

# Proxy Controls and Panel Data\*

Ben Deaner<sup>†</sup>

3/15/20

## Abstract

We present a flexible approach to the identification and estimation of causal objects in nonparametric, non-separable models with confounding. Key to our analysis is the use of ‘proxy controls’: covariates that do not satisfy a standard ‘unconfoundedness’ assumption but which are informative proxies for variables that do. Our methods are presented in sufficient generality that they apply to both cross-sectional and panel models. Our identification results motivate an easy-to-implement non-parametric estimation method. Under our identifying assumptions the estimation problem is ‘well-posed’. We describe the estimator and derive convergence rates. When applied in panel settings our methods provide a novel approach to identification with non-separable general heterogeneity and a fixed time dimension. In the panel case, observations from different periods serve as proxies for unobserved individual heterogeneity and our key identifying assumptions follow from restrictions on the serial dependence structure of the data and latent variables. We apply our methodology to two separate empirical settings that respectively showcase the cross-sectional and the panel implementations of our approach. We estimate causal effects of grade retention on performance in a range of cognitive tests using cross-sectional variation in the data and we estimate a structural Engel curve for food using panel data.

Confounding factors are difficult and unavoidable challenges for the empirical economist. The threat of confounding is familiar to quantitative researchers in all fields, but it is of particular concern to economists, who are interested almost exclusively in causal inference and whose data are usually drawn from observational studies. Confounding may be understood in terms of factors that impact both the assignment of treatments (variables in whose causal impact we are interested) and potential outcomes. These factors are often inherently unobservable, they are composed of features like innate ability and tastes in

---

\*Previous editions of this work can be found at <https://arxiv.org/abs/1810.00283>, the first version was submitted on September 30th 2018.

<sup>†</sup>PhD candidate, Massachusetts Institute of Technology. Email at [bdeaner@mit.edu](mailto:bdeaner@mit.edu). Many thanks to Whitney Newey, Anna Mikusheva and Jerry Hausman for numerous helpful comments on this work and to those who attended the Econometric society session C1 at the ASSA 2020 Annual Meeting in San Diego for useful feedback.

consumption. Suppose that controlling for these factors the treatment assignments and potential outcomes are independent, that is, conditioning on these factors ‘unconfoundedness’ holds. Then we say that these factors are a set of ‘perfect controls’.

While perfect controls are often unobserved, the researcher may have access to covariates that proxy for the perfect controls. These ‘proxy controls’ could be a set of test scores in place of a measure of innate ability, or they could be some demographic characteristics like self-reported wages and years in education in place of socio-economic status.

A naive approach to estimation with proxy controls would treat the proxies as if they were perfect controls. For example, one could treat test scores as if they did in fact perfectly measure ability. In the panel setting one could condition on the history of observables and assume this controls for all confounding between unobserved heterogeneity and today’s treatment. However, if the proxies mis-measure the perfect controls then controlling for the proxies in the conventional manner need not remove all the confounding. Therefore, the resulting estimates are likely to be asymptotically biased.

We develop new results on non-parametric identification of causal objects when only proxy controls are available. Our assumptions weaken the unconfoundedness and full-support conditions that identify causal effects with perfect controls. We suggest a non-parametric estimation procedure based on our identification results that is straight-forward to implement and is, to the best of our knowledge, novel.

Our identifying assumptions are entirely non-parametric; they take the form of conditional independence assumptions, a full-support condition, statistical completeness and a smoothness assumption. We do not require any kind of additive separability, the existence nor knowledge of any sufficient statistics, nor any shape restrictions like monotonicity.

While our analysis applies in cross-sectional settings, our results are well-suited to the context of panel data. In the context of panel data, observations from other time periods can be informative proxies for underlying confounding factors. To illustrate, suppose that innate ability is a confounding factor. Then an individual’s innate ability is associated with both the individual’s treatment assignments and potential outcomes. It follows that the history of treatment assignments is informative about innate ability. We show that in panel models one can exploit assumptions on the serial dependence of the data and latent variables to form proxy controls from past observations so that our conditional independence restrictions are satisfied. Thus we add to the panel literature by suggesting a novel non-parametric approach to identification and estimation of causal objects in fixed- $T$  panel models with general, non-separable heterogeneity.

Our analysis treats identification and estimation with proxy controls as a measurement error problem. The proxy controls mis-measure a set of latent perfect controls. To account for the measurement error, the researcher divides the available proxy controls into two groups and, in effect, uses one group of proxy controls to instrument for the other. The validity of this approach does not require that the proxy controls be valid instruments in the standard sense.

Instead, the proxy controls must satisfy a conditional independence restriction which, loosely speaking, states that the two sets of proxy controls are only related through their mutual association with the unobserved perfect controls. In addition to this assumption, one requires that the proxy controls are sufficiently informative (defined in terms of statistical completeness) about the latent perfect controls.

Instrumenting for mis-measured variables has a long history in econometrics.<sup>1</sup> Our results suggest that when the mis-measurement is in control variables, a nonparametric analogue of the standard IV approach can be justified, even when the underlying model is both non-separable and non-parametric and the measurement error is neither classical and nor zero-mean.

Our assumptions resemble some of those in Hu & Schennach (2008) which apply for general measurement error (i.e., in treatments rather than just controls). Identification with proxy controls is somewhat more tractable than the problem of measurement error in treatment variables. We are not interested in the causal effect of the latent perfect controls themselves and we do not recover any distributions involving the latent perfect controls, even as an intermediate step in estimation. Thus we can weaken some of the assumptions in Hu & Schennach (2008) and provide a simpler, constructive identification of causal objects and an uncomplicated estimation method. Notably, we do not require a normalization like mean- or median-unbiasedness of the mis-measured variables which is required by Hu & Schennach (2008).

The assumption that the two sets of proxy controls are related only through their mutual association with underlying perfect controls must be assessed on a case-by-case basis. Consider the case in which we proxy for academic ability using test scores. If multiple sets of scores are available one may reasonably assume that they reflect only underlying academic ability and random conditions on the day of the test. Therefore, if academic ability is the relevant perfect control, the scores on the different tests are plausibly independent conditional on this latent factor (this argument is made in Cunha *et al.* (2010)). Thus the sets of test scores plausibly satisfy the conditional independence restriction and are valid proxy controls.

In the panel case where past observations are used as proxy controls, the assumption can be understood in terms of the serial dependence structure of the data and some latent variables. Suppose that treatment assignment at each period  $t$  depends only on innate ability, the treatment assignment at period  $t-1$  and some exogenous, serially independent factors. In other words, conditional on innate ability the treatment assignments follow a first-order Markov dependence structure. Let one set of proxy controls be the treatment assignments from periods prior to  $t$  and let the other set contain treatments in the periods subsequent to  $t+1$ . Then the two sets of proxy controls are related only through innate ability and the treatment at period  $t+1$ , which together are sufficient for the confounding and thus constitute a set of perfect controls.

---

<sup>1</sup>See Angrist & Krueger (2001) for some discussion of early use of IV to tackle the errors-in-variables problem.

The assumption that each of the two sets of proxy controls is sufficiently informative about the perfect controls is analogous to an instrumental relevance condition (see Newey & Powell (2003)). The proxy controls should be relevant instruments for the unobserved perfect controls. This generally places some restrictions on the number of unobserved perfect controls compared to proxy controls analogous to the order condition in linear instrumental variables. In the panel case the number of available observations from different time periods is limited by the panel length. If the proxy controls are observations from periods other than  $t$ , then the order condition implies a lower bound on the panel length.

We specify conditions under which the estimation problem suggested by our identification result is ‘well-posed’. The well-posedness of our estimation problem is crucial for deriving simple rates of convergence comparable to those achieved in standard nonparametric regression. We present an easy-to-implement non-parametric estimator that builds on our identification results and analyze its properties.

To demonstrate the usefulness of our methodology we apply it to two very different real world data problems. These empirical examples serve both as proofs of concept for our estimation method and also provide realistic settings in which to examine the implications of our identifying assumptions.

We revisit the empirical setting of Fruehwirth *et al.* (2016) who use data from the Early Childhood Longitudinal Study of Kindergartners (ECLS-K) to estimate the causal impact of grade retention on the performance of US students in cognitive tests. We use the cleaned data from Fruehwirth *et al.* (2016) to estimate some of the same counterfactual objects using our methods. While the ECLS-K provides four periods of panel data, we use this setting to demonstrate the application of our methods to cross-sectional data. We estimate positive effects of grade retention in kindergarten and in first or second grade on the cognitive scores of those retained. We find that those not retained would have achieved lower average scores in reading and math had they been retained.

In addition, we use data from the Panel Survey of Income Dynamics (PSID) to estimate a structural Engel curve for food and another counterfactual object. In this case our analysis is premised upon a Markov-type serial dependence restriction on the structure of the data and some latent variables. We discuss the plausibility of our assumptions in this context. We estimate the average structural Engel curve using our methods and find it to be downward-sloping and concave in the logarithm of total expenditure.

To summarize, our contribution is fourfold. We provide new results for identification with proxy controls that apply to both the cross-sectional and panel settings. We show that in dynamic panel settings our conditional independence restrictions follow from conditions on the serial dependence structure. We propose a novel estimation method based on our identification results and analyze its asymptotic properties. Finally we use our methodology to estimate causal objects in two separate empirical settings.

## Related Literature and the Structure of the Paper

A recent literature provides conditions in which causal effects are nonparametrically identified in cross-sectional models using proxy controls. Notably Miao *et al.* (2018) in the biometrics literature, which in turn builds on Kuroki & Pearl (2014). In the economics literature, identification with proxy controls is achieved in the context of regression discontinuity in Rokkanen (2015) which uses Hu & Schennach (2008) as an intermediate step.

Miao *et al.* (2018) consider identification when controls are mis-measured and develop a related statistical test, they do not provide an estimator. We employ a similar set of identifying assumptions to Miao *et al.* (2018) and achieve a somewhat similar characterization of our causal objects of interest. Our identification results are distinguished from Miao *et al.* (2018) in three key ways. Firstly, we identify conditional average effects where the conditioning is on observed treatment status. For example, we can identify the average effect of treatment on the treated. By contrast, Miao *et al.* (2018) identify unconditional average outcomes. Secondly, we provide conditions under which our characterization of the conditional average structural function is ‘well-posed’. Thirdly, we consider panel models and present panel-type assumptions that are sufficient for our key identifying assumptions. We provide a more detailed comparison of our identification results and theirs in Section 1. We are, to the best of our knowledge, the first to develop an estimator based on our identification results or results similar to ours and are therefore also the first to derive convergence rates for such an estimator.

Our panel analysis follows a long line of work in which observations from other periods are used to account for unobserved heterogeneity. This approach dates back to Hausman & Taylor (1981) and is the basis of classic methods like those of Holtz-Eakin *et al.* (1988) and Arellano & Bond (1991). A recent literature takes a similar approach to control for unobserved heterogeneity that is non-additive and appears in non-linear models. For example, the work of Arellano & Bonhomme (2016), Freyberger (2018) and Evdokimov (2009). Of these, Arellano & Bonhomme (2016) employs identifying assumptions that are most similar to our own; they too require statistical completeness and conditional independence restrictions. However, our objects of interest differ from those of Arellano & Bonhomme (2016). They are interested in conditional quantile functions involving the time-invariant unobserved heterogeneity (i.e., latent perfect controls) whereas we are interested in conditional average potential outcomes and related objects. We are not interested in the unobserved heterogeneity itself and we treat its distribution as a nuisance parameter. As a result we are able to specify an estimation procedure that is based on a conditional moment restriction and does not require simulation.

The key step in our estimation method is a Penalized Sieve Minimum Distance (PSMD) procedure. PSMD estimators are analyzed extensively in Chen & Pouzo (2012) and Chen & Pouzo (2015). PSMD estimation generalizes earlier methods for estimating conditional moment restriction models, for example those presented in Newey & Powell (2003) and Ai & Chen (2003).

There is a long history of research examining the effects of grade retention on cognitive ability and on social and economic success. For a meta-analysis of some earlier literature on this topic see Jimerson (2001). Our analysis of the effects of grade retention builds off of the work of Fruehwirth *et al.* (2016). We use the data that is available in the supplement of their paper as well as their code to clean that data and we estimate some of the same causal effects as they do in their work. The methodological differences between our approach and that of Fruehwirth *et al.* (2016) are detailed in Section 4.

The nonparametric estimation of Engel curves for food originates in the work of Ernst Engel himself. In the late 19th century Engel evaluated average expenditures on food by income group (see Chai & Moneta (2010)). Recent work to estimate structural (i.e., causal) Engel curves for food in a nonparametric or semiparametric fashion includes the instrumental variables approach of Blundell *et al.* (2007) and the panel approach of Chernozhukov *et al.* (2015). For a short survey of work on this topic see Lewbel (2008).

The paper is structured as follows. In Section 1 we present a general nonparametric causal model and specify our counterfactual objects of interest. We define proxy controls and provide conditions under which our objects of interest are identified. We compare our results to those of Rokkanen (2015) and Miao *et al.* (2018). In Section 2 we show how our identification results apply in panel settings with a fixed number of time periods. In Section 3 we present our estimation method and provide conditions for its consistency. In Section 4 we apply our methods to real-world data in two separate settings.

## 1 General Model and Identification

Consider the following structural model:

$$Y = y_0(X, U) \tag{1.1}$$

$Y$  is an observed dependent variable,  $X$  is a column vector of observables that represents the levels of assigned treatments, and  $U$  is a (potentially infinite-dimensional) vector that represents unobserved heterogeneity. The ‘structural function’  $y_0$  is not assumed to be of any particular parametric form.

The model above incorporates both cross-sectional and panel settings. In the panel case the model applies for a particular period  $t$ , that is, for a particular cross-sectional slice of the panel data. We could make the time-dependence explicit and rewrite the model above as  $Y_t = y_{0,t}(X_t, U_t)$ . However, for notational convenience and also to emphasize that the results in this section apply for cross-sectional models we keep the time-dependence implicit. In Section 2 we consider the panel case exclusively and thus include time subscripts.

Throughout the discussion it is assumed that the structural function  $y_0$  in (1.1) captures the causal effect of  $X$  on  $Y$ . For clarity, we situate our analysis in the potential outcomes framework. If a unit has realization of the heterogeneity  $U$  of  $u$ , then  $y_0(x, u)$  is the ‘potential outcome’ from treatment level  $x$ . That is,

the outcome that would have been observed had the treatment of that unit been set to level  $x$ . Thus  $U$  captures all heterogeneity in the potential outcomes. In some of the existing literature the random potential outcome from a counterfactual treatment  $x$ , which we denote by  $y_0(x, U)$ , is denoted by  $Y_x$  or  $Y(x)$ . We assume throughout (without loss of generality) that the mapping between the potential outcomes  $y_0(\cdot, u)$  and heterogeneity in potential outcomes  $u$  is one-to-one. This means that independence of some variable with the heterogeneity  $U$  is equivalent to independence of that variable with the potential outcomes  $y_0(\cdot, U)$ .

We suppose throughout that the random pairs  $(X, U)$  are independently and identically distributed. The assumption that the distribution is identical across units is not very restrictive in this setting because the distribution of the treatment variable  $X$  could depend strongly on the unobserved heterogeneity  $U$ . Note that in the panel case we do not require that the variables be iid across time, only across units. We conjecture that the iid assumption could be replaced by some weak dependence condition without substantially altering our results.

The focus of this paper is on the identification and estimation of conditional average potential outcomes, where we condition on the assigned treatments  $X$ . The function that returns the conditional average potential outcomes is sometimes referred to as the ‘conditional average structural function’, we use the two terms interchangeably.

Conditional average potential outcomes are defined formally as follows. The conditional average potential outcome from treatment level  $x_1$ , conditional on treatment assignment  $X$  equal to  $x_2$  is:

$$\bar{y}(x_1|x_2) = E[y_0(x_1, U)|X = x_2]$$

In words, suppose we draw a unit at random from the sub-population who were assigned treatment  $X = x_2$ . Then the expected counterfactual

outcome had the unit instead received treatment level  $x_1$  is  $\bar{y}(x_1|x_2)$ .<sup>2</sup>

Note that one may also be interested in identifying average potential outcomes conditional on the treatments as well as some additional variables, i.e.,  $E[y_0(x_1, U)|X = x_2, S = s]$  for some additional variables  $S$ . Our results extend straight-forwardly to this case. If  $S$  is discrete one can simply apply our analysis to the sub-population with  $S$  at some fixed value  $s$ . If  $S$  is not discrete then one can apply the analysis to the subpopulation with  $S$  in some set  $\mathcal{S}$  for which  $S \in \mathcal{S}$  with strictly positive probability, and thus identify  $E[y_0(x_1, U)|X = x_2, S \in \mathcal{S}]$ . If this object is identified for every such  $\mathcal{S}$  then one can identify  $E[y_0(x_1, U)|X = x_2, S = s]$  for  $F_S$ -almost all  $S$  where  $F_S$  is the distribution of  $S$ .<sup>3</sup>

Many counterfactual objects of interest can be written in terms of the conditional average potential outcomes. For example, conditional average treatment

<sup>2</sup>Note that if  $X$  is continuously distributed then  $\bar{y}(x_1|x_2)$  is only uniquely defined for  $x_2$  up to a set of  $F_X$ -measure zero, where  $F_X$  is the law of  $X$ .

