

BALANCING WEIGHTS FOR CAUSAL MEDIATION ANALYSIS

KENTARO KAWATO

The University of Tokyo

ABSTRACT. This paper develops methods for estimating the natural direct and indirect effects in causal mediation analysis. The efficient influence function-based estimator (EIF-based estimator) and the inverse probability weighting estimator (IPW estimator), which are standard in causal mediation analysis, both rely on the inverse of the estimated propensity scores, and thus they are vulnerable to two key issues: (i) *instability* and (ii) *finite-sample covariate imbalance*. We propose estimators based on the weights obtained by an algorithm that directly penalizes weight dispersion while enforcing approximate covariate and mediator balance, thereby improving stability and mitigating bias in finite samples. We establish the convergence rates of the proposed weights and show that the resulting estimators are asymptotically normal and achieve the semiparametric efficiency bound. Monte Carlo simulations demonstrate that the proposed estimator outperforms not only the EIF-based estimator and the IPW estimator but also the regression imputation estimator in challenging scenarios with model misspecification. Furthermore, the proposed method is applied to a real dataset from a study examining the effects of media framing on immigration attitudes.

Keywords: causal mediation analysis; natural direct and indirect effects; propensity score instability; balancing weights; finite-sample covariate imbalance.

1. INTRODUCTION

Causal mediation analysis has become an essential framework for researchers who seek to understand the mechanisms of a causal effect. Many traditional studies focus on estimating the average treatment effect (ATE). However, researchers are now increasingly attempting to uncover the underlying causal pathways by decomposing the ATE into its mediated and unmediated components. This is important because improving policies or interventions often requires knowing why an effect exists, not simply confirming its existence. Reflecting this practical importance, this framework has become widespread across various disciplines, with both theoretical and empirical studies actively pursued (Imai et al. (2010a,b, 2011); VanderWeele (2015); Huber (2020); Celli (2022); Nguyen et al. (2020, 2022)). This paper

Date: December 11, 2025.

Address: Hongo 7-3-1, Bunkyo City, Tokyo, JAPAN. 113-8654.

E-Mail: kawato-kentaro380@g.ecc.u-tokyo.ac.jp

I am grateful to Ryo Okui for his continued guidance and support. All errors are my own.

contributes to this field by developing a novel weighting estimator for causal mediation analysis that enhances the finite-sample performance.

We introduce notation and define the estimands. Let \mathcal{X} , \mathcal{M} , and \mathcal{Y} denote the supports of the covariates, mediator, and outcome, respectively. The observed data are $(Y, M, D, X) \in \mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{M} \times \{0, 1\} \times \mathcal{X}$. We use potential outcomes to formalize causal mechanisms. For $d \in \{0, 1\}$, let M_d denote the mediator that would be observed if D were set to d , and let Y_{dm} denote the outcome that would be observed if (D, M) were set to (d, m) . We write $Y_d := Y_{dM_d}$ and, critically for causal mediation analysis, $Y_{dM_{d'}}$ for the cross-world outcome where the treatment is d while the mediator follows the distribution it would have under d' .

We consider two key estimands in causal mediation analysis: the natural direct effect (NDE) and the natural indirect effect (NIE). The NDE, defined as $\text{NDE}(d) := \mathbb{E}[Y_{1M_d} - Y_{0M_d}]$, measures the causal effect of changing the treatment from 0 to 1 while fixing the mediator to the distribution it would take under $D = d$. In this way, the NDE captures the part of the treatment effect that does not operate through the mediator and reflects only the direct path from treatment to outcome. The NIE, defined as $\text{NIE}(d) := \mathbb{E}[Y_{dM_1} - Y_{dM_0}]$, measures the effect of the treatment through the mediator on the outcome. The ATE ($:= \mathbb{E}[Y_1 - Y_0]$), can be decomposed as $\text{ATE} = \text{NDE}(1) + \text{NIE}(0) = \text{NIE}(1) + \text{NDE}(0)$, which are depicted in Figure 1. Accordingly, we are interested in the targets $\theta_{d,1-d} := \mathbb{E}[Y_{dM_{1-d}}]$, $\theta_d := \mathbb{E}[Y_d]$, $d \in \{0, 1\}$.




FIGURE 1. Setting of standard causal mediation analysis. The NDE is represented by thick arrows. The NIE is represented by thin arrows. Dashed arrows represent the possible confounding by covariates.

We focus on two main weighting estimators for causal mediation analysis: the inverse probability weighting (IPW) estimator and its augmented counterpart, the efficient influence function (EIF)–based estimator. The IPW estimator of Huber (2014) for $\theta_{1,0}$ is given by

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{D_i \hat{\xi}_0(M_i, X_i)}{\hat{\pi}_0(X_i) \hat{\xi}_1(M_i, X_i)} Y_i, \quad (1)$$

where $\hat{\xi}_d(M, X)$ and $\hat{\pi}_d(X)$ are estimators of $P(D = d \mid M, X)$ and $P(D = d \mid X)$, respectively. Since this weight also plays a role in the EIF–based estimator discussed below, we denote it by $\hat{w}_2^{\text{EIF}}(M_i, X_i) = \hat{\xi}_0(M_i, X_i) / \hat{\pi}_0(X_i) \hat{\xi}_1(M_i, X_i)$. Notably, these propensity score estimators appear in the denominator, which gives rise to the issues of interest. We also consider an augmented version, the EIF–based estimator of Tchetgen Tchetgen and Shpitser (2012), as introduced in (2), which combines weighting with outcome regression (regression imputation). Specifically, the EIF–based estimator for $\theta_{1,0}$ employs not only $\hat{w}_2^{\text{EIF}}(M_i, X_i)$

but also $\widehat{w}_1^{\text{EIF}}(X_i) = 1/\widehat{\pi}_0(X_i)$, which also depends on the inverse of the estimated propensity score.¹

Both the IPW estimator and the EIF-based estimator rely on the weights based on the inverse of the estimated propensity scores and are therefore susceptible to two key issues noted in previous studies: (i) *instability* and (ii) *finite-sample covariate imbalance* (Hirshberg and Zubizarreta (2017); Chattopadhyay et al. (2020); Ben-Michael et al. (2021); Cohn et al. (2023)).

(i) *Instability.* The weights $\widehat{w}_1^{\text{EIF}}(X_i)$ and $\widehat{w}_2^{\text{EIF}}(M_i, X_i)$ can become highly unstable when the estimated propensity scores approach zero or one. Not only that, but standard propensity score estimation methods do *not* explicitly penalize the instability of these inverse weights. For example, consider an individual with a true propensity score of 0.05, which corresponds to an inverse weight of 20. If the estimated propensity score is 0.09, then its inverse is approximately 11. However, if the estimate is 0.01, its inverse rises to 100, and there is no penalty for this type of explosion in the weights.² In a causal mediation setting, this issue becomes particularly severe because, as seen in the estimator (1), the denominator involves a product of inverse probability terms. Therefore, it is necessary to develop an algorithm that directly penalizes the dispersion of the weights.

(ii) *Finite-sample covariate imbalance.* The weights $\widehat{w}_1^{\text{EIF}}(X_i)$ and $\widehat{w}_2^{\text{EIF}}(M_i, X_i)$ asymptotically balance the distributions of covariates and mediators (we will see this in Proposition 3.2, Section 3). However, this property does not necessarily hold in finite samples. Specifically, for certain functions $f(M_i, X_i)$ and $g(X_i)$, we may observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n D_i \widehat{w}_2^{\text{EIF}}(M_i, X_i) f(M_i, X_i) &\neq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (1 - D_i) \widehat{w}_1^{\text{EIF}}(X_i) f(M_i, X_i), \\ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (1 - D_i) \widehat{w}_1^{\text{EIF}}(X_i) g(X_i) &\neq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n g(X_i). \end{aligned}$$

As we will show in Section 3, if $f(M_i, X_i)$ and $g(X_i)$ are important predictors of the outcome, then such imbalances in finite samples lead to finite-sample bias. Therefore, it is necessary to develop an algorithm that explicitly enforces covariate and mediator balance in finite samples.³

To directly address these two concerns, we propose alternative weighting methods by extending balancing weights to causal mediation analysis. In particular, we build on the “minimal-dispersion approximate balancing weights” (hereafter, minimal weights) of Wang

¹The subscripts 1 and 2 in $\widehat{w}_1^{\text{EIF}}(X_i)$ and $\widehat{w}_2^{\text{EIF}}(M_i, X_i)$ correspond to the discussion of the proposed two-step algorithm in Section 4.

²This example is taken from Ben-Michael et al. (2021).

³Although it is possible to assess balance after weight estimation and re-estimate if needed, such an ad hoc iterative procedure can invalidate subsequent inference.

and Zubizarreta (2019), as this framework encompasses several existing methods as special cases, including entropy balancing (Hainmueller 2012), stable balancing weights (Zubizarreta 2015), and empirical balancing calibration weights (Chan et al. 2016b). The method’s name describes the two simultaneous objectives of the underlying optimization problem: “minimal dispersion”, i.e. minimizing a measure of weight dispersion such as a squared loss or an entropy-based loss, and “approximate balancing”, i.e. enforcing covariate balance up to pre-specified tolerances. In this way, the method addresses both of the issues discussed above—(i) *instability* and (ii) *finite-sample covariate imbalance*. At the same time, it removes the need for ad hoc post-estimation covariate balance diagnostics or trimming of extreme weights, both of which are commonly applied in practice.

We propose a “two-step minimal-dispersion approximate balancing weights” method (hereafter, two-step minimal weights) for causal mediation. The name “two-step” reflects our strategy to first balance the marginal distribution of the covariates, and then the joint distribution of the covariates and the mediator. This sequential approach is motivated by our analysis in Section 3, which reveals that imbalances in these specific distributions generate the bias. While a similar decomposition of the bias source has been recently discussed by Liu and Ghassami (2024), our study leverages this insight to construct the different weighting algorithm. For clarity, we denote the resulting two-step minimal weights by $\hat{w}_1^{\text{MW}}(X_i)$ and $\hat{w}_2^{\text{MW}}(M_i, X_i)$.

As a theoretical contribution, we establish the consistency of the weights $\hat{w}_1^{\text{MW}}(X_i)$ and $\hat{w}_2^{\text{MW}}(M_i, X_i)$ and the asymptotic normality and semiparametric efficiency of the resulting estimators: IPW estimator and EIF-based estimator with weights $\hat{w}_1^{\text{MW}}(X_i)$ and $\hat{w}_2^{\text{MW}}(M_i, X_i)$. Firstly, by considering a nonparametric setting in which the number of balancing constraints increases with the sample size, we show that the optimization-based weights $\hat{w}_1^{\text{MW}}(X_i)$ and $\hat{w}_2^{\text{MW}}(M_i, X_i)$ converge, respectively, to $\xi_0(M_i, X_i)/\pi_0(X_i)\xi_1(M_i, X_i)$ and $1/\pi_0(X_i)$. The proof of this result relies on the dual formulation and is derived under standard M-estimation assumptions. We also impose conditions that are standard in sieve estimation (see, e.g., Newey (1997); Chen (2007)), and our asymptotic arguments parallel those in the balancing-weight literature (e.g., Wang and Zubizarreta (2019); Fan et al. (2023)). Secondly, under additional assumptions such as the complexity of the function class, we establish that the estimators are asymptotically normally distributed with variance achieving the semiparametric efficiency bound. These results imply that, under the stated conditions, the proposed estimators are asymptotically equivalent to those based on $\hat{w}_1^{\text{EIF}}(X_i)$ and $\hat{w}_2^{\text{EIF}}(M_i, X_i)$. We therefore conclude that the proposed method enhances finite-sample performance while preserving its desirable asymptotic properties.

The proofs of these asymptotic properties are provided in the Appendix. While we employ techniques similar to those in Wang and Zubizarreta (2019) for the ATE, extending them to causal mediation analysis is non-trivial. Specifically, a key challenge lies in controlling the influence of the first-step weight estimation on the second step. We address this issue by

exploiting the structure of the efficient influence function, building on insights from recent work such as Farbmacher et al. (2022).

To evaluate the finite-sample performance of our method, we conduct extensive simulations based on two settings from Tchetgen Tchetgen and Shpitser (2012) and Wong and Chan (2018), under both (A) correct specification and (B) misspecification. We compare our approach with three baseline estimators: the IPW estimator, the EIF-based estimator, and the regression imputation estimator. A concise summary of the simulation results is reported in Table 1. Overall, the method performs as well as or better than the baseline estimators. In addition, we implement other competing weighting schemes, including covariate balancing propensity scores (CBPS)⁴ and an oracle variant based on the true propensity scores. The proposed method further outperforms these alternatives, confirming its broad advantages.

Simulation Setting	Estimation Methods		
	Proposed Method	EIF/IPW	Regression
Tchetgen Tchetgen & Shpitser (A)	○	○	○
Tchetgen Tchetgen & Shpitser (B)	○	✗	○
Wong & Chan (A)	○	○	✗
Wong & Chan (B)	○	✗	○

TABLE 1. Performance summary across simulation settings. ○ = good, ✗ = poor.

We illustrate the practical value of our approach using the media-framing data of Brader et al. (2008). To focus squarely on the role of weighting quality, we consider two generic estimators: an IPW-type estimator obtained by plugging arbitrary weights into estimator (1), and an EIF-type estimator defined as its augmented counterpart with outcome regression. In particular, we show that using our proposed minimal weights can reduce standard errors in both the EIF-type and IPW-type estimators, thereby providing clearer results.

1.1. Related literature. This paper contributes to both the literature on causal mediation analysis and the literature on balancing weights. The key references we build upon for the estimation of the NDE and NIE are Tchetgen Tchetgen and Shpitser (2012) and Huber (2014). For a review of estimators, including weighting estimators and regression estimators, see Nguyen et al. (2023). While Nguyen et al. (2023) discusses the general idea of achieving balance between covariates and the mediator, it does not explore concrete balancing-weight algorithms or their theoretical properties, which are the focus of the present paper.

While the literature on balancing weights is extensive for the ATE (Hainmueller 2012; Zubizarreta 2015; Chan et al. 2016b; Hirshberg and Zubizarreta 2017; Chattopadhyay et al.

⁴The CBPS method was originally proposed by Imai and Ratkovic (2014). Its extension to causal mediation analysis is provided in Appendix A.1 of this paper.

2020; Ben-Michael et al. 2021; Cohn et al. 2023), its extension to causal mediation analysis remains limited. Although several optimization-based weighting approaches have been proposed recently, our method remains distinct. For instance, Huang et al. (2024), building on Ai et al. (2021), proposed estimating nonparametric propensity scores by minimizing entropy loss. However, their approach does not explicitly address the issue of (ii) *finite-sample covariate imbalance*. Liu and Ghassami (2024) introduced a minimax estimation framework following Dikkala et al. (2020) that accounts for covariate imbalance, but their algorithmic approach differs fundamentally from ours. Our method is specifically designed to simultaneously tackle two key issues: (i) *instability* and (ii) *finite-sample covariate imbalance*. In this regard, the work most closely related to ours is Chan et al. (2016a), which also seeks to determine weights by minimizing a distance measure. However, our algorithm diverges by incorporating approximate balancing constraints to explicitly optimize the bias–variance trade-off. Furthermore, we establish our asymptotic properties under weaker assumptions than those required in Chan et al. (2016a).

1.2. Outline. The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. Section 2 introduces the basic setup and the identification of the key estimands. Section 3 presents the EIF-based and IPW estimators and provides a formal bias-decomposition analysis. Section 4 proposes the two-step minimal-weights algorithm. Section 5 establishes the asymptotic properties of the proposed estimators. Section 6 presents the results of simulation studies. Section 7 then reports an empirical application. Finally, Section 8 concludes the paper and outlines directions for future research. Implementation notes and proofs of the main theorems are provided in the Appendix.

2. CAUSAL MEDIATION ANALYSIS: SETUP AND IDENTIFICATION

This section introduced notations and assumptions for identification. We state the standard consistency, sequential ignorability, and positivity assumptions, and present identification formulas for $\theta_{d,1-d}$ and θ_d .

To facilitate the subsequent discussion, we introduce the following notations.

- $f_{Y|M,D,X}(y)$, $f_{M|D,X}(m)$, and $f_X(x)$ denote the (conditional) densities of the outcome, mediator, and covariates, respectively.
- **Conditional outcome expectation (m):** The function $m_d(X) := \mathbb{E}[Y \mid D = d, X]$ denotes the conditional mean of the outcome under treatment status d given covariates X .
- **Conditional outcome expectation with mediator (μ):** The function $\mu_d(M, X) := \mathbb{E}[Y \mid M, D = d, X]$ denotes the conditional mean of the outcome under treatment status d given the mediator, treatment, and covariates.
- **Counterfactual outcome expectation (η):** The function $\eta_{d,1-d}(X) := \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[Y \mid M, D = d, X] \mid D = 1 - d, X] = \int_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \mu_d(m, X) f_{M|D=1-d,X}(m) dm$ denotes the expected value

of the outcome under treatment status d and the mediator distribution that would occur under the opposite treatment status $1 - d$.

- **Propensity score (π):** The function $\pi_d(X) := P(D = d|X)$ denotes the conditional probability of receiving the treatment d given the covariates.
- **Propensity score given mediator (ξ):** The function $\xi_d(M, X) := P(D = d|M, X)$ denotes the conditional probability of receiving the treatment d given both the mediator and the covariates.

$\theta_{d,1-d}$ and θ_d for $d \in \{0, 1\}$ are identified by the following theorem.

Theorem 2.1. *If all of these conditions hold:*

- (1) **Consistency:** *If $D = d$ then $M_d = M$ (w.p.1), and if $D = d$ and $M = m$, then $Y_{dm} = Y$ (w.p.1).*
- (2) **Sequential ignorability:** *For each $d \in \{0, 1\}$ and $m \in \mathcal{M}$,*
 $Y_{dm} \perp\!\!\!\perp D \mid X, \quad M_d \perp\!\!\!\perp D \mid X, \quad Y_{dm} \perp\!\!\!\perp M \mid D = d, X, \text{ and } Y_{dm} \perp\!\!\!\perp M_{1-d} \mid X.$
- (3) **Positivity:**
 $0 < f_{M|D,X}(m) < 1$ for each $m \in \mathcal{M}$, and $0 < \pi_d(X) < 1$ for each $d \in \{0, 1\}$.

Then, $\theta_{d,1-d}$ and θ_d are identified as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \theta_{d,1-d} &= \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{(dD + (1-d)(1-D))\xi_{1-d}(M, X)}{\pi_{1-d}(X)\xi_d(M, X)} (Y - \mu_d(M, X)) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{(1-d)D + d(1-D)}{\pi_{1-d}(X)} (\mu_d(M, X) - \eta_{d,1-d}(X)) + \eta_{d,1-d}(X) \right] \\ \theta_d &= \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{(dD + (1-d)(1-D))}{\pi_d(X)} (Y - m_d(X)) + m_d(X) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

For the proof of Theorem 2.1, see Tchetgen Tchetgen and Shpitser (2012). The identification can be established through several complementary results:

$$\begin{aligned} \theta_{d,1-d} &= \mathbb{E}[\eta_{d,1-d}(X)], \\ \theta_{d,1-d} &= \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{(1-d)D + d(1-D)}{\pi_{1-d}(X)} \mu_d(M, X) \right], \\ \theta_{d,1-d} &= \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{(dD + (1-d)(1-D))\xi_{1-d}(M, X)}{\pi_{1-d}(X)\xi_d(M, X)} Y \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Theorem 2.1 can be viewed as a combination of these results. Intuitively, identification can be achieved either through weighting alone or through outcome expectations alone, while their combination naturally yields an alternative representation. Indeed, the expression

$$\frac{(dD + (1-d)(1-D))\xi_{1-d}(M, X)}{\pi_{1-d}(X)\xi_d(M, X)} (Y - \mu_d(M, X))$$

$$+ \frac{(1-d)D + d(1-D)}{\pi_{1-d}(X)} (\mu_d(M, X) - \eta_{d,1-d}(X)) + \eta_{d,1-d}(X)$$

constitutes an efficient influence function for $\theta_{d,1-d}$. The derivation of the efficient influence function for $\mathbb{E}[Y_{dM_{1-d}}]$ can be found in Tchetgen Tchetgen and Shpitser (2012).⁵ The estimator based on this representation is therefore referred to as the EIF-based estimator.

We now provide a more detailed explanation of the assumptions for identification. Consistency assumes that the observed mediator and outcome are equal to the potential mediator and outcome under the observed treatment and mediator assignments. The sequential ignorability assumption consists of the following four conditional independences. First, $Y_{dm} \perp\!\!\!\perp D \mid X$, which ensures that the effect of treatment D on the outcome Y is unconfounded given X . Second, $M_d \perp\!\!\!\perp D \mid X$, implying that the effect of treatment D on the mediator M is unconfounded given X . Third, $Y_{dm} \perp\!\!\!\perp M \mid D = d, X$, which states that the effect of the mediator M on the outcome is unconfounded given X . Finally, the so-called cross-world independence assumption $Y_{dm} \perp\!\!\!\perp M_{1-d} \mid X$ is crucial. It ensures the absence of confounding between the mediator and the outcome that is induced by the treatment. Such a confounder, often called a treatment-induced confounder (denoted by L in Figure 2), is a variable affected by D that subsequently affects both M and Y . For further details on the sequential ignorability assumptions, see, for example, Pearl (2001); Imai et al. (2010b); VanderWeele et al. (2014). Positivity assumption requires that each treatment and mediator level has a nonzero probability for every given value of the covariates.




