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Abstract

Practitioners in medicine, business, political science, and other fields are increasingly aware that decisions should be personalized to each patient, customer, or voter. A given treatment (e.g. a drug or advertisement) should be administered only to those who will respond most positively, and certainly not to those who will be harmed by it. Individual-level treatment effects (ITEs) can be estimated with tools adapted from machine learning, but different models can yield contradictory estimates. Unlike risk prediction models, however, treatment effect models cannot be easily evaluated against each other using a held-out test set because the true treatment effect itself is never directly observed. Besides outcome prediction accuracy, several approaches that use held-out data to evaluate treatment effects models have been proposed, but they are largely unknown or cloistered within disciplines. We present a review of these approaches and demonstrate theoretical relationships among them. We demonstrate their behavior using simulations of both randomized and observational data. Based on our empirical and theoretical results, we advocate for the standardized use of estimated decision value for individual treatment effect model selection and validation.
1 Introduction

For a particular individual $i$ characterized by a vector of covariates $x_i$, a decision maker must choose between prescribing an intervention $w_i = 1$ or no intervention $w_i = 0$. The intervention (treatment) may be a drug, an advertisement, a campaign email etc. The decision-maker’s goal is to maximize some outcome $y_i$ for that patient or customer, which may be their lifespan, their net purchases, their political engagement etc. Inferring the effects of the treatment on the outcome is a causal inference problem. Using the potential outcomes framework [21], we write the conditional means of the potential outcomes as $\mu_0(x) = E[Y|W = 0, X = x]$ and $\mu_1(x) = E[Y|W = 1, X = x]$. The estimand in question is the conditional average treatment effect $\tau(x_i) = \mu_1(x_i) - \mu_0(x_i)$, which is the expected difference in potential outcomes under the alternative interventions for the individual in question. In different fields this quantity is alternatively called the individual treatment effect, individual causal effect, individual benefit, or individual lift.

If the true conditional mean functions $\mu_w(x)$ are known, the rule (policy) that assigns each individual $x_i$ their optimal treatment is $d(x) = \text{argmax}_{w \in \{0, 1\}} \mu_w(x)$, or, alternatively, $d(x) = I(\tau(x) > 0)$ where $I$ is the indicator function. Generally, the conditional mean functions $\mu_w(x)$ are unknown, meaning that there is uncertainty about the optimal treatment policy $d(x)$.

Prior to the development of modern statistical methods, policies were generally one-size-fits-all prescriptions based on estimates of the average treatment effect $\bar{\tau} = E[\tau(X)]$ [22]. These experiments limit individual heterogeneity by imposing strict criteria on the population under study [24]. Recently, however, researchers in multiple domains have attempted to leverage modern statistical technology and real-world data to tailor decisions to individuals; this phenomena is exemplified by the rise of personalized medicine [8] and targeted advertisement [2, 17]. Decision-makers recognize that treating to the average, while expedient, does not result in the best outcome for all individuals [16, 22].

Note that estimating individual treatment effects is not the same as estimating personalized risks or prognoses with prediction models (e.g. for a heart attack, customer churn, or non-voting). Prediction models only predict what would happen to the individual given standard practice, not the difference of what would happen if a treatment were or were not given. As such, prediction models by themselves are often of little practical utility unless the effects of available treatments are known and relatively constant. If that is not the case, targeting high-risk individuals is not an optimal strategy: there may be high-risk individuals who do not respond or respond negatively to the treatment, and low-risk individuals who would respond very positively [2].

There are currently a suite of methods to estimate individual treatment effects from randomized data. The process of estimating these effects is alternatively referred to as heterogenous effect modeling, uplift modeling, or individual treatment effect modeling. These approaches can also be used for observational data if certain assumptions are met or if combined with propensity score or matching techniques.
A manual subgroup analysis is the traditional approach to heterogenous treatment effect estimation. A subgroup analysis partitions the population of individuals into manually-specified subgroups and typically estimates an average treatment effect in each subgroup using traditional methods (i.e. linear or logistic regression) [9]. This approach requires a high degree of domain knowledge and is prone to multiple-hypothesis testing problems if subgroups are not pre-specified.

An alternative is to use any supervised learning method (e.g. LASSO, random forest, neural network) to fit functions \( \hat{\mu}_0 \) and \( \hat{\mu}_1 \) that estimate the conditional means \( \mu_0 \) and \( \mu_1 \) of the potential outcomes. These estimates are then used to estimate the treatment effect \( \hat{\tau}(x) = \hat{\mu}_1(x) - \hat{\mu}_0(x) \) [10, 5, 23]. This can be done by regressing the observed outcomes on the covariates in the untreated group to get \( \hat{\mu}_0 \) and regressing the observed outcomes on the covariates in the treated group to get \( \hat{\mu}_1 \). This method is alternately referred to as g-computation, simulated twins, counterfactual regression, or conditional mean regression. Similarly, it is possible to fit a single model \( \hat{\mu}(x,w) \) and estimate the treatment effect as \( \hat{\tau}(x) = \hat{\mu}(x,1) - \hat{\mu}(x,0) \), although it appears that the two-model approach has theoretical advantages [1].

