

On Multiply Robust Mendelian Randomization (MR²) With Many Invalid Genetic Instruments

Baolu Sun¹, Zhonghua Liu² and Eric Tchetgen Tchetgen³

¹Department of Statistics and Data Science, National University of Singapore

²Department of Statistics and Actuarial Science, University of Hong Kong

³Department of Statistics and Data Science,
The Wharton School of the University of Pennsylvania

Abstract

Mendelian randomization (MR) is a popular instrumental variable (IV) approach, in which genetic markers are used as IVs. In order to improve efficiency, multiple markers are routinely used in MR analyses, leading to concerns about bias due to possible violation of IV exclusion restriction of no direct effect of any IV on the outcome other than through the exposure in view. To address this concern, we introduce a new class of Multiply Robust MR (MR²) estimators that are guaranteed to remain consistent for the causal effect of interest provided that at least one genetic marker is a valid IV without necessarily knowing which IVs are invalid. We show that the proposed MR² estimators are a special case of a more general class of estimators that remain consistent provided that a set of at least k^\dagger out of K candidate instrumental variables are valid, for $k^\dagger \leq K$ set by the analyst ex ante, without necessarily knowing which IVs are invalid. We provide formal semiparametric theory supporting our results, and characterize the semiparametric efficiency bound for the exposure causal effect which cannot be improved upon by any regular estimator with our favorable robustness property. We conduct extensive simulation studies and apply our methods to a large-scale analysis of UK Biobank data, demonstrating the superior empirical performance of MR² compared to competing MR methods.

Keywords: Instrumental variable, exclusion restriction, additive model, genetic epistasis, g-estimation, confounding, robustness

1 Introduction

Mendelian randomization (MR) is an instrumental variable (IV) approach with growing popularity in epidemiology studies. In MR, one aims to establish a causal association between a given exposure and an outcome of interest in the presence of possible unmeasured confounding, by leveraging one or more genetic markers defining the IV ([Davey Smith and Ebrahim, 2003](#); [Lawlor et al., 2008](#)). In order to be a valid IV, a genetic marker must satisfy the following key conditions:

- (a) It must be associated with the exposure.
- (b) It must be independent of any unmeasured confounder of the exposure-outcome relationship.
- (c) There must be no direct effect of the genetic marker on the outcome which is not fully mediated by the exposure in view.

Assumption (c) also known as the exclusion restriction is rarely credible in the MR context as it requires complete understanding of the biological mechanism by which each genetic marker influences the outcome. Such a priori knowledge may be unrealistic in practice due to the possible existence of unknown pleiotropic effects of the markers ([Little and Khoury, 2003](#); [Davey Smith and Ebrahim, 2003](#); [Lawlor et al., 2008](#)). Violation of assumption (b) can also occur due to linkage disequilibrium or population stratification ([Lawlor et al., 2008](#)). Possible violation or near violation of assumption (a) known as the weak instrumental variable problem also poses an important challenge in MR as individual genetic effects on complex traits can be weak.

There has been tremendous interest in the development of methods to detect and account for violation of IV assumptions (a)-(c), primarily in multiple-IV settings under standard linear outcome and exposure models. Literature addressing violation of assumption

(a) is arguably the most developed and extends to possible nonlinear models under a generalized methods of moments framework; notable papers of this rich literature include [Staiger and Stock \(1997\)](#); [Stock and Wright \(2000\)](#); [Stock et al. \(2002\)](#); [Chao and Swanson \(2005\)](#); [Newey and Windmeijer \(2009\)](#). A growing literature has likewise emerged on methods to address violations of assumptions (b) and (c), a representative sample of which includes [Bowden et al. \(2015, 2016\)](#); [Kang et al. \(2016\)](#); [Windmeijer et al. \(2019\)](#); [Liu et al. \(2020b\)](#); [Tchetgen Tchetgen et al. \(2021\)](#); [Ye et al. \(2021\)](#). The current paper is perhaps most closely related to the works of [Kang et al. \(2016\)](#); [Guo et al. \(2018\)](#); [Windmeijer et al. \(2019\)](#). Specifically, [Kang et al. \(2016\)](#) developed a penalized regression approach that can recover valid inferences about the causal effect of interest provided fewer than fifty percent of genetic markers are invalid IVs (known as majority rule); [Windmeijer et al. \(2019\)](#) improved on the penalized approach, including a proposal for standard error estimation lacking in [Kang et al. \(2016\)](#). In an alternative approach, [Han \(2008\)](#) established that the median of multiple estimators of the effect of exposure obtained using one instrument at the time is a consistent estimator under majority rule and that IVs cannot have direct effects on the outcome unless the IVs are uncorrelated. [Guo et al. \(2018\)](#) proposed two stage hard thresholding (TSHT) with voting, which is consistent for the causal effect under linear outcome and exposure models, and a plurality rule which can be considerably weaker than the majority rule. The plurality rule is defined in terms of regression parameters encoding (i) the association of each invalid IV with the outcome and that encoding (ii) the association of the corresponding IV with the exposure. The condition effectively requires that the number of valid IVs is greater than the largest number of invalid IVs with equal ratio of regression coefficients (i) and (ii). Furthermore, they provide a simple construction for 95% confidence intervals to obtain inferences about the exposure effect which are guaranteed to have correct coverage under the plurality rule. Importantly, in these works, a candidate IV may be invalid either because it violates the exclusion restriction, or because it shares an

unmeasured common cause with the outcome, i.e. either (b) or (c) fails. Both the penalized approach and the median estimator may be inconsistent if majority rule fails, while TSHT may be inconsistent if plurality rule fails. It is important to note that because confidence intervals for the causal effect of the exposure obtained by [Windmeijer et al. \(2019\)](#) and [Guo et al. \(2018\)](#) rely on a consistent model selection procedure, such confidence intervals fail to be uniformly valid over the entire model space ([Leeb and Pötscher, 2008](#); [Guo et al., 2018](#)).

Interestingly, [Kang et al. \(2016\)](#); [Guo et al. \(2018\)](#) and [Windmeijer et al. \(2019\)](#) effectively tackle the task of obtaining valid inferences about a confounded causal effect in the presence of invalid IVs as a model selection problem. Specifically, they aim to correctly identify which candidate IVs are invalid, while simultaneously obtaining valid MR inferences using selected valid IVs, arguably a more challenging task than may be required to obtain causal inferences that are robust to the presence of invalid IVs without necessarily knowing which IVs are invalid. In contrast, the methods proposed in this paper by-pass the model selection step altogether to deliver a regular and asymptotically linear multiply robust MR (MR²) estimator of the causal parameter of interest, provided at least one genetic instrument satisfies IV assumptions (a)-(c) without knowledge of the invalid IVs. Therefore, our estimators can be consistent with a single valid IV even when majority and plurality rules fail to hold. Furthermore, our estimators are regular and asymptotically linear, and therefore can be used to obtain uniformly valid 95% confidence intervals in large samples. We further show that the proposed estimators are a special case of a more general class of estimators that remain consistent provided that k^\dagger out of K candidate instrumental variables are valid, for $k^\dagger \leq K$ set by the analyst ex ante, without necessarily knowing which $K - k^\dagger$ are invalid IVs. A necessary trade-off between more stringent IV relevance requirements in exchange for less stringent IV exclusion restriction requirements is revealed by increasing the value of k^\dagger , thus providing formal quantification of the efficiency cost

one must incur in exchange for increased robustness. We characterize a semiparametric efficiency bound which cannot be improved upon by any regular and asymptotically linear estimator which shares the robustness property of our class of estimators.

The rest of the article proceeds as follows. In Section 2, we introduce notation and definitions. In Section 3, we describe our novel identification strategy with many independent invalid IVs. In Section 4, we perform extensive simulation studies to demonstrate the empirical performance of our proposed MR² estimator along with competing ones, and apply our method in Section 5 to estimate the average causal effects of body mass index on systolic and diastolic blood pressure using large-scale UK Biobank data. In Sections 6 and 7, we discuss generalizations to the setting with correlated invalid IVs and partial identification respectively. We conclude with a brief discussion in Section 8. The R package for the proposed method is publicly available at: <https://github.com/zhonghualiu/MRSquared>.

2 Notation and Definitions

Suppose that one has observed n i.i.d. realizations of a vector (Y, A, G_1, \dots, G_K) where A is an exposure, $\mathcal{G} = \{G_k : k = 1, \dots, K\}$ are candidate genetic IVs and Y is the outcome. Let U denote an unmeasured confounder (possibly multivariate) of the effect of A on Y . $\mathcal{G} \setminus G_k$ denotes the set of candidate genetic IVs excluding G_k . Then, G_k is said to be a valid instrumental variable provided it fulfills the following three conditions:

Assumption 1. IV relevance: $G_k \perp\!\!\!\perp A | \mathcal{G} \setminus G_k$;

Assumption 2. IV independence: $G_k \perp\!\!\!\perp U | \mathcal{G} \setminus G_k$;

Assumption 3. Exclusion restriction: $G_k \perp\!\!\!\perp Y | A, U, \mathcal{G} \setminus G_k$.

The first condition ensures that the IV is a correlate of the exposure. The second condition states that the IV is independent of all unmeasured confounders of the exposure-outcome

association, while the third condition formalizes the assumption of no direct effect of G_k on Y not mediated by A (presuming Assumption 2 holds). The causal diagram in Figure 1 encodes these three assumptions and therefore provides a graphical representation of the IV model. It is well known that while a valid IV satisfying assumptions 1-3, i.e. the causal diagram in Figure 1, suffices to obtain a valid statistical test of the sharp null hypothesis of no individual causal effect, the population average causal effect is itself not point identified with a valid IV without an additional assumption. Consider the following condition:

Assumption 4. There is no additive $A - (U, \mathcal{G})$ interaction in model for $E(Y|A, \mathcal{G}, U)$

$$E(Y|A = a, \mathcal{G}, U) - E(Y|A = 0, \mathcal{G}, U) = \beta_a a \quad (1)$$

Note that the condition does not require the vector \mathcal{G} to be a valid IV. Equation (1) implies that the additive causal effect of A on Y is not modified by either U or \mathcal{G} . These restrictions imply the following semi-additive models:

$$E(Y|A, \mathcal{G}, U) = \beta_a A + \beta_{g,u}(\mathcal{G}, U), \quad (2)$$

$$E(A|\mathcal{G}, U) = \alpha(\mathcal{G}, U_a) \quad (3)$$

where $\beta_{g,u}(\cdot)$ and $\alpha(\cdot)$ are functions solely restricted by natural features of the model, e.g. such that the outcome and exposure means are bounded between zero and one in the binary case. If G_{k^*} is a valid IV, then $\beta_{g,u}(\mathcal{G}, U) = \beta_{g,u}(\mathcal{G}_{-k^*}, U)$ where $\mathcal{G}_{-k^*} = \mathcal{G} \setminus G_{k^*}$, by the exclusion restriction implying Assumption 4 reduces to the assumption of no $(U, \mathcal{G}_{-k^*}) - A$ interaction in the model for $E(Y|A, \mathcal{G}, U)$; Furthermore, we have that $\Pr\{E(A|\mathcal{G}, U) - E(A|\mathcal{G}_{-k}, G_{k^*} = 0, U) = 0\} \neq 0$ by Assumption 1. Note that models $E(Y|A, \mathcal{G}, U)$ and $E(A|\mathcal{G}, U)$ considered by Bowden et al. (2015) satisfy (2) and (3) with $\beta_g(\cdot)$ and $\alpha(\cdot)$ linear functions, while Kang et al. (2016) specified models implied by these two restrictions; Tchetgen Tchetgen et al. (2021) considered inference with invalid IVs under model (2) and $E(A|\mathcal{G}, U) = \alpha_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathcal{G}) + \alpha_U(U)$, and $\Pr\{\text{Var}(A|\mathcal{G}) - \text{Var}(A|\mathcal{G}=0) = 0\} \neq 0$. Clearly, the

framework we are considering subsumes models considered in these prior works. Despite its widespread use, the semi-additive model can be mis-specified in presence of an additive interaction between treatment and either an invalid IV SNP, or an unmeasured confounder in the outcome model. It may also fail to hold in case of nonlinearity in dose-response curve for a continuous exposure. In both cases the model can be viewed as a first order approximation to the extent that departure from the additive structure is relatively small. Still, it is also important to note that even with an IV known *ex ante* to be valid, a homogeneity condition akin to (2) for the outcome model or a similar condition for the treatment model appears to be necessary for point identification of causal effects, see [Robins \(1994\)](#), [Angrist et al. \(1996\)](#) and [Wang and Tchetgen Tchetgen \(2018\)](#). Crucially, the semi-additive model is guaranteed to hold under the null hypothesis of no additive causal effect, in which case a distribution-free test of the null becomes feasible. In Section 7, partial identification of average causal effects with many invalid IVs is considered under a fully nonparametric model that does not impose restriction (2).




Figure 1: Causal diagram representing the IV model within strata of $\mathcal{G} \setminus G_k$. The bi-directed arrow between G_k and A indicates potential unmeasured common causes of G_k and A .

3 Identification for Many Independent Invalid IVs

In this section, we state our results under the following joint independence assumption of genetic variants included in \mathcal{G} , which we later relax.

Assumption 5. Let $\vec{g} = (g_1, \dots, g_k) \in \text{supp}(\mathcal{G})$ then

$$\Pr(\mathcal{G} \leq \vec{g}) = \prod_k \Pr(G_k \leq g_k)$$

This assumption may be reasonable in case genetic variants encode presence of a minor allele at single polymorphism locations under linkage equilibrium of \mathcal{G} . In practice, if genetic variants are in linkage disequilibrium (LD), then one can perform LD clumping to choose an independent set of genetic variants as candidate instruments using the well-established genetics analysis software PLINK (Purcell et al., 2007).

Next, suppose that unbeknownst to the analyst, Assumptions 1-3 hold for G_{k^*} , so that any of the genetic variants in $\mathcal{G} \setminus G_{k^*}$ may be invalid. In order to ease the exposition, we give our first identification result in the special case of binary G_k , $k = 1, \dots, K$. For example, G_k may encode whether the risk/protective allele is present at the k -th genetic location.