FIGURE 2. Confounders of concern in causal mediation analysis. Dashed arrows represent unobserved confounding by (U_1, U_2, U_3) . The confounder L , depicted with thick arrows, is induced by treatment and confounds both M and Y .

⁵In fact, the estimator in (3) is an alternative expression of that in Tchetgen Tchetgen and Shpitser (2012), where the original form is given by

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{D_i \hat{f}_{M_i|D_i=0, X_i}}{\hat{\pi}_1(X_i) \hat{f}_{M_i|D_i=1, X_i}} (Y_i - \hat{\mu}_1(M_i, X_i)) + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1 - D_i}{\hat{\pi}_0(X_i)} (\hat{\mu}_1(M_i, X_i) - \hat{\eta}_{1,0}(X_i)) + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \hat{\eta}_{1,0}(X_i). \quad (2)$$

In this work, we adopt expression (3) to avoid estimating the mediator's density and to facilitate the discussion of the covariate balancing propensity score method in Appendix A.1. The estimator (3) is derived by a straightforward application of Bayes' rule to (2) and thus retains the properties described in Tchetgen Tchetgen and Shpitser (2012).

3. WEIGHTING ESTIMATORS AND THEIR FINITE-SAMPLE BIAS

We now proceed from identification to estimation. Estimating the NDE and NIE requires estimating the quantity $\mathbb{E}[Y_{dM_1-d}]$. This estimand is unique to causal mediation because it relies on the potential outcome under two treatment statuses. For notational simplicity, we will henceforth focus on estimating $\theta_{1,0} := \mathbb{E}[Y_{1M_0}]$.⁶

This section treats the two canonical weighting estimators for $\theta_{1,0}$: the EIF-based estimator and the IPW estimator introduced in Section 1. In addition, we introduce the IPW-type estimator and the EIF-type estimator, which replace the weights based on the inverse of the estimated propensity scores with a set of general weights. For both the EIF-type and IPW-type estimators, we provide a finite-sample bias decomposition. This decomposition formally demonstrates the importance of addressing (ii) finite-sample covariate imbalance, one of the two concerns highlighted in Section 1, alongside (i) instability.

3.1. Efficient influence function-based estimator. The EIF-based estimator is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\theta}_{1,0}^{\text{EIF}} = & \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n D_i \hat{w}_2^{\text{EIF}}(M_i, X_i) \left(Y_i - \hat{\mu}_1(M_i, X_i) \right) \\ & + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (1 - D_i) \hat{w}_1^{\text{EIF}}(X_i) \left(\hat{\mu}_1(M_i, X_i) - \hat{\eta}_{1,0}(X_i) \right) + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \hat{\eta}_{1,0}(X_i), \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

where

$$\hat{w}_2^{\text{EIF}}(M_i, X_i) = \frac{\hat{\xi}_0(M_i, X_i)}{\hat{\pi}_0(X_i) \hat{\xi}_1(M_i, X_i)} \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{w}_1^{\text{EIF}}(X_i) = \frac{1}{\hat{\pi}_0(X_i)}. \quad (4)$$

We denote $\hat{\pi}_0(X_i)$, $\hat{\xi}_d(M_i, X_i)$, $\hat{\mu}_1(M_i, X_i)$, and $\hat{\eta}_{1,0}(X_i)$ as estimators of $\pi_0(X_i)$, $\xi_d(M_i, X_i)$ for $d \in \{0, 1\}$, $\mu_1(M_i, X_i)$, and $\eta_{1,0}(X_i)$, respectively.

One of the key properties of the EIF-based estimator is a semiparametric efficiency.

Theorem 3.1 (Semiparametric efficiency, Tchetgen Tchetgen and Shpitser (2012)). *If all nuisance parameters are correctly specified, then the EIF-based estimator $\hat{\theta}_{1,0}^{\text{EIF}}$ achieves the semiparametric efficiency bound.*

For the proof, see Tchetgen Tchetgen and Shpitser (2012). In Section 5, we show that our proposed estimator also attains this semiparametric efficiency bound under certain regularity conditions⁷.

⁶All the following analysis applies similarly to $\theta_{0,1} := \mathbb{E}[Y_{0M_1}]$.

⁷Another key property of the EIF-based estimator is its multiple robustness.

If one of the following conditions hold:

- (a) Both $\hat{\pi}_0(X_i)$ and $\hat{\xi}_1(M_i, X_i)$ are consistent;
- (b) Both $\hat{\pi}_0(X_i)$ and $\hat{\mu}_1(M_i, X_i)$ are consistent;
- (c) Both $\hat{\mu}_1(M_i, X_i)$ and $\hat{\eta}_{1,0}(X_i)$ are consistent;

then the estimator $\hat{\theta}_{1,0}^{\text{EIF}}$ is consistent.

3.2. EIF-type estimator and its finite-sample bias. Although the EIF-based estimator is multiple robust and semiparametrically efficient, its reliance on the inverse of propensity scores leads to the aforementioned issues of instability and covariate imbalance. To formally investigate the latter, we consider a general EIF-type weighting estimator, which replaces the specific EIF weights $\hat{w}_2^{\text{EIF}}(M_i, X_i)$ and $\hat{w}_1^{\text{EIF}}(X_i)$ with generic weights $\hat{w}_2(M_i, X_i)$ and $\hat{w}_1(X_i)$:

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\theta}_{1,0}^{\text{EIF-type}} &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n D_i \hat{w}_2(M_i, X_i) \left(Y_i - \hat{\mu}_1(M_i, X_i) \right) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (1 - D_i) \hat{w}_1(X_i) \left(\hat{\mu}_1(M_i, X_i) - \hat{\eta}_{1,0}(X_i) \right) + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \hat{\eta}_{1,0}(X_i). \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

Decomposing the bias of this estimator requires defining two sets of terms. First, we define the estimation errors in the nuisance functions as

$$\tilde{\mu}_1(M_i, X_i) := \mu_1(M_i, X_i) - \hat{\mu}_1(M_i, X_i), \quad \tilde{\eta}_{1,0}(X_i) := \eta_{1,0}(X_i) - \hat{\eta}_{1,0}(X_i).$$

Second, we define the random errors as

$$u_i := Y_i - \mu_1(M_i, X_i), \quad v_i := \mu_1(M_i, X_i) - \eta_{1,0}(X_i).$$

With these components defined, we can formally state the sources of the estimator's bias in the following proposition.

Proposition 3.1 (The bias of the EIF-type weighting estimator in finite samples). *For the EIF-type weighting estimator (5), the bias in finite samples is given by*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[\hat{\theta}_{1,0}^{\text{EIF-type}} - \theta_{1,0} \right] &= \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n D_i \hat{w}_2(M_i, X_i) \tilde{\mu}_1(M_i, X_i) - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (1 - D_i) \hat{w}_1(X_i) \tilde{\mu}_1(M_i, X_i) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (1 - D_i) \hat{w}_1(X_i) \tilde{\eta}_{1,0}(X_i) - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \tilde{\eta}_{1,0}(X_i) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

We prove Proposition 3.1. First, the difference between the EIF-type weighting estimator and the target parameter can be decomposed as:

$$\hat{\theta}_{1,0}^{\text{EIF-type}} - \theta_{1,0} = \underbrace{\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n D_i \hat{w}_2(M_i, X_i) \tilde{\mu}_1(M_i, X_i) - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (1 - D_i) \hat{w}_1(X_i) \tilde{\mu}_1(M_i, X_i)}_{\text{Imbalance in } \tilde{\mu}_1(M_i, X_i)}$$

This result implies that the estimator remains consistent even when some nuisance parameters are misspecified. Although multiple robustness is not the main focus of this paper, we can show, similar to Tchetgen Tchetgen and Shpitser (2012), that when the balancing constraints for the weights are correctly specified, the estimator remains consistent even if the outcome models are misspecified. In fact, in Section 6, we confirm this consistency under outcome model misspecification.

$$\begin{aligned}
& + \underbrace{\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (1 - D_i) \widehat{w}_1(X_i) \widetilde{\eta}_{1,0}(X_i) - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \widetilde{\eta}_{1,0}(X_i)}_{\text{Imbalance in } \widetilde{\eta}_{1,0}(X_i)} \\
& + \underbrace{\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n D_i \widehat{w}_2(M_i, X_i) u_i}_{\text{Noise 1}} + \underbrace{\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (1 - D_i) \widehat{w}_1(X_i) v_i}_{\text{Noise 2}} + \underbrace{\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \eta_{1,0}(X_i) - \theta_{1,0}}_{\text{Sampling Variation}}.
\end{aligned}$$

The first two terms reflect imbalances in $\widetilde{\mu}_1(M_i, X_i)$ and $\widetilde{\eta}_{1,0}(X_i)$. Imbalance in $\widetilde{\mu}_1(M_i, X_i)$ arises when the weights $\widehat{w}_2(M_i, X_i)$ do not balance the distributions of the mediator and covariates between the treatment group and the control group weighted by $\widehat{w}_1(X_i)$. Similarly, imbalance in $\widetilde{\eta}_{1,0}(X_i)$ arises when the weights $\widehat{w}_1(X_i)$ fail to balance the covariate distributions between the control group and the full sample. The third and fourth terms capture the errors u_i and v_i , while the last term represents the sampling variation of $\eta_{1,0}(X_i)$.

Next, by taking expectations on both sides, we show that the last three terms are equal to 0. First, note that $\mathbb{E}[\eta_{1,0}(X)] = \theta_{1,0}$. For the first noise term, using the law of total expectation, we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[D \widehat{w}_2(M, X) u] &= \mathbb{E}[\widehat{w}_2(M, X) \mathbb{E}[Du | M, X]] \\
&= \mathbb{E}[\widehat{w}_2(M, X) \mathbb{E}[Y - \mathbb{E}[Y | M, D = 1, X] | M, D = 1, X] P(D = 1 | M, X)] \\
&= 0.
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, for the second noise term,

$$\mathbb{E}[(1 - D) \widehat{w}_1(X) v] = \mathbb{E}[\widehat{w}_1(X) \mathbb{E}[(1 - D) \varepsilon' | X]] = 0.$$

This completes the proof of Proposition 3.1. The key insight from this decomposition is that the finite-sample bias stems solely from imbalances in the estimation errors, $\widetilde{\mu}_1(M, X)$ and $\widetilde{\eta}_{1,0}(X)$. Our proposed weighting scheme is therefore designed to directly target this source of bias.

Furthermore, this bias decomposition sheds light on another property of the EIF-based estimator (3): it is asymptotically unbiased due to its population covariate balance.

Proposition 3.2 (Population covariate balance of EIF weights (4)). *Let $f(M, X)$ and $g(X)$ be any bounded functions. We denote $w_1^*(X) = 1/\pi_0(X)$ and $w_2^*(M, X) = \xi_0(M, X)/\pi_0(X)\xi_1(M, X)$. Then,*

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[D w_2^*(M, X) f(M, X)] &= \mathbb{E}[(1 - D) w_1^*(X) f(M, X)], \\
\mathbb{E}[(1 - D) w_1^*(X) g(X)] &= \mathbb{E}[g(X)].
\end{aligned}$$

The proof is deferred to Appendix B. Proposition 3.2 shows that the moment equalities hold for arbitrary measurable functions $f(M, X)$ and $g(X)$. Consequently, as long as

$\xi_d(M, X)$ and $\pi_d(X)$ are consistently estimated, the EIF-based estimator (3) remains asymptotically unbiased, regardless of the specification of $\tilde{\mu}(M, X)$ and $\tilde{\eta}(X)$. However, the EIF weights $\hat{w}_1^{\text{EIF}}(X_i)$ and $\hat{w}_2^{\text{EIF}}(M_i, X_i)$ are not constructed to ensure finite-sample covariate balance, which introduces bias as Proposition 3.1 implies.

3.3. IPW-type estimator and its finite-sample bias. To complement the EIF-type estimator, which leverages an outcome model, we introduce an alternative that relies exclusively on weights to estimate the NDE and NIE. This estimator is particularly useful for isolating and evaluating the performance of the weighting scheme itself. We define this estimator here and show that its finite-sample bias can be decomposed in a manner analogous to that of the EIF-type estimator. The IPW-type estimator is defined as:

$$\hat{\theta}_{1,0}^{\text{IPW-type}} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n D_i \hat{w}_2(M_i, X_i) Y_i.$$

Following a similar process as in the proof of Proposition 3.1, the IPW-type estimator has the following bias decomposition.

Proposition 3.3 (The bias of the IPW-type weighting estimator in finite samples). *For the IPW-type weighting estimator, the bias in finite samples is given by*

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\hat{\theta}_{1,0}^{\text{IPW-type}} - \theta_{1,0} \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n D_i \hat{w}_2(M_i, X_i) \mu_1(M_i, X_i) - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (1 - D_i) \hat{w}_1(X_i) \mu_1(M_i, X_i) \right. \quad (6)$$

$$\left. + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (1 - D_i) \hat{w}_1(X_i) \eta_{1,0}(X_i) - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \eta_{1,0}(X_i) \right]. \quad (7)$$

The difference between this bias decomposition and that of the EIF-type estimator (Proposition 3.1) is that the bias of the IPW-type estimator stems from the imbalance of the true $\mu_1(M_i, X_i)$ and $\eta_{1,0}(X_i)$, rather than its estimation error $\tilde{\mu}_1(M_i, X_i)$ and $\tilde{\eta}_{1,0}(X_i)$.

Therefore, for both the IPW-type and EIF-type estimators, it is crucial that the weights balance mediators and covariates, such as those included in the specifications of $\mu_1(M_i, X_i)$ and $\eta_{1,0}(X_i)$.

4. PROPOSED METHOD: TWO-STEP MINIMAL WEIGHTS

To address the issues of (i) instability and (ii) finite-sample covariate balance in weighting estimators discussed previously, this section introduces an optimization-based approach. Applying the “minimal weight” method (Wang and Zubizarreta 2019) to causal mediation analysis requires an adaptation to account for the two distinct sources of bias identified in Section 3. To this end, we propose the “two-step minimal weights” method. This algorithm constructs weights by solving an optimization problem, specifically designed to sequentially correct the two types of imbalances inherent in causal mediation analysis.

In what follows, we first formally present the two-step algorithm. We then introduce a data-driven procedure for tuning its key tolerance hyperparameters which govern the trade-off between bias and variance.

4.1. Two-step minimal weights. We propose the following two-step algorithm to derive weights for the weighting estimators of $\theta_{1,0}$.

Algorithm 4.1 (Two-step minimal weights). We define the weights derived by the following two-step optimization as “two-step minimal weights”. Here, $f(w)$ denotes a weight function specified by the researcher, subject to the condition that $f''(w) > 0$.

Step 1 Obtain $\{\hat{w}_1^{\text{MW}}(X_i)\}_{i=1}^n$ by solving the constrained optimization problem:

$$\min_{\{w_{1,i}\}_{i=1}^n} \sum_{i=1}^n (1 - D_i) f(w_{1i}), \quad (8)$$

$$\text{subject to } \left| \sum_{i=1}^n (1 - D_i) w_{1i} c_j(X_i) - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n c_j(X_i) \right| \leq \varepsilon_j, \quad j = 1, \dots, K, \quad (9)$$

where $\{c_j(X_i)\}_{j=1}^K$ are smooth basis functions of the covariates.

Step 2 Using the weights $\{\hat{w}_1^{\text{MW}}(X_i)\}_{i=1}^n$ from Step 1, obtain $\{\hat{w}_2^{\text{MW}}(X_i, M_i)\}_{i=1}^n$ by solving:

$$\min_{\{w_{2,i}\}_{i=1}^n} \sum_{i=1}^n D_i f(w_{2i}), \quad (10)$$

$$\text{subject to } \left| \sum_{i=1}^n D_i w_{2i} b_j(X_i, M_i) - \sum_{i=1}^n (1 - D_i) \hat{w}_1^{\text{MW}}(X_i) b_j(M_i, X_i) \right| \leq \delta_j, \quad j = 1, \dots, L, \quad (11)$$

where $\{b_j(X_i, M_i)\}_{j=1}^L$ are smooth basis functions of the covariates and mediator.

To provide an overview, Algorithm 4.1 is tailored to causal mediation by coupling a mediation-aware balance design with an explicit stabilization mechanism. It adopts a sequential scheme that first balances X in Step 1 (control versus full sample) and then balances (M, X) in Step 2 (treated versus reweighted control), reflecting the two imbalances that arise in our bias decomposition in Proposition 3.1 and Proposition 3.3. Each step minimizes a convex dispersion penalty $f(\cdot)$ subject to approximate balance constraints governed by tolerances $\{\varepsilon_j\}_{j=1}^K$ and $\{\delta_j\}_{j=1}^L$.

To begin, we discuss the choice of the loss function. Typical choices for f include entropy balancing ($f(w) = w \log w$) and stable balancing weights ($f(w) = (w - 1/n_0)^2$, with n_0 the number of controls), both of which tame the dispersion of inverse-propensity-type weights while preserving the targeted balance moments.

Next, we turn to the balancing constraints. In Step 1, the constraints are applied to the target functions $\{c_j(X)\}_{j=1}^K$, reflecting the assumption that $\eta_{1,0}(X)$ (or its estimation error

$\tilde{\eta}_{1,0}(X)$) can be well approximated by a linear combination of these bases. Setting $\varepsilon_j = 0$ corresponds to an exact sample balance.

In practice, to normalize the weights, one may add $c_{K+1}(X_i) = 1$ with $\varepsilon_{K+1} = 0$. The non-negativity condition of the weights is typically achieved either by directly including it as a constraint or by an appropriate choice of loss function, which we explain when presenting Theorem 5.1 that derives the dual form of the Algorithm 4.1. Step 2 applies the same procedure to $\{b_j(M, X)\}_{j=1}^L$, aligning the treated group with the reweighted control group on the joint (M, X) distribution.

Finally, the choice of hyperparameters $\{\varepsilon_j\}_{j=1}^K$ and $\{\delta_j\}_{j=1}^L$ which determine the bias–variance trade-off, is discussed in the next subsection.

Then, we can construct the EIF-type weighting estimator and IPW-type weighting estimator with normalized two-step minimal weights:

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{\theta}_{1,0}^{\text{EIF-MW}} &= \sum_{i=1}^n D_i \hat{w}_2^{\text{MW}}(M_i, X_i) \left(Y_i - \hat{\mu}_1(M_i, X_i) \right) \\ &\quad + \sum_{i=1}^n (1 - D_i) \hat{w}_1^{\text{MW}}(X_i) \left(\hat{\mu}_1(M_i, X_i) - \hat{\eta}_{1,0}(X_i) \right) + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \hat{\eta}_{1,0}(X_i) \\ \hat{\theta}_{1,0}^{\text{IPW-MW}} &= \sum_{i=1}^n D_i \hat{w}_2^{\text{MW}}(M_i, X_i) Y_i.\end{aligned}$$

The properties of these estimators are examined in Section 5. In our subsequent simulation and empirical application sections, we will employ both estimators to evaluate the properties of the proposed weights.

Remark 4.1. An extension to the case of multiple mediators is straightforward by including all mediators in the second step of our procedure, but the interpretation requires caution. For instance, suppose there are two mediators, M_{I} and M_{II} . Without additional assumptions, it is not possible to separately identify the pathways $D \rightarrow M_{\text{I}} \rightarrow Y$, $D \rightarrow M_{\text{II}} \rightarrow Y$, and $D \rightarrow M_{\text{I}} \rightarrow M_{\text{II}} \rightarrow Y$. Under the current identification assumptions and estimation strategy, we can identify and estimate only the NIE through the joint mediators, $D \rightarrow \{M_{\text{I}}, M_{\text{II}}\} \rightarrow Y$, along with its corresponding NDE. In the empirical application presented in Section 7, we estimate the NDE and NIE considering joint mediators. Extending balancing methods to path-specific effects (see Miles et al. (2020)) is left for future research.

4.2. Hyperparameter tuning for tolerances. One of the key features of our proposed method is the use of tolerances $\{\varepsilon_j\}_{j=1}^K$ and $\{\delta_j\}_{j=1}^L$, which allow for approximate rather than exact covariate balance. Since the weights are constructed without using outcome data, standard cross-validation is not applicable. Therefore, we adapt the procedure from Wang and Zubizarreta (2019), which selects the tolerances by evaluating the stability of covariate balance across bootstrap samples, as detailed in Algorithm 4.2.

Algorithm 4.2. Let $\mathcal{E} \subset [0, (nK)^{-1/2}]$ denote a finite grid of candidate values for $\{\varepsilon_j\}_{j=1}^K$ and let $\mathcal{D} \subset [0, (nL)^{-1/2}]$ denote a finite grid of candidate values for $\{\delta_j\}_{j=1}^L$. These grids are based on Assumption 5.1 and Assumption C.1.

