gamma_n}} \right) \right\}.$$

□

Lemma E.9. *Suppose that Assumptions 4 and 5 hold. Assume either $\gamma_n(X) = g(X^\top \alpha_{PS}^*)$ or $\mu(X) = X^\top \beta_{OR}^*$ holds. Choose $\lambda_\alpha \asymp \lambda_\beta \asymp \sqrt{\log d / (n\gamma_n)}$. If $n\gamma_n \gg (\log n)^2 \log d$, $s_\alpha = o(\sqrt{n\gamma_n} / \log d)$ and $s_\alpha s_\beta = o(n\gamma_n / (\log n (\log d)^2))$, then as $n, d \rightarrow \infty$, $\hat{\theta}_g - \theta_g = O_p((n\gamma_n)^{-1/2})$, $\hat{\sigma}_g^2 = \sigma_g^2 \{1 + o_p(1)\}$, and $\hat{\sigma}_g^{-1} \sqrt{n} (\hat{\theta}_g - \theta_g) \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$.*

In addition, Assume that $\mu(X) = X^\top \beta_{OR}^$ holds. Choose $\lambda_\alpha \asymp \lambda_\beta \asymp \sqrt{\log d / (n\gamma_n)}$. If $n\gamma_n \gg (\log n)^2 \log d$ and $s_\alpha s_\beta = o(n\gamma_n / (\log n (\log d)^2))$, then as $n, d \rightarrow \infty$, $\hat{\theta}_g - \theta_g = O_p((n\gamma_n)^{-1/2})$, $\hat{\sigma}_g^2 = \sigma_g^2 \{1 + o_p(1)\}$, and $\hat{\sigma}_g^{-1} \sqrt{n} (\hat{\theta}_g - \theta_g) \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$.*

Proof. When $n\gamma_n \gg (\log n)^2 \log d$, $s_\alpha = o(\sqrt{n\gamma_n}/\log d)$ and $s_\alpha s_\beta = o(n\gamma_n/(\log n(\log d)^2))$, we have $n\gamma_n \gg \max\{s_\alpha, s_\beta \log n, (\log n)^2\} \log d$ and $s_\alpha s_\beta \ll (n\gamma_n)^{3/2}/(\log n(\log d)^2)$.

First, by Lemma E.1 and Lemma E.5, we have

$$\widehat{\theta}_g - \theta_g = O_p \left(\frac{(s_\alpha + \sqrt{s_\alpha s_\beta}) \log d}{n\gamma_n} + (n\gamma_n)^{-1/2} \right) = O_p((n\gamma_n)^{-1/2}).$$

Second, by Lemma E.8,

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\sigma}_g^2 &= \sigma_g^2 \left\{ 1 + O_p \left(\sqrt{\frac{(s_\alpha + s_\beta) \log d}{n\gamma_n}} \right) \right\} \\ &= \sigma_g^2 \{1 + o_p(1)\}. \end{aligned}$$

Third, by Lemma E.5, we have

$$\widehat{\theta}_g - \widetilde{\theta}_g = O_p \left(\frac{(s_\alpha + \sqrt{s_\alpha s_\beta}) \log d}{n\gamma_n} \right) = o_p((n\gamma_n)^{-1/2}).$$

By Lemma E.1, since $\sigma_g^2 \asymp \gamma_n^{-1}$, by Slutsky's theorem,

$$\widehat{\sigma}_g^{-1} \sqrt{n} (\widehat{\theta}_g - \theta_g) = \widehat{\sigma}_g^{-1} \sigma_g \left(\sigma_g^{-1} \sqrt{n} (\widetilde{\theta}_g - \theta_g) + \sigma_g^{-1} \sqrt{n} (\widehat{\theta}_g - \widetilde{\theta}_g) \right) \rightarrow \mathcal{N}(0, 1).$$

In addition, if $\mu(X) = X^\top \beta_{OR}^*$, we only need $s_\alpha s_\beta = o(n\gamma_n/(\log n(\log d)^2))$, which implies $s_\alpha = o(n\gamma_n/(\log n(\log d)^2))$. Under these conditions, by Lemma E.5,

$$\widehat{\theta}_g - \widetilde{\theta}_g = O_p \left(\frac{\sqrt{s_\alpha \log d}}{n\gamma_n} + \frac{\sqrt{s_\alpha s_\beta \log d}}{n\gamma_n} \right) = o_p((n\gamma_n)^{-1/2}).$$

The rest of proof follows similarly. □

E.2 Auxiliary lemmas for transportability

Lemma E.10. *Suppose that Assumptions 4 and 5 hold. Assume either $\gamma_n(X) = g(X^\top \alpha_{PS}^*)$ or $\mu(X) = X^\top \beta_{OR}^*$ holds. If $n\gamma_n \gg 1$, then as $n, d \rightarrow \infty$, $\sigma_t^2 \asymp \gamma_n^{-1}$ and*

$$\sigma_t^{-1} \sqrt{n} (\widetilde{\theta}_t - \theta_t) \rightarrow \mathcal{N}(0, 1),$$

where $\widetilde{\theta}_t = n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \left\{ \frac{1-\Gamma_i}{1-\gamma_n} (X_i^\top \beta_{OR}^* - \theta_t) + \frac{\Gamma_i(1-g(X_i^\top \alpha_{PS}^*))}{(1-\gamma_n)g(X_i^\top \alpha_{PS}^*)} (Y_i - X_i^\top \beta_{OR}^*) \right\} + \theta_t$

Proof. Let $w_i = Y_i - X_i^\top \beta^*$.

$$V_{t,i} = \frac{1 - \Gamma_i}{1 - \gamma_n} (X_i^\top \beta^* - \theta_t) + \frac{\Gamma_i (1 - g(X_i^\top \alpha^*))}{(1 - \gamma_n) g(X_i^\top \alpha^*)} (Y_i - X_i^\top \beta^*) + \theta_t.$$

When either $\gamma_n(X) = g(X^\top \alpha_{PS}^*)$ or $\mu(X) = X^\top \beta_{OR}^*$ holds, under Assumption 4 we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} [\tilde{\theta}_t - \theta_t] &= \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1 - \Gamma_i}{1 - \gamma_n} X_i^\top \beta^* \right] + \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\Gamma_i (1 - g(X_i^\top \alpha^*))}{(1 - \gamma_n) g(X_i^\top \alpha^*)} (Y_i - X_i^\top \beta^*) \right] - \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1 - \Gamma_i}{1 - \gamma_n} \right] \theta_t \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1 - \Gamma_i}{1 - \gamma_n} X_i^\top \beta^* \right] + \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\Gamma_i (1 - g(X_i^\top \alpha^*))}{(1 - \gamma_n) g(X_i^\top \alpha^*)} (Y_i - X_i^\top \beta^*) \right] - \theta_t \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1 - \Gamma_i}{1 - \gamma_n} (X_i^\top \beta^* - Y_i) \right] + \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\Gamma_i (1 - g(X_i^\top \alpha^*))}{(1 - \gamma_n) g(X_i^\top \alpha^*)} (Y_i - X_i^\top \beta^*) \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\frac{1 - \Gamma_i}{1 - \gamma_n} - \frac{\Gamma_i (1 - g(X_i^\top \alpha^*))}{(1 - \gamma_n) g(X_i^\top \alpha^*)} \right) (X_i^\top \beta^* - Y_i) \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{E} \left[\left(\frac{g(X_i^\top \alpha^*) - \Gamma_i}{(1 - \gamma_n) g(X_i^\top \alpha^*)} \right) (X_i^\top \beta^* - Y_i) \mid X_i \right] \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\frac{\mathbb{E} [g(X_i^\top \alpha^*) - \Gamma_i \mid X_i]}{(1 - \gamma_n) g(X_i^\top \alpha^*)} \right) \mathbb{E} [X_i^\top \beta^* - Y_i \mid X_i] \right] \\ &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

By Lyapunov's central limit theorem, it suffices to prove for some $\delta > 0$ and $C > 0$,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} n^{-\delta/2} \sigma^{-(2+\delta)} \mathbb{E} \left[|V_{t,i} - \theta_t|^{2+\delta} \right] = 0. \quad (70)$$

If $\mathbb{E}[Y_i | X_i] = X_i^\top \beta^*$, then $\mathbb{E}[w_i | X_i] = 0$ and

$$\begin{aligned}
\sigma_t^2 &= \mathbb{E}[(V_{t,i} - \theta_t)^2] \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left[\left\{ \frac{1 - \Gamma_i}{1 - \gamma_n} (X_i^\top \beta^* - \theta_t) + \frac{\Gamma_i (1 - g(X_i^\top \alpha^*))}{(1 - \gamma_n) g(X_i^\top \alpha^*)} w_i \right\}^2 \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\frac{1 - \Gamma_i}{1 - \gamma_n} (X_i^\top \beta^* - \theta_t) \right)^2 \right] + \mathbb{E} \left[\Gamma_i \left(\frac{(1 - g(X_i^\top \alpha^*))}{(1 - \gamma_n) g(X_i^\top \alpha^*)} \right)^2 w_i^2 \right] \\
&\quad + 2\mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{E} \left[\left(\frac{1 - \Gamma_i}{1 - \gamma_n} (X_i^\top \beta^* - \theta_t) \right) \frac{\Gamma_i (1 - g(X_i^\top \alpha^*))}{(1 - \gamma_n) g(X_i^\top \alpha^*)} w_i \mid X_i \right] \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\frac{1 - \Gamma_i}{1 - \gamma_n} X_i^\top (\beta^* - \theta_t) \right)^2 \right] + \mathbb{E} \left[\Gamma_i \left(\frac{(1 - g(X_i^\top \alpha^*))}{(1 - \gamma_n) g(X_i^\top \alpha^*)} \right)^2 w_i^2 \right] \\
&\quad + 2\mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{E} \left[\left(\frac{1 - \Gamma_i}{1 - \gamma_n} (X_i^\top \beta^* - \theta_t) \right) \frac{\Gamma_i (1 - g(X_i^\top \alpha^*))}{(1 - \gamma_n) g(X_i^\top \alpha^*)} \mid X_i \right] \mathbb{E}[w_i | X_i] \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\frac{1 - \Gamma_i}{1 - \gamma_n} (X_i^\top \beta^* - \theta_t) \right)^2 \right] + \mathbb{E} \left[\Gamma_i \left(\frac{(1 - g(X_i^\top \alpha^*))}{(1 - \gamma_n) g(X_i^\top \alpha^*)} \right)^2 w_i^2 \right].
\end{aligned}$$

Under Assumption 4, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\theta_t &= \mathbb{E}[Y_i | \Gamma_i = 0] = \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[Y_i | \Gamma_i = 0, X_i] | \Gamma_i = 0] \\
&= \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[Y_i | X_i] | \Gamma_i = 0] \\
&= \mathbb{E}[X_i^\top \beta^* | \Gamma_i = 0]
\end{aligned}$$

Under Assumption 5,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E} \left[\left(\frac{1 - \Gamma_i}{1 - \gamma_n} (X_i^\top \beta^* - \theta_t) \right)^2 \right] &= (1 - \gamma_n)^{-1} \mathbb{E} \left[(X_i^\top \beta^* - \theta_t)^2 | \Gamma_i = 0 \right] \\
&\leq \mathbb{E} \left[(X_i^\top \beta^*)^2 | \Gamma_i = 0 \right] \\
&\leq C\sigma^2.
\end{aligned}$$

In addition, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E} \left[\Gamma_i \left(\frac{(1 - g(X_i^\top \alpha^*))}{(1 - \gamma_n) g(X_i^\top \alpha^*)} \right)^2 w_i^2 \right] &= \gamma_n \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\frac{(1 - g(X_i^\top \alpha^*))}{(1 - \gamma_n) g(X_i^\top \alpha^*)} \right)^2 w_i^2 \mid \Gamma_i = 1 \right] \\
&\asymp \gamma_n \frac{(1 + \gamma_n^{-1})^2}{(1 - \gamma_n)^2} \mathbb{E} [w_i^2 \mid \Gamma_i = 1] \\
&\asymp \gamma_n^{-1}.
\end{aligned}$$

It follows that when $\mathbb{E}[w_i \mid X_i] = 0$,

$$\sigma_t^2 \asymp \gamma_n^{-1}.$$

On the other hand, if $\mathbb{E}[\Gamma_i \mid X_i] = g(X_i^\top \alpha^*)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\sigma_t^2 &= \mathbb{E} [(V_{t,i} - \theta_t)^2] \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left[\left\{ \frac{1 - \Gamma_i}{1 - \gamma_n} (X_i^\top \beta^* - \theta_t) + \frac{\Gamma_i (1 - g(X_i^\top \alpha^*))}{(1 - \gamma_n) g(X_i^\top \alpha^*)} w_i \right\}^2 \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left[\left\{ \frac{1 - \Gamma_i}{1 - \gamma_n} (Y_i - \theta_t) + \left(\frac{\Gamma_i (1 - g(X_i^\top \alpha^*))}{(1 - \gamma_n) g(X_i^\top \alpha^*)} - \frac{1 - \Gamma_i}{1 - \gamma_n} \right) w_i \right\}^2 \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left[\left\{ \left(\frac{1 - \Gamma_i}{1 - \gamma_n} (Y_i - \theta_t) \right) + \frac{\Gamma_i - g(X_i^\top \alpha^*)}{(1 - \gamma_n) g(X_i^\top \alpha^*)} w_i \right\}^2 \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\frac{1 - \Gamma_i}{1 - \gamma_n} (Y_i - \theta_t) \right)^2 \right] + \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\frac{\Gamma_i - g(X_i^\top \alpha^*)}{(1 - \gamma_n) g(X_i^\top \alpha^*)} w_i \right)^2 \right] \\
&\quad + 2\mathbb{E} \left[\left(\frac{1 - \Gamma_i}{1 - \gamma_n} (Y_i - \theta_t) \right) \left(\frac{\Gamma_i - g(X_i^\top \alpha^*)}{(1 - \gamma_n) g(X_i^\top \alpha^*)} w_i \right) \right].
\end{aligned}$$

Note that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E} \left[\left(\frac{1 - \Gamma_i}{1 - \gamma_n} (Y_i - \theta_t) \right) \left(\frac{\Gamma_i - g(X_i^\top \alpha^*)}{(1 - \gamma_n) g(X_i^\top \alpha^*)} w_i \right) \right] \\
&= -(1 - \gamma_n)^{-1} \mathbb{E} [(Y_i - \theta_t) w_i \mid \Gamma_i = 0] \\
&\leq c_0^{-1} \left(\mathbb{E} [w_i^2 \mid \Gamma_i = 0] + \mathbb{E} [w_i^2 \mid \Gamma_i = 0]^{1/2} \mathbb{E} [(X_i^\top \beta^*)^2 \mid \Gamma_i = 0]^{1/2} + |\theta_t| \mathbb{E} [|w_i| \mid \Gamma_i = 0] \right) \\
&\leq c_0^{-1} C (c_0^{-1} \sigma_w^2 + c_0^{-1} \sigma_w \sigma + c_0^{-1} \sigma_w).
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E} \left[\left(\frac{1 - \Gamma_i}{1 - \gamma_n} (Y_i - \theta_t) \right)^2 \right] &= \mathbb{E} [(Y_i - \theta_t)^2 \mid \Gamma_i = 0] \\
&\leq \mathbb{E} [Y_i^2 \mid \Gamma_i = 0] \\
&\leq 2 \left(\mathbb{E} [w_i^2 \mid \Gamma_i = 0] + \mathbb{E} [(X_i^\top \beta)^2 \mid \Gamma_i = 0] \right) \\
&\leq 2 (c_0^{-1} C_1 \sigma_w^2 + C_2 \sigma^2).
\end{aligned}$$

In addition,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E} \left[\left(\frac{\Gamma_i - g(X_i^\top \alpha^*)}{(1 - \gamma_n) g(X_i^\top \alpha^*)} \right)^2 w_i^2 \right] &= \gamma_n \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\frac{1 - g(X_i^\top \alpha^*)}{(1 - \gamma_n) g(X_i^\top \alpha^*)} \right)^2 w_i^2 \mid \Gamma_i = 1 \right] \\
&\quad + (1 - \gamma_n)^{-1} \mathbb{E} [w_i^2 \mid \Gamma_i = 0] \\
&\asymp \gamma_n \left(\frac{1 - \gamma_n^{-1}}{(1 - \gamma_n) \gamma_n} \right)^2 \mathbb{E} [w_i^2 \mid \Gamma_i = 1] \\
&\quad + (1 - \gamma_n)^{-1} \mathbb{E} [w_i^2 \mid \Gamma_i = 0] \\
&\asymp \gamma_n^{-1}.
\end{aligned}$$

It follows that when $\mathbb{E} [\Gamma_i \mid X_i] = g(X_i^\top \alpha^*)$,

$$\sigma_t^2 \asymp \gamma_n^{-1}.$$

Thus, when either $\gamma_n(X) = g(X^\top \alpha_{PS}^*)$ or $\mu(X) = X^\top \beta_{OR}^*$ holds, we have

$$\sigma_t^2 \asymp \gamma_n^{-1}. \tag{71}$$

By Minkowski's inequality, we have

$$\|V_{t,i} - \theta_t\|_{\mathbb{P}, 2+\delta} \leq \left\| \frac{1 - \Gamma_i}{1 - \gamma_n} X_i^\top \beta^* \right\|_{\mathbb{P}, 2+\delta} + \left\| \frac{\Gamma_i (1 - g(X_i^\top \alpha^*))}{(1 - \gamma_n) g(X_i^\top \alpha^*)} w_i \right\|_{\mathbb{P}, 2+\delta} + c_0^{-1} |\theta_t|.$$

Choose $\delta = 2$. Then under Assumption 5,

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\left| \frac{1 - \Gamma_i}{1 - \gamma_n} X_i^\top \beta^* \right|^4 \right] \leq c_0^{-4} \mathbb{E} [(X_i^\top \beta^*)^4] \leq c_0^{-4} C_3^4 \sigma^4.$$

In addition,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E} \left[\left| \frac{\Gamma_i (1 - g(X_i^\top \alpha^*))}{(1 - \gamma_n) g(X_i^\top \alpha^*)} w_i \right|^4 \right] &= \gamma_n (1 - \gamma_n)^{-4} \mathbb{E} \left[\left| \frac{(1 - g(X_i^\top \alpha^*))}{g(X_i^\top \alpha^*)} w_i \right|^4 \mid \Gamma_i = 1 \right] \\
&\leq c_0^{-4} \gamma_n^{-3} \mathbb{E} [w_i^4 \mid \Gamma_i = 1] \\
&\leq c_0^{-4} \gamma_n^{-3} \sigma_w^4.
\end{aligned}$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
\|V_{t,i} - \theta_t\|_{\mathbb{P},4} &\leq c_0^{-1} C_3 \sigma + c_0^{-1} \sigma_w \gamma_n^{-3/4} + c_0^{-1} |\theta_t| \\
&\leq \gamma_n^{-3/4} (c_0^{-1} C_3 \sigma + c_0^{-1} \sigma_w + c_0^{-1} |\theta_t|).
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, if $n\gamma_n \gg 1$, as $n, d \rightarrow \infty$,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} n^{-\delta/2} \sigma^{-(2+\delta)} \mathbb{E} [|V_{t,i} - \theta_t|^{2+\delta}] \leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} C n^{-1} \gamma_n^2 \gamma_n^{-3} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} C (n\gamma_n)^{-1} = 0.$$

□

Lemma E.11. *Suppose that Assumption 5 holds. Choose $\lambda_\alpha \asymp \lambda_\beta \asymp \sqrt{\log d / (n\gamma_n)}$. If $n\gamma_n \gg \max\{s_\alpha, s_\beta \log n, (\log n)^2\} \log d$ and $s_\alpha s_\beta \ll (n\gamma_n)^{3/2} / (\log n (\log d)^2)$, then as $n, d \rightarrow \infty$,*

$$\hat{\theta}_t - \tilde{\theta}_t = O_p \left(\frac{(s_\alpha + \sqrt{s_\alpha s_\beta}) \log d}{n\gamma_n} \right).$$