<sup>3</sup>A previous working version of this paper explicitly incorporated additional conditioning variables  $S$ . For ease of exposition we have dropped this feature from the current draft.

effects and the average effect of treatment on the treated can both be expressed using the conditional average potential outcomes and the probability distributions of some observables. For a more involved example, consider the average outcome among agents had they received treatments ten percent larger than those that were actually assigned. This can be written as:

$$E[y_0(1.1X, U)] = \int \bar{y}(1.1x|x)F_X(dx)$$

By transforming the model one can define an even richer set of counterfactual objects in terms of the conditional average potential outcomes of the transformed model. For example, let  $y$  be some fixed scalar and consider the transformation  $w \mapsto 1\{w \leq y\}$ . Let  $\tilde{Y}$  be the transformed outcome variable, that is  $\tilde{Y} = 1\{Y \leq y\}$ , and let  $\tilde{y}_0$  be the transformed structural function, that is  $\tilde{y}_0(x, u) = 1\{y_0(x, u) \leq y\}$ . The transformed model is:

$$\tilde{Y} = \tilde{y}_0(X, U)$$

The conditional cumulative distribution function of the potential outcomes in the original model can be written as:

$$\begin{aligned} P(y_0(x_1, U) \leq y | X = x_2) &= E[1\{y_0(x_1, U) \leq y\} | X = x_2] \\ &= E[\tilde{y}_0(x_1, U) | X = x_2] \end{aligned}$$

The right-hand side of the final equality above is the conditional average structural function for the transformed model. Our identifying assumptions do not refer to  $Y$  directly but instead to the latent variable  $U$ , and as such our assumptions are invariant to transformations of the kind above. That is, if our assumptions apply for the original model they also apply for the transformed model. Thus if we can identify the conditional average potential outcomes then we can also identify the conditional cumulative distribution function of the potential outcomes. Note that identification of the conditional cumulative distribution implies identification of the conditional quantiles.

## Proxy Controls

A common approach to identification in the presence of confounding relies on the presence of what we term ‘perfect controls’. A vector of perfect controls is an observable random vector  $W^*$ , so that conditioning on  $W^*$ , the treatments  $X$  and the heterogeneity in potential outcomes are independent. Formally we write  $U \perp\!\!\!\perp X | W^*$ . Note that we use this notation to denote conditional independence throughout the paper. Variables  $W^*$  with this property are sometimes referred to as ‘confounders’ but due to the lack of consensus over this term (VanderWeele & Shpitser (2013)) we refer to them as ‘perfect controls’.

To achieve identification with observed perfect controls, one generally requires additional conditions, in particular something like a full support assumption for the distribution of  $W^*$ . We give sufficient conditions in Assumption 1



below. Assumption 1.i repeats the conditional independence assumption, that is, it states  $W^*$  is indeed a vector of perfect controls. Assumption 1.ii, loosely speaking, states that conditional on  $X$ , the vector  $W^*$  has positive probability on the same sets as it does unconditionally. In the case in which the variables admit a probability density function this reduces to a full-support assumption: the conditional density of  $W^*$  given  $X$  has the same support as the unconditional density. Assumption 1.iii states that for each relevant  $x$ ,  $y_0(x, U)$  has a finite first moment as does the outcome  $Y$ . This last condition ensures that the conditional average structural function is well defined.

**Assumption 1 (Perfect Control).** i.  $U \perp\!\!\!\perp X|W^*$  ii. The joint distribution  $F_{(X, W^*)}$  is absolutely continuous with the product of the distributions  $F_{W^*}$  and  $F_X$ . iii.  $E[|Y|] < \infty$  and for  $F_X$ -almost all  $X$   $E[|y_0(x, U)|] < \infty$ .

Under Assumption 1 the conditional average potential outcomes/structural function satisfies:

$$\bar{y}(x_1|x_2) = E[E[Y|W^*, X = x_1]|X = x_2]$$

Where the equality holds for  $F_X$ -almost all  $x_1$  and  $x_2$ . If  $W^*$  is observed then the RHS of the final equality depends only on the distribution of observables, thus the equation above identifies  $\bar{y}(x_1|x_2)$ . The characterization above is well-known but we formally state and prove it in Proposition B.1 in Appendix B and give intuition for the role of Assumption 1.ii.

When perfect controls  $W^*$  are unavailable the researcher may have access to proxy controls  $W$ .  $W$  need not be a vector of perfect controls (i.e.,  $U \not\perp\!\!\!\perp X|W$ ), however  $W$  may be informative about the perfect controls  $W^*$ .

We present assumptions that imply identification when only proxy controls  $W$  are available. The assumptions refer to the vector of perfect controls  $W^*$  for which  $W$  acts as a proxy. Since  $W^*$  is unobserved, the assumptions can be understood to state that a vector of latent variables  $W^*$  exists that simultaneously satisfies all the conditions in our assumptions. To argue persuasively that the assumptions are plausible in a given setting, a researcher will generally have to choose a particular set of unobserved perfect controls  $W^*$  and argue that the assumptions hold for those controls. Our identification results resemble those of Miao *et al.* (2018) and, to a lesser extent, Rokkanen (2015). We provide a detailed comparison later in this section.

As Rokkanen (2015) notes, the problem of identification with proxy controls can be understood as a measurement-error problem. The vector of proxy controls  $W$  can be understood as a measurement of  $W^*$  that is subject to non-classical (i.e., non-zero mean and non-additive) noise. Like Miao *et al.* (2018), we propose that the researcher split the vector of proxy controls  $W$  into two (possibly over-lapping) sub-vectors  $V$  and  $Z$ . The researcher in effect uses the proxy controls in  $Z$  as instruments for the proxy controls in  $V$ .

In the panel setting we suggest  $V$  and  $Z$  be composed of observations from different time periods. For example, if the researcher is interested in the conditional average structural function at time  $t$  then  $V$  and  $Z$  could each be a vector

of some treatments prior to  $t$ . In Section 2 we provide detailed discussion of panel models and appropriate choices of  $V$  and  $Z$  in these settings.

The instruments  $Z$  must be valid in that they satisfy a conditional independence restriction involving the proxy controls  $V$ , the treatments  $X$  and the unobserved perfect controls  $W^*$ . We emphasize that, unlike in standard instrumental variables analysis,  $Z$  implicitly acts as an instrument for  $W^*$  and not for the treatments  $X$ . As such,  $Z$  is not required to be independent of  $W^*$ . In fact,  $Z$  must satisfy an informativeness assumption that is analogous to an instrumental relevance condition and this generally precludes that  $Z$  and  $W^*$  be independent.<sup>4</sup>

In some cases we may observe some components of the perfect controls  $W^*$  and not others. In this case the observed components should be included in both  $V$  and  $Z$ . If all perfect controls  $W^*$  are observed then one can set  $V = Z = W^*$  and the remaining identifying assumptions hold trivially.

**Assumption 2 (Conditional Independence).** i.  $U \perp\!\!\!\perp Z|(X, W^*)$  ii.  $V \perp\!\!\!\perp (X, Z)|W^*$

**Assumption 3 (Informativeness).** i. For  $F_X$ -almost all  $x$ , for any function  $\delta \in L_2(F_{W^*|X=x})$ :

$$E[\delta(W^*)|Z = z, X = x] = 0 \iff \delta(w^*) = 0$$

Where the first equality means  $F_{Z|X=x}$ -almost sure equality and the second  $F_{W^*|X=x}$ -almost sure. ii. For  $F_X$ -almost all  $x$ , for any function  $\delta \in L_2(F_{W^*|X=x})$ :

$$E[\delta(W^*)|V = v, X = x] = 0 \iff \delta(w^*) = 0$$

Where the first equality means  $F_{V|X=x}$ -almost sure equality and the second  $F_{W^*|X=x}$ -almost sure.

Assumption 2 makes two assertions of conditional independence. In words, Assumption 2.i states that the treatments  $X$  and perfect controls  $W^*$  explain all the association between the heterogeneity  $U$  and proxy controls  $Z$ . Note that Assumptions 1.i and 2.i together are equivalent to the single conditional independence assumption  $U \perp\!\!\!\perp (X, Z)|W^*$ . Assumption 2.ii states that any dependence between  $V$  and  $(X, Z)$  is explained by their mutual association with the perfect controls  $W^*$ . We emphasize that the independence between  $V$  and  $(X, Z)$  in Assumption 2.ii is conditional. Without conditioning on the perfect controls  $W^*$ ,  $V$  could be strongly associated with both  $X$  and  $Z$ . Again, note that neither Assumption 2.i nor 2.ii requires either  $V$  or  $Z$  be independent of  $W^*$ .

Assumptions 3.i and 3.ii state, loosely speaking, that both  $V$  and  $Z$  are sufficiently informative about the unobserved perfect controls  $W^*$ . The informativeness conditions are in terms of ‘completeness’, or more precisely,  $L_2$ -completeness (Andrews (2017)). Completeness is used to achieve identification

---

<sup>4</sup>More precisely,  $Z$  and  $W^*$  must not be independent conditional on  $X$  (apart from in the trivial case of  $W^*$  non-random).

in the non-parametric instrumental variables (NPIV) models of Newey & Powell (2003) and Ai & Chen (2003). In the NPIV context, completeness is an instrumental relevance condition analogous to the rank condition for identification in linear IV (see Newey & Powell (2003) for discussion). With this interpretation, 3.i states that conditional on any given value of assigned treatments  $X$ ,  $Z$  is a relevant instrument for  $W^*$ , and 2.b. states that conditioning on  $X$ ,  $V$  is a relevant instrument for  $W^*$ . Some sufficient conditions for statistical completeness can be found in D'Haultfoeuille (2011) and Hu & Shiu (2018). In some settings  $L_2$ -completeness is generic in a certain sense (Andrews (2017), Chen *et al.* (2014)).

In the linear IV case, the rank condition can only hold if the number of instruments exceeds the number of endogenous regressors, this is known as the ‘order condition’. Such a condition is not, strictly speaking, necessary for  $L_2$ -completeness in nonparametric models.<sup>5</sup> However, an order condition is necessary in certain special cases, for example the conditional Gaussian case discussed in Newey & Powell (2003). Therefore, in practice, it seems prudent to require that the order condition hold. To emphasize this we state the order condition formally below.

**Order Condition.** Each of the vectors  $V$  and  $Z$  is of a weakly larger dimension than  $W^*$ .

In addition to Assumptions 1, 2 and 3 we require that either one of two regularity conditions hold. The conditions refer to sequences of functions  $\{\mu_k\}_{k=1}^\infty$ ,  $\{u_k\}_{k=1}^\infty$  and  $\{v_k\}_{k=1}^\infty$  that depend on the joint distribution of  $Z$ ,  $V$  and  $X$ . The definition of these functions is somewhat technical and so we relegate it to Appendix A. In Appendix A we state a weak condition on the joint distribution of observables, Assumption A.1, under which these sequences of functions are well-defined.

Assumption 4.i also refers to the  $\frac{dF_{V|X=x_2}}{dF_{V|X=x_1}}$ , the Radon-Nikodym derivative of  $F_{V|X=x_2}$  with respect to  $F_{V|X=x_1}$ . This must exist under Assumptions 1.ii and 2.ii, we prove this as Proposition B.2 in Appendix B. Note that if the distribution of  $V$  given  $X$  admits a conditional probability density function then the Radon-Nikodym derivative is simply the ratio of the conditional pdfs. That is  $\frac{dF_{V|X=x_1}}{dF_{V|X=x_2}}(v)$  is equal to  $f(v|x_1)/f(v|x_2)$  where  $f(v|x)$  is the probability density of  $V$  at  $v$  conditional on  $X = x$ .

Finally, in order to state the Assumptions below we let  $\bar{W}$  be the vector of components that appear in both the vectors  $V$  and  $Z$  (recall that  $V$  and  $Z$  may share some common components).

**Assumption 4 (Regularity).** i. Assumptions A.1, 1.ii, and 2.ii hold. For  $F_{\bar{W}}$ -almost all  $\bar{w}$  and  $F_X$ -almost all  $x_1$  and  $x_2$ :

$$E \left[ \frac{dF_{V|X=x_2}}{dF_{V|X=x_1}}(V)^2 \middle| X = x_1, \bar{W} = \bar{w} \right] < \infty$$

<sup>5</sup>The methods of Andrews (2017) can be used to construct  $L_2$ -complete distributions even when the number of endogenous regressors exceeds the number of instruments.

And:

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\mu_k(x_1, \bar{w})^2} E\left[\frac{dF_{V|X=x_2}}{dF_{V|X=x_1}}(V) u_k(V, X) | X = x_1, \bar{W} = \bar{w}\right]^2 \leq C(\bar{w})$$

With  $E[C(\bar{W})] < C$ . ii. Assumptions A.1, 1.ii, and 2.ii hold. For  $F_{\bar{W}}$ -almost all  $\bar{w}$  and  $F_X$ -almost all  $x$ :

$$E[E[Y|Z, X]^2 | X = x, \bar{W} = \bar{w}] < \infty$$

And:

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\mu_k(x, \bar{w})^2} E[E[Y|Z, X] v_k(Z, X) | X = x, \bar{W} = \bar{w}]^2 \leq D(\bar{w})$$

With  $E[D(\bar{W})] < D$ .

Assumption 4.i and 4.ii (when combined with Assumptions 1 to 3 and Assumption A.1) ensure the existence of that solutions to two equations exist. In particular, Assumption 4.i implies that there exists a function  $\varphi$  so that for  $F_X$ -almost all  $x_1$  and  $x_2$ ,  $E[\varphi(x_1, x_2, Z)^2 | X = x_1] \leq C$  and:

$$E[\varphi(x_1, x_2, Z) | X = x_1, V] = \frac{dF_{V|X=x_2}}{dF_{V|X=x_1}}(V)$$

4.ii implies that there exists a function  $\gamma$  with  $E[\gamma(X, V)^2 | X = x] \leq D$  for  $F_X$ -almost all  $x$  and:

$$E[\gamma(X, V) | X, Z] = E[Y | X, Z]$$

We prove the existence of these solutions in Lemma A.1 in Appendix A along with further discussion.

The Assumptions 4.i and 4.ii first state that  $\frac{dF_{V|X=x_2}}{dF_{V|X=x_1}}(V)$  and  $[Y|Z, X]$  have finite mean square conditional on realized values of  $X$  and  $\bar{W}$ . This is a fairly weak condition and follows immediately if these objects are bounded. The second parts of 4.i and 4.ii require that some generalized Fourier coefficients go to zero sufficiently quickly. These restrictions can be understood as smoothness conditions (see Hall & Horowitz (2005)). Conditions of the same form are used elsewhere in the literature, for example to establish existence of an NPIV regression function in Darolles *et al.* (2011). Miao *et al.* (2018) employs a condition that closely resembles Assumption 4.ii for a similar purpose to us.

Assumption 4 is crucial to our analysis because it ensures our characterization of the conditional average structural function is well-defined and that estimation of the conditional average structural function is not ‘ill-posed’ in a certain sense discussed below. This allows us to derive simple convergence rates for our estimation method that are comparable to those in standard non-parametric regression. Loosely speaking, Theorem 1 below characterizes the

conditional average structural function as a linear functional of a nonparametric instrumental variables (NPIV) regression function. Estimation of an NPIV regression function is generally ill-posed but estimation of a sufficiently smooth linear functional of an NPIV regression function is well-posed.

The use of existence conditions like those in Assumption 3 to demonstrate well-posedness is closely related to results in Severini & Tripathi (2012) and Ichimura & Newey (2017) who prove the root- $n$  estimability of linear functionals of NPIV regression functions under existence conditions of this kind. Deaner (2019) shows a similar existence condition is necessary and sufficient for robust estimation of such linear functionals.

**Theorem 1.** *Suppose Assumptions 1, 2 and 3 hold for all  $x$ . Then if **either** of 4.i and 4.ii holds, the conditional average structural function  $E[y_0(x_1, U)|X = x_2]$  is identified (for  $x_1$  and  $x_2$  up to a set of  $F_X$ -measure zero). In particular:*

*a. If 4.ii (and not necessarily 4.i) holds then there exists a function  $\gamma$  with  $\gamma(x, \cdot) \in L_2(F_{V|X=x})$  so that:*

$$E[Y - \gamma(X, V)|X, Z] = 0 \quad (1.2)$$

*And for any such  $\gamma$ , for  $F_X$ -almost all  $x_1$  and  $x_2$ :*

$$\bar{y}(x_1|x_2) = E[\gamma(x_1, V)|X = x_2]$$

*b. If 4.i (and not necessarily 4.ii) holds then there exists a function  $\varphi$  with  $\varphi(x_1, x_2, \cdot) \in L_2(F_{Z|X=x_1})$  so that:*

$$E[\varphi(X, x_2, Z)|X = x_1, V] = \frac{dF_{V|X=x_2}}{dF_{V|X=x_1}}(V) \quad (1.3)$$

*And for any such  $\varphi$ , for  $F_X$ -almost all  $x_1$  and  $x_2$ :*

$$\bar{y}(x_1|x_2) = E[Y\varphi(x_1, x_2, Z)|X = x_1]$$

*Furthermore, if 4.i (and not necessarily 4.ii) holds then the problem in a. is well-posed in the following sense: for any function  $\tilde{\gamma}$ , and for  $F_X$ -almost all  $x_1$  and  $x_2$ :*

$$\begin{aligned} & (\bar{y}(x_1|x_2) - E[\tilde{\gamma}(x_1, V)|X = x_2])^2 \\ & \leq CE \left[ (E[Y - \tilde{\gamma}(X, V)|X, Z])^2 \Big| X = x_1 \right] \end{aligned} \quad (1.4)$$

*If 4.ii holds (and not necessarily 4.i) then the problem in b. is well-posed in the following sense. For any function  $\tilde{\varphi}$ , and for  $F_X$ -almost all  $x_1$  and  $x_2$ :*

$$\begin{aligned} & (\bar{y}(x_1|x_2) - E[Y\tilde{\varphi}(x_1, x_2, Z)|X = x_1])^2 \\ & \leq DE \left[ \left( E[\tilde{\varphi}(X, x_2, Z)|X, V] - \frac{dF_{V|X=x_2}}{dF_{V|X=x_1}}(V) \right)^2 \Big| X = x_1 \right] \end{aligned} \quad (1.5)$$

The characterization of the conditional average structural function in Theorem 1 suggests a two-step approach to estimation. Recall the moment condition in part a. of Theorem 1:

$$E[\gamma(X, V) - Y|X, Z] = 0 \quad (1.6)$$

The equation above is equivalent to a non-parametric instrumental variables (NPIV) moment condition in which  $V$  is the vector of endogenous regressors,  $X$  is a vector of exogenous regressors, and  $Z$  is a vector of instruments. Suppose  $\hat{\gamma}$  solves an empirical analogue of the moment condition (1.6). In a second step Theorem 1 suggests we estimate the conditional average structural function by:

$$\bar{y}(x_1|x_2) \approx \hat{E}[\hat{\gamma}(x_1, V)|X = x_2]$$

where ‘ $\hat{E}$ ’ denotes some empirical analogue of the conditional expectation. The inequality 1.4 implies that if  $\hat{\gamma}$  satisfies the population moment condition (1.6) with small error (in a mean-squared sense), then  $E[\hat{\gamma}(x_1, V)|X = x_2]$  is close to the conditional average potential outcome  $\bar{y}(x_1|x_2)$ . If, in addition,  $E[\hat{\gamma}(x_1, V)|X = x_2]$  is close to the sample analogue  $\hat{E}[\hat{\gamma}(x_1, V)|X = x_2]$ , then the latter provides a good estimate of the conditional average potential outcome. This motivates our estimator in Section 3.