Step 1: For each $\varepsilon' \in \mathcal{E}$:

- (1) Apply the Step 1 of Algorithm 4.1 with tolerances $\varepsilon_j = \varepsilon'$ for $j = 1, \dots, K$ to obtain the weights $\{\hat{w}_1(X_i)\}_{i=1}^n$ and normalize them.
- (2) For $r = 1, \dots, R$, draw a bootstrap sample S_r (with replacement) from the original data and compute the covariate balance criterion

$$C_r := \sum_{j=1}^K \left\| \left(\sum_{i \in S_r} \hat{w}_1(X_i)(1 - D_i)c_j(X_i) - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n c_j(X_i) \right) / \text{sd}(c_j(X)) \right\|_2.$$

- (3) Compute the average imbalance $\bar{C}(\varepsilon') := \frac{1}{R} \sum_{r=1}^R C_r$.

Select the optimal imbalance level $\varepsilon^* := \arg \min_{\varepsilon' \in \mathcal{E}} \bar{C}(\varepsilon')$.

Step 2: For each $\delta' \in \mathcal{D}$:

- (1) Using the optimal weights $\{\hat{w}_1(X_i)\}_{i=1}^n$ obtained with ε^* , apply the Step 2 of Algorithm 4.1 with tolerances $\delta_j = \delta'$ for $j = 1, \dots, L$ to obtain the weights $\{\hat{w}_2(X_i, M_i)\}_{i=1}^n$ and normalize them.
- (2) For $r = 1, \dots, R$, draw a bootstrap sample S_r (with replacement) from the original data and compute the covariate balance criterion

$$B_r := \sum_{j=1}^L \left\| \left(\sum_{i \in S_r} \hat{w}_2(M_i, X_i) D_i b_j(M_i, X_i) - \sum_{i=1}^n \hat{w}_1(X_i)(1 - D_i) b_j(M_i, X_i) \right) / \text{sd}(b_j(M, X)) \right\|_2.$$

- (3) Compute the average imbalance $\bar{B}(\delta') := \frac{1}{R} \sum_{j=1}^R B_r$.

Select the optimal imbalance level $\delta^* := \arg \min_{\delta' \in \mathcal{D}} \bar{B}(\delta')$.

The core idea of this algorithm is to select the tolerances that yield the most stable covariate balance across multiple bootstrap resamples of the data. By averaging the imbalance measure over these resamples, the procedure aims to find hyperparameters that perform well not only on the original sample but also under bootstrap resampling.

However, there are a couple of downsides to this algorithm. First, the sequential optimization can sometimes get stuck in a local optimum. For example, even if the first stage selects an ε^* that provides good balance for the $\{c_k(X)\}_{k=1}^K$ basis functions, this does not necessarily ensure good balance for the $\{b_l(M, X)\}_{l=1}^L$ basis functions in the second stage. Second, the algorithm applies the same ε^* and δ^* to all basis functions. Ideally, we would prefer to balance covariates that are more strongly related to the outcome, but the fundamental difficulty is that doing so would make the weights outcome-dependent.

5. ASYMPTOTIC PROPERTIES OF THE TWO-STEP MINIMAL WEIGHTS

In this section, we establish the key asymptotic properties of our proposed two-step minimal weights. We begin by deriving the convergence rates of the weights. Building on this result, we then prove the main theoretical claim of the paper: that the proposed estimator is consistent, asymptotically normal, and attains the semiparametric efficiency bound. We note that both the EIF-type and IPW-type estimators exhibit the same asymptotic properties under nearly identical assumptions. Thus, we conclude that the proposed method improves finite-sample behavior without compromising asymptotic guarantees.

5.1. Convergence rates of the two-step minimal weights. First, we investigate the convergence rates of the two-step minimal weights derived in Algorithm 4.1. For the weights derived in the first step optimization problem (8) and (9), Theorem 2 of Wang and Zubizarreta (2019) directly yields the convergence rates. Specifically, it has been established that $n\hat{w}_1^{\text{MW}}(x)$ consistently estimates $1/\pi_0(x)$. For completeness, we describe the assumption and the result in the Appendix C. In parallel to their theorem, we obtain the following results for the weights derived in the second step optimization problem (10) and (11).

We begin by deriving the dual of the optimization problem.

Theorem 5.1. *The dual problem of (10) and (11) is the following unconstrained optimization problem:*

$$\min_{\lambda} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(D_i n \rho(B(M_i, X_i)^\top \lambda) - (1 - D_i) n \hat{w}_1^{\text{MW}}(X_i) B(M_i, X_i)^\top \lambda \right) + |\lambda|^\top \delta, \quad (12)$$

where $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_L)^\top$ is the vector of dual variables associated with the L balancing constraints $B(M_i, X_i) = (b_1(M_i, X_i), b_2(M_i, X_i), \dots, b_L(M_i, X_i))^\top$, $\delta = (\delta_1, \dots, \delta_L)^\top$ are tolerances, and $\rho(t) = (f')^{-1}(t)t - f((f')^{-1}(t))$. Moreover, the primal solution $\hat{w}_2^{\text{MW}}(M_i, X_i)$ satisfies

$$\hat{w}_2^{\text{MW}}(M_i, X_i) = \rho' \left(B(M_i, X_i)^\top \lambda^\dagger \right) \quad (i = 1, \dots, n),$$

where λ^\dagger is the solution to the dual optimization problem.

The proof is provided in Appendix D. First, note that problem (12) can be viewed as a shrinkage estimation problem. The weights are estimated by a generalized linear model on the basis functions $B(M_i, X_i)$ with link function ρ' . The dual variables in λ can be interpreted as the coefficients of the basis functions. From an optimization perspective, they represent the shadow prices of the covariate balance constraints: a larger dual variable indicates that balancing the associated covariate is more important or more difficult, and that relaxing the constraint would lead to a larger reduction in the objective function. The inclusion of an ℓ_1 penalty further mitigates the influence of covariates that are particularly hard to balance, thereby preventing the weights from becoming overly dependent on them. In addition, this formulation helps ensure the nonnegativity of the weights. For example, if

we set $f(w) = w \log w$, then $\rho'(t) = \exp(t - 1)$, which guarantees that the resulting weights are nonnegative.

By utilizing Theorem 5.1, we establish the convergence rates of the weights. To this end, the following conditions are assumed.

Assumption 5.1. *The following conditions hold:*

(i) *The minimizer*

$$\lambda^\circ = \arg \min_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \mathbb{E} \left[Dn\rho(B(M, X)^\top \lambda) - (1 - D)n\widehat{w}_1^{MW}(X)B(M, X)^\top \lambda \right]$$

is unique, where Λ is the compact parameter space for λ . $\lambda^\circ \in \text{int}(\Lambda)$, where $\text{int}(\cdot)$ stands for the interior of a set;

(ii) *There exists a constant $0 < c_0 < 1/2$ such that*

$$c_0 \leq n\rho'(v) \leq 1 - c_0$$

for any $v = B(M, X)^\top \lambda$ with $\lambda \in \text{int}(\Lambda)$; also, there exist constants $0 < c_1 < c_2$ such that

$$0 < c_1 \leq n\rho''(v) \leq c_2$$

for any $v = B(M, X)^\top \lambda$ with $\lambda \in \text{int}(\Lambda)$;

(iii) *There exist constants $c > 0$ and $C < \infty$ such that*

$$\sup_{(m, x) \in \mathcal{M} \times \mathcal{X}} \|B(m, x)\|_2 \leq CL^{1/2}, \quad \|B(M, X)\|_{P, 2} \leq CL^{1/2},$$

and

$$c \leq \lambda_{\min}(\mathbb{E}[B(M, X)B(M, X)^\top]) \leq \lambda_{\max}(\mathbb{E}[B(M, X)B(M, X)^\top]) \leq C,$$

with $\mathbb{E}[B(M, X)B(M, X)^\top] \preceq CI$. Here, for a symmetric matrix A , $\lambda_{\min}(A)$ and $\lambda_{\max}(A)$ denote its minimum and maximum eigenvalues, respectively, and $A \preceq CI$ means that $CI - A$ is positive semidefinite. I denotes the identity matrix. Also, we denote $\|f(Z)\|_{P, 2} = (\mathbb{E}[\|f(Z)\|_2^2])^{1/2} = (\int \|f(z)\|_2^2 dF_Z(z))^{1/2}$.

(iv) *The number of basis functions L satisfies $L \rightarrow \infty$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, $L^2 \log L = o(n)$ and $LK^{-r_1} = o(1)$;*

(v) *There exist constants $r_2 > 1$ and λ^* such that the true propensity score function satisfies*

$$\sup_{(m, x) \in \mathcal{M} \times \mathcal{X}} \left| w_2^*(m, x) - n\rho'(B(m, x)^\top \lambda^*) \right| = O(L^{-r_2}),$$

where $w_2^(m, x) = \xi_0(m, x)/\pi_0(x)\xi_1(m, x)$;*

(vi) *$\|\delta\|_\infty = o_p((nL)^{-1/2})$ and so $\|\delta\|_2 = o_p(n^{-1/2})$.*

These assumptions are analogous to Assumption 1 of Wang and Zubizarreta (2019). In Assumption 5.1, conditions (i) represent standard regularity assumptions that ensure the consistency of M-estimators. Given the result that $\widehat{m}_1^{MW}(X)$ is consistent for $1/\pi_0(X)$,

and using the first-order condition together with Proposition 3.2, we can deduce that there exists a λ° such that $w_2^*(m, x) = n\rho'(B(m, x)^\top \lambda^\circ)$. Condition (ii) enables the consistency of λ^\dagger to imply the consistency of the estimated weights. Noting that $\rho'(t) = (f')^{-1}(t)$ by a simple calculation, it is clear that this condition is met by standard choices of f used in the definition of two-step minimal weights 4.1, such as the squared loss $f(w) = w^2$ and the entropy-based loss $f(w) = w \log w$. Condition (iii) imposes a technical restriction on the magnitude of the basis functions. Condition (iv) controls the growth rate of the number of basis functions relative to the sample size. Condition (v) ensures that the weights $w_2^*(m, x)$ can be uniformly approximated, which typically requires that the basis $B(m, x)$ is sufficiently rich. Conditions (iii)–(v) are satisfied by a wide range of basis functions, including regression splines, trigonometric polynomials, and wavelets (see, e.g., Newey (1997); Chen (2007)). Lastly, condition (vi) characterizes the degree to which the equality constraints for exact covariate balance may be relaxed by hyperparameters without compromising the asymptotic properties of the estimated weights.

Under these assumptions, we establish the convergence rate of $\widehat{w}_2(M_i, X_i)$ to $w_2^*(M_i, X_i)$. Since normalization makes $\widehat{w}_2^{\text{MW}}(m, x)$ tend to zero as $n \rightarrow \infty$, we rescale by n to obtain a nontrivial convergence rate.

Theorem 5.2. *Under the conditions in Assumption 5.1, we have:*

$$\sup_{(m,x) \in \mathcal{M} \times \mathcal{X}} |n\widehat{w}_2^{\text{MW}}(m, x) - w_2^*(m, x)| = O_p \left(\sqrt{\frac{L^2 \log L}{n}} + L^{1-r_2} + LK^{-r_1} \right) = o_p(1),$$

$$\|n\widehat{w}_2^{\text{MW}}(M, X) - w_2^*(M, X)\|_{P,2} = O_p \left(\sqrt{\frac{L^2 \log L}{n}} + L^{1-r_2} + LK^{-r_1} \right) = o_p(1),$$

where r_1 is defined in Assumption C.1 in Appendix C.⁸

The first component of the convergence rate, $O_p(\sqrt{L^2 \log L/n} + L^{1-r_2})$, parallels Theorem 2 of Wang and Zubizarreta (2019), while the second component, $O_p(LK^{-r_1})$, reflects the influence of the first-step estimation.

5.2. Asymptotic normality and semiparametric efficiency. Next, we establish the asymptotic normality of the EIF-type estimator and IPW-type estimator based on our proposed weights.

5.2.1. EIF-type weighting estimator. We require the following Assumption 5.2.

⁸When considering the norm of an estimator \widehat{f} with the notation $\|\widehat{f}(Z)\|_{P,2}$, the expectation is not taken with respect to the same sample of Z that was used to construct \widehat{f} . Instead, we conceptually introduce an independent copy Z' of Z and evaluate

$$\|\widehat{f}(Z')\|_{P,2} = \left(\int \|\widehat{f}(z')\|_2^2 dF_{Z'}(z') \right)^{1/2}.$$

Assumption 5.2. *The following conditions hold:*

- (i) $\mathbb{E}[|Y - \mu_1(M, X)|] < \infty$, $\mathbb{E}[|\mu_1(M, X) - \eta_{1,0}(X)|] < \infty$,
- (ii) *There exist $r_\mu, r_\eta > 1$ and β, γ such that $\mu_1(m, x)$ and $\eta_{1,0}(x)$ satisfies*

$$\sup_{(m,x) \in \mathcal{M} \times \mathcal{X}} |\mu_1(m, x) - B(m, x)^\top \beta| = O(L^{-r_\mu});$$

$$\sup_{x \in \mathcal{X}} |\eta_{1,0}(x) - C(x)^\top \gamma| = O(K^{-r_\eta}).$$

- (iii) *For the sets of smooth functions $\mathcal{W}_1, \mathcal{W}_2, \mathcal{U}$ and \mathcal{T} such that $w_1^* \in \mathcal{W}_1, w_2^* \in \mathcal{W}_2, \mu \in \mathcal{U}$ and $\eta \in \mathcal{T}$,*

$$\log n_{[]}(\varepsilon, \mathcal{W}_1, L_2(P)) \leq C(1/\varepsilon)^{1/k_1}, \quad \log n_{[]}(\varepsilon, \mathcal{W}_2, L_2(P)) \leq C(1/\varepsilon)^{1/k_2}$$

$$\log n_{[]}(\varepsilon, \mathcal{U}, L_2(P)) \leq C(1/\varepsilon)^{1/k_\mu}, \quad \log n_{[]}(\varepsilon, \mathcal{T}, L_2(P)) \leq C(1/\varepsilon)^{1/k_\eta}$$

for a positive constant C and $k_1, k_2, k_\mu, k_\eta > 1/2$, with $n_{[]}(\varepsilon, S, L_2(P))$ denoting the bracketing number of the set S by ε -brackets; Moreover, we assume that the function classes $\mathcal{W}_1, \mathcal{W}_2, \mathcal{U}$, and \mathcal{T} admit envelope functions belonging to $L_2(P)$;

- (iv) $n^{1/2}L^{1-r_2-r_\mu} = o(1)$, $n^{1/2}L^{1-r_\mu}K^{-r_1} = o(1)$, $n^{1/2}K^{1-r_1}L^{-r_\mu} = o(1)$ and $n^{1/2}K^{1-r_1-r_\eta} = o(1)$.

Assumption 5.2 is analogous to that of Wang and Zubizarreta (2019). Condition (i) states the standard regularity requirements, ensuring the estimators have finite moments. Condition (ii) then requires a uniform approximation for μ and η , similar to Assumption 5.1 (v). Condition (iii) introduces a complexity constraint, requiring that the metric entropy of the classes $\mathcal{W}_1, \mathcal{W}_2, \mathcal{U}$, and \mathcal{T} does not grow too rapidly as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. This condition is met by Hölder classes of smoothness s on any bounded convex subset of \mathbb{R}^d when $s/d > 1$ (see, e.g., van der Vaart and Wellner (1996)). Consistent with Wang and Zubizarreta (2019) and Fan et al. (2023), these uniform approximation rate requirements are regarded as some of the least stringent in the literature (e.g. Hirano et al. (2003); Chan et al. (2016b); Chan et al. (2016a)). Additionally, condition (iv) restricts how quickly the number of basis functions, K and L , may increase with the sample size n . The permissible rate for this increase is governed by the sum of the approximation errors ($r_2 + r_\mu$, $r_1 + r_\mu$, and $r_1 + r_\eta$) of the propensity score and outcome estimators. This feature, that the product structures become crucial in the asymptotics, resembles the findings of Farbmacher et al. (2022) on debiased machine learning for causal mediation.

Finally, we can establish the asymptotic distribution of the EIF-type estimator and show that it achieves the semiparametric efficiency bound.

Theorem 5.3. *Suppose that Assumptions 5.1 and 5.2 hold. Furthermore, we assume that $\hat{\mu}_1(M_i, X_i)$ and $\hat{\eta}_{1,0}(X_i)$ are linear combinations of $B(M_i, X_i)$ and $C(X_i)$. Then,*

$$\sqrt{n} \left(\hat{\theta}_{1,0}^{\text{EIF-MW}} - \theta_{1,0} \right) \rightarrow \mathcal{N}(0, V_{\text{opt}}),$$

where V_{opt} is the semiparametric efficiency bound given by the efficient influence function:

$$\frac{D_i \xi_0(M_i, X_i)}{\pi_0(X_i) \xi_1(M_i, X_i)} (Y_i - \mu_1(M_i, X_i)) + \frac{1 - D_i}{\pi_0(X_i)} (\mu_1(M_i, X_i) - \eta_{1,0}(X_i)) + \eta_{1,0}(X_i) - \theta_{1,0}.$$

The variance can be estimated by the sample variance of the efficient influence function, in which the weights, which consist of propensity scores, are simply replaced by two-step minimal weights. Specifically,

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{V}_{\text{opt}}^{\text{EIF-MW}} = & \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left[D_i n \hat{w}_2^{\text{MW}}(M_i, X_i) \left(Y_i - \hat{\mu}_1(M_i, X_i) \right) \right. \\ & \left. + (1 - D_i) n \hat{w}_1^{\text{MW}}(X_i) \left(\hat{\mu}_1(M_i, X_i) - \hat{\eta}_{1,0}(X_i) \right) + \hat{\eta}_{1,0}(X_i) - \hat{\theta}_{1,0}^{\text{EIF-MW}} \right]^2, \end{aligned}$$

5.2.2. IPW-type weighting estimator. For the IPW-type estimator, we obtain the same asymptotic result.

Theorem 5.4. *Suppose that Assumptions 5.1 and 5.2 hold. Then,*

$$\sqrt{n} \left(\hat{\theta}_{1,0}^{\text{IPW-MW}} - \theta_{1,0} \right) \rightarrow \mathcal{N}(0, V_{\text{opt}}),$$

where V_{opt} is the semiparametric efficiency bound given by the efficient influence function. The variance can be estimated consistently by the following estimator:

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{V}_{\text{opt}}^{\text{IPW-MW}} = & \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left[D_i n \hat{w}_2^{\text{MW}}(M_i, X_i) \left(Y_i - \hat{\mu}_1(M_i, X_i) \right) \right. \\ & \left. + (1 - D_i) n \hat{w}_1^{\text{MW}}(X_i) \left(\hat{\mu}_1(M_i, X_i) - \hat{\eta}_{1,0}(X_i) \right) + \hat{\eta}_{1,0}(X_i) - \hat{\theta}_{1,0}^{\text{IPW-MW}} \right]^2, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\mu}_1(M_i, X_i) &= B(M_i, X_i)^\top \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n D_i B(M_i, X_i) B(M_i, X_i)^\top \right)^{-1} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n D_i B(M_i, X_i) Y_i \\ \hat{\eta}_{1,0}(X_i) &= C(X_i)^\top \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (1 - D_i) C(X_i) C(X_i)^\top \right)^{-1} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (1 - D_i) C(X_i) \hat{\mu}_1(M_i, X_i) \end{aligned}$$

6. SIMULATION STUDIES

In this section, we conduct two Monte Carlo simulation studies to evaluate the performance of our proposed two-step minimal weights against several competing estimators. In addition, we implement the hyperparameter tuning of the balancing tolerances (Algorithm 4.2).

6.1. Tchetgen Tchetgen and Shpitser (2012) setting. First, we consider a simulation setting adapted from Tchetgen Tchetgen and Shpitser (2012). The data are generated as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
Z_1, Z_2, \dots, Z_{10} &\stackrel{\text{i.i.d.}}{\sim} \mathcal{N}(0, 1), \quad X_1 = \exp(Z_1/2), \quad X_2 = \frac{Z_2}{1 + \exp(Z_1)} + 10, \\
X_3 &= \left(\frac{Z_1 Z_3}{25} + 0.6 \right)^3, \quad X_4 = (Z_2 Z_4 + 20)^2, \\
D &\sim \text{Bernoulli} \left(\frac{1}{1 + \exp(-(Z_1 - 0.5Z_2 + 0.25Z_3 + 0.1Z_4))} \right), \\
M &\sim \text{Bernoulli} \left(\frac{1}{1 + \exp(-(0.5 - Z_1 + 0.5Z_2 - 0.9Z_3 + Z_4 - 1.5D))} \right), \\
Y &= 210 + 27.4Z_1 + 13.7Z_2 + 13.7Z_3 + 13.7Z_4 + M + D + \varepsilon, \quad \varepsilon \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1).
\end{aligned}$$

We denote $\text{Bernoulli}(p)$ as a Bernoulli distribution where the variable takes the value 1 with probability p , and $\mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ as a normal distribution with mean zero and variance one. In this data-generating process, the covariates $\{X_1, \dots, X_4\}$ are complex nonlinear transformations of the underlying covariates $\{Z_1, \dots, Z_4\}$. The estimands are $\text{NDE}(0)$ and $\text{NDE}(1)$. The true values of both direct effects are 1.

