

## Online Appendix for "Surrogate measures and consistent surrogates" by TJ VanderWeele

The following definitions and results were given in work on signed causal directed acyclic graphs (VanderWeele et al., 2008; VanderWeele and Robins, 2009, 2010). Lemma 1 below was stated in somewhat greater generality in VanderWeele and Robins (2009) but the special case given below will suffice here.

DEFINITION 1. Suppose that variable  $A$  is a parent of some variable  $Y$  and let  $\widetilde{pa}_Y$  denote the parents of  $Y$  other than  $A$ . We say that  $A$  has a distributional positive monotonic effect on  $Y$  if the survivor function  $S = (y | \widetilde{pa}_Y) = pr(Y > y | A = a, \widetilde{pa}_Y)$  is such that whenever  $a_1 \geq a_0$  we have  $S(y | a_1, \widetilde{pa}_Y) \geq S(y | a_0, \widetilde{pa}_Y)$  for all  $y$  and all  $\widetilde{pa}_Y$ ; the variable  $A$  is said to have a distributional negative monotonic effect on  $Y$  if whenever  $a_1 \geq a_0$  we have  $S(y | a_1, \widetilde{pa}_Y) \leq S(y | a_0, \widetilde{pa}_Y)$  for all  $y$  and all  $\widetilde{pa}_Y$ .

DEFINITION 2. An edge on a causal directed acyclic graph from  $A$  to  $Y$  is said to be of positive or negative sign if respectively  $A$  has a distributional positive or negative monotonic effect on  $Y$ ; if an edge is neither positive nor negative, it is said to be without a sign. The sign of a path on a causal directed acyclic graph is the product of the signs of the edges that constitute that path. If one of the edges on a path is without a sign then the sign of the path is said to be undefined.

LEMMA 1. Let  $X$  denote some set of non-descendants of  $A$  that blocks all backdoor paths from  $A$  to  $Y$ . If all directed paths between  $A$  and  $Y$  are of positive sign then  $pr(Y > y | a, x)$  is non-decreasing in  $a$  for all  $y$ ; if all directed paths between  $A$  and  $Y$  are of negative sign then  $pr(Y > y | a, x)$  is non-increasing in  $a$  for all  $y$ .

Lemma 1 immediately implies Proposition 4 in the text, stated again below.

PROPOSITION 4: In the causal diagram in Figure 2, if (a)  $pr(Y > y | a, s, u)$  is non-decreasing in  $a$  and  $s$  for all  $y, u$  and (b)  $pr(S > s | a, u)$  is non-decreasing in  $a$  for all  $s, u$

then  $pr(Y_a > y)$  is non-decreasing in  $a$ .

To prove Proposition 3 in the text we consider a variant of the definitions and results in VanderWeele and Robins (2009, 2010).

DEFINITION 3. Suppose that variable  $A$  is a parent of some variable  $Y$  and let  $\widetilde{pa}_Y$  denote the parents of  $Y$  other than  $A$ . We say that  $A$  has an average positive monotonic effect on  $Y$  if whenever  $a_1 \geq a_0$  we have  $E(Y|a_1, \widetilde{pa}_Y) \geq E(Y|a_0, \widetilde{pa}_Y)$  for all  $y$  and all  $\widetilde{pa}_Y$ ; the variable  $A$  is said to have an average negative monotonic effect on  $Y$  if whenever  $a_1 \geq a_0$  we have  $E(Y|a_1, \widetilde{pa}_Y) \leq E(Y|a_0, \widetilde{pa}_Y)$  for all  $y$  and all  $\widetilde{pa}_Y$ .

DEFINITION 4. A directed path which is of positive sign with the exception that the parent of the final edge may only have an average monotonic effect on the child, rather than a distributional monotonic effect, will be said to be a directed path with mean positive sign. A directed path which is of negative sign with the exception that the parent of the final edge may only have an average monotonic effect on the child, rather than a distributional monotonic effect, will be said to be a directed path with mean negative sign.

LEMMA 2. Let  $X$  denote some set of non-descendants of  $A$  that blocks all backdoor paths from  $A$  to  $Y$ . If all directed paths between  $A$  and  $Y$  are of mean positive sign then  $E(Y|a, x)$  is non-decreasing in  $a$  for all  $x$ ; if all directed paths between  $A$  and  $Y$  are of mean negative sign then  $E(Y|a, x)$  is non-increasing in  $a$  for all  $x$ .

The proof of Lemma 2 follows from the proof of Proposition 4 in VanderWeele and Robins (2009) by simply replacing " $E[1(Y > y)|\dots]$ " by " $E[Y|\dots]$ " wherever the former expression appears in the proof. Lemma 2 immediately implies Proposition 3 in the text, stated again below.

PROPOSITION 3: In the causal diagram in Figure 2, if (a)  $E(Y|a, s, u)$  is non-decreasing in  $a$  and  $s$  for all  $u$  and (b)  $pr(S > s|a, u)$  is non-decreasing in  $a$  for all  $s, u$  then  $E(Y_a)$  is non-decreasing in  $a$ .