**Electronic Journal of Statistics** Vol. 8 (2014) 1273–1289 ISSN: 1935-7524 DOI: 10.1214/14-EJS908

## Discussion of "Dynamic treatment regimes: Technical challenges and applications"\*

## James Robins<sup>†</sup>

Dep. of Epidemiology and Biostatistics, Harvard School of Public Health, Boston, MA, 02115, USA e-mail: robins@hsph.harvard.edu

## and

## Andrea Rotnitzky<sup>†</sup>

Dep. of Economics, Di Tella University, Buenos Aires, 1425, Argentina e-mail: arotnitzky@utdt.edu

Received May 2014.

We thank the editor for organizing this discussion of the article by Laber et al. (2014) (throughout referred to as LLQPM). The authors offer an elegant solution to the inferential problem caused by nonregularity. Our discussion will to a large extent focus on conceptual rather than technical issues, in part because the authors handled the technical matters so decisively and well. In so doing, we recognize that discussion of conceptual issues was not the authors' goal and that the authors have written elsewhere about many of the issues we raise. Indeed, in our own writing, we have often either ignored the issues we raise or were unable to offer coherent solutions to them. We hope our discussion makes for an interesting and lively interchange.

We first address the following conceptual issue. The author's target of inference is the stage one nonregular parameter  $\beta_{11}^*$  that determines the optimal treatment strategy  $\pi_1^{dp}$  at stage one of their two-stage trial. Robins (2004, Sec. 5) first recognized that  $\beta_{11}^*$  was nonregular and offered a method for obtaining a valid (necessarily conservative) confidence interval. However, in that section, Robins also noted that  $\beta_{11}^*$  only determines the optimal treatment decision at stage one for patients who will follow the optimal strategy at stage two; hence, because of uncertainty, it is not possible to know that the optimal strategy  $\pi_2^{dp}$ will in fact be followed at time two (even when we assume all the uncertainty is attributable to sampling variability), and therefore it is unclear that  $\beta_{11}^*$  should

<sup>\*</sup>Main article 10.1214/14-EJS920.

 $<sup>^\</sup>dagger James$  Robins and Andrea Rotnitzky were partially supported by grant 2 R37 AI032475-16A 1 from the US from the National Institutes of Health.