Proposition 1. *Suppose that $\{G_k : k\}$ are binary random variables, and G_{k^*} satisfies Assumptions 1-3, furthermore suppose that Assumptions 4 and 5 hold, then*

$$\beta_a = \frac{E \left[Y \prod_k \{G_k - E(G_k)\} \right]}{E \left[A \prod_k \{G_k - E(G_k)\} \right]}, \quad (4)$$

provided that

$$E \left[A \prod_k \{G_k - E(G_k)\} \right] \neq 0. \quad (5)$$

Formal proofs of all results are given in the Supplementary Materials. Proposition 1 provides an explicit identifying expression for the average causal effect β_a of A on Y in the presence of additive confounding, which leverages the fact that at least one candidate genetic IV G_{k^*} is valid, without knowing which are invalid genetic IVs. Notably, the formula (4) given in the Proposition 1 is a natural generalization to accommodate many invalid genetic IVs, of the standard IV estimand which an Oracle with knowledge of k^* would in principle be able to evaluate in the population:

$$\beta_a = \frac{E[Y \{G_{k^*} - E(G_{k^*})\}]}{E[A \{G_{k^*} - E(G_{k^*})\}]}.$$

It is instructive to note that the left-hand side of (5) is equivalent to the following being a nontrivial function of all variables in \mathcal{G}_{-k^*} ,

$$\alpha_{k^*}(\mathcal{G}) \equiv E(A|\mathcal{G}_{-k^*}, G_{k^*} = 1) - E(A|\mathcal{G}_{-k^*}, G_{k^*} = 0),$$

i.e. the K^{th} order additive interaction of \mathcal{G} in $E(A|\mathcal{G})$ is non-null. Intuitively, the Proposition can be motivated upon noting that if G_{k^*} is a valid IV, then the main effects and additive interactions of all order involving G_{k^*} are excluded from $\beta_g(\mathcal{G})$ and therefore, the main effect of G_{k^*} and all its interactions could in principle be used as potential IVs provided they are not also excluded from the first stage regression function $E\{\alpha(\mathcal{G}, U_a) | \mathcal{G}\}$. Now, without knowledge of k^* , it is generally not possible to identify ex ante which of these main effects or interactions can be excluded from $\beta_g(\mathcal{G})$ without error, as we might inadvertently exclude an invalid IV or interactions of invalid IVs; with the exception of the K^{th} order additive interaction which is a priori known with certainty to be excluded from $\beta_g(\mathcal{G})$ when one or more candidate IVs satisfies the exclusion restriction, in which case $\alpha_{k^*}(\mathcal{G})$ must depend on the K^{th} order interaction in order for the latter to be a valid IV, i.e. for IV relevance to also hold. In MR, such higher-order interaction among genetic markers is an important biological phenomenon that has been extensively studied in the genetics literature (Ritchie et al., 2001; Domingo et al., 2018). In order to illustrate the

result, suppose that $K = 2$, then, without loss of generality assuming that unbeknownst to the analyst, G_1 is in fact a valid IV, while G_2 is not. Consider the exposure conditional mean $E(A|\mathcal{G}) = \alpha_{0,0} + \alpha_{1,0}G_1 + \alpha_{0,1}G_2 + \alpha_{1,1}G_1G_2 = (\alpha_{0,0} + \alpha_{0,1}G_2) + G_1(\alpha_{1,0} + \alpha_{1,1}G_2)$. Then, according to the theorem,

$$\beta_a = \frac{E[Y \{G_1 - E(G_1)\} \{G_2 - E(G_2)\}]}{E[A \{G_1 - E(G_1)\} \{G_2 - E(G_2)\}]}$$

provided that, for binary G_1, G_2 :

$$\alpha_{k^*}(\mathcal{G}) = \alpha_1(\mathcal{G}) = \alpha_{10} + \alpha_{11}G_2 \text{ with } \alpha_{1,1} \neq 0,$$

a more stringent IV requirement than standard IV relevance which requires that either $\alpha_{1,0} \neq 0$ or $\alpha_{1,1} \neq 0$.

Interestingly, the following result firmly establishes that above strengthening of IV relevance is in fact a necessary condition for the existence of a regular and asymptotically linear (RAL) estimator of β_a under (2) and (3) such that $\beta_{g,u}(\mathcal{G}, U) = \beta_{g,u}(\mathcal{G}_{-k^*}, U)$ without a priori knowledge of k^* . In this vein, consider the following semiparametric model \mathcal{M}_{k^*} characterized by (i) the following observed data restriction implied by structural model (2):

$$E(Y|\mathcal{G}) = \beta_a E(A|\mathcal{G}) + \beta_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathcal{G}_{-k^*}) = \mu_{k^*}(\mathcal{G}) \quad (6)$$

and (ii) Assumption 5. The following result establishes a necessary condition for existence of a RAL estimator under the semiparametric union model $\mathcal{M}_{union} = \cup_{k=1}^K \mathcal{M}_k$ in which at least one SNP is a valid IV without ex ante knowledge which SNPs are invalid IVs.

Theorem 1. *Any RAL estimator $\hat{\beta}_a$ of β_a in \mathcal{M}_{union} must satisfy the following:*

$$\sqrt{n} \left(\hat{\beta}_a - \beta_a \right) = n^{1/2} \mathbb{P}_n W(\beta_a, c) + o_p(1),$$

where

$$W(\beta_a, c) = E \left[A \prod_k \{G_k - E(G_k)\} \right]^{-1} \times \left\{ \left[\prod_k \{G_k - E(G_k)\} \right] \{Y - \beta_a A - E\{Y - \beta_a A | \mathcal{G}_{-k^*}\} + c(\mathcal{G})\} \right\}$$

for some function $c(\mathcal{G})$ that satisfies the restriction

$$E\{c(\mathcal{G}) | G_k\} = 0, k = 1, \dots, K.$$

Furthermore, the efficient influence function of β_a in \mathcal{M}_{union} is given by $W(\beta_a, 0)$ and the semiparametric efficiency bound of β_a in \mathcal{M}_{union} is given by

$$E \left[A \prod_k \{G_k - E(G_k)\} \right]^{-2} E \left\{ E\{\varepsilon^2 | \mathcal{G}\} \left[\prod_k \{G_k - E(G_k)\} \right]^2 \right\},$$

where

$$\varepsilon = Y - \beta_a A - E\{Y - \beta_a A | \mathcal{G}_{-k^*}\}.$$

An immediate corollary of the above result is that

$$E \left[A \prod_k \{G_k - E(G_k)\} \right] \neq 0$$

is in fact a necessary condition for the existence of a RAL estimator for β_a in \mathcal{M}_{union} with a finite asymptotic variance. Because at least 1 out of K putative IVs are known *a priori* to be valid, but we do not know the identity of the valid IV \mathcal{G}_{k^*} , the influence function in Theorem 1 may be evaluated as

$$W(\beta_a, c) = E \left[A \prod_k \{G_k - E(G_k)\} \right]^{-1} \times \left\{ \left[\prod_k \{G_k - E(G_k)\} \right] \{Y - \beta_a A - E\{Y - \beta_a A | \mathcal{G}\}\} + c(\mathcal{G}) \right\},$$

which is an equivalent representation in \mathcal{M}_{union} due to (6). In the next Section, we establish a more general result by considering a less restrictive invalid IV model in which at least $k^\dagger > 1$ SNPs are known *ex ante* to be valid IVs, without knowledge of which SNPs are invalid IVs. This general framework is particularly instructive as it reveals a fundamental trade-off between the strength of required IV relevance condition, and the potential number of invalid IVs one is willing to allow in a given MR analysis

3.1 K Choose k^\dagger Multiple Robustness

In this section, we derive estimators for β_a under model (2) provided at least $k^\dagger > 1$ SNPs are known ex ante to be valid IVs, without necessarily knowing which SNPs are invalid IVs. An important limitation of inference under \mathcal{M}_{union} is its over reliance on the strong IV relevance requirement, that a K -way additive interaction involving all candidate SNP IVs be sufficiently related to the treatment to ensure root-n consistency and asymptotic normality of the estimated treatment effect. Such a requirement may be overly conservative in practice, and prone to weak IV bias if the K -way additive interaction in the first stage regression of the endogenous treatment on candidate SNP IVs is weak. Also, it could be that the analyst has a significant degree of ex ante confidence that at least $k^\dagger > 1$ SNPs are valid IVs; see for instance Kang et al. (2016) and Windmeijer et al. (2019) for methods that assume ex ante that at least 50% of IVs are valid. Alternatively, even when such a priori knowledge is lacking, one may wish to alleviate weak IV concerns, by conducting a sensitivity analysis in which a consistent estimator is obtained assuming at least k^\dagger valid IVs for $k^\dagger = 1, \dots, K$.

The following result generalizes Proposition 1 to this more general setting. Consider for a fixed value of k^\dagger , the semiparametric model $\mathcal{M}_{\vec{k}^*}$, $\vec{k}^* = (k^*(1), \dots, k^*(k^\dagger))$ with $k^*(1) < \dots < k^*(k^\dagger) \in \{1, \dots, K\}$ in which Assumption 5 holds, and structural model (2) holds with \vec{k}^* valid IVs, which further implies that:

$$E(Y|\mathcal{G}) = \beta_a E(A|\mathcal{G}) + \beta_{\mathcal{G}} \left(\mathcal{G}_{-\vec{k}^*} \right) = \mu_{\vec{k}^*}(\mathcal{G}). \quad (7)$$

Note that, for notational convenience, we have suppressed dependence on k^\dagger , and G_k may not necessarily be binary. The following result provides an identification result of β_a under the semiparametric union model $\mathcal{M}_{union, k^\dagger} = \cup_{\vec{k} \in \mathcal{K}(k^\dagger)} \mathcal{M}_{\vec{k}}$ where the union is taken over all elements of

$$\mathcal{K}(k^\dagger) = \{(k(1), \dots, k(k^\dagger)) : k(1) < \dots < k(k^\dagger) \in \{1, \dots, K\}\}.$$

$\mathcal{M}_{union, k^\dagger}$ is formally the set of all observed data distributions in which assumption 5 holds, and model (7) holds for at least k^\dagger SNPs without ex ante knowledge which SNPs are Invalid IVs among the remaining $K - k^\dagger$ SNPs.

Proposition 2. *Under model $\mathcal{M}_{union, k^\dagger}$, we have that:*

$$\beta_a = \frac{E \left\{ Y \left[\sum_{\vec{k} \in \mathcal{K}(k^\dagger)} \{h_{\vec{k}}(\mathcal{G}_{\vec{k}}) - E(H_{\vec{k}})\} \prod_{s \notin \vec{k}} \{G_s - E(G_s)\} \right] \right\}}{E \left\{ \sum_{\vec{k} \in \mathcal{K}(k^\dagger)} A \{h_{\vec{k}}(\mathcal{G}_{\vec{k}}) - E(H_{\vec{k}})\} \prod_{s \notin \vec{k}} \{G_s - E(G_s)\} \right\}} \quad (8)$$

provided that

$$E \left\{ \sum_{\vec{k} \in \mathcal{K}(k^\dagger)} A \{h_{\vec{k}}(\mathcal{G}_{\vec{k}}) - E(H_{\vec{k}})\} \prod_{s \notin \vec{k}} \{G_s - E(G_s)\} \right\} \neq 0 \quad (9)$$

The result provides an explicit expression of the identifying formula for β_a under $\mathcal{M}_{union, k^\dagger}$, the union semiparametric model under which at least k^\dagger out of K IVs are known *a priori* to be valid, without knowing which IVs are invalid.

Remark 1. *The multiple robustness result of Proposition 2 is distinct from prior literature which primarily concerns nuisance model specification under a single causal model, whereas our notion of multiply robust inference concerns identification in the union of causal models $\mathcal{M}_{union, k^\dagger}$. In fact, each model $\mathcal{M}_{\vec{k}}$ of the union model of the Proposition may be represented by a distinct causal diagram such as Figure 1. To the best of our knowledge, Proposition 2 constitutes the first instance of causal identification multiple robustness property. In contrast, existing literature on multiple robustness has primarily focused on nuisance model specification under a common set of causal identification, e.g. two out of three nuisance model specification robustness in mediation analysis (Tchetgen Tchetgen and Shpitser, 2012) as well as doubly robust estimation of the average treatment effect under unconfoundedness conditions and related missing data problems (Scharfstein et al., 1999).*

In order to illustrate the result, suppose that $K = 5$ and $k^\dagger = 2$; then, without loss of generality assuming that unbeknownst to the analyst, G_1 and G_2 are in fact valid IVs, while G_3, G_4, G_5 are not, according to the theorem,

$$\beta_a = \frac{E[Yh(\mathcal{G})]}{E[Ah(\mathcal{G})]}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} h(\mathcal{G}) = & \{h_{1,2}(G_1, G_2) - E(h_{1,2}(G_1, G_2))\} \{G_3 - E(G_3)\} \{G_4 - E(G_4)\} \{G_5 - E(G_5)\} \\ & + \{h_{1,3}(G_1, G_3) - E(h_{1,3}(G_1, G_3))\} \{G_2 - E(G_2)\} \{G_4 - E(G_4)\} \{G_5 - E(G_5)\} \\ & + \{h_{1,4}(G_1, G_4) - E(h_{1,4}(G_1, G_4))\} \{G_2 - E(G_2)\} \{G_3 - E(G_3)\} \{G_5 - E(G_5)\} \\ & + \{h_{1,5}(G_1, G_5) - E(h_{1,5}(G_1, G_5))\} \{G_2 - E(G_2)\} \{G_3 - E(G_3)\} \{G_4 - E(G_4)\} \\ & + \{h_{2,3}(G_2, G_3) - E(h_{2,3}(G_2, G_3))\} \{G_1 - E(G_1)\} \{G_4 - E(G_4)\} \{G_5 - E(G_5)\} \\ & + \{h_{2,4}(G_2, G_4) - E(h_{2,4}(G_2, G_4))\} \{G_1 - E(G_1)\} \{G_3 - E(G_3)\} \{G_5 - E(G_5)\} \\ & + \{h_{2,5}(G_2, G_5) - E(h_{2,5}(G_2, G_5))\} \{G_1 - E(G_1)\} \{G_3 - E(G_3)\} \{G_4 - E(G_4)\} \\ & + \{h_{3,4}(G_3, G_4) - E(h_{3,4}(G_3, G_4))\} \{G_1 - E(G_1)\} \{G_2 - E(G_2)\} \{G_5 - E(G_5)\} \\ & + \{h_{3,5}(G_3, G_5) - E(h_{3,5}(G_3, G_5))\} \{G_1 - E(G_1)\} \{G_2 - E(G_2)\} \{G_4 - E(G_4)\} \\ & + \{h_{4,5}(G_4, G_5) - E(h_{4,5}(G_4, G_5))\} \{G_1 - E(G_1)\} \{G_2 - E(G_2)\} \{G_3 - E(G_3)\} \end{aligned}$$

provided that,

$$E[Ah(\mathcal{G})] \neq 0.$$

An intuitive interpretation of this identification result is obtained by noting that by virtue of (G_1, G_2) being valid IVs,

$$\begin{aligned} & E[Yh(\mathcal{G})] \\ & = E \left\{ \left[\beta_a E(A|\mathcal{G}) + \beta_{\mathcal{G}} \left(\mathcal{G}_{-\overline{k^*}} \right) \right] h(\mathcal{G}) \right\} \\ & = \beta_a E \{ E(A|\mathcal{G}) h(\mathcal{G}) \} \\ & + E \{ \beta_{\mathcal{G}} (G_3, G_4, G_5) h(\mathcal{G}) \} \end{aligned}$$

Next, we note that $E\{h(\mathcal{G}) | G_3, G_4, G_5\} = 0$ which implies

$$E[Yh(\mathcal{G})] = \beta_a E\{E(A|\mathcal{G})h(\mathcal{G})\}$$

Likewise it is straightforward to verify that

$$E[Ah(\mathcal{G})] = E\{E(A|\mathcal{G})h(\mathcal{G})\} \neq 0$$

only if $E(A|\mathcal{G})$ depends on a four-way interaction of form $G_1G_3G_4G_5$ or $G_2G_3G_4G_5$; or the five-way interaction $G_1G_2G_3G_4G_5$. Clearly, this is a weaker requirement than for inference under $K = 5$ and $k^\dagger = 1$, which would require that $E(A|\mathcal{G})$ definitely include the nonzero five-way additive interaction $G_1G_2G_3G_4G_5$. By the same token, inferences under $K = 5$ and $k^\dagger = 3$ can be shown to be possible if say G_1, G_2 and G_3 are in fact valid IVs, while G_4, G_5 are invalid IVs, provided that $E(A|\mathcal{G})$ depends on a three-way interaction $G_1G_4G_5, G_2G_4G_5$, or $G_3G_4G_5$; or alternatively on a four-way interaction $G_1G_3G_4G_5, G_1G_2G_4G_5$ or $G_2G_3G_4G_5$; or alternatively on the five-way interaction $G_1G_2G_3G_4G_5$. This example illustrates that the more candidate SNPs are valid IVs, the less stringent is the IV relevance assumption required for identification. In fact when all five SNPs are valid IVs, then the above result provides an identifying expression for β_a provided at least one of the SNPs is associated with the treatment. We emphasize that there exists strong evidence that genetic higher-order interactions contribute to complex traits ([Ritchie et al., 2001](#); [Taylor and Ehrenreich, 2015](#); [Domingo et al., 2018](#)). For example, [Ritchie et al. \(2001\)](#) identified a statistically significant high-order interaction among four SNPs from three different estrogen-metabolism genes in breast cancer studies, even in the absence of any statistically significant main effects. At any rate, appropriateness of the interaction-IVs relevance assumption in question for a given value of k^\dagger is empirically testable as later illustrated in the UK BioBank Analysis.