We compare the performance of several weighting methods when applied to the EIF-type and IPW-type estimators for NDE. This allows us to assess the performance of the weights both in conjunction with an outcome model and independently. The weighting methods are as follows:

- **EIF weights:** These are the EIF-based weights defined in (4), where the nuisance parameters are estimated using parametric methods such as logistic regression and linear regression.
- **EIF trimmed:** A variant of the EIF-based weights that trims the propensity scores (or their products) to lie within the interval $[0.01, 0.99]$.
- **MW:** Two-step minimal weights obtained via Algorithm 4.1. As a dispersion penalty, we choose the entropy penalty $f(w) = w \log w$.
- **CBPS:** Covariate balancing propensity scores obtained via Algorithm A.1 in Appendix A.1.
- **True PS:** EIF-based weights computed by substituting the estimated propensity scores with the true propensity scores.

All weights are normalized to sum to one. To specify the estimators, we introduce the following notation:

- **Weights with exchanged treatment status** (\tilde{w}_1, \tilde{w}_2): In addition to the standard weights \hat{w}_1 and \hat{w}_2 described above, our estimators also require a second set of weights defined under exchanged treatment status. We denote these by \tilde{w}_1 and \tilde{w}_2 , obtained by swapping the roles of the treatment ($D = 1$) and control ($D = 0$) groups

in the original weight definitions. For EIF weights, we define $\tilde{w}_1(X_i) = 1/\hat{\pi}_1(X_i)$ and $\tilde{w}_2(M_i, X_i) = \hat{\xi}_1(M_i, X_i)/(\hat{\pi}_1(X_i)\hat{\xi}_0(M_i, X_i))$. For the two-step minimal weights, these are constructed by applying Algorithm 4.1 with treatment and control reversed: Step 1 is applied to the treatment group to balance covariates against the full population, followed by Step 2 applied to the control group.

Then, the EIF-type estimators for NDE(0) and NDE(1) are given by the following two equations, respectively:

$$\begin{aligned}\widehat{\text{NDE}}(0)^{\text{EIF}} &= \sum_{i=1}^n D_i \hat{w}_2(M_i, X_i) \left(Y_i - \hat{\mu}_1(M_i, X_i) \right) + \sum_{i=1}^n (1 - D_i) \hat{w}_1(X_i) \left(\hat{\mu}_1(M_i, X_i) - \hat{\eta}_{1,0}(X_i) \right) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \hat{\eta}_{1,0}(X_i) - \left(\sum_{i=1}^n (1 - D_i) \tilde{w}_1(Y_i - \hat{m}_0(X_i)) + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \hat{m}_0(X_i) \right), \\ \widehat{\text{NDE}}(1)^{\text{EIF}} &= \sum_{i=1}^n (1 - D_i) \tilde{w}_2(M_i, X_i) \left(Y_i - \hat{\mu}_0(M_i, X_i) \right) + \sum_{i=1}^n D_i \tilde{w}_1(X_i) \left(\hat{\mu}_0(M_i, X_i) - \hat{\eta}_{0,1}(X_i) \right) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \hat{\eta}_{0,1}(X_i) - \left(\sum_{i=1}^n D_i \hat{w}_1(Y_i - \hat{m}_1(X_i)) + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \hat{m}_1(X_i) \right),\end{aligned}$$

where the terms $\sum_{i=1}^n (1 - D_i) \tilde{w}_1(Y_i - \hat{m}_0(X_i)) - 1/n \sum_{i=1}^n \hat{m}_0(X_i)$ and $\sum_{i=1}^n D_i \tilde{w}_1(Y_i - \hat{m}_1(X_i)) - 1/n \sum_{i=1}^n \hat{m}_1(X_i)$ are the estimators for $\mathbb{E}[Y_0]$ and $\mathbb{E}[Y_1]$. The IPW-type weighting estimators for NDE(0) and NDE(1) are given by the following two equations, respectively:

$$\begin{aligned}\widehat{\text{NDE}}(0)^{\text{IPW}} &= \sum_{i=1}^n D_i \hat{w}_2(M_i, X_i) Y_i - \sum_{i=1}^n (1 - D_i) \tilde{w}_1(X_i) Y_i \\ \widehat{\text{NDE}}(1)^{\text{IPW}} &= \sum_{i=1}^n (1 - D_i) \tilde{w}_2(M_i, X_i) Y_i - \sum_{i=1}^n D_i \hat{w}_1(X_i) Y_i,\end{aligned}$$

where the terms $\sum_{i=1}^n (1 - D_i) \tilde{w}_1(X_i) Y_i$ and $\sum_{i=1}^n D_i \hat{w}_1(X_i) Y_i$ are the estimators for $\mathbb{E}[Y_0]$ and $\mathbb{E}[Y_1]$.

To evaluate the balance of covariates and the mediator achieved by the weights, we adopt the target absolute standardized mean difference (TASMD) from Chattopadhyay et al. (2020). The TASMDs for the first and second weighting steps are defined as follows:

$$\text{TASMD}_{\text{cp}}(X) = \frac{|\bar{X}_{\hat{w}_{1,c}} - \bar{X}_{\text{full}}|}{s_c}, \quad \text{TASMD}_{\text{tc}}(X) = \frac{|\bar{X}_{\hat{w}_{2,t}} - \bar{X}_{\hat{w}_{1,c}}|}{s_t}.$$

Here, $\bar{X}_{\hat{w}_{1,c}}$ and $\bar{X}_{\hat{w}_{2,t}}$ are the weighted means of a covariate X in the control group (using weights \hat{w}_1) and the treatment group (using weights \hat{w}_2), respectively. \bar{X}_{full} is the unweighted mean of X in the full population. The denominators s_c and s_t are the unweighted sample standard deviations of X in the control and treated groups, respectively.

We implement the Monte Carlo simulation with 2000 iterations in two settings described below.

- (A) All models and the basis functions for balancing constraints use $\{Z_1, Z_2, Z_3, Z_4\}$.
- (B) The outcome regression models for μ and η use $\{X_1, X_2, X_3, X_4\}$, whereas the propensity score models for π and η as well as the basis functions for balancing constraints use $\{X_1, X_2, X_3, X_4, Z_1, Z_2, Z_3, Z_4\}$.

Figures 3 and 4 display the Monte Carlo means and variances for each estimator. Specifically, Figure 3 presents the results for NDE(1), while Figure 4 corresponds to NDE(0). We first examine Setting (A), which is depicted in the first two columns of the plots in both figures. In this setting, for both NDE(1) and NDE(0), the well-specified outcome model masks the underlying differences in weight quality for the EIF-type estimators, resulting in similarly strong performance across all methods. The IPW-type estimators, however, isolate the direct impact of the weighting schemes. In this context, our proposed MW is the only method that remains unbiased with substantially low variance. Notably, both standard EIF weights and even the True PS-based weights result in unignorable bias and large variance. While trimming the EIF weights reduces variance, it fails to correct the bias. This result highlights that even a perfectly specified propensity score model is insufficient when sample-level covariate balance is not enforced. It also reveals the inherent instability of inverting propensity scores.

Next, we examine Setting (B), which is displayed in the remaining columns of Figures 3 and 4. These results demonstrate the proposed method’s robustness to outcome model misspecification. For the EIF-type estimators, our proposed MW method continues to yield unbiased estimates with low variance, performing as well as it did in setting (A). In contrast, the estimators using standard EIF weights and True PS weights are now substantially biased, as their weights fail to correct for the misspecified outcome model. A similar pattern of MW’s superior performance is observed for the IPW-type estimators.

The covariate balances of each weighting method are illustrated in Figure 5 and Figure 6 for setting (B) with $n = 1000$. Figure 5 presents the TASMD for the first-step weights, comparing the weighted control group to the full population. Figure 6 shows the TASMD for the second-step weights, comparing the weighted treated group to the weighted control group. In both steps, our proposed MW achieves a TASMD of virtually zero across all specified covariates $\{Z_1, \dots, Z_4, X_1, \dots, X_4\}$ and the mediator M . This demonstrates that MW successfully enforces perfect sample-level balance as designed. In contrast, all competing methods, including EIF, EIF trimmed, CBPS, and even weights based on True PS, exhibit imbalances for several covariates, as indicated by their non-zero TASMD values.

Remark 6.1. As Table 6 shows, in setting (A), the results of MW closely resemble those from regression imputation (RI) using $\{Z_1, Z_2, Z_3, Z_4\}$ as regressors. In setting (B), the results are similarly close to those from regression imputation with $\{X_1, X_2, X_3, X_4, Z_1, Z_2, Z_3, Z_4\}$ as regressors. These patterns are consistent with the findings of Bruns-Smith et al. (2025), which show that a balancing weights estimator with exact zero constraints can be expressed




FIGURE 3. Simulation results for estimating NDE(1) under the Tchetgen Tchetgen and Shpitser (2012) setting. The top and bottom rows display the absolute bias and variance, respectively. The left two columns correspond to Setting (A), while the right two columns correspond to Setting (B). In each setting, EIF-type and IPW-type estimators are evaluated across sample sizes of 500 and 1000 using five different weighting methods. Results for the regression imputation estimator are also plotted for comparison.

as the sum of a regression imputation term and an approximation error. In our simulation, the approximation error is possibly small, making the two approaches appear nearly equivalent.

Remark 6.2. We include both $\{Z_1, Z_2, Z_3, Z_4\}$ and $\{X_1, X_2, X_3, X_4\}$ in the weight models due to the bias decomposition discussed in Section 3, which suggests that the covariates used in the regression models should also be incorporated into the weighting models. For instance, if the balancing constraints of MW and CBPS target $\{Z_1, Z_2, Z_3, Z_4\}$, while the regression estimators are linear combinations of $\{X_1, X_2, X_3, X_4\}$, this mismatch introduces a bias that does not vanish asymptotically (see Proposition 3.1, Proposition 3.3 and Appendix A).



FIGURE 4. Simulation results for estimating $NDE(0)$ under the Tchetgen Tchetgen and Shpitser (2012) setting. The layout is identical to that in Figure 3.




FIGURE 5. TASMD (control vs full population) of the first step weights \hat{w}_1 in the Tchetgen Tchetgen and Shpitser simulation setting (B) and $n = 1000$.




FIGURE 6. TASMD (treatment vs control) of the second step weights \hat{w}_2 in the Tchetgen Tchetgen and Shpitser simulation setting (B) and $n = 1000$.

6.2. Wong and Chan (2018) setting. In light of Remark 6.1, we now demonstrate the utility of MW in a different setting. To this end, we adapt the simulation design of Wong and Chan (2018) to a causal mediation framework. The data are generated as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} Z_1, Z_2, \dots, Z_{10} &\stackrel{\text{i.i.d.}}{\sim} \mathcal{N}(0, 1), \quad X_1 = \exp(Z_1/2), \quad X_2 = \frac{Z_2}{1 + \exp(Z_1)}, \quad X_3 = \left(\frac{Z_1 Z_3}{25} + 0.6 \right)^3, \\ X_4 &= (Z_2 + Z_4 + 20)^2, \quad X_j = Z_j \quad \text{for } j = 5, \dots, 10, \\ D &\sim \text{Bernoulli} \left(\frac{1}{1 + \exp(-(-Z_1 - 0.1Z_4))} \right), \\ M &\sim \text{Bernoulli} \left(\frac{1}{1 + \exp(-(0.5 - Z_1 + 0.5Z_2 - 0.9Z_3 + Z_4 - 1.5D))} \right), \\ Y &= 210 + (1.5D + M - 0.5)(27.4Z_1 + 13.7Z_2 + 13.7Z_3 + 13.7Z_4) + \varepsilon, \quad \varepsilon \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1). \end{aligned}$$

Note that $\text{NDE}(1) = \text{NDE}(0) = 0$ because the treatment effect arises only through interactions with covariates. In this setting, a regression imputation model that omits the interaction terms between the treatment and the covariates is misspecified and thus expected to perform poorly. We consider the following two settings:

- (A) All models and the balancing constraints use covariates $\{Z_1, Z_2, Z_3, Z_4\}$ without interaction terms.
- (B) Outcome regression models use $\{X_1, X_2, \dots, X_{10}\}$, while propensity score π and the balancing constraint in the first step use $\{X_1, X_2, \dots, X_{10}, Z_1, \dots, Z_4\}$ and propensity score ξ and the balancing constraint in the second step use $\{X_1, X_2, \dots, X_{10}, Z_1, \dots, Z_4, M \times Z_1, M \times Z_2, M \times Z_3, M \times Z_4\}$.

The performance of all weighting estimators in these simulation settings is presented in Figures 7 and 8. In setting (A), the performance of all estimators is degraded by the outcome model misspecification. While our proposed MW estimator consistently achieves the lowest variance, it exhibits a non-trivial bias when estimating $\text{NDE}(0)$.

Conversely, the advantages of the MW estimator are demonstrated in setting (B). In this setting, the propensity score models and the balancing constraints are enriched with the true covariates $\{Z_1, \dots, Z_4\}$ and their interactions with the mediator $\{M \times Z_1, \dots, M \times Z_4\}$, even though the main outcome models remain misspecified. As a result, MW substantially outperforms all competing estimators. It is the only method to simultaneously achieve low bias and variance for both $\text{NDE}(1)$ and $\text{NDE}(0)$, as indicated by the bolded values in the table. The covariate balance diagnostics for setting (B) with $n = 1000$ in Figures 9 and 10 support these results. The figures clearly show that only MW achieves near-perfect balance in both weighting steps, whereas all other methods exhibit imbalance.

For comparison, we consider a regression imputation (RI) estimator; the results are shown in Figures 7 and 8. As expected, the RI estimator is severely biased in setting (A) due to its inability to capture the treatment-covariate interactions. Notably, this poor performance




FIGURE 7. Simulation results for estimating NDE(1) under the Wong and Chan (2018) setting. The layout is identical to that in Figure 3.

occurs even though the RI model utilizes the same set of covariates as the MW estimator, highlighting the weakness of the simple linear imputation approach in this setting. In setting (B), when the RI model is correctly specified to include these interactions, its performance becomes comparable to that of our MW estimator.

In summary, these results provide a compelling case for the proposed MW estimator. In setting (A), where the simple RI estimator fails due to model misspecification, MW performs comparably to the EIF-type estimator and offers improvement over RI. Conversely, in setting (B), where a correctly specified RI model performs well, MW matches its high level of accuracy and efficiency, with both methods outperforming the EIF-type estimator. This demonstrates that the estimator with MW matches or exceeds the performance of the best alternative method in both scenarios.




FIGURE 8. Simulation results for estimating NDE(0) under the Wong and Chan (2018) setting. The layout is identical to that in Figure 3.




FIGURE 9. TASMD_{cf} of the first step weights (control vs full population) in the Wong and Chan simulation setting (B) and $n = 1000$.




FIGURE 10. TASMD_{tc} of the second step weights (treatment vs control) in the Wong and Chan simulation setting (B) and $n = 1000$.

6.3. Hyperparameter tuning. Finally, we conduct a simulation study to evaluate the hyperparameter tuning procedure detailed in Algorithm 4.2. We focus on setting (B) from the Wong and Chan simulation. The Monte Carlo simulation is performed with a sample size of $n = 500$ and 100 iterations. For the tuning algorithm, we construct a grid of 500 points for the hyperparameters ε and δ , and we employ bootstrap resampling with $R = 50$ repetitions.

The results, presented in Table 2, compare the performance of the MW estimator under exact balancing (i.e., $\varepsilon = 0, \delta = 0$) against the estimator with optimally chosen hyperparameters. The tuning algorithm leads to a reduction in bias across all four estimator configurations. This reduction is a consequence of the algorithm preferring approximate balance over exact balance, as illustrated by the TASMD plots in Figures 11 and 12, which show that the selected hyperparameters yield small but non-zero balance errors. For the EIF-type estimators, the reduction in bias is accompanied by a slight increase in variance, resulting in a marginally higher mean squared error (MSE). In contrast, for the IPW-type estimators, the tuning algorithm successfully reduces both bias and variance, leading to an improved overall MSE.

Weights (Estimand)	Exact Balance ($\varepsilon = 0, \delta = 0$)			Optimal (ε, δ)		
	Mean	Var	MSE	Mean	Var	MSE
MW (EIF, NDE(1))	-0.1290	5.4439	5.4062	0.0823	5.6149	5.5655
MW (EIF, NDE(0))	-0.1274	5.4406	5.4024	0.0765	5.5679	5.5180
MW (IPW, NDE(1))	-0.1307	5.4412	5.4038	-0.1219	5.4402	5.4007
MW (IPW, NDE(0))	-0.1274	5.4356	5.3975	-0.0878	5.4264	5.3799

TABLE 2. Comparison of mean, variance, and MSE for the MW estimator under exact balancing and with optimally selected hyperparameters from Algorithm 4.2.




FIGURE 11. Comparison of TASMD_{cf} under exact balance versus optimal hyperparameter tuning for the first-step weights (control vs. full population) in Wong and Chan simulation setting (B) with $n = 500$.




FIGURE 12. Comparison of TASMD_{tc} under exact balance versus optimal hyperparameter tuning for the second-step weights (treatment vs. control) in Wong and Chan simulation setting (B) with $n = 500$.

7. EMPIRICAL APPLICATION: THE EFFECT OF MEDIA FRAMING ON IMMIGRATION ATTITUDES

In this section, we analyze the **framing** dataset using our proposed two-step minimal weights estimator. The dataset originates from Brader et al. (2008), who investigated how media framing of immigration news influences public opinion and political behavior. It is available in the R package **mediation** (Tingley et al. (2025)). In their experiment, participants were randomly assigned to read an article about immigration and subsequently answered a series of follow-up questions from which the outcome, mediators, and covariates were measured. Our objective is to assess the causal pathways through which framing influences information-seeking behavior: to what extent the effect arises directly from exposure to the media frame and ethnic cues, and to what extent it is mediated by shifts in perceived harm and negative emotional responses.

The sample consists of 265 individuals, with the main variables defined as follows:

- **Treatment** (D): We constructed an indicator for whether participants were exposed to a negatively framed article featuring the photo of a Latino (Mexican) immigrant or to a positively framed article featuring the photo of a European (Russian) immigrant.⁹
- **Mediator 1** (M_I): Perceived harm from increased immigration, measured on a 2–8 scale.¹⁰
- **Mediator 2** (M_{II}): Anxiety about increased immigration, measured with a single four-point item (Very / Somewhat / A little / Not at all).
- **Mediator 3** (M_{III}): Negative affect during the experiment, based on three items (anxious, worried, angry), summed to a 3–12 scale.¹¹
- **Outcome** (Y): Whether subjects requested information from anti-immigration organizations (1 = receive, 0 = not receive).¹²
- **Covariates** (X): Pre-treatment demographics (age, education level, gender, and income), along with their quadratic and cubic terms, as well as all two-way and three-way interactions (excluding higher-order terms for dummy variables), yielding 20 covariates in total.

We specify all nuisance models—the outcome regression models, the propensity score models, and the balancing constraints, using the same covariate set. We estimate ATE, NDE, and NIE using two types of estimators, EIF-type estimator and IPW-type estimator, across four different weighting schemes: EIF, EIF (trimmed), our proposed MW, and CBPS.

First, we assess the finite-sample balance of each weighting method by examining the TASMD. Figure 13 displays the balance for the first-step weights (weighting the control group to resemble the full population), while Figure 14 shows the balance for the second-step weights (weighting the treated group to resemble the re-weighted control group). In both figures, our proposed MW estimator achieves a TASMD of virtually zero for all 20 covariates included in the model.

⁹The positive versus negative framing differed in whether the article emphasized the beneficial consequences of immigration (e.g., strengthening the economy, increasing tax revenues, enriching American culture) or its harmful consequences (e.g., lowering wages, consuming public resources, eroding American values). The framing was further reinforced by portraying state governors as either welcoming or concerned about immigration and by depicting citizens as having either positive or negative experiences with immigrants. With respect to immigrant identity, the Mexican versus Russian cue was conveyed through the photograph and its caption, which read: “[Jose Sanchez/Nikolai Vandinsky] is one of thousands of new immigrants who arrived in the United States during the first half of this year.”

¹⁰After reading the article, participants answered questions such as: (i) “How likely is it that immigration will have a negative financial impact on many Americans?” and (ii) “How likely is it that immigration will have a negative financial impact on you or your family?” The two items were summed to form the perceived-harm index. Higher values indicate greater perceived harm.

¹¹Both M_2 and M_3 were derived from the same emotion battery: “How [anxious/proud/angry/hopeful/worried/excited] does it make you feel when thinking about high levels of immigration?” (Very, somewhat, a little, or not at all).