Modeling the conditional means is a valid approach, but many have noted that since the object of interest is the treatment effect we may be better off modeling it directly without appeal to the correctness of \( \hat{\mu}_0 \) and \( \hat{\mu}_1 \). Approaches in this vein include Zhao et al. [28], Athey et al. [4], and Powers et al. [19].

Among the variety of approaches and the number of hyper-parameter settings within each approach, which is best? As is the case with all statistical learning problems, there is no free lunch [26]; different methods will give better or worse estimates depending on the application and there cannot be a universally-best method. Indeed, using a large set of diverse simulations, Dorie et al. [7] find that the only somewhat consistent predictor of the success of a causal inference method is its ability to “flexibly” model the conditional means or treatment effect. Although that result surely depends upon the particulars of their simulations, it parallels the common knowledge in the machine learning literature that deep nets and additive regression trees often outperform linear models for real-world applications. However, even limiting ourselves to flexible treatment effect modeling methods, we are left with a panoply of approaches and hyper-parameter settings to choose from.

We digress briefly to discuss the standard supervised learning setting where the task is to estimate \( y \) given \( x \) by building an estimator \( \hat{\mu}(x) \). There we can use the diversity of machine learning approaches to our advantage by performing model selection. Given \( M \) modeling approaches and/or hyper-parameter settings, we build \( M \) estimators \( \{\hat{\mu}_1, \hat{\mu}_2, \ldots, \hat{\mu}_m, \ldots, \hat{\mu}_M\} \). The quantity of interest in this case is the expected error of the model when it is applied to new data, according to some loss \( l \). We express that as \( e = E[l(\hat{\mu}_m(X), Y)] \). The idea of model selection is to estimate this expected error for each of our models and find the model that minimizes it. There are several ways to estimate this error, including information criteria and Vapnik-Chervonenkis dimension, but data-splitting is the easiest and most widely applicable [12]. Before fitting the models, the observations are randomly split into training and validation samples. The
models are fit on the training sample $\mathcal{T}$ and evaluated on the validation sample $\mathcal{V}$. The error of each model is estimated with $\hat{e}_m = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{V}|} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{V}} l(\hat{\mu}_m(x_i), y_i)$. In cross-validation, this process is repeated round-robin across different random splits of the data and the estimated errors are averaged per model.

This approach breaks down for treatment effect estimation because the true treatment effect is never observed in any sample. We would like to evaluate models $\{\hat{\tau}_1, \hat{\tau}_2, \ldots, \hat{\tau}_m, \ldots, \hat{\tau}_M\}$ by estimating their error on a validation set via $\hat{e}_m = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{V}|} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{V}} l(\hat{\tau}_m(x_i), \tau(x_i))$ (this quantity has been called the precision in estimating heterogenous effects or PEHE [13]). The problem is that we never observe $\tau(x_i)$ directly (we only see one of the two potential outcomes) and thus have nothing to compare $\hat{\tau}(x_i)$ to. This estimator of the treatment effect error is thus infeasible.

Several treatment effect model selection approaches have been suggested in the literature, but none of them enjoys the wide use and dominance that prediction error cross-validation has in the supervised learning setting. Most approaches are not general-purpose in that they require that the set of estimators $\{\hat{\tau}_1, \hat{\tau}_2, \ldots, \hat{\tau}_m, \ldots, \hat{\tau}_M\}$ come from a specific class of models. For example, Powers et al. [19] and Athey and Imbens [3] both use selection methods that are specific to the models they propose. The Focused Information Criterion (FIC) [6] is a promising approach, but as of yet cannot be used to select between most machine learning estimators [14]. Alaa et al. [1] propose an empirical Bayes approach for optimal prior selection. Nie and Wager [18] circumvent the problem with a different method of treatment effect estimation which precludes comparison to standard approaches, but allows for internal model selection using prediction error.

It is clear that we lack a go-to general-purpose approach for applied researchers to select among treatment effect models. The absence of a standard leaves the door open for poor practice, which we hope to combat by presenting our findings here.

In section 2, we describe several general-purpose approaches for treatment effect model selection. In section 3 we argue for the validity of those approaches and uncover theoretical relationships between them. Section 4 explores approaches that are inspired by area-under-the-curve statistics. The simulations described in section 5 underscore our findings. We conclude in section 6 with a summary of our contributions and recommendations for researchers interested in estimating individual treatment effects.