We also have the following result establishing a necessary condition for existence of a RAL estimator under $\mathcal{M}_{union, k^\dagger}$.

Theorem 2. Any RAL estimator $\widehat{\beta}_a$ of β_a in $\mathcal{M}_{union, k^\dagger}$ must satisfy the following:

$$\sqrt{n} \left(\widehat{\beta}_a - \beta_a \right) = n^{1/2} \mathbb{P}_n W(\beta_a) + o_p(1),$$

$$W(\beta_a; c, h) = E[Ah(\mathcal{G})]^{-1} \left[h(\mathcal{G}) \left[Y - \beta_a A - E \left\{ Y - \beta_a A | \mathcal{G}_{-\vec{k}^*} \right\} \right] + c(\mathcal{G}) \right]$$

for a function $c(\mathcal{G})$ that satisfies the restriction

$$E \{ c(\mathcal{G}) | G_k \} = 0, k = 1, \dots, K;$$

and functions $\left\{ h_{\vec{k}}(\mathcal{G}_{\vec{k}}) : \vec{k} \in \mathcal{K}(k^\dagger - 1) \right\}$ such that

$$h(\mathcal{G}) = \sum_{\vec{k} \in \mathcal{K}(k^\dagger)} \left\{ h_{\vec{k}}(\mathcal{G}_{\vec{k}}) - E(H_{\vec{k}}) \right\} \prod_{s \notin \vec{k}} \{ G_s - E(G_s) \}$$

provided that $E(A|\mathcal{G})$ depends on at least one nonzero higher order interaction of order greater or equal to $K - k^\dagger + 1$ involving all invalid IVs $\{ G_s : s \notin \vec{k}^* \}$; and at least one valid IV $\{ G_s : s \in \vec{k}^* \}$. Furthermore, an estimator which achieves the semiparametric efficiency bound for $\mathcal{M}_{union, k^\dagger}$ admits the above expansion with influence function given by $W(\beta_a; c = 0, h_{opt})$, with h_{opt} given in the Supplementary Materials.

3.2 MR² Estimation

Theorem 2 provides a novel characterization of all functions that have zero-mean conditional on $\mathcal{G}_{-\vec{k}}$ for all $\vec{k} \in \mathcal{K}(k^\dagger)$. This general result motivates the following MR² estimator via two stage least squares. Specifically, to ground ideas, suppose for each vector $\vec{k} \in \mathcal{K}(k^\dagger)$, the analyst defines $H_{\vec{k}} = h_{\vec{k}}(\mathcal{G}_{\vec{k}}) = \sum_s G_s 1 \{ s \in \vec{k} \}$, which in case G_s indicates presence of a minor allele at SNP locus s , counts the number of SNPs with a minor allele present among all SNPs in $\vec{k} \in \mathcal{K}(k^\dagger)$. We then note that one can construct valid IVs from $\{ G_s : s \}$ under $\mathcal{M}_{union, k^\dagger}$ as followed:

$$Z_{\vec{k}} = \left(H_{\vec{k}} - \widehat{E}(H_{\vec{k}}) \right) \prod_{s \notin \vec{k}} \left\{ G_s - \widehat{E}(G_s) \right\}; \vec{k} \in \mathcal{K}(k^\dagger)$$

Then, upon obtaining these valid IVs, a standard two stage least squares approach entails:

1. Regressing A on valid IVs $\{Z_{\vec{k}} : \vec{k} \in \mathcal{K}(k^\dagger)\}$ by OLS, with corresponding fitted values

$$\hat{A} = \hat{\alpha}_0 + \sum_{\vec{k} \in \mathcal{K}(k^\dagger)} \hat{\alpha}_{\vec{k}} Z_{\vec{k}}$$

2. Regressing Y on \hat{A} by OLS to obtain $\hat{\beta}_a$.

Then $\hat{\beta}_a$ is a consistent and asymptotically normal MR² estimator of β_a under $\mathcal{M}_{union, k^\dagger}$, with influence function given in the Supplementary Materials, which can be used for inference, such as to construct 95% confidence intervals for β_a . An appealing feature of the MR² estimator is that it is able to attain the semiparametric efficiency bound asymptotically under homoskedasticity $E(\varepsilon^2 | \mathcal{G}) = E(\varepsilon^2)$ by replacing the original candidate IVs with a corresponding set of generated valid IVs. For improved efficiency, one can further adjust for certain eligible functions of SNPs under $\mathcal{M}_{union, k^\dagger}$. Specifically, we note that under $\mathcal{M}_{union, k^\dagger}$, higher order interactions of order greater or equal to $K - k^\dagger + 1$ comprise valid IVs, however interactions of order strictly lower than $K - k^\dagger + 1$ may not be valid IVs as they may be associated with the outcome, in which case they might be of use to reduce variability in the outcome, and thus improve estimation efficiency, and when also associated with the treatment, they might also partially account for confounding.

In this vein, we let X denote a vector of eligible covariates, which may include main effects, together with second, third, ..., $(K - k^\dagger)$ th order interactions of $\{G_s : s\}$. Then, to the extent that they are predictive of the outcome, further adjusting for X in stage 2 outcome regression by regressing Y on (\hat{A}, X) can yield a more efficient estimator $\hat{\beta}_a$ for the regression coefficient of \hat{A} . Further adjusting for other observed covariates, which we may denote as M to account for possible confounding of the effect of SNPs on the outcome typically due to population stratification (i.e. confounding by ancestry), can likewise be implemented. This can be done by simply replacing $\hat{E}(H_{\vec{k}})$ with $\hat{E}(H_{\vec{k}} | M)$ and $\hat{E}(G_s)$ with $\hat{E}(G_s | M)$ obtained by fitting standard regression models for $H_{\vec{k}}$ and G_s .

on M respectively, in construction of $Z_{\vec{k}}$, and by including both X and M in the stage 2 outcome regression model.

4 Simulation Study

We perform Monte Carlo simulations to investigate the numerical performance of the proposed estimators. The instruments $\mathcal{G} = (G_1, \dots, G_K)^T$ are generated from independent Bernoulli distributions with probability $p = 0.8$. Similar to the study designs in [Guo et al. \(2018\)](#) and [Windmeijer et al. \(2019\)](#), the outcome and exposure are generated without covariates from

$$\begin{aligned} Y &= \beta_a A + \beta^T \mathcal{G} + \epsilon_1 \\ A &= \alpha^T h(\mathcal{G}) + \epsilon_2, \end{aligned}$$

where α encodes all main and interaction effects of \mathcal{G} , and

$$\begin{pmatrix} \epsilon_1 \\ \epsilon_2 \end{pmatrix} \sim N \left[\begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0.25 \\ 0.25 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \right].$$

Under this data generating mechanism, we set the number of IVs to be $K = 5$, the causal effect parameter $\beta_a = 1$ and vary

- (1) the sample size $n = 10000$ or 50000 ;
- (2) the number of valid IVs $K - \|\beta\|_0$; and
- (3) the IV strength $\alpha = (1, \dots, 1)^T C$ for $C = 0.6$ or 1 .

For (2), we first set $\beta = (0, 0, 0, 0.2, 0.2)^T$ encoding three valid IVs so that the 50% rule of [Kang et al. \(2016\)](#) holds. Then we consider the case where only two IVs are valid, and set $\beta = (0, 0, 0.1, 0.2, 0.3)^T$ or $\beta = (0, 0, 0.2, 0.2, 0.2)^T$. The plurality rule of [Guo et al. \(2018\)](#) holds in the former design but is violated in the latter.

We use the R package `AER` (Kleibler and Zeileis, 2008) to implement the semiparametric efficient MR^2 estimator under homoskedasticity when there are at least 2 valid IVs, i.e. in the union model $\mathcal{M}_{union,2}$. A sandwich estimate of the asymptotic variance is available directly as an output from the function `ivreg`. We compare the MR^2 method with

- (1) the oracle two stage least squares (2SLS) estimator using only the valid IVs;
- (2) the naive 2SLS estimator using all of \mathcal{G} ;
- (3) the post-adaptive Lasso (Post-Lasso) estimator of Windmeijer et al. (2019) which uses adaptive Lasso tuned with an initial median estimator to select valid IVs; and
- (4) the two-stage hard thresholding (TSHT) estimator of Guo et al. (2018).

The oracle 2SLS estimator is included as a benchmark. It requires *a priori* knowledge of which of the putative IVs are valid, and thus is infeasible in practice. Table 1 summarizes the estimation results for the setting with $C = 0.6$ based on 1000 replications. When the 50% rule holds, both Post-Lasso and TSHT perform nearly as well as the oracle 2SLS in terms of absolute bias, coverage and variance. When the 50% rule is violated but the plurality rule holds, TSHT performs as well as the oracle 2SLS once $n = 50000$. As Post-Lasso relies on the 50% rule condition for consistency, it performs poorly in this setting. When both the 50% and the plurality rules are violated, Post-Lasso and TSHT exhibit noticeable bias and poor coverage. In agreement with theory, naive 2SLS suffers from poor coverage throughout, regardless of sample size.

The proposed MR^2 estimator performs well across all simulation settings, including those in which both the 50% and the plurality rules are violated, but with substantially higher variance than the other methods. For inference, the standard sandwich estimator of the asymptotic variance which ignores data-dependency of the estimated means $\{\widehat{E}(G_j)\}_{j=1,\dots,K}$ is conservative (Robins et al., 1994), albeit readily available as an output from existing off-the-shelf software. As shown in the Supplementary Materials, the degree

of conservativeness increases with the amount of outcome variation that can be explained by the IVs. Thus when there are more invalid IVs having direct effects on the outcome, e.g. in settings with 50% rule violated in Table 1, the conservativeness is more pronounced. A convenient alternative for obtaining standard errors is to implement the nonparametric bootstrap which appropriately accounts for all sources of uncertainty.

Overall, the simulation study shows that Post-Lasso and TSHT perform better than MR^2 in terms of efficiency when their respective identifying conditions hold. On the other hand, MR^2 is able to deliver the desired level of coverage across the range of simulation settings considered. As expected, such robustness comes at the expense of wider confidence intervals, as measured by the square root of the average of squared standard error estimates, and requiring more samples. The absolute bias and variance of the estimators are generally smaller with stronger IV when $C = 1$; because the conclusions are otherwise qualitatively similar, the estimation results for this setting are included in the Supplementary Materials.

4.1 Varying Degree of Exposure Interactions

It is also of interest to investigate the performance of estimators under settings where the exposure model is sparse. To mimick the degree of genetic interactions, in addition to the main effects we randomly select $\gamma = 30\%$ or 60% of both the lower and higher order interactions (of order $\geq \|\beta\|_0 + 1$) to have nonzero coefficients in α . However, this sampling scheme may render the plurality rule invalid even when $\beta = (0, 0, 0.1, 0.2, 0.3)^T$, due to potential asymmetric interactions in the exposure model. Therefore, Table 2 summarizes the estimation results with $C = 0.6$ corresponding to the two cases $\beta = (0, 0, 0, 0.2, 0.2)^T$ and $\beta = (0, 0, 0.2, 0.2, 0.2)^T$ only, the latter of which represents violation of both the 50% and plurality rules. As expected the proposed MR^2 has smaller absolute bias and lower variance as the degree of interactions in the exposure model increases, with empirical coverage close to the nominal level throughout. The estimation results when $C = 1$ are

reported in the Supplementary Materials, and yield qualitatively similar conclusions.

4.2 Single Index Models

We present further Monte Carlo results for exposures generated under the class of semi-parametric single index models $E(A|\mathcal{G}) = g(\alpha^T \mathcal{G})$ where $g(\cdot)$ is a link function. Specifically, the continuous exposure is generated without covariates from

$$A = \exp(\alpha^T \mathcal{G}) + \epsilon_2.$$

We also consider the important setting of a binary exposure generated from

$$A = I(-3 + \alpha^T \mathcal{G} + \epsilon_2 > 0),$$

where $I(\cdot)$ is the indicator function. We fix $C = 1$, while all other simulation settings are unchanged. Tables 3 and 4 summarize the estimation results based on 1000 replications. Remarkably, the proposed MR^2 method performs well, even though in both settings only main effects are included in the linear predictor function, as exposure interactive effects are induced on the additive scale by the nonlinear link function, rather than specified explicitly *a priori*. All other conclusions are qualitatively similar to those drawn when the exposure is generated under the identity link with interactions.

5 An Application to the UK Biobank Data

The UK Biobank (UKB) is a large-scale ongoing prospective cohort study that recruited around 500,000 participants aged 40-69 at recruitment from 2006 to 2010. Participants provided biological samples, completed questionnaires, underwent assessments, and had nurse led interviews. Follow up is chiefly through cohort-wide linkages to National Health Service data, including electronic, coded death certificate, hospital, and primary care data (Sudlow et al., 2015). Genotyping was performed using two arrays, the Affymetrix UK

BiLEVE (UK Biobank Lung Exome Variant Evaluation) Axiom array (about 50,000 participants) and Affymetrix UK Biobank Axiom array (about 450,000 participants). The SNPs included for analysis were directly genotyped or imputed using the Haplotype Reference Consortium panel. To reduce confounding bias due to population stratification, we restrict our analysis to people of genetically verified white British descent, as in previous studies (Tyrrell et al., 2016). For quality control, we exclude participants with (1) excess relatedness (more than 10 putative third-degree relatives), or (2) mismatched information on sex between genotyping and self-report, or (3) sex-chromosomes not XX or XY, or (4) poor-quality genotyping based on heterozygosity and missing rates $> 2\%$.

We are interested in estimating the causal effects of body mass index (BMI) on systolic blood pressure (SBP) and diastolic blood pressure (DBP) respectively. We exclude participants who are taking anti-hypertensive medication based on self-report. In total, the sample size for the final analysis is 292,757. Among the study samples, the mean (SD) BMI was 27.27 (4.65) kg/m^2 , the mean (SD) SBP was 139.6 (19.56) mm Hg, and the mean (SD) diastolic BP was 82.06 (10.66) mm Hg. We use top 10 independent SNPs that are strongly associated with BMI at genome-wide significance level $p < 5 \times 10^{-8}$ (Locke et al., 2015), more detailed information about those 10 SNPs is provided in the Table S1 in the Supplementary Materials. We first perform a conventional regression analysis with BMI as the exposure, SBP/DBP as the outcomes and adjust for sex and age. We obtain a point estimate of 0.680 (SE: 0.007) for SBP and 0.602 (SE:0.004) for DBP for one unit change of BMI. We then apply our proposed MR² method along with the following competing methods: Naive 2SLS, TSHT (Guo et al., 2018), sisVIVE (Kang et al., 2016) and Post-Lasso (Windmeijer et al., 2019).

The data analysis results are summarized in Table 5; note that sisVIVE method does not provide SE estimates. For the BMI-SBP relationship, all effect estimates using MR methods were smaller than estimates from conventional regression analysis. TSHT selected

all 10 SNPs as valid IVs, which explains why results are identical for Naive 2SLS and TSHT. Setting $k^\dagger = 10$, we obtained a point estimate 0.496 with SE: 0.090. As expected, this was close to naive 2SLS and TSHT results.