In addition, suppose that Assumption 4 holds. Assume that $\mu(X) = X^\top \beta_{OR}^$ holds. Then as $n, d \rightarrow \infty$,*

$$\hat{\theta}_t - \tilde{\theta}_t = O_p \left(\frac{\sqrt{s_\alpha \log d}}{n\gamma_n} + \frac{\sqrt{s_\alpha s_\beta} \log d}{n\gamma_n} \right).$$

Proof. Let $\hat{\Delta}_\alpha^{(-k)} = \hat{\alpha}^{(-k)} - \alpha^*$, $\hat{\Delta}_\beta^{(-k)} = \hat{\beta}^{(-k)} - \beta^*$, $\tilde{\Delta}_\beta^{(-k)} = \tilde{\beta}^{(-k)} - \beta^*$, $\Delta^{(-k)} = \hat{\beta}^{(-k)} - \tilde{\beta}^{(-k)}$,

$\hat{\gamma}_k = n_k^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \Gamma_i$, $\hat{\gamma} = n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \Gamma_i$, and

$$\Phi_i(\alpha, \beta) = \Gamma_i \frac{1 - g(X_i^\top \alpha)}{g(X_i^\top \alpha)} (Y_i - X_i^\top \beta) = \Psi_i(\alpha, \beta) - \Gamma_i Y_i.$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned}\widehat{\theta}_t^{(k)} &= (1 - \widehat{\gamma}_k)^{-1} n_k^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \left\{ (1 - \Gamma_i) \bar{X}_0^\top \widehat{\beta}^{(-k)} + \Phi_i \left(\widehat{\alpha}^{(-k)}, \widehat{\beta}^{(-k)} \right) \right\}, \\ \widetilde{\theta}_t^{(k)} &= (1 - \gamma_n)^{-1} n_k^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \left\{ (1 - \Gamma_i) \bar{X}_0^\top \beta^* + \Phi_i(\alpha^*, \beta^*) \right\} + \frac{\widehat{\gamma}_k - \gamma_n}{1 - \gamma_n} \theta_t,\end{aligned}$$

where $\widetilde{\theta}_t = K^{-1} \sum_{k=1}^K \widetilde{\theta}_t^{(k)}$. Note that $\Phi_i \left(\widehat{\alpha}^{(-k)}, \widehat{\beta}^{(-k)} \right) - \Phi_i(\alpha^*, \beta^*) = \Psi_i \left(\widehat{\alpha}^{(-k)}, \widehat{\beta}^{(-k)} \right) - \Psi_i(\alpha^*, \beta^*)$ and

$$(1 - \widehat{\gamma}_k) \widehat{\theta}_t^{(k)} - (1 - \gamma_n) \left(\widetilde{\theta}_t^{(k)} - \frac{\widehat{\gamma}_k - \gamma_n}{1 - \gamma_n} \theta_t \right) = \widehat{\theta}_g^{(k)} - \widetilde{\theta}_g^{(k)}.$$

By results in Lemma E.5 we have

$$(1 - \widehat{\gamma}_k) \widehat{\theta}_t^{(k)} - (1 - \gamma_n) \left(\widetilde{\theta}_t^{(k)} - \frac{\widehat{\gamma}_k - \gamma_n}{1 - \gamma_n} \theta_t \right) = O_p \left(\frac{(s_\alpha + \sqrt{s_\alpha s_\beta}) \log d}{n \gamma_n} \right).$$

On the other hand, let

$$\bar{\theta}_t^{(k)} = n_k^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \left\{ \frac{1 - \Gamma_i}{1 - \gamma_n} X_i^\top \beta^* + \Phi_i(\alpha^*, \beta^*) \right\} + \frac{\widehat{\gamma}_k - \gamma_n}{1 - \gamma_n} \theta_t.$$

Then

$$\widetilde{\theta}_t^{(k)} - \bar{\theta}_t^{(k)} = q_1 - q_2 + q_3,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}q_1 &= \frac{1 - \widehat{\gamma}_k}{1 - \gamma_n} (1 - \widehat{\gamma})^{-1} n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \left\{ (1 - \Gamma_i) X_i - \mathbb{E}[(1 - \Gamma_i) X_i] \right\}^\top \beta^*, \\ q_2 &= \frac{1}{1 - \gamma_n} n_k^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \left\{ (1 - \Gamma_i) X_i - \mathbb{E}[(1 - \Gamma_i) X_i] \right\}^\top \beta^*, \\ q_3 &= \left(\frac{1 - \widehat{\gamma}_k}{1 - \gamma_n} (1 - \widehat{\gamma})^{-1} - \frac{1}{1 - \gamma_n} \right) \mathbb{E}[(1 - \Gamma_i) X_i]^\top \beta^*.\end{aligned}$$

For q_1 , let

$$q_{1a} = n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \left\{ (1 - \Gamma_i) X_i - \mathbb{E}[(1 - \Gamma_i) X_i] \right\}^\top \beta^*.$$

Then $\mathbb{E}[q_{1a}] = 0$. By Assumption 5,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}[q_{1a}^2] &= n^{-1} \mathbb{E} \left[\left\{ ((1 - \Gamma_i) X_i - \mathbb{E}[(1 - \Gamma_i) X_i])^\top \beta^* \right\}^2 \right] \\ &\leq n^{-1} \mathbb{E} \left[(1 - \Gamma_i) (X_i^\top \beta^*)^2 \right] \\ &= (1 - \gamma_n) n^{-1} \mathbb{E} \left[(X_i^\top \beta^*)^2 \mid \Gamma_i = 0 \right] \\ &= O_p(n^{-1}).\end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$q_{1a} = O_p(n^{-1/2}).$$

By Lemma D.1,

$$\frac{1 - \gamma_n}{1 - \widehat{\gamma}_k} - 1 = O_p\left(\sqrt{\frac{\gamma_n}{n}}\right) \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{1}{1 - \widehat{\gamma}_k} = O_p(1). \quad (72)$$

Thus,

$$q_1 = O_p(n^{-1/2}).$$

Similarly, we have

$$q_2 = O_p(n^{-1/2}).$$

By Lemma C.3 and Lemma D.1, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1 - \widehat{\gamma}_k}{1 - \widehat{\gamma}} - 1 &= \frac{1 - \widehat{\gamma}_k - (1 - \gamma_n)}{1 - \gamma_n} \left(\frac{1 - \gamma_n}{1 - \widehat{\gamma}} - 1 \right) + \left(\frac{1 - \gamma_n}{1 - \widehat{\gamma}} - 1 \right) + \frac{1 - \widehat{\gamma}_k - (1 - \gamma_n)}{1 - \gamma_n} \\ &= O_p\left((n(1 - \gamma_n))^{-1/2}\right) O_p\left((n(1 - \gamma_n))^{-1/2} \gamma_n^{1/2}\right) + O_p(n(1 - \gamma_n))^{-1/2} \\ &= O_p(\gamma_n^{1/2} (n(1 - \gamma_n))^{-1}) + O_p(n(1 - \gamma_n))^{-1/2}.\end{aligned}$$

Since $1 - \gamma_n \geq c_0$, we have

$$q_3 = O_p(n^{-1/2}).$$

Thus,

$$\tilde{\theta}_t^{(k)} - \bar{\theta}_t^{(k)} = O_p(n^{-1/2}).$$

Note that by Lemma E.10, $\bar{\theta}_t^{(k)} - \theta_t = O_p((n\gamma_n)^{-1/2})$. Then by (72), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\theta}_t^{(k)} - \hat{\theta}_t^{(k)} &= \left(\frac{1 - \gamma_n}{1 - \hat{\gamma}_k} - 1 \right) (\tilde{\theta}_t^{(k)} - \bar{\theta}_t^{(k)}) + \left(\frac{1 - \gamma_n}{1 - \hat{\gamma}_k} - 1 \right) (\bar{\theta}_t^{(k)} - \theta_t) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{1 - \hat{\gamma}_k} O_p \left((s_\alpha + s_\beta) \frac{\log d}{n} \right) \\ &= O_p(\gamma_n^{1/2} n^{-1}) + O_p(n^{-1}) + O_p \left(\frac{(s_\alpha + \sqrt{s_\alpha s_\beta}) \log d}{n\gamma_n} \right) \\ &= O_p \left(\frac{(s_\alpha + \sqrt{s_\alpha s_\beta}) \log d}{n\gamma_n} \right). \end{aligned}$$

It follows that

$$\hat{\theta}_t - \tilde{\theta}_t = O_p \left(\frac{(s_\alpha + \sqrt{s_\alpha s_\beta}) \log d}{n\gamma_n} \right).$$

In addition, when $\mu(X_i) = X_i^\top \beta^*$, by Lemma E.5, we have

$$(1 - \hat{\gamma}_k) \hat{\theta}_t^{(k)} - (1 - \gamma_n) \left(\tilde{\theta}_t^{(k)} - \frac{\hat{\gamma}_k - \gamma_n}{1 - \gamma_n} \theta_t \right) = O_p \left(\frac{\sqrt{s_\alpha \log d}}{n\gamma_n} + \frac{\sqrt{s_\alpha s_\beta} \log d}{n\gamma_n} \right).$$

By identical analysis, we have

$$\hat{\theta}_t - \tilde{\theta}_t = O_p \left(\frac{\sqrt{s_\alpha \log d}}{n\gamma_n} + \frac{\sqrt{s_\alpha s_\beta} \log d}{n\gamma_n} \right).$$

□

Lemma E.12. *Suppose that Assumptions 4 and 5 hold. Assume either $\gamma_n(X) = g(X^\top \alpha_{PS}^*)$ or $\mu(X) = X^\top \beta_{OR}^*$ holds. Choose $\lambda_\alpha \asymp \lambda_\beta \asymp \sqrt{\log d / (n\gamma_n)}$. If $n\gamma_n \gg \max\{s_\alpha, s_\beta \log n, (\log n)^2\} \log d$ and $s_\alpha s_\beta \ll (n\gamma_n)^{3/2} / (\log n (\log d)^2)$, then as $n, d \rightarrow \infty$,*

$$\hat{\sigma}_t^2 = \sigma_t^2 \left\{ 1 + O_p \left(\sqrt{\frac{(s_\alpha + s_\beta) \log d}{n\gamma_n}} + \gamma_n \sqrt{\frac{s_\alpha s_\beta \log d}{n\gamma_n}} \right) \right\}.$$

Proof. Note that

$$\widehat{\sigma}_t^2 - \widetilde{\sigma}_t^2 = K^{-1} \sum_{k=1}^K (p_{k1a} - p_{k1b} + p_{k2a} - p_{k2b} - 2(p_{k3a} - p_{k3b}) + p_{k4a} - p_{k4b}),$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} p_{k1a} &= (1 - \widehat{\gamma}_k)^{-1} \widehat{\beta}^{(-k), \top} \Xi_0 \widehat{\beta}^{(-k)}, \\ p_{k1b} &= \frac{1 - \widehat{\gamma}_k}{(1 - \gamma_n)^2} \beta^{*, \top} \Xi_0 \beta^*, \\ p_{k2a} &= (1 - \widehat{\gamma}_k)^{-2} n_k^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \Phi_i \left(\widehat{\alpha}^{(-k)}, \widehat{\beta}^{(-k)} \right)^2, \\ p_{k2b} &= (1 - \gamma_n)^{-2} n_k^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \Phi_i (\alpha^*, \beta^*)^2, \\ p_{k3a} &= (1 - \widehat{\gamma}_k)^{-1} \left(\bar{X}_0^\top \widehat{\beta}^{(-k)} \right) \widehat{\theta}_t, \\ p_{k3b} &= (1 - \gamma_n)^{-2} (1 - \widehat{\gamma}_k) \left(\bar{X}_0^\top \beta^* \right) \theta_t, \\ p_{k4a} &= (1 - \widehat{\gamma}_k)^{-1} \widehat{\theta}_t^2, \\ p_{k4b} &= (1 - \gamma_n)^{-2} (1 - \widehat{\gamma}_k) \theta_t^2. \end{aligned}$$

Recall s_{k21}, s_{k22} in the proof of Lemma E.8,

$$\begin{aligned} (1 - \widehat{\gamma}_k)^2 p_{k1a} - (1 - \gamma_n)^2 p_{k1b} &= (1 - \widehat{\gamma}_k) \left(\widehat{\Delta}_\beta^{(-k), \top} \Xi_0 \widehat{\Delta}_\beta^{(-k)} + 2\beta^{*, \top} \Xi_0 \widehat{\Delta}_\beta^{(-k)} \right) \\ &\leq s_{k21} + 2s_{k22} \\ &= O_p \left(\|\Delta^{(-k)}\|_1 \sqrt{\frac{\log d}{n}} + \|\Delta^{(-k)}\|_2 + \|\widehat{\Delta}_\beta^{(-k)}\|_2 \right). \end{aligned}$$

Under Assumption 5,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} [\Phi_i (\alpha^*, \beta^*)^2] &= \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\Gamma_i}{(1 - \gamma_n)^2} \left(\frac{1 - g(X_i^\top \alpha^*)}{g(X_i^\top \alpha^*)} \right)^2 w_i^2 \right] \\ &\leq c_0^{-2} k_0^{-2} \gamma_n^{-2} \mathbb{E} [\Gamma_i w_i^2] \\ &= c_0^{-2} k_0^{-2} \gamma_n^{-1} \mathbb{E} [w_i^2 \mid \Gamma_i = 1] \\ &\leq c_0^{-2} k_0^{-2} \sigma_w^{-1} \gamma_n^{-1}, \end{aligned}$$

which implies

$$p_{k2b} = O_p \left((1 - \gamma_n)^{-2} \gamma_n^{-1} \right) = O_p \left(\gamma_n^{-1} \right). \quad (73)$$

Since $a^2 - b^2 = (a - b)^2 + 2(a - b)b$ and

$$\Phi_i \left(\widehat{\alpha}^{(-k)}, \widehat{\beta}^{(-k)} \right) - \Phi_i \left(\alpha^*, \beta^* \right) = \Psi_i \left(\widehat{\alpha}^{(-k)}, \widehat{\beta}^{(-k)} \right) - \Psi_i \left(\alpha^*, \beta^* \right),$$

by Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & (1 - \widehat{\gamma}_k)^2 p_{k2a} - (1 - \gamma_n)^2 p_{k2b} \\ &= n_k^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \left(\Psi_i \left(\widehat{\alpha}^{(-k)}, \widehat{\beta}^{(-k)} \right) - \Psi_i \left(\alpha^*, \beta^* \right) \right)^2 \\ & \quad + 2n_k^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \left(\Psi_i \left(\widehat{\alpha}^{(-k)}, \widehat{\beta}^{(-k)} \right) - \Psi_i \left(\alpha^*, \beta^* \right) \right) \Phi_i \left(\alpha^*, \beta^* \right) \\ & \leq n_k^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \left(\Psi_i \left(\widehat{\alpha}^{(-k)}, \widehat{\beta}^{(-k)} \right) - \Psi_i \left(\alpha^*, \beta^* \right) \right)^2 \\ & \quad + 2 \left\{ n_k^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \left(\Psi_i \left(\widehat{\alpha}^{(-k)}, \widehat{\beta}^{(-k)} \right) - \Psi_i \left(\alpha^*, \beta^* \right) \right)^2 \right\}^{1/2} (p_{k2b})^{1/2} \\ & \stackrel{(i)}{=} O_p \left(\gamma_n^{-1} \left\{ \left\| \widehat{\Delta}_\alpha^{(-k)} \right\|_2^2 + \left\| \widehat{\Delta}_\beta^{(-k)} \right\|_2^2 \right\} \right) + O_p \left(\gamma_n^{-1} \left\{ \left\| \widehat{\Delta}_\alpha^{(-k)} \right\|_2 + \left\| \widehat{\Delta}_\beta^{(-k)} \right\|_2 \right\} \right), \end{aligned}$$

where we use Lemma E.7 in (i). In addition,

$$\begin{aligned} (1 - \widehat{\gamma}_k)^2 p_{k3a} - (1 - \gamma_n)^2 p_{k3b} &= (1 - \widehat{\gamma}_k) \left\{ \bar{X}_0^\top \widehat{\Delta}_\beta^{(-k)} \left(\widehat{\theta}_t - \theta_t \right) + \bar{X}_0^\top \beta^* \left(\widehat{\theta}_t - \theta_t \right) + \bar{X}_0^\top \widehat{\Delta}_\beta^{(-k)} \theta_t \right\} \\ &= \frac{1 - \widehat{\gamma}_k}{1 - \widehat{\gamma}} \left(\widehat{\theta}_t - \theta_t + \theta_t \right) n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (1 - \Gamma_i) X_i^\top \Delta^{(-k)} \\ & \quad + \frac{1 - \widehat{\gamma}_k}{1 - \widehat{\gamma}} \left(\widehat{\theta}_t - \theta_t \right) n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (1 - \Gamma_i) X_i^\top \beta^* \\ & \quad + \frac{1 - \widehat{\gamma}_k}{1 - \widehat{\gamma}} \left(\widehat{\theta}_t - \theta_t + \theta_t \right) n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (1 - \Gamma_i) X_i^\top \widetilde{\Delta}_\beta^{(-k)}. \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma C.1(c), for some $C > 0$,

$$\max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \max_{1 \leq k \leq d} \left\| \left((1 - \Gamma_i) X_i - \mathbb{E}[(1 - \Gamma_i) X_i] \right)^\top e_k \right\|_{\psi_2} \leq C\sigma,$$

and

$$\max_{1 \leq k \leq d} n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E} \left[\left\{ ((1 - \Gamma_i) X_i - \mathbb{E}[(1 - \Gamma_i) X_i])^\top e_k \right\}^2 \right] \leq C\sigma_2.$$

Since $n\gamma_n \gg (\log n)^2 \log d$, by Lemma C.4,

$$\left\| n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (1 - \Gamma_i) X_i - \mathbb{E}[(1 - \Gamma_i) X_i] \right\|_\infty = O_p \left(\sqrt{\frac{\log d}{n}} \right).$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (1 - \Gamma_i) X_i^\top \Delta^{(-k)} &\leq \left\| n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (1 - \Gamma_i) X_i - \mathbb{E}[(1 - \Gamma_i) X_i] \right\|_\infty \|\Delta^{(-k)}\|_1 \\ &\quad + \|\mathbb{E}[(1 - \Gamma_i) X_i]\|_\infty \|\Delta^{(-k)}\|_1 \\ &= O_p(\|\Delta^{(-k)}\|_1). \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma C.1 (c),

$$\mathbb{E}[(1 - \Gamma_i) X_i^\top \beta^*] \leq \mathbb{E}[|X_i^\top \beta^*|] \leq C\sigma,$$

we have

$$n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (1 - \Gamma_i) X_i^\top \beta^* = O_p(1).$$

Since $\tilde{\Delta}_\beta^{(-k)} \perp (1 - \Gamma_i) X_i \mid \Gamma_{1:n}$, then by Lemma C.1(c),

$$\mathbb{E} \left[(1 - \Gamma_i) X_i^\top \tilde{\Delta}_\beta^{(-k)} \mid \Gamma_{1:n}, \tilde{\beta}^{(-k)} \right] = (1 - \Gamma_i) \mathbb{E}[X_i \mid \Gamma_i = 0]^\top \tilde{\Delta}_\beta^{(-k)} \leq 2\sigma \left\| \tilde{\Delta}_\beta^{(-k)} \right\|_2.$$

By Lemma C.2,

$$n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (1 - \Gamma_i) X_i^\top \tilde{\Delta}_\beta^{(-k)} = O_p \left(\left\| \tilde{\Delta}_\beta^{(-k)} \right\|_2 \right).$$

By Lemma E.10 and Lemma E.11,

$$\hat{\theta}_t - \theta_t = O_p \left(\frac{(s_\alpha + \sqrt{s_\alpha s_\beta}) \log d}{n\gamma_n} + (n\gamma_n)^{-1/2} \right).$$