Assumptions 1, 2 and 4.i imply well-posedness in the sense of 1.4. However, without Assumption 4.ii the estimation of the conditional expectation  $E[\hat{\gamma}(x_1, V)|X = x_2]$  may, in a sense, represent a second source of ill-posedness. This is because in order for  $\hat{\gamma}$  to satisfy the population moment condition 1.6 up to a desired precision,  $\hat{\gamma}$  may have to have a mean-squared norm greater than some large quantity, with the lower bound on the norm going to infinity as the desired precision increases. If the norm of  $\hat{\gamma}$  is large then it is more difficult to obtain precise estimates of its conditional mean, i.e., the estimate  $\hat{E}[\hat{\gamma}(x_1, V)|X = x_2]$  may be far from  $E[\hat{\gamma}(x_1, V)|X = x_2]$ . In short there may be a trade-off between two competing concerns: that of finding a  $\hat{\gamma}$  that comes close to satisfying the population moment condition 1.6, and that of precisely estimating the conditional mean of that  $\hat{\gamma}$ . Assumption 4.i ensures that we avoid this trade-off because it suggests that there exists a  $\hat{\gamma}$  with bounded norm that exactly satisfies the moment condition 1.6. Thus if we assume both Assumptions 4.i and 4.ii then both steps in our estimation problem are well-posed.

Note that one could also motivate an estimator based on part b. of Theorem 1. In particular one would first estimate the Radon-Nikodym derivative  $\frac{dF_{V|X=x_2}}{dF_{V|X=x_1}}(v)$ . Call this estimate  $\hat{f}(v, x_1, x_2)$ . one would then solve for  $\varphi$  in an empirical analogue of the equation

$$E[\varphi(X, x_2, Z)|X = x_1, V] = \hat{f}(V, x_1, x_2)$$

and plug the empirical solution  $\hat{\varphi}$  into an empirical analogue of the conditional expectation  $E[Y\hat{\varphi}(x_1, x_2, Z)|X = x_1]$ . In fact, one could combine both approaches and estimate  $E[\hat{\gamma}(x_1, V)\hat{\varphi}(x_1, x_2, Z)|X = x_1]$ , where  $\hat{\gamma}$  and  $\hat{\varphi}$  are

solutions to empirical moment conditions as described above.<sup>6</sup> However, we choose the method based only on the moment condition 1.6 in order to avoid estimating the Radon-Nikodym derivative.

## Relationship to Existing Identification Results

Our identification results are closely related to those in Miao *et al.* (2018). Our Assumptions 3.i and 3.ii play a similar role to the completeness assumptions in Conditions 2 and 3 of Miao *et al.* (2018). In fact, if either our Assumption 2 holds or their conditional independence restriction (f) holds, then their Conditions 2 and 3 are stronger than our Assumption 3.<sup>7</sup> Our Assumption 2 is equivalent to their restriction (f). Our characterization of the conditional average potential outcomes in Theorem 1 somewhat resembles their characterization of  $p(y|do(x))$ . Note that Miao *et al.* (2018) do not assume that  $U \perp\!\!\!\perp X|W^*$ . They equate  $p(y|do(x))$  with (for a binary  $Y$ ) the object  $E[E[Y|X = x, W^*]]$ . For this to equal the average potential outcome  $E[y_0(x, U)]$  one generally requires  $U \perp\!\!\!\perp X|W^*$ . Further, our Assumption 4.ii plays a similar role in part a. of our Theorem 1 to an existence condition in Theorem 1 of Miao *et al.* (2018) and they also show that their existence condition follows if a sequence of generalized Fourier coefficients declines sufficiently quickly.

However, our identification result differs from Miao *et al.* (2018) in key ways. Firstly, our analysis allows us to identify the conditional average or the conditional distribution of potential outcomes (conditional on assigned treatments  $X$ ). This allows us to identify a richer set of counterfactual objects, for example the average effect of treatment on the treated. Conditional effects are of primary interest in economic applications, for an example see our empirical application to the causal impact of grade retention. Furthermore, we introduce an additional existence condition, Assumption 4.ii, which is not necessary for identification but which implies the well-posedness of estimators based on our characterization of the conditional average structural function. Well-posedness is crucial for deriving fast and simple convergence rates that do not depend on a sieve-measure of ill-posedness.

Rokkanen (2015) gives conditions for identification in the setting of regression discontinuity design. Our Assumptions 3.i and 3.ii resemble but are weaker than the analogous Assumptions D.1 and C.2 in Rokkanen (2015). We require only  $L_2$ -completeness, compared to the bounded completeness in Assumptions D.2 and C.5 in Rokkanen (2015). Rokkanen (2015) applies the results of Hu & Schennach (2008) and correspondingly his Condition C.4 requires that the mis-measured perfect controls satisfy a normalization like mean- or median-unbiasedness.<sup>8</sup>

<sup>6</sup>If both Assumption 4.i and 4.ii hold then any population solutions  $\gamma$  and  $\varphi$  satisfy  $\bar{y}(x_1|x_2) = E[\gamma(x_1, V)\varphi(x_1, x_2, Z)|X = x_1]$ .

<sup>7</sup>In particular, under Assumption 2, our Assumption 3.i is weaker than the assumption  $E[\delta(V)|Z, X = x] = 0 \iff \delta(V) = 0$  which is analogous to the corresponding assumption in their paper.

<sup>8</sup>We conjecture that even under a failure of Assumption C.4 the identification results of Rokkanen (2015) are still valid, his work does not consider this possibility.

The reason that we do not require a normalization of the kind in Hu & Schennach (2008) is that their results apply for measurement error in treatments rather than just controls. Suppose that treatment variables are mis-measured in the following way: rather than observe the true treatments we instead observe the treatments multiplied by an unknown constant. In this case there is little hope of recovering a treatment effect without some normalization. Now suppose that the treatments are measured correctly and instead the controls are multiplied by an unknown constant. If the original controls and treatments satisfy an unconfoundedness assumption then so do the mis-measured controls and treatments. Therefore the mis-measurement is of no consequence and there is no need for a normalization. Our results show that this reasoning applies for more general and stochastic forms of measurement error.

## 2 Panel Models

The analysis in previous section applies to the model (1.1) which may apply in both cross-sectional and panel settings. In the previous section we are agnostic about the source of the proxy controls  $W$  and sub-vectors  $V$  and  $Z$ . In panel settings, observations from previous periods are a natural source of proxy controls. Loosely speaking, if the same factors explain the confounding in each period (there are time-invariant perfect controls), then treatment assignments in other periods are informative about the confounding. Thus we can form vectors  $V$  and  $Z$  using treatments (and possibly outcomes) from different periods. Then the conditional independence restrictions in Assumptions 1.i and 2 can be understood in terms of the serial dependence of the observables. In this section we specify some forms of serial dependence so that our conditional independence restrictions apply for corresponding choices of  $V$  and  $Z$ . In the panel case the order condition places restrictions on the number of time periods, we discuss this relationship later in this section.

In the panel setting, the data have a ‘time’ dimension and a ‘unit’ dimension. To apply our analysis in the panel case we rewrite the model (1.1) with time subscripts:

$$Y_t = y_{0,t}(X_t, U_t)$$

Then for each group there is an associated draw of the random variables  $(X_1, \dots, X_T)$ ,  $(U_1, \dots, U_T)$  and a resulting sequence of outcomes  $(Y_1, \dots, Y_T)$ . We assume that the data are iid across groups but not necessarily within groups. More precisely, we assume that draws of  $(X_1, \dots, X_T, U_1, \dots, U_T)$  are independent and identically distributed. However, within each group the random variables  $(X_t, U_t)$  may exhibit various forms of serial-dependence. Note that the specification above allows for dynamic models with feedback, for example if the treatments  $X_t$  includes lags of the outcome  $Y_t$ .

In the panel setting our goal is to identify and estimate causal objects of the form below for a particular value of  $t$ :

$$E[y_{0,t}(x_1, U_t) | X_t = x_2]$$



The above is the conditional average potential outcome at period  $t$  from treatment  $x_1$  conditional on assignment of treatment  $x_2$  at  $t$ . In this context Assumptions 1.i, 2.i and 2.ii state that:

$$\begin{aligned} U_t &\perp\!\!\!\perp (X_t, Z)|W^* \\ V &\perp\!\!\!\perp (X_t, Z)|W^* \end{aligned}$$

As we note in the previous section,  $U_t \perp\!\!\!\perp (X_t, Z)|W^*$  is equivalent to the combination of  $U_t \perp\!\!\!\perp X_t|W^*$  and  $U_t \perp\!\!\!\perp Z|(X_t, W^*)$ . Below we present two key cases in which the conditional independence restrictions above follow from more primitive conditions on the panel structure for appropriate choices of  $V$  and  $Z$ . We further discuss the plausibility of these conditions in the context of our second empirical application in Section 4 in which we use panel data to estimate counterfactual demands for food.

## Markov Treatment Assignments and Predetermination

Suppose we are interested in the conditional average structural function (equivalently, conditional average potential outcomes) at some fixed period  $t$ . Suppose that conditional on some (possibly period  $t$ -specific) latent variables  $\tilde{W}^*$ , the following conditional independence restriction holds:

$$U_t \perp\!\!\!\perp (X_1, \dots, X_t)|\tilde{W}^*$$

In words, the condition above states that the history of treatments up to and including period  $t$  is only related to potential outcomes through some factors  $\tilde{W}^*$ . If  $\tilde{W}^*$  is taken to represent some persistent latent factors, then the restriction is a non-parametric analogue of the ‘predetermination’ condition often employed in linear panel models. One justification for the assumption is as follows. Suppose we interpret  $\tilde{W}^*$  to contain all persistent factors in the potential outcomes. Then any remaining variation in  $U_t$  represents shocks to potential outcomes. In this case the assumption states that the history of treatments up to and including time  $t$  is uninformative about these shocks. However, the assumption allows for the possibility that shocks to potential outcomes impact (or, more generally, are associated with) future treatment assignments.

Let  $\lfloor t/2 \rfloor$  denote the largest natural number weakly less than half of  $t$ . Suppose that conditional on the latent variables  $\tilde{W}^*$ , the regressors satisfy a first-order Markov dependence structure at  $\lfloor t/2 \rfloor$ . Formally:

$$(X_1, \dots, X_{\lfloor t/2 \rfloor - 1}) \perp\!\!\!\perp (X_{\lfloor t/2 \rfloor + 1}, \dots, X_T)|(\tilde{W}^*, X_{\lfloor t/2 \rfloor})$$

That is, conditional on the latent variables  $\tilde{W}^*$ , the treatment assignments for periods strictly prior to the given period  $\lfloor t/2 \rfloor$  are only related to treatments after  $\lfloor t/2 \rfloor$  through the treatment at  $\lfloor t/2 \rfloor$ . In this case suppose we set  $V$  and  $Z$  as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} V &= (X_1, \dots, X_{\lfloor t/2 \rfloor}) \\ Z &= (X_{\lfloor t/2 \rfloor}, \dots, X_{t-1}) \end{aligned}$$

Let the perfect controls  $W^*$  consist not only of the latent factors  $\tilde{W}^*$  but also the treatment assignment at  $\lfloor t/2 \rfloor$ . That is:

$$W^* = (\tilde{W}^*, X_{\lfloor t/2 \rfloor})$$

Note that we treat  $X_{\lfloor t/2 \rfloor}$  as an observable perfect control, we therefore include it in both  $V$  and  $Z$ . Given the Markov structure, conditioning on the treatment at period  $\lfloor t/2 \rfloor$  removes the dependence between  $V$  and  $Z$ . Setting  $V$ ,  $Z$  and  $W^*$  as above and assuming the predetermination and Markov conditions apply, one can see that that Assumptions 1.i and 2 hold. That is:

$$\begin{aligned} U_t &\perp\!\!\!\perp (X_t, Z) | W^* \\ V &\perp\!\!\!\perp (X_t, Z) | W^* \end{aligned}$$

## Markov Treatment Assignments and Heterogeneity

We now give conditions under which  $Z$  and  $V$  may be composed not only of treatment assignments from periods other than  $t$ , but also the outcomes from other periods. We strengthen the conditional independence restriction from the previous subsection:

$$U_t \perp\!\!\!\perp (X_1, \dots, X_t, U_1, \dots, U_{t-1}) | \tilde{W}^*$$

The above states that any dependence between treatment assignments in all periods up to and including  $t$  and heterogeneity in potential outcomes in all periods up to and including  $t$ , is explained by the (possibly period- $t$  specific) factors  $\tilde{W}^*$ . Recall from the first section that we assume that for any  $x$  and any  $u_1 \neq u_2$  that  $y_{0,t}(x, u_1) \neq y_{0,t}(x, u_2)$ . Thus the above implies:

$$U_t \perp\!\!\!\perp (X_1, \dots, X_t, Y_1, \dots, Y_{t-1}) | \tilde{W}^*$$

We suppose that conditional on the latent variables  $\tilde{W}^*$ , both the treatment assignments and heterogeneity are jointly first-order Markov process. Formally, conditional on  $(\tilde{W}^*, X_{\lfloor t/2 \rfloor}, U_{\lfloor t/2 \rfloor})$ :

$$(X_1, \dots, X_{\lfloor t/2 \rfloor - 1}, U_1, \dots, U_{\lfloor t/2 \rfloor - 1}) \perp\!\!\!\perp (X_{\lfloor t/2 \rfloor + 1}, \dots, X_t, U_{\lfloor t/2 \rfloor + 1}, \dots, U_t)$$

The condition above implies that conditional on  $(\tilde{W}^*, X_{\lfloor t/2 \rfloor}, Y_{\lfloor t/2 \rfloor})$ :

$$(X_1, \dots, X_{\lfloor t/2 \rfloor}, Y_1, \dots, Y_{\lfloor t/2 \rfloor}) \perp\!\!\!\perp (X_{\lfloor t/2 \rfloor}, \dots, X_t, Y_{\lfloor t/2 \rfloor}, \dots, Y_{t-1})$$

Suppose we set  $V$ ,  $Z$  and  $W^*$  as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} V &= (X_1, \dots, X_{\lfloor t/2 \rfloor}, Y_1, \dots, Y_{\lfloor t/2 \rfloor}) \\ Z &= (X_{\lfloor t/2 \rfloor}, \dots, X_{t-1}, Y_{\lfloor t/2 \rfloor}, \dots, Y_{t-1}) \\ W^* &= (\tilde{W}^*, X_{\lfloor t/2 \rfloor}, Y_{\lfloor t/2 \rfloor}) \end{aligned}$$

Then Assumptions 1.i and 2 hold:

$$\begin{aligned} U_t &\perp\!\!\!\perp (X_t, Z) | W^* \\ V &\perp\!\!\!\perp (X_t, Z) | W^* \end{aligned}$$

## The Order Condition in the Panel Case

Assumption 3 consists of two  $L_2$ -completeness conditions. As discussed in Section 1, these conditions can be understood as instrumental relevance conditions: conditioning on  $X_t$ , both  $V$  and  $Z$  must be relevant instruments for the perfect controls  $W^*$ .

In the Markov treatment assignment case discussed above, both  $V$  and  $Z$  are likely to be strongly associated with the perfect controls  $W^* = (\tilde{W}^*, X_{\lfloor t/2 \rfloor})$ . Both  $Z$  and  $V$  contain  $X_{\lfloor t/2 \rfloor}$  and in addition some treatment assignments for periods other than  $t$ . Recall that by the predetermination condition  $\tilde{W}^*$  are latent variables that explain the confounding between  $(X_1, \dots, X_t)$  and  $U_t$ . If there is confounding in each period that is explained by the presence of those same variables  $\tilde{W}^*$  then each component of  $Z$  and  $V$  ought to be informative about  $\tilde{W}^*$ .