For the BMI-DBP relationship, TSHT selected nine SNPs as valid, which explains why point estimates for THST and Naive 2SLS differ slightly from each other. Setting $k^\dagger = 10$ gave a point estimate of 0.349 with SE: 0.049. Interestingly, the proposed MR² method delivered a point estimate of 0.649 when $k^\dagger = 4$, which is larger than those of competing methods. When $k^\dagger = 6$ or 8 and thus more than half of the SNPs are assumed to be valid, the point estimate of MR² is similar to those of sisVIVE and Post-Lasso, both of which require the 50% rule for consistency. We also observe that the standard errors of the MR² method decrease substantially when the value of k^\dagger increases, which is in line with our theory. In particular, when $k^\dagger = 2$, the p-value (0.47) for the weak IV diagnostic test in the first stage regression (computed using the R package `AER`) is not significant, and hence the point estimates are likely to be biased due to weak IVs. For this reason, we do not report results for $k^\dagger = 2$. We further perform the Hausman homogeneity test ([Hausman, 1978](#)) to compare the point estimates under $k^\dagger = 6, 8, 10$ versus that under $k^\dagger = 4$ to see whether they differ beyond sampling error using the following test statistic ht

$$ht = \frac{\widehat{\beta}_{k^\dagger=4} - \widehat{\beta}_{k^\dagger=s}}{\sqrt{\widehat{\text{Var}}(\widehat{\beta}_{k^\dagger=4}) - \widehat{\text{Var}}(\widehat{\beta}_{k^\dagger=s})}}, s = 6, 8, 10,$$

which follows $N(0, 1)$ under the null hypothesis $\beta_{k^\dagger=4} = \beta_{k^\dagger=s}$, $s = 6, 8, 10$, respectively. A large absolute value of the test statistic ht suggests that estimators $\widehat{\beta}_{k^\dagger=s}$ and $\widehat{\beta}_{k^\dagger=4}$ have different limiting values. For the BMI-SBP relationship, we did not find statistically significant differences at 5% level when comparing point estimates for $k^\dagger = 6, 8, 10$ with the point estimate for $k^\dagger = 4$, indicating that results are relatively insensitive to the assumed number of valid IVs, although inferences for $k^\dagger = 6, 8$ may be most reliable. For the BMI-DBP relationship, we found that the point estimate under $k^\dagger = 6$ is not statistically

different ($p = 0.063$) from that under $k^\dagger = 4$, however, point estimates under $k^\dagger = 8, 10$ are statistically different ($p < 0.05$) from that for $k^\dagger = 4$, which in this case may be most reliable.

6 Correlated Invalid IVs

We consider a generalization of the results from section 3 to allow for correlated SNPs, i.e. without Assumption 5. In context of invalid IVs, this generalization is particularly important for the approach to allow for non-genetic candidate IVs. Consider the semiparametric model which solely assumes that (7) holds for at least k^\dagger SNPs without ex ante knowledge of which SNPs are invalid IVs among the remaining $K - k^\dagger$ SNPs. We have the following result.

Proposition 3. *Under model $\mathcal{M}_{union, k^\dagger}$, we have that:*

$$\beta_\alpha = \frac{E \left\{ WY \left[\sum_{\vec{k} \in \mathcal{K}(k^\dagger)} \left\{ h_{\vec{k}}(\mathcal{G}_{\vec{k}}) - \tilde{E}(H_{\vec{k}}) \right\} \prod_{s \notin \vec{k}} \{G_s - E(G_s)\} \right] \right\}}{E \left\{ \sum_{\vec{k} \in \mathcal{K}(k^\dagger)} WA \left\{ h_{\vec{k}}(\mathcal{G}_{\vec{k}}) - \tilde{E}(H_{\vec{k}}) \right\} \prod_{s \notin \vec{k}} \{G_s - E(G_s)\} \right\}} \quad (10)$$

provided that

$$E \left\{ \sum_{\vec{k} \in \mathcal{K}(k^\dagger)} WA \left\{ h_{\vec{k}}(\mathcal{G}_{\vec{k}}) - \tilde{E}(H_{\vec{k}}) \right\} \prod_{s \notin \vec{k}} \{G_s - E(G_s)\} \right\} \neq 0 \quad (11)$$

where

$$W = \frac{\prod_{k=1}^K f_k(G_k)}{g(\mathcal{G})}$$

with $g(\mathcal{G})$ the joint probability mass function of \mathcal{G} and $f_k(G_k)$ the marginal probability mass function of G_k , and the expectation $\tilde{E}(\cdot)$ is taken with respect to the joint probability mass function $\prod_{k=1}^K f_k(G_k)$ under independence.

The weight W formally accounts for possible SNP dependence and in fact, we note that under Assumption 5, $W = 1$ for all units, recovering the result from Section 3.

7 Partial Identification

The proposed approach also allows for partial identification of average causal effects with many possibly invalid IVs, even in the absence of semi-additive structural restrictions. The key observation that allows one to obtain valid bounds for a causal effect of interest assuming k^\dagger out of K candidate IVs are valid is that, as pointed out in section 3, such assumption logically implies that all higher order interactions involving at least $K - k^\dagger + 1$ candidate IVs must in fact satisfy the exclusion restriction, since such interactions can at most involve $K - k^\dagger$ invalid IV and at least one valid IV. To illustrate, suppose that $K = 5$ and $k^\dagger = 2$; then all four-way interactions $G_1G_2G_3G_4$, $G_1G_2G_3G_5$, $G_1G_2G_4G_5$, $G_1G_3G_4G_5$, $G_2G_3G_4G_5$, and the five way interaction $G_1G_2G_3G_4G_5$ must satisfy the exclusion restriction condition, regardless of which two IVs are valid IVs, because at least one such valid IV is necessarily included in all of these interactions. With these valid candidate interaction-IVs defined, one may then proceed with any existing IV bounds in the literature to obtain partial inference for a variety of average causal effects (Swanson et al., 2018).

8 Discussion

In this paper, we introduce a new class of MR² estimators that are guaranteed to be root- n consistent for the causal effect of interest in MR studies, provided at least one genetic IV is valid, but without necessarily knowing which one. We further extend the result to

a more general class of estimators that remain root- n consistent provided that k^\dagger of the K putative IVs are valid. In practice, if one has some prior knowledge about k^\dagger , then such prior knowledge can be incorporated into the analysis. In practice, we propose that one report inferences corresponding to a range of values of k^\dagger to assess the extent to which inferences vary with more or less stringent IV conditions in a manner of sensitivity analysis. For each value of k^\dagger , one may diagnose weak IVs by inspecting the significance value of the F-statistic in our first-stage regression for the candidate genetic interactions. Both simulation studies and real data analysis demonstrate the finite sample performance of the proposed approach.

Our contribution is multi-fold. First, we by-pass the model selection procedure of [Kang et al. \(2016\)](#); [Guo et al. \(2018\)](#) and [Windmeijer et al. \(2019\)](#); our confidence intervals are based on a regular and asymptotically linear estimator and therefore are uniformly valid over the parameter space of the union model. Second, we establish the semiparametric efficiency bound for estimation of causal effects under a general, union invalid IV model that subsumes models considered by prior works, and provide a formal quantification of the IV relevance requirements and efficiency in exchange for increased robustness. Lastly, we propose MR² two-stage least squares estimators that can be readily implemented using existing off-the-shelf software.

MR² readily extends to binary, count and censored survival outcome settings simply by re-coding the candidate IVs as discussed in Section 7 and using the derived interaction-IVs as valid IVs in appropriate IV analysis for the given type of outcome available in the causal inference literature ([Robins, 1994](#); [Abadie, 2003](#); [Vansteelandt and Goetghebeur, 2003](#); [Tan, 2010](#); [Tchetgen Tchetgen et al., 2015](#); [Wang and Tchetgen Tchetgen, 2018](#); [Liu et al., 2020a](#)).

In closing, we acknowledge certain limitations of the MR² method. First, the approach may be vulnerable to weak IV bias which may occur if exposure is weakly dependent

on interaction-IVs. However, although not pursued here, in principle, one can leverage existing literature on many weak IVs to address this challenge (Newey and Windmeijer, 2009; Ye et al., 2021). Second, in observational studies the IV assumptions may only hold conditional on a high dimensional set of baseline covariates and the multiple candidate IVs may be dependent, thus requiring methods briefly introduced in Section 6. In such setting, the need to model the joint density of candidate IVs presents several computational and inferential challenges we plan to address in future work.

Acknowledgment

Eric Tchetgen Tchetgen's work is funded by NIH grant R01AI104459. Baoluo Sun is supported by the National University of Singapore Start-Up Grant (R-155-000-203-133). This research has been conducted using the UK Biobank resource (<https://www.ukbiobank.ac.uk>) under application number 44430.

Table 1: Comparison of methods with continuous exposure generated under the identity link ($C = 0.6$). The two rows of results for each estimator correspond to sample sizes of $n = 10000$ and $n = 50000$ respectively.

	MR ²	Oracle 2SLS	Naive 2SLS	Post-Lasso	TSHT
50% rule holds					
Bias	.007	.000	.014	.000	.000
	.002	.000	.014	.000	.000
$\sqrt{\text{Var}}$.019	.002	.002	.003	.003
	.009	.001	.001	.001	.002
$\sqrt{\text{EVar}}$.019	.002	.002	.003	.003
	.009	.001	.001	.001	.001
Cov95	.929	.951	.000	.940	.950
	.943	.945	.000	.947	.947
50% rule violated but plurality rule holds					
Bias	.032	.000	.021	.014	.009
	.017	.000	.021	.012	.000
$\sqrt{\text{Var}}$.058	.003	.002	.009	.009
	.043	.001	.001	.007	.003
$\sqrt{\text{EVar}}$.068	.003	.002	.003	.003
	.047	.001	.001	.001	.001
Cov95	.935	.938	.000	.118	.424
	.933	.951	.000	.000	.944
Both 50% and plurality rules violated					
Bias	.032	.000	.021	.035	.035
	.017	.000	.021	.036	.035
$\sqrt{\text{Var}}$.057	.003	.002	.003	.003
	.043	.001	.001	.001	.002
$\sqrt{\text{EVar}}$.068	.003	.002	.002	.002
	.047	.001	.001	.001	.001
Cov95	.933	.941	.000	.000	.000
	.933	.950	.000	.000	.000

Note: |Bias| and $\sqrt{\text{Var}}$ are the Monte Carlo absolute bias and standard deviation of the point estimates, $\sqrt{\text{EVar}}$ is the square root of the mean of the variance estimates and Cov95 is the coverage proportion of the 95% confidence intervals, based on 1000 repeated simulations. Zeros denote values smaller than .0005.

Table 2: Comparison of methods with continuous exposure generated under the identity link ($C = 0.6$), and varying degree of interactive effects. The two rows of results for each estimator correspond to sample sizes of $n = 10000$ and $n = 50000$ respectively.

	MR ²	Oracle 2SLS	Naive 2SLS	Post-Lasso	TSHT
50% rule holds, $\gamma = 30\%$					
Bias	.029	.000	.039	.002	.002
	.009	.000	.039	.000	.000
$\sqrt{\text{Var}}$.056	.006	.007	.009	.010
	.030	.003	.006	.003	.003
$\sqrt{\text{EVar}}$.057	.007	.005	.007	.007
	.031	.003	.002	.003	.003
Cov95	.919	.961	.000	.937	.919
	.940	.941	.000	.941	.943
50% rule holds, $\gamma = 60\%$					
Bias	.012	.000	.022	.000	.000
	.003	.000	.022	.000	.000
$\sqrt{\text{Var}}$.032	.004	.003	.004	.005
	.016	.002	.002	.002	.003
$\sqrt{\text{EVar}}$.031	.004	.003	.004	.004
	.016	.002	.001	.002	.002
Cov95	.927	.953	.000	.954	.951
	.948	.950	.000	.945	.944
Both 50% and plurality rules violated, $\gamma = 30\%$					
Bias	.098	.000	.059	.093	.085
	.070	.000	.059	.094	.054
$\sqrt{\text{Var}}$.143	.009	.007	.016	.029
	.125	.004	.006	.011	.037
$\sqrt{\text{EVar}}$.166	.009	.005	.007	.008
	.137	.004	.002	.003	.003
Cov95	.923	.943	.000	.000	.024
	.922	.941	.000	.000	.205
Both 50% and plurality rules violated, $\gamma = 60\%$					
Bias	.054	.000	.034	.055	.054
	.030	.000	.034	.055	.042
$\sqrt{\text{Var}}$.091	.005	.004	.006	.009
	.072	.002	.002	.004	.017
$\sqrt{\text{EVar}}$.106	.005	.003	.004	.004
	.077	.002	.001	.002	.002
Cov95	.936	.946	.000	.000	.000
	.925	.959	.000	.000	.043

Note: See the footnote of Table 1.

Table 3: Comparison of methods with continuous exposure generated under the log link. The two rows of results for each estimator correspond to sample sizes of $n = 10000$ and $n = 50000$ respectively.

	MR ²	Oracle 2SLS	Naive 2SLS	Post-Lasso	TSHT
50% rule holds					
Bias	.000	.000	.002	.000	.000
	.000	.000	.002	.000	.000
$\sqrt{\text{Var}}$.001	.000	.000	.000	.000
	.001	.000	.000	.000	.000
$\sqrt{\text{EVar}}$.001	.000	.000	.000	.000
	.001	.000	.000	.000	.000
Cov95	.939	.951	.000	.938	.950
	.948	.945	.000	.947	.946
50% rule violated but plurality rule holds					
Bias	.002	.000	.003	.002	.001
	.000	.000	.003	.001	.000
$\sqrt{\text{Var}}$.006	.000	.000	.001	.001
	.003	.000	.000	.001	.000
$\sqrt{\text{EVar}}$.006	.000	.000	.000	.000
	.003	.000	.000	.000	.000
Cov95	.944	.939	.000	.118	.423
	.956	.951	.000	.000	.944
Both 50% and plurality rules violated					
Bias	.002	.000	.003	.004	.004
	.000	.000	.003	.004	.004
$\sqrt{\text{Var}}$.006	.000	.000	.000	.000
	.003	.000	.000	.000	.000
$\sqrt{\text{EVar}}$.006	.000	.000	.000	.000
	.003	.000	.000	.000	.000
Cov95	.940	.939	.000	.000	.000
	.956	.950	.000	.000	.000

Note: See the footnote of Table 1.

Table 4: Comparison of methods with binary exposure generated under the probit link. The two rows of results for each estimator correspond to sample sizes of $n = 10000$ and $n = 50000$ respectively.

	MR ²	Oracle 2SLS	Naive 2SLS	Post-Lasso	TSHT
50% rule holds					
Bias	.065	.002	.300	.002	.000
	.015	.002	.302	.002	.004
$\sqrt{\text{Var}}$.187	.051	.039	.055	.059
	.090	.023	.018	.023	.032
$\sqrt{\text{EVar}}$.185	.051	.039	.051	.052
	.091	.023	.017	.022	.023
Cov95	.928	.952	.000	.941	.948
	.954	.947	.000	.948	.946
50% rule violated but plurality rule holds					
Bias	.377	.003	.450	.302	.203
	.196	.003	.453	.252	.008
$\sqrt{\text{Var}}$.704	.062	.040	.196	.195
	.535	.028	.018	.147	.053
$\sqrt{\text{EVar}}$	1.077	.062	.039	.056	.062
	.561	.028	.017	.026	.027
Cov95	.932	.939	.000	.110	.396
	.925	.951	.000	.000	.945
Both 50% and plurality rules violated					
Bias	.378	.003	.450	.749	.751
	.196	.003	.453	.753	.752
$\sqrt{\text{Var}}$.704	.062	.039	.055	.055
	.536	.028	.018	.023	.030
$\sqrt{\text{EVar}}$	1.085	.062	.039	.051	.051
	.561	.028	.017	.022	.023
Cov95	.933	.939	.000	.000	.000
	.924	.951	.000	.000	.000

Note: See the footnote of Table 1.