Moreover, by Lemma C.3 and Lemma D.1,

$$\frac{1 - \widehat{\gamma}_k}{1 - \widehat{\gamma}} = \frac{1 - \widehat{\gamma}_k}{1 - \gamma_n} \left(\frac{1 - \gamma_n}{1 - \widehat{\gamma}} - 1 \right) + \frac{1 - \widehat{\gamma}_k}{1 - \gamma_n} = O_p(1),$$

which implies

$$p_{k3b} = (1 - \gamma_n)^{-2} (1 - \widehat{\gamma}_k) (\bar{X}_0^\top \beta^*) \theta_t = O_p(1). \quad (74)$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} & (1 - \widehat{\gamma}_k)^2 p_{k3a} - (1 - \gamma_n)^2 p_{k3b} \\ &= O_p \left(\left\| \Delta^{(-k)} \right\|_1 + \left\| \widetilde{\Delta}_\beta^{(-k)} \right\|_2 + \frac{(s_\alpha + \sqrt{s_\alpha s_\beta}) \log d}{n\gamma_n} + (n\gamma_n)^{-1/2} \right). \end{aligned}$$

It is clear that

$$p_{k4b} = \frac{1 - \widehat{\gamma}_k}{(1 - \gamma_n)^2} \theta_t^2 = O_p(1), \quad (75)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} (1 - \widehat{\gamma}_k)^2 p_{k4a} - (1 - \gamma_n)^2 p_{k4b} &= (1 - \widehat{\gamma}_k) \left\{ (\widehat{\theta}_t - \theta_t)^2 + 2(\widehat{\theta}_t - \theta_t) \theta_t \right\} \\ &= O_p \left(\frac{(s_\alpha + \sqrt{s_\alpha s_\beta}) \log d}{n\gamma_n} + (n\gamma_n)^{-1/2} \right). \end{aligned}$$

In conclusion, by Proposition B.2, Lemma C.19, and Lemma C.15, we have

$$\begin{aligned} a_1 &= (1 - \widehat{\gamma}_k)^2 p_{k1a} - (1 - \gamma_n)^2 p_{k1b} = O_p \left(\sqrt{\frac{(s_\alpha + s_\beta) \log d}{n\gamma_n}} \right), \\ a_2 &= (1 - \widehat{\gamma}_k)^2 p_{k2a} - (1 - \gamma_n)^2 p_{k2b} = O_p \left(\gamma_n^{-1} \sqrt{\frac{(s_\alpha + s_\beta) \log d}{n\gamma_n}} \right), \\ a_3 &= (1 - \widehat{\gamma}_k)^2 p_{k3a} - (1 - \gamma_n)^2 p_{k3b} = O_p \left(\sqrt{\frac{s_\alpha s_\beta \log d}{n\gamma_n}} \right), \\ a_4 &= (1 - \widehat{\gamma}_k)^2 p_{k4a} - (1 - \gamma_n)^2 p_{k4b} = O_p \left(\frac{(s_\alpha + \sqrt{s_\alpha s_\beta}) \log d}{n\gamma_n} + (n\gamma_n)^{-1/2} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Note that

$$p_{k1b} = \frac{1 - \widehat{\gamma}_k}{(1 - \gamma_n)^2} \beta^{*,\top} \Xi_0 \beta^* = \frac{(1 - \widehat{\gamma}_k)(1 - \widehat{\gamma})}{(1 - \gamma_n)^2} n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (1 - \Gamma_i) (X_i^\top \beta^*)^2.$$

By Lemma C.3, $1 - \widehat{\gamma}_k = O_p(1 - \gamma_n)$, $1 - \widehat{\gamma} = O_p(1 - \gamma_n)$. By Lemma C.1(c),

$$\mathbb{E} \left[(1 - \Gamma_i) (X_i^\top \beta^*)^2 \right] = (1 - \gamma_n) \mathbb{E} \left[(X_i^\top \beta^*)^2 \mid \Gamma_i = 0 \right] = O_p(1 - \gamma_n),$$

which implies

$$p_{k1b} = O_p(1 - \gamma_n). \quad (76)$$

In addition, by Lemma D.1, $\frac{1 - \gamma_n}{1 - \widehat{\gamma}_k} - 1 = O_p\left(\gamma_n^{1/2} (n(1 - \gamma_n))^{-1/2}\right)$ and

$$\left(\frac{1 - \gamma_n}{1 - \widehat{\gamma}_k} \right)^2 - 1 = \left(\frac{1 - \gamma_n}{1 - \widehat{\gamma}_k} - 1 \right)^2 + 2 \left(\frac{1 - \gamma_n}{1 - \widehat{\gamma}_k} - 1 \right) = O_p\left(\gamma_n^{1/2} (n(1 - \gamma_n))^{-1/2}\right). \quad (77)$$

By (73)-(77), we have

$$\begin{aligned} & p_{k1a} - p_{k1b} + p_{k2a} - p_{k2b} - 2(p_{k3a} - p_{k3b}) + p_{k4a} - p_{k4b} \\ &= \left(\left(\frac{1 - \gamma_n}{1 - \widehat{\gamma}_k} \right)^2 - 1 \right) (p_{k1b} + p_{k2b} - 2p_{k3b} + p_{k4b}) \\ &+ \frac{1}{(1 - \widehat{\gamma}_k)^2} (a_1 + a_2 - 2a_3 + a_4) \\ &= O_p \left(\gamma_n^{-1} \sqrt{\frac{(s_\alpha + s_\beta) \log d}{n\gamma_n}} + \sqrt{\frac{s_\alpha s_\beta \log d}{n\gamma_n}} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Then it follows that

$$\widehat{\sigma}_t^2 - \widetilde{\sigma}_t^2 = O_p \left(\gamma_n^{-1} \sqrt{\frac{(s_\alpha + s_\beta) \log d}{n\gamma_n}} + \sqrt{\frac{s_\alpha s_\beta \log d}{n\gamma_n}} \right).$$

On the other hand, since

$$\sigma_t^2 = \mathbb{E} \left[\left\{ \frac{1 - \Gamma_i}{1 - \gamma_n} (X_i^\top \beta^* - \theta_t) + \frac{\Gamma_i (1 - g(X_i^\top \alpha^*))}{(1 - \gamma_n) g(X_i^\top \alpha^*)} (Y_i - X_i^\top \beta^*) \right\}^2 \right],$$

we have $\mathbb{E}[\tilde{\sigma}_t^2 - \sigma_t^2] = 0$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}\left[(\tilde{\sigma}_t^2 - \sigma_t^2)^2\right] &\leq n^{-1}\mathbb{E}\left[\left\{\frac{1 - \Gamma_i}{1 - \gamma_n}(X_i^\top\beta^* - \theta_t) + \frac{\Gamma_i(1 - g(X_i^\top\alpha^*))}{(1 - \gamma_n)g(X_i^\top\alpha^*)}w_i\right\}^4\right] \\
&= n^{-1}(1 - \gamma_n)^{-4}\left\{\mathbb{E}\left[(1 - \Gamma_i)(X_i^\top\beta^* - \theta_t)^4\right] - \mathbb{E}\left[\left(\frac{\Gamma_i(1 - g(X_i^\top\alpha^*))}{g(X_i^\top\alpha^*)}\right)^4 w_i^4\right]\right\} \\
&\leq Cn^{-1}(1 - \gamma_n)^{-4}\left\{(1 - \gamma_n)\mathbb{E}\left[(X_i^\top\beta^*)^4 \mid \Gamma_i = 0\right] + \gamma_n^4\mathbb{E}\left[\Gamma_i w_i^4\right]\right\} \\
&\leq Cn^{-1}(1 - \gamma_n)^{-4}\left\{(1 - \gamma_n)\mathbb{E}\left[(X_i^\top\beta^*)^4 \mid \Gamma_i = 0\right] + \gamma_n^3\mathbb{E}\left[w_i^4 \mid \Gamma_i = 1\right]\right\} \\
&= O_p(n^{-1}\gamma_n^{-3}),
\end{aligned}$$

which implies

$$\tilde{\sigma}_t^2 - \sigma_t^2 = O_p\left(\gamma_n^{-1}(n\gamma_n)^{-1/2}\right).$$

By Lemma E.10, $\sigma_t^2 \asymp \gamma_n^{-1}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{\sigma}_t^2 &= \sigma_t^2 + O_p\left(\gamma_n^{-1}(n\gamma_n)^{-1/2}\right) + O_p\left(\gamma_n^{-1}\sqrt{\frac{(s_\alpha + s_\beta)\log d}{n\gamma_n}} + \sqrt{\frac{s_\alpha s_\beta \log d}{n\gamma_n}}\right) \\
&= \sigma_t^2 \left\{1 + O_p\left(\sqrt{\frac{(s_\alpha + s_\beta)\log d}{n\gamma_n}} + \gamma_n\sqrt{\frac{s_\alpha s_\beta \log d}{n\gamma_n}}\right)\right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma E.13. *Suppose that Assumptions 4 and 5 hold. Assume either $\gamma_n(X) = g(X^\top\alpha_{PS}^*)$ or $\mu(X) = X^\top\beta_{OR}^*$ holds. Choose $\lambda_\alpha \asymp \lambda_\beta \asymp \sqrt{\log d/(n\gamma_n)}$. If $n\gamma_n \gg (\log n)^2 \log d$, $s_\alpha = o(\sqrt{n\gamma_n}/\log d)$ and $s_\alpha s_\beta = o(n\gamma_n/(\log n(\log d)^2))$, then as $n, d \rightarrow \infty$, $\hat{\theta}_t - \theta_t = O_p((n\gamma_n)^{-1/2})$, $\hat{\sigma}_t^2 = \sigma_t^2\{1 + o_p(1)\}$, and $\hat{\sigma}_t^{-1}\sqrt{n}(\hat{\theta}_t - \theta_t) \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$.*

In addition, Assume that $\mu(X) = X^\top\beta_{OR}^$ holds. Choose $\lambda_\alpha \asymp \lambda_\beta \asymp \sqrt{\log d/(n\gamma_n)}$. If $n\gamma_n \gg (\log n)^2 \log d$, $s_\alpha s_\beta = o(n\gamma_n/(\log n(\log d)^2))$, then as $n, d \rightarrow \infty$, $\hat{\theta}_t - \theta_t = O_p((n\gamma_n)^{-1/2})$, $\hat{\sigma}_t^2 = \sigma_t^2\{1 + o_p(1)\}$, and $\hat{\sigma}_t^{-1}\sqrt{n}(\hat{\theta}_t - \theta_t) \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$.*

Proof. When $n\gamma_n \gg (\log n)^2 \log d$, $s_\alpha = o(\sqrt{n\gamma_n}/\log d)$ and $s_\alpha s_\beta = o(n\gamma_n/(\log n(\log d)^2))$, we have $n\gamma_n \gg \max\{s_\alpha, s_\beta \log n, (\log n)^2\} \log d$ and $s_\alpha s_\beta \ll (n\gamma_n)^{3/2}/(\log n(\log d)^2)$.

First, by Lemma E.10 and Lemma E.11, we have

$$\widehat{\theta}_t - \theta_t = O_p \left(\frac{(s_\alpha + \sqrt{s_\alpha s_\beta}) \log d}{n\gamma_n} + (n\gamma_n)^{-1/2} \right) = O_p((n\gamma_n)^{-1/2}).$$

Second, by Lemma E.8,

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\sigma}_t^2 &= \sigma_t^2 \left\{ 1 + O_p \left(\sqrt{\frac{(s_\alpha + s_\beta) \log d}{n\gamma_n}} + \gamma_n \sqrt{\frac{s_\alpha s_\beta \log d}{n\gamma_n}} \right) \right\} \\ &= \sigma_g^2 \{1 + o_p(1)\}. \end{aligned}$$

Third, by Lemma E.11, we have

$$\widehat{\theta}_g - \widetilde{\theta}_g = O_p \left(\frac{(s_\alpha + \sqrt{s_\alpha s_\beta}) \log d}{n\gamma_n} \right) = o_p((n\gamma_n)^{-1/2}).$$

By Lemma E.10, since $\sigma_t^2 \asymp \gamma_n^{-1}$, by Slutsky's theorem,

$$\widehat{\sigma}_t^{-1} \sqrt{n}(\widehat{\theta}_t - \theta_t) = \widehat{\sigma}_t^{-1} \sigma_t \left(\sigma_g^{-1} \sqrt{n}(\widetilde{\theta}_t - \theta_t) + \sigma_t^{-1} \sqrt{n}(\widehat{\theta}_t - \widetilde{\theta}_t) \right) \rightarrow \mathcal{N}(0, 1).$$

In addition, if $\mu(X) = X^\top \beta_{OR}^*$, we only need $s_\alpha s_\beta = o(n\gamma_n/(\log n(\log d)^2))$, which implies $s_\alpha = o(n\gamma_n/(\log n(\log d)^2))$. Under these conditions, by Lemma E.11,

$$\widehat{\theta}_t - \widetilde{\theta}_t = O_p \left(\frac{\sqrt{s_\alpha \log d}}{n\gamma_n} + \frac{\sqrt{s_\alpha s_\beta \log d}}{n\gamma_n} \right) = o_p((n\gamma_n)^{-1/2}).$$

The rest of proof follows similarly. □

E.3 Proof of Theorem 3

Proof. Theorem 3 follows directly from Lemma E.9 and Lemma E.13. □

F Proof of results in Section 4

For each $a \in \{0, 1\}$, define

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{\beta}_{a,g}^{(-k)} &= \operatorname{argmin}_{\beta \in \mathbb{R}^d} \left\{ M^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{-k,\beta}} \Gamma_{a,i} \exp(-X_i^\top \alpha_{a,g}^*) (Y_i - X_i^\top \beta)^2 + \lambda_\beta \|\beta\|_1 \right\}, \\ \tilde{\beta}_{a,t}^{(-k)} &= \operatorname{argmin}_{\beta \in \mathbb{R}^d} \left\{ M^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{-k,\beta}} \Gamma_{a,i} \exp(-X_i^\top \hat{\alpha}_{a,t}^*) (Y_i - X_i^\top \beta)^2 + \lambda_\beta \|\beta\|_1 \right\}.\end{aligned}$$

In addition, for each $a \in \{0, 1\}$, we define the sparsity levels of $\alpha_{a,g}^*$, $\beta_{a,g}^*$ and $\alpha_{a,t}^*$, $\beta_{a,t}^*$ as $s_{\alpha_{a,g}}, s_{\beta_{a,g}}$ and $s_{\alpha_{a,t}}, s_{\beta_{a,t}}$, respectively.

F.1 Auxiliary lemmas for generalizability

Lemma F.1. *Suppose that Assumption 6 holds and for each $a \in \{0, 1\}$, Assumption 5 holds with $(\alpha_{PS}^*, \beta_{OR}^*, w_{OR})$ replaced by $(\alpha_{a,g}^*, \beta_{a,g}^*, w_{a,g})$. Then*

(a) *For each $a \in \{0, 1\}$, $\Gamma_{a,i} \perp Y_i(a) \mid X_i$;*

(b) *For each $a \in \{0, 1\}$, there exists some constant $k_0, c_0 \in (0, 1)$ such that*

$$k_0(1 - \gamma_{a,g})/\gamma_{a,g} \leq (1 - g(X^\top \alpha_{a,g}^*))/g(X^\top \alpha_{a,g}^*) \leq k_0^{-1}(1 - \gamma_{a,g})/\gamma_{a,g},$$

where $\gamma_{a,g} = \mathbb{P}(\Gamma_{a,i} = 1) \asymp \gamma_n$ and $1 - \gamma_{a,g} \geq c_0$. In addition, for some $q > 1$ and $\nu > 0$, $\mathbb{E}[\mathbb{P}(\Gamma_{a,i} = 1 \mid X_i)^q] \leq \nu \gamma_{a,g}^q$.

(c) *For each $a \in \{0, 1\}$, there exist some constants $\lambda_l, \sigma > 0$, X_i is sub-Gaussian given $\Gamma_{a,i} = \Gamma_a$ such that $\|X_i^\top \beta_{a,g}^*\|_{\psi_2} \leq \sigma$ and*

$$\|X_i\|_{g, \Gamma_a, \psi_2} := \sup_{v \in \mathbb{R}^d, \|v\|_2=1} \inf \left\{ t > 0 : \mathbb{E} \left[\exp \left\{ \frac{(X_i^\top v)^2}{t^2} \right\} \mid \Gamma_{a,i} = \Gamma_a \right] \leq 2 \right\} \leq \sigma.$$

In addition, $\lambda_{\min}(\mathbb{E}[X_i X_i^\top \mid \Gamma_{a,i} = 1]) \geq \lambda_l$.

(d) *For each $a \in \{0, 1\}$, let $w_{a,g,i} = Y_i(a) - X_i^\top \beta_{a,g}^*$. There exist some constants $\sigma_w, \delta_w > 0$, $w_{a,g,i}$ is sub-Gaussian with $\|w_{a,g,i}\|_{\psi_2} \leq \sigma_w$ and*

$$\mathbb{E}[w_{a,g,i}^8 \mid \Gamma_{a,i} = 1] \leq \sigma_w^8 \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{E}[w_{a,g,i}^2 \mid \Gamma_{a,i} = 1] \geq \delta_w.$$

Proof. (a) follows directly from Assumption 6.

(b) Under Assumption 6,

$$\gamma_{a,g} = \mathbb{P}(\Gamma_{a,i} = 1) = \mathbb{E} \left[\Gamma_i \mathbb{E} [\mathbb{1}_{\{A_i=a\}} \mid \Gamma_i] \right] \asymp \mathbb{E} [\Gamma_i] = \gamma_n,$$

$$1 - \gamma_{a,g} = \mathbb{P}(\Gamma_{a,i} = 0) = \mathbb{E} [(1 - \Gamma_i) \mathbb{E} [\mathbb{1}_{\{A_i=a\}} \mid \Gamma_i]] \asymp \mathbb{E} [(1 - \Gamma_i)] = 1 - \gamma_n,$$

which implies (b).