Note that the larger the time dimension  $T$ , the more numerous are available treatments from different periods from which one may form  $Z$  and  $V$ .  $Z$  and  $V$  are then more likely to satisfy Assumption 3. As we discuss in Section 1, it is prudent to require that an order condition hold, i.e., that  $V$  and  $Z$  each be of a weakly larger dimension than  $W^*$ . In the first-order Markov treatment assignment example above when treatments are scalar,  $Z$  is of length  $t - \lfloor t/2 \rfloor$  and  $V$  is of length  $\lfloor t/2 \rfloor$ . Therefore, the order condition requires that  $\tilde{W}^*$  be of length at most  $\lfloor t/2 \rfloor - 1$ . If we are interested in the conditional average structural function at the final period  $T$  then  $\tilde{W}^*$  must be of length no greater than  $\lfloor T/2 \rfloor - 1$ .

## 3 Estimation

In this section we describe our estimation method and prove its consistency. The key step in the procedure corresponds to penalized sieve minimum distance (PSMD) estimation. PSMD estimators and some of their properties are discussed in Chen & Pouzo (2012), Chen & Pouzo (2015), and others. Because the estimation procedure is of the “sieve” type, the practitioner must choose an appropriate sequence of linear sieve spaces.

Our estimator can be applied in panel settings and with only cross-sectional data. To make clear this generality we return to the notation in Section 1 in which we suppress time-subscripts. Thus in the panel case the observables  $X$  and  $Y$  should be understood to represent observations from a fixed period  $t$  and the estimand  $\bar{y}(x_1|x_2)$  should be understood to represent the conditional average structural function for that same fixed time-period.

Let  $\{(Y_i, X_i, Z_i, V_i)\}_{i=1}^n$  be a sample of  $n$  observations of the variables  $Y$ ,  $X$ ,  $Z$ , and  $V$ . Let  $K_n$  be an increasing sequence of natural numbers. For each  $n$  let  $\Phi_n$  be a length- $K_n$  column vector of basis functions defined on the support of  $(X, V)$ . In a first stage the practitioner estimates the vector of regression functions  $\Pi_n$  defined by:

$$\Pi_n(x, z) = E[\Phi_n(X, V) | X = x, Z = z]$$

The practitioner also estimates the vector of regression functions  $\alpha_n$  defined by:

$$\alpha_n(x_1, x_2) = E[\Phi_n(x_1, V)|X = x_2]$$

And finally, the practitioner estimates the function  $g$  given by:

$$g(x, z) = E[Y|X = x, Z = z]$$

Denote the estimates of  $\Pi_n$ ,  $\alpha_n$  and  $g$  by  $\hat{\Pi}_n$ ,  $\hat{\alpha}_n$  and  $\hat{g}$  respectively. The estimation of each of these functions can be carried out using a standard non-parametric regression method like local-linear regression, polynomial-series regression or Nadaraya-Watson. For our empirical application we use ridge regression to estimate each of these functions with the penalty parameters chosen by cross-validation. For details, including explicit formulas for the ridge estimators see Section 4.

Let  $P$  be some penalty function (for example the  $l_2$  penalty for ridge). Again, let  $\lambda_n$  be a positive scalar penalty parameter. In the second stage, the researcher evaluates a vector of coefficients  $\hat{\theta} \in \Theta_n \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{K_n}$  that minimize the penalized least squares objective below:

$$\hat{\theta} \in \arg \min_{\theta \in \Theta_n} \left[ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (\hat{g}_i - \hat{\Pi}'_{n,i} \theta)^2 + \lambda_n P(\theta) \right] \quad (3.1)$$

The estimate of the conditional average structural function is then given by:

$$\bar{y}(x_1|x_2) \approx \hat{\alpha}_n(x_1, x_2)' \hat{\theta} \quad (3.2)$$

For notational convenience all the penalized least-squares regressions above use the same penalty parameter  $\lambda_n$ . In practice one may choose different values of  $\lambda_n$  for each regression. In fact, in our empirical application we choose the penalty parameter separately using cross-validation for every regression.

Note that for certain choices of the penalty function  $P$  and coefficient space  $\Theta_n$ , the penalized least squares problem that is used to define  $\hat{\theta}$  has an analytical solution. This is true, for example, if  $\Theta_n = \mathbb{R}^{K_n}$  and the squared  $l_2$  penalty is used (i.e.,  $P(\theta) = \theta' \theta$ ). Therefore, depending on the regression method used in the first stage our procedure may not require any kind of numerical optimization.

## Consistency and Convergence Rate

Below we provide simple high-level conditions that, when combined with Assumptions 1, 2, 3 and 4 in Section 1, guarantee consistency and a convergence rate for our estimator. The convergence rate does not depend on any ‘sieve-measure of ill-posedness’ (Chen & Pouzo (2012)). The well-posedness of our problem depends crucially on Assumption 4.i.

In the assumptions below, ‘ess sup’ denotes the essential supremum over the random variable  $X$ . To be precise, for a scalar-valued function  $\delta$  defined on the support of  $X$ ,  $\text{ess sup } \delta(X)$  is the smallest scalar that exceeds that exceeds  $\delta(X)$  with probability 1.

**Assumption 5.** i. There exists a sequence  $\{\theta_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$  with  $\theta_n \in \Theta_n$  for each  $n$  and a sequence  $\kappa_n \downarrow 0$  so that:

$$\text{ess sup } E \left[ \left( g(X, Z) - \Pi_n(X, Z)' \theta_n \right)^2 \middle| X \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} = O(\kappa_n)$$

ii. There exists a sequence  $\eta_n \downarrow 0$  and constants  $c_1, c_2 > 0$  so that:

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left( g(X_i, Z_i) - \hat{\Pi}_n(X_i, Z_i)' \theta_n \right)^2 \leq c_1 E \left[ \left( g(X_i, Z_i) - \Pi_n(X_i, Z_i)' \theta_n \right)^2 \right] + O_p(\eta_n)$$

and uniformly over  $\theta \in \Theta_n$ :

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left( g(X_i, Z_i) - \hat{\Pi}_n(X_i, Z_i)' \theta \right)^2 \geq c_2 E \left[ \left( g(X_i, Z_i) - \Pi_n(X_i, Z_i)' \theta \right)^2 \right] + O_p(\eta_n)$$

iii. There exists a constant  $c_3 > 0$  so that uniformly over  $\theta \in \Theta_n$

$$c_3 E \left[ \left( g(X, Z) - \Pi_n(X, Z)' \theta \right)^2 \right] \leq \text{ess sup } E \left[ \left( g(X, Z) - \Pi_n(X, Z)' \theta \right)^2 \middle| X \right]$$

iv. There exists a sequence  $\delta_n \downarrow 0$  so that  $\lambda_n P(\theta_n) = O(\delta_n)$  v. Let  $\alpha_n(x_1, x_2) = E[\Phi_n(x_1, V) | X = x_2]$ , there exists a sequence  $b_n \downarrow 0$  so that uniformly over  $x_1$  and  $x_2$  in the support of  $X$ :

$$|\hat{\alpha}_n(x_1, x_2)' \hat{\theta} - \alpha_n(x_1, x_2)' \hat{\theta}| \leq O_p(b_n)$$

Where  $\hat{\theta}$  is treated as non-random in the expectation on the LHS above.

Theorem 2 below gives a convergence rate for our estimator in terms of the rates given in Assumption 5.

**Theorem 1.** *Suppose Assumptions 1, 2, 3, 4.i and 5 hold, then uniformly over  $F_X$ -almost all  $x_1$  and  $x_2$ :*

$$|\bar{y}(x_1 | x_2) - \hat{\alpha}_n(x_1, x_2)' \hat{\theta}| = O_p(\kappa_n + \eta_n + \delta_n + b_n)$$

Assumptions 5.ii, 5.iii and 5.iv are used in the proof of Lemma 1 in Appendix B and do not enter into the proof of Theorem 2 otherwise. Thus one could assume the conclusion of Lemma 1 directly or derive it under some other set of conditions. Assumption 5.ii appears elsewhere in the literature, for example 5.ii corresponds to Assumptions 3.3.i and 3.3.ii in Chen & Pouzo (2012). Note that in 5.ii one could replace the parameter space  $\Theta_n$  with any space that must contain  $\hat{\theta}$  with probability approaching 1. Chen & Pouzo (2012) provide primitive conditions for their Assumptions 3.3.i and 3.3.ii in Appendix C when the first-stage regressions are carried out using series least squares. Note that Assumption C.2.ii in Chen & Pouzo (2012) is implied by our Assumption 5.i. Therefore, if the other conditions for their Lemma C.2 hold, their results give that Assumption 5.ii holds with  $\eta_n = O(\frac{K_n}{n} + \kappa_n)$ .

Assumption 5.iii is a norm-equivalence assumption, and can be established by placing smoothness restrictions on the function:

$$E \left[ (g(X, Z) - \Pi_n(X, Z)' \theta)^2 \middle| X = x \right]$$

Assumption 5.iv states that the penalty parameter  $\lambda_n$  goes to zero sufficiently quickly. If  $P(\theta_n)$  is asymptotically bounded then Assumption 5.iv follows if  $\lambda_n = O(b_n)$ .

Assumption 5.v ensures that the vector of first stage regression estimators  $\hat{\alpha}_n$  converges sufficiently quickly. It could be replaced by the stronger condition that  $|\hat{\alpha}_n(x_1, x_2)' \theta - \alpha_n(x_1, x_2)' \theta|$  converge at rate  $b_n$  uniformly over  $\theta \in \Theta_n$  as well as over  $F_X$ -almost all  $x_1$  and  $x_2$ .

The approximation condition 5.i is somewhat non-standard, it differs from the approximation conditions in standard non-parametric regression because the researcher does not choose the basis functions  $\Pi_n(X, Z)$  directly. Furthermore, 5.i differs from approximation conditions in the NPIV literature (for example in Ai & Chen (2003)) because it does not specify a rate of approximation of the solution  $\gamma$  to the moment condition 1.6 using the basis functions  $\Phi_n$ . One could derive a rate at which  $\gamma$  can be approximated using  $\Phi_n$  by placing smoothness conditions on  $\gamma$ , in turn this would allow us to derive a rate  $\kappa_n$  in 5.i. However, this is undesirable because  $\gamma$  does not have a clear structural interpretation. Instead, we use the following proposition to bound the rate in Assumption 5.i by the rate at which the basis functions  $\Phi_n$  can approximate the Radon-Nikodym derivative  $\frac{dF_{V|Z=z, X=x}}{dF_{V|X=x}}$ . Recall that if  $V$  admits a conditional pdf this is simply equal to  $f(v|z, x)/f(v|x)$  where  $f(v|z, x)$  is the density of  $V$  at  $v$  given  $Z = z$  and  $X = x$ , and  $f(v|x)$  is the density of  $V$  at  $v$  given  $X = x$ .

**Proposition 1.** *Suppose Assumption 4 holds and that the Radon-Nikodym derivative  $\frac{dF_{V|Z=z, X=x}}{dF_{V|X=x}}$  exists. Suppose that uniformly over  $(z, x)$  in the support of  $(Z, X)$ , that  $\frac{dF_{V|Z=z, X=x}}{dF_{V|X=x}}(v)$  can be approximated by linear combinations of the basis functions  $\Phi_n(\cdot, x)$  with mean squared error rate  $\kappa_n$ . Formally:*

$$\inf_{\beta \in \mathbb{R}^n} E \left[ \left( \frac{dF_{V|Z=z, X=x}}{dF_{V|X=x}}(V) - \Phi_n(V, x)' \beta \right)^2 \middle| X = x \right] = O(\kappa_n)$$

*Uniformly over  $F_X$ -almost all  $x$ . Let  $\Theta_n$  be the subset of  $\mathbb{R}^{K_n}$  that contains those vectors  $\theta \in \Theta_n$  so that  $E \left[ (\Phi_n(V, x)' \beta_n)^2 \middle| X = x \right] \leq D$  (where  $D$  is the constant in Assumption 4.ii), then:*

$$\inf_{\theta \in \Theta_n} \text{esssup} E \left[ (g(X, Z) - \Pi_n(X, Z)' \theta)^2 \middle| X \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} = O(\kappa_n)$$

*Note that the above applies uniformly over all  $g$  that satisfy Assumption 4.*

Numerous results in the literature provide uniform approximation rates of different basis functions under smoothness conditions on the function to be approximated. For example, if  $\frac{dF_{V|Z=z, X=x}}{dF_{V|X=x}}$  is of Holder smoothness class  $\sigma$  in its arguments  $(v, x, z) \in \mathbb{R}^d$ , then it can be approximated at rate  $\kappa_n = K_n^{-\min\{\sigma, \sigma_0\}/d}$  by either a product basis of B-splines, local polynomial partition series, or CDV wavelets, each of a fixed order  $\sigma_0$ . See for example, DeVore & Lorentz (1993). Note that the Proposition 1 requires that Assumption 4.ii hold, whereas Theorem 1 requires only Assumption 4.i.

## 4 Empirical Applications

We apply our methodology to real data. In order to emphasize the applicability of our approach to both cross-sectional and panel models we present two separate empirical settings. In our first application we use cross-sectional variation to estimate causal effects, and in the second application we exploit the panel structure of the data.

Recall from Section 3 that to apply our estimation procedure one must choose a set of basis functions and a number of non-parametric regression methods. We constrain ourselves to use the same regression methods in both of our applications. We perform every non-parametric regression discussed in Section 3 using sieve ridge regression with the penalty parameter chosen by 5-fold cross-validation. The penalty function used in the penalized least squares problem 3.1 is the  $l_2$  penalty (with the variables appropriately scaled) so that this least squares problem also amounts to ridge regression and again, the penalty parameter is chosen by 5-fold cross validation.

We cannot use exactly the same sieve basis functions in both applications because the dimensions of the relevant variables differ. However, we generate the basis functions in the same way. First of all, the vectors of basis functions  $\Phi_n(v, x)$  is separable in  $v$  and  $x$  the following sense. Let  $\rho_n$  be a vector of functions on the support of  $V$  and let  $\chi_n$  be a vector defined on the supports of  $X$  respectively. Then:

$$\Phi_n(v, x) = \rho_n(v) \otimes \chi_n(x)$$

Where ‘ $\otimes$ ’ above is the Kronecker product. We then let  $\rho_n$  and  $\chi_n$  consist of the first 4-order power series of the components of  $v$  and  $x$  respectively. So letting  $v_l$  denote the  $l^{th}$  components of  $v$  which is of length  $L$ ,  $\rho_n(v)$  is the vector of functions of the form  $v_1^{a_1} \times v_2^{a_2} \times \dots \times v_L^{a_L}$  where  $a_1, \dots, a_L$  are positive integers with  $\sum_{l=1}^L a_l \leq 5$ . We define  $\chi_n(x)$  analogously for  $x$ , likewise we define  $\Psi_n(x, z)$  analogously with the vector  $v$  replaced by the vector  $(x, z)$ .

The expressions below give the ridge regression formulas we use for  $\hat{\Pi}_n$  and  $\hat{\alpha}_n$ . We use the separability of the bases so that to evaluate each of  $\hat{\Pi}_n$  and  $\hat{\alpha}_n$  we need only perform as many regressions as there are components of  $\rho_n$  rather than as many as the components of  $\Phi_n(v, x)$ . For a vector  $v$ , let  $[v]_l$  denote its  $l^{th}$  component. We perform the following ridge regressions for each natural

number  $l$  less than the length of  $\rho_n$ :

$$\hat{\beta}_{\pi,l} = \hat{\Sigma}_{l,n}^{-1} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \Psi_n(X_i, Z_i)' [\rho_n(V_i)]_l$$

$$\hat{\beta}_{\alpha,l} = \hat{R}_{l,n}^{-1} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \chi_n(X_i)' [\rho_n(V_i)]_l$$

Where  $\hat{\Sigma}_{l,n}$  and  $\hat{R}_{l,n}$  are defined as below:

$$\hat{\Sigma}_{l,n} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \Psi_n(X_i, Z_i) \Psi_n(X_i, Z_i)' + \lambda_{\Sigma,l,n} I$$

$$\hat{R}_{l,n} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \chi_n(X_i) \chi_n(X_i)' + \lambda_{R,l,n} I$$

Where  $I$  is the identity matrix of appropriate dimension and  $\lambda_{\Sigma,l,n}$  and  $\lambda_{R,l,n}$  are regression-specific penalty parameters which we choose by cross-validation. Let  $\hat{B}_{\pi}$  be the matrix whose  $l^{th}$  column is  $\hat{\beta}_{\pi,l}$  and  $\hat{B}_{\alpha}$  with  $l^{th}$  column  $\hat{\beta}_{\alpha,l}$ . Then:

$$\hat{\Pi}_n(x, z) = [B'_{\pi} \Psi_n(x, z)] \otimes \chi_n(x)$$

$$\hat{\alpha}_n(x_1, x_2) = [B'_{\alpha} \chi_n(x_2)] \otimes \chi_n(x_1)$$

The ridge estimator  $\hat{g}(x, z)$  is defined by:

$$\hat{g}(x, z) = \Psi_n(x, z)' \hat{\Sigma}_{g,n}^{-1} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \Psi_n(X_i, Z_i)' Y_i$$

Where  $\hat{\Sigma}_{g,n}$  is identical to  $\hat{\Sigma}_{l,n}$  but with a different penalty parameter which is again chosen by cross-validation.