Table 5: Estimates of the causal effects of body mass index on systolic blood pressure and diastolic blood pressure in the UK Biobank of European descent ($K = 10, n = 292,757$).

Naive 2SLS	TSHT	sisVIVE	Post-Lasso	MR ² (k^\dagger)			
				4*	6*	8*	10*
Systolic blood pressure							
.447	.447	.604	.628	.543	.523	.530	.496
(.109)	(.109)		(.133)	(.296)	(.135)	(.090)	(.090)
Diastolic blood pressure							
.254	.296	.386	.459	.649	.410	.363	.349
(.059)	(.059)	—	(.065)	(.147)	(.071)	(.048)	(.048)

Note: Point estimate with standard error in parenthesis. *indicates that the weak IV null hypothesis is rejected at 0.05 level using the diagnostic test implemented in the R package **AER** (Kleiberg and Zeileis, 2008).

References

- Abadie, A. (2003). Semiparametric instrumental variable estimation of treatment response models. *Journal of econometrics*, 113(2):231–263.
- Angrist, J. D., Imbens, G. W., and Rubin, D. B. (1996). Identification of causal effects using instrumental variables. *Journal of the American statistical Association*, 91(434):444–455.
- Bickel, P. J., Klaassen, C. A., Bickel, P. J., Ritov, Y., Klaassen, J., Wellner, J. A., and Ritov, Y. (1993). *Efficient and adaptive estimation for semiparametric models*, volume 4. Johns Hopkins University Press Baltimore.
- Bowden, J., Davey Smith, G., and Burgess, S. (2015). Mendelian randomization with invalid instruments: effect estimation and bias detection through egger regression. *International Journal of Epidemiology*, 44(2):512–525.
- Bowden, J., Davey Smith, G., Haycock, P. C., and Burgess, S. (2016). Consistent estimation in mendelian randomization with some invalid instruments using a weighted median estimator. *Genetic Epidemiology*, 40(4):304–314.
- Chao, J. C. and Swanson, N. R. (2005). Consistent estimation with a large number of weak instruments. *Econometrica*, 73(5):1673–1692.
- Davey Smith, G. and Ebrahim, S. (2003). ‘Mendelian randomization’: can genetic epidemiology contribute to understanding environmental determinants of disease? *International Journal of Epidemiology*, 32(1):1–22.
- Domingo, J., Diss, G., and Lehner, B. (2018). Pairwise and higher-order genetic interactions during the evolution of a trna. *Nature*, 558(7708):117–121.
- Guo, Z., Kang, H., Cai, T. T., and Small, D. S. (2018). Confidence intervals for causal

- effects with invalid instruments by using two-stage hard thresholding with voting. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)*, 80(4):793–815.
- Han, C. (2008). Detecting invalid instruments using L1-GMM. *Economics Letters*, 101(3):285–287.
- Hausman, J. A. (1978). Specification tests in econometrics. *Econometrica: Journal of the Econometric Society*, pages 1251–1271.
- Kang, H., Zhang, A., Cai, T. T., and Small, D. S. (2016). Instrumental variables estimation with some invalid instruments and its application to mendelian randomization. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 111(513):132–144.
- Kleibergen, C. and Zeileis, A. (2008). *Applied Econometrics with R*. Springer-Verlag, New York. ISBN 978-0-387-77316-2.
- Lawlor, D. A., Harbord, R. M., Sterne, J. A. C., Timpson, N., and Davey Smith, G. (2008). Mendelian randomization: Using genes as instruments for making causal inferences in epidemiology. *Statistics in Medicine*, 27(8):1133–1163.
- Leeb, H. and Pötscher, B. M. (2008). Sparse estimators and the oracle property, or the return of hedges’ estimator. *Journal of Econometrics*, 142(1):201–211.
- Little, J. and Khoury, M. J. (2003). Mendelian randomisation: a new spin or real progress? *The Lancet*, 362(9388):930–930.
- Liu, L., Miao, W., Sun, B., Robins, J., and Tchetgen, E. T. (2020a). Identification and inference for marginal average treatment effect on the treated with an instrumental variable. *Statistica Sinica*, 30(3):1517.

- Liu, Z., Ye, T., Sun, B., Schooling, M., and Tchetgen Tchetgen, E. (2020b). On mendelian randomization mixed-scale treatment effect robust identification (MR MiSTERI) and estimation for causal inference. arXiv:2009.14484.
- Locke, A. E., Kahali, B., Berndt, S. I., and et al. (2015). Genetic studies of body mass index yield new insights for obesity biology. *Nature*, 518(7538):197–206.
- Newey, W. K. (1994). The asymptotic variance of semiparametric estimators. *Econometrica: Journal of the Econometric Society*, pages 1349–1382.
- Newey, W. K. and McFadden, D. (1994). Chapter 36 large sample estimation and hypothesis testing. volume 4 of *Handbook of Econometrics*, pages 2111–2245. Elsevier.
- Newey, W. K. and Windmeijer, F. (2009). Generalized method of moments with many weak moment conditions. *Econometrica*, 77(3):687–719.
- Nijenhuis, A. and Wilf, H. S. (2014). *Combinatorial algorithms: for computers and calculators*. Elsevier.
- Okui, R., Small, D. S., Tan, Z., and Robins, J. M. (2012). Doubly robust instrumental variable regression. *Statistica Sinica*, pages 173–205.
- Purcell, S., Neale, B., Todd-Brown, K., Thomas, L., Ferreira, M. A., Bender, D., Maller, J., Sklar, P., De Bakker, P. I., Daly, M. J., et al. (2007). Plink: a tool set for whole-genome association and population-based linkage analyses. *The American Journal of Human Genetics*, 81(3):559–575.
- Ritchie, M. D., Hahn, L. W., Roodi, N., Bailey, L. R., Dupont, W. D., Parl, F. F., and Moore, J. H. (2001). Multifactor-dimensionality reduction reveals high-order interactions among estrogen-metabolism genes in sporadic breast cancer. *The American Journal of Human Genetics*, 69(1):138–147.

- Robins, J. M. (1994). Correcting for non-compliance in randomized trials using structural nested mean models. *Communications in Statistics-Theory and methods*, 23(8):2379–2412.
- Robins, J. M. (2000). Robust estimation in sequentially ignorable missing data and causal inference models. In *Proceedings of the American Statistical Association*, volume 1999, pages 6–10. Indianapolis, IN.
- Robins, J. M., Rotnitzky, A., and Zhao, L. P. (1994). Estimation of regression coefficients when some regressors are not always observed. *Journal of the American statistical Association*, 89(427):846–866.
- Scharfstein, D. O., Rotnitzky, A., and Robins, J. M. (1999). Adjusting for nonignorable drop-out using semiparametric nonresponse models: Rejoinder. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 94(448):1135–1146.
- Staiger, D. and Stock, J. H. (1997). Instrumental variables regression with weak instruments. *Econometrica*, 65(3):557–586.
- Stock, J. H. and Wright, J. H. (2000). Gmm with weak identification. *Econometrica*, 68(5):1055–1096.
- Stock, J. H., Wright, J. H., and Yogo, M. (2002). A survey of weak instruments and weak identification in generalized method of moments. *Journal of Business & Economic Statistics*, 20(4):518–529.
- Sudlow, C., Gallacher, J., Allen, N., Beral, V., Burton, P., Danesh, J., Downey, P., Elliott, P., Green, J., Landray, M., et al. (2015). UK Biobank: an open access resource for identifying the causes of a wide range of complex diseases of middle and old age. *Plos Medicine*, 12(3):e1001779.

- Swanson, S. A., Hernán, M. A., Miller, M., Robins, J. M., and Richardson, T. S. (2018). Partial identification of the average treatment effect using instrumental variables: review of methods for binary instruments, treatments, and outcomes. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 113(522):933–947.
- Tan, Z. (2010). Marginal and nested structural models using instrumental variables. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 105(489):157–169.
- Taylor, M. B. and Ehrenreich, I. M. (2015). Higher-order genetic interactions and their contribution to complex traits. *Trends in Genetics*, 31(1):34–40.
- Tchetgen Tchetgen, E., Sun, B., and Walter, S. (2021). The genius approach to robust mendelian randomization inference. *Statistical Science*, 36(3):443–464.
- Tchetgen Tchetgen, E. J., Robins, J. M., and Rotnitzky, A. (2010). On doubly robust estimation in a semiparametric odds ratio model. *Biometrika*, 97(1):171–180.
- Tchetgen Tchetgen, E. J. and Shpitser, I. (2012). Semiparametric theory for causal mediation analysis: efficiency bounds, multiple robustness, and sensitivity analysis. *Annals of Statistics*, 40(3):1816.
- Tchetgen Tchetgen, E. J., Walter, S., Vansteelandt, S., Martinussen, T., and Glymour, M. (2015). Instrumental variable estimation in a survival context. *Epidemiology (Cambridge, Mass.)*, 26(3):402.
- Tyrrell, J., Jones, S. E., Beaumont, R., Astley, C. M., Lovell, R., Yaghootkar, H., Tuke, M., Ruth, K. S., Freathy, R. M., Hirschhorn, J. N., et al. (2016). Height, body mass index, and socioeconomic status: mendelian randomisation study in UK Biobank. *BMJ*, 352:i582.

- Vansteelandt, S. and Goetghebeur, E. (2003). Causal inference with generalized structural mean models. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)*, 65(4):817–835.
- Wang, L. and Tchetgen Tchetgen, E. (2018). Bounded, efficient and multiply robust estimation of average treatment effects using instrumental variables. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series B, Statistical methodology*, 80(3):531.
- Windmeijer, F., Farbmacher, H., Davies, N., and Davey Smith, G. (2019). On the use of the lasso for instrumental variables estimation with some invalid instruments. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 114(527):1339–1350.
- Wooldridge, J. M. (2010). *Econometric analysis of cross section and panel data*. MIT press.
- Ye, T., Liu, Z., Sun, B., and Tchetgen Tchetgen, E. (2021). GENIUS-MAWII: For robust Mendelian randomization with many weak invalid instruments. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2107.06238*.

Supplementary Materials

With a slight abuse of notation, throughout we let \vec{k} denote either the tuple $(k(1), \dots, k(k^\dagger))$ or the set $\{k(1), \dots, k(k^\dagger)\}$ depending on the context. The complement of set \vec{k} is denoted as \vec{k}^c , and the set difference $\vec{k}_1 \cap \vec{k}_2^c$ is denoted as $\vec{k}_1 \setminus \vec{k}_2$. We use $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A}}$ to denote the set of variables $\{G_s : s \in \mathcal{A}\}$ for any set of indices $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \{1, \dots, K\}$. In addition, we denote $\varepsilon = Y - \beta_a A - E(Y - \beta_a A | \mathcal{G}_{\vec{k}^c})$ and $\bar{h}(\mathcal{G}) = h(\mathcal{G}) - E\{h(\mathcal{G})\}$ for any function $h(\mathcal{G})$. Proposition 1 and Theorem 1 are special cases of Proposition 2 and Theorem 2 respectively with $k^\dagger = 1$; their proofs are thus omitted.

Proof of Proposition 2

$$\begin{aligned}
 & E \left[Y \left\{ \sum_{\vec{k} \in \mathcal{K}(k^\dagger)} \bar{h}_{\vec{k}}(\mathcal{G}_{\vec{k}^\rightarrow}) \prod_{s \in \vec{k}^{\mathcal{C}}} \bar{G}_s \right\} \right] \\
 &= E \left(E \left[Y \left\{ \sum_{\vec{k} \in \mathcal{K}(k^\dagger)} \bar{h}_{\vec{k}}(\mathcal{G}_{\vec{k}^\rightarrow}) \prod_{s \in \vec{k}^{\mathcal{C}}} \bar{G}_s \right\} \middle| A, \mathcal{G}, U \right] \right) \\
 &= E \left[\{\beta_a A + \beta_{g,u}(\mathcal{G}, U)\} \left\{ \sum_{\vec{k} \in \mathcal{K}(k^\dagger)} \bar{h}_{\vec{k}}(\mathcal{G}_{\vec{k}^\rightarrow}) \prod_{s \in \vec{k}^{\mathcal{C}}} \bar{G}_s \right\} \right] \text{ by Assumption 4} \\
 &= E \left[\{\beta_a A + \beta_{g,u}(\mathcal{G}_{\vec{k}^{\ast\mathcal{C}}}, U)\} \left\{ \sum_{\vec{k} \in \mathcal{K}(k^\dagger)} \bar{h}_{\vec{k}}(\mathcal{G}_{\vec{k}^\rightarrow}) \prod_{s \in \vec{k}^{\mathcal{C}}} \bar{G}_s \right\} \right] \text{ by Assumption 3} \\
 &= \beta_a E \left[A \left\{ \sum_{\vec{k} \in \mathcal{K}(k^\dagger)} \bar{h}_{\vec{k}}(\mathcal{G}_{\vec{k}^\rightarrow}) \prod_{s \in \vec{k}^{\mathcal{C}}} \bar{G}_s \right\} \right] \\
 &\quad + E \left[\beta_{g,u}(\mathcal{G}_{\vec{k}^{\ast\mathcal{C}}}, U) \left\{ \sum_{\vec{k} \in \mathcal{K}(k^\dagger)} \bar{h}_{\vec{k}}(\mathcal{G}_{\vec{k}^\rightarrow}) \prod_{s \in \vec{k}^{\mathcal{C}}} \bar{G}_s \right\} \right] \\
 &= \beta_a E \left[A \left\{ \sum_{\vec{k} \in \mathcal{K}(k^\dagger)} \bar{h}_{\vec{k}}(\mathcal{G}_{\vec{k}^\rightarrow}) \prod_{s \in \vec{k}^{\mathcal{C}}} \bar{G}_s \right\} \right] \\
 &\quad + E \left[\beta_{g,u}(\mathcal{G}_{\vec{k}^{\ast\mathcal{C}}}, U) \sum_{\vec{k} \in \mathcal{K}(k^\dagger)} E \left\{ \bar{h}_{\vec{k}}(\mathcal{G}_{\vec{k}^\rightarrow}) \prod_{s \in \vec{k}^{\mathcal{C}}} \bar{G}_s \middle| \mathcal{G}_{\vec{k}^{\ast\mathcal{C}}}, U \right\} \right] \\
 &:= \beta_a E \left[A \left\{ \sum_{\vec{k} \in \mathcal{K}(k^\dagger)} \bar{h}_{\vec{k}}(\mathcal{G}_{\vec{k}^\rightarrow}) \prod_{s \in \vec{k}^{\mathcal{C}}} \bar{G}_s \right\} \right] \\
 &\quad + E \left\{ \beta_{g,u}(\mathcal{G}_{\vec{k}^{\ast\mathcal{C}}}, U) \sum_{\vec{k} \in \mathcal{K}(k^\dagger)} \phi_{\vec{k}}(\mathcal{G}_{\vec{k}^{\ast\mathcal{C}}}, U) \right\}.
 \end{aligned}$$

Consider each term $\phi_{\vec{k}}(\mathcal{G}_{\vec{k}^* \mathbb{C}}, U)$. If $\vec{k} = \vec{k}^*$, then