(c) Let $\Gamma_a = 1$. For any $t > 0$ and $v \in \mathbb{R}^d, \|v\|_2 = 1$, under Assumption 6,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[\exp \left\{ \frac{(X_i^\top v)^2}{t^2} \right\} \mid \Gamma_{a,i} = 1 \right] &= \gamma_{a,g}^{-1} \mathbb{E} \left[\Gamma_i \mathbb{1}_{\{A_i=a\}} \exp \left\{ \frac{(X_i^\top v)^2}{t^2} \right\} \right] \\ &= \gamma_{a,g}^{-1} \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{E} [\mathbb{1}_{\{A_i=a\}} \mid \Gamma_i, X_i] \Gamma_i \exp \left\{ \frac{(X_i^\top v)^2}{t^2} \right\} \right] \\ &\asymp \gamma_n^{-1} \mathbb{E} \left[\Gamma_i \exp \left\{ \frac{(X_i^\top v)^2}{t^2} \right\} \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\exp \left\{ \frac{(X_i^\top v)^2}{t^2} \right\} \mid \Gamma_i = 1 \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$\|X_i\|_{g,1,\psi_2} \asymp \|X_i\|_{1,\psi_2}.$$

Let $\Gamma_a = 0$. Note that under Assumption 6,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\Gamma_{a,i} = 0) &= \mathbb{P}(\{\Gamma_i = 0\} \cup \{\Gamma_i = 1, A_i \neq a\}) \\ &= \mathbb{P}(\Gamma_i = 0) + \mathbb{P}(A_i \neq a \mid \Gamma_i = 1) \mathbb{P}(\Gamma_i = 1) \\ &\geq 1 - \gamma_n + \eta_0 \gamma_n \geq \eta_0. \end{aligned}$$

In addition, for any $t > 0$ and $v \in \mathbb{R}^d, \|v\|_2 = 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E} \left[\exp \left\{ \frac{(X_i^\top v)^2}{t^2} \right\} \mid \Gamma_{a,i} = 0 \right] \\ &= (1 - \gamma_{a,g})^{-1} \mathbb{E} \left[(1 - \Gamma_i \mathbb{1}_{\{A_i=a\}}) \exp \left\{ \frac{(X_i^\top v)^2}{t^2} \right\} \right] \\ &\leq \eta^{-1} \mathbb{E} \left[\exp \left\{ \frac{(X_i^\top v)^2}{t^2} \right\} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$\|X_i\|_{g,0,\psi_2} \leq \sqrt{\log(1/\eta_0)} \|X_i\|_{\psi_2}.$$

(d) Note that $\gamma_{a,g} = \mathbb{P}(\Gamma_{a,i} = 1) = \mathbb{E}[\Gamma_i \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{1}_{\{A_i=a\}} | \Gamma_i]]$. Under Assumption 6,

$$\eta_0 \gamma_n \leq \gamma_{a,g} \leq (1 - \eta_0) \gamma_n.$$

Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[w_{a,g,i}^8 | \Gamma_{a,i} = 1] &= \gamma_{a,g}^{-1} \mathbb{E}[\Gamma_i \mathbb{1}_{\{A_i=a\}} w_{a,g,i}^8] \\ &\leq \eta_0^{-1} \gamma_n^{-1} \mathbb{E}[\Gamma_i w_{a,g,i}^8] \\ &= \eta_0^{-1} \mathbb{E}[w_{a,g,i}^8 | \Gamma_i = 1] \leq \eta_0^{-1} \sigma_w^8, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[w_{a,g,i}^2 | \Gamma_{a,i} = 1] &= \gamma_{a,g}^{-1} \mathbb{E}[\Gamma_i \mathbb{1}_{\{A_i=a\}} w_{a,g,i}^2] \\ &\geq (1 - \eta_0)^{-1} \gamma_n^{-1} \mathbb{E}[\Gamma_i w_{a,g,i}^2] \\ &= (1 - \eta_0)^{-1} \mathbb{E}[w_{a,g,i}^2 | \Gamma_i = 1] \geq \eta^{-1} \delta_w. \end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma F.2. *Suppose that Assumption 6 holds, and for each $a \in \{0, 1\}$, Assumption 5 holds with $(\alpha_{PS}^*, \beta_{OR}^*, w_{OR})$ replaced by $(\alpha_{a,g}^*, \beta_{a,g}^*, w_{a,g})$. Let either $\mathbb{P}(\Gamma_{a,i} = 1 | X_i) = g(X_i^\top \alpha_{a,g}^*)$ or $\mathbb{E}[Y_i(a) | X_i] = X_i^\top \beta_{a,g}^*$ holds for each $a \in \{0, 1\}$. If $n\gamma_n \gg 1$, then as $n, d \rightarrow \infty$, $\Sigma_g^2 \asymp \gamma_n^{-1}$ and*

$$\Sigma_g^{-1} \sqrt{n} (\tilde{\tau}_g - \tau_g) \rightarrow \mathcal{N}(0, 1),$$

where $\tilde{\tau}_g = \tilde{\tau}_{1,g} - \tilde{\tau}_{0,g}$ and $\tilde{\tau}_{a,g} = n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n X_i^\top \beta_{a,g}^* + \frac{\Gamma_{a,i}}{g(X_i^\top \alpha_{a,g}^*)} (Y_i - X_i^\top \beta_{a,g}^*)$.

Proof. Let $Q_{g,i} = Q_{1,g,i} - Q_{0,g,i}$, where

$$Q_{a,g,i} = X_i^\top \beta_{a,g}^* + \frac{\Gamma_{a,i}}{g(X_i^\top \alpha_{a,g}^*)} (Y_i - X_i^\top \beta_{a,g}^*).$$

Note that $\Gamma_{a,i} = \Gamma_i \mathbb{1}_{\{A_i=a\}}$, then under Assumption 6, we have $\Gamma_{a,i} \perp Y_i(a) \mid X_i$ and $\Gamma_{a,i} Y_i = \Gamma_{a,i} Y_i(a)$. It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[Q_{a,g,i}] - \mathbb{E}[Y_i(a)] &= \mathbb{E} \left[X_i^\top \beta_{a,g}^* + \frac{\Gamma_{a,i}}{g(X_i^\top \alpha_{a,g}^*)} (Y_i(a) - X_i^\top \beta_{a,g}^*) \right] - \mathbb{E}[Y_i(a)] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\frac{\Gamma_{a,i}}{g(X_i^\top \alpha_{a,g}^*)} - 1 \right) (Y_i(a) - X_i^\top \beta_{a,g}^*) \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\mathbb{E}[\Gamma_{a,i} - g(X_i^\top \alpha_{a,g}^*) \mid X_i]}{g(X_i^\top \alpha_{a,g}^*)} \mathbb{E}[Y_i(a) - X_i^\top \beta_{a,g}^* \mid X_i] \right]. \end{aligned}$$

When either $\mathbb{P}[\Gamma_{a,i} = 1 \mid X_i] = g(X_i^\top \alpha_{a,g}^*)$ or $\mathbb{E}[Y_i(a) \mid X_i] = X_i^\top \beta_{a,g}^*$ holds for each $a \in \{0, 1\}$, we have

$$\mathbb{E}[Q_{a,g,i}] - \mathbb{E}[Y_i(a)] = 0.$$

Thus,

$$\mathbb{E}[\tilde{\tau}_g] = \mathbb{E}[Q_{g,i}] = \tau_g.$$

By Lyapunov's central limit theorem, it suffices to prove for some $\delta > 0$,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} n^{-\delta/2} \Sigma_g^{-(2+\delta)} \mathbb{E} \left[|Q_{g,i} - \theta|^{2+\delta} \right] = 0. \quad (78)$$

Note that

$$\begin{aligned}
\Sigma_g^2 &= \mathbb{E} [\{Q_{g,i} - \tau_g\}^2] \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left[\left\{ X_i^\top \beta_{1,g}^* - X_i^\top \beta_{0,g}^* - \tau_g + \frac{\Gamma_i A_i}{g (X_i^\top \alpha_{1,g}^*)} (Y_i - X_i^\top \beta_{1,g}^*) - \frac{\Gamma_i (1 - A_i)}{g (X_i^\top \alpha_{0,g}^*)} (Y_i - X_i^\top \beta_{0,g}^*) \right\}^2 \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left[(X_i^\top \beta_{1,g}^* - X_i^\top \beta_{0,g}^* - \tau_g)^2 \right] + \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\Gamma_i A_i}{(g (X_i^\top \alpha_{1,g}^*))^2} (Y_i(1) - X_i^\top \beta_{1,g}^*)^2 \right] \\
&\quad + \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\Gamma_i (1 - A_i)}{(g (X_i^\top \alpha_{0,g}^*))^2} (Y_i(0) - X_i^\top \beta_{0,g}^*)^2 \right] \\
&\quad + 2\mathbb{E} \left[(X_i^\top \beta_{1,g}^* - X_i^\top \beta_{0,g}^* - \tau_g) \frac{\Gamma_i A_i}{g (X_i^\top \alpha_{1,g}^*)} (Y_i(1) - X_i^\top \beta_{1,g}^*) \right] \\
&\quad - 2\mathbb{E} \left[(X_i^\top \beta_{1,g}^* - X_i^\top \beta_{0,g}^* - \tau_g) \frac{\Gamma_i (1 - A_i)}{g (X_i^\top \alpha_{0,g}^*)} (Y_i(0) - X_i^\top \beta_{0,g}^*) \right].
\end{aligned}$$

By Minkowski's inequality,

$$\begin{aligned}
\|X_i^\top \beta_{1,g}^* - X_i^\top \beta_{0,g}^* - \tau_g\|_{\mathbb{P},2} &\leq \|X_i^\top \beta_{1,g}^*\|_{\mathbb{P},2} + \|X_i^\top \beta_{0,g}^*\|_{\mathbb{P},2} + |\tau_g| \\
&\leq C_1 \sigma + |\tau_g|,
\end{aligned}$$

which implies

$$\mathbb{E} \left[(X_i^\top \beta_{1,g}^* - X_i^\top \beta_{0,g}^* - \tau_g)^2 \right] \leq (C_1 \sigma + |\tau_g|)^2.$$

By Lemma F.1,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\Gamma_i A_i}{(g (X_i^\top \alpha_{1,g}^*))^2} (Y_i(1) - X_i^\top \beta_{1,g}^*)^2 \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{E} [A_i | \Gamma_i, X_i] \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\Gamma_i}{(g (X_i^\top \alpha_{1,g}^*))^2} (Y_i(1) - X_i^\top \beta_{1,g}^*)^2 \mid \Gamma_i, X_i \right] \right] \\
&\asymp \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\Gamma_i}{(g (X_i^\top \alpha_{1,g}^*))^2} (Y_i(1) - X_i^\top \beta_{1,g}^*)^2 \right] \\
&= \gamma_n \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{(g (X_i^\top \alpha_{1,g}^*))^2} (Y_i(1) - X_i^\top \beta_{1,g}^*)^2 \mid \Gamma_i = 1 \right] \\
&\asymp \gamma_n^{-1} \mathbb{E} \left[(Y_i(1) - X_i^\top \beta_{1,g}^*)^2 \mid \Gamma_i = 1 \right] \\
&\asymp \gamma_n^{-1}.
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, we have

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\Gamma_i (1 - A_i)}{(g(X_i^\top \alpha_{0,g}^*))^2} (Y_i(0) - X_i^\top \beta_{0,g}^*)^2 \right] \asymp \gamma_n^{-1}.$$

Moreover, by Hölder inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \mathbb{E} \left[(X_i^\top \beta_{1,g}^* - X_i^\top \beta_{0,g}^* - \tau_g) \frac{\Gamma_i A_i}{g(X_i^\top \alpha_{1,g}^*)} (Y_i(1) - X_i^\top \beta_{1,g}^*) \right] \right| \\ &= \left| \gamma_n \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{A_i}{g(X_i^\top \alpha_{1,g}^*)} (X_i^\top \beta_{1,g}^* - X_i^\top \beta_{0,g}^* - \tau_g) (Y_i(1) - X_i^\top \beta_{1,g}^*) \mid \Gamma_i = 1 \right] \right| \\ &\leq |k_0^{-1} \mathbb{E} [(X_i^\top \beta_{1,g}^* - X_i^\top \beta_{0,g}^* - \tau_g) (Y_i(1) - X_i^\top \beta_{1,g}^*) \mid \Gamma_i = 1]| \\ &\leq k_0^{-1} \mathbb{E} [(X_i^\top \beta_{1,g}^* - X_i^\top \beta_{0,g}^* - \tau_g)^2 \mid \Gamma_i = 1]^{1/2} \mathbb{E} [(Y_i(1) - X_i^\top \beta_{1,g}^*)^2 \mid \Gamma_i = 1]^{1/2} \\ &\leq k_0^{-1} (C_1 \sigma + |\tau_g|) \sigma_w. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, we have

$$\left| \mathbb{E} \left[(X_i^\top \beta_{1,g}^* - X_i^\top \beta_{0,g}^* - \tau_g) \frac{\Gamma_i (1 - A_i)}{g(X_i^\top \alpha_{0,g}^*)} (Y_i(0) - X_i^\top \beta_{0,g}^*) \right] \right| \leq k_0^{-1} (C_1 \sigma + |\tau_g|) \sigma_w.$$

Thus,

$$\Sigma_g^2 \asymp \gamma_n^{-1}.$$

On the other hand, choose $\delta = 2$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \|Q_{g,i} - \tau_g\|_{\mathbb{P},4} &\leq \|X_i^\top \beta_{1,g}^* - X_i^\top \beta_{0,g}^* - \tau_g\|_{\mathbb{P},4} + \left\| \frac{\Gamma_i A_i}{g(X_i^\top \alpha_{1,g}^*)} (Y_i(1) - X_i^\top \beta_{1,g}^*) \right\|_{\mathbb{P},4} \\ &\quad + \left\| \frac{\Gamma_i (1 - A_i)}{g(X_i^\top \alpha_{0,g}^*)} (Y_i(0) - X_i^\top \beta_{0,g}^*) \right\|_{\mathbb{P},4} \\ &\leq \|X_i^\top \beta_{1,g}^* - X_i^\top \beta_{0,g}^* - \tau_g\|_{\mathbb{P},4} + k_0^{-1} \gamma_n^{-1} \|\Gamma_i (Y_i(1) - X_i^\top \beta_{1,g}^*)\|_{\mathbb{P},4} \\ &\quad + k_0^{-1} \gamma_n^{-1} \|\Gamma_i (Y_i(0) - X_i^\top \beta_{0,g}^*)\|_{\mathbb{P},4}. \end{aligned}$$

In addition, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|X_i^\top \beta_{1,g}^* - X_i^\top \beta_{0,g}^* - \tau_g\|_{\mathbb{P},4} &\leq \|X_i^\top \beta_{1,g}^*\|_{\mathbb{P},4} + \|X_i^\top \beta_{0,g}^*\|_{\mathbb{P},4} + |\tau_g| \\ &\leq C_2 \sigma + |\tau_g|, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\Gamma_i (Y_i(1) - X_i^\top \beta_{1,g}^*)\|_{\mathbb{P},4} &= \mathbb{E} \left[\Gamma_i (Y_i(1) - X_i^\top \beta_{1,g}^*)^4 \right]^{1/4} \\
&= \gamma_n^{1/4} \mathbb{E} \left[(Y_i(1) - X_i^\top \beta_{1,g}^*)^4 \mid \Gamma_i = 1 \right]^{1/4} \\
&\leq \sigma_w \gamma_n^{1/4}.
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, we have

$$\|\Gamma_i (Y_i(0) - X_i^\top \beta_{0,g}^*)\|_{\mathbb{P},4} \leq \sigma_w \gamma_n^{1/4}.$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E} [|Q_{g,i} - \tau_g|^4] &= \|Q_{g,i} - \tau_g\|_{\mathbb{P},4}^4 \leq (C_2\sigma + |\tau_g| + 2k_0^{-1}\sigma_w\gamma_n^{-3/4})^4 \\
&\leq \gamma_n^{-3} (C_2\sigma + |\tau_g| + 2k_0^{-1}\sigma_w)^4 \\
&=: C_3\gamma_n^{-3}.
\end{aligned}$$

It follows that for $\delta = 2$, if $n\gamma_n \gg 1$, as $n, d \rightarrow \infty$,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} n^{-1} \Sigma_g^{-4} \mathbb{E} [|Q_{g,i} - \theta|^4] \leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} C (n\gamma_n)^{-1} = 0.$$

□

Lemma F.3. *Suppose that Assumption 6 holds, and for each $a \in \{0, 1\}$, Assumption 5 holds with $(\alpha_{PS}^*, \beta_{OR}^*, w_{OR})$ replaced by $(\alpha_{a,g}^*, \beta_{a,g}^*, w_{a,g})$. Then as $n, d \rightarrow \infty$, it holds that*

(a) *Choose $\lambda_\alpha \asymp \sqrt{\log d / (n\gamma_n)}$. If $n\gamma_n \gg \max \{s_{\alpha_{a,g}}, \log n\} \log d$, then*

$$\|\widehat{\alpha}_{a,g}^{(-k)} - \alpha_{a,g}^*\|_1 = O_p \left(s_{\alpha_{a,g}} \sqrt{\frac{\log d}{n\gamma_n}} \right) \text{ and } \|\widehat{\alpha}_{a,g}^{(-k)} - \alpha_{a,g}^*\|_2 = O_p \left(\sqrt{\frac{s_{\alpha_{a,g}} \log d}{n\gamma_n}} \right).$$

(b) *Choose $\lambda_\alpha \asymp \sqrt{\log d / (n\gamma_n)}$. If $n\gamma_n \gg \max \{s_{\beta_{a,g}}, (\log n)^2\} \log d$, then*

$$\|\widetilde{\beta}_{a,g}^{(-k)} - \beta_{a,g}^*\|_1 = O_p \left(s_{\beta_{a,g}} \sqrt{\frac{\log d}{n\gamma_n}} \right) \text{ and } \|\widetilde{\beta}_{a,g}^{(-k)} - \beta_{a,g}^*\|_2 = O_p \left(\sqrt{\frac{s_{\beta_{a,g}} \log d}{n\gamma_n}} \right).$$

(c) Choose $\lambda_\alpha \asymp \lambda_\beta \asymp \sqrt{\log d / (n\gamma_n)}$. If $n\gamma_n \gg \max\{s_{\alpha_{a,g}}, s_{\beta_{a,g}} \log n, (\log n)^2\} \log d$ and $s_{\alpha_{a,g}} s_{\beta_{a,g}} \ll (n\gamma_n)^{3/2} / (\log n (\log d)^2)$, then

$$\left\| \widehat{\beta}_{a,g}^{(-k)} - \widetilde{\beta}_{a,g}^{(-k)} \right\|_1 = O_p \left(\sqrt{\frac{s_{\alpha_{a,g}} s_{\beta_{a,g}} \log d}{n\gamma_n}} \right) \quad \text{and} \quad \left\| \widehat{\beta}_{a,g}^{(-k)} - \widetilde{\beta}_{a,g}^{(-k)} \right\|_2 = O_p \left(\sqrt{\frac{s_{\alpha_{a,g}} \log d}{n\gamma_n}} \right).$$

Proof. Lemma F.3 holds true by repeating the proof of Lemma C.15 and Lemma C.19. \square

Lemma F.4. Suppose that Assumption 6 holds, and for each $a \in \{0, 1\}$, Assumption 5 holds with $(\alpha_{PS}^*, \beta_{OR}^*, w_{OR})$ replaced by $(\alpha_{a,g}^*, \beta_{a,g}^*, w_{a,g})$. Choose $\lambda_\alpha \asymp \lambda_\beta \asymp \sqrt{\log d / (n\gamma_n)}$. If $n\gamma_n \gg \sum_{a=0,1} \max\{s_{\alpha_{a,g}}, s_{\beta_{a,g}} \log n, (\log n)^2\} \log d$ and $\sum_{a=0,1} s_{\alpha_{a,g}} s_{\beta_{a,g}} \ll (n\gamma_n)^{3/2} / (\log n (\log d)^2)$, then as $n, d \rightarrow \infty$,

$$\widehat{\tau}_g - \widetilde{\tau}_g = O_p \left(\sum_{a=0,1} \frac{(s_{\alpha_{a,g}} + \sqrt{s_{\alpha_{a,g}} s_{\beta_{a,g}}}) \log d}{n\gamma_n} \right).$$

In addition, assume that $\mathbb{E}[Y_i(a) | X_i] = X_i^\top \beta_{a,g}^*$ for all $a \in \{0, 1\}$. Then as $n, d \rightarrow \infty$,

$$\widehat{\tau}_g - \widetilde{\tau}_g = O_p \left(\sum_{a=0,1} \left\{ \frac{\sqrt{s_{\alpha_{a,g}} \log d}}{n\gamma_n} + \frac{\sqrt{s_{\alpha_{a,g}} s_{\beta_{a,g}} \log d}}{n\gamma_n} \right\} \right).$$

Proof. Lemma F.4 holds true by repeating the proof of Lemma E.5. \square

Lemma F.5. Suppose that Assumption 6 holds, and for each $a \in \{0, 1\}$, Assumption 5 holds with $(\alpha_{PS}^*, \beta_{OR}^*, w_{OR})$ replaced by $(\alpha_{a,g}^*, \beta_{a,g}^*, w_{a,g})$. Let either $\mathbb{P}(\Gamma_{a,i} = 1 | X_i) = g(X_i^\top \alpha_{a,g}^*)$ or $\mathbb{E}[Y_i(a) | X_i] = X_i^\top \beta_{a,g}^*$ holds for each $a \in \{0, 1\}$. Choose $\lambda_\alpha \asymp \lambda_\beta \asymp \sqrt{\log d / (n\gamma_n)}$. If $n\gamma_n \gg \sum_{a=0,1} \max\{s_{\alpha_{a,g}}, s_{\beta_{a,g}} \log n, (\log n)^2\} \log d$ and $\sum_{a=0,1} s_{\alpha_{a,g}} s_{\beta_{a,g}} \ll (n\gamma_n)^{3/2} / (\log n (\log d)^2)$, then as $n, d \rightarrow \infty$,

$$\widehat{\Sigma}_g^2 = \Sigma_g^2 \left\{ 1 + O_p \left(\sum_{a=0,1} \sqrt{\frac{(s_{\alpha_{a,g}} + s_{\beta_{a,g}}) \log d}{n\gamma_n}} \right) \right\}.$$