## Causal Impact of Grade Retention

Fruehwirth *et al.* (2016) examine the causal effect of grade retention (that is, being made to repeat a particular grade level) on the cognitive development of US students. They use data from the ECLS-K panel study which contains panel data on the early cognitive development of US children. We use our methods to examine the effect of grade retention on the cognitive outcomes of children in the 1998-1999 kindergarten school year using cleaned data available with their paper. Following Fruehwirth *et al.* (2016), we take our outcome variables to be the tests scores in reading, math and science when aged approximately eleven. Also in line with Fruehwirth *et al.* (2016) our treatments are indicators for retention in kindergarten, ‘early’ (in first or second grade) and ‘late’ (in third or fourth grade). The cleaned data from Fruehwirth *et al.* (2016) contains only students who are retained at most once in the sample period and no students



who skip a grade. For more details on the sample selection see Fruehwirth *et al.* (2016).

Estimation of the causal effect of grade retention is challenging because students that repeat a grade typically do so due to poor academic performance. Poor academic performance in the past may be associated with poor cognitive ability in the future, with retention status held fixed. As such, the average future cognitive performance of the retained students may be worse than their peers under the counterfactual in which no student is retained.

The ECLS-K dataset contains a number of covariates that can act as proxies for the trajectory of cognitive ability. In particular, the dataset contains scores that measure a student’s behavioral and social skills in kindergarten as well as the student’s performance in a range of cognitive tests at different ages. To account for the confounding Fruehwirth *et al.* (2016) estimate a latent factor model with a particular structure. They assume that all confounding between grade retention and potential future cognitive test scores is due to the presence of three independent latent factors that they interpret as cognitive ability, behavioral ability and general ability. Fruehwirth *et al.* (2016) then use test scores to recover the distribution of the latent factors and the factor loadings. They assume that given the latent factors, heterogeneity in potential outcomes and in components of the selection decision are independent. They assume a particular multiplicative structure between the factors (which are time-invariant) and time-specific factor loadings in both their outcome and selection equations.

In our approach,  $W^*$  plays a role analogous to the latent factors in the analysis of Fruehwirth *et al.* (2016), and our approach is valid under similar assumptions about independence in the noise of our test scores. However, we do not assume any particular factor structure, in particular we do not assume any multiplicative structure in the factor model for the test scores (nor in any components of a selection equation).

We let the set of proxies  $V$  contain the student’s scores on the behavioral and social skills tests in kindergarten and  $Z$  contain the kindergarten cognitive test scores. Fruehwirth *et al.* (2016) note that these first period scores are from tests taken prior to any retention (those already retained were dropped from the sample). The unobserved factors for which we wish to control  $W^*$  are taken to measure the student’s classroom success in kindergarten.

Recall that our Assumption 2 essentially requires that both the test scores  $Z$  and the behavioral scores  $V$  would each be relevant instruments for  $W^*$ .  $Z$  directly (but likely with bias and noise) measures academic success and so it seems reasonable to assume that  $Z$  and  $W^*$  are closely associated.  $V$  measures behavioral and social skills which presumably play a role in the child’s ability to concentrate and participate in the classroom which determines the unobserved academic success  $W^*$ . Moreover, the child’s behavior and social ability may reflect the general cognitive development of the child which is further informative about  $W^*$ . Each of  $Z$  and  $V$  are three dimensional, thus an order condition in this context would require  $W^*$  comprise at most three latent factors.

Our conditional independence restriction Assumption 2.i is:

$$U \perp\!\!\!\perp (X, Z) | W^*$$

In this context the assumption states that a student’s kindergarten test scores and retention status are only related to the student’s potential age-eleven test scores through the mutual dependence on classroom success. This assumption may be justified by the following arguments. Conditional on a child’s classroom success  $W^*$ , we suppose that remaining variation in test scores  $Z$  reflects factors like the child’s mood on the day of the test which are unrelated to the child’s potential future test scores. Further, suppose the treatment  $X$  is decided by the child’s teachers and parents who base their decision on their perception of the child’s academic performance and on their own attitudes to grade retention. We assume that, conditional on the child’s actual kindergarten classroom success  $W^*$ , these attitudes towards retention are unrelated to the potential academic trajectory of the child. The perception of academic success is again an error-prone measure of a function of  $W^*$ . The noise in this measure may be explained by random increases or decreases in the child’s grades or average test scores which, conditional on actual success  $W^*$  may be explained by exogenous factors like a random period of illness or a particularly interesting insect distracting the child from a work assignment.

Our conditional independence restriction Assumption 2.ii is:

$$V \perp\!\!\!\perp (X, Z) | W^*$$

That is, the student’s behavioral scores are only related to cognitive test scores and treatment assignment through the mutual association with the student’s underlying academic success in kindergarten. Note that we do not require retention status  $X$  and test scores  $Z$  be independent of each other, even conditional on the underlying academic success  $W^*$ . This assumption holds if we assume (much as in the discussion of Assumption 2.i above) that  $X$  and  $Z$  depend only on the student’s underlying academic success  $W^*$  and some noise that is independent of the scores in the behavioral tests in  $V$ . We emphasize that the behavioral test scores in  $V$  may be highly correlated with the treatment status  $X$  and scores in  $Z$ , we simply assume that this dependence is eliminated once we control for the underlying classroom success  $W^*$ .

We apply the estimation method set out in Section 3 to estimate average effects of retention at different grades. Table 1 below presents our results, and corresponds roughly to Table 4 in Fruehwirth *et al.* (2016).

We estimate that retention in kindergarten and in first or second grade raises the average scores for reading, math and science for those students who were in fact retained at these ages. In other words, the average effect of treatment on the treated (ATT) is estimated to be positive for retention in kindergarten and for early retention. However, of these positive effects only the ATT of kindergarten retention on science scores is statistically significant from zero at the 90% level.<sup>9</sup> We estimate that the test scores in math and science of those

<sup>9</sup>In the present draft we have yet to give conditions for asymptotic validity of the  $t$ -test with boot-strapped standard errors in this setting.

Table 1: Effects of Grade Retention on Cognitive Performance

## (a) Reading Ability

$n = 1998$		<b>Observed retention status:</b>			
<b>Difference from non-retention:</b>	Not retained	Retained kindergarten	Retained early	Retained late	
Retained kindergarten	-0.063 (0.103)	0.144 (0.171)	0.023 (0.276)	0.166 (0.165)	
Retained early	-0.125 (0.091)	0.295 (0.247)	0.132 (0.211)	0.024 (0.149)	
Retained late	-0.234 (0.140)	-0.803 (0.588)	-0.949 (0.638)	0.143 (0.173)	

## (b) Math Ability

$n = 1999$		<b>Observed retention status:</b>			
<b>Difference from non-retention:</b>	Not retained	Retained kindergarten	Retained early	Retained late	
Retained kindergarten	-0.087 (0.127)	0.198 (0.202)	0.183 (0.287)	0.067 (0.153)	
Retained early	-0.149 (0.094)	0.331 (0.276)	0.301 (0.255)	0.002 (0.141)	
Retained late	-0.235 (0.334)	-1.548 (1.102)	-1.481 (1.102)	-0.085 (0.143)	

## (c) Science Ability

$n = 1999$		<b>Observed retention status:</b>			
<b>Difference from non-retention:</b>	Not retained	Retained kindergarten	Retained early	Retained late	
Retained kindergarten	0.030 (0.196)	0.645 (0.368)	0.349 (0.436)	0.161 (0.234)	
Retained early	-0.165 (0.182)	0.803 (0.473)	0.542 (0.400)	0.173 (0.242)	
Retained late	-0.656 (0.514)	-1.931 (1.911)	-1.444 (1.982)	-0.063 (0.256)	

The results of running our proxy control method to estimate treatment effects for groups with different treatment statuses.  $n$  is the number of observations, this differs slightly between the tables because for some individuals the outcome cognitive scores are only available for a subset of reading, math and science. Numbers in parentheses are estimated standard errors for the numbers above. The standard errors were calculated using nonparametric bootstrap, with 500 bootstrap samples. To be precise, we re-sample the data with replacement 500 times, and for each of these 500 bootstrap samples we reevaluate the estimator with the penalty parameters fixed at the values used to achieve the central estimates (i.e., we do not recalculate penalty parameters on each bootstrap sample). The standard error is then the square-root of the variance of the estimates over the bootstrap samples.

retained in third or fourth grade were lowered by that retention and reading scores raised. However none of these estimates is significant.

The first column in each table gives the counterfactual effects of retention at different ages for those students who were not retained at any of the ages covered in our data. In all but one of these cases we estimate a negative effect. The sole exception is the effect of retention in kindergarten on those not retained for which we estimate a very small (and not statistically significant) positive effect.

In all, these results paint a more positive picture of schools' retention policies than those of Fruehwirth *et al.* (2016). They find significant negative effects on reading and math scores from retention in kindergarten and in the first or second grade on those actually retained at these grade levels. They do not present results for the science test score outcomes. For those retained in third or fourth grade they estimate a positive average effect of treatment on the treated for reading and negative for math but neither are significant. Perhaps surprisingly, Fruehwirth *et al.* (2016) estimate that the students who are not retained would benefit in both reading and math from being retained in kindergarten, in first or second grade, and in third or fourth grade in some cases. In general, their results suggest that those who are retained suffer as a result and those who are not retained would benefit from it. By contrast, we find a mix of positive and negative effects of retention on the retained that vary with the timing of retention, and which are generally not statistically significant, but we find that those students who were not retained would be made worse off by it on average.

## Structural Engel Curve for Food

A household's Engel curve for a particular class of good captures the relationship between the share of the household's budget spent on that class and the total expenditure of the household. An Engel curve is 'structural' if it captures the effect of an exogenous change in total expenditure. Imagine an ideal experiment in which the household's total expenditure is chosen by a researcher using a random number generator and the household then chooses how to allocate that total expenditure between different classes of goods. Then the resulting relationship between the total expenditure and budget share is a structural Engel curve.

A nonparametric regression of the budget share spent on food and the total expenditure spent on certain classes of goods is unlikely to represent the average structural Engel curve for food. This is because total expenditure is chosen by the household and thus depends upon the household's underlying consumption preferences, but these same preferences partially determine the household's expenditure on food.

We estimate average structural Engel curves for food using data from the Panel Study of Income Dynamics (PSID). The PSID study follows US households over a number years and record expenditure on various classes of goods. We use ten periods of data from the surveys carried out every two years between 1999 and 2017 inclusive. We drop all households whose household heads are not married or cohabiting and drop all households for which we lack the full ten

periods of data for all the variables included in our analysis. This leaves us with a sample of 840 households. The PSID does not directly measure total household expenditures so we take as the total expenditure the sums of expenditures on food (both at home and away from home), housing, utilities, transportation, education, childcare and healthcare. The Engel curves we estimate are for the expenditure share of food at home.

We apply the approach to identification with fixed- $T$  panels set out in Section 2, in particular the Markov treatment assignment and predetermination case. Let  $X_t$  denote the total expenditure in period  $t$ , which is our treatment of interest in this setting. We aim to estimate the average and conditional average structural Engel curve for period  $T$ . Let  $\tilde{W}^*$  consist of factors that capture heterogeneity in household preferences. Our Markov assumption is formally stated as the following conditional independence relation:

$$(X_1, \dots, X_{t-1}) \perp\!\!\!\perp (X_{t+1}, \dots, X_T) | (X_t, \tilde{W}^*)$$

In words, we assume that total expenditure in the past and in the future are only related through the expenditure today and the household's consumption preferences. Conditioning on today's expenditure  $X_t$  is important because the even conditioning on preferences household expenditure may still be serially correlated because past expenditure runs down the household's asset position and thus reduces assets available to be spent in future. Furthermore the total expenditure may depend on wages and labor supply decisions which may also be serially correlated even controlling for  $\tilde{W}^*$ . We suppose that the remaining persistence in assets and wages, (and therefore in total expenditure) is controlled for by conditioning on current total expenditure.

The assumption of predetermination at time  $T$  is formally stated as:

$$U_T \perp\!\!\!\perp (X_1, \dots, X_T) | \tilde{W}^*$$

Here  $U_T$  represents period- $T$ -specific variation in the household's tendency to allocate a percentage of total expenditure onto consumption of food at home. Thus the above states that time-varying preferences for spending money on food are only related to the history of total expenditure through the mutual association with the underlying time-invariant preferences of the household  $\tilde{W}^*$ .


Given these assumptions we set  $V$  and  $Z$  in line with the suggestions in Section 2:

$$\begin{aligned} V &= (X_1, \dots, X_5) \\ Z &= (X_5, \dots, X_9) \end{aligned}$$

Recall the discussion of Assumption 2 given in Section 2. To justify the assumption in this setting note that we assume  $\tilde{W}^*$  is time-invariant, and thus presumably is correlated with treatment in every period (not just period  $T$ ). As such Assumption 2 (which is analogous to an instrumental relevance assumption) is essentially a dimension restriction. The order condition here requires that  $\tilde{W}^*$  be of dimension no greater than four, that is, the variation in the household's underlying preferences can be captured by four distinct factors.

We apply the estimation procedure presented in Section 3. Sub-Figure 1.a below plots our nonparametric estimate of the average over our sample of the structural Engel curve for food.

Figure 1: Demand for Food



The results of our estimation method. We plot our estimates at 100 points evenly spaced between the 10% and 90% quantiles of total expenditure (not in logs). To evaluate the average expenditure share in Sub-Figure 1.a we estimate the average structural function/potential outcomes  $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \bar{y}(x, X_i)$  for each counterfactual total expenditure  $x$ . For Sub-Figure 1.b we estimate the change in the conditional average structural function/potential outcomes  $\bar{y}(1.1x, x) - \bar{y}(x, x)$  for each counterfactual total expenditure  $x$ .

Sub-Figure 1.a above shows a downward-sloping Engel curve that (with a log scale for total expenditure) is subtly concave. The downward slope of the curve suggests that food is a normal good, at least in aggregate.

Sub-Figure 1.b presents estimates of the average change in the budget share of food from an exogenous 10% increase in total expenditure broken down by the observed total expenditure. In all cases the estimated change in expenditure share is negative, which again would be true of a normal good. Note that in general the response is more strongly negative for individuals whose observed total expenditure is higher to begin with.

## Conclusion

We present new results on identification and estimation with proxy controls. Our analysis applies in cross-sections and can be specialized to panel models. We apply our methodology to an empirical setting that based on cross-sectional variation and panel variation.

The present work raises questions for future research. In particular, in some settings the number of available proxies may be very large. In this case it may be appropriate to perform asymptotic theory under a growing number of available

proxy controls and identification with an infinite number of proxy controls. In this case the assumptions of completeness and existence (Assumptions 3 and 4) may apply or hold to a very close approximation when the number of proxies is large, even if the number of unobserved perfect controls is large or infinite. This same analysis may apply to panel models with a growing (rather than fixed) time dimension.

The properties of our estimation method under misspecification have yet to be analyzed. The well-posedness of our problem suggests the sensitivity to a failure of our conditional independence assumptions may be limited, but the well-posedness depends crucially on Assumption 4 and the implications of a failure of this assumption are less clear.

We intend to explore both of these avenues in future work. If our assumptions do not hold for a fixed number of proxy controls but come increasingly close to holding as the available proxies grow in number then the sensitivity of our method to some small failure of the assumptions may be central to the asymptotic properties as the pool of available proxies grows. Thus these two topics may be closely linked.

## Appendix A: Results Relating to Assumption 4

Assumption 4 refers to sequences of functions  $\{\mu_k\}_{k=1}^\infty$ ,  $\{u_k\}_{k=1}^\infty$  and  $\{v_k\}_{k=1}^\infty$ . In this Appendix we define these functions and their properties under Assumption A.1 referenced in the main text. We also state and prove Lemma A.1 which is used in our proof of Theorem 1.

First we introduce some additional notation. The vectors  $Z$  and  $V$  may share some common components. Denote the shared components by  $\bar{W}$  and let  $\tilde{Z}$  and  $\tilde{V}$ . Thus we can decompose  $Z = (\tilde{Z}, \bar{W})$ ,  $V = (\tilde{V}, \bar{W})$ .

For each  $(x, \bar{w})$  in the support of  $(X, \bar{W})$  define a linear operator  $A_{x, \bar{w}} : L_2(F_{\tilde{V}|X=x, \bar{W}=\bar{w}}) \rightarrow L_2(F_{\tilde{Z}|X=x, \bar{W}=\bar{w}})$  by:

$$A_{x, \bar{w}}[\delta](\tilde{z}) = E[\delta(\tilde{V})|\tilde{Z} = \tilde{z}, X = x, \bar{W} = \bar{w}]$$

The adjoint of this linear operator  $A_{x, \bar{w}}^* : L_2(F_{\tilde{Z}|X=x, \bar{W}=\bar{w}}) \rightarrow L_2(F_{\tilde{V}|X=x, \bar{W}=\bar{w}})$  is given by:

$$A_{x, \bar{w}}^*[\delta](\tilde{v}) = E[\delta(\tilde{Z})|\tilde{V} = \tilde{v}, X = x, \bar{W} = \bar{w}]$$

Assumption A.1 below implies that the operators  $A_{x, \bar{w}}$  and  $A_{x, \bar{w}}^*$  are ‘compact’ (map bounded sets of functions into relatively compact sets). Compactness of linear operators implies the existence of a singular system for each of these operators. Singular systems of linear operators in functional analysis are analogous to the singular value decompositions of matrices in standard linear algebra. For background on singular value decompositions of linear operators between function spaces see Kress (1999).