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \phi_{\vec{k}^*}(\mathcal{G}_{\vec{k}^* \mathbb{C}}, U) \\
 &= E \left\{ \bar{h}_{\vec{k}^*}(\mathcal{G}_{\vec{k}^*}) \prod_{s \in \vec{k}^* \mathbb{C}} \bar{G}_s \middle| \mathcal{G}_{\vec{k}^* \mathbb{C}}, U \right\} \\
 &= \prod_{s \in \vec{k}^* \mathbb{C}} \bar{G}_s E \left\{ \bar{h}_{\vec{k}^*}(\mathcal{G}_{\vec{k}^*}) \middle| \mathcal{G}_{\vec{k}^* \mathbb{C}}, U \right\} \\
 &= \prod_{s \in \vec{k}^* \mathbb{C}} \bar{G}_s E \left[\bar{h}_{\vec{k}^*}(\mathcal{G}_{\vec{k}^*}) \middle| \mathcal{G}_{\vec{k}^* \mathbb{C}} \right] \text{ by Assumption 2} \\
 &= \prod_{s \in \vec{k}^* \mathbb{C}} \bar{G}_s E \{ \bar{h}_{\vec{k}^*}(\mathcal{G}_{\vec{k}^*}) \} \text{ by Assumption 5} \\
 &= 0.
 \end{aligned}$$

Otherwise $\vec{k} \neq \vec{k}^*$, and

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \phi_{\vec{k}}(\mathcal{G}_{\vec{k}^* \mathbb{C}}, U) \\
 &= E \left\{ \bar{h}_{\vec{k}}(\mathcal{G}_{\vec{k}}) \prod_{s \in \vec{k}^* \mathbb{C}} \bar{G}_s \middle| \mathcal{G}_{\vec{k}^* \mathbb{C}}, U \right\} \\
 &= \prod_{s \in (\vec{k} \cup \vec{k}^*)^c} \bar{G}_s E \left\{ \bar{h}_{\vec{k}}(\mathcal{G}_{\vec{k}}) \prod_{s \in \vec{k}^* \setminus \vec{k}} \bar{G}_s \middle| \mathcal{G}_{\vec{k}^* \mathbb{C}}, U \right\} \\
 &= \prod_{s \in (\vec{k} \cup \vec{k}^*)^c} \bar{G}_s E \left\{ \bar{h}_{\vec{k}}(\mathcal{G}_{\vec{k}}) \prod_{s \in \vec{k}^* \setminus \vec{k}} \bar{G}_s \middle| \mathcal{G}_{\vec{k}^* \mathbb{C}} \right\} \text{ by Assumption 2} \\
 &= \prod_{s \in (\vec{k} \cup \vec{k}^*)^c} \bar{G}_s E \left\{ \bar{h}_{\vec{k}}(\mathcal{G}_{\vec{k}}) \prod_{s \in \vec{k}^* \setminus \vec{k}} \bar{G}_s \middle| \mathcal{G}_{\vec{k} \setminus \vec{k}^*} \right\} \text{ by Assumption 5} \\
 &= \prod_{s \in (\vec{k} \cup \vec{k}^*)^c} \bar{G}_s E \left\{ \bar{h}_{\vec{k}}(\mathcal{G}_{\vec{k}}) \middle| \mathcal{G}_{\vec{k} \setminus \vec{k}^*} \right\} E \left[\prod_{s \in \vec{k}^* \setminus \vec{k}} \bar{G}_s \middle| \mathcal{G}_{\vec{k} \setminus \vec{k}^*} \right]
 \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 &= \prod_{s \in (\vec{k} \cup \vec{k}^*)^c} \bar{G}_s E \left\{ \bar{h}_{\vec{k}}(\mathcal{G}_{\vec{k}}) \middle| \mathcal{G}_{\vec{k} \setminus \vec{k}^*} \right\} \prod_{s \in \vec{k}^* \setminus \vec{k}} E(\bar{G}_s) \\
 &= 0.
 \end{aligned}$$

Therefore $\sum_{\vec{k} \in \mathcal{K}(k^\dagger)} \phi_{\vec{k}}(\mathcal{G}_{\vec{k}^* \setminus \vec{k}}, U) = 0$ almost surely, and

$$E \left[Y \left\{ \sum_{\vec{k} \in \mathcal{K}(k^\dagger)} \bar{h}_{\vec{k}}(\mathcal{G}_{\vec{k}}) \prod_{s \in \vec{k}^c} \bar{G}_s \right\} \right] = \beta_a E \left[A \left\{ \sum_{\vec{k} \in \mathcal{K}(k^\dagger)} \bar{h}_{\vec{k}}(\mathcal{G}_{\vec{k}}) \prod_{s \in \vec{k}^c} \bar{G}_s \right\} \right]. \square$$

Proof of Theorem 2

Consider a parametric path θ for the joint law of $O = (Y, A, \mathcal{G})$. The joint density with respect to some dominating measure is given by $f_\theta(O) = f_\theta(Y|A, \mathcal{G}) f_\theta(A|\mathcal{G}) \prod_{k=1}^K f_\theta(G_k)$. The resulting tangent space is given by $\mathcal{T} = \{S_\theta(O) = S_\theta(Y|A, \mathcal{G}) + S_\theta(A|\mathcal{G}) + \sum_{k=1}^K S_{k,\theta}(G_k)\}$, where $E_\theta\{S_\theta(Y|A, \mathcal{G})|A, \mathcal{G}\} = E_\theta\{S_\theta(A|\mathcal{G})|\mathcal{G}\} = 0$ and $E_\theta\{S_{k,\theta}(G_k)\} = 0$ for $k = 1, \dots, K$. The parameter of interest $\beta_a(\theta)$ is defined implicitly as a functional of the observed data law through the conditional mean independence restriction

$$E_\theta(Y - \beta_a A | \mathcal{G}) = E_\theta \left(Y - \beta_a A \middle| \mathcal{G}_{\vec{k}^* \setminus \vec{k}} \right). \quad (\text{S1})$$

Following [Bickel et al. \(1993\)](#) and [Newey \(1994\)](#), we derive all influence curves $\text{IF}(O)$ that satisfy

$$\partial\beta(\theta)/\partial\theta|_{\theta=0} = E\{\text{IF}(O)S(O)\}.$$

Moment condition (S1) is equivalent to the class of unconditional moment restrictions

$$\{E_\theta\{\tilde{\varphi}_\theta(\mathcal{G})(Y - \beta_a A)\} = 0 : \varphi \text{ unrestricted}\}, \quad (\text{S2})$$

where $\tilde{\varphi}_\theta(\mathcal{G}) = \varphi(\mathcal{G}) - E_\theta(\varphi|\mathcal{G}_{\vec{k}^* \setminus \vec{k}})$. For an arbitrary moment restriction in (S2), differentiating under the integral yields

$$\partial\beta(\theta)/\partial\theta|_{\theta=0} = -\Delta_{\tilde{\varphi}}^{-1}(\Gamma_1 + \Gamma_2),$$

where $\Delta_{\tilde{\varphi}} = E\{\tilde{\varphi}(\mathcal{G})A\}$, $\Gamma_1 = E\{\tilde{\varphi}(\mathcal{G})(Y - \beta_a A)S(O)\}$ and

$$\begin{aligned}\Gamma_2 &= -E\left[(Y - \beta_a A)E\left\{\varphi(\mathcal{G})S(\mathcal{G})\middle|\mathcal{G}_{\vec{k}^*c}\right\}\right] \\ &= -E\left[E\left(Y - \beta_a A\middle|\mathcal{G}_{\vec{k}^*c}\right)E\left\{\varphi(\mathcal{G})S(\mathcal{G})\middle|\mathcal{G}_{\vec{k}^*c}\right\}\right] \\ &= -E\left[E\left(Y - \beta_a A\middle|\mathcal{G}_{\vec{k}^*c}\right)\varphi(\mathcal{G})S(\mathcal{G})\right] \\ &= -E\left[E\left(Y - \beta_a A\middle|\mathcal{G}_{\vec{k}^*c}\right)\tilde{\varphi}(\mathcal{G})S(O)\right]\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, $\partial\beta(\theta)/\partial\theta|_{\theta=0} = -\Delta_{\tilde{\varphi}}^{-1}E[\tilde{\varphi}(\mathcal{G})\varepsilon S(O)]$. It is straightforward to verify that the orthocomplement to the tangent space is given by

$$\mathcal{T}^\perp = \{c(\mathcal{G}) : c(\mathcal{G}) \text{ unrestricted except } E\{c(\mathcal{G})|G_k\} = 0, k = 1, \dots, K\}.$$

We can add to each influence curve any element from \mathcal{T}^\perp , hence the set of influence curves of β_a in semiparametric model $\mathcal{M}_{\vec{k}^*}$ is

$$\begin{aligned}\text{IF}_{\vec{k}^*} &= \left\{ -\Delta_{\tilde{\varphi}}^{-1}\{\tilde{\varphi}(\mathcal{G})\varepsilon + c(\mathcal{G})\} : \right. \\ &\quad \left. \tilde{\varphi}, c \text{ unrestricted except } \Delta_{\tilde{\varphi}} \neq 0, E\{\tilde{\varphi}(\mathcal{G})\middle|\mathcal{G}_{\vec{k}^*c}\} = 0 \text{ and } E\{c(\mathcal{G})\middle|G_k\} = 0, k = 1, \dots, K \right\}.\end{aligned}$$

The Set of Influence Functions in the Semiparametric Union Model

$\mathcal{M}_{union, k^\dagger}$

By definition, an estimator of β_a is RAL under the union model $\mathcal{M}_{union, k^\dagger}$ if and only if it is RAL under each of $\mathcal{M}_{\vec{k}^*}$, $\vec{k}^* \in \mathcal{K}(k^\dagger)$, i.e. its influence function is an element in the intersection set

$$\begin{aligned}\cap_{\vec{k}^* \in \mathcal{K}(k^\dagger)} \text{IF}_{\vec{k}^*} &= \left\{ -\Delta_{\tilde{\varphi}}^{-1}\{\varphi(\mathcal{G})\varepsilon + c(\mathcal{G})\} : \varphi, c \text{ unrestricted except} \right. \\ &\quad \left. \Delta_{\tilde{\varphi}} \neq 0, E\{\varphi(\mathcal{G})\middle|\mathcal{G}_{\vec{k}^*c}\} = 0 \text{ for } \vec{k}^* \in \mathcal{K}(k^\dagger) \text{ and } E\{c(\mathcal{G})\middle|G_k\} = 0 \text{ for } k = 1, \dots, K \right\}.\end{aligned}$$

In the following, we consider the enumeration $\{\vec{k}_j^*\}_{j=1, \dots, \binom{K}{k^\dagger}}$ of the elements in $\mathcal{K}(k^\dagger)$ in Gray code order via the revolving door algorithm (Nijenhuis and Wilf, 2014), which

establishes a bijection from the set of integers $\{1, 2, \dots, \binom{K}{k^\dagger}\}$ to $\mathcal{K}(k^\dagger)$ such that $\vec{k}_{j-1} \setminus \vec{k}_j$ and $\vec{k}_j \setminus \vec{k}_{j-1}$ are singletons for any $2 \leq j \leq K$. Let $\cup_t := \cup_{j=1}^t \vec{k}_j$, $\cap_t := \cap_{j=1}^t \vec{k}_j$ and define

$$\Gamma_t(\mathcal{G}; d, h) := d\left(\mathcal{G}_{\cup_t^c}\right) \left\{ \sum_{j=1}^t \bar{h}_{\vec{k}_j} \left(\mathcal{G}_{\vec{k}_j}\right) \prod_{s \in \cup_t \setminus \vec{k}_j} \bar{G}_s - \bar{h}_{\cap_t}(\mathcal{G}_{\cap_t}) \right\},$$

for all $2 \leq t \leq K$, where $h := \{h_{\cap_t}, h_{\vec{k}_1}, \dots, h_{\vec{k}_t}\}$. Following the proof of Proposition 3, Γ_t satisfies

$$E \left\{ \Gamma_t(\mathcal{G}; d, h) \middle| \mathcal{G}_{\vec{k}_j^c} \right\} = 0, \quad (\text{S3})$$

for $j = 1, \dots, t$. We also define the set

$$\Lambda_t := \left\{ \varphi(\mathcal{G}) : \varphi(\mathcal{G}) \text{ unrestricted except } E\{\varphi(\mathcal{G}) | \mathcal{G}_{\vec{k}_j^c}\} = 0, j = 1, \dots, t \right\}.$$

In the following we aim to show that for all $2 \leq t \leq K$,

$$\Lambda_t = \{\Gamma_t(\mathcal{G}; d, h) : d, h\}. \quad (\text{S4})$$

Proof of $P(2)$: $\Lambda_2 = \{\Gamma_2(\mathcal{G}; d, h) : d, h\}$

The conditional independence $\mathcal{G}_{\vec{k}_1^c} \perp \mathcal{G}_{\vec{k}_2^c} | \mathcal{G}_{\cup_2^c}$ holds under Assumption 5. Then Theorem 1 of [Tchetgen Tchetgen et al. \(2010\)](#) implies that

$$\Lambda_2 = \{r(\mathcal{G}) - r^\dagger(\mathcal{G}) : r(\mathcal{G}) \text{ unrestricted}\},$$

where $r^\dagger(\mathcal{G}) := \sum_{j=1}^2 E\{r(\mathcal{G}) | \mathcal{G}_{\vec{k}_j^c}\} - E\{r(\mathcal{G}) | \mathcal{G}_{\cup_2^c}\}$. Because \mathcal{G} consists of all binary variables, any arbitrary function of \mathcal{G} may be decomposed¹ as

$$r(\mathcal{G}) = d_0\left(\mathcal{G}_{\cup_2^c}\right) + d_1\left(\mathcal{G}_{\cup_2^c}\right) \left\{ v_0(\mathcal{G}_{\cap_2}) + \bar{G}_{\cup_2 \setminus \vec{k}_1} v_1(\mathcal{G}_{\cap_2}) + \bar{G}_{\cup_2 \setminus \vec{k}_2} v_3(\mathcal{G}_{\cap_2}) + \bar{G}_{\cup_2 \setminus \vec{k}_1} \bar{G}_{\cup_2 \setminus \vec{k}_2} v_4(\mathcal{G}_{\cap_2}) \right\},$$

¹The sets $\cup_2 \setminus \vec{k}_1$ and $\cup_2 \setminus \vec{k}_2$ are singletons due to the enumeration scheme.

for some functions $\{d_0, d_1, v_0, v_1, v_2, v_3, v_4\}$. It may be shown after some algebraic manipulations that

$$r(\mathcal{G}) - r^\dagger(\mathcal{G}) = d_1(\mathcal{G}_{\cup_2^{\mathcal{C}}}) \underbrace{\left\{ \sum_{j=1}^2 \bar{G}_{\cup_2 \setminus \vec{k}_j} \bar{h}_{\vec{k}_j}(\mathcal{G}_{\vec{k}_j}) - \bar{h}_{\cap_2}(\mathcal{G}_{\cap_2}) \right\}}_{:=h(\mathcal{G}_{\cup_2})},$$

for arbitrary functions d_1 and h .