2 Existing Approaches

2.1 $\mu$-error

There are many simple examples where minimizing the mean-squared error of predicted outcomes badly fails to select the model with the most accurate treatment effect [20]. Despite this, in the absence of anything better, prediction error has been used to select among treatment effect models. Assuming the
treatment effect model is built by regressing the outcomes onto the covariates and treatment to obtain $\hat{\mu}_0$ and $\hat{\mu}_1$, we can estimate prediction error with

$$\hat{\epsilon} = \frac{1}{|V|} \sum_{i \in V} l(\hat{\mu}_{w_i}(x_i), y_i)$$  \hspace{1cm} (1)

We call this approach $\mu$-error because it targets the error in estimating the outcome functions $\hat{\mu}_{w_i}$. For individuals in the validation set who were treated ($w = 1$), we estimate their outcome using the treated model and assess error, and vice-versa for the untreated. This is equivalent to assessing the predictive errors separately for $\hat{\mu}_1$ and $\hat{\mu}_0$.

$\mu$-error has two face-value disadvantages. First, it does not target the function of interest: the best available estimators for the potential outcomes may not make for the best estimator of the treatment effect. Second, it is not fully general-purpose: it may not make sense to evaluate targeted estimation methods that do not produce useful estimates of the potential outcomes in this way.

2.2 $\tau$-error

We have already seen that $\hat{\epsilon}_m = \frac{1}{|V|} \sum_{i \in V} l(\hat{\tau}_m(x_i), \tau(x_i))$ is infeasible. A natural approach is to replace $\tau(x_i)$ with an estimate derived from the validation set:

$$\hat{\epsilon} = \frac{1}{|V|} \sum_{i \in V} l(\hat{\tau}(x_i), \hat{\tau}_i)$$  \hspace{1cm} (2)

Here, $\hat{\tau}$ is a plug-in estimate of $\tau$ estimated using data in the validation set $V$. We call this approach $\tau$-error estimation and it has several variants depending on what estimator $\hat{\tau}$ and loss $l$ are used.

2.2.1 Matched MSE

Rolling and Yang [20] propose an estimator $\hat{\tau}_i$ based on matched treated and control individuals in the validation set. Briefly, for each individual $i$ in the validation set they use Mahalanobis distance matching to identify the most similar individual $\tilde{i}$ in the validation set with the opposite treatment ($w_i \neq w_{\tilde{i}}$) and compute $\hat{\tau}_i = (2w_i - 1)(y_i - y_{\tilde{i}})$ as the plug-in estimate of $\tau(x_i)$.

They prove under general assumptions and a squared-error loss that a more mathematically tractable version of their algorithm has selection consistency, meaning that it correctly selects the best model as the number of individuals goes to infinity. They conjecture that the practical version of the algorithm retains this property.

The downsides of this approach are that Mahalanobis matching scales relatively poorly and matches become difficult to find in high-dimensional covariate spaces.
2.2.2 Transformed outcome MSE

Here we use the notation $Y(w) = Y|W=w$ to denote the potential outcomes and $p(X) = E[W|X=x]$ to denote the propensity score. It has long been known that the transformed outcome $Y^\dagger = Y(0) - W p(X) - Y(1) + W p(X)$ (3) is, on expectation under standard assumptions, the treatment effect: $E[Y^\dagger|X=x] = \tau(x)$. Gutierrez and Gerardy [10] leverage this fact and propose an estimator $\hat{\tau}_i = Y^\dagger_i$ that they show leads to consistent estimation of the generalization error. In randomized and/or controlled experiments, the propensity score is known. In observational settings, a plug-in estimate of the propensity score may be used.

2.3 Decision value

Kapelner et al. [15] and Zhao et al. [29] select among treatment effect models by comparing their estimated decision-theoretic values instead of estimating prediction errors. Each model $\hat{\tau}_m(x)$ has an associated set of decision rules $\hat{d}_m(x, k) = I(\hat{\tau}_m(x) > k)$ which indicate which individuals should be treated if we wish to treat all individuals with expected benefit greater than $k$. Generally, $k = 0$ so that all individuals who stand to benefit are treated. For notational convenience we write $\hat{d}_m(x) = \hat{d}_m(x, 0)$. The value of a decision policy $\hat{d}$ is $v = E[Y|W = \hat{d}(X)]$. In other words, the value is the expected outcome of an individual when all individuals are treated according to the policy $\hat{d}$. If larger values of the outcome are more desirable (e.g. lifespan, click-through rate, approval ratings), then the policy that maximizes the value is optimal, and vice-versa. Without loss of generality, we will assume that we are interested in maximizing value. The best possible policy, $d(x) = I(\tau(x) > 0)$, is generally unknown because we do not know the true treatment effect $\tau(x)$.

As before, we assume that estimators $\hat{\tau}_m$ have been previously estimated on an independent training set and we now dedicate our attention to data in the validation set $V$. Somewhat remarkably, we will see that the value of a treatment effect model can be estimated without separately estimating the conditional treatment effect in the validation set.