**Assumption A.1 (Compact Operator).** For  $F_{(X, \bar{W})}$ -almost all  $(x, \bar{w})$  let ‘ $F_{prod}$ ’ denote the product measure of  $\tilde{V}$  and  $\tilde{Z}$  conditional on  $(X, \bar{W}) =$

$(x, \bar{w})$ .<sup>10</sup> The conditional joint measure  $F_{(\tilde{V}, \tilde{Z})|X=x_1, \bar{W}=\bar{w}}$  is absolutely continuous with respect to  $F_{prod}$  and the corresponding Radon-Nikodym derivative is square integrable with respect to  $F_{prod}$ :

$$\int \left( \frac{dF_{(\tilde{V}, \tilde{Z})|X=x, \bar{W}=\bar{w}}}{dF_{prod}}(\tilde{v}, \tilde{z}) \right)^2 F_{prod}(d\tilde{v}, d\tilde{z}) < \infty$$

Under Assumption A.1 for  $F_{(X, \bar{W})}$ -almost all  $(x, \bar{w})$  there exists a unique singular system (indexed by  $(x, \bar{w})$ )  $\{(u_k^{(x, \bar{w})}, v_k^{(x, \bar{w})}, \mu_k^{(x, \bar{w})})\}_{k=1}^\infty$  for  $A_{x, \bar{w}}$ .  $\mu_k^{(x, \bar{w})}$  is the  $k^{th}$  singular value of  $A_{x, \bar{w}}$ .  $u_k^{(x, \bar{w})}$  is a real-valued function that maps from the support of  $\tilde{V}$  conditional on  $(X, \bar{W}) = (x, \bar{w})$ .  $v_k^{(x, \bar{w})}$  is a scalar valued function that maps from the support of  $\tilde{Z}$  conditional on  $(X, \bar{W}) = (x, \bar{w})$ .  $u_k^{(x, \bar{w})}$  and  $v_k^{(x, \bar{w})}$  are known as the  $k^{th}$  singular functions of the operator  $A_{x, \bar{w}}$ .<sup>11</sup>

The functions  $\{(u_k, v_k, \mu_k)\}_{k=1}^\infty$ , referred to in Assumption 4, are then defined as follows. For each  $k$ , and  $(x, \bar{w})$ ,  $u_k(v, x) = u_k^{(x, \bar{w})}(\tilde{v})$  where  $v = (\tilde{v}, \bar{w})$  (recall we can decompose  $V = (\tilde{V}, \bar{W})$ ). Similarly  $v_k(z, x) = v_k^{(x, \bar{w})}(\tilde{z})$  where  $v = (\tilde{v}, \bar{w})$  and  $\mu_k(x, \bar{w}) = \mu_k^{(x, \bar{w})}$ .

The following lemma is an application of Theorems 15.16 and 15.18 (Picard) in Kress (1999).

**Lemma A.1.** *Suppose Assumptions 1, 2 and 3 and Assumption A.1 hold. Then 1. Assumption 4.i implies that there exists a function  $\varphi$  so that for  $F_X$ -almost all  $x_1$  and  $x_2$ ,  $E[\varphi(x_1, x_2, Z)^2|X = x_1] \leq C$  and:*

$$E[\varphi(x_1, x_2, Z)|X = x_1, V] = \frac{dF_{V|X=x_2}}{dF_{V|X=x_1}}(V)$$

And 2. 4.ii implies that there exists a function  $\gamma$  with  $E[\gamma(X, V)^2|X = x] \leq D$  for  $F_X$ -almost all  $x$  and:

$$E[\gamma(X, V)|X, Z] = E[Y|X, Z]$$

*Proof.* First we state conditions on the existence of solutions to operator equations involving  $A_{x_1, \bar{w}}^*$  and  $A_{x, \bar{w}}$  and show that these imply the conclusions 1. and 2. of the lemma.

Suppose that for  $F_{\bar{W}}$ -almost all  $\bar{w}$  and  $F_X$ -almost all  $x_1$  and  $x_2$  the function  $\frac{dF_{V|X=x_2}}{dF_{V|X=x_1}}((\cdot, \bar{w}))$  is in the range of  $A_{x_1, \bar{w}}^*$ . That is, there exists a function  $\tilde{\varphi}_{x_1, x_2, \bar{w}} \in L_2(F_{\tilde{Z}|X=x, \bar{W}=\bar{w}})$  so that:

$$E[\tilde{\varphi}_{x_1, x_2, \bar{w}}(\tilde{Z})|X = x_1, \bar{W} = \bar{w}, \tilde{V} = \tilde{v}] = \frac{dF_{V|X=x_2}}{dF_{V|X=x_1}}((\tilde{v}, \bar{w}))$$

<sup>10</sup>In more conventional notation  $F_{prod}$  is equal to  $F_{\tilde{V}|X=x, \bar{W}=\bar{w}} \otimes F_{\tilde{Z}|X=x, \bar{W}=\bar{w}}$ .

<sup>11</sup>See, e.g., Kress (1999) Theorem 15.16 and associated discussion.



For  $F_{\tilde{V}|X=x_1, \bar{W}=\bar{w}}$ -almost all  $\tilde{v}$ . Further suppose that there exists a function  $C(\cdot)$  with  $E[C(\bar{W})|X = x_1] \leq C$  and  $F_{\bar{W}|X=x_1}$ -almost all  $\bar{w}$ , the following holds:

$$E[\tilde{\varphi}_{x_1, x_2, \bar{w}}(\tilde{Z})^2 | X = x_1, \bar{W} = \bar{w}] \leq C(\bar{w})$$

Then by iterated expectations, setting  $\varphi(x_1, x_2, (\tilde{z}, \bar{w})) = \tilde{\varphi}_{x_1, x_2, \bar{w}}(\tilde{z})$  conclusion 1. holds. Thus for conclusion 1. it is enough to show  $\frac{dF_{V|X=x_2}}{dF_{V|X=x_1}}((\cdot, \bar{w}))$  is in the range of  $A_{x_1, \bar{w}}^*$  with a solution that has norm bounded by  $C(\bar{w})$ .

Similarly, the following implies conclusion 2. For  $F_{\bar{W}}$ -almost all  $\bar{w}$  and  $F_X$ -almost all  $x$  the following conditions hold. the function  $E[Y|Z = (\cdot, \bar{w}), X = x]$  is in the range of  $A_{x, \bar{w}}$  and that the solution  $\tilde{\gamma}_{x, \bar{w}}$  satisfies:

$$E[\tilde{\gamma}_{x, \bar{w}}(\tilde{V})^2 | X = x, \bar{W} = \bar{w}] \leq D(\bar{w})$$

For a function  $D(\bar{w})$  with  $E[D(\bar{W})|X = x] \leq D$ . Then the function  $\gamma(x, (\tilde{v}, \bar{w})) = \tilde{\gamma}_{x, \bar{w}}(\tilde{v})$  satisfies conclusion 2. Thus for conclusion 2. it is enough to show  $E[Y|Z = (\cdot, \bar{w}), X = x]$  is in the range of  $A_{x_1, \bar{w}}$  with a solution that has norm bounded by  $D(\bar{w})$ .

To establish the relevant functions are in the ranges of the desired operators we apply Theorem 15.18 (Picard) in Kress (1999). We restate the theorem below and then show its premises hold under our assumptions.

Theorem 15.18 (Picard) in Kress (1999) states the following. Let  $T : H_1 \rightarrow H_2$  be a compact linear operator from a Hilbert space  $H_1$  to a Hilbert space  $H_2$  with singular system  $\{(u_k^{(H)}, v_k^{(H)}, \mu_k^{(H)})\}_{k=1}^\infty$ . Then a function  $\delta \in H_2$  is in the range of  $T$  (i.e., there exists a function  $f \in H_1$  with  $T[f] = \delta$ ) if and only if  $f$  is in the orthogonal complement of the null space of the adjoint  $T^*$  and for some finite scalar  $c$ :

$$\sum_{k=1}^\infty \frac{1}{(\mu_k^{(H)})^2} |\langle \delta, v_k^{(H)} \rangle|^2 \leq c \quad (4.1)$$

In which case the norm of the solution  $f$  is at most  $c$ . The bilinear form  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$  is the inner product associated with the Hilbert space  $H_2$ .

The operator  $A_{x, \bar{w}}$  maps from the Hilbert space  $L_2(F_{\tilde{V}|X=x, \bar{W}=\bar{w}})$  to  $L_2(F_{\tilde{Z}|X=x, \bar{W}=\bar{w}})$ , the latter of which has inner product given by:

$$\langle f_1, f_2 \rangle = E[f_1(\tilde{Z})f_2(\tilde{Z}) | X = x, \bar{W} = \bar{w}]$$

The adjoint  $A_{x, \bar{w}}^*$  maps from  $L_2(F_{\tilde{Z}|X=x, \bar{W}=\bar{w}})$  to  $L_2(F_{\tilde{V}|X=x, \bar{W}=\bar{w}})$ , the latter of which has inner product given by:

$$\langle f_1, f_2 \rangle = E[f_1(\tilde{V})f_2(\tilde{V}) | X = x, \bar{W} = \bar{w}]$$

Thus to apply Picard's theorem and show  $\frac{dF_{V|X=x_2}}{dF_{V|X=x_1}}((\cdot, \bar{w}))$  is in the range of  $A_{x_1, \bar{w}}^*$  we need to show the following. a.  $A_{x_1, \bar{w}}^*$  is compact and has a singular system, b. that  $\frac{dF_{V|X=x_2}}{dF_{V|X=x_1}}((\cdot, \bar{w}))$  is an element of  $L_2(F_{\tilde{V}|X=x_1, \bar{W}=\bar{w}})$  and c. that  $\frac{dF_{V|X=x_2}}{dF_{V|X=x_1}}((\cdot, \bar{w}))$  is in the orthogonal complement of  $A_{x_1, \bar{w}}$ . Finally, we must

show that d. 4.1 holds for  $\frac{dF_{V|X=x_2}}{dF_{V|X=x_1}}((\cdot, \bar{w}))$  in place of  $\delta$  and for the relevant Hilbert space and linear operator  $A_{x_1, \bar{w}}^*$  and with the norm  $c$  of the solution bounded by  $C(\bar{w})$ .

Similarly, to apply Picard's theorem and show  $E[Y|Z = (\cdot, \bar{w}), X = x]$  is in the range of  $A_{x_1, \bar{w}}$  we need to show that e.  $A_{x, \bar{w}}$  is compact and has a singular system, f. that  $E[Y|Z = (\cdot, \bar{w}), X = x]$  is an element of  $L_2(F_{\tilde{Z}|X=x_1, \bar{W}=\bar{w}})$  and g. that  $E[Y|Z = (\cdot, \bar{w}), X = x]$  is in the orthogonal complement of  $A_{x, \bar{w}}^*$ . And further, h. that 4.1 holds for  $E[Y|Z = (\cdot, \bar{w}), X = x]$  in place of  $\delta$  and for the relevant Hilbert space and linear operator  $A_{x_1, \bar{w}}$  and with the norm  $c$  of the solution bounded by  $D(\bar{w})$ .

First we show that Assumptions A.1 implies that the operator  $A_{x, \bar{w}}$  and its adjoint  $A_{x, \bar{w}}^*$  are compact and therefore have unique singular systems (points a. and e. above). To see this first note that:

$$\begin{aligned} A_{x, \bar{w}}[\delta](\tilde{z}) &= E[\delta(\tilde{V})|\tilde{Z} = \tilde{z}, X = x, \bar{W} = \bar{w}] \\ &= \int \frac{dF_{(\tilde{V}, \tilde{Z})|X=x, \bar{W}=\bar{w}}}{dF_{prod}}(\tilde{v}, \tilde{z})\delta(\tilde{w}^*)F_{\tilde{V}|X=x, \bar{W}=\bar{w}}(d\tilde{v}) \end{aligned}$$

Thus  $A_{x, \bar{w}} : L_2(F_{\tilde{V}|X=x, \bar{W}=\bar{w}}) \rightarrow L_2(F_{\tilde{Z}|X=x, \bar{W}=\bar{w}})$  is an integral operator with kernel  $\frac{dF_{(\tilde{V}, \tilde{Z})|X=x, \bar{W}=\bar{w}}}{dF_{prod}}$  and Assumption A.1 states that the kernel is square integral with respect to the product measure of  $F_{\tilde{V}|X=x, \bar{W}=\bar{w}}$  and  $F_{\tilde{Z}|X=x, \bar{W}=\bar{w}}$ . This implies that the operator  $A_{x, \bar{w}}$  is Hilbert-Schmidt and therefore compact (see for example Section 3.3.1 of Sunder (2016)). Compactness of an operator implies compactness of its adjoint (alternatively we could simply repeat the steps above for  $A_{x, \bar{w}}^*$ ). If  $A_{x, \bar{w}}$  is compact then by Theorem 15.16 of Kress (1999) it admits a singular system. Note that the singular system of the adjoint  $A_{x, \bar{w}}^*$  is the same as for  $A_{x, \bar{w}}$  but with the roles of the singular functions  $u_k^{(x, \bar{w})}$  and  $v_k^{(x, \bar{w})}$  switched for each  $k$ . Thus we have shown a. and e. hold.

Next note that the first part of Assumptions 4.i states that

$$E\left[\frac{dF_{V|X=x_2}}{dF_{V|X=x_1}}(X, (\tilde{V}, \bar{W}))^2 \middle| X = x_1\right] < \infty$$

or in other words:

$$\frac{dF_{V|X=x_2}}{dF_{V|X=x_1}}((\cdot, \bar{w})) \in L_2(F_{\tilde{V}|X=x_1, \bar{W}=\bar{w}})$$

Similarly the first part of 4.ii is equivalent to  $E[Y|Z = (\cdot, \bar{w}), X = x] \in L_2(F_{\tilde{Z}|X=x_1, \bar{W}=\bar{w}})$ . Thus 4.i and 4.ii imply point b. and f. respectively.

It remains to show that under Assumptions 1 and 2, c. and g. hold, that is the functions  $\frac{dF_{V|X=x_2}}{dF_{V|X=x_1}}((\cdot, \bar{w}))$  and  $E[Y|Z = (\cdot, \bar{w}), X = x]$  are in the orthogonal complements of the null spaces of operators  $A_{x_1, \bar{w}}^*$  and  $A_{x, \bar{w}}$  respectively.

Under Assumption 2.ii, for  $F_X$ -almost all  $x_1$  and  $x_2$ , and  $F_V$ -almost all  $v$ :

$$E\left[\frac{dF_{W^*|X=x_2}}{dF_{W^*|X=x_1}}(W^*) \middle| X = x_1, V = v\right] = \frac{dF_{V|X=x_2}}{dF_{V|X=x_1}}(v)$$

For intermediate steps that show the above see 4.2 in the proof of Theorem 1 in Appendix B. Now, let a function  $\delta$  be in the null space of  $A_{x,\bar{w}}^*$ , that is  $F_{\tilde{Z}|X=x_1, \bar{W}=\bar{w}}$ -almost surely:

$$E[\delta(\tilde{V})|X = x_1, \bar{W} = \bar{w}, \tilde{Z} = z] = 0$$

Then by iterated expectations and Assumption 2.ii:

$$\begin{aligned} & E[\delta(\tilde{V})|X = x_1, \bar{W} = \bar{w}, \tilde{Z} = z] \\ &= E[E[\delta(\tilde{V})|X, W^*]|X = x_1, \bar{W} = \bar{w}, \tilde{Z} = z] \\ &= 0 \end{aligned}$$

And so by Assumption 3.ii  $F_{W^*|X=x_1}$ -almost surely:

$$E[\delta(\tilde{V})|X = x_1, W^* = w^*] = 0$$

But then we see that the  $L_2(F_{\tilde{V}|X=x_1, \bar{W}=\bar{w}})$ -inner product of  $\delta$  and  $\frac{dF_{V|X=x_2}}{dF_{V|X=x_1}}((\cdot, \bar{w}))$  is zero:

$$\begin{aligned} & E\left[\frac{dF_{V|X=x_2}}{dF_{V|X=x_1}}(V)\delta(\tilde{V})\middle|X = x_1, Z = z\right] \\ &= E\left[E\left[\frac{dF_{W^*|X=x_2}}{dF_{W^*|X=x_1}}(W^*)|X, V\right]\delta(\tilde{V})\middle|X = x_1, Z = z\right] \\ &= E\left[\frac{dF_{W^*|X=x_2}}{dF_{W^*|X=x_1}}(W^*)E[\delta(\tilde{V})|X = x_1, W^*]\middle|X = x_1, Z = z\right] \\ &= 0 \end{aligned}$$

Where the first equality follows by substituting for  $\frac{dF_{V|X=x_2}}{dF_{V|X=x_1}}$ , the second by iterated expectations and the third because  $E[\delta(\tilde{V})|X = x_1, W^*]$  is  $F_{W^*|X=x_1}$ -almost surely zero. Since the inner product is zero for any  $\delta$  in the null-space of  $A_{x,\bar{w}}^*$ , by definition  $\frac{dF_{V|X=x_2}}{dF_{V|X=x_1}}((\cdot, \bar{w}))$  is in the orthogonal complement of the null-space. Thus c. holds.