Proof of $P(\ell) \rightarrow P(\ell + 1)$ for $\ell \geq 2$

Now suppose for some $\ell \geq 2$, $\Lambda_\ell = \{\Gamma_\ell(\mathcal{G}; d, h) : d, h\}$. We aim to show that $\Lambda_{\ell+1} = \{\Gamma_{\ell+1}(\mathcal{G}; d, h) : d, h\}$. Consider an arbitrary element $\Gamma_{\ell+1}(d^\dagger, h^\dagger) \in \{\Gamma_{\ell+1}(\mathcal{G}; d, h) : d, h\}$. Then

$$E \left\{ \Gamma_{\ell+1}(d^\dagger, h^\dagger) \middle| \mathcal{G}_{\vec{k}_j^{\mathcal{C}}} \right\} = 0,$$

for $j = 1, \dots, \ell + 1$ by (S3), and therefore $\Gamma_{\ell+1}(d^\dagger, h^\dagger) \in \Lambda_{\ell+1}$. Conversely, let $\omega \in \Lambda_{\ell+1}$, which implies that

$$\omega(d^\dagger, h^\dagger) = d^\dagger(\mathcal{G}_{\cup_\ell^{\mathcal{C}}}) \underbrace{\left\{ \sum_{j=1}^{\ell} \bar{h}_{\vec{k}_j}^\dagger(\mathcal{G}_{\vec{k}_j}) \prod_{s \in \cup_\ell \setminus \vec{k}_j} \bar{G}_s - \bar{h}_{\cap_\ell}^\dagger(\mathcal{G}_{\cap_{1:\ell}}) \right\}}_{:=h^\dagger(\mathcal{G}_{\cup_\ell})} \in \Lambda_\ell = \{\Gamma_\ell(\mathcal{G}; d, h) : d, h\}, \tag{S5}$$

for some index functions (d^\dagger, h^\dagger) , and also

$$\omega(d^\dagger, h^\dagger) \in \left\{ \varphi(\mathcal{G}) : \varphi(\mathcal{G}) \text{ unrestricted except } E\{\varphi(\mathcal{G}) | \mathcal{G}_{\vec{k}_{\ell+1}^{\mathcal{C}}}\} = 0 \right\}. \tag{S6}$$

We consider the following two cases:

Case 1: $\{\cup_{1:\ell+1} \setminus \cup_{1:\ell}\}$ is a singleton

$$\begin{aligned} \omega &= \underbrace{\left\{ d_0^\dagger(\mathcal{G}_{\cup_{\ell+1}^{\mathbb{C}}}) + \bar{G}_{\cup_{\ell+1} \setminus \cup_{\ell}} d_1^\dagger(\mathcal{G}_{\cup_{\ell+1}^{\mathbb{C}}}) \right\}}_{:=d^\dagger(\mathcal{G}_{\cup_{\ell}^{\mathbb{C}}})} \underbrace{\left\{ \sum_{j=1}^{\ell} \bar{h}_{\vec{k}_j}^\dagger(\mathcal{G}_{\vec{k}_j}) \prod_{s \in \cup_{\ell} \setminus \vec{k}_j} \bar{G}_s - \bar{h}_{\cap_{\ell}}^\dagger(\mathcal{G}_{\cap_{\ell}}) \right\}}_{:=h^\dagger(\mathcal{G}_{\cup_{\ell}})} \\ &= d_0^\dagger(\mathcal{G}_{\cup_{\ell+1}^{\mathbb{C}}}) h^\dagger(\mathcal{G}_{\cup_{\ell}}) + d_1^\dagger(\mathcal{G}_{\cup_{\ell+1}^{\mathbb{C}}}) \left\{ \sum_{j=1}^{\ell} \bar{h}_{\vec{k}_j}^\dagger(\mathcal{G}_{\vec{k}_j}) \prod_{s \in \cup_{\ell+1} \setminus \vec{k}_j} \bar{G}_s - \bar{h}_{\cap_{\ell}}^\dagger(\mathcal{G}_{\cap_{\ell}}) \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Following the proof of Proposition 3, we have

$$E \left[d_1^\dagger(\mathcal{G}_{\cup_{\ell+1}^{\mathbb{C}}}) \left\{ \sum_{j=1}^{\ell} \bar{h}_{\vec{k}_j}^\dagger(\mathcal{G}_{\vec{k}_j}) \prod_{s \in \cup_{\ell+1} \setminus \vec{k}_j} \bar{G}_s \right\} \middle| \mathcal{G}_{\vec{k}_{\ell+1}^{\mathbb{C}}} \right] = 0.$$

Then (S6) has the nontrivial implication that

$$d_0^\dagger(\mathcal{G}_{\cup_{\ell+1}^{\mathbb{C}}}) = 0 \text{ and } \bar{h}_{\cap_{\ell}}^\dagger(\mathcal{G}_{\cap_{\ell}}) = \bar{h}_{\cap_{\ell+1}}^\dagger(\mathcal{G}_{\cap_{\ell+1}}),$$

almost surely, so that $\omega \in \{\Gamma_{\ell+1}(\mathcal{G}; d, h) : d, h\}$.

Case 2: $\cup_{\ell+1} = \cup_{\ell}$

In this case,

$$\omega(d^\dagger, h^\dagger) = d^\dagger(\mathcal{G}_{\cup_{\ell+1}^{\mathbb{C}}}) \left\{ \sum_{j=1}^{\ell} \bar{h}_{\vec{k}_j}^\dagger(\mathcal{G}_{\vec{k}_j}) \prod_{s \in \cup_{\ell+1} \setminus \vec{k}_j} \bar{G}_s - \bar{h}_{\cap_{\ell+1}}^\dagger(\mathcal{G}_{\cap_{\ell+1}}) \right\} \in \{\Gamma_{\ell+1}(\mathcal{G}; d, h) : d, h\}.$$

We may conclude that $\Lambda_{\ell+1} = \{\Gamma_{\ell+1}(\mathcal{G}; d, h) : d, h\}$, and (S4) holds by mathematical induction. In particular $\Lambda_K = \{\Gamma_K(\mathcal{G}; d, h) : d, h\}$ where

$$\Gamma_K(\mathcal{G}; d, h) = d \sum_{j=1}^K \bar{h}_{\vec{k}_j}(\mathcal{G}_{\vec{k}_j}) \prod_{s \in \vec{k}_j^{\mathbb{C}}} \bar{G}_s = d \sum_{\vec{k} \in \mathcal{K}(k^\dagger)} \bar{h}_{\vec{k}}(\mathcal{G}_{\vec{k}}) \prod_{s \in \vec{k}^{\mathbb{C}}} \bar{G}_s, \quad d \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Hence,

$$\cap_{j=1}^K \text{IF}_{\vec{k}_j} = \left\{ W(\beta_a; c, h) = -\Delta_h^{-1} \left[\underbrace{\left\{ \sum_{\vec{k} \in \mathcal{K}(k^\dagger)} \bar{h}_{\vec{k}}(\mathcal{G}_{\vec{k}}) \prod_{s \in \vec{k}^{\mathbb{C}}} \bar{G}_s \right\}}_{:=h(\mathcal{G})} \varepsilon + c(\mathcal{G}) \right] : \right.$$

$$\left. h, c \text{ unrestricted except } \Delta_h \neq 0 \text{ and } E\{c(\mathcal{G})|G_k\} = 0 \text{ for } k = 1, \dots, K \right\}.$$

Semiparametric Efficiency Bound of β_a in the Union Model $\mathcal{M}_{union, k^\dagger}$

For any $c(\mathcal{G}) \neq 0$ almost surely, the difference of the asymptotic variances of the estimators indexed by $W(\beta_a; c, h)$ and $W(\beta_a; c = 0, h)$ respectively for fixed $h(\mathcal{G})$ is

$$E \{W(\beta_a; c, h)^2 - W(\beta_a; c = 0, h)^2\} = \Delta_h^{-2} E \{2c(\mathcal{G})h(\mathcal{G})\varepsilon + c^2(\mathcal{G})\} = \Delta_h^{-2} E \{c^2(\mathcal{G})\} > 0,$$

where the last equality follows from

$$E \{c(\mathcal{G})h(\mathcal{G})\varepsilon\} = E \{c(\mathcal{G})E(h(\mathcal{G})\varepsilon|\mathcal{G})\} = E [c(\mathcal{G})h(\mathcal{G})\{E(Y - \beta_a A|\mathcal{G}) - E(Y - \beta_a A|\mathcal{G})\}] = 0.$$

Therefore the efficient influence function of β_a lies in the set

$$\tilde{\text{IF}} = \{W(\beta_a; c = 0, h) : h \text{ unrestricted except } \Delta_h \neq 0\}.$$

We derive the efficient element in $\tilde{\text{IF}}$ by considering saturated models for the functions $\{\bar{h}_{\vec{k}}(\mathcal{G}_{\vec{k}})\}_{\vec{k} \in \mathcal{K}(k^\dagger)}$ in $h(\mathcal{G})$. Then using a symmetry argument, the index function $h(\mathcal{G}) = \theta^T \mathbf{H}(\mathcal{G})$ is a linear combination with parameter vector $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^{\sum_{\ell=K-k^\dagger+1}^K \binom{K}{\ell}}$ and a vector of basis functions $\mathbf{H}(\mathcal{G}) = \{\mathbf{H}_{K-k^\dagger+1}^T(\mathcal{G}), \dots, \mathbf{H}_K^T(\mathcal{G})\}^T$, where for each $\ell = K - k^\dagger + 1, \dots, K$,

$$\mathbf{H}_\ell(\mathcal{G}) = \left[\left\{ \prod_{s \in \{1, \dots, \ell\} \setminus \{K-k^\dagger+1, \dots, \ell\}} \bar{G}_{k(s)} \right\} \left\{ \prod_{t \in \{K-k^\dagger+1, \dots, \ell\}} G_{k(t)} - E \left(\prod_{t \in \{K-k^\dagger+1, \dots, \ell\}} G_{k(t)} \right) \right\} : (k(1), \dots, k(\ell)) \in \mathcal{K}(\ell) \right]^T,$$

is a $\binom{K}{\ell} \times 1$ vector of ℓ -way interactions. Therefore we have the equivalent representation

$$\tilde{\text{IF}} = \{W(\beta_a; c = 0, \theta^T \mathbf{H}(\mathcal{G})) : \theta \text{ unrestricted except } \Delta_{\theta^T \mathbf{H}(\mathcal{G})} = E\{\theta^T \mathbf{H}(\mathcal{G})A\} \neq 0\}.$$

By Theorem 5.3 of [Newey and McFadden \(1994\)](#), the optimal linear combination in terms of asymptotic variance is indexed by $\tilde{\theta}$ which satisfies the generalized information equality

$$E\{\theta^T \mathbf{H}(\mathcal{G})A\} = E \left\{ \varepsilon^2 \theta^T \mathbf{H}^{\otimes 2}(\mathcal{G}) \tilde{\theta} \right\}, \quad \forall \theta,$$

where $Q^{\otimes 2} := QQ^T$. Equivalently,

$$0 = \theta^T E \left\{ \varepsilon^2 \mathbf{H}^{\otimes 2}(\mathcal{G}) \tilde{\theta} - \mathbf{H}(\mathcal{G})A \right\} = \theta^T E \left\{ E(\varepsilon^2 | \mathcal{G}) \mathbf{H}^{\otimes 2}(\mathcal{G}) \tilde{\theta} - \mathbf{H}(\mathcal{G})A \right\}, \quad \forall \theta.$$

Taking $\theta = E \left\{ E(\varepsilon^2 | \mathcal{G}) \mathbf{H}^{\otimes 2}(\mathcal{G}) \tilde{\theta} - \mathbf{H}(\mathcal{G})A \right\}$ yields

$$0 = E \left\{ E(\varepsilon^2 | \mathcal{G}) \mathbf{H}^{\otimes 2}(\mathcal{G}) \tilde{\theta} - \mathbf{H}(\mathcal{G})A \right\}^2.$$

Hence, $\tilde{\theta} = E \left\{ E(\varepsilon^2 | \mathcal{G}) \mathbf{H}^{\otimes 2}(\mathcal{G}) \right\}^{-1} E \left\{ \mathbf{H}(\mathcal{G})A \right\}$ and

$$h_{opt}(\mathcal{G}) = \tilde{\theta}^T \mathbf{H}(\mathcal{G}) = E \left\{ \mathbf{A} \mathbf{H}^T(\mathcal{G}) \right\} E \left\{ E(\varepsilon^2 | \mathcal{G}) \mathbf{H}^{\otimes 2}(\mathcal{G}) \right\}^{-1} \mathbf{H}(\mathcal{G}).$$

The semiparametric efficiency bound of β_a in $\mathcal{M}_{union, k^\dagger}$ is therefore given by

$$E \left\{ W(\beta_a, 0, h_{opt})^2 \right\} = E \left\{ h_{opt}(\mathcal{G})A \right\}^{-2} E \left\{ \{ h_{opt}(\mathcal{G}) \varepsilon \}^2 \right\} = V,$$

where $V = \left[E \left\{ \mathbf{A} \mathbf{H}^T(\mathcal{G}) \right\} E \left\{ E(\varepsilon^2 | \mathcal{G}) \mathbf{H}^{\otimes 2}(\mathcal{G}) \right\}^{-1} E \left\{ \mathbf{H}(\mathcal{G})A \right\} \right]^{-1}$. In particular when $k^\dagger = 1$, $\mathbf{H}(\mathcal{G}) = \left\{ \prod_{s=1}^K \bar{G}_s \right\}$ consists of only one basis function and

$$V = E \left\{ \prod_{s=1}^K \bar{G}_s A \right\}^{-2} E \left\{ E(\varepsilon^2 | \mathcal{G}) \left(\prod_{s=1}^K \bar{G}_s \right)^2 \right\},$$

a result given in Theorem 1.

Influence Function of the MR² Estimator

Let $\mathbf{Z}(\mathcal{G})$ denote a user-specified vector of mean zero basis functions, evaluated at $\{E(G_j)\}_{j=1, \dots, K}$.

For the example in the manuscript,

$$\mathbf{Z}(\mathcal{G}) = \left\{ \left(H_{\vec{k}} - E(H_{\vec{k}}) \right) \prod_{s \notin \vec{k}} \{ G_s - E(G_s) \} : \vec{k} \in \mathcal{K}(k^\dagger) \right\}.$$

In addition, let $\bar{\alpha} := E\{AZ^T(\mathcal{G})\}E\{\mathbf{Z}^{\otimes 2}(\mathcal{G})\}^{-1}$ denote the population exposure regression coefficients. It follows from the results of [Robins \(2000\)](#) and [Okui et al. \(2012\)](#) that the two-stage least squares estimator $\hat{\beta}_a(\mathbf{Z})$ has the asymptotic expansion

$$n^{1/2} \left\{ \hat{\beta}_a(\mathbf{Z}) - \beta_a \right\} = -\frac{1}{\bar{\alpha}E\{\mathbf{Z}(\mathcal{G})A\}} \left\{ n^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^n \bar{\alpha}\mathbf{Z}(\mathcal{G})(Y - \beta_0 - \beta_a A) \right\} + o_p(1).$$

Let $\hat{\mathbf{Z}}(\mathcal{G})$ denote the same user-specified vector of basis functions, but evaluated at the (non-parametrically) estimated means $\{\hat{E}(G_j)\}_{j=1,\dots,K}$. Following [Newey \(1994\)](#), the adjustment term to the above influence function due to nonparametric estimation of the means in the semiparametric union model $\mathcal{M}_{union,k^\dagger}$ is $\{\bar{\alpha}\mathbf{Z}(\mathcal{G})E(Y - \beta_0 - \beta_a A|\mathcal{G})\}/E\{\bar{\alpha}\mathbf{Z}(\mathcal{G})A\}$, and therefore

$$n^{1/2} \left\{ \hat{\beta}_a(\hat{\mathbf{Z}}) - \beta_a \right\} = -\frac{1}{\bar{\alpha}E\{\mathbf{Z}(\mathcal{G})A\}} \left\{ n^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^n \bar{\alpha}\mathbf{Z}(\mathcal{G})\varepsilon \right\} + o_p(1),$$

with influence function $-\{\bar{\alpha}\mathbf{Z}(\mathcal{G})\varepsilon\}/E\{\bar{\alpha}\mathbf{Z}(\mathcal{G})A\} \in \tilde{\text{IF}}$. By Slutsky's Theorem and the Central Limit Theorem,

$$n^{1/2} \left\{ \hat{\beta}_a(\hat{\mathbf{Z}}) - \beta_a \right\} \xrightarrow{D} N(0, \Sigma),$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$, where $\Sigma = E\{\bar{\alpha}\mathbf{Z}(\mathcal{G})A\}^{-2}\bar{\alpha}E\{\mathbf{Z}^{\otimes 2}(\mathcal{G})\varepsilon^2\}\bar{\alpha}^T$. The standard sandwich estimator

$$\hat{\Sigma} = \hat{E}\{\hat{\alpha}\mathbf{Z}(\mathcal{G})A\}^{-2}\hat{\alpha}\hat{E}\left\{\mathbf{Z}^{\otimes 2}(\mathcal{G})(Y - \hat{\beta}_0 - \hat{\beta}_a A)^2\right\}\hat{\alpha}^T$$

of Σ which ignores first stage estimation of $\{E(G_j)\}_{j=1,\dots,K}$, is readily available from existing off-the-shelf software. Because $\text{Cov}\{\mathbf{Z}(\mathcal{G})(Y - \beta_0 - \beta_a A)\} - E[\text{Cov}\{\mathbf{Z}(\mathcal{G})(Y - \beta_0 - \beta_a A)|\mathcal{G}\}]$ is positive semidefinite, $\hat{\Sigma}$ is a conservative estimator of the asymptotic variance. An appealing feature of the MR² estimator under an additional homoskedasticity assumption $E(\varepsilon^2|\mathcal{G}) = E(\varepsilon^2) := \sigma^2$ is that it is the efficient one among the class of estimators that uses linear combinations of the basis functions in $\mathbf{Z}(\mathcal{G})$ (see Section 5.2.3 of [Wooldridge \(2010\)](#)). In this case the asymptotic variance formula simplifies to

$$\Sigma = \sigma^2/E\{\bar{\alpha}\mathbf{Z}(\mathcal{G})A\} = \sigma^2[E\{AZ^T(\mathcal{G})\}E\{\mathbf{Z}^{\otimes 2}(\mathcal{G})\}^{-1}E\{\mathbf{Z}(\mathcal{G})A\}]^{-1}.$$

In particular, if the analyst uses the full suite of basis functions $\mathbf{H}(\mathcal{G})$, then $\Sigma = V$ and the MR^2 estimator attains the semiparametric efficiency bound asymptotically.