Kapelner et al. [15] and Zhao et al. [29] propose the same validation set estimator for the value of a treatment effect model:

$$\hat{v} = \frac{1}{|V|} \sum_{V} \frac{y_i I(w_i = \hat{d}(x_i))}{p_{w_i}(x_i)}$$ (4)

where $p_{w_i}(x_i) = P(W = w_i|X = x_i)$. This is the propensity score if $w_i = 1$ and one minus the propensity score if $w_i = 0$.
In the randomized setting where \( p_w(x_i) = 0.5 \), we can imagine that two side-by-side experiments were run, one in which treatments were assigned according to the model \((W = \hat{d}(X))\) and one in which they were assigned according to the opposite recommendation \((W = 1 - \hat{d}(X))\). The data in the validation set are a concatenation of the data from these two experiments. To estimate the value of our model, we average the outcomes of individuals in the first experiment and ignore the data from the second experiment. This is essentially what the estimator in equation 4 is doing. When \( p_w(x_i) \neq 0.5 \), we must appropriately weigh the outcomes according to the probability of treatment to accomplish the same goal. Kapelner et al. [15] give a similar explanation, but omit the role of the propensity score. Zhao et al. [29] provide a short proof that \( \hat{v} \) is unbiased for the true value \( v = E[Y|W = \hat{d}(X)] \).

3 Theory

3.1 Connection value and \( \tau \)-error

It is straightforward to see how the matching MSE and transformed outcome MSE are special cases of \( \tau \)-error using squared-error loss and two different estimators for \( \hat{\tau} \). Here we show that optimizing decision value also optimizes a particular \( \tau \)-error in expectation. To do so, we first introduce gain, which has been previously used in the direct marketing literature to select treatment effect models. We will show that gain can be seen as a \( \tau \)-error and that optimizing gain is equivalent in expectation to optimizing value.

Gain (sometimes also called lift) is defined as follows:

\[
\hat{g} = \frac{1}{|V|} \left( \frac{\sum y_i \hat{d}(x_i) w_i}{\sum \hat{d}(x_i) w_i} - \frac{\sum y_i \hat{d}(x_i)(1 - w_i)}{\sum \hat{d}(x_i)(1 - w_i)} \right) \sum \hat{d}(x_i)
\]

The first term inside the parentheses is the average outcome among treated individuals in the validation set who were also recommended for treatment by the model. The second term is the average outcome among untreated individuals in the validation set who were recommended for treatment by the model. The resulting difference is an estimate of the average treatment effect among individuals recommended for treatment by the model. That number is multiplied by the total number of individuals in the validation set recommended for treatment by the model.

This estimator (which we call traditional gain) is actually a special case of the generalized gain:

\[
\hat{g} = \frac{1}{|V|} \sum y_i \hat{d}(x_i) w_i - \frac{\sum y_i \hat{d}(x_i)(1 - w_i)}{1 - p(x_i)} = \frac{1}{|V|} \sum y_i \hat{d}(x_i)
\]
To see this, we rewrite equation 5 as:

$$\frac{1}{|V|} \sum_{V} \hat{d}(x_i) \sum_{V} y_i \hat{d}(x_i) w_i - \frac{1}{|V|} \sum_{V} \hat{d}(x_i) \sum_{V} y_i \hat{d}(x_i)(1 - w_i) \cdot \frac{1}{1 - \hat{p}}$$

The multipliers underbraced above are unbiased estimates of $1/\hat{p}_w$, because of the conditional independence of $d(X)$ and $W$.

Thus the traditional formula for gain is a version of our formula that is suitable for use when $p(x) = p$ is a constant, as is the case in randomized experiments. By and large, the direct marketing literature has focused on randomized data - to our knowledge this is the first time a gain estimator has been constructed for observational data.

Note that gain is a special case of equation 2 where $l(\hat{r}(x_i), \hat{r}_i) = -\hat{r}_i I(\hat{r}(x_i) > 0)$ (we call this the decision cost loss) and $\hat{r}_i = y_i^\dagger$ (the transformed outcome). Gain can thus been seen as a $\tau$-error. In our experiments we test both this $\tau$-error and a $\tau$-error with the same loss but with the matching estimator from section 2.2.1 instead of the transformed outcome.

**Theorem 1.** In expectation, a model that maximizes estimated gain also maximizes estimated value.

**Proof.** Note that

$$E[\hat{g}|X = x] = E[Y^\dagger \hat{d}(x)|X = x]$$

$$= (\mu_1(x) - \mu_0(x)) \hat{d}(x)$$

$$E[\hat{v}|X = x] = E[Y|W = d(x), X = x]$$

$$= \mu_0(x)(1 - \hat{d}(x)) + \mu_1(x) \hat{d}(x)$$

Consider two policies $\hat{d}_a$ and $\hat{d}_b$ and their respective estimated values $\hat{v}_a, \hat{v}_b$ and gains $\hat{g}_a, \hat{g}_b$. The expected difference in value between the two models is

$$E[\hat{v}_a - \hat{v}_b] = E[E[\hat{v}_a|X] - E[\hat{v}_b|X]]$$

$$= E\left[\mu_0(X)(1 - \hat{d}_a(X)) + \mu_1(X) \hat{d}_a(X) - \mu_0(X)(1 - \hat{d}_b(X)) - \mu_1(X) \hat{d}_b(X)\right]$$

$$= E\left[\hat{d}_a(X)(\mu_1(X) - \mu_0(X)) - \hat{d}_b(X)(\mu_1(X) - \mu_0(X))\right]$$

$$= E\left[E[\hat{g}_a|X] - E[\hat{g}_b|X]\right]$$

$$= E[\hat{g}_a - \hat{g}_b]$$

If the estimated value of $\hat{d}_a$ is larger than than of $\hat{d}_b$, we expect the relationship between their gains to be the same. Since this relation holds between any two policies $\hat{d}_a$ and $\hat{d}_b$, the policy that maximizes estimated gain also maximizes estimated value in expectation. 