¹²They asked if they would like more information about immigration from a variety of sources, including nonpartisan research centers, the U.S. government, pro-immigrant groups, and anti-immigrant groups.




FIGURE 13. TASMD_{cf} of the first-step weights (control vs. full population) in empirical application.




FIGURE 14. TASMD_{tc} of the first-step weights (treated vs. control) in empirical application.

We next examine the estimates reported in Figure 15. The ATE is negative in all specifications. In other words, participants exposed to a positively framed story with a European (Russian) immigrant were more likely to request information from anti-immigration organizations than those exposed to a negatively framed story with a Latino (Mexican) immigrant. This aligns with the findings of Brader et al. (2008), who suggest that European cues, especially under a positive frame, may spark curiosity and information seeking. Indeed, consistent with this explanation, both $\text{NDE}(1)$ and $\text{NDE}(0)$ are negative, indicating that the media cue itself shifts the outcome downward. By contrast, $\text{NIE}(1)$ and $\text{NIE}(0)$ are positive, suggesting that changes in mediators induced by the treatment move behavior upward. This can be explained by the observation that exposure to a negatively framed story featuring a Latino (Mexican) immigrant changes perceived harm and emotions, leading individuals to seek information from anti-immigration organizations. Taken together, this implies that the positive indirect pathway partly offsets the negative direct effect.

Most estimates are not statistically significant. The important exception is $\text{NDE}(0)$: under the EIF-type specification, all weighting methods yield significant results ($p \approx 0.01\text{-}0.03$),




FIGURE 15. Empirical application results: point estimates, corresponding variances, p-values, and 95% confidence intervals for each estimator. Var. columns are printed to six decimals without digit grouping to better display small differences. Bolded point estimates highlight the two-step minimal weights estimator results for NDE(0).

with MW producing the smallest variance and the narrowest interval. Under the IPW/HT-type specification, significance appears only with MW ($p \approx 0.013$), again due to a notable reduction in variance.

8. CONCLUSION

This paper addressed the challenge of estimating natural direct and indirect effects in the presence of finite-sample instability and covariate imbalance, which are two critical

limitations of the EIF-based estimator and IPW estimator. To this end, we introduced a novel two-step minimal weights estimator specifically tailored for the causal mediation setting.

Our theoretical contribution began with a formal decomposition of the EIF-type estimator's bias. This analysis pinpointed imbalances in the marginal covariate distribution and the joint distribution of covariates and the mediator as the primary sources of bias, thereby motivating our two-step weight estimation algorithm, which sequentially targets these specific imbalances. We established the convergence rates for the proposed weights and proved that the resulting estimator is asymptotically normal and achieves the semiparametric efficiency bound.

Our simulation studies and empirical application provided empirical support for this approach. The two-step proposed minimal weights consistently reduced both bias and variance compared to competitors, particularly in challenging scenarios with model misspecification where standard methods failed. This underscores a key implication for applied researchers: directly targeting sample-level balance and weight stability can yield substantially more reliable estimates of causal mechanisms.

As a direction for future research, we note that causal mediation analysis is closely connected to the study of long-term treatment effects and statistical surrogacy, since mediators are often interpreted as short-term outcomes or surrogate endpoints (Chen and Ritzwoller (2023); Imbens et al. (2024); Athey et al. (2024)). This topic has attracted increasing attention in econometrics, and we expect that estimators analogous to those proposed in this paper can be developed in this setting as well.

Appendix

APPENDIX A. IMPLEMENTATION NOTES AND ADDITIONAL SIMULATION RESULTS

A.1. Two-step covariate balancing propensity score. In this subsection, we describe the application of the covariate balancing propensity score (CBPS) approach proposed by Imai and Ratkovic (2014) to the causal mediation analysis. Based on the EIF weights (4), the CBPS involves modelling two types of propensity score:

$$\pi_{1,\beta}(X) = \frac{\exp(X^T \beta)}{1 + \exp(X^T \beta)}, \quad \xi_{1,\gamma}(M, X) = \frac{\exp((X, M)^T \gamma)}{1 + \exp((X, M)^T \gamma)}.$$

The parameters β and γ are usually estimated using logistic regression with the following first-order conditions:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n s_{\beta}(D_i, X_i) &= 0, \quad \text{where } s_{\beta}(D_i, X_i) = \frac{D_i \pi'_{1,\beta}(X_i)}{\pi_{1,\beta}(X_i)} - \frac{(1 - D_i) \pi'_{0,\beta}(X_i)}{\pi_{0,\beta}(X_i)}, \\ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n s_{\gamma}(D_i, X_i, M_i) &= 0, \quad \text{where } s_{\gamma}(D_i, X_i, M_i) = \frac{D_i \xi'_{1,\gamma}(M_i, X_i)}{\xi_{1,\gamma}(M_i, X_i)} - \frac{(1 - D_i) \xi'_{0,\gamma}(M_i, X_i)}{\xi_{0,\gamma}(M_i, X_i)}. \end{aligned}$$

The CBPS approach incorporates balancing constraints to ensure sample covariate balance in addition to these conditions and estimates the parameters via overidentified GMM.

Algorithm A.1 (Two-step covariate balancing propensity score). We define the weights derived by the following two-step estimation as CBPS weights.

Step 1 Estimate β by GMM with the following moment conditions:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n s_{\beta}(D_i, X_i) &= 0, \\ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left[\frac{1 - D_i}{\pi_{0,\beta}(X_i)} c_j(X_i) - c_j(X_i) \right] &= 0, \quad j = 1, \dots, K, \end{aligned}$$

where $c_j(X_i)$ are smooth basis functions of the covariates.

Step 2 Using the estimated $\hat{\beta}$ from Step 1, estimate γ by GMM with the following moment conditions:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n s_{\gamma}(D_i, X_i, M_i) &= 0, \\ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left[\frac{D_i \xi_{0,\gamma}(M_i, X_i)}{\xi_{1,\gamma}(M_i, X_i) \pi_{0,\hat{\beta}}(X_i)} b_j(X_i) - \frac{1 - D_i}{\pi_{0,\hat{\beta}}(X_i)} b_j(X_i, M_i) \right] &= 0, \quad j = 1, \dots, L, \end{aligned}$$

where $b_j(X_i, M_i)$ are smooth basis functions of the covariates and mediator.

Then, calculate the weights:

$$\hat{w}_1^{\text{CBPS}}(X_i) = \frac{1}{\pi_{\hat{\beta},0}(X_i)}, \quad \hat{w}_2^{\text{CBPS}}(X_i, M_i) = \frac{\xi_{\hat{\gamma},0}(M_i, X_i)}{\pi_{\hat{\beta},0}(X_i) \xi_{\hat{\gamma},1}(M_i, X_i)}.$$

Similarly to the two-step minimal weights, one may include 1 as a basis function for normalization.

A.2. Bias induced by inconsistency between the regression and weight models. As discussed in Section 6, excluding covariates used in the regression models from the balancing constraints leads to biased estimates of the two-step minimal weights. For example, consider the following setting:

- (C) The regression models for μ and η are specified using (X_1, X_2, X_3, X_4) , while the propensity score and weight models are constructed based on (Z_1, Z_2, Z_3, Z_4) .

The results are shown in Table 3, and we observe that the two-step minimal weights are biased. In contrast, the estimates are unbiased when the covariates (X_1, X_2, X_3, X_4) are included (Table 4). It is clear that the estimates based on MW are biased.

A.3. Additional Numerical Results for Simulation Studies. The numerical results (absolute bias and variance) of weighting estimators in the simulation in Section 6.1 are

Weights (Estimand)	EIF-type (C)		IPW-type (C)	
	Mean	Var	Mean	Var
$n = 500$				
EIF weights (NDE(1))	0.968	8.208	1.121	9.296
EIF trimmed (NDE(1))	0.867	6.521	1.083	7.964
MW (NDE(1))	0.286	1.221	0.996	0.011
CBPS (NDE(1))	0.782	6.075	0.679	7.900
TruePS (NDE(1))	0.717	8.755	0.549	24.058
EIF weights (NDE(0))	0.956	6.455	1.102	8.994
EIF trimmed (NDE(0))	0.903	5.947	1.089	7.978
MW (NDE(0))	0.317	1.185	0.998	0.012
CBPS (NDE(0))	0.571	4.555	0.883	7.276
TruePS (NDE(0))	0.768	7.714	0.537	23.253
$n = 1000$				
EIF weights (NDE(1))	0.859	3.548	1.075	3.714
EIF trimmed (NDE(1))	0.886	3.281	1.088	3.546
MW (NDE(1))	0.268	0.678	1.001	0.006
CBPS (NDE(1))	0.750	3.299	0.691	4.426
TruePS (NDE(1))	0.710	4.433	0.857	12.801
EIF weights (NDE(0))	0.762	4.160	1.143	4.173
EIF trimmed (NDE(0))	0.816	3.184	1.119	3.400
MW (NDE(0))	0.278	0.690	1.001	0.006
CBPS (NDE(0))	0.550	3.205	0.895	3.642
TruePS (NDE(0))	0.713	4.836	0.856	12.083

TABLE 3. Comparison of estimates for $n = 500$ and $n = 1000$ in the setting (C).

reported in Table 4. The numerical results corresponding to the simulation in Section 6.2 are reported in Table 5.

For the regression imputation estimators, the numerical results Section 6.1 are reported in Table 6. The numerical results Section 6.2 are reported in Table 7.

Weights (Estimand)	EIF-type (A)		IPW-type (A)		EIF-type (B)		IPW-type (B)	
	Abs.Bias	Var	Abs.Bias	Var	Abs.Bias	Var	Abs.Bias	Var
$n = 500$								
EIF weights (NDE(1))	0.002	0.014	0.012	8.565	0.019	5.173	0.412	9.893
EIF trimmed (NDE(1))	0.002	0.014	0.002	7.582	0.059	3.675	0.312	7.263
MW (NDE(1))	0.002	0.012	0.002	0.012	0.003	0.014	0.003	0.014
CBPS (NDE(1))	0.002	0.014	0.388	7.858	0.095	5.499	0.127	13.080
TruePS (NDE(1))	0.002	0.014	0.396	24.105	0.254	8.191	0.396	24.105
EIF weights (NDE(0))	0.002	0.015	0.085	8.391	0.028	3.570	0.371	7.712
EIF trimmed (NDE(0))	0.002	0.014	0.085	7.431	0.044	3.015	0.251	6.548
MW (NDE(0))	0.003	0.013	0.003	0.013	0.002	0.014	0.002	0.014
CBPS (NDE(0))	0.002	0.014	0.108	7.278	0.083	3.604	0.154	9.988
TruePS (NDE(0))	0.002	0.014	0.316	23.780	0.189	7.717	0.316	23.780
$n = 1000$								
EIF weights (NDE(1))	0.001	0.007	0.160	3.930	0.234	4.348	0.036	5.591
EIF trimmed (NDE(1))	0.001	0.007	0.147	3.419	0.190	2.131	0.015	3.642
MW (NDE(1))	0.000	0.006	0.000	0.006	0.000	0.007	0.000	0.007
CBPS (NDE(1))	0.001	0.007	0.226	4.265	0.309	4.605	0.302	7.053
TruePS (NDE(1))	0.000	0.007	0.079	12.365	0.183	4.469	0.079	12.365
EIF weights (NDE(0))	0.001	0.007	0.200	4.217	0.087	2.225	0.073	3.999
EIF trimmed (NDE(0))	0.001	0.007	0.177	3.534	0.063	1.510	0.042	3.162
MW (NDE(0))	0.001	0.006	0.001	0.006	0.001	0.007	0.001	0.007
CBPS (NDE(0))	0.001	0.007	0.069	3.855	0.044	2.008	0.086	4.779
TruePS (NDE(0))	0.001	0.007	0.079	12.095	0.182	4.542	0.079	12.095

TABLE 4. Tchetgen Tchetgen and Shpitser (2012) simulation setting. Comparison of estimates for $n = 500$ and $n = 1000$ in the settings (A) (correct) and (B) (incorrect). Values in bold denote the best (i.e., smallest absolute) bias and variance within each block.

Weights (Estimand)	EIF-type (A)		IPW-type (A)		EIF-type (B)		IPW-type (B)	
	Abs.Bias	Var	Abs.Bias	Var	Abs.Bias	Var	Abs.Bias	Var
$n = 500$								
EIF weights (NDE(1))	0.095	10.452	0.338	12.176	0.808	12.499	0.091	10.611
EIF trimmed (NDE(1))	0.106	10.388	0.301	11.992	0.392	11.057	0.012	9.841
MW (NDE(1))	0.100	7.851	0.100	7.851	0.018	5.871	0.018	5.871
CBPS (NDE(1))	0.169	9.945	0.637	9.484	1.015	11.289	0.954	10.007
TruePS (NDE(1))	0.210	10.992	0.081	17.774	0.645	19.201	0.081	17.774
EIF weights (NDE(0))	0.693	13.915	0.316	25.929	0.223	12.842	0.468	18.449
EIF trimmed (NDE(0))	0.684	13.904	0.303	25.774	0.055	11.654	0.489	16.405
MW (NDE(0))	0.564	9.804	0.564	9.804	0.015	5.870	0.015	5.870
CBPS (NDE(0))	1.087	12.973	0.033	23.576	0.010	12.304	0.802	21.304
TruePS (NDE(0))	0.272	14.933	0.257	37.929	0.151	21.486	0.257	37.929
$n = 1000$								
EIF weights (NDE(1))	0.125	5.364	0.301	6.338	0.525	6.704	0.013	4.962
EIF trimmed (NDE(1))	0.125	5.310	0.281	6.196	0.326	5.835	0.059	4.661
MW (NDE(1))	0.121	4.039	0.121	4.039	0.005	2.989	0.005	2.989
CBPS (NDE(1))	0.063	5.231	0.487	5.214	0.644	6.485	0.430	5.132
TruePS (NDE(1))	0.093	5.848	0.138	9.584	0.393	10.145	0.138	9.584
EIF weights (NDE(0))	0.561	7.225	0.111	14.310	0.189	6.633	0.061	9.898
EIF trimmed (NDE(0))	0.559	7.058	0.133	13.509	0.063	5.771	0.150	7.733
MW (NDE(0))	0.458	4.997	0.458	4.997	0.035	2.857	0.035	2.857
CBPS (NDE(0))	0.836	6.913	0.135	13.539	0.040	6.386	0.484	12.622
TruePS (NDE(0))	0.093	7.500	0.190	18.988	0.077	10.930	0.190	18.988

TABLE 5. Wong and Chan (2018) simulation setting. Comparison of estimates for $n = 500$ and $n = 1000$ in the settings (A) and (B). Values in bold denote the best (i.e., smallest absolute) bias and variance within each block.

	(Z)		(Z, X)	
	Abs.Bias	Var	Mean	Var
$n = 500$				
RI (NDE(1))	0.002	0.011	0.002	0.013
RI (NDE(0))	0.001	0.012	0.002	0.013
$n = 1000$				
RI (NDE(1))	0.000	0.006	0.000	0.006
RI (NDE(0))	0.000	0.006	0.001	0.006

TABLE 6. Regression imputation estimates for $n = 500$ and $n = 1000$. The first two columns show the regression imputation results using $\{Z_1, Z_2, Z_3, Z_4\}$ as regressors. The remaining two columns show the results using $\{X_1, X_2, X_3, X_4, Z_1, Z_2, Z_3, Z_4\}$ as regressors.

	(A)		(B)	
	Abs.Bias	Var	Abs.Bias	Var
$n = 500$				
RI (NDE(1))	3.368	8.430	0.019	5.868
RI (NDE(0))	4.186	10.348	0.016	5.871
$n = 1000$				
RI (NDE(1))	3.360	4.016	0.006	2.989
RI (NDE(0))	-4.127	4.898	0.005	2.986

TABLE 7. Regression imputation estimates for $n = 500$ and $n = 1000$. The first two columns show the regression-imputation results using $\{Z_1, \dots, Z_4\}$ as regressors for μ and η . The last two columns show results using $\{X_1, \dots, X_{10}, Z_1, \dots, Z_4, M \times Z_1, \dots, M \times Z_4\}$ for μ and $\{X_1, \dots, X_{10}, Z_1, \dots, Z_4\}$ for η .

	EIF-type					IPW-type				
	Est.	Var.	p-val.	CI low	CI high	Est.	Var.	p-val.	CI low	CI high
ATE										
EIF	-0.067	0.002795	0.203	-0.171	0.036	-0.054	0.003820	0.379	-0.175	0.067
EIF (trimmed)	-0.067	0.002812	0.204	-0.171	0.037	-0.055	0.003846	0.372	-0.177	0.066
MW	-0.064	0.002553	0.202	-0.163	0.035	-0.064	0.002797	0.223	-0.168	0.039
CBPS	-0.067	0.002795	0.203	-0.171	0.036	-0.054	0.003820	0.379	-0.175	0.067
NDE(1)										
EIF	-0.097	0.003552	0.102	-0.214	0.019	-0.093	0.005026	0.190	-0.232	0.046
EIF (trimmed)	-0.101	0.003595	0.092	-0.219	0.016	-0.095	0.005097	0.183	-0.235	0.045
MW	-0.092	0.003108	0.098	-0.202	0.017	-0.092	0.003796	0.134	-0.213	0.028
CBPS	-0.097	0.003552	0.102	-0.214	0.019	-0.093	0.005026	0.190	-0.232	0.046
NDE(0)										
EIF	-0.101	0.002089	0.027	-0.191	-0.012	-0.083	0.002713	0.112	-0.185	0.019
EIF (trimmed)	-0.102	0.002107	0.027	-0.191	-0.012	-0.084	0.002739	0.110	-0.186	0.019
MW	-0.099	0.001803	0.019	-0.183	-0.016	-0.099	0.001604	0.013	-0.178	-0.021
CBPS	-0.101	0.002089	0.027	-0.191	-0.012	-0.083	0.002713	0.112	-0.185	0.019
NIE(1)										
EIF	0.034	0.000588	0.161	-0.013	0.082	0.028	0.000419	0.166	-0.012	0.069
EIF (trimmed)	0.034	0.000589	0.159	-0.013	0.082	0.028	0.000419	0.166	-0.012	0.068
MW	0.035	0.000880	0.238	-0.023	0.093	0.035	0.000602	0.154	-0.013	0.083
CBPS	0.034	0.000588	0.161	-0.013	0.082	0.028	0.000419	0.166	-0.012	0.069
NIE(0)										
EIF	0.030	0.000806	0.288	-0.026	0.086	0.039	0.000751	0.159	-0.015	0.092
EIF (trimmed)	0.034	0.000817	0.237	-0.022	0.090	0.040	0.000771	0.153	-0.015	0.094
MW	0.028	0.000830	0.334	-0.029	0.084	0.028	0.000549	0.235	-0.018	0.074
CBPS	0.030	0.000806	0.288	-0.026	0.086	0.039	0.000751	0.159	-0.015	0.092

TABLE 8. Empirical application results: point estimates, corresponding variances, p-values, and 95% confidence intervals for each estimator. Var. columns are printed to six decimals without digit grouping to better display small differences. Bolded point estimates highlight the two-step minimal weights estimator results for NDE(0).

APPENDIX B. PROOF OF PROPOSITION 3.2

Recall the notations $\pi_0(X) = P(D = 0 \mid X)$, $\xi_0(M, X) = P(D = 0 \mid M, X)$, and $\xi_1(M, X) = P(D = 1 \mid M, X)$. Then, for any bounded function $g(M, X)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{D\xi_0(M, X)}{\pi_0(X)\xi_1(M, X)} g(M, X) \mid X \right] &= \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{Df_{M|D=0,X}}{P(D=1 \mid X)f_{M|D=1,X}} g(M, X) \mid X \right] \\
&= \int \sum_{d \in \{0,1\}} \frac{df_{M|D=0,X}(m)}{P(D=1 \mid X)f_{M|D=1,X}(m)} g(m, X) P(M=m, D=d \mid X) dm \\
&= \int \frac{f_{M|D=0,X}(m)}{P(D=1 \mid X)f_{M|D=1,X}(m)} g(m, X) P(M=m, D=1 \mid X) dm \\
&= \int \frac{f_{M|D=0,X}(m)}{f_{M|D=1,X}(m)} g(m, X) f_{M|D=1,X}(m) P(D=1 \mid X) dm \\
&= \int g(m, X) P(M=m \mid D=0, X) dm \\
&= \mathbb{E}[g(M, X) \mid D=0, X].
\end{aligned}$$

Moreover, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1-D}{P(D=0 \mid X)} g(M, X) \mid X \right] &= \int \frac{1}{P(D=0 \mid X)} g(M, X) P(M=m, D=0 \mid X) dm \\
&= \int g(M, X) P(M=m \mid D=0, X) dm \\
&= \mathbb{E}[g(M, X) \mid D=0, X].
\end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

This establishes the first result, and the second result follows immediately from (13). \square

APPENDIX C. ASSUMPTIONS FOR THE FIRST STEP WEIGHTS (ALGORITHM 4.1)

These results are identical to those in Wang and Zubizarreta (2019). We modify the notation and restate it here for completeness.