Proof. Let $\widehat{\Delta}_{\alpha_{a,g}}^{(-k)} = \widehat{\alpha}_{a,g}^{(-k)} - \alpha_{a,g}^*$, $\widehat{\Delta}_{\beta_{a,g}}^{(-k)} = \widehat{\beta}_{a,g}^{(-k)} - \beta_{a,g}^*$, $\Delta_{a,g}^{(-k)} = \widehat{\beta}_{a,g}^{(-k)} - \beta_{a,g}^*$, $\widetilde{\Delta}_{\beta_{a,g}}^{(-k)} =$

$\tilde{\beta}_{a,g}^{(-k)} - \beta_{a,g}^*$, $\hat{\gamma}_k = n_k^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \Gamma_i$, $\hat{\gamma} = n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \Gamma_i$, and

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\Sigma}_g^2 &= n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (1 - \Gamma_i) (X_i^\top \beta_{1,g}^* - X_i^\top \beta_{0,g}^*)^2 \\ &\quad + n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \Gamma_i A_i \left(X_i^\top \beta_{1,g}^* - X_i^\top \beta_{0,g}^* + \frac{Y_i - X_i^\top \beta_{1,g}^*}{g (X_i^\top \alpha_{1,g}^*)} \right)^2 \\ &\quad + n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \Gamma_i (1 - A_i) \left(X_i^\top \beta_{1,g}^* - X_i^\top \beta_{0,g}^* - \frac{Y_i - X_i^\top \beta_{0,g}^*}{g (X_i^\top \alpha_{0,g}^*)} \right)^2 - \tau_g^2. \end{aligned}$$

Then

$$\hat{\Sigma}_g^2 - \tilde{\Sigma}_g^2 = K^{-1} \sum_{k=1}^K (\ell_{k1a} - \ell_{k1b} + \ell_{k2a} - \ell_{k2b} + \ell_{k3a} - \ell_{k3b} - \ell_{k4}),$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \ell_{k1a} &= (1 - \hat{\gamma}_k) \left(\hat{\beta}_{1,g}^{(-k),\top} \bar{\Xi}_0 \hat{\beta}_{1,g}^{(-k)} + \hat{\beta}_{0,g}^{(-k),\top} \bar{\Xi}_0 \hat{\beta}_{0,g}^{(-k)} - 2 \hat{\beta}_{1,g}^{(-k),\top} \bar{\Xi}_0 \hat{\beta}_{0,g}^{(-k)} \right), \\ \ell_{k1b} &= (1 - \hat{\gamma}_k) \left(\beta_{1,g}^{*,\top} \bar{\Xi}_0 \beta_{1,g}^* + \beta_{0,g}^{*,\top} \bar{\Xi}_0 \beta_{0,g}^* - 2 \beta_{1,g}^{*,\top} \bar{\Xi}_0 \beta_{0,g}^* \right), \\ \ell_{k2a} &= n_k^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \Gamma_i A_i \left(X_i^\top \hat{\beta}_{1,g}^{(-k)} - X_i^\top \hat{\beta}_{0,g}^{(-k)} + \frac{Y_i - X_i^\top \hat{\beta}_{1,g}^{(-k)}}{g (X_i^\top \hat{\alpha}_{1,g}^{(-k)})} \right)^2, \\ \ell_{k2b} &= n_k^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \Gamma_i A_i \left(X_i^\top \beta_{1,g}^* - X_i^\top \beta_{0,g}^* + \frac{Y_i - X_i^\top \beta_{1,g}^*}{g (X_i^\top \alpha_{1,g}^*)} \right)^2, \\ \ell_{k3a} &= n_k^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \Gamma_i (1 - A_i) \left(X_i^\top \hat{\beta}_{1,g}^{(-k)} - X_i^\top \hat{\beta}_{0,g}^{(-k)} - \frac{Y_i - X_i^\top \hat{\beta}_{0,g}^{(-k)}}{g (X_i^\top \hat{\alpha}_{0,g}^{(-k)})} \right)^2, \\ \ell_{k3b} &= n_k^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \Gamma_i (1 - A_i) \left(X_i^\top \beta_{1,g}^* - X_i^\top \beta_{0,g}^* - \frac{Y_i - X_i^\top \beta_{0,g}^*}{g (X_i^\top \alpha_{0,g}^*)} \right)^2, \\ \ell_{k4} &= \hat{\tau}_g^2 - \tau_g^2. \end{aligned}$$

For $\ell_{k1a} - \ell_{k1b}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \ell_{k1a} - \ell_{k1b} &= (1 - \hat{\gamma}_k) \left(\hat{\beta}_{1,g}^{(-k),\top} \bar{\Xi}_0 \hat{\beta}_{1,g}^{(-k)} - \beta_{1,g}^{*,\top} \bar{\Xi}_0 \beta_{1,g}^* \right) \\ &\quad + (1 - \hat{\gamma}_k) \left(\hat{\beta}_{0,g}^{(-k),\top} \bar{\Xi}_0 \hat{\beta}_{0,g}^{(-k)} - \beta_{0,g}^{*,\top} \bar{\Xi}_0 \beta_{0,g}^* \right) \\ &\quad - 2(1 - \hat{\gamma}_k) \left(\hat{\beta}_{1,g}^{(-k),\top} \bar{\Xi}_0 \hat{\beta}_{0,g}^{(-k)} - \beta_{1,g}^{*,\top} \bar{\Xi}_0 \beta_{0,g}^* \right). \end{aligned}$$

Recall s_{k2} in Lemma E.8. Similarly, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & (1 - \widehat{\gamma}_k) \left(\widehat{\beta}_{1,g}^{(-k),\top} \widehat{\Xi}_0 \widehat{\beta}_{1,g}^{(-k)} - \beta_{1,g}^{*,\top} \widehat{\Xi}_0 \beta_{1,g}^* \right) \\ &= O_p \left(\left\| \Delta_{1,g}^{(-k)} \right\|_1 \sqrt{\frac{\log d}{n}} + \left\| \Delta_{1,g}^{(-k)} \right\|_2 + \left\| \widehat{\Delta}_{\beta_{1,g}}^{(-k)} \right\|_2 \right), \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & (1 - \widehat{\gamma}_k) \left(\widehat{\beta}_{0,g}^{(-k),\top} \widehat{\Xi}_0 \widehat{\beta}_{0,g}^{(-k)} - \beta_{0,g}^{*,\top} \widehat{\Xi}_0 \beta_{0,g}^* \right) \\ &= O_p \left(\left\| \Delta_{0,g}^{(-k)} \right\|_1 \sqrt{\frac{\log d}{n}} + \left\| \Delta_{0,g}^{(-k)} \right\|_2 + \left\| \widehat{\Delta}_{\beta_{0,g}}^{(-k)} \right\|_2 \right). \end{aligned}$$

Note that

$$(1 - \widehat{\gamma}_k) \left(\widehat{\beta}_{1,g}^{(-k),\top} \widehat{\Xi}_0 \widehat{\beta}_{0,g}^{(-k)} - \beta_{1,g}^{*,\top} \widehat{\Xi}_0 \beta_{0,g}^* \right) = \frac{1 - \widehat{\gamma}_k}{1 - \widehat{\gamma}} (\ell_{k11} + \ell_{k12} + \ell_{k13}),$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \ell_{k11} &= n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (1 - \Gamma_i) \left(X_i^\top \widehat{\Delta}_{\beta_{1,g}}^{(-k)} \right)^2, \\ \ell_{k12} &= n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (1 - \Gamma_i) \left(X_i^\top \widehat{\Delta}_{\beta_{0,g}}^{(-k)} \right) \left(X_i^\top \beta_{1,g}^* \right), \\ \ell_{k13} &= n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (1 - \Gamma_i) \left(X_i^\top \widehat{\Delta}_{\beta_{1,g}}^{(-k)} \right) \left(X_i^\top \beta_{0,g}^* \right). \end{aligned}$$

Recall s_{k21} and s_{k22} of Lemma E.8. Similarly, we have

$$\ell_{k11} = O_p \left(\left\| \Delta_{1,g}^{(-k)} \right\|_1^2 \frac{\log d}{n} + \left\| \Delta_{1,g}^{(-k)} \right\|_2^2 + \left\| \widehat{\Delta}_{\beta_{1,g}}^{(-k)} \right\|_2^2 \right)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \ell_{k12} &= O_p \left(\left\| \Delta_{0,g}^{(-k)} \right\|_1 \sqrt{\frac{\log d}{n}} + \left\| \Delta_{0,g}^{(-k)} \right\|_2 + \left\| \widehat{\Delta}_{\beta_{0,g}}^{(-k)} \right\|_2 \right), \\ \ell_{k13} &= O_p \left(\left\| \Delta_{1,g}^{(-k)} \right\|_1 \sqrt{\frac{\log d}{n}} + \left\| \Delta_{1,g}^{(-k)} \right\|_2 + \left\| \widehat{\Delta}_{\beta_{1,g}}^{(-k)} \right\|_2 \right). \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma C.3, $\widehat{\gamma}_k - \gamma_n = o_p(1)$ and $\widehat{\gamma} - \gamma_n = o_p(1)$, then

$$\begin{aligned} & (1 - \widehat{\gamma}_k) \left(\widehat{\beta}_{1,g}^{(-k),\top} \bar{\Xi}_0 \widehat{\beta}_{0,g}^{(-k)} - \beta_{1,g}^{*\top} \bar{\Xi}_0 \beta_{0,g}^* \right) \\ &= O_p \left(\sum_{a=0,1} \left\{ \|\Delta_{a,g}^{(-k)}\|_1 \sqrt{\frac{\log d}{n}} + \|\Delta_{a,g}^{(-k)}\|_2 + \|\widehat{\Delta}_{\beta_{a,g}}^{(-k)}\|_2 \right\} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$\ell_{k1a} - \ell_{k1b} = O_p \left(\sum_{a=0,1} \left\{ \|\Delta_{a,g}^{(-k)}\|_1 \sqrt{\frac{\log d}{n}} + \|\Delta_{a,g}^{(-k)}\|_2 + \|\widehat{\Delta}_{\beta_{a,g}}^{(-k)}\|_2 \right\} \right).$$

For $\ell_{k2a} - \ell_{k2b}$, let

$$\varphi_{a,i}(\alpha, \beta_1, \beta_0) = \Gamma_{a,i} \left(X_i^\top \beta_1 - X_i^\top \beta_0 + \frac{Y_i - X_i^\top \beta_1}{g(X_i^\top \alpha)} \right).$$

Since $a^2 - b^2 = (a - b)^2 + 2(a - b)b$, it follows

$$\begin{aligned} & \ell_{k2a} - \ell_{k2b} \\ &= n_k^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \left(\varphi_{1,i} \left(\widehat{\alpha}_{1,g}^{(-k)}, \widehat{\beta}_{1,g}^{(-k)}, \widehat{\beta}_{0,g}^{(-k)} \right) - \varphi_{1,i} \left(\alpha_{1,g}^*, \beta_{1,g}^*, \beta_{0,g}^* \right) \right)^2 \\ &+ 2n_k^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \left(\varphi_{1,i} \left(\widehat{\alpha}_{1,g}^{(-k)}, \widehat{\beta}_{1,g}^{(-k)}, \widehat{\beta}_{0,g}^{(-k)} \right) - \varphi_{1,i} \left(\alpha_{1,g}^*, \beta_{1,g}^*, \beta_{0,g}^* \right) \right) \left(\varphi_{1,i} \left(\alpha_{1,g}^*, \beta_{1,g}^*, \beta_{0,g}^* \right) \right) \\ &\leq n_k^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \left(\varphi_{1,i} \left(\widehat{\alpha}_{1,g}^{(-k)}, \widehat{\beta}_{1,g}^{(-k)}, \widehat{\beta}_{0,g}^{(-k)} \right) - \varphi_{1,i} \left(\alpha_{1,g}^*, \beta_{1,g}^*, \beta_{0,g}^* \right) \right)^2 \\ &+ 2 \left(n_k^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \left(\varphi_{1,i} \left(\widehat{\alpha}_{1,g}^{(-k)}, \widehat{\beta}_{1,g}^{(-k)}, \widehat{\beta}_{0,g}^{(-k)} \right) - \varphi_{1,i} \left(\alpha_{1,g}^*, \beta_{1,g}^*, \beta_{0,g}^* \right) \right)^2 \right)^{1/2} (\ell_{k2b})^{1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

Let $w_{1,g,i} = Y_i(1) - X_i^\top \beta_{1,g}^*$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(\varphi_{1,i} \left(\widehat{\alpha}_{1,g}^{(-k)}, \widehat{\beta}_{1,g}^{(-k)}, \widehat{\beta}_{0,g}^{(-k)} \right) - \varphi_{1,i} \left(\alpha_{1,g}^*, \beta_{1,g}^*, \beta_{0,g}^* \right) \right)^2 \\ &= \Gamma_i A_i \left\{ X_i^\top \widehat{\Delta}_{\beta_{1,g}}^{(-k)} - X_i^\top \widehat{\Delta}_{\beta_{0,g}}^{(-k)} - \frac{1}{g(X_i^\top \widehat{\alpha}_{1,g}^{(-k)})} X_i^\top \widehat{\Delta}_{\beta_{1,g}}^{(-k)} + \left(\frac{1}{g(X_i^\top \widehat{\alpha}_{1,g}^{(-k)})} - \frac{1}{g(X_i^\top \alpha_{1,g}^*)} \right) w_{1,g,i} \right\}^2 \\ &\leq 4\Gamma_i A_i \left(1 - \frac{1}{g(X_i^\top \alpha_{1,g}^*)} \right)^2 \left(X_i^\top \widehat{\Delta}_{\beta_{1,g}}^{(-k)} \right)^2 + 4\Gamma_i A_i \left(\frac{1}{g(X_i^\top \widehat{\alpha}_{1,g}^{(-k)})} - \frac{1}{g(X_i^\top \alpha_{1,g}^*)} \right)^2 \left(X_i^\top \widehat{\Delta}_{\beta_{1,g}}^{(-k)} \right)^2 \\ &+ 4\Gamma_i A_i \left(X_i^\top \widehat{\Delta}_{\beta_{0,g}}^{(-k)} \right)^2 + 4\Gamma_i A_i \left(\frac{1}{g(X_i^\top \widehat{\alpha}_{1,g}^{(-k)})} - \frac{1}{g(X_i^\top \alpha_{1,g}^*)} \right)^2 w_{1,g,i}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Recall R_2 and R_3 of Lemma E.7. Similarly, we have

$$n_k^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \Gamma_i A_i \left(\frac{1}{g(X_i^\top \widehat{\alpha}_{1,g}^{(-k)})} - \frac{1}{g(X_i^\top \alpha_{1,g}^*)} \right)^2 \left(X_i^\top \widehat{\Delta}_{\beta_{1,g}}^{(-k)} \right)^2 = O_p \left(\gamma_n^{-1} \left\| \widehat{\Delta}_{\alpha_{1,g}}^{(-k)} \right\|_2^2 \left\| \widehat{\Delta}_{\beta_{1,g}}^{(-k)} \right\|_2^2 \right),$$

and

$$n_k^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \Gamma_i A_i \left(\frac{1}{g(X_i^\top \widehat{\alpha}_{1,g}^{(-k)})} - \frac{1}{g(X_i^\top \alpha_{1,g}^*)} \right)^2 w_{1,g,i}^2 = O_p \left(\gamma_n^{-1} \left\| \widehat{\Delta}_{\alpha_{1,g}}^{(-k)} \right\|_2^2 \right).$$

By Lemma C.1(c), for some $C > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} & n_k^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \mathbb{E} \left[\Gamma_i A_i \left(1 - \frac{1}{g(X_i^\top \alpha_{1,g}^*)} \right)^2 \left(X_i^\top \widehat{\Delta}_{\beta_{1,g}}^{(-k)} \right)^2 \mid \Gamma_{1:n}, \widehat{\beta}_{1,g}^{(-k)} \right] \\ & \leq k_0^{-2} \gamma_n^{-2} n_k^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \mathbb{E} \left[\Gamma_i \left(X_i^\top \widehat{\Delta}_{\beta_{1,g}}^{(-k)} \right)^2 \mid \Gamma_i, \widehat{\beta}_{1,g}^{(-k)} \right] \\ & \leq C \gamma_n^{-2} n_k^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \Gamma_i \left\| \widehat{\Delta}_{\beta_{1,g}}^{(-k)} \right\|_2^2. \end{aligned}$$

Since $n_k^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \Gamma_i = O_p(\gamma_n)$, then

$$n_k^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \Gamma_i A_i \left(1 - \frac{1}{g(X_i^\top \alpha_{1,g}^*)} \right)^2 \left(X_i^\top \widehat{\Delta}_{\beta_{1,g}}^{(-k)} \right)^2 = O_p \left(\gamma_n^{-1} \left\| \widehat{\Delta}_{\beta_{1,g}}^{(-k)} \right\|_2^2 \right).$$

Similarly,

$$n_k^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \Gamma_i A_i \left(X_i^\top \widehat{\Delta}_{\beta_{0,g}}^{(-k)} \right)^2 = O_p \left(\gamma_n \left\| \widehat{\Delta}_{\beta_{0,g}}^{(-k)} \right\|_2^2 \right).$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} & n_k^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \left(\varphi_{a,i} \left(\widehat{\alpha}_{1,g}^{(-k)}, \widehat{\beta}_{1,g}^{(-k)}, \widehat{\beta}_{0,g}^{(-k)} \right) - \varphi_{a,i} \left(\alpha_{1,g}^*, \beta_{1,g}^*, \beta_{0,g}^* \right) \right)^2 \\ & = O_p \left(\gamma_n^{-1} \left(\left\| \widehat{\Delta}_{\alpha_{1,g}}^{(-k)} \right\|_2^2 + \left\| \widehat{\Delta}_{\beta_{1,g}}^{(-k)} \right\|_2^2 + \gamma_n^2 \left\| \widehat{\Delta}_{\beta_{0,g}}^{(-k)} \right\|_2^2 \right) \right). \end{aligned}$$