□
To our knowledge, this is the first result that demonstrates the link between gain and decision-theoretic value and demonstrates why maximizing gain works in practice. Since gain is a τ-error, we have demonstrated a connection between decision value and τ-error.

3.2 Properties of some τ-errors

3.2.1 Consistency under squared-error loss

Here we show for the first time that any unbiased and consistent estimate \( \hat{\tau} \) of the treatment effect calculated on the validation set can be used for estimation of the generalization error under squared-error loss.

Theorem 2. If \( \hat{\tau} \) is unbiased for \( \tau \), then

\[
E \left[ \frac{1}{|V|} \sum_{i \in V} (\hat{\tau}(X_i) - \hat{\tau}_i)^2 \right] = E[\hat{\tau}(X) - \tau(X)]^2 + E[(\hat{\tau}(X) - \tau(X))^2]
\]

Proof.\]

\[
E \left[ \frac{1}{|V|} \sum_{i \in V} (\hat{\tau}(X_i) - \hat{\tau}_i)^2 \right] = E[\hat{\tau}(X) - \tau + \tau - \hat{\tau}]^2
\]

(7)

The quantity in the sum can be expressed as

\[
E[(\hat{\tau}(X) - \tau)^2] + 2E[(\hat{\tau}(X) - \tau)(\tau - \hat{\tau})] + E[(\tau - \hat{\tau})^2]
\]

Using the law of total expectation, we rewrite the second term as \( E[E[(\hat{\tau}(x_i) - \tau(x_i)(\tau(x_i) - \hat{\tau}_i)|X = x_i]] \). Since \( \hat{\tau}_i \) and \( \hat{\tau}(x_i) \) are independent, this factors to \( E[E[\hat{\tau}(x_i) - \tau(x_i)|X = x_i]E[\tau(x_i) - \hat{\tau}_i|X = x_i]] \), which is 0 because \( E[\tau(x_i) - \hat{\tau}_i|X = x_i] = 0 \) by unbiasedness. Thus equation 7 becomes

\[
E \left[ \frac{1}{|V|} \sum_{i \in V} (\hat{\tau}(x_i) - \hat{\tau}_i)^2 \right] = E[\hat{\tau}(X) - \tau(X)]^2 + E[(\tau - \hat{\tau}(X))^2]
\]

The expected estimated error when we use \( \hat{\tau} \) as an estimate for \( \tau \) is the expected error of our model \( \hat{\tau} \) plus the expected error of our plug-in estimate \( \hat{\tau} \). Consequently, the estimated error we obtain is likely to be greater than the true generalization error of our model. However, our estimate can still be used to select between treatment effect models since the surplus error \( E[(\hat{\tau}(X) - \hat{\tau}(X))^2] \) does not depend on the model \( \hat{\tau}(X) \). This result implies that using consistent unbiased estimators \( \hat{\tau} \) and squared-error loss leads to consistent model selection. If \( \hat{\tau} \) is consistent, the surplus error asymptotically approaches its expected value, which does not vary with \( \hat{\tau} \). In the limit, when subtracting τ-errors from two models \( \hat{\tau}_A \) and \( \hat{\tau}_B \), the surplus errors cancel exactly to yield the desired \( E[(\hat{\tau}_A(X) - \tau(X))^2] - E[(\hat{\tau}_B(X) - \tau(X))^2] \).
3.2.2 Unbiasedness under multiplicative loss

**Theorem 3.** For losses of the form \( l(\hat{\tau}(x), \hat{\tau}(x)) = \hat{\tau}(x)f(\hat{\tau}(x)), \) if \( E[\hat{\tau}(X)|X] = \tau(x), \) then \( E[\hat{\epsilon}] = E[l(\tau, \hat{\tau})]. \)

**Proof.**

\[
E[\hat{\epsilon}] = E \left[ \frac{1}{|\mathcal{V}|} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{V}} \hat{\tau}(X)f(\hat{\tau}(X)) \right] \\
= E \left[ E[\hat{\tau}(X)f(\hat{\tau}(X))]|X] \right] \\
= E \left[ E[\hat{\tau}(X)|X]f(\hat{\tau}(X)) \right] \\
= E \left[ \tau(X)f(\hat{\tau}(X)) \right] \\
= E[l(\tau, \hat{\tau})]
\]

\[\square\]

We can therefore generalize gain, using any unbiased estimator of \( \tau \) instead of \( y^\dagger. \) By an argument similar to that of theorem 1, maximizing any form of generalized gain will maximize value in expectation.