Proof of Proposition 3

Let $\tilde{E}(\cdot)$ denote the expectation with respect to the probability mass function $\tilde{g}(\mathcal{G}) = \prod_{k=1}^K f_k(G_k)$. Because $W = \tilde{g}(\mathcal{G})/g(\mathcal{G})$ is a function of \mathcal{G} only, it follows from the proof of Proposition 2 that

$$\begin{aligned} & E \left[WY \left\{ \sum_{\vec{k} \in \mathcal{K}(k^\dagger)} \bar{h}_{\vec{k}}(\mathcal{G}_{\vec{k}^\rightarrow}) \prod_{s \in \vec{k}^{\mathcal{C}}} \bar{G}_s \right\} \right] \\ &= \beta_a E \left\{ \sum_{\vec{k} \in \mathcal{K}(k^\dagger)} WA \bar{h}_{\vec{k}}(\mathcal{G}_{\vec{k}^\rightarrow}) \prod_{s \in \vec{k}^{\mathcal{C}}} \bar{G}_s \right\} \\ & \quad + E \left[\beta_{g,u}(\mathcal{G}_{\vec{k}^{\mathcal{C}}}, U) \sum_{\vec{k} \in \mathcal{K}(k^\dagger)} E \left\{ W \bar{h}_{\vec{k}}(\mathcal{G}_{\vec{k}^\rightarrow}) \prod_{s \in \vec{k}^{\mathcal{C}}} \bar{G}_s \middle| \mathcal{G}_{\vec{k}^{\mathcal{C}}}, U \right\} \right] \\ &:= \beta_a E \left\{ \sum_{\vec{k} \in \mathcal{K}(k^\dagger)} WA \bar{h}_{\vec{k}}(\mathcal{G}_{\vec{k}^\rightarrow}) \prod_{s \in \vec{k}^{\mathcal{C}}} \bar{G}_s \right\} \\ & \quad + E \left\{ \beta_{g,u}(\mathcal{G}_{\vec{k}^{\mathcal{C}}}, U) \sum_{\vec{k} \in \mathcal{K}(k^\dagger)} \tilde{\phi}_{\vec{k}}(\mathcal{G}_{\vec{k}^{\mathcal{C}}}, U) \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Consider each term $\tilde{\phi}_{\vec{k}}(\mathcal{G}_{\vec{k}^* \mathbb{C}}, U)$. If $\vec{k} = \vec{k}^*$, then

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \tilde{\phi}_{\vec{k}^*}(\mathcal{G}_{\vec{k}^* \mathbb{C}}, U) \\
 &= E \left\{ W \bar{h}_{\vec{k}^*}(\mathcal{G}_{\vec{k}^*}) \prod_{s \in \vec{k}^* \mathbb{C}} \bar{G}_s \middle| \mathcal{G}_{\vec{k}^* \mathbb{C}}, U \right\} \\
 &= \prod_{s \in \vec{k}^* \mathbb{C}} \bar{G}_s E \left\{ W \bar{h}_{\vec{k}^*}(\mathcal{G}_{\vec{k}^*}) \middle| \mathcal{G}_{\vec{k}^* \mathbb{C}}, U \right\} \\
 &= \prod_{s \in \vec{k}^* \mathbb{C}} \bar{G}_s E \left\{ W \bar{h}_{\vec{k}^*}(\mathcal{G}_{\vec{k}^*}) \middle| \mathcal{G}_{\vec{k}^* \mathbb{C}} \right\} \text{ by Assumption 2} \\
 &= \prod_{s \in \vec{k}^* \mathbb{C}} \bar{G}_s \frac{\tilde{g}(\mathcal{G}_{\vec{k}^* \mathbb{C}})}{g(\mathcal{G}_{\vec{k}^* \mathbb{C}})} \left\{ \tilde{E}(H_{\vec{k}^*}) - \tilde{E}(H_{\vec{k}^*}) \right\} \\
 &= 0.
 \end{aligned}$$

Otherwise $\vec{k} \neq \vec{k}^*$, and

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \tilde{\phi}_{\vec{k}}(\mathcal{G}_{\vec{k}^* \mathbb{C}}, U) \\
 &= E \left\{ W \bar{h}_{\vec{k}}(\mathcal{G}_{\vec{k}}) \prod_{s \in \vec{k}^* \mathbb{C}} \bar{G}_s \middle| \mathcal{G}_{\vec{k}^* \mathbb{C}}, U \right\} \\
 &= \prod_{s \in (\vec{k} \cup \vec{k}^*)^{\mathbb{C}}} \bar{G}_s E \left\{ W \bar{h}_{\vec{k}}(\mathcal{G}_{\vec{k}}) \prod_{s \in \vec{k}^* \setminus \vec{k}} \bar{G}_s \middle| \mathcal{G}_{\vec{k}^* \mathbb{C}}, U \right\} \\
 &= \prod_{s \in (\vec{k} \cup \vec{k}^*)^{\mathbb{C}}} \bar{G}_s E \left\{ W \bar{h}_{\vec{k}}(\mathcal{G}_{\vec{k}}) \prod_{s \in \vec{k}^* \setminus \vec{k}} \bar{G}_s \middle| \mathcal{G}_{\vec{k}^* \mathbb{C}} \right\} \text{ by Assumption 2} \\
 &= \prod_{s \in (\vec{k} \cup \vec{k}^*)^{\mathbb{C}}} \bar{G}_s \frac{\tilde{g}(\mathcal{G}_{\vec{k}^* \mathbb{C}})}{g(\mathcal{G}_{\vec{k}^* \mathbb{C}})} \left\{ \tilde{E}(H_{\vec{k}} | G_{\vec{k}^* \setminus \vec{k}}) - \tilde{E}(H_{\vec{k}}) \right\} \prod_{s \in \vec{k}^* \setminus \vec{k}} \tilde{E}(\bar{G}_s) \\
 &= \prod_{s \in (\vec{k} \cup \vec{k}^*)^{\mathbb{C}}} \bar{G}_s \frac{\tilde{g}(\mathcal{G}_{\vec{k}^* \mathbb{C}})}{g(\mathcal{G}_{\vec{k}^* \mathbb{C}})} \left\{ \tilde{E}(H_{\vec{k}} | G_{\vec{k}^* \setminus \vec{k}}) - \tilde{E}(H_{\vec{k}}) \right\} \prod_{s \in \vec{k}^* \setminus \vec{k}} \tilde{E} \left\{ G_s - \tilde{E}(G_s) \right\} \\
 &= 0.
 \end{aligned}$$

Therefore $\sum_{\vec{k} \in \mathcal{K}(k^\dagger)} \tilde{\phi}_{\vec{k}}(\mathcal{G}_{\vec{k}^c}, U) = 0$ almost surely, and

$$E \left[WY \left\{ \sum_{\vec{k} \in \mathcal{K}(k^\dagger)} \bar{h}_{\vec{k}}(\mathcal{G}_{\vec{k}^\dagger}) \prod_{s \in \vec{k}^c} \bar{G}_s \right\} \right] = \beta_a E \left\{ \sum_{\vec{k} \in \mathcal{K}(k^\dagger)} WA \bar{h}_{\vec{k}}(\mathcal{G}_{\vec{k}^\dagger}) \prod_{s \in \vec{k}^c} \bar{G}_s \right\}. \square$$

Additional Simulation Results

Table S1: Comparison of methods with continuous exposure generated under the identity link ($C = 1.0$). The two rows of results for each estimator correspond to sample sizes of $n = 10000$ and $n = 50000$ respectively.

	MR ²	Oracle 2SLS	Naive 2SLS	Post-Lasso	TSHT
50% rule holds					
Bias	.004	.000	.008	.000	.000
	.001	.000	.009	.000	.000
$\sqrt{\text{Var}}$.012	.001	.001	.002	.002
	.006	.001	.001	.001	.001
$\sqrt{\text{EVar}}$.011	.001	.001	.002	.001
	.006	.001	.001	.001	.001
Cov95	.931	.951	.000	.939	.950
	.941	.945	.001	.947	.947
50% rule violated but plurality rule holds					
Bias	.018	.000	.013	.009	.005
	.010	.000	.013	.007	.000
$\sqrt{\text{Var}}$.035	.002	.001	.005	.005
	.026	.001	.001	.004	.002
$\sqrt{\text{EVar}}$.041	.002	.001	.005	.005
	.028	.001	.001	.001	.001
Cov95	.937	.937	.000	.119	.425
	.936	.951	.000	.000	.944
Both 50% and plurality rules violated					
Bias	.019	.000	.013	.021	.021
	.010	.000	.013	.021	.021
$\sqrt{\text{Var}}$.035	.002	.001	.002	.002
	.026	.001	.001	.001	.001
$\sqrt{\text{EVar}}$.041	.002	.001	.001	.002
	.028	.001	.001	.001	.001
Cov95	.936	.940	.000	.000	.000
	.936	.950	.000	.000	.000

Note: |Bias| and $\sqrt{\text{Var}}$ are the Monte Carlo absolute bias and standard deviation of the point estimates, $\sqrt{\text{EVar}}$ is the square root of the mean of the variance estimates and Cov95 is the coverage proportion of the 95% confidence intervals, based on 1000 repeated simulations. Zeros denote values smaller than .0005.

Table S2: Comparison of methods with continuous exposure generated under the identity link ($C = 1.0$), and varying degree of interactive effects. The two rows of results for each estimator correspond to sample sizes of $n = 10000$ and $n = 50000$ respectively.

	MR ²	Oracle 2SLS	Naive 2SLS	Post-Lasso	TSHT
50% rule holds, $\gamma = 30\%$					
Bias	.015	.000	.024	.001	.001
	.005	.000	.024	.000	.000
$\sqrt{\text{Var}}$.034	.004	.004	.006	.006
	.018	.002	.003	.002	.002
$\sqrt{\text{EVar}}$.035	.004	.003	.004	.004
	.019	.002	.001	.002	.002
Cov95	.932	.961	.000	.937	.919
	.942	.941	.000	.941	.942
50% rule holds, $\gamma = 60\%$					
Bias	.006	.000	.013	.000	.000
	.002	.000	.013	.000	.000
$\sqrt{\text{Var}}$.020	.002	.002	.002	.003
	.009	.001	.001	.001	.002
$\sqrt{\text{EVar}}$.019	.002	.002	.002	.002
	.009	.001	.001	.001	.001
Cov95	.932	.953	.000	.954	.950
	.950	.950	.000	.945	.944
Both 50% and plurality rules violated, $\gamma = 30\%$					
Bias	.056	.000	.036	.056	.051
	.040	.000	.035	.056	.033
$\sqrt{\text{Var}}$.088	.005	.004	.010	.017
	.077	.002	.003	.007	.022
$\sqrt{\text{EVar}}$.104	.005	.003	.004	.005
	.084	.002	.001	.002	.002
Cov95	.935	.944	.000	.000	.023
	.931	.943	.000	.000	.205
Both 50% and plurality rules violated, $\gamma = 60\%$					
Bias	.030	.000	.020	.033	.033
	.017	.000	.020	.033	.025
$\sqrt{\text{Var}}$.055	.003	.002	.003	.006
	.044	.001	.001	.002	.010
$\sqrt{\text{EVar}}$.064	.003	.002	.002	.003
	.047	.001	.001	.001	.001
Cov95	.944	.946	.000	.000	.000
	.929	.959	.000	.000	.041

Note: See the footnote of Table S1.

UK Biobank Data Analysis

The following table provides detailed information about the 10 SNPs used in the main text for estimating the average causal effects of BMI on SBP and DBP respectively. These 10 SNPs are independent from each other.

Table S3: Information about the top 10 SNPs used in the UK Biobank data analysis in the main text. CHR stands for chromosome, BP stands for the base-pair position in the chromosome, EAF stands for the allele frequency of allele 1 (effect allele), Var-ex stands for the variance explained by the SNP, F-stat stands for the F-statistics in the first -stage regression.

SNP Name	CHR	BP	Gene	Allele 1/2	F-stat	Effect	SE	EAF	Var-ex	P-value
rs1558902	16	52361075	FTO	A/T	781.20	0.082	0.003	0.415	0.33%	7.51E-153
rs6567160	18	55980115	MC4R	C/T	298.67	0.056	0.004	0.236	0.11%	3.93E-53
rs13021737	2	622348	TMEM18	G/A	229.98	0.06	0.004	0.828	0.10%	1.11E-50
rs10938397	4	44877284	GNPDA2	G/A	221.47	0.04	0.003	0.434	0.08%	3.21E-38
rs543874	1	176156103	SEC16B	G/A	189.54	0.048	0.004	0.193	0.07%	2.62E-35
rs2207139	6	50953449	TFAP2B	G/A	155.24	0.045	0.004	0.177	0.06%	4.13E-29
rs11030104	11	27641093	BDNF	A/G	147.65	0.041	0.004	0.792	0.06%	5.56E-28
rs3101336	1	72523773	NEGR1	C/T	129.01	0.033	0.003	0.613	0.05%	2.66E-26
rs7138803	12	48533735	BCDIN3D	A/G	126.37	0.032	0.003	0.384	0.05%	8.15E-24
rs10182181	2	25003800	ADCY3	G/A	120.26	0.031	0.003	0.462	0.05%	8.78E-24

Figure S1: Point estimates (solid dots) of the causal effects of BMI on SBP and DBP with corresponding 95% confidence intervals (vertical bars) respectively.