In addition, by Lemma F.1 and Lemma C.1(c),

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} \left[\Gamma_i A_i \left(X_i^\top \beta_{1,g}^* - X_i^\top \beta_{0,g}^* + \frac{Y_i - X_i^\top \beta_{1,g}^*}{g(X_i^\top \alpha_{1,g}^*)} \right)^2 \right] \\
& \leq 3\mathbb{E} \left[(X_i^\top \beta_{1,g}^*)^2 \right] + 3\mathbb{E} \left[(X_i^\top \beta_{0,g}^*)^2 \right] + 3\mathbb{E} \left[\Gamma_i \frac{w_{1,g,i}^2}{(g(X_i^\top \alpha_{1,g}^*))^2} \right] \\
& \leq 3C\sigma^2 + 3\gamma_n \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{w_{1,g,i}^2}{(g(X_i^\top \alpha_{1,g}^*))^2} \mid \Gamma_i = 1 \right] \\
& \leq 3C\sigma^2 + 3k_0^{-2} \gamma_n^{-1} \mathbb{E} [w_{1,g,i}^2 \mid \Gamma_i = 1] \\
& \leq 3C\sigma^2 + 3\sigma_w^2 k_0^{-2} \gamma_n^{-1},
\end{aligned}$$

which implies

$$\begin{aligned}
\ell_{k2b} &= n_k^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{L}_k} \Gamma_i A_i \left(X_i^\top \beta_{1,g}^* - X_i^\top \beta_{0,g}^* + \frac{Y_i - X_i^\top \beta_{1,g}^*}{g(X_i^\top \alpha_{1,g}^*)} \right)^2 \\
&= O_p(\gamma_n^{-1}).
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
\ell_{k2a} - \ell_{k2b} &= O_p \left(\gamma_n^{-1} \left(\left\| \widehat{\Delta}_{\alpha_{1,g}}^{(-k)} \right\|_2^2 + \left\| \widehat{\Delta}_{\beta_{1,g}}^{(-k)} \right\|_2^2 + \gamma_n^2 \left\| \widehat{\Delta}_{\beta_{0,g}}^{(-k)} \right\|_2^2 \right) \right) \\
&+ O_p \left(\gamma_n^{-1/2} \sqrt{\left\| \widehat{\Delta}_{\alpha_{1,g}}^{(-k)} \right\|_2^2 + \left\| \widehat{\Delta}_{\beta_{1,g}}^{(-k)} \right\|_2^2 + \gamma_n^2 \left\| \widehat{\Delta}_{\beta_{0,g}}^{(-k)} \right\|_2^2} \right) O_p(\gamma_n^{-1/2}) \\
&= O_p \left(\gamma_n^{-1} \sqrt{\left\| \widehat{\Delta}_{\alpha_{1,g}}^{(-k)} \right\|_2^2 + \left\| \widehat{\Delta}_{\beta_{1,g}}^{(-k)} \right\|_2^2 + \gamma_n^2 \left\| \widehat{\Delta}_{\beta_{0,g}}^{(-k)} \right\|_2^2} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, we have

$$\ell_{k3a} - \ell_{k3b} = O_p \left(\gamma_n^{-1} \sqrt{\left\| \widehat{\Delta}_{\alpha_{0,g}}^{(-k)} \right\|_2^2 + \left\| \widehat{\Delta}_{\beta_{0,g}}^{(-k)} \right\|_2^2 + \gamma_n^2 \left\| \widehat{\Delta}_{\beta_{1,g}}^{(-k)} \right\|_2^2} \right).$$

For ℓ_{k4} , by Lemma F.2 and Lemma F.4,

$$\begin{aligned}
\ell_{k4} &= \widehat{\tau}_g^2 - \tau_g^2 \\
&= (\widehat{\tau}_g - \tau_g)^2 + 2(\widehat{\tau}_g - \tau_g) \tau_g \\
&= O_p \left(\sum_{a=0,1} \left\{ \frac{(s_{\alpha_{a,g}} + \sqrt{s_{\alpha_{a,g}} s_{\beta_{a,g}}}) \log d}{n\gamma_n} \right\} + (n\gamma_n)^{-1/2} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

By Lemma F.3, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \ell_{k1a} - \ell_{k1b} + \ell_{k2a} - \ell_{k2b} + \ell_{k3a} - \ell_{k3b} - \ell_{k4} \\
&= O_p \left(\sum_{a=0,1} \left\{ \|\Delta_{a,g}^{(-k)}\|_1 \sqrt{\frac{\log d}{n}} + \|\Delta_{a,g}^{(-k)}\|_2 + \|\widehat{\Delta}_{\beta_{a,g}}^{(-k)}\|_2 \right\} \right) \\
&+ O_p \left(\gamma_n^{-1} \sum_{a=0,1} \left\{ \|\widehat{\Delta}_{\alpha_{a,g}}^{(-k)}\|_2 + \|\widehat{\Delta}_{\beta_{a,g}}^{(-k)}\|_2 \right\} \right) \\
&+ O_p \left(\sum_{a=0,1} \left\{ \frac{(s_{\alpha_{a,g}} + \sqrt{s_{\alpha_{a,g}} s_{\beta_{a,g}}}) \log d}{n\gamma_n} \right\} + (n\gamma_n)^{-1/2} \right) \\
&= O_p \left(\gamma_n^{-1} \sum_{a=0,1} \sqrt{\frac{(s_{\alpha_{a,g}} + s_{\beta_{a,g}}) \log d}{n\gamma_n}} \right),
\end{aligned}$$

which implies

$$\widehat{\Sigma}_g^2 - \widetilde{\Sigma}_g^2 = O_p \left(\gamma_n^{-1} \sum_{a=0,1} \sqrt{\frac{(s_{\alpha_{a,g}} + s_{\beta_{a,g}}) \log d}{n\gamma_n}} \right). \quad (79)$$

On the other hand, note that

$$\begin{aligned}
\Sigma_g^2 &= \mathbb{E} \left[\left\{ X_i^\top \beta_{1,g}^* - X_i^\top \beta_{0,g}^* + \frac{\Gamma_i A_i}{g (X_i^\top \alpha_{1,g}^*)} (Y_i - X_i^\top \beta_{1,g}^*) - \frac{\Gamma_i (1 - A_i)}{g (X_i^\top \alpha_{0,g}^*)} (Y_i - X_i^\top \beta_{0,g}^*) \right\}^2 \right] - \tau_g^2 \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left[(1 - \Gamma_i) (X_i^\top \beta_{1,g}^* - X_i^\top \beta_{0,g}^*)^2 \right] + \mathbb{E} \left[\Gamma_i A_i \left(X_i^\top \beta_{1,g}^* - X_i^\top \beta_{0,g}^* + \frac{Y_i - X_i^\top \beta_{1,g}^*}{g (X_i^\top \alpha_{1,g}^*)} \right)^2 \right] \\
&+ \mathbb{E} \left[\Gamma_i (1 - A_i) \left(X_i^\top \beta_{1,g}^* - X_i^\top \beta_{0,g}^* - \frac{Y_i - X_i^\top \beta_{0,g}^*}{g (X_i^\top \alpha_{0,g}^*)} \right)^2 \right] - \tau_g^2.
\end{aligned}$$

We have $\mathbb{E} \left[\tilde{\Sigma}_g^2 - \Sigma_g^2 \right] = 0$ and

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E} \left[\left(\tilde{\Sigma}_g^2 - \Sigma_g^2 \right)^2 \right] &\leq n^{-1} \mathbb{E} \left[(1 - \Gamma_i) (X_i^\top \beta_{1,g}^* - X_i^\top \beta_{0,g}^*)^4 \right] \\
&\quad + n^{-1} \mathbb{E} \left[\Gamma_i A_i \left(X_i^\top \beta_{1,g}^* - X_i^\top \beta_{0,g}^* + \frac{Y_i - X_i^\top \beta_{1,g}^*}{g (X_i^\top \alpha_{1,g}^*)} \right)^4 \right] \\
&\quad + n^{-1} \mathbb{E} \left[\Gamma_i (1 - A_i) \left(X_i^\top \beta_{1,g}^* - X_i^\top \beta_{0,g}^* - \frac{Y_i - X_i^\top \beta_{0,g}^*}{g (X_i^\top \alpha_{0,g}^*)} \right)^4 \right] \\
&\leq n^{-1} \mathbb{E} \left[(X_i^\top \beta_{1,g}^* - X_i^\top \beta_{0,g}^*)^4 \right] \\
&\quad + n^{-1} \mathbb{E} \left[\Gamma_i \left(X_i^\top \beta_{1,g}^* - X_i^\top \beta_{0,g}^* + \frac{Y_i (1) - X_i^\top \beta_{1,g}^*}{g (X_i^\top \alpha_{1,g}^*)} \right)^4 \right] \\
&\quad + n^{-1} \mathbb{E} \left[\Gamma_i \left(X_i^\top \beta_{1,g}^* - X_i^\top \beta_{0,g}^* - \frac{Y_i (0) - X_i^\top \beta_{0,g}^*}{g (X_i^\top \alpha_{0,g}^*)} \right)^4 \right].
\end{aligned}$$

By Minkowski's inequality,

$$\|X_i^\top \beta_{1,g}^* - X_i^\top \beta_{0,g}^*\|_{\mathbb{P},4} \leq \|X_i^\top \beta_{1,g}^*\|_{\mathbb{P},4} + \|X_i^\top \beta_{0,g}^*\|_{\mathbb{P},4} \leq C\sigma.$$

By Lemma F.1,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\| \Gamma_i \left(X_i^\top \beta_{1,g}^* - X_i^\top \beta_{0,g}^* + \frac{Y_i (1) - X_i^\top \beta_{1,g}^*}{g (X_i^\top \alpha_{1,g}^*)} \right) \right\|_{\mathbb{P},4} \\
&\leq \|X_i^\top \beta_{1,g}^* - X_i^\top \beta_{0,g}^*\|_{\mathbb{P},4} + \left\| \Gamma_i \frac{w_{1,g,i}}{g (X_i^\top \alpha_{1,g}^*)} \right\|_{\mathbb{P},4} \\
&\leq C\sigma + k_0^{-1} \gamma_n^{-1} \|\Gamma_i w_{1,g,i}\|_{\mathbb{P},4}.
\end{aligned}$$

In addition,

$$\mathbb{E} [\Gamma_i w_{1,g,i}^4] = \gamma_n \mathbb{E} [w_{1,g,i}^4 \mid \Gamma_i = 1] \leq \gamma_n \sigma_w^4.$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E} \left[\Gamma_i \left(X_i^\top \beta_{1,g}^* - X_i^\top \beta_{0,g}^* + \frac{Y_i (1) - X_i^\top \beta_{1,g}^*}{g (X_i^\top \alpha_{1,g}^*)} \right)^4 \right] &\leq (C\sigma + k_0^{-1} \sigma_w \gamma_n^{-3/4})^4 \\
&\leq (C\sigma + k_0^{-1} \sigma_w)^4 \gamma_n^{-3}.
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly,

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\Gamma_i \left(X_i^\top \beta_{1,g}^* - X_i^\top \beta_{0,g}^* - \frac{Y_i(0) - X_i^\top \beta_{0,g}^*}{g(X_i^\top \alpha_{0,g}^*)} \right)^4 \right] \leq (C\sigma + k_0^{-1}\sigma_w)^4 \gamma_n^{-3}.$$

Thus,

$$\tilde{\Sigma}_g^2 - \Sigma_g^2 = O_p \left(\gamma_n^{-1} (n\gamma_n)^{-1/2} \right).$$

Together with (79),

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\Sigma}_g^2 - \Sigma_g^2 &= \hat{\Sigma}_g^2 - \tilde{\Sigma}_g^2 + \tilde{\Sigma}_g^2 - \Sigma_g^2 \\ &= O_p \left(\gamma_n^{-1} \sum_{a=0,1} \sqrt{\frac{(s_{\alpha_{a,g}} + s_{\beta_{a,g}}) \log d}{n\gamma_n}} \right) + O_p \left(\gamma_n^{-1} (n\gamma_n)^{-1/2} \right) \\ &= O_p \left(\gamma_n^{-1} \sum_{a=0,1} \sqrt{\frac{(s_{\alpha_{a,g}} + s_{\beta_{a,g}}) \log d}{n\gamma_n}} \right). \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma F.2, $\Sigma_g^2 \asymp \gamma_n^{-1}$, it holds that

$$\hat{\Sigma}_g^2 = \Sigma_g^2 \left\{ 1 + O_p \left(\sum_{a=0,1} \sqrt{\frac{(s_{\alpha_{a,g}} + s_{\beta_{a,g}}) \log d}{n\gamma_n}} \right) \right\}.$$

□

F.2 Proof of Theorem 4

Proof. Theorem 4 follows from Lemma F.4, Lemma F.2, and Lemma F.5 by repeating the proof of Lemma E.9. □

F.3 Auxiliary lemmas for transportability

Lemma F.6. *Suppose that Assumption 6 holds, and for each $a \in \{0, 1\}$, Assumption 5 holds with $(\alpha_{PS}^*, \beta_{OR}^*, w_{OR})$ replaced by $(\alpha_{a,t}^*, \beta_{a,t}^*, w_{a,t})$. Then*

(a) For each $a \in \{0, 1\}$, there exist some constants $\lambda_l, \sigma > 0$, X_i is sub-Gaussian given

$\Gamma_i = \Gamma$ such that $\|\Omega_{a,i} X_i^\top \beta_{a,t}^*\|_{\psi_2} \leq \sigma$ and

$$\|\Omega_{a,i} X_i\|_{\Gamma, \psi_2} := \sup_{v \in \mathbb{R}^d, \|v\|_2=1} \inf \left\{ t > 0 : \mathbb{E} \left[\exp \left\{ \frac{\Omega_{a,i} (X_i^\top v)^2}{t^2} \right\} \mid \Gamma_i = \Gamma \right] \leq 2 \right\} \leq \sigma.$$

In addition, $\lambda_{\min}(\mathbb{E}[\Omega_{a,i} X_i X_i^\top \mid \Gamma_i = 1]) \geq \lambda_l$.

(b) For each $a \in \{0, 1\}$, let $\tilde{w}_{a,t,i} = \Omega_{a,i} (Y_i(a) - X_i^\top \beta_{a,t}^*)$. There exist some constants $\sigma_w, \delta_w > 0$, $\tilde{w}_{a,t,i}$ is sub-Gaussian with $\|\tilde{w}_{a,t,i}\|_{\psi_2} \leq \sigma_w$ and

$$\mathbb{E}[\tilde{w}_{a,t,i}^8 \mid \Gamma_i = 1] \leq \sigma_w^8 \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{E}[\tilde{w}_{a,t,i}^2 \mid \Gamma_i = 1] \geq \delta_w.$$

Proof. (a) Note that $|\Omega_{a,i} X_i| \leq |X_i|$ and $|\Omega_{a,i} X_i^\top \beta_{a,t}^*| \leq |X_i^\top \beta_{a,t}^*|$, then $\|\Omega_{a,i} X_i\|_{\Gamma, \psi_2} \leq \|X_i\|_{\Gamma, \psi_2}$ and $\|\Omega_{a,i} X_i^\top \beta_{a,t}^*\|_{\psi} \leq \sigma$. In addition, we have

$$\mathbb{E}[\Omega_{a,i} X_i X_i^\top \mid \Gamma_i = 1] = \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[\Omega_{a,i} \mid \Gamma_i = 1, X_i] X_i X_i^\top] \succcurlyeq \eta_0 \mathbb{E}[X_i X_i^\top].$$

(b) Under Assumption 6, for some constant $C_1, C_2 > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\tilde{w}_{a,t,i}^8 \mid \Gamma_i = 1] &= \mathbb{E}[A_i (Y_i(a) - X_i^\top \beta_{a,t}^*)^8 \mid \Gamma_i = 1] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}[w_{1,t,i}^8 \mid \Gamma_i = 1] \\ &\leq \sigma_w^8. \end{aligned}$$

In addition, by Assumption 6,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\tilde{w}_{a,t,i}^8 \mid \Gamma_i = 1] &= \mathbb{E}[A_i w_{1,t,i}^8 \mid \Gamma_i = 1] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[A_i \mid \Gamma_i = 1, X_i] \mathbb{E}[w_{1,t,i}^8 \mid X_i, \Gamma_i = 1] \mid \Gamma_i = 1] \\ &\geq \eta_0 \mathbb{E}[w_{1,t,i}^8 \mid \Gamma_i = 1] \geq \eta_0 \delta_w. \end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma F.7. Suppose that Assumption 6 holds, and for each $a \in \{0, 1\}$, Assumption 5 holds with $(\alpha_{PS}^*, \beta_{OR}^*, w_{OR})$ replaced by $(\alpha_{a,t}^*, \beta_{a,t}^*, w_{a,t})$. Let either $\mathbb{P}(\Gamma_{a,i} = 1 \mid X_i, \Omega_{a,i} = 1) =$

$g(X_i^\top \alpha_{a,t}^*)$ or $\mathbb{E}[Y_i(a) | X_i] = X_i^\top \beta_{a,t}^*$ holds for each $a \in \{0, 1\}$. If $n\gamma_n \gg 1$, then as $n, d \rightarrow \infty$, $\Sigma_t^2 \asymp \gamma_n^{-1}$ and

$$\Sigma_t^{-1} \sqrt{n} (\tilde{\tau}_t - \tau_t) \rightarrow \mathcal{N}(0, 1),$$

where $\tilde{\tau}_t = \tilde{\tau}_{1,t} - \tilde{\tau}_{0,t}$ and

$$\tilde{\tau}_{a,t} = n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \left\{ \frac{1 - \Gamma_i}{1 - \gamma_n} (X_i^\top \beta_{a,t}^* - \tau_{a,t}) + \frac{\Gamma_i \mathbb{1}_{\{A_i=a\}}}{1 - \gamma_n} \frac{1 - g(X_i^\top \alpha_{a,t}^*)}{g(X_i^\top \alpha_{a,t}^*)} (Y_i - X_i^\top \beta_{a,t}^*) \right\} + \tau_{a,t}.$$

Proof. Let $Q_{t,i} = Q_{1,t,i} - Q_{0,t,i} + \tau_t$ where

$$Q_{a,t,i} = \frac{1 - \Gamma_i}{1 - \gamma_n} (X_i^\top \beta_{a,t}^* - \tau_{a,t}) + \frac{\Gamma_i \mathbb{1}_{\{A_i=a\}}}{1 - \gamma_n} \frac{1 - g(X_i^\top \alpha_{a,t}^*)}{g(X_i^\top \alpha_{a,t}^*)} (Y_i - X_i^\top \beta_{a,t}^*).$$

Under Assumption 6,

$$\mathbb{1}_{\{A_i=a\}} Y_i = \mathbb{1}_{\{A_i=a\}} Y_i(a).$$

Note that $\Omega_{a,i} = 1 - \Gamma_i + \Gamma_i \mathbb{1}_{\{A_i=a\}} = \mathbb{1}_{\{\Gamma_i=0\} \cup \{\Gamma_i=1, A_i=a\}}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\Gamma_i = 1, A_i = a | X_i, \Omega_{a,i} = 1) &= \frac{\mathbb{P}(\Gamma_i = 1, A_i = a, \Omega_{a,i} = 1) | X_i}{\mathbb{P}(\Omega_{a,i} = 1 | X_i)} \\ &= \frac{\mathbb{P}(\Gamma_i = 1, A_i = a) | X_i}{\mathbb{P}(\Omega_{a,i} = 1 | X_i)}. \end{aligned}$$

It follows that when either $\mathbb{P}[\Gamma_{a,i} = 1 | X_i, \Omega_{a,i} = 1] = g(X_i^\top \alpha_{a,t}^*)$ or $\mathbb{E}[Y_i(a) | X_i] = X_i^\top \beta_{a,t}^*$ holds for each $a \in \{0, 1\}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\tilde{\tau}_{a,t}] &= \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1 - \Gamma_i}{1 - \gamma_n} (X_i^\top \beta_{a,t}^* - \tau_{a,t}) + \frac{\Gamma_i \mathbb{1}_{\{A_i=a\}}}{1 - \gamma_n} \frac{1 - g(X_i^\top \alpha_{a,t}^*)}{g(X_i^\top \alpha_{a,t}^*)} (Y_i(a) - X_i^\top \beta_{a,t}^*) \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\frac{1 - \Gamma_i}{1 - \gamma_n} - \frac{\Gamma_i \mathbb{1}_{\{A_i=a\}}}{1 - \gamma_n} \frac{1 - g(X_i^\top \alpha_{a,t}^*)}{g(X_i^\top \alpha_{a,t}^*)} \right) (Y_i(a) - X_i^\top \beta_{a,t}^*) \right] \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1 - \Gamma_i}{1 - \gamma_n} (Y_i(a) - \tau_{a,t}) \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\mathbb{E}[\Omega_{a,i} g(X_i^\top \alpha_{a,t}^*) - \Gamma_i \mathbb{1}_{\{A_i=a\}} | X_i]}{(1 - \gamma_n) g(X_i^\top \alpha_{a,t}^*)} \mathbb{E}[Y_i(a) - X_i^\top \beta_{a,t}^* | X_i] \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{g(X_i^\top \alpha_{a,t}^*) \mathbb{P}(\Omega_{a,i} = 1 | X_i) - \mathbb{P}(\Gamma_i = 1, A_i = a | X_i)}{(1 - \gamma_n) g(X_i^\top \alpha_{a,t}^*)} \mathbb{E}[Y_i(a) - X_i^\top \beta_{a,t}^* | X_i] \right] \\ &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, $\mathbb{E}[\tilde{\tau}_t] = \mathbb{E}[Q_{t,i}] = \tau_t$. By Lyapunov's central limit theorem, it suffices to prove for some $\delta > 0$ and $C > 0$,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} n^{-\delta/2} \Sigma_t^{-(2+\delta)} \mathbb{E} \left[|Q_{t,i} - \tau_t|^{2+\delta} \right] = 0. \quad (80)$$