3.2.3 Implications

If squared-error loss is used, only consistency in estimating a difference in generalization errors can be guaranteed, even with an unbiased estimator \( \hat{\tau}. \) In other words, model selection with these approaches is not guaranteed to work (on average) unless the number of individuals in the validation set is large.

Our results do guarantee that the estimate of generalization error will be unbiased (even in finite samples) if \( \hat{\tau} \) is unbiased for \( \tau \) and a multiplicative loss is used. The result should not be surprising given the relationship between these kinds of \( \tau \)-errors and value (section 3.1) and knowing that we can unbiasedly estimate value in finite samples.

4 AUC-style selection methods

There are a few treatment effect model selection approaches that we have not examined: the direct marketing literature documents the use of various functions of the “uplift curve” [10], while van Klaveren et al. [25] propose what they call the concordance-for-benefit statistic.

Recall that the decision policy can be parametrized with a cutoff \( k: \hat{d}(x,k) = I(\hat{\tau} > k). \) We can therefore also calculate the gain at \( k, \hat{g}(k), \) which is the gain obtained when individuals with an estimated treatment effect greater than \( k \) are treated. Researchers in direct marketing often rely on uplift curves (also called gain curves or cumulative gain charts) to aid in model selection. The uplift curve plots gain at \( k \) against the percentage of individuals in the validation set recommended for treatment at \( k. \) These curves are evaluated either heuristically, using the maximum value over \( k, \) or, most commonly, using the area under the curve [10]. The area under the gain curve is called the Qini coefficient.
van Klaveren et al. [25] propose the concordance-for-benefit statistic to select among treatment effect models. Briefly, each individual \( i \) in the validation set is matched without replacement according to estimated treatment effect with another individual in the validation set \( \bar{i} \) \((\hat{\tau}(x_i) \approx \hat{\tau}(x_{\bar{i}}))\) with the opposite treatment \( w_i \neq w_{\bar{i}} \). The total number of pairs is \( J \). For each pair of matched patients \( j \), the difference in outcomes between the treated and untreated individuals is recorded: \( \delta_j = (2w_i - 1)(y_i - y_{\bar{i}}) \), along with the predicted treatment effect for both patients \( t_j = \hat{\tau}(x_i) \). The concordance-for-benefit (or c-for-benefit) statistic is

\[
\hat{c} = \frac{\sum_{j=1}^{J} \sum_{j'>j} (1 - \text{sign}(\delta_{j'} - \delta_j)(t_{j'} - t_j)))}{(J^2 - J)}
\]

This is the proportion of pairs-of-pairs in which the difference in predicted treatment effects is discordant with the difference in “observed” treatment effects in the validation set. This assesses the overall ranking of individuals with respect to their estimated treatment effects.

Both of these approaches are inspired by different interpretations of the area under the receiver operating characteristic curve statistic (AUC), which is both the area under a parametric curve indexed by a classification cutoff (i.e. \( k \)) and an estimate of the proportion of pairs expected to have discordant classifications [11]. We conjecture that there is a theoretical relationship between these approaches and that they are related to decision value, but do not provide results to that effect. However, we do test both of these methods in simulation, along with value-at-k AUC, which is equivalent to the Qini coefficient, but using \( \hat{\delta}(k) \) instead of \( \hat{g}(k) \).

5 Simulations

5.1 Overview

We demonstrate the utility of these approaches using simulations. Each simulation is defined by a data-generating process with a known effect function, which allows us to compute true test set errors. Each run of each simulation generates a dataset, which we split into training and test samples. We perform 5-fold cross validation on the training data and compute each model selection metric (\( \mu \)-error, \( \tau \)-errors, value, etc.) on each validation fold. I.e. for each training fold, we estimate \( M \) different treatment effect functions \( \hat{\tau}_m \) and for each of those we calculate each metric using the data in the corresponding validation fold. The metrics are averaged for each model across all folds. Each model selection approach then selects the model among the \( M \) models that minimizes (or maximizes, when appropriate) its corresponding metric. The models selected by each approach on the basis of cross-validation are refit on the full training data and applied to the test set. The test-set treatment effect estimates of each model are compared to the known effects to calculate the true cost of using each approach for model selection. Each simulation is repeated multiple times. All of
the code used to set up, run, and analyze the simulations is freely available on github.

5.1.1 Data-generating processes and sampling

We use the sixteen simulations from Powers et al. [19], each of which we repeat 50 times. In each repetition, 1000 samples are used for training and validation and 2000 are used for testing.