Theorem C.1. *The dual of problem (8) and (9) is equivalent to the unconstrained optimization problem:*

$$\min_{\theta} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n [-(1-D_i)n\zeta(C(X_i)^\top \theta) + C(X_i)^\top \theta] + |\theta|^\top \varepsilon,$$

where $\theta = (\theta_1, \dots, \theta_K)^\top$ is the vector of dual variables associated with the K balancing constraints and $\varepsilon = (\varepsilon_1, \dots, \varepsilon_K)$ denotes, with $\zeta(y) = y/n - y(h')^{-1}(y) + h((h')^{-1}(y))$ and $h(x) = f(1/n - x)$. Moreover, the primal solution $\hat{w}_1^{\text{MW}}(X_i)$ satisfies

$$\hat{w}_1^{\text{MW}}(X_i) = \zeta'(C(X_i)^\top \theta^\dagger) \quad (i = 1, \dots, n),$$

where θ^\dagger is the solution to the dual optimization problem.

Assumption C.1. *We assume the following:*

- (i) *The minimizer $\theta^\circ = \arg \min_{\theta \in \Theta} \mathbb{E}[-(1-D)n\zeta(C(X)^\top \theta) + C(X)^\top \theta]$ is unique, where Θ is the compact parameter space for θ ; $\theta^\circ \in \text{int}(\Theta)$, where $\text{int}(\cdot)$ stands for the interior of a set;*
- (ii) *There exists a constant $0 < c_0 < 1/2$ such that $c_0 \leq n\zeta'(v) \leq 1 - c_0$ for any $v = C(x)^\top \theta$ with $\theta \in \text{int}(\Theta)$; also, there exist constants $c_1 < c_2 < 0$ such that $c_1 \leq n\zeta''(v) \leq c_2 < 0$ for any $v = C(x)^\top \theta$ with $\theta \in \text{int}(\Theta)$;*
- (iii) *There exists a constant $c > 0$ and $C < \infty$ such that $\sup_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \|C(x)\|_2 \leq CK^{1/2}$, $\|C(X)\|_{P,2} \leq CK^{1/2}$, $c \leq \lambda_{\min}(\mathbb{E}[C(X)C(X)^\top]) \leq \lambda_{\max}(\mathbb{E}[C(X)C(X)^\top]) \leq C$ and $\mathbb{E}[C(X)C(X)^\top] \preceq CI$;*
- (iv) *The number of basis functions K satisfies $K^2 \log K = o(n)$;*
- (v) *There exist constants $r_1 > 1$ and θ^* such that the true propensity score function satisfies*

$$\sup_{x \in \mathcal{X}} |m^*(x) - C(x)^\top \theta^*| = O(K^{-r_1})$$

where $m^*(\cdot) = (\zeta')^{-1}(1/n\pi_0(x))$;

- (vi) $\|\varepsilon\|_\infty = o_p((nK)^{-1/2})$ and so $\|\varepsilon\|_2 = o_p(n^{-1/2})$.

Theorem C.2. *Let θ^\dagger be the solution to 8 and $\hat{w}_1^{\text{MW}}(x) = \zeta'(C(x)^\top \theta^\dagger)$. Suppose that Assumption C.1 holds. Then, we have:*

- (i) $\sup_{x \in \mathcal{X}} |n\hat{w}_1^{\text{MW}}(x) - 1/\pi_0(x)| = O_p(\sqrt{K^2(\log K)/n} + K^{1-r_1}) = o_p(1)$;
- (ii) $\|n\hat{w}_1^{\text{MW}}(X) - 1/\pi_0(X)\|_{P,2} = O_p(\sqrt{K^2(\log K)/n} + K^{1-r_1}) = o_p(1)$.

APPENDIX D. PROOF OF THEOREM 5.1

We follow the proof of Wang and Zubizarreta (2019). For notational convenience, we write \hat{w}_{1i} in place of $\hat{w}_1^{\text{MW}}(X_i)$ and w_{2i} in place of $w_2(M_i, X_i)$. We note that

$$\sum_{i=1}^n D_i f(w_{2i}) = \sum_{i=1}^n D_i f(D_i w_{2i} - (1 - D_i) \hat{w}_{1i})$$

We denote $s_{n \times 1} = (s_i)_{n \times 1} = (D_i w_{2i} - (1 - D_i) \hat{w}_{1i})_{n \times 1}$ and rewrite the optimization problem in matrix notation,

$$\min_{w_{2i}} \sum_{i=1}^n D_i f(s_i)$$

subject to

$$Q_{2L \times n} s_{n \times 1} \leq d_{2L \times 1}$$

where

$$B_{L \times n} = \begin{pmatrix} b_1(X_1, M_1) & b_1(X_2, M_2) & \cdots & b_1(X_n, M_n) \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ b_L(X_1, M_1) & b_L(X_2, M_2) & \cdots & b_L(X_n, M_n) \end{pmatrix},$$

$$Q_{2L \times n} = \begin{pmatrix} B_{L \times n} \\ -B_{L \times n} \end{pmatrix}, \quad d_{2L \times 1} = \begin{pmatrix} \delta_{L \times 1} \\ \delta_{L \times 1} \end{pmatrix}.$$

Then, the dual of this problem is

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{\lambda} \quad & - \sum_{i=1}^n f_i^*(Q_i^\top \lambda) - \lambda^\top d \\ \text{subject to } & \lambda \geq 0 \end{aligned}$$

where $f_i^*(\cdot)$ is the convex conjugate of $D_i f(\cdot)$ and Q_i is the i -th column of $Q_{2L \times n}$. We denote $g(\lambda) := - \sum_{i=1}^n f_i^*(Q_i^\top \lambda) - \langle \lambda, d \rangle$ and $y := Q_i^\top \lambda$.

Then, $f_i^*(y)$ can be written as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} f_i^*(y) &= \sup_{s_i} \{y s_i - D_i f(s_i)\} \\ &= \sup_{w_2} \{y(D_i w_{2i} - (1 - D_i)\widehat{w}_{1i}) - D_i f(D_i w_{2i} - (1 - D_i)\widehat{w}_{1i})\} \\ &= D_i w_{2i}^\dagger y - (1 - D_i)\widehat{w}_{1i} y - D_i f(D_i w_{2i}^\dagger - (1 - D_i)\widehat{w}_{1i}) \end{aligned}$$

where w_{2i}^\dagger satisfies the first order condition,

$$\begin{aligned} D_i y - D_i f'(D_i w_{2i}^\dagger - (1 - D_i)\widehat{w}_{1i}) &= 0, \\ \Rightarrow f'(w_{2i}^\dagger) &= y, \\ \Rightarrow w_{2i}^\dagger &= (f')^{-1}(y), \end{aligned}$$

where we note that the second line holds because when $D_i = 0$ it holds obviously and the last line holds by the strict convexity of f . Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} f_i^*(y) &= D_i (f')^{-1}(y) y - (1 - D_i)\widehat{w}_{1i} y - D_i f(D_i w_{2i}^\dagger - (1 - D_i)\widehat{w}_{1i}) \\ &= D_i (f')^{-1}(y) y - (1 - D_i)\widehat{w}_{1i} y - D_i f((f')^{-1}(y)) \\ &= D_i \{ (f')^{-1}(y) y - f((f')^{-1}(y)) \} - (1 - D_i)\widehat{w}_{1i} y. \end{aligned}$$

We denote $\rho(y) := (f')^{-1}(y) y - f((f')^{-1}(y))$, which gives

$$f_i^*(y) = D_i \rho(y) - (1 - D_i)\widehat{w}_{1i} y$$

Finally, $g(\lambda)$ can be written as:

$$g(\lambda) = -\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n [D_i n \rho(Q_i^\top \lambda) - (1 - D_i) n \widehat{w}_{1i} Q_i^\top \lambda] - \lambda^\top d$$

Thus, by inverting the sign, the dual formulation thus becomes

$$\text{minimize} \quad -g(\lambda) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n [D_i n \rho(Q_i^\top \lambda) - (1 - D_i) n \widehat{w}_{1i} Q_i^\top \lambda] + \lambda^\top d$$

subject to $\lambda \geq 0$

Also, we note that

$$\begin{aligned}\rho'(y) &= (f')^{-1}(y) + \{(f')^{-1}(y)\}'y - \{(f')^{-1}(y)\}'f'((f')^{-1}(y)) \\ &= (f')^{-1}(y) + \{(f')^{-1}(y)\}'y - \{(f')^{-1}(y)\}'y = (f')^{-1}(y)\end{aligned}$$

Recalling $w_{2i}^\dagger = (f')^{-1}(y)$, $w_{2i}^\dagger = \rho'(Q_i^\top \lambda)$ holds, and we note that $w_{2i}^\dagger = \hat{w}^{\text{MW}}(M_i, X_i)$ because of the strong duality (see, e.g., Section 5.2.3. of Boyd and Vandenberghe (2004)), which will imply the second statement of Theorem 5.1.

We then rewrite this problem into the form given by Theorem 5.1. Denoting

$$\lambda_{2L \times 1} = \begin{pmatrix} \lambda_{+, L \times 1} \\ \lambda_{-, L \times 1} \end{pmatrix}_{2L \times 1} \quad \text{and} \quad B_i := B(X_i, M_i) = (b_1(X_i, M_i), \dots, b_L(X_i, M_i))^\top,$$

then the objective function can be written as

$$\begin{aligned}& \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (D_i n \rho(B_i^\top \lambda_+ - B_i^\top \lambda_-) - (1 - D_i) n \hat{w}_{1i} (B_i^\top \lambda_+ - B_i^\top \lambda_-)) + \lambda_+^\top \delta + \lambda_-^\top \delta \\ &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (D_i n \rho(B_i^\top (\lambda_+ - \lambda_-)) - (1 - D_i) n \hat{w}_{1i} B_i^\top (\lambda_+ - \lambda_-)) + \lambda_+^\top \delta + \lambda_-^\top \delta\end{aligned}$$

Denote the optimizer is $\lambda_{2L \times 1}^\dagger = \begin{pmatrix} \lambda_{+, L \times 1}^\dagger \\ \lambda_{-, L \times 1}^\dagger \end{pmatrix}_{2L \times 1}$. We claim that $\lambda_{+, l}^\dagger \cdot \lambda_{-, l}^\dagger = 0$, for $l = 1, \dots, L$, where the index l points to the l -th entry of a vector.

We prove this claim by contradiction. Recalling $\lambda \geq 0$ by constraint, and suppose the opposite. If $\lambda_{+, l}^\dagger > 0$ and $\lambda_{-, l}^\dagger > 0$ for some l , then define

$$\begin{aligned}\lambda^{\ddagger \top} &:= \left[\lambda_+^\dagger - (0, \dots, 0, \min(\lambda_{+, l}^\dagger, \lambda_{-, l}^\dagger), 0, \dots, 0), \lambda_-^\dagger - (0, \dots, 0, \min(\lambda_{+, l}^\dagger, \lambda_{-, l}^\dagger), 0, \dots, 0) \right] \\ &:= \left[\lambda_+^\ddagger, \lambda_-^\ddagger \right].\end{aligned}$$

We note that $\lambda_+^\ddagger - \lambda_-^\ddagger = \lambda_+^\dagger - \lambda_-^\dagger$ and thus we have,

$$\begin{aligned}l(\lambda^\ddagger) - l(\lambda^\dagger) &= \left((\lambda_+^\ddagger + \lambda_-^\ddagger)^\top \delta \right) - \left((\lambda_+^\dagger + \lambda_-^\dagger)^\top \delta \right) \\ &= -2 \min(\lambda_{+, l}^\dagger, \lambda_{-, l}^\dagger) \cdot \delta_l < 0.\end{aligned}$$

by $\delta_l > 0$ and $\min(\lambda_{+, l}^\dagger, \lambda_{-, l}^\dagger) > 0$. This contradicts the fact that λ^\dagger is the optimizer. Theorem 5.1 then follows by rewriting $\lambda_+ - \lambda_-$ as λ and deducing $\lambda_+ + \lambda_- = |\lambda|$ from $\lambda_{+, l}^\dagger \cdot \lambda_{-, l}^\dagger = 0$, $l = 1, \dots, L$.

APPENDIX E. PROOF OF THEOREM 5.2

The proof also proceeds analogously to that of Wang and Zubizarreta (2019).

E.1. Proof of Lemma E.1. We define

$$G(\lambda) := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(D_i n \rho(B_i^\top \lambda) - (1 - D_i) n \widehat{w}_{1i} B_i^\top \lambda \right) + \delta^\top |\lambda|.$$

ρ is convex because $\rho'(y) = (f')^{-1}(y)$ and f is strictly convex, and thus the map $\lambda \mapsto \rho(B_i^\top \lambda)$ is convex; linear functions are convex; and nonnegative sums of convex functions are convex; hence G is convex (and continuous). Recalling Assumption 5.1(i) which states that the parameter space Λ is compact, G admits at least one global minimizer $\lambda^\dagger \in \arg \min_\lambda G(\lambda)$.

We then establish the following lemma.

Lemma E.1.

$$\|\lambda^\dagger - \lambda^*\|_2 = O_p \left(\sqrt{L \log L/n} + L^{1/2-r_2} + L^{1/2} K^{-r_1} \right).$$

Let

$$r_n := C \left(\sqrt{L \log L/n} + L^{1/2-r_2} + L^{1/2} K^{-r_1} \right), \quad \mathcal{C} := \{\Delta \in \mathbb{R}^L : \|\Delta\|_2 \leq r_n\},$$

and set

$$m_n := \inf_{\|\Delta\|_2=r_n} \{G(\lambda^* + \Delta) - G(\lambda^*)\}.$$

Because G is continuous and $\partial\mathcal{C} = \{\Delta : \|\Delta\|_2 = r_n\}$ is compact, the infimum is attained: there exists Δ_n^* with $\|\Delta_n^*\|_2 = r_n$ and $m_n = G(\lambda^* + \Delta_n^*) - G(\lambda^*)$. It is enough to prove $P(m_n > 0) \rightarrow 1$, since by convexity, for any unit u where $\|u\|_2 = 1$, the function $\phi_u(t) := G(\lambda^* + tu) - G(\lambda^*)$ is convex on $[0, \infty)$ with $\phi_u(0) = 0$, and for $t \geq r_n$ the convexity inequality yields $\phi_u(r_n) \leq \frac{r_n}{t} \phi_u(t) \leq \phi_u(t)$. In other words, the positivity on the boundary ($\|\Delta\|_2 = r_n$) implies the positivity on the exterior ($\|\Delta\|_2 \geq r_n$),

$$\inf_{\|\Delta\|_2 \geq r_n} \{G(\lambda^* + \Delta) - G(\lambda^*)\} \geq m_n > 0.$$

On this event, any global minimizer λ^\dagger must lie inside the ball. Indeed, assume $\|\lambda^\dagger - \lambda^*\|_2 > r_n$ and set $\Delta^\dagger := \lambda^\dagger - \lambda^*$. Then $\|\Delta^\dagger\|_2 \geq r_n$, so by exterior positivity we have

$$G(\lambda^\dagger) - G(\lambda^*) = G(\lambda^* + \Delta^\dagger) - G(\lambda^*) > 0.$$

But global optimality of λ^\dagger entails $G(\lambda^\dagger) \leq G(\lambda^*)$, a contradiction. Hence, $P(m_n > 0) \rightarrow 1$ implies $P(\|\lambda^\dagger - \lambda^*\|_2 \leq r_n) \rightarrow 1$, i.e., $\|\lambda^\dagger - \lambda^*\|_2 = O_p(r_n)$.

In sum, to establish Lemma E.1 it therefore suffices to prove

$$P(G(\lambda^* + \Delta_n^*) - G(\lambda^*) > 0) \rightarrow 1.$$

Recall $G(\lambda) = g(\lambda) + \delta^\top |\lambda|$ with $g(\lambda) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(D_i n \rho(B_i^\top \lambda) - (1 - D_i) n \widehat{w}_{1i} B_i^\top \lambda \right)$. Assumption 5.1 (ii) ensures $n\rho''(v)$ is bounded and strictly positive, and (iii) gives $\sup_{(m,x)} \|B(m,x)\|_2 \leq CL^{1/2}$. Using the mean value theorem along the segment $\{\lambda^* + t\Delta_n^* : t \in [0, 1]\}$, there exists

$\tilde{\lambda}$ on this segment such that

$$g(\lambda^* + \Delta_n^*) - g(\lambda^*) = \nabla g(\lambda^*)^\top \Delta_n^* + \frac{1}{2}(\Delta_n^*)^\top H(\tilde{\lambda}) \Delta_n^*,$$

where

$$\nabla g(\lambda^*) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(D_i n \rho'(B_i^\top \lambda^*) - (1 - D_i) n \widehat{w}_{1i} \right) B_i, \quad H(\tilde{\lambda}) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n D_i n \rho''(B_i^\top \tilde{\lambda}) B_i B_i^\top.$$

For the nonsmooth penalty we use the reverse triangle inequality componentwise: $|\lambda^* + \Delta_n^*| - |\lambda^*| \geq -|\Delta_n^*|$, whence

$$\delta^\top (|\lambda^* + \Delta_n^*| - |\lambda^*|) \geq -\delta^\top |\Delta_n^*| \geq -\|\delta\|_2 \|\Delta_n^*\|_2.$$

Combining these two displays and applying Cauchy–Schwarz to the linear term yields

$$G(\lambda^* + \Delta_n^*) - G(\lambda^*) \geq -\|\Delta_n^*\|_2 \left\| \nabla g(\lambda^*) \right\|_2 + \frac{1}{2}(\Delta_n^*)^\top H(\tilde{\lambda}) \Delta_n^* - \|\delta\|_2 \|\Delta_n^*\|_2. \quad (*)$$

Assumption 5.1 (iii) gives a uniform lower bound $n\rho''(v) \geq c_1 > 0$, then $H(\tilde{\lambda}) \geq c_1 \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n D_i B_i B_i^\top \right)$. Consequently,

$$(\Delta_n^*)^\top H(\tilde{\lambda}) \Delta_n^* \geq c_1 (\Delta_n^*)^\top \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n D_i B_i B_i^\top \right) \Delta_n^* \geq c_1 \lambda_{\min} \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n D_i B_i B_i^\top \right) \|\Delta_n^*\|_2^2.$$

If, in addition, the design is nondegenerate on the treated subsample, i.e. $\lambda_{\min}(\mathbb{E}[DBB^\top]) \geq c_B > 0$, then by a law of large numbers $\lambda_{\min} \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n D_i B_i B_i^\top \right) \xrightarrow{P} \lambda_{\min}(\mathbb{E}[DBB^\top]) \geq c_B$, so there exists $\kappa > 0$ such that, with probability tending to one,

$$(\Delta_n^*)^\top H(\tilde{\lambda}) \Delta_n^* \geq \kappa \|\Delta_n^*\|_2^2.$$

Plugging this back into (*) we obtain, with probability tending to one,

$$G(\lambda^* + \Delta_n^*) - G(\lambda^*) \geq -\|\Delta_n^*\|_2 \left\| \nabla g(\lambda^*) \right\|_2 + \frac{\kappa}{2} \|\Delta_n^*\|_2^2 - \|\delta\|_2 \|\Delta_n^*\|_2.$$

Next, in order to control $\|\nabla g(\lambda^*)\|_2$, we first rewrite the gradient term with the population weight $w_{2,i}^*(m, x) := \xi_0(m, x) / \{\pi_0(x) \xi_1(m, x)\}$ from Assumption 5.1 (v). For brevity, write

$$w_{2,i}^* := w_{2,i}^*(M_i, X_i), \quad \pi_i := \pi_0(X_i), \quad g(\lambda) := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(D_i n \rho(B_i^\top \lambda) - (1 - D_i) n \widehat{w}_{1i} B_i^\top \lambda \right).$$

Then

$$\left\| \nabla g(\lambda^*) \right\|_2 = \left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(D_i n \rho'(B_i^\top \lambda^*) - (1 - D_i) n \widehat{w}_{1i} \right) B_i \right\|_2 \leq A_1 + A_2 + A_3,$$

where

$$A_1 := \left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n D_i (n \rho'(B_i^\top \lambda^*) - w_{2,i}^*) B_i \right\|_2, \quad A_2 := \left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(D_i w_{2,i}^* - (1 - D_i) \frac{1}{\pi_i} \right) B_i \right\|_2,$$

$$A_3 := \left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (1 - D_i) \left(n\hat{w}_{1i} - \frac{1}{\pi_i} \right) B_i \right\|_2.$$

Control of A_1 . By Assumption 5.1 (v), $\sup_{(m,x)} |w_2^*(m, x) - n\rho'(B(m, x)^\top \lambda^*)| = O(L^{-r_2})$. Using Assumption 5.1 (iii), $\|B_i\|_2 \leq CL^{1/2}$ uniformly, hence

$$A_1 \leq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \|B_i\|_2 O(L^{-r_2}) = O(L^{1/2-r_2}).$$

Control of A_2 . By construction of w_2^* and the Proposition 3.2 (population balance property),

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\left(Dw_2^*(M, X) - (1 - D) \frac{1}{\pi_0(X)} \right) B(M, X) \right] = 0.$$

Set the mean-zero vector $Z_i := \left(D_i w_{2,i}^* - (1 - D_i)/\pi_i \right) B_i$ and apply the following matrix Bernstein inequality.