Note that under Assumption 5 with $(\alpha_{PS}^*, \beta_{OR}^*, w_i)$ replaced by $(\alpha_{a,t}^*, \beta_{a,t}^*, w_{a,t,i})$,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Var}(Q_{t,i}) &= \Sigma_t^2 \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1 - \Gamma_i}{(1 - \gamma_n)^2} (X_i^\top \beta_{1,t}^* - X_i^\top \beta_{0,t}^* - \tau_t)^2 \right] \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\Gamma_i A_i}{(1 - \gamma_n)^2} \left(\frac{1 - g(X_i^\top \alpha_{1,t}^*)}{g(X_i^\top \alpha_{1,t}^*)} \right)^2 (Y_i(1) - X_i^\top \beta_{1,t}^*)^2 \right] \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\Gamma_i (1 - A_i)}{(1 - \gamma_n)^2} \left(\frac{1 - g(X_i^\top \alpha_{0,t}^*)}{g(X_i^\top \alpha_{0,t}^*)} \right)^2 (Y_i(0) - X_i^\top \beta_{0,t}^*)^2 \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Since

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1 - \Gamma_i}{(1 - \gamma_n)^2} (X_i^\top \beta_{1,t}^* - X_i^\top \beta_{0,t}^* - \tau_t)^2 \right] \leq c_0^{-2} \mathbb{E} \left[(X_i^\top \beta_{1,t}^* - X_i^\top \beta_{0,t}^* - \tau_t)^2 \right],$$

by Minkowski's inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} \|X_i^\top \beta_{1,t}^* - X_i^\top \beta_{0,t}^* - \tau_t\|_{\mathbb{P},2} &\leq \|X_i^\top \beta_{1,t}^*\|_{\mathbb{P},2} + \|X_i^\top \beta_{0,t}^*\|_{\mathbb{P},2} + |\tau_t| \\ &\leq C_1 \sigma + |\tau_t|. \end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1 - \Gamma_i}{(1 - \gamma_n)^2} (X_i^\top \beta_{1,t}^* - X_i^\top \beta_{0,t}^* - \tau_t)^2 \right] \leq c_0^{-2} (C\sigma + |\tau_t|)^2.$$

In addition,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\Gamma_i A_i}{(1 - \gamma_n)^2} \left(\frac{1 - g(X_i^\top \alpha_{1,t}^*)}{g(X_i^\top \alpha_{1,t}^*)} \right)^2 (Y_i(1) - X_i^\top \beta_{1,t}^*)^2 \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{E}[A_i \mid \Gamma_i, X_i] \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\Gamma_i}{(1 - \gamma_n)^2} \left(\frac{1 - g(X_i^\top \alpha_{1,t}^*)}{g(X_i^\top \alpha_{1,t}^*)} \right)^2 (Y_i(1) - X_i^\top \beta_{1,t}^*)^2 \mid \Gamma_i, X_i \right] \right] \\
&\asymp \mathbb{E} \left[\Gamma_i \left(\frac{1 - g(X_i^\top \alpha_{1,t}^*)}{g(X_i^\top \alpha_{1,t}^*)} \right)^2 (Y_i(1) - X_i^\top \beta_{1,t}^*)^2 \right] \\
&= \gamma_n \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\frac{1 - g(X_i^\top \alpha_{1,t}^*)}{g(X_i^\top \alpha_{1,t}^*)} \right)^2 (Y_i(1) - X_i^\top \beta_{1,t}^*)^2 \mid \Gamma_i = 1 \right] \\
&\asymp \gamma_n^{-1} \mathbb{E} \left[(Y_i(1) - X_i^\top \beta_{1,t}^*)^2 \mid \Gamma_i = 1 \right] \asymp \gamma_n^{-1}.
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, we have

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\Gamma_i (1 - A_i)}{(1 - \gamma_n)^2} \left(\frac{1 - g(X_i^\top \alpha_{0,t}^*)}{g(X_i^\top \alpha_{0,t}^*)} \right)^2 (Y_i(0) - X_i^\top \beta_{0,t}^*)^2 \right] \asymp \gamma_n^{-1}.$$

Choose $\delta = 2$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E} (|Q_{t,i} - \tau_t|^4) &= \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1 - \Gamma_i}{(1 - \gamma_n)^4} (X_i^\top \beta_{1,t}^* - X_i^\top \beta_{0,t}^* - \tau_t)^4 \right] \\
&+ \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\Gamma_i A_i}{(1 - \gamma_n)^4} \left(\frac{1 - g(X_i^\top \alpha_{1,t}^*)}{g(X_i^\top \alpha_{1,t}^*)} \right)^4 (Y_i(1) - X_i^\top \beta_{1,t}^*)^4 \right] \\
&+ \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\Gamma_i (1 - A_i)}{(1 - \gamma_n)^4} \left(\frac{1 - g(X_i^\top \alpha_{0,t}^*)}{g(X_i^\top \alpha_{0,t}^*)} \right)^4 (Y_i(0) - X_i^\top \beta_{0,t}^*)^4 \right] \\
&\leq c_0^{-4} \mathbb{E} \left[(X_i^\top \beta_{1,t}^* - X_i^\top \beta_{0,t}^* - \tau_t)^4 \right] \\
&+ c_0^{-4} \mathbb{E} \left[\Gamma_i A_i \left(\frac{1 - g(X_i^\top \alpha_{1,t}^*)}{g(X_i^\top \alpha_{1,t}^*)} \right)^4 (Y_i(1) - X_i^\top \beta_{1,t}^*)^4 \right] \\
&+ c_0^{-4} \mathbb{E} \left[\Gamma_i (1 - A_i) \left(\frac{1 - g(X_i^\top \alpha_{0,t}^*)}{g(X_i^\top \alpha_{0,t}^*)} \right)^4 (Y_i(0) - X_i^\top \beta_{0,t}^*)^4 \right].
\end{aligned}$$

By Minkowski's inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} \|X_i^\top \beta_{1,t}^* - X_i^\top \beta_{0,t}^* - \tau_t\|_{\mathbb{P},4} &\leq \|X_i^\top \beta_{1,t}^*\|_{\mathbb{P},4} + \|X_i^\top \beta_{0,t}^*\|_{\mathbb{P},4} + |\tau_t| \\ &\leq C_2\sigma + |\tau_t|, \end{aligned}$$

which implies

$$\mathbb{E} \left[(X_i^\top \beta_{1,t}^* - X_i^\top \beta_{0,t}^* - \tau_t)^4 \right] \leq (C_2\sigma + |\tau_t|)^4.$$

Note that

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E} \left[\Gamma_i A_i \left(\frac{1 - g(X_i^\top \alpha_{1,t}^*)}{g(X_i^\top \alpha_{1,t}^*)} \right)^4 (Y_i(1) - X_i^\top \beta_{1,t}^*)^4 \right] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E} \left[\Gamma_i \left(\frac{1}{g(X_i^\top \alpha_{1,t}^*)} \right)^4 (Y_i(1) - X_i^\top \beta_{1,t}^*)^4 \right] \\ &= \gamma_n \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\frac{1}{g(X_i^\top \alpha_{1,t}^*)} \right)^4 (Y_i(1) - X_i^\top \beta_{1,t}^*)^4 \mid \Gamma_i = 1 \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Observe that

$$\left(\frac{1}{g(X_i^\top \alpha_{1,t}^*)} \right)^4 \leq k_0^{-4} \gamma_n^{-4} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{E} \left[(Y_i(1) - X_i^\top \beta_{1,t}^*)^4 \mid \Gamma_i = 1 \right] \leq \sigma_w^4,$$

which implies

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\Gamma_i A_i \left(\frac{1 - g(X_i^\top \alpha_{1,t}^*)}{g(X_i^\top \alpha_{1,t}^*)} \right)^4 (Y_i(1) - X_i^\top \beta_{1,t}^*)^4 \right] \leq k_0^{-4} \sigma_w^4 \gamma_n^{-3}.$$

Similarly,

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\Gamma_i (1 - A_i) \left(\frac{1 - g(X_i^\top \alpha_{0,t}^*)}{g(X_i^\top \alpha_{0,t}^*)} \right)^4 (Y_i(0) - X_i^\top \beta_{0,t}^*)^4 \right] \leq k_0^{-4} \sigma_w^4 \gamma_n^{-3}.$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} (|Q_{t,i} - \tau_t|^4) &\leq c_0^{-4} \{ (C_2\sigma + |\tau_t|)^4 + 2k_0^{-4} \sigma_w^4 \gamma_n^{-3} \} \\ &\leq c_0^{-4} \{ (C_2\sigma + |\tau_t|)^4 + 2k_0^{-4} \sigma_w^4 \} \gamma_n^{-3} =: C_3 \gamma_n^{-3}. \end{aligned}$$

It follows that for $\delta = 2$, if $n\gamma_n \gg 1$, as $n, d \rightarrow 0$,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} n^{-1} \Sigma_t^{-4} \mathbb{E} [|Q_{t,i} - \tau_t|^4] \leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} n^{-1} C \gamma_n^{-1} = 0.$$

□

Lemma F.8. *Suppose that Assumption 6 holds, and for each $a \in \{0, 1\}$, Assumption 5 holds with $(\alpha_{PS}^*, \beta_{OR}^*, w_{OR})$ replaced by $(\alpha_{a,t}^*, \beta_{a,t}^*, w_{a,t})$. Then as $n, d \rightarrow \infty$, it holds that*

(a) *Choose $\lambda_\alpha \asymp \sqrt{\log d / (n\gamma_n)}$. If $n\gamma_n \gg \max\{s_{\alpha_{a,t}}, \log n\} \log d$, then*

$$\left\| \widehat{\alpha}_{a,t}^{(-k)} - \alpha_{a,t}^* \right\|_1 = O_p \left(s_{\alpha_{a,t}} \sqrt{\frac{\log d}{n\gamma_n}} \right) \quad \text{and} \quad \left\| \widehat{\alpha}_{a,t}^{(-k)} - \alpha_{a,t}^* \right\|_2 = O_p \left(\sqrt{\frac{s_{\alpha_{a,t}} \log d}{n\gamma_n}} \right).$$

(b) *Choose $\lambda_\alpha \asymp \sqrt{\log d / (n\gamma_n)}$. If $n\gamma_n \gg \max\{s_{\beta_{a,t}}, (\log n)^2\} \log d$, then*

$$\left\| \widetilde{\beta}_{a,t}^{(-k)} - \beta_{a,t}^* \right\|_1 = O_p \left(s_{\beta_{a,t}} \sqrt{\frac{\log d}{n\gamma_n}} \right) \quad \text{and} \quad \left\| \widetilde{\beta}_{a,t}^{(-k)} - \beta_{a,t}^* \right\|_2 = O_p \left(\sqrt{\frac{s_{\beta_{a,t}} \log d}{n\gamma_n}} \right).$$

(c) *Choose $\lambda_\alpha \asymp \lambda_\beta \asymp \sqrt{\log d / (n\gamma_n)}$. If $n\gamma_n \gg \max\{s_{\alpha_{a,t}}, s_{\beta_{a,t}} \log n, (\log n)^2\} \log d$ and $s_{\alpha_{a,t}} s_{\beta_{a,t}} \ll (n\gamma_n)^{3/2} / (\log n (\log d)^2)$, then*

$$\left\| \widehat{\beta}_{a,t}^{(-k)} - \widetilde{\beta}_{a,t}^{(-k)} \right\|_1 = O_p \left(\sqrt{\frac{s_{\alpha_{a,t}} s_{\beta_{a,t}} \log d}{n\gamma_n}} \right) \quad \text{and} \quad \left\| \widehat{\beta}_{a,t}^{(-k)} - \widetilde{\beta}_{a,t}^{(-k)} \right\|_2 = O_p \left(\sqrt{\frac{s_{\alpha_{a,t}} \log d}{n\gamma_n}} \right).$$

Proof. Note that $(1 - \Gamma_i) = (1 - \Gamma_i) \Omega_{a,i}$ and $\Gamma_{a,i} = \Gamma_i \Omega_{a,i}$. Let $(\widetilde{X}_{a,i}, \widetilde{Y}_{a,i}) = (\Omega_{a,i} X_i, \Omega_{a,i} Y_i)$, then Lemma F.3 holds true by repeating the proof of Lemma C.15 and Lemma C.19. □

Lemma F.9. *Suppose that Assumption 6 holds, and for each $a \in \{0, 1\}$, Assumption 5 holds with $(\alpha_{PS}^*, \beta_{OR}^*, w_{OR})$ replaced by $(\alpha_{a,t}^*, \beta_{a,t}^*, w_{a,t})$. Choose $\lambda_\alpha \asymp \lambda_\beta \asymp \sqrt{\log d / (n\gamma_n)}$. If $n\gamma_n \gg \sum_{a=0,1} \max\{s_{\alpha_{a,t}}, s_{\beta_{a,t}} \log n, (\log n)^2\} \log d$ and $\sum_{a=0,1} s_{\alpha_{a,t}} s_{\beta_{a,t}} \ll (n\gamma_n)^{3/2} / (\log n (\log d)^2)$, then as $n, d \rightarrow \infty$,*

$$\widehat{\tau}_t - \widetilde{\tau}_t = O_p \left(\sum_{a=0,1} \frac{(s_{\alpha_{a,t}} + \sqrt{s_{\alpha_{a,t}} s_{\beta_{a,t}}}) \log d}{n\gamma_n} \right).$$

In addition, assume that $\mathbb{E}[Y_i(a) | X_i] = X_i^\top \beta_{a,t}^$ for all $a \in \{0, 1\}$. Then as $n, d \rightarrow \infty$,*

$$\widehat{\tau}_t - \widetilde{\tau}_t = O_p \left(\sum_{a=0,1} \left\{ \frac{\sqrt{s_{\alpha_{a,t}} \log d}}{n\gamma_n} + \frac{\sqrt{s_{\alpha_{a,t}} s_{\beta_{a,t}} \log d}}{n\gamma_n} \right\} \right).$$

Proof. Note that $(1 - \Gamma_i) = (1 - \Gamma_i)\Omega_{a,i}$ and $\Gamma_{a,i} = \Gamma_i\Omega_{a,i}$. Let $(\tilde{X}_{a,i}, \tilde{Y}_{a,i}) = (\Omega_{a,i}X_i, \Omega_{a,i}Y_i)$, then Lemma F.9 holds true by repeating the proof of Lemma E.11. \square

Lemma F.10. *Suppose that Assumption 6 holds, and for each $a \in \{0, 1\}$, Assumption 5 holds with $(\alpha_{PS}^*, \beta_{OR}^*, w_{OR})$ replaced by $(\alpha_{a,t}^*, \beta_{a,t}^*, w_{a,t})$. Let either $\mathbb{P}(\Gamma_{a,i} = 1 \mid X_i, \Omega_{a,i} = 1) = g(X_i^\top \alpha_{a,t}^*)$ or $\mathbb{E}[Y_i(a) \mid X_i] = X_i^\top \beta_{a,t}^*$ holds for each $a \in \{0, 1\}$. Choose $\lambda_\alpha \asymp \lambda_\beta \asymp \sqrt{\log d / (n\gamma_n)}$. If $n\gamma_n \gg \sum_{a=0,1} \max\{s_{\alpha_{a,t}}, s_{\beta_{a,t}} \log n, (\log n)^2\} \log d$ and $\sum_{a=0,1} s_{\alpha_{a,t}} s_{\beta_{a,t}} \ll (n\gamma_n)^{3/2} / (\log n (\log d)^2)$, then as $n, d \rightarrow \infty$,*

$$\widehat{\Sigma}_t^2 = \Sigma_t^2 \left\{ 1 + O_p \left(\sum_{a=0,1} \left\{ \sqrt{\frac{(s_{\alpha_{a,t}} + s_{\beta_{a,t}}) \log d}{n\gamma_n}} + \gamma_n \sqrt{\frac{s_{\alpha_{a,t}} s_{\beta_{a,t}} \log d}{n\gamma_n}} \right\} \right) \right\}.$$

Proof. Let $\widehat{\Delta}_{\alpha_{a,t}}^{(-k)} = \widehat{\alpha}_{a,t}^{(-k)} - \alpha_{a,t}^*$, $\widehat{\Delta}_{\beta_{a,t}}^{(-k)} = \widehat{\beta}_{a,t}^{(-k)} - \beta_{a,t}^*$, $\Delta_{a,g}^{(-k)} = \widehat{\beta}_{a,t}^{(-k)} - \beta_{a,t}^*$, $\widetilde{\Delta}_{\beta_{a,t}}^{(-k)} = \widehat{\beta}_{a,t}^{(-k)} - \beta_{a,t}^*$, $\widehat{\gamma}_k = n_k^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \Gamma_i$, $\widehat{\gamma} = n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \Gamma_i$,

$$\begin{aligned} \widetilde{\Sigma}_t^2 &= n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1 - \Gamma_i}{(1 - \gamma_n)^2} (X_i^\top \beta_{1,t}^* - X_i^\top \beta_{0,t}^* - \tau_t)^2 \\ &\quad + n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\Gamma_i A_i}{(1 - \gamma_n)^2} \left(\frac{1 - g(X_i^\top \alpha_{1,t}^*)}{g(X_i^\top \alpha_{1,t}^*)} \right)^2 (Y_i - X_i^\top \beta_{1,t}^*)^2 \\ &\quad + n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\Gamma_i (1 - A_i)}{(1 - \gamma_n)^2} \left(\frac{1 - g(X_i^\top \alpha_{0,t}^*)}{g(X_i^\top \alpha_{0,t}^*)} \right)^2 (Y_i - X_i^\top \beta_{0,t}^*)^2. \end{aligned}$$

Then

$$\widehat{\Sigma}_t^2 - \widetilde{\Sigma}_t^2 = K^{-1} \sum_{k=1}^K (S_{k1a} - S_{k1b} + S_{k2a} - S_{k2b} + S_{k3a} - S_{k3b} + S_{k4a} - S_{k4b}),$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
S_{k1a} &= \frac{\widehat{\beta}_{1,t}^{(-k),\top} \Xi_0 \widehat{\beta}_{1,t}^{(-k)} + \widehat{\beta}_{0,t}^{(-k),\top} \Xi_0 \widehat{\beta}_{0,t}^{(-k)} - 2\widehat{\beta}_{1,t}^{(-k),\top} \Xi_0 \widehat{\beta}_{0,t}^{(-k)} - 2\bar{X}_0^\top \widehat{\beta}_{1,t}^{(-k)} \widehat{\tau}_t + 2\bar{X}_0^\top \widehat{\beta}_{0,t}^{(-k)} \widehat{\tau}_t}{n_k^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} (1 - \Gamma_i)}, \\
S_{k1b} &= \frac{\beta_{1,t}^{*,\top} \Xi_0 \beta_{1,t}^* + \beta_{0,t}^{*,\top} \Xi_0 \beta_{0,t}^* - 2\beta_{1,t}^{*,\top} \Xi_0 \beta_{0,t}^* - 2\bar{X}_0^\top \beta_{1,t}^* \tau_t + 2\bar{X}_0^\top \beta_{0,t}^* \tau_t}{(1 - \gamma_n)^2}, \\
S_{k2a} &= \frac{\widehat{\tau}_t^2}{n_k^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} (1 - \Gamma_i)}, \\
S_{k2b} &= \frac{n_k^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} (1 - \Gamma_i) \tau_t^2}{(1 - \gamma_n)^2}, \\
S_{k3a} &= n_k^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \frac{\Gamma_i A_i \left(\frac{1-g(X_i^\top \widehat{\alpha}_{1,t}^{(-k)})}{g(X_i^\top \widehat{\alpha}_{1,t}^{(-k)})} \right)^2 (Y_i - X_i^\top \widehat{\beta}_{1,t}^{(-k)})^2}{(n_k^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} (1 - \Gamma_i))^2}, \\
S_{k3b} &= n_k^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \frac{\Gamma_i A_i}{(1 - \gamma_n)^2} \left(\frac{1 - g(X_i^\top \alpha_{1,t}^*)}{g(X_i^\top \alpha_{1,t}^*)} \right)^2 (Y_i - X_i^\top \beta_{1,t}^*)^2, \\
S_{k4a} &= n_k^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \frac{\Gamma_i (1 - A_i) \left(\frac{1-g(X_i^\top \widehat{\alpha}_{0,t}^{(-k)})}{g(X_i^\top \widehat{\alpha}_{0,t}^{(-k)})} \right)^2 (Y_i - X_i^\top \widehat{\beta}_{0,t}^{(-k)})^2}{(n_k^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} (1 - \Gamma_i))^2}, \\
S_{k4b} &= n_k^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \frac{\Gamma_i (1 - A_i)}{(1 - \gamma_n)^2} \left(\frac{1 - g(X_i^\top \alpha_{0,t}^*)}{g(X_i^\top \alpha_{0,t}^*)} \right)^2 (Y_i - X_i^\top \beta_{0,t}^*)^2.
\end{aligned}$$