5.1.2 Models

We fit several treatment effect models to each simulated dataset. We limit ourselves to two-model conditional mean regressions: given a model specification, we fit two separate models to predict the outcomes of the individuals who were treated and not treated and take the difference in predicted outcomes as the estimated individual treatment effect. This is so that we can calculate $\mu$-error as a selection metric for comparison to $\tau$-errors and value. As a result we do not use any models that directly estimate the individual treatment effect (e.g. causal forests). The models we use are gradient boosted trees (number of trees ranging from 1 to 500, tree depth of 3, shrinkage of 0.2 and minimum 3 individuals per node) and elastic nets ($\alpha = 0.5, \lambda \in [e^{-5}, e^2]$). These models give us a range of high-performing linear and nonlinear models to select among. For efficiency, we only consider combinations of $\hat{\mu}_1$ and $\hat{\mu}_0$ that were fit using the same method with the same hyperparameters. This constraint need not be enforced in practice (i.e. $\hat{\mu}_0$ could be fit using a linear model and $\hat{\mu}_1$ fit using a random forest). All models are fit using the caret R package.

5.1.3 Model selection approaches

The following metrics are used to select among models in each simulation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Reference section</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Random</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covariate matched-pairs / MSE</td>
<td>2.2.1</td>
<td>$\tau$-error</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformed outcome / MSE</td>
<td>2.2.1</td>
<td>$\tau$-error</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covariate matched-pairs / decision cost</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>$\tau$-error / value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformed outcome / decision cost (neg. generalized gain)</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>$\tau$-error / value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional gain</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision value</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-for-benefit</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>AUC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qini coefficient (gain-at-k AUC)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>AUC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value-at-k AUC</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>AUC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome prediction MSE</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>$\mu$-error</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Taking the model that minimizes (or maximizes, when appropriate) one of these metrics on average across validation folds defines a model selection approach.

We split the approaches into several categories based on the theoretical motivation for each. The ITE loss approaches all minimize metrics of the form of equation 2. The “value” approaches are those that have some theoretical equivalence to maximizing the decision value of a model. The AUC-style approaches are briefly described in section 4.

Note that the “random” metric assigns a random number to each model, which means that the model selected by that metric is chosen uniformly at random from the available models.

In simulations with biased treatment assignment, we estimate a propensity score with logistic regression. That estimated propensity is used in place of the true value in calculating all metrics that require a propensity score.

5.1.4 Evaluation metrics

Let the model \( \hat{\tau}_m \) selected by optimizing metric \( h \) in cross-validation be written as \( \hat{\tau}^{*h} \).

We are interested in the quantities

\[
\tau \text{MSE}(\hat{\tau}^{*h}) = E[(\hat{\tau}^{*h}(X) - \tau(X))^2]
\]

and

\[
v(\hat{\tau}^{*h}) = E[Y|W = \hat{d}^{*h}(X)]
\]

which we unbiasedly estimate in a large test set \( T \) via

\[
\tau \text{MSE}(T)(\hat{\tau}^{*h}) = \frac{1}{|T|} \sum_{i \in T} (\hat{\tau}^{*h}(x_i) - \tau(x_i))^2
\]

and

\[
v(T)(\hat{\tau}^{*h}) = \frac{1}{|T|} \sum_{i \in T} \mu_{\hat{d}^{*h}(x_i)}(x_i)
\]

Where \( \hat{d}^{*h}(x_i) = I(\hat{\tau}^{*h}(x_i) > 0) \) as before.

\( \tau \text{MSE}(T) \) calculates how well the selected model estimates the treatment effect for individuals in the test set. \( v(T) \) is the decision value of applying the treatment policy \( \hat{d}(x)^{*h} \) derived from each selected model \( \hat{\tau}^{*h}(x) \) to the individuals in the test set.

These are both useful metrics, although only the first (\( \tau \text{MSE} \), sometimes called “precision in estimating heterogeneous effects”, or PEHE) has typically been used in simulation studies. To see why the test set decision value is also important, consider two models (A and B) that estimate the same treatment effect for all individuals, except two \((i = 1 \text{ and } i = 2)\). Let \( \tau(x_1) = \tau(x_2) = 0.1 \), i.e. both individuals would benefit from the treatment in reality. Model A estimates
\[ \hat{\tau}_A(x_1) = -0.1 \text{ and } \hat{\tau}_A(x_2) = 0.1. \] In other words, it incorrectly suggests not treating individual 1, although the absolute difference \(|\hat{\tau}_A(x_1) - \tau(x_1)| = 0.2\) is quite small, so it is not heavily penalized by \(\tau_{MSE}\). Model B estimates \(\hat{\tau}_B(x_1) = 0.1\) and \(\hat{\tau}_B(x_2) = 100.\) Model B correctly suggests the treatment for both individuals, but the absolute difference \(|\hat{\tau}_B(x_2) - \tau(x_2)| = 99.9\) is large and is heavily penalized by \(\tau_{MSE}\). Often, what we want is a model that correctly assigns treatment to the individuals who stand to benefit from it. Using \(\tau_{MSE}\) in this case would favor model A even though it leads to the mistreatment of more individuals than model B does. However, \(\tau_{MSE}\) is still a useful metric. There may be cases where a researcher is interested in the precise magnitude of the effect for each individual, perhaps so that scarce resources can be allocated most effectively.