Next note that Assumption 2.i and iterated expectations implies:

$$E[E[Y|W^*, X]|Z = z, X = x] = E[Y|X = x, Z = z]$$

let a function  $\delta$  be in the null space of  $A_{x,\bar{w}}$ , that is, for  $\tilde{v}$   $F_{\tilde{V}|X=x, \bar{W}=\bar{w}}$ -almost surely:

$$E[\delta(\tilde{Z})|X = x, \bar{W} = \bar{w}, \tilde{V} = \tilde{v}] = 0$$

Then by iterated expectations and Assumption 2.ii:

$$\begin{aligned} & E[\delta(\tilde{Z})|X = x, \bar{W} = \bar{w}, \tilde{V} = \tilde{v}] \\ &= E[E[\delta(\tilde{Z})|X, W^*]|X = x, \bar{W} = \bar{w}, \tilde{V} = \tilde{v}] \\ &= 0 \end{aligned}$$

And so by Assumption 3.ii  $F_{W^*|X=x}$ -almost surely:

$$E[\delta(\tilde{V})|X = x, W^* = w^*] = 0$$

But then we see that the  $L_2(F_{\tilde{Z}|X=x, \bar{W}=\bar{w}})$ -inner product of  $\delta$  and  $E[Y|X = x, Z = (\cdot, \bar{w})]$  is zero:

$$\begin{aligned} & E\left[E[Y|X, Z]\delta(\tilde{Z})\middle|X = x, V = v\right] \\ &= E\left[E[E[Y|X, W^*]|X, V]\delta(\tilde{Z})\middle|X = x, Z = z\right] \\ &= E\left[E[Y|X, W^*]E[\delta(\tilde{Z})|X = x, W^*]\middle|X = x, Z = z\right] \\ &= 0 \end{aligned}$$

And so  $E[Y|X = x, Z = (\cdot, \bar{w})]$  is in the null space of  $A_{x, \bar{w}}$ . Thus g. holds.

Finally, points d. and h. One can then see that for each given  $(x_1, \bar{w})$  Assumption 4.i. is precisely the condition 4.1 where  $\frac{dF_{V|X=x_2}}{dF_{V|X=x_1}}((\cdot, \bar{w}))$  is the function  $\delta$ , the inner-product is that of the space  $L_2(F_{\tilde{V}|X=x, \bar{W}=\bar{w}})$ , and the singular values,  $\mu_k^{(H)}$  and functions  $v_k^{(H)}$  are those of  $A_{x, \bar{w}}^*$ . In particular,  $\mu_k^{(H)}$  and  $v_k^{(H)}$  are given by  $\mu_k^{(x, \bar{w})} = \mu_k(x, \bar{w})$  and  $u_k^{(x, \bar{w})} = u_k(x, (\cdot, \bar{w}))$ . Moreover, the norm of the solution  $c$  is replaced by  $C(\bar{w})$  with  $E[C(\bar{W})|X = x_1] \leq C$ . For each given  $(x, \bar{w})$  Assumption 4.ii is precisely the condition 4.1 with  $\delta$  given by  $E[Y|Z = (\cdot, \bar{w}), X = x]$ , the inner-product that of  $L_2(F_{\tilde{Z}|X=x, \bar{W}=\bar{w}})$ , and the singular system that of  $A_{x, \bar{w}}$ . The norm of the solution  $c$  is equal to  $D(\bar{w})$  with  $E[D(\bar{W})|X = x] \leq D$ .  $\square$

## Appendix B: Proofs

**Proposition B.1.** *Under Assumption 1:*

$$\bar{y}(x_1|x_2) = E[E[Y|W^*, X = x_1]|X = x_2]$$

*Proof.* By iterated expectations:

$$\bar{y}(x_1|x_2) = E[E[y_0(x_2, U)|W^*, X = x_2]|X = x_2]$$

By Assumption 1.i and the definition of  $y_0$ :

$$\begin{aligned} E[y_0(x_1, U)|W^* = w^*, X = x_2] &= E[y_0(x_1, U)|W^* = w^*, X = x_1] \\ &= E[Y|W^* = w^*, X = x_1] \end{aligned}$$

Under Assumption 1.ii  $E[Y|W^* = w^*, X = x_1]$  is well-defined for  $F_{W^*|X=x_2}$ -almost all  $w^*$  (rather than just  $F_{W^*|X=x_1}$ -almost all  $w^*$ ). So we can substitute to get:

$$\bar{y}(x_1|x_2) = E[E[Y|W^*, X = x_1]|X = x_2]$$

$\square$

To understand the use of Assumption 1.ii in the proof above suppose that for each  $x$  in the support of  $X$ ,  $W^*$  admits a conditional probability density function  $f_{W^*|X}(\cdot|x)$ , then we can write:

$$\bar{y}(x_1|x_2) = \int E[Y|W^* = w^*, X = x_1] f_{W^*|X}(w^*|x_2) dw^*$$

Thus the conditional expectation  $E[Y|W^* = w^*, X = x_1]$  must be identified for almost all  $w^*$  for which  $f_{W^*|X}(w^*|x_2) > 0$ . But  $E[Y|W^* = w^*, X = x_1]$  is only uniquely defined for almost all  $w^*$  for which  $f_{W^*|X}(w^*|x_1) > 0$ . Thus we need the two conditional pdfs to be non-zero on the same support. Assumption 1.ii strengthens this full-support requirement to allow for  $W^*$  without a conditional probability density function (say, because  $F_{W^*}$  has mass points).

**Proposition B.2.** *Under Assumption 1.ii and 2.ii the Radon-Nikodym derivative  $\frac{dF_{V|X=x_2}}{dF_{V|X=x_1}}$  exists.*

*Proof.* Let  $F_{(X,V)}[\mathcal{A}]$  be the probability that  $(X, V)$  is in the set  $\mathcal{A}$ . Note that:

$$\begin{aligned} F_{(X,V)}[\mathcal{A}] &= E \left[ E[P[(X, V) \in \mathcal{A}|X, W^*]|X] \right] \\ &= \int E[P[(x, V) \in \mathcal{A}|W^* = w^*] F_{(X,W^*)}(d(x, w^*)) \end{aligned}$$

Where the first equality follows by iterated expectations and the second by Assumption 2.ii. Let  $F_X \otimes F_V[\mathcal{A}]$  be the product measure of  $\mathcal{A}$ . We have:

$$\begin{aligned} F_X \otimes F_V[\mathcal{A}] &= \int P[(x, V) \in \mathcal{A}] F_X(dx) \\ &= \int \int P[(x, V) \in \mathcal{A}|W^* = w^*] F_X \otimes F_{W^*}(d(x, w^*)) \end{aligned}$$

Where  $F_X \otimes F_{W^*}$  is the product measure of  $F_X$  and  $F_{W^*}$ . The first equality and second above follow by iterated expectations. But by Assumption 1.ii, the measure  $F_{(X,W^*)}$  is non-zero on precisely the sets for which  $F_X \otimes F_{W^*}$  is non-zero. Since  $P[(x, V) \in \mathcal{A}|W^* = w^*]$  is weakly positive it follows that  $F_{(X,V)}[\mathcal{A}]$  is strictly positive if and only if  $F_X \otimes F_V[\mathcal{A}]$  is strictly positive. Since this holds for any  $\mathcal{A}$ ,  $F_X \otimes F_V$  and  $F_{(X,V)}$  are absolutely continuous. Existence of  $\frac{dF_{V|X=x_2}}{dF_{V|X=x_1}}$  then follows by the Radon-Nikodym theorem.  $\square$

*Proof Theorem 1.* Throughout the proof, statements involving  $x_1$  and  $x_2$  should be understood to hold for  $F_X$ -almost all  $x_1$  and  $x_2$ .

First Theorem 1.a. By Lemma A.1, under Assumption 4.ii there exists a function  $\gamma$  so that:

$$E[Y - \gamma(X, V)|X, Z] = 0$$

Fix such a  $\gamma$ , by iterated expectations and Assumption 2.ii:

$$\begin{aligned} E[\gamma(X, V)|X, Z] &= E[E[\gamma(X, V)|X, W^*, Z]|X, Z] \\ &= E[E[\gamma(X, V)|X, W^*]|X, Z] \end{aligned}$$

And by iterated expectations and Assumption 2.i:

$$\begin{aligned} E[Y|X, Z] &= [y_0(X, U)|X, Z] \\ &= E[E[y_0(X, U)|X, W^*, Z]|X, Z] \\ &= E[E[y_0(X, U)|X, W^*]|X, Z] \end{aligned}$$

And so:

$$E[E[y_0(X, U)|X, W^*] - E[\gamma(X, V)|X, W^*]|X, Z] = 0$$

But then by Assumption 3.i:

$$E[y_0(X, U)|X, W^*] = E[\gamma(X, V)|X, W^*]$$

By Assumption 1.i and 1.ii:

$$E[y_0(X, U)|X = x_1, W^*] = E[y_0(x_1, U)|X = x_2, W^*]$$

And by Assumption 2.ii:

$$E[\gamma(X, V)|X = x_1, W^*] = E[\gamma(x_1, V)|X = x_2, W^*]$$

And so:

$$E[y_0(x_1, U)|X = x_2, W^*] = E[\gamma(x_1, V)|X = x_2, W^*]$$

By iterated expectations:

$$E[y_0(x_1, U)|X = x_2] = E[\gamma(x_1, V)|X = x_2]$$

And by definition the LHS equals  $\bar{y}(x_1|x_2)$ .

Now for Theorem 1.b. By Lemma A.1, under Assumption 4.i there exists a function  $\varphi$  so that:

$$E[\varphi(x_1, x_2, Z)|X = x_1, V] = \frac{dF_{V|X=x_2}}{dF_{V|X=x_1}}(V)$$

Fix such a  $\varphi$ . The next step refers to  $\frac{dF_{W^*|X=x_2}}{dF_{W^*|X=x_1}}$ , which is the Radon-Nikodym derivative of  $F_{W^*|X=x_2}$  with respect to  $F_{W^*|X=x_1}$ . By the Radon-Nikodym theorem this exists if the two distributions are absolutely continuous which is in turn implied by Assumption 1.ii.

Note that under Assumption 2.ii:

$$E\left[\frac{dF_{W^*|X=x_2}}{dF_{W^*|X=x_1}}(W^*) \middle| X = x_1, V\right] = \frac{dF_{V|X=x_2}}{dF_{V|X=x_1}}(V)$$

To see this note that:

$$\begin{aligned}
& E \left[ \frac{dF_{W^*|X=x_2}}{dF_{W^*|X=x_1}}(W^*) \middle| X = x_1, V = v \right] \\
&= E \left[ \frac{dF_{W^*|X=x_2}}{dF_{W^*|X=x_1}}(W^*) \frac{dF_{W^*|V=v, X=x_1}}{dF_{W^*|X=x_2}}(W^*) \middle| X = x_2 \right] \\
&= E \left[ \frac{dF_{W^*|V=v, X=x_1}}{dF_{W^*|X=x_1}}(W^*) \middle| X = x_2 \right] \\
&= E \left[ \frac{dF_{V|W^*=w, X=x_1}}{dF_{V|X=x_1}}(v, W^*) \middle| X = x_2 \right] \\
&= E \left[ \frac{dF_{V|W^*=w, X=x_2}}{dF_{V|X=x_1}}(v, W^*) \middle| X = x_2 \right] \\
&= \frac{dF_{V|X=x_2}}{dF_{V|X=x_1}}(v)
\end{aligned} \tag{4.2}$$

The first equality follows by the Radon-Nikodym theorem, the second by the chain rule, the third by properties of Radon-Nikodym derivatives, the fourth by Assumption 2.ii and the fourth by properties of the Radon-Nikodym derivative. Further, by iterated expectations and Assumption 2.ii:

$$\begin{aligned}
E[\varphi(x_1, x_2, Z)|X = x_1, V] &= E[E[\varphi(x_1, x_2, Z)|W^*, X, V]|X = x_1, V] \\
&= E[E[\varphi(x_1, x_2, Z)|W^*, X]|X = x_1, V]
\end{aligned}$$

So we have:

$$E \left[ \frac{dF_{W^*|X=x_2}}{dF_{W^*|X=x_1}}(W^*) - E[\varphi(x_1, x_2, Z)|W^*, X] \middle| X = x_1, V = v \right] = 0$$

By Assumption 3.ii this implies:

$$E[\varphi(x_1, x_2, Z)|W^*, X = x_1] = \frac{dF_{W^*|X=x_2}}{dF_{W^*|X=x_1}}(W^*) \tag{4.3}$$

Next note that by iterated expectations and Assumptions 1.i and 1.ii:

$$\begin{aligned}
E[y_0(x_1, U)|X = x_2] &= E[E[y_0(x_1, U)|X = x_2, W^*]|X = x_2] \\
&= E[E[y_0(X, U)|X = x_1, W^*]|X = x_2]
\end{aligned} \tag{4.4}$$

And by the Radon-Nikodym theorem:

$$\begin{aligned}
& E[E[Y|X = x_1, W^*]|X = x_2] \\
&= E \left[ \frac{dF_{W^*|X=x_2}}{dF_{W^*|X=x_1}}(W^*) E[y_0(X, U)|X, W^*] \middle| X = x_1 \right]
\end{aligned}$$

Substituting for the LHS by 4.4 and for the Radon-Nikodym derivative on the RHS by 4.3 we get:

$$\begin{aligned}
& E[y_0(x_1, U)|X = x_2] \\
&= E \left[ E[\varphi(x_1, x_2, Z)|W^*, X] E[y_0(X, U)|X, W^*] \middle| X = x_1 \right]
\end{aligned}$$

Next note that:

$$\begin{aligned}
& E \left[ E[\varphi(x_1, x_2, Z)|W^*, X] E[y_0(X, U)|X, W^*] \middle| X = x_1 \right] \\
&= E \left[ \varphi(x_1, x_2, Z) E[y_0(X, U)|X, W^*] \middle| X = x_1 \right] \\
&= E \left[ \varphi(x_1, x_2, Z) E[y_0(X, U)|X, W^*, Z] \middle| X = x_1 \right] \\
&= E \left[ \varphi(x_1, x_2, Z) y_0(X, U) \middle| X = x_1 \right] \\
&= E \left[ \varphi(x_1, x_2, Z) Y \middle| X = x_1 \right]
\end{aligned}$$

Where the first equality follows by iterated expectations, the second by Assumption 2.i, the third by iterated expectations and the final by the definition of  $Y$ . Combining we get:

$$E[y_0(x_1, U)|X = x_2] = E \left[ \varphi(x_1, x_2, Z) Y \middle| X = x_1 \right]$$

As required.

Now we prove the last two statements of the Theorem. First the penultimate inequality. Note that by The Radon-Nikodym theorem, for any  $\tilde{\gamma}$ :

$$\begin{aligned}
& E[\tilde{\gamma}(x_1, V)|X = x_2] \\
&= E[\tilde{\gamma}(X, V) \frac{dF_{V|X=x_2}}{dF_{V|X=x_1}}(v) | X = x_1] \\
&= E[\tilde{\gamma}(X, V) E[\varphi(x_1, x_2, Z)|X, V] | X = x_1]
\end{aligned}$$

Where  $\varphi$  satisfies the equation in Assumption 4.i. By iterated expectations:

$$\begin{aligned}
& E[\tilde{\gamma}(X, V) E[\varphi(x_1, x_2, Z)|X, V] | X = x_1] \\
&= E[\tilde{\gamma}(X, V) \varphi(x_1, x_2, Z) | X = x_1] \\
&= E[E[\tilde{\gamma}(X, V)|X, Z] \varphi(x_1, x_2, Z) | X = x_1]
\end{aligned}$$

Under Assumptions 1, 2 and 4.i we established above that part b. or Theorem 1 holds, and so using the conclusion of b. and the equation above:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \bar{y}(x_1|x_2) - E[\tilde{\gamma}(x_1, V)|X = x_2] \\
&= E \left[ (Y - E[\tilde{\gamma}(X, V)|X, Z]) \varphi(x_1, x_2, Z) \middle| X = x_1 \right]
\end{aligned}$$

And so applying Cauchy-Schwartz:

$$\begin{aligned}
& (\bar{y}(x_1|x_2) - E[\tilde{\gamma}(x_1, V)|X = x_2])^2 \\
& \leq E[\varphi(x_1, x_2, Z)^2 | X = x_1] \\
& \times E \left[ (Y - E[\tilde{\gamma}(X, V)|X, Z])^2 \middle| X = x_1 \right]
\end{aligned}$$



But Assumption 4.i states that we can find a solution  $\varphi$  for which  $E[\varphi(x_1, x_2, Z)^2 | X = x_1]$  is less than  $C$ . Thus from the above we get:

$$\begin{aligned} & (\bar{y}(x_1|x_2) - E[\tilde{\gamma}(x_1, V)|X = x_2])^2 \\ & \leq CE \left[ (Y - E[\tilde{\gamma}(X, V)|X, Z])^2 \middle| X = x_1 \right] \end{aligned}$$

Now the final statement of the theorem. By iterated expectations for any  $\tilde{\varphi}$ :

$$E[\tilde{\varphi}(x_1, x_2, Z)Y | X = x_1] = E[\tilde{\varphi}(x_1, x_2, Z)E[Y|Z, X] | X = x_1]$$

Letting  $\gamma$  satisfy the equation in 4.ii we can substitute out  $E[Y|Z, X]$  in the above to get:

$$\begin{aligned} & E[\tilde{\varphi}(x_1, x_2, Z)Y | X = x_1] \\ & = E[\tilde{\varphi}(x_1, x_2, Z)E[\gamma(X, V)|Z, X] | X = x_1] \end{aligned} \quad (4.5)$$

$$= E[E[\tilde{\varphi}(x_1, x_2, Z)|V, X]\gamma(X, V) | X = x_1] \quad (4.6)$$

Where the second equality follows by iterated expectations. Recall that under the conditions of part a. of the theorem:

$$\bar{y}(x_1|x_2) = E[\gamma(x_1, V)|X = x_2] \quad (4.7)$$

By the Radon-Nikodym theorem:

$$E[\gamma(x_1, V)|X = x_2] = E \left[ \gamma(X, V) \frac{dF_{V|X=x_2}}{dF_{V|X=x_1}}(v) \middle| X = x_1 \right]$$

Combining with 4.6 and 4.7 we get:

$$\begin{aligned} & \bar{y}(x_1|x_2) - E[\tilde{\varphi}(x_1, x_2, Z)Y | X = x_1] \\ & = E \left[ \gamma(X, V) \left( \frac{dF_{V|X=x_2}}{dF_{V|X=x_1}}(v) - E[\tilde{\varphi}(x_1, x_2, Z)|V, X] \right) \middle| X = x_1 \right] \end{aligned}$$

By Cauchy-Schwartz:

$$\begin{aligned} & (\bar{y}(x_1|x_2) - E[\tilde{\varphi}(x_1, x_2, Z)Y | X = x_1])^2 \\ & = E[\gamma(X, V)^2 | X = x_1] \\ & \times E \left[ \left( \frac{dF_{V|X=x_2}}{dF_{V|X=x_1}}(v) - E[\tilde{\varphi}(x_1, x_2, Z)|V, X] \right)^2 \middle| X = x_1 \right] \end{aligned}$$

Recall that Assumption 4.ii states that we can find such a  $\gamma$  with  $E[\gamma(x_1, V)^2 | X = x_1] \leq D$ . So from the above we have:

$$\begin{aligned} & (\bar{y}(x_1|x_2) - E[\tilde{\varphi}(x_1, x_2, Z)Y | X = x_1])^2 \\ & = DE \left[ \left( \frac{dF_{V|X=x_2}}{dF_{V|X=x_1}}(v) - E[\tilde{\varphi}(x_1, x_2, Z)|V, X] \right)^2 \middle| X = x_1 \right] \end{aligned}$$

□

The following Lemma is used in the proof of Theorem 2.