For S_{k1a} and S_{k1b} ,

$$\begin{aligned}
& (1 - \widehat{\gamma}_k)^2 S_{k1a} - (1 - \gamma_n)^2 S_{k1b} \\
&= (1 - \widehat{\gamma}_k) \left(\widehat{\beta}_{1,t}^{(-k),\top} \Xi_0 \widehat{\beta}_{1,t}^{(-k)} - \beta_{1,t}^{*,\top} \Xi_0 \beta_{1,t}^* \right) + (1 - \widehat{\gamma}_k) \left(\widehat{\beta}_{0,t}^{(-k),\top} \Xi_0 \widehat{\beta}_{0,t}^{(-k)} - \beta_{0,t}^{*,\top} \Xi_0 \beta_{0,t}^* \right) \\
&\quad - 2(1 - \widehat{\gamma}_k) \left(\widehat{\beta}_{1,t}^{(-k),\top} \Xi_0 \widehat{\beta}_{0,t}^{(-k)} - \beta_{1,t}^{*,\top} \Xi_0 \beta_{0,t}^* \right) - 2(1 - \widehat{\gamma}_k) \left(\bar{X}_0^\top \widehat{\beta}_{1,t}^{(-k)} \widehat{\tau}_t - \bar{X}_0^\top \beta_{1,t}^* \tau_t \right) \\
&\quad + 2(1 - \widehat{\gamma}_k) \left(\bar{X}_0^\top \widehat{\beta}_{0,t}^{(-k)} \widehat{\tau}_t - \bar{X}_0^\top \beta_{0,t}^* \tau_t \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Similar to $\ell_{k1a} - \ell_{k1b}$ of Lemma F.5, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& (1 - \widehat{\gamma}_k) \left(\widehat{\beta}_{1,t}^{(-k),\top} \Xi_0 \widehat{\beta}_{1,t}^{(-k)} - \beta_{1,t}^{*,\top} \Xi_0 \beta_{1,t}^* \right) \\
&= O_p \left(\left(\left\| \Delta_{1,t}^{(-k)} \right\|_1 \sqrt{\frac{\log d}{n}} + \left\| \Delta_{1,t}^{(-k)} \right\|_2 + \left\| \widehat{\Delta}_{\beta_{1,t}}^{(-k)} \right\|_2 \right) \right),
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & (1 - \widehat{\gamma}_k) \left(\widehat{\beta}_{0,t}^{(-k),\top} \Xi_0 \widehat{\beta}_{0,t}^{(-k)} - \beta_{0,t}^{*,\top} \Xi_0 \beta_{0,t}^* \right) \\ &= O_p \left(\left\| \Delta_{0,t}^{(-k)} \right\|_1 \sqrt{\frac{\log d}{n}} + \left\| \Delta_{0,t}^{(-k)} \right\|_2 + \left\| \widehat{\Delta}_{\beta_{0,t}}^{(-k)} \right\|_2 \right), \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & (1 - \widehat{\gamma}_k) \left(\widehat{\beta}_{1,t}^{(-k),\top} \Xi_0 \widehat{\beta}_{0,t}^{(-k)} - \beta_{1,t}^{*,\top} \Xi_0 \beta_{0,t}^* \right) \\ &= O_p \left(\sum_{a=0}^1 \left\{ \left\| \Delta_{a,t}^{(-k)} \right\|_1 \sqrt{\frac{\log d}{n}} + \left\| \Delta_{a,t}^{(-k)} \right\|_2 + \left\| \widehat{\Delta}_{\beta_{a,t}}^{(-k)} \right\|_2 \right\} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Recall p_{k3a} and p_{k3b} of Lemma E.12. Similarly, by Lemma F.7 and Lemma F.9,

$$\widehat{\tau}_t - \tau_t = O_p \left(\sum_{a=0,1} \frac{(s_{\alpha_{a,t}} + \sqrt{s_{\alpha_{a,t}} s_{\beta_{a,t}}}) \log d}{n\gamma_n} + (n\gamma_n)^{-1/2} \right), \quad (81)$$

then

$$\begin{aligned} & (1 - \widehat{\gamma}_k) \left(\bar{X}_0^\top \widehat{\beta}_{1,t}^{(-k)} \widehat{\tau}_t - \bar{X}_0^\top \beta_{1,t}^* \tau_t \right) \\ &= O_p \left(\left\| \Delta_{1,t}^{(-k)} \right\|_1 + \left\| \widetilde{\Delta}_{\beta_{1,t}}^{(-k)} \right\|_2 + \sum_{a=0,1} \frac{(s_{\alpha_{a,t}} + \sqrt{s_{\alpha_{a,t}} s_{\beta_{a,t}}}) \log d}{n\gamma_n} + (n\gamma_n)^{-1/2} \right). \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & (1 - \widehat{\gamma}_k) \left(\bar{X}_0^\top \widehat{\beta}_{0,t}^{(-k)} \widehat{\tau}_t - \bar{X}_0^\top \beta_{0,t}^* \tau_t \right) \\ &= O_p \left(\left\| \Delta_{0,t}^{(-k)} \right\|_1 + \left\| \widetilde{\Delta}_{\beta_{0,t}}^{(-k)} \right\|_2 + \sum_{a=0,1} \frac{(s_{\alpha_{a,t}} + \sqrt{s_{\alpha_{a,t}} s_{\beta_{a,t}}}) \log d}{n\gamma_n} + (n\gamma_n)^{-1/2} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} & (1 - \widehat{\gamma}_k)^2 S_{k1a} - (1 - \gamma_n)^2 S_{k1b} \\ &= O_p \left(\sum_{a=0,1} \left\{ \left\| \Delta_{a,t}^{(-k)} \right\|_1 \sqrt{\frac{\log d}{n}} + \left\| \Delta_{a,t}^{(-k)} \right\|_2 + \left\| \widehat{\Delta}_{\beta_{a,t}}^{(-k)} \right\|_2 \right\} \right) \\ &+ O_p \left(\sum_{a=0,1} \left\{ \left\| \Delta_{a,t}^{(-k)} \right\|_1 + \left\| \widetilde{\Delta}_{\beta_{a,t}}^{(-k)} \right\|_2 \right\} + \sum_{a=0,1} \frac{(s_{\alpha_{a,t}} + \sqrt{s_{\alpha_{a,t}} s_{\beta_{a,t}}}) \log d}{n\gamma_n} + (n\gamma_n)^{-1/2} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Note that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[|S_{k1b}|] &\leq c_0^{-2} \mathbb{E} \left[(1 - \Gamma_i) (X_i^\top \beta_{1,t})^2 \right] + c_0^{-2} \mathbb{E} \left[(1 - \Gamma_i) (X_i^\top \beta_{0,t})^2 \right] \\
&\quad + 2c_0^{-2} \mathbb{E} \left[(1 - \Gamma_i) |(X_i^\top \beta_{1,t}) (X_i^\top \beta_{0,t})| \right] + 2c_0^{-2} \mathbb{E} \left[(1 - \Gamma_i) |X_i^\top \beta_{1,t}| \right] |\tau_t| \\
&\quad + 2c_0^{-2} \mathbb{E} \left[(1 - \Gamma_i) |X_i^\top \beta_{0,t}| \right] |\tau_t| \\
&\leq c_0^{-2} \mathbb{E} \left[(X_i^\top \beta_{1,t})^2 \right] + c_0^{-2} \mathbb{E} \left[(X_i^\top \beta_{0,t})^2 \right] \\
&\quad + 2c_0^{-2} \mathbb{E} \left[(X_i^\top \beta_{1,t})^2 \right]^{1/2} \mathbb{E} \left[(X_i^\top \beta_{0,t})^2 \right]^{1/2} + 2c_0^{-2} \mathbb{E} \left[|X_i^\top \beta_{1,t}| \right] |\tau_t| \\
&\quad + 2c_0^{-2} \mathbb{E} \left[|X_i^\top \beta_{0,t}| \right] |\tau_t| \\
&\leq C_1 c_0^{-2} \sigma^2 + C_2 c_0^{-2} \sigma |\tau_t|.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, $S_{k1b} = O_p(1)$. It follows that by (77) and Lemma F.8,

$$\begin{aligned}
S_{k1a} - S_{k1b} &= \left(\left(\frac{1 - \gamma_n}{1 - \hat{\gamma}_k} \right)^2 - 1 \right) S_{k1b} + \frac{1}{(1 - \hat{\gamma}_k)^2} O_p \left(\sum_{a=0,1} \sqrt{\frac{(s_{\alpha_{a,t}} + s_{\beta_{a,t}}) \log d}{n\gamma_n}} \right) \\
&= O_p \left(\sum_{a=0,1} \left(\sqrt{\frac{(s_{\alpha_{a,t}} + s_{\beta_{a,t}}) \log d}{n\gamma_n}} + \sqrt{\frac{s_{\alpha_{a,t}} s_{\beta_{a,t}} \log d}{n\gamma_n}} \right) \right).
\end{aligned}$$

For S_{k2a} and S_{k2b} , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
(1 - \hat{\gamma}_k)^2 S_{k2a} - (1 - \gamma_n)^2 S_{k2b} &= (1 - \hat{\gamma}_k) (\hat{\tau}_t^2 - \tau_t^2) \\
&= (1 - \hat{\gamma}_k) \{ (\hat{\tau}_t - \tau_t)^2 + 2(\hat{\tau}_t - \tau_t) \tau \}.
\end{aligned}$$

By Lemma C.3 and (81), $1 - \hat{\gamma}_k = O_p(1 - \gamma_n)$ and

$$(1 - \hat{\gamma}_k)^2 S_{k2a} - (1 - \gamma_n)^2 S_{k2b} = O_p \left(\sum_{a=0,1} \frac{(s_{\alpha_{a,t}} + \sqrt{s_{\alpha_{a,t}} s_{\beta_{a,t}}}) \log d}{n\gamma_n} + (n\gamma_n)^{-1/2} \right).$$

By Lemma C.3, $S_{k2b} = O_p(1)$. Thus, by (77),

$$\begin{aligned}
S_{k2a} - S_{k2b} &= \left(\left(\frac{1 - \gamma_n}{1 - \hat{\gamma}_k} \right)^2 - 1 \right) S_{k2b} + \frac{1}{(1 - \hat{\gamma}_k)^2} O_p \left(\sum_{a=0,1} (s_{\alpha_{a,t}} + s_{\beta_{a,t}}) \frac{\log d}{n\gamma_n} + (n\gamma_n)^{-1/2} \right) \\
&= O_p \left(\sum_{a=0,1} \frac{(s_{\alpha_{a,t}} + \sqrt{s_{\alpha_{a,t}} s_{\beta_{a,t}}}) \log d}{n\gamma_n} + (n\gamma_n)^{-1/2} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

For S_{k3a} and S_{k3b} , let

$$\Phi_{a,i}(\alpha, \beta) = \Gamma_{a,i} \frac{1 - g(X_i^\top \alpha)}{g(X_i^\top \alpha)} (Y_i - X_i^\top \beta).$$

Recall $(1 - \widehat{\gamma}_k)^2 p_{k2a} - (1 - \gamma_n)^2 p_{k2b}$ of Lemma E.12. We have $S_{k3b} = O_p(\gamma_n^{-1})$ and

$$\begin{aligned} (1 - \widehat{\gamma}_k)^2 S_{k3a} - (1 - \gamma_n)^2 S_{k3b} &= n_k^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \left\{ \Phi_{a,i}(\widehat{\alpha}_{1,t}^{(-k)}, \widehat{\beta}_{1,t}^{(-k)})^2 - \Phi_{a,i}(\alpha_{1,t}^*, \beta_{1,t}^*)^2 \right\} \\ &= O_p\left(\gamma_n^{-1} \left\{ \|\widehat{\Delta}_{\alpha_{1,t}}^{(-k)}\|_2 + \|\widehat{\Delta}_{\beta_{1,t}}^{(-k)}\|_2 \right\}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Then by Lemma F.8,

$$\begin{aligned} S_{k3a} - S_{k3b} &= \left(\left(\frac{1 - \gamma_n}{1 - \widehat{\gamma}_k} \right)^2 - 1 \right) S_{k3b} + \frac{1}{(1 - \widehat{\gamma}_k)^2} O_p\left(\gamma_n^{-1} \left(\sum_{a=0,1} \sqrt{\frac{(s_{\alpha_{a,t}} + s_{\beta_{a,t}}) \log d}{n\gamma_n}} \right)\right) \\ &= O_p\left(\gamma_n^{-1} \left(\sum_{a=0,1} \sqrt{\frac{(s_{\alpha_{a,t}} + s_{\beta_{a,t}}) \log d}{n\gamma_n}} \right)\right). \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, for S_{k4a} and S_{k4b} , we have

$$S_{k4a} - S_{k4b} = O_p\left(\gamma_n^{-1} \left(\sum_{a=0,1} \sqrt{\frac{(s_{\alpha_{a,t}} + s_{\beta_{a,t}}) \log d}{n\gamma_n}} \right)\right).$$

Then it follows

$$\widehat{\Sigma}_t^2 - \widetilde{\Sigma}_t^2 = O_p\left(\gamma_n^{-1} \left(\sum_{a=0,1} \left\{ \sqrt{\frac{(s_{\alpha_{a,t}} + s_{\beta_{a,t}}) \log d}{n\gamma_n}} + \gamma_n \sqrt{\frac{s_{\alpha_{a,t}} s_{\beta_{a,t}} \log d}{n\gamma_n}} \right\} \right)\right).$$

On the other hand, since

$$\begin{aligned} \Sigma_t^2 &= \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1 - \Gamma_i}{(1 - \gamma_n)^2} (X_i^\top \beta_{1,t}^* - X_i^\top \beta_{0,t}^* - \tau_t)^2 \right] + \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\Gamma_i A_i}{(1 - \gamma_n)^2} \left(\frac{1 - g(X_i^\top \alpha_{1,t}^*)}{g(X_i^\top \alpha_{1,t}^*)} \right)^2 (Y_i - X_i^\top \beta_{1,t}^*)^2 \right] \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\Gamma_i (1 - A_i)}{(1 - \gamma_n)^2} \left(\frac{1 - g(X_i^\top \alpha_{0,t}^*)}{g(X_i^\top \alpha_{0,t}^*)} \right)^2 (Y_i - X_i^\top \beta_{0,t}^*)^2 \right], \end{aligned}$$

we have $\mathbb{E} \left[\tilde{\Sigma}_t^2 - \Sigma_t^2 \right] = 0$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E} \left[\left(\tilde{\Sigma}_t^2 - \Sigma_t^2 \right)^2 \right] &\leq n^{-1} \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1 - \Gamma_i}{(1 - \gamma_n)^4} \left(X_i^\top \beta_{1,t}^* - X_i^\top \beta_{0,t}^* - \tau_t \right)^4 \right] \\
&\quad + n^{-1} \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\Gamma_i A_i}{(1 - \gamma_n)^4} \left(\frac{1 - g(X_i^\top \alpha_{1,t}^*)}{g(X_i^\top \alpha_{1,t}^*)} \right)^4 \left(Y_i - X_i^\top \beta_{1,t}^* \right)^4 \right] \\
&\quad + n^{-1} \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\Gamma_i (1 - A_i)}{(1 - \gamma_n)^4} \left(\frac{1 - g(X_i^\top \alpha_{0,t}^*)}{g(X_i^\top \alpha_{0,t}^*)} \right)^4 \left(Y_i - X_i^\top \beta_{0,t}^* \right)^4 \right] \\
&\leq c_0^{-4} n^{-1} \mathbb{E} \left[\left(X_i^\top \beta_{1,t}^* - X_i^\top \beta_{0,t}^* - \tau_t \right)^4 \right] \\
&\quad + c_0^{-4} k_0^{-4} \gamma_n^{-4} n^{-1} \mathbb{E} \left[\Gamma_i \left(Y_i(1) - X_i^\top \beta_{1,t}^* \right)^4 \right] \\
&\quad + c_0^{-4} k_0^{-4} \gamma_n^{-4} n^{-1} \mathbb{E} \left[\Gamma_i \left(Y_i(0) - X_i^\top \beta_{0,t}^* \right)^4 \right].
\end{aligned}$$

Since

$$\begin{aligned}
\|X_i^\top \beta_{1,t}^* - X_i^\top \beta_{0,t}^* - \tau_t\|_{\mathbb{P},4} &\leq \|X_i^\top \beta_{1,t}^*\|_{\mathbb{P},4} + \|X_i^\top \beta_{0,t}^*\|_{\mathbb{P},4} + |\tau_t| \leq C_3 \sigma + |\tau_t|, \\
\mathbb{E} \left[\Gamma_i \left(Y_i(1) - X_i^\top \beta_{1,t}^* \right)^4 \right] &= \gamma_n \mathbb{E} \left[\left(Y_i(1) - X_i^\top \beta_{1,t}^* \right)^4 \mid \Gamma_i = 1 \right] \leq \gamma_n \sigma_w^4, \\
\mathbb{E} \left[\Gamma_i \left(Y_i(0) - X_i^\top \beta_{0,t}^* \right)^4 \right] &= \gamma_n \mathbb{E} \left[\left(Y_i(0) - X_i^\top \beta_{0,t}^* \right)^4 \mid \Gamma_i = 1 \right] \leq \gamma_n \sigma_w^4,
\end{aligned}$$

we have

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\left(\tilde{\Sigma}_t^2 - \Sigma_t^2 \right)^2 \right] \leq c_0^{-4} \left((C_3 \sigma + |\tau_t|)^4 + k_0^{-4} \sigma_w^4 \right) n^{-1} \gamma_n^{-3}.$$

It follows that

$$\tilde{\Sigma}_t^2 - \Sigma_t^2 = O_p \left(\gamma_n^{-1} \left(n \gamma_n^{-1/2} \right) \right).$$

In conclusion, by Lemma F.7, $\Sigma_t^2 \asymp \gamma_n^{-1}$ and

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{\Sigma}_t^2 &= \hat{\Sigma}_t^2 - \tilde{\Sigma}_t^2 + \tilde{\Sigma}_t^2 - \Sigma_t^2 + \Sigma_t^2 \\
&= \Sigma_t^2 \left\{ 1 + O_p \left(\sum_{a=0,1} \left\{ \sqrt{\frac{(s_{\alpha_{a,t}} + s_{\beta_{a,t}}) \log d}{n \gamma_n}} + \gamma_n \sqrt{\frac{s_{\alpha_{a,t}} s_{\beta_{a,t}} \log d}{n \gamma_n}} \right\} \right) \right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

□

F.4 Proof of Theorem 5

Proof. Theorem 5 follows from Lemma F.7, Lemma F.9, and Lemma F.10 by repeating the proof of Lemma E.13. □