Lemma E.2. *Theorem 6.1.1. of Tropp (2015). Let $\{Z_i\}$ be a sequence of independent random matrices with dimensions $d_1 \times d_2$. Assume that $\mathbb{E}[Z_i] = 0$ and $\|Z_i\|_2 \leq R_n$ almost surely. Define*

$$\sigma_n^2 = \max \left(\left\| \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}(Z_i Z_i^\top) \right\|_2, \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}(Z_i^\top Z_i) \right\|_2 \right).$$

Then for all $t \geq 0$,

$$\Pr \left(\left\| \sum_{i=1}^n Z_i \right\|_2 \geq t \right) \leq (d_1 + d_2) \exp \left(-\frac{t^2/2}{\sigma_n^2 + R_n t/3} \right).$$

We verify the conditions. Assumption 5.1 (iii) and boundedness of w_2^* , $1/\pi_0$ from Assumption 5.1 (ii) together with (v) yield

$$\|Z_i\|_2 \leq C\|B_i\|_2 \leq CL^{1/2},$$

$$\left\| \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[Z_i Z_i^\top] \right\|_2 \leq Cn$$

,and, since $\mathbb{E}[\|Z_i\|_2^2] \leq C\mathbb{E}[\|B_i\|_2^2] \leq CL$,

$$\left\| \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[Z_i^\top Z_i] \right\|_2 = n\mathbb{E}[\|Z_i\|_2^2] \leq nC'L$$

Hence, for $t' > 0$,

$$\Pr \left(\left\| \sum_{i=1}^n Z_i \right\|_2 \geq t' \right) \leq (L + 1) \exp \left(-\frac{t'^2/2}{C'Ln + CL^{1/2}t'} \right)$$

and this implies for $t = t'/n > 0$,

$$\Pr \left(\left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n Z_i \right\|_2 \geq t \right) \leq (L+1) \exp \left(-\frac{nt^2/2}{C'L + CL^{1/2}t} \right).$$

Fix $0 < \delta < 1$ and set $s := \log((L+1)/\delta)$. The requirement that the right side is at most δ is equivalent to

$$\frac{nt^2}{2(C'L + CL^{1/2}t)} \geq s \iff nt^2 - 2CsL^{1/2}t - 2C'sL \geq 0.$$

Solving this quadratic inequality in t shows that it holds if

$$t \geq t_\delta := \frac{CsL^{1/2} + \sqrt{C^2s^2L + 2C'snL}}{n}.$$

Therefore, $\Pr \left(\left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n Z_i \right\|_2 \geq t_\delta \right) \leq \delta$. Then, using $\sqrt{x+y} \leq \sqrt{x} + \sqrt{y}$, we obtain the convenient upper bound

$$t_\delta \leq t'_\delta := \sqrt{\frac{2C'L}{n} \log \frac{L+1}{\delta}} + \frac{2CL^{1/2}}{n} \log \frac{L+1}{\delta}.$$

Since we have $\Pr \left(\left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n Z_i \right\|_2 \geq t'_\delta \right) \leq \Pr \left(\left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n Z_i \right\|_2 \geq t_\delta \right) \leq \delta$, consequently, with probability at least $1 - \delta$,

$$\left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n Z_i \right\|_2 \leq \sqrt{\frac{2C'L}{n} \log \frac{L+1}{\delta}} + \frac{2CL^{1/2}}{n} \log \frac{L+1}{\delta}. \quad (14)$$

Therefore, we have under Assumption 5.1 (iv),

$$\|A_2\|_2 = O_p \left(\sqrt{\frac{L \log L}{n}} + \frac{\sqrt{L \log L}}{n} \right) = O_p \left(\sqrt{\frac{L \log L}{n}} \right)$$

Control of A_3 . The first-stage \hat{w}_1 satisfies the uniform rate $\sup_x |n\hat{w}_1(x) - 1/\pi_0(x)| = O_p(K^{-r_1})$ for some $r_1 > 0$ as in Assumption C.1 (v), then using Assumption 5.1 (iii) yields

$$A_3 \leq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \|B_i\|_2 \sup_x \left| n\hat{w}_1(x) - \frac{1}{\pi_0(x)} \right| = O_p(L^{1/2}K^{-r_1}).$$

Combining the three bounds, we obtain the lower bound

$$\begin{aligned} G(\lambda^* + \Delta_n^*) - G(\lambda^*) &\geq -\|\Delta_n^*\|_2 \left\| \nabla g(\lambda^*) \right\|_2 + \frac{\kappa}{2} \|\Delta_n^*\|_2^2 - \|\delta\|_2 \|\Delta_n^*\|_2 \\ &\geq -\|\Delta_n^*\|_2 \cdot O_p \left(\sqrt{\frac{L \log L}{n}} + L^{1/2-r_2} + L^{1/2}K^{-r_1} \right) + \frac{\kappa}{2} \|\Delta_n^*\|_2^2 - \|\delta\|_2 \|\Delta_n^*\|_2. \end{aligned}$$

Assumption 5.1(vii) gives $\|\delta\|_2 = o_p(n^{-1/2})$, which is negligible. Then, recalling that $\|\Delta_n^*\|_2 = C \left(\sqrt{L \log L/n} + L^{1/2-r_2} + L^{1/2}K^{-r_1} \right)$, $G(\lambda^* + \Delta_n^*) - G(\lambda^*) > 0$ holds with probability tending to 1 by taking large enough C so that the squared term $\kappa/2 \|\Delta_n^*\|_2^2$ dominates.

E.2. Proof of Theorem 5.2. By Theorem 5.1, $\widehat{w}_2^{\text{MW}}(x, m) = \rho'(B(x, m)^\top \lambda^\dagger)$. Assumption 5.1 (v) states that there exists λ^* such that, with

$$r_L(x, m) := w_2^*(x, m) - n\rho'(B(x, m)^\top \lambda^*),$$

we have $\sup_{(x, m)} |r_L(x, m)| = O(L^{-r_2})$. Therefore, by the triangle inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{(x, m)} |n\widehat{w}_2(x, m) - w_2^*(x, m)| &\leq \sup_{(x, m)} \left| n\rho'(B(x, m)^\top \lambda^\dagger) - n\rho'(B(x, m)^\top \lambda^*) \right| + \sup_{(x, m)} |r_L(x, m)| \\ &= \sup_{(x, m)} \left| n\rho'(B(x, m)^\top \lambda^\dagger) - n\rho'(B(x, m)^\top \lambda^*) \right| + O(L^{-r_2}). \end{aligned}$$

For the first term, apply the mean value theorem along the segment $\{\lambda^* + t(\lambda^\dagger - \lambda^*) : t \in [0, 1]\}$: for each (x, m) there exists $\widetilde{\lambda}(x, m)$ on that segment such that

$$n\rho'(B(x, m)^\top \lambda^\dagger) - n\rho'(B(x, m)^\top \lambda^*) = n\rho''(B(x, m)^\top \widetilde{\lambda}(x, m)) B(x, m)^\top (\lambda^\dagger - \lambda^*).$$

By Assumption 5.1 (ii), there exist constants $0 < c_1 \leq c_2 < \infty$ such that $c_1 \leq n\rho''(v) \leq c_2$; by Lemma E.1, so

$$\sup_{(x, m)} n\rho''(B(x, m)^\top \widetilde{\lambda}(x, m)) \leq c_2.$$

Using Assumption 5.1 (iii), $\sup_{(x, m)} \|B(x, m)\|_2 \leq CL^{1/2}$, we obtain

$$\sup_{(x, m)} \left| n\rho'(B(x, m)^\top \lambda^\dagger) - n\rho'(B(x, m)^\top \lambda^*) \right| \leq c_2 \sup_{(x, m)} \|B(x, m)\|_2 \|\lambda^\dagger - \lambda^*\|_2 \leq CL^{1/2} \|\lambda^\dagger - \lambda^*\|_2.$$

Invoking Lemma E.1 and putting the pieces together yield by Assumptions 5.1 (iv) and

$$\sup_{(x, m)} |n\widehat{w}_2(x, m) - w_2^*(x, m)| = O_p \left(\sqrt{\frac{L^2 \log L}{n}} + L^{1-r_2} + LK^{-r_1} \right) = o_p(1).$$

We also give the convergence rate regarding the norm $\|\cdot\|_{P,2}$. Repeating the same steps, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|n\widehat{w}_2(M, X) - w_2^*(M, X)\|_{P,2} &\leq \|n\rho'(B(M, X)^\top \lambda^\dagger) - n\rho'(B(M, X)^\top \lambda^*)\|_{P,2} + \|r_L\|_{P,2} \\ &= \|n\rho''(B(M, X)^\top \widetilde{\lambda}) B(M, X)^\top (\lambda^\dagger - \lambda^*)\|_{P,2} + O(L^{-r_2}) \\ &\leq \left(\sup_v n\rho''(v) \right) \|B(M, X)\|_{P,2} \|\lambda^\dagger - \lambda^*\|_2 + O(L^{-r_2}), \end{aligned}$$

where $\widetilde{\lambda}$ lies on the segment between λ^* and λ^\dagger . By Assumption 5.1 (ii), $\sup_v n\rho''(v) \leq c_2$ on that segment, and by Assumption 5.1 (iii), $\|B(M, X)\|_{P,2} \leq CL^{1/2}$. Hence,

$$\|n\widehat{w}_2(M, X) - w_2^*(M, X)\|_{P,2} \leq CL^{1/2} \|\lambda^\dagger - \lambda^*\|_2 + O(L^{-r_2}).$$

Using Lemma E.1 again,

$$\|n\widehat{w}_2(M, X) - w_2^*(M, X)\|_{P,2} = O_p \left(\sqrt{\frac{L^2 \log L}{n}} + L^{1-r_2} + LK^{-r_1} \right) = o_p(1).$$

APPENDIX F. PROOF OF THEOREM 5.4

We recall that $w_1^*(X_i) = 1/\pi_0(X_i)$ and $w_2^*(M_i, X_i) = \xi_0(M_i, X_i)/\pi_0(X_i)\xi_1(M_i, X_i)$. Then, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{i=1}^n D_i \widehat{w}_2(M_i, X_i) Y_i - \theta_{1,0} \\
&= \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n D_i w_2^*(M_i, X_i) (Y_i - \mu_1(M_i, X_i)) + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (1 - D_i) w_1^*(X_i) (\mu_1(M_i, X_i) - \eta_{1,0}(X_i)) \right. \\
&+ \left. \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \eta_{1,0}(X_i) - \theta_{1,0} \right) + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (D_i w_2^*(M_i, X_i) - (1 - D_i) w_1^*(X_i)) \mu_1(M_i, X_i) \\
&+ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n ((1 - D_i) w_1^*(X_i) - 1) \eta_{1,0}(X_i) + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n D_i (n \widehat{w}_2(M_i, X_i) - w_2^*(M_i, X_i)) Y_i
\end{aligned}$$

To complete the proof, it remains to show that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n (D_i w_2^*(M_i, X_i) - (1 - D_i) w_1^*(X_i)) \mu_1(M_i, X_i) \\
&+ \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n ((1 - D_i) w_1^*(X_i) - 1) \eta_{1,0}(X_i) + \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n D_i (n \widehat{w}_2(M_i, X_i) - w_2^*(M_i, X_i)) Y_i \quad (15)
\end{aligned}$$

is $o_p(1)$. The terms (15) can be written as follows

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n D_i (n \widehat{w}_2(M_i, X_i) - w_2^*(M_i, X_i)) (Y_i - \mu_1(M_i, X_i)) \quad (16)$$

$$+ \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n D_i (n \widehat{w}_2 - w_2^*) (\mu_1(M_i, X_i) - B(X_i, M_i)^\top \beta) \quad (17)$$

$$+ \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n (D_i w_2^* - (1 - D_i) w_1^*) (\mu_1(M_i, X_i) - B(X_i, M_i)^\top \beta) \quad (18)$$

$$+ \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n (1 - D_i) (w_1^* - n \widehat{w}_1) (\mu_1(M_i, X_i) - B(X_i, M_i)^\top \beta) \quad (19)$$

$$+ \sqrt{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (D_i \widehat{w}_2 - (1 - D_i) \widehat{w}_1) B(X_i, M_i)^\top \beta \quad (20)$$

$$+ \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n (1 - D_i) (n \widehat{w}_1 - w_1^*(X_i)) (\mu_1(M_i, X_i) - \eta_{1,0}(X_i)) \quad (21)$$

$$+ \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n ((1 - D_i) \widehat{w}_1 - 1) (\eta_{1,0}(X_i) - C(X_i)^\top \gamma) \quad (22)$$

$$+ \sqrt{n} \sum_{i=1}^n ((1 - D_i)\widehat{w}_1 - \frac{1}{n})C(X_i)^\top \gamma \quad (23)$$

We prove each term is $o_p(1)$. First, for the terms (20) and (23), we show that each term is $o_p(1)$ using the ℓ_∞ -bounds implied by the balancing constraints. Define

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_B &= \sum_{i=1}^n D_i \widehat{w}_2 B(X_i, M_i) - \sum_{i=1}^n (1 - D_i) \widehat{w}_1 B(X_i, M_i) \\ \Delta_C &= \sum_{i=1}^n (1 - D_i) \widehat{w}_1 C(X_i) - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n C(X_i). \end{aligned}$$

By Algorithm 4.1, each coordinate of Δ_B is bounded by δ_j and each coordinate of Δ_C is bounded by ε_j . Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Delta_B\|_2 &\leq \sqrt{L} \|\Delta_B\|_\infty \leq \sqrt{L} \|\delta\|_\infty, \\ \|\Delta_C\|_2 &\leq \sqrt{K} \|\Delta_C\|_\infty \leq \sqrt{K} \|\varepsilon\|_\infty. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, by Cauchy–Schwarz inequality,

$$\sqrt{n} \left| \sum_{i=1}^n (D_i \widehat{w}_2 - (1 - D_i) \widehat{w}_1) B(X_i, M_i)^\top \beta \right| = \sqrt{n} |\beta^\top \Delta_B| \leq \sqrt{n} \|\beta\|_2 \|\Delta_B\|_2 \leq \sqrt{n} \|\beta\|_2 \sqrt{L} \|\delta\|_\infty,$$

and

$$\sqrt{n} \left| \sum_{i=1}^n \left((1 - D_i) \widehat{w}_1 - \frac{1}{n} \right) C(X_i)^\top \gamma \right| = \sqrt{n} |\gamma^\top \Delta_C| \leq \sqrt{n} \|\gamma\|_2 \|\Delta_C\|_2 \leq \sqrt{n} \|\gamma\|_2 \sqrt{K} \|\varepsilon\|_\infty.$$

Since $\|\delta\|_\infty = o_p((nL)^{-1/2})$ and $\|\varepsilon\|_\infty = o_p((nK)^{-1/2})$ by Assumption 5.1 (vii) and Assumption C (vii), these are $o_p(1)$ provided.

For the term (16), let $f_0(M, X, Y) := D(n\widehat{w}_2(M, X) - w_2^*(M, X))(Y - \mu_1(M, X))$ and write $\mathbb{G}_n := \sqrt{n}(P_n - P)$. For $\delta_0 := C \left(\sqrt{L^2 \log L/n} + L^{1-r_2} + LK^{-r_1} \right)$, we will prove that $|\mathbb{G}_n(f_0)| = O_p(\delta_0)$.

First, by the law of iterated expectation (see Proposition 3.2), $\mathbb{E}[f_0] = 0$.

By Theorem 5.2, $\|n\widehat{w}_2 - w_2^*\|_{P,2} = O_p(\delta_0)$. Fix $C_1 > 0$ large enough and define the high-probability event $A_n := \{\|n\widehat{w}_2 - w_2^*\|_{P,2} \leq C_1 \delta_0\}$. Then $\Pr(A_n) \rightarrow 1$, and on A_n the difference $g := n\widehat{w}_2 - w_2^*$ lies in the localized class

$$\mathcal{G}(\delta_0) := \{g \in \mathcal{W}_2 : \|g\|_{P,2} \leq C_1 \delta_0\},$$

where we denote the centered classes

$$\mathcal{W}_2^\Delta := \{f - w_2^* : f \in \mathcal{W}_2\} \subset L_2(P).$$

Define the corresponding function class

$$\mathcal{F}(\delta_0) := \{f(M, X, Y) = D(Y - \mu_1(M, X))g(M, X) : g \in \mathcal{G}(\delta_0)\}.$$

By construction, on A_n we have $f_0 \in \mathcal{F}(\delta_0)$.

Assumption 5.1 (iii) implies $n\rho'(B^\top \lambda)$ is uniformly bounded away from 0 and 1, hence $n\hat{w}_2$ is uniformly bounded. Moreover, by Assumption 5.1 (vi) there exists λ^* with $\sup_{m,x} |w_2^*(m, x) - n\rho'(B^\top \lambda^*)| = O(L^{-r_2})$, so w_2^* is also uniformly bounded for large n ; thus g is uniformly bounded on a high-probability event. Consequently, there exists a deterministic, pointwise envelope G_B for \mathcal{W}_2^Δ such that $|g(m, x)| \leq G_B(m, x)$ for all $g \in \mathcal{W}_2^\Delta$, with $G_B \in L_\infty$. Hence an envelope for $\mathcal{F}(\delta_0)$ is $F(M, X, Y) := |D||Y - \mu_1(M, X)|G_B(M, X)$, and by Assumption 5.2 (ii) together with boundedness of G_B and D ,

$$\|F\|_{P,2} = (\mathbb{E}[D^2(Y - \mu_1)^2 G_B^2])^{1/2} < \infty.$$

By Assumption 5.2 (iv), we have $\log N_{[]}(\varepsilon, \mathcal{W}_2^\Delta, L_2(P)) \leq C\varepsilon^{-1/k_2}$ for some $k_2 > 1/2$. Localization to the $L_2(P)$ -ball of radius $C_1\delta_0$ gives

$$N_{[]}(\varepsilon, \mathcal{G}(\delta_0), L_2(P)) \leq N_{[]}(\varepsilon/\delta_0, \mathcal{W}_2^\Delta, L_2(P)) \lesssim \left(\frac{\delta_0}{\varepsilon}\right)^{1/k_2}, \quad 0 < \varepsilon \leq c\delta_0,$$

while $N_{[]}(\varepsilon, \mathcal{G}(\delta_0), L_2(P)) = 1$ for $\varepsilon \geq c\delta_0$ (the class has L_2 -diameter $\lesssim \delta_0$). Since $\mathcal{F}(\delta_0) = H \cdot \mathcal{G}(\delta_0)$ with multiplier $H := |D||Y - \mu_1|$, this gives

$$\log N_{[]}(\varepsilon, \mathcal{F}(\delta_0), L_2(P)) \lesssim \log N_{[]}(\varepsilon, \mathcal{G}(\delta_0), L_2(P)) \lesssim \left(\frac{\delta_0}{\varepsilon}\right)^{1/k_2},$$

for $0 < \varepsilon \leq c\delta_0$. By the bracketing maximal inequality, we obtain

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}(\delta_0)} |\mathbb{G}_n f| \right] \lesssim J_{[]}(\|F\|_{P,2}, \mathcal{F}(\delta_0), L_2(P)),$$

where $J_{[]}(\|F\|_{P,2}, \mathcal{F}(\delta_0), L_2(P))$ is the bracketing entropy integral. Noting that the envelope function of $\mathcal{F}(\delta_0)$ can be bounded as $\|F\|_{P,2} \leq c\delta_0$ for some c because of the construction of $\mathcal{G}(\delta_0)$, we obtain

$$J_{[]}(\|F\|_{P,2}, \mathcal{F}(\delta_0)) = \int_0^{\|F\|_{P,2}} \sqrt{\log N_{[]}(\varepsilon, \mathcal{F}(\delta_0), L_2(P))} d\varepsilon \lesssim \int_0^{c\delta_0} \left(\frac{\delta_0}{\varepsilon}\right)^{\frac{1}{2k_2}} d\varepsilon \lesssim \delta_0,$$

where the last integral is finite because $k_2 > \frac{1}{2}$. Applying Markov's inequality to the non-negative random variable $\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}(\delta_0)} |\mathbb{G}_n f|$ yields

$$\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}(\delta_0)} |\mathbb{G}_n f| = O_p \left(\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}(\delta_0)} |\mathbb{G}_n f| \right] \right) = O_p(J_{[]}(\|F\|_{P,2}, \mathcal{F}(\delta_0))) = O_p(\delta_0).$$

On A_n we have $f_0 \in \mathcal{F}(\delta_0)$, hence

$$|\mathbb{G}_n(f_0)| \leq \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}(\delta_0)} |\mathbb{G}_n f| = O_p(\delta_0).$$

Since $\Pr(A_n) \rightarrow 1$, the same bound holds unconditionally. This completes the proof that the term (16) is $o_p(1)$. For the terms (18) and (21), we apply a similar proof by noting that they can also be regarded as mean-zero empirical processes. For the terms (17), (19), and

(22), however, they are not mean-zero. Therefore, we must show that their expectations are also $o_p(1)$ by exploiting their product structure.