**Lemma 1.** *Suppose Assumptions 5.ii, 5.iii and 5.iv hold. Then there exists a constant  $c > 0$  so that:*

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{ess sup } E \left[ \left( g(X, Z) - \Pi_n(X, Z)' \hat{\theta} \right)^2 \middle| X \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ & \leq c \inf_{\theta \in \Theta_n} \text{ess sup } E \left[ \left( g(X, Z) - \Pi_n(X, Z)' \theta \right)^2 \middle| X \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} + O_p(\eta_n + \delta_n) \end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* First, by Assumption 5.iii, for some  $c_3 > 0$ , for all  $\theta \in \Theta_n$ :

$$\begin{aligned} & c_3 E \left[ \left( g(X, Z) - \Pi_n(X, Z)' \theta \right)^2 \right] \\ & \leq \text{ess sup } E \left[ \left( g(X, Z) - \Pi_n(X, Z)' \theta \right)^2 \middle| X \right] \\ & \leq E \left[ \left( g(X, Z) - \Pi_n(X, Z)' \theta \right)^2 \right] \end{aligned} \tag{4.8}$$

Then the conclusion follows if:

$$\begin{aligned} & E \left[ \left( g(X, Z) - \Pi_n(X, Z)' \hat{\theta} \right)^2 \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ & \leq \frac{c}{\sqrt{c_3}} \inf_{\theta \in \Theta_n} E \left[ \left( g(X, Z) - \Pi_n(X, Z)' \theta \right)^2 \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} + O_p(\eta_n + \delta_n) \end{aligned}$$

The square root is sub-additive on positive numbers and so the following is sufficient for the above:

$$E \left[ \left( g(X, Z) - \Pi_n(X, Z)' \hat{\theta} \right)^2 \right] \leq \bar{c} \inf_{\theta \in \Theta_n} E \left[ \left( g(X, Z) - \Pi_n(X, Z)' \theta \right)^2 \right] + O_p(\eta_n + \delta_n) \tag{4.9}$$

Where  $\bar{c} = \frac{c^2}{c_3}$ . For notational convenience define the following functions:

$$\begin{aligned} Q_n(\theta) &= E \left[ \left( g(X, Z) - \Pi_n(X, Z)' \theta \right)^2 \right] + \lambda_n P(\theta) \\ \hat{Q}_n(\theta) &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left( g(X_i, Z_i) - \hat{\Pi}_n(X_i, Z_i)' \theta \right)^2 + \lambda_n P(\theta) \\ \tilde{Q}_n(\theta) &= E \left[ \left( g(X, Z) - \Pi_n(X, Z)' \theta \right)^2 \right] \\ \hat{\tilde{Q}}_n(\theta) &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left( g(X_i, Z_i) - \hat{\Pi}_n(X_i, Z_i)' \theta \right)^2 \end{aligned}$$

Then 4.9 (which is sufficient for the conclusion) is equivalent to:

$$\tilde{Q}_n(\hat{\theta}) \leq \bar{c} \inf_{\theta \in \Theta_n} \tilde{Q}_n(\theta) + O_p(\eta_n)$$

Note that by definition of  $\hat{\theta}$  for any  $\theta$ :

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{Q}_n(\hat{\theta}) &\leq \hat{Q}_n(\theta) \\ &\leq c_1 Q_n(\theta) + [\hat{Q}_n(\theta) - c_1 Q_n(\theta)]\end{aligned}\tag{4.10}$$

Where the second inequality holds for any constant  $c_1 > 0$  by simply adding and subtracting  $c_1 Q_n(\theta)$ . Similarly by adding and subtracting  $c_2 \hat{Q}_n(\hat{\theta})$  for any constant  $c_2 > 0$ :

$$Q_n(\hat{\theta}) \leq c_2 \hat{Q}_n(\hat{\theta}) + [Q_n(\hat{\theta}) - c_2 \hat{Q}_n(\hat{\theta})]$$

Substituting 4.10 into the above we get:

$$\begin{aligned}Q_n(\hat{\theta}) &\leq c_1 c_2 Q_n(\theta) + c_2 [\hat{Q}_n(\theta) - c_1 Q_n(\theta)] + [Q_n(\hat{\theta}) - c_2 \hat{Q}_n(\hat{\theta})] \\ &= c_1 c_2 \tilde{Q}_n(\theta) + c_2 \lambda_n P(\theta) + c_2 [\hat{\tilde{Q}}_n(\theta) - c_1 \tilde{Q}_n(\theta)] \\ &\quad + [\tilde{Q}_n(\hat{\theta}) - c_2 \hat{\tilde{Q}}_n(\hat{\theta})] + (1 - c_2) \lambda_n P(\hat{\theta})\end{aligned}$$

Where the equality follows from the definitions. Again using the definitions we get:

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{Q}_n(\hat{\theta}) &\leq c_1 c_2 \tilde{Q}_n(\theta) + c_2 \lambda_n P(\theta) + c_2 [\hat{\tilde{Q}}_n(\theta) - c_1 \tilde{Q}_n(\theta)] \\ &\quad + [\tilde{Q}_n(\hat{\theta}) - c_2 \hat{\tilde{Q}}_n(\hat{\theta})] - c_2 \lambda_n P(\hat{\theta}) \\ &\leq c_1 c_2 \tilde{Q}_n(\theta) + c_2 \lambda_n P(\theta) + c_2 [\hat{\tilde{Q}}_n(\theta) - c_1 \tilde{Q}_n(\theta)] + [\tilde{Q}_n(\hat{\theta}) - c_2 \hat{\tilde{Q}}_n(\hat{\theta})]\end{aligned}$$

Where we have used that  $\lambda_n P(\hat{\theta}) \geq 0$  and  $c_2 > 0$ . Next, let  $\theta_n \in \arg \inf_{\theta \in \Theta_n} \tilde{Q}_n(\theta)$ , substituting  $\theta_n$  for  $\theta$  in the expression above and using that  $\hat{\theta} \in \Theta_n$ :

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{Q}_n(\hat{\theta}) &\leq c_1 c_2 \tilde{Q}_n(\theta_n) + c_2 \lambda_n P(\theta_n) + c_2 [\hat{\tilde{Q}}_n(\theta_n) - c_1 \tilde{Q}_n(\theta_n)] \\ &\quad + \sup_{\theta \in \Theta_n} [\tilde{Q}_n(\theta) - c_2 \hat{\tilde{Q}}_n(\theta)]\end{aligned}$$

By Assumption 5.ii:

$$\hat{\tilde{Q}}_n(\theta_n) \leq c_1 \tilde{Q}_n(\theta_n) + O_p(\eta_n)$$

And By Assumption 5.iii:

$$\tilde{Q}_n(\theta) \leq c_2 \hat{\tilde{Q}}_n(\theta) + O_p(\eta_n)$$

By Assumption 5.iv  $\lambda_n P(\theta_n) = O(\delta_n)$ . Combining we get:

$$\tilde{Q}_n(\hat{\theta}) \leq c_1 c_2 \tilde{Q}_n(\theta_n) + O_p(\eta_n + \delta_n)$$

So 4.9 holds with  $\bar{c} = c_1 c_2$  in which case the conclusion of the lemma holds with  $c = \sqrt{c_1 c_2 c_3}$ .  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 2.* First we show that under Assumptions 1, 2, 3 and 5.v uniformly over  $F_X$ -almost all  $x_1$ :

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{ess sup } |\bar{y}(x_1|X) - \hat{E}[\Phi_n(x_1, V)\hat{\theta}|X]| \\ & \leq \text{ess sup } \sqrt{C}E \left[ (g(X, Z) - \Pi_n(X, Z)' \hat{\theta})^2 \middle| X \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ & + O_p(b_n) \end{aligned} \quad (4.11)$$

Where  $\hat{\theta}$  is treated as a constant in the expectation on the RHS above. By the triangle inequality:

$$\begin{aligned} & |\bar{y}(x_1|x_2) - \hat{E}[\Phi_n(x_1, V)\hat{\theta}|X = x_2]| \\ & \leq |\bar{y}(x_1|x_2) - E[\Phi_n(x_1, V)\hat{\theta}|X = x_2]| \\ & + |\hat{\alpha}_n(x_1, x_2)' \hat{\theta} - \alpha_n(x_1, x_2)' \hat{\theta}| \end{aligned}$$

By Assumption 5.v uniformly over  $F_X$ -almost all  $x_1$  and  $x_2$ :

$$|\hat{\alpha}_n(x_1, x_2)' \hat{\theta} - \alpha_n(x_1, x_2)' \hat{\theta}| \leq O_p(b_n)$$

Applying the well-posedness result of Theorem 1 with  $\gamma(X, V) = \Phi(X, V)' \hat{\theta}$ :

$$\begin{aligned} & (\bar{y}(x_1|x_2) - E[\Phi_n(x_1, V)\hat{\theta}|X = x_2])^2 \\ & \leq CE \left[ (g(X, Z) - \Pi_n(X, Z)' \hat{\theta})^2 \middle| X = x_1 \right] \end{aligned}$$

Combining gives 4.11. Next note that by Lemma 1:

$$\begin{aligned} & E \left[ (g(X, Z) - \Pi_n(X, Z)' \hat{\theta})^2 \middle| X = x_1 \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ & \leq c \inf_{\theta \in \Theta_n} \text{ess sup } E \left[ (g(X, Z) - \Pi_n(X, Z)' \theta)^2 \middle| X \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} + O_p(\eta_n + \delta_n) \end{aligned}$$

And under Assumption 5.i:

$$c \inf_{\theta \in \Theta_n} \text{ess sup } E \left[ (g(X, Z) - \Pi_n(X, Z)' \theta)^2 \middle| X \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} = O(\kappa_n)$$

Combining with 4.11 we get the result.  $\square$

*Proof of Proposition 1.* The approximation condition can be restated as follows. There exist functions  $\Gamma_n$ ,  $r_n$  and a constant  $F > 0$  so that:

$$\frac{dF_{V|Z=z, X=x}}{dF_{V|X=x}}(v) = \Phi_n(v, x)' \Gamma_n(z, x) + r_n(v, z, x) \quad (4.12)$$

For  $F_{(V,Z,X)}$ -almost all  $(V, Z, X)$  and:

$$E[r_n(V, z, x)^2 | X = x] \leq F\kappa_n$$

Using the definition of  $\Pi_n$  and 4.12:

$$\begin{aligned} & \Pi_n(z, x) \\ &= E[\Phi_n(V, x) | Z = z, X = x] \\ &= E[\Phi_n(V, x) \frac{dF_{V|Z=z, X=x}}{dF_{V|X=x}}(v) | X = x] \\ &= E[\Phi_n(V, x)(\Phi_n(V, x)' \Gamma_n(z, x) + r_n(V, z, x)) | X = x] \\ &= E[\Phi_n(V, x) \Phi_n(V, x)' | X = x] \Gamma_n(z, x) \\ &+ E[\Phi_n(V, x) r_n(V, z, x) | X = x] \end{aligned}$$

For each  $n$  define the vector  $\beta_n$  by:

$$\beta_n = E[\Phi_n(V, x) \Phi_n(V, x)' | X = x]^{-1} E[\gamma(V, x) \Phi_n(V, x) | X = x]$$

Note that  $\Phi_n(v, x)' \beta_n$  is a conditional mean least squares projection of  $\gamma$  onto the basis functions  $\Phi_n$  and so:

$$\begin{aligned} E\left[(\Phi_n(V, x)' \beta_n - \gamma(V, x))^2 \middle| X = x\right] &\leq E[\gamma(V, x)^2 | X = x] \\ &\leq D \end{aligned} \tag{4.13}$$

For  $F_X$ -almost all  $x$ , and further:

$$\begin{aligned} E\left[(\Phi_n(V, x)' \beta_n)^2 \middle| X = x\right] &\leq E[\gamma(V, x)^2 | X = x] \\ &\leq D \end{aligned}$$

Now note that:

$$\begin{aligned} g(z, x) &= E[\gamma(V, x) | Z = z, X = x] \\ &= E[\gamma(V, x) \Phi_n(V, x)' | X = x] \Gamma_n(z, x) \\ &+ E[\gamma(V, x) r_n(V, z, x) | X = x] \\ &= \Pi_n(z, x)' \beta_n \\ &+ E\left[(\gamma(V, x) - \Phi_n(V, x)' \beta_n) r_n(V, z, x) \middle| X = x\right] \end{aligned}$$

Where for the last equality we substitute for  $\Gamma_n(z, x)$  using 4.12. And so, using

Cauchy-Schwartz and 4.13:

$$\begin{aligned}
& E[(g(z, x) - \Pi_n(z, x)' \beta_n)^2 | X = x] \\
&= E \left[ \left( \gamma(V, x) - \Phi_n(V, x)' \beta_n \right) r_n(V, z, x) \middle| X = x \right]^2 \\
&\leq E \left[ \left( \Phi_n(V, x)' \beta_n - \gamma(V, x) \right)^2 \middle| X = x \right] \\
&\quad \times E[r_n(V, z, x)^2 | X = x] \\
&\leq DF \kappa_n \\
&= O(\kappa_n)
\end{aligned}$$

□

## References

- Ai, Chunrong, & Chen, Xiaohong. 2003. Efficient estimation of models with conditional moment restrictions containing unknown functions. *Econometrica*, **71**(6), 1795–1843.
- Andrews, Donald WK. 2017. Examples of L2-complete and boundedly-complete distributions. *Journal of Econometrics*, **199**(2), 213–220.
- Angrist, Joshua D., & Krueger, Alan B. 2001. Instrumental Variables and the Search for Identification: From Supply and Demand to Natural Experiments. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, **15**, 69–85.
- Arellano, Manuel, & Bond, Stephen. 1991. Some tests of specification for panel data: Monte Carlo evidence and an application to employment equations. *The review of economic studies*, **58**(2), 277–297.
- Arellano, Manuel, & Bonhomme, Stéphanie. 2016. Nonlinear panel data estimation via quantile regressions. *The Econometrics Journal*, **19**, C61–C94.
- Blundell, Richard, Chen, Xiaohong, & Kristensen, Dennis. 2007. Semi-nonparametric IV estimation of shape-invariant Engel curves. *Econometrica. Journal of the Econometric Society*, **75**(6), 1613–1669.
- Chai, Andreas, & Moneta, Alessio. 2010. Retrospectives: Engel Curves. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, **24**, 225–240.
- Chen, Xiaohong, & Pouzo, Demian. 2012. Estimation of Nonparametric Conditional Moment Models with Possibly Nonsmooth Generalized Residuals. *Econometrica*.
- Chen, Xiaohong, & Pouzo, Demian. 2015. Sieve Wald and QLR Inferences on Semi/Nonparametric Conditional Moment Models. *Econometrica*, **83**, 1013–1079.

- Chen, Xiaohong, Chernozhukov, Victor, Lee, Sokbae, & Newey, Whitney K. 2014. Local Identification of Nonparametric and Semiparametric Models. *Econometrica*.
- Chernozhukov, Victor, Fernández-Val, Iván, Hoderlein, Stefan, Holzmann, Hajo, & Newey, Whitney. 2015. Nonparametric identification in panels using quantiles. *Journal of Econometrics*, **188**, 378–392.
- Cunha, Flavio, Heckman, James, & Schennach, Susanne. 2010. Estimating the Technology of Cognitive and Noncognitive Skill Formation. *Econometrica*.
- Darolles, Serge, Fan, Yanqin, Florens, Jean-Pierre, & Renault, Eric. 2011. Non-parametric Instrumental Regression. *Econometrica*.
- Deaner, Ben. 2019. *Nonparametric Instrumental Variables Estimation Under Misspecification*. Working paper.
- DeVore, Ronald A., & Lorentz, George G. 1993. *Constructive Approximation*. Springer-Verlag.