In our simulations, we also calculate the optima of both \(v(T)\) and \(\tau_{MSE}(T)\) over all the computed models \(\hat{\tau}_m \in \{\hat{\tau}_1 \ldots \hat{\tau}_M\}\):

\[
\tau_{MSE}(T)(\hat{\tau}^*) = \min_m \frac{1}{|T|} \sum_{i \in T} (\hat{\tau}_m(x_i) - \tau(x_i))^2
\]

\[
v(T)(\hat{\tau}^*) = \max_m \frac{1}{|T|} \sum_{i \in T} \mu \delta_m(x_i)(x_i)
\]

These quantities represent the best possible performance that any model selection method could achieve given the available models in a given simulation. We use these quantities as baselines.

### 5.2 Results

\(\tau\)-error approaches perform well, but those that employ covariate matching are notably worse off in several simulations, likely due to the difficulty of finding good covariate matches in high dimensions. All of the approaches related to value estimation perform similarly, as expected, since the metrics they are optimizing have equivalent differences in expectation (theorem 1). In some simulations with biased assignment, the traditional formulation of gain does poorly where our generalized version succeeds, presumably because our formulation correctly incorporates the propensity score. Of the AUC-style approaches, the Qini coefficient performs poorly, C-for-benefit performs reasonably, and our proposed value-at-k AUC does well. A straightforward application of outcome prediction MSE (\(\mu\)-error) does well. Random model selection leads to reasonable performance in many simulations because all of the available models perform only somewhat worse than the best among them. This is reflective of real-world use where poor models or hyperparameter combinations are removed a-priori.

Relative performance between methods is similar when gauged by either \(v(T)\) or \(\tau_{MSE}(T)\).
Figure 1: Test-set decision value \( \nu(T)(\hat{\tau}^* h) \) of the model selected by each approach (y-axis) in each simulation (x-axis) relative to the test-set decision value of the true best model \( \nu(T)(\hat{\tau}^*) \), averaged over each repetition of the simulation. Selection approaches are ranked top-to-bottom by averages of this quantity taken across all simulations. Values closer to zero indicate that the model selection approach choses better models on average.
Figure 2: Test-set treatment effect mean-squared-error $\tau M SE^{(T)}(\hat{\tau}^h)$ of the model selected by each approach (y-axis) in each simulation (x-axis) relative to the test-set treatment effect mean-squared-error of the true best model $\tau M SE^{(T)}(\hat{\tau}^*)$, averaged over each repetition of the simulation. Selection approaches are ranked top-to-bottom by averages of this quantity taken across all simulations. Values closer to zero indicate that the model selection approach choses better models on average.
6 Conclusion

Although prediction error cross-validation is widely used to select between predictive models, there is no consensus on how to perform model selection for individual treatment effects models. Several general-purpose approaches have been proposed. We describe each of these approaches and demonstrate that many of them work by minimizing a loss between the treatment effect function estimated from the training set (then applied to the validation set) and a treatment effect directly estimated from the validation set ($\tau$-error). The validation set estimate serves as a plug-in for the true individual treatment effect of each individual in the validation set. We establish some conditions on the validation set estimator that ensure statistically sound model selection. We also explore methods that are based on optimizing decision value and demonstrate a connection between them and the treatment effect loss-based methods.

Somewhat surprisingly, minimizing the prediction MSE ($\mu$-error: section 2.1) of the potential outcomes models is the best performing model selection approach according to our simulations. It should be noted that model selection based on prediction MSE fared poorly in our preliminary simulation experiments when the potential outcomes were fit as a single model $\hat{\mu}(x, w)$. This is likely because the single-model approach effectively regularizes the treatment effect estimate. We do not include those results here because the single-model approach has been found to be theoretically deficient for that same reason [1], but we suggest using a metric other than prediction MSE if a one-model approach is required.

Estimated decision value suffers from higher variance than estimated $\mu$-error. Only the weighted outcomes from the “lucky” individuals are used when estimating value, meaning there is higher variance in the computed mean. In contrast, $\mu$-error makes use of all of the observed outcomes in the validation set. It may be possible to reduce the variance of the value estimator with a doubly-robust approach in the style of Zhang et al. [27]. It may also be possible to select models based on a heuristic combination of value and $\mu$-error.

Despite its good performance in our simulations, $\mu$-error is not a general-purpose method for treatment effect model selection because it requires that the user have access to the potential outcomes models $\hat{\mu}_w$. If only the estimated treatment effects are available, our results suggest that estimates of decision value (section 2.3) should be used to select among treatment effect models. Although other methods perform almost as well in our simulations, estimated decision value has several advantages. For one, it is a direct estimate of the quantity that is of ultimate interest to many decision-makers. It is also the only available metric besides $\mu$-error that is usable in studies with more than two treatment regimens [28].

Based on our empirical and theoretical results, we advocate for the standardized use of estimated decision value for individual treatment effect model selection and validation. Model selection on the basis of $\mu$-error is also empirically justified and may be appropriate in some cases.
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