For the control of term (17), let

$$f_1(M, X, Y, D) := D(n\hat{w}_2(M, X) - w_2^*(M, X))(\mu_1(M, X) - B(M, X)^\top \beta).$$

We will prove that $|\mathbb{G}_n(f_1)| = o_p(1)$ and $\sqrt{n}|\mathbb{E}f_1| = o_p(1)$. We again introduce the centered (difference) classes

$$\mathcal{W}_2^\Delta := \{f - w_2^* : f \in \mathcal{W}_2\} \subset L_2(P), \quad \mathcal{U}^\Delta := \{\mu - B^\top \beta : \mu \in \mathcal{U}\} \subset L_2(P),$$

so that $g := n\hat{w}_2 - w_2^* \in \mathcal{W}_2^\Delta$ and $h := \mu_1 - B^\top \beta \in \mathcal{U}^\Delta$. By Theorem 5.2 there exists $C_1 > 0$ such that, with probability tending to one, $\|g\|_{P,2} \leq C_1\delta_1$ with $\delta_1 := C\left(\sqrt{L^2 \log L/n} + L^{1-r_2} + LK^{-r_1}\right)$. Also, by Assumption 5.2 (iii), $\|h\|_{P,2} \leq \|h\|_\infty \leq C_2\delta_2$ with $\delta_2 := CL^{-r_\mu}$. Fix such constants and define the localized classes

$$\mathcal{G}_1(\delta_1) := \{g \in \mathcal{W}_2^\Delta : \|g\|_{P,2} \leq C_1\delta_1\}, \quad \mathcal{G}_2(\delta_2) := \{h \in \mathcal{U}^\Delta : \|h\|_{P,2} \leq C_2\delta_2\}.$$

Then, on a high-probability event, $g \in \mathcal{G}_1(\delta_1)$ and $h \in \mathcal{G}_2(\delta_2)$. Let

$$\mathcal{F}_1(\delta_1, \delta_2) := \{f = D \cdot g \cdot h : g \in \mathcal{G}_1(\delta_1), h \in \mathcal{G}_2(\delta_2)\}.$$

Assumption 5.1(iii) implies $n\rho'(B^\top \lambda)$ is uniformly bounded and bounded away from 0, and Assumption 5.1(iv) gives a pointwise envelope G_B for \mathcal{W}_2 (hence for \mathcal{W}_2^Δ). Moreover, Assumption 5.2(iii) yields a pointwise envelope G_μ for \mathcal{U}^Δ with $G_\mu \lesssim L^{-r_\mu}$. Therefore, an envelope for $\mathcal{F}_1(\delta_1, \delta_2)$ is

$$F_1(M, X, Y) := |D| \cdot G_B(M, X) \cdot G_\mu(M, X), \quad \|F_1\|_{P,2} < \infty,$$

by Assumption 5.2(ii). By Assumption 5.2(iv),

$$\log N_{[]}(\varepsilon, \mathcal{W}_2, L_2(P)) \leq C\varepsilon^{-1/k_2}, \quad \log N_{[]}(\varepsilon, \mathcal{U}, L_2(P)) \leq C\varepsilon^{-1/k_\mu}, \quad k_2, k_\mu > 1/2.$$

By translation invariance of bracketing numbers the same inequalities hold for \mathcal{W}_2^Δ and \mathcal{U}^Δ .

By the scaling, localizing to the $L_2(P)$ -balls of radii $C_1\delta_1$ and $C_2\delta_2$ gives

$$\log N_{[]}(\varepsilon, \mathcal{G}_1(\delta_1), L_2(P)) \lesssim \left(\frac{\delta_1}{\varepsilon}\right)^{1/k_2}, \quad \log N_{[]}(\varepsilon, \mathcal{G}_2(\delta_2), L_2(P)) \lesssim \left(\frac{\delta_2}{\varepsilon}\right)^{1/k_\mu}, \quad 0 < \varepsilon \leq c(\delta_1 \wedge \delta_2).$$

For the product class $\mathcal{F}_1(\delta_1, \delta_2) = D \cdot \mathcal{G}_1(\delta_1) \cdot \mathcal{G}_2(\delta_2)$, a standard bracketing bound yields

$$\log N_{[]}(\varepsilon, \mathcal{F}_1(\delta_1, \delta_2), L_2(P)) \lesssim \left(\frac{\delta_1}{\varepsilon}\right)^{1/k_2} + \left(\frac{\delta_2}{\varepsilon}\right)^{1/k_\mu}, \quad 0 < \varepsilon \leq c(\delta_1 \wedge \delta_2),$$

while $N_{[]}(\varepsilon, \mathcal{F}_1(\delta_1, \delta_2), L_2(P)) = 1$ for $\varepsilon \geq c(\delta_1 \wedge \delta_2)$ because the $L_2(P)$ -diameter of \mathcal{F}_1 is $O(\delta_1 \wedge \delta_2)$. By the bracketing maximal inequality,

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}_1(\delta_1, \delta_2)} |\mathbb{G}_n f|\right] \lesssim J_{[]}(\|F_1\|_{P,2}, \mathcal{F}_1(\delta_1, \delta_2), L_2(P)),$$

and the bracketing integral satisfies,

$$\begin{aligned} J_{[]}(\|F_1\|_{P,2}, \mathcal{F}_1(\delta_1, \delta_2), L_2(P)) &= \int_0^{\|F_1\|_{P,2}} \sqrt{\log N_{[]}(\varepsilon, \mathcal{F}_1(\delta_1, \delta_2), L_2(P))} d\varepsilon \\ &\lesssim \int_0^{c(\delta_1 \wedge \delta_2)} \left[\left(\frac{\delta_1}{\varepsilon} \right)^{\frac{1}{2k_2}} + \left(\frac{\delta_2}{\varepsilon} \right)^{\frac{1}{2k_\mu}} \right] d\varepsilon \\ &\lesssim \delta_1 + \delta_2, \end{aligned}$$

since $k_2, k_\mu > 1/2$. Applying Markov's inequality to $\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}_1(\delta_1, \delta_2)} |\mathbb{G}_n f| \geq 0$ gives

$$\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}_1(\delta_1, \delta_2)} |\mathbb{G}_n f| = O_p \left(\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}_1(\delta_1, \delta_2)} |\mathbb{G}_n f| \right] \right) = O_p(\delta_1 + \delta_2) = o_p(1),$$

because $\delta_1 \rightarrow 0$ by $L^2 \log L = o(n)$ and $\delta_2 \rightarrow 0$ by $r_\mu > 1/2$ and $L \rightarrow \infty$.

By Cauchy–Schwarz,

$$\begin{aligned} \sqrt{n} |\mathbb{E} f_1| &\leq C \sqrt{n} \|g\|_{P,2} \|h\|_{P,2} \leq C \sqrt{n} \delta_1 \delta_2 \\ &= C \left\{ \sqrt{n} L^{1-r_2-r_\mu} + \sqrt{n} L^{1-r_\mu} K^{-r_1} + L^{1-r_\mu} \sqrt{\log L} \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

The first two terms vanish by Assumption 5.2(v), namely $n^{1/2} L^{1-r_2-r_\mu} = o(1)$ and $n^{1/2} L^{1-r_\mu} K^{-r_1} = o(1)$. The last term vanishes under the Assumption 5.2 (iii) $r_\mu > 1$.

Finally, we prove the consistency of the variance estimator. By the Assumption 5.2(iii) we first observe $Y_i = B(M_i, X_i)^\top \beta + b + u_i$ where $b = O(L^{-r_\mu})$ and $\mathbb{E}[u_i | M_i, D_i = 1, X_i] = 0$.

We note that

$$\begin{aligned} &\left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n D_i B(M_i, X_i) B(M_i, X_i)^\top \right)^{-1} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n D_i B(M_i, X_i) Y_i \\ &= \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n D_i B(M_i, X_i) B(M_i, X_i)^\top \right)^{-1} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n D_i B(M_i, X_i) (B(M_i, X_i)^\top \beta + b + u_i) \\ &= \beta + \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n D_i B(M_i, X_i) B(M_i, X_i)^\top \right)^{-1} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n D_i B(M_i, X_i) b \\ &\quad + \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n D_i B(M_i, X_i) B(M_i, X_i)^\top \right)^{-1} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n D_i B(M_i, X_i) u_i \\ &= \beta + \mathbb{E}[D_i B(M_i, X_i) B(M_i, X_i)^\top]^{-1} \mathbb{E}[D_i B(M_i, X_i)] b + O_p(n^{-1/2}) \\ &= \beta + O_p(L^{-r_\mu+1/2}) + O_p(n^{-1/2}) = \beta + O_p(L^{-r_\mu+1/2}), \end{aligned}$$

where the last line holds by Assumption 5.1(iv). Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\mu}_1(M_i, X_i) &= B(M_i, X_i)^\top \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n D_i B(M_i, X_i) B(M_i, X_i)^\top \right)^{-1} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n D_i B(M_i, X_i) Y_i \\ &= B(M_i, X_i)^\top \beta + B(M_i, X_i)^\top O_p(L^{-r_\mu+1/2}) \end{aligned}$$

$$= \mu_1(M_i, X_i) + B(M_i, X_i)^\top O_p(L^{-r_\mu+1/2}) + O_p(L^{-r_\mu}) = \mu_1(M_i, X_i) + o_p(1),$$

where the last line holds by the additional assumption that $r_\mu > 1$. Next, we the Assumption 5.2(iii) we observe that $\mu_1(M_i, X_i) = C(X_i)^\top \gamma + c + v_i$ where $c = O(K^{-r_\mu})$ and $\mathbb{E}[v_i|D_i = 0, X_i] = 0$. Then, we proceed in the same way to complete the proof.

APPENDIX G. PROOF OF THEOREM 5.3

We denote the empirical average operator $\mathbb{E}_n[\cdot] := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (\cdot)$. Also, we denote that

$$\begin{aligned} \psi_0 &= \frac{D_i \xi_0(M_i, X_i)}{\pi_0(X_i) \xi_1(M_i, X_i)} (Y_i - \mu_1(M_i, X_i)) + \frac{1 - D_i}{\pi_0(X_i)} (\mu_1(M_i, X_i) - \eta_{1,0}(X_i)) + \eta_{1,0}(X_i) - \theta_{1,0} \\ &:= \phi_0 - \theta_{1,0} \\ \hat{\psi} &= D_i n \hat{w}_2(M_i, X_i) (Y_i - \hat{\mu}_1(M_i, X_i)) + (1 - D_i) n \hat{w}_1(X_i) (\hat{\mu}_1(M_i, X_i) - \hat{\eta}_{1,0}(X_i)) + \hat{\eta}_{1,0}(X_i) - \hat{\theta}_{1,0} \\ &:= \hat{\phi} - \hat{\theta}_{1,0}. \end{aligned}$$

Then,

$$\hat{\theta}_{1,0} - \theta_{1,0} = \mathbb{E}_n[\psi_0] + \mathbb{E}_n[\hat{\psi} - \psi_0]$$

We need to prove that $\mathbb{E}_n[\hat{\psi} - \psi_0] = o_p(n^{-1/2})$. $\mathbb{E}_n[\hat{\psi} - \psi_0]$ can be decomposed as follows:

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n D_i (w_2(M_i, X_i) - n \hat{w}_2(M_i, X_i)) (Y_i - \mu_1(M_i, X_i)) \quad (24)$$

$$+ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (D_i n \hat{w}_2(M_i, X_i) - (1 - D_i) n \hat{w}_1(X_i)) (B(M_i, X_i)^\top \hat{\beta} - B(M_i, X_i)^\top \beta) \quad (25)$$

$$+ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n D_i (n \hat{w}_2(M_i, X_i) - w_2(M_i, X_i)) (B(M_i, X_i)^\top \beta - \mu_1(M_i, X_i)) \quad (26)$$

$$+ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (D_i w_2(M_i, X_i) - (1 - D_i) w_1(X_i)) (B(M_i, X_i)^\top \beta - \mu_1(M_i, X_i)) \quad (27)$$

$$+ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (1 - D_i) (w_1(X_i) - n \hat{w}_1(X_i)) (B(M_i, X_i)^\top \beta - \mu_1(M_i, X_i)) \quad (28)$$

$$+ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (1 - D_i) (w_1(X_i) - n \hat{w}_1(X_i)) (\mu_1(M_i, X_i) - \eta_{1,0}(X_i)) \quad (29)$$

$$+ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n ((1 - D_i) n \hat{w}_1(X_i) - 1) (C(X_i)^\top \hat{\gamma} - C(X_i)^\top \gamma) \quad (30)$$

$$+ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n ((1 - D_i) n \hat{w}_1(X_i) - 1) (C(X_i)^\top \gamma - \eta_{1,0}(X_i)) \quad (31)$$

Terms (24), (27) and (29) can be proven to be $o_p(n^{-1/2})$ in the same way as (16), (18) and (21). Next, terms (26), (28) and (31) can be proven to be $o_p(n^{-1/2})$ in the same way as (17), (19) and (22). Lastly, terms (25) and (30) can be proven to be $o_p(n^{-1/2})$ in the same way as (20) and (23).

REFERENCES

- Ai, C., Linton, O., Motegi, K., Zhang, Z., 2021. A unified framework for efficient estimation of general treatment models. *Quantitative Economics* 12, 779–816.
- Athey, S., Chetty, R., Imbens, G., Kang, H., 2024. Estimating treatment effects using multiple surrogates: The role of the surrogate score and the surrogate index. Working Paper, arXiv: 1603.09326 [stat.ME], ArXiV.
- Ben-Michael, E., Feller, A., Hirshberg, D.A., Zubizarreta, J.R., 2021. The balancing act in causal inference. Working Paper, arXiv: 2110.14831 [stat.ME], ArXiV.
- Boyd, S., Vandenberghe, L., 2004. *Convex Optimization*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Brader, T., Valentino, N., Suhay, E., 2008. What triggers public opposition to immigration? anxiety, group cues, and immigration threat. *American Journal of Political Science* 52, 959–978.
- Bruns-Smith, D., Dukes, O., Feller, A., Ogburn, E.L., 2025. Augmented balancing weights as linear regression. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B: Statistical Methodology* URL: <https://doi.org/10.1093/jrsssb/qkaf019>, doi:10.1093/jrsssb/qkaf019.
- Celli, V., 2022. Causal mediation analysis in economics: Objectives, assumptions, models. *Journal of Economic Surveys* 36, 214–234.
- Chan, K.C.G., Imai, K., Yam, S.C.P., Zhang, Z., 2016a. Efficient nonparametric estimation of causal mediation effects. Working Paper, arXiv: 1601.03501 [stat.ME], ArXiV.
- Chan, K.C.G., Yam, S.C.P., Zhang, Z., 2016b. Globally efficient non-parametric inference of average treatment effects by empirical balancing calibration weighting. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)* 78, 673–700.
- Chattopadhyay, A., Hase, C.H., Zubizarreta, J.R., 2020. Balancing vs modeling approaches to weighting in practice. *Statistics in Medicine* 39, 3227–3254.
- Chen, J., Ritzwoller, D.M., 2023. Semiparametric estimation of long-term treatment effects. *Journal of Econometrics* 237, 105545.
- Chen, X., 2007. Chapter 76: Large sample sieve estimation of semi-nonparametric models, in: *Handbook of Econometrics*. Elsevier. volume 6 of *Handbook of Econometrics*, pp. 5549–5632.
- Cohn, E.R., Ben-Michael, E., Feller, A., Zubizarreta, J.R., 2023. Balancing weights for causal inference, in: *Handbook of Matching and Weighting Adjustments for Causal Inference*. Chapman and Hall/CRC, pp. 293–312.
- Dikkala, N., Lewis, G., Mackey, L., Syrgkanis, V., 2020. Minimax estimation of conditional moment models, in: *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pp. 12248–12262.
- Fan, J., Imai, K., Lee, I., Liu, H., Ning, Y., Yang, X., 2023. Optimal covariate balancing conditions in propensity score estimation. *Journal of Business & Economic Statistics* 41,

97–110.

- Farbmacher, H., Huber, M., Laffers, L., Langen, H., Spindler, M., 2022. Causal mediation analysis with double machine learning. *The Econometrics Journal* 25, 277–300.
- Hainmueller, J., 2012. Entropy balancing for causal effects: A multivariate reweighting method to produce balanced samples in observational studies. *Political Analysis* 20, 25–46.
- Hirano, K., Imbens, G.W., Ridder, G., 2003. Efficient estimation of average treatment effects using the estimated propensity score. *Econometrica* 71, 1161–1189.
- Hirshberg, D.A., Zubizarreta, J.R., 2017. On two approaches to weighting in causal inference. *Epidemiology* 28, 812–816.
- Huang, L., Huang, W., Linton, O., Zhang, Z., 2024. Nonparametric estimation of mediation effects with a general treatment. *Econometric Reviews* , 1–0.
- Huber, M., 2014. Identifying causal mechanisms (primarily) based on inverse probability weighting. *Journal of Applied Econometrics* 29, 920–943.
- Huber, M., 2020. Mediation analysis, in: Zimmermann, K.F. (Ed.), *Handbook of Labor, Human Resources and Population Economics*. Springer International Publishing, pp. 1–38.
- Imai, K., Keele, L., Tingley, D., 2010a. A general approach to causal mediation analysis. *Psychological Methods* 15, 309–334.
- Imai, K., Keele, L., Tingley, D., Yamamoto, T., 2011. Unpacking the black box of causality: Learning about causal mechanisms from experimental and observational studies. *American Political Science Review* 105, 765–789.
- Imai, K., Keele, L., Yamamoto, T., 2010b. Identification, inference and sensitivity analysis for causal mediation effects. *Statistical Science* 25, 51–71.
- Imai, K., Ratkovic, M., 2014. Covariate balancing propensity score. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)* 76, 243–263.
- Imbens, G., Kallus, N., Mao, X., Wang, Y., 2024. Long-term causal inference under persistent confounding via data combination. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)* .
- Liu, C., Ghassami, A., 2024. Two-stage nuisance function estimation for causal mediation analysis. Working Paper, arXiv: 2404.00735 [stat.ME], ArXiV.
- Miles, B.C.H., Shpitser, I., Kanki, P., Meloni, S., Tchetgen, E.J.T., 2020. On semiparametric estimation of a path-specific effect in the presence of mediator-outcome confounding. *Biometrika* 107, 159–172.
- Newey, W., 1997. Convergence rates and asymptotic normality for series estimators. *Journal of Econometrics* 79, 147–168.
- Nguyen, T.Q., Ogburn, E.L., Schmid, I., Sarker, E.B., Greifer, N., Koning, I.M., Stuart, E.A., 2023. Causal mediation analysis: From simple to more robust strategies for estimation of marginal natural (in)direct effects. *Statistics Surveys* 17, 1–41.

- Nguyen, T.Q., Schmid, I., Ogburn, E.L., Stuart, E.A., 2022. Clarifying causal mediation analysis: Effect identification via three assumptions and five potential outcomes. *Journal of Causal Inference* 10, 246–279.
- Nguyen, T.Q., Schmid, I., Stuart, E.A., 2020. Clarifying causal mediation analysis for the applied researcher: Defining effects based on what we want to learn. *Psychological Methods* .
- Pearl, J., 2001. Direct and indirect effects, in: *Proceedings of the Seventeenth Conference on Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence (UAI)*, Morgan Kaufmann, San Francisco. pp. 411–420.
- Tchetgen Tchetgen, E.J., Shpitser, I., 2012. Semiparametric theory for causal mediation analysis: Efficiency bounds, multiple robustness, and sensitivity analysis. *Annals of Statistics* 40, 1816–1845.
- Tingley, D., Yamamoto, T., Hirose, K., Keele, L., Imai, K., Trinh, M., Wong, W., 2025. mediation: Causal Mediation Analysis. URL: <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=mediation>, doi:10.32614/CRAN.package.mediation. r package version 4.5.1.
- Tropp, J.A., 2015. An introduction to matrix concentration inequalities. *Foundations and Trends in Machine Learning* 8, 1–230.
- van der Vaart, A.W., Wellner, J.A., 1996. *Weak Convergence and Empirical Processes: With Applications to Statistics*. Springer Series in Statistics, Springer, New York.
- VanderWeele, T.J., 2015. *Explanation in Causal Inference: Methods for Mediation and Interaction*. Oxford University Press, New York.
- VanderWeele, T.J., Vansteelandt, S., Robins, J.M., 2014. Effect decomposition in the presence of an exposure-induced mediator-outcome confounder. *Epidemiology* 25, 300–306.
- Wang, Y., Zubizarreta, J.R., 2019. Minimal dispersion approximately balancing weights: asymptotic properties and practical considerations. *Biometrika* 107, 93–105.
- Wong, R.K.W., Chan, K.C.G., 2018. Kernel-based covariate functional balancing for observational studies. *Biometrika* 105, 199–213.
- Zubizarreta, J.R., 2015. Stable weights that balance covariates for estimation with incomplete outcome data. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 110, 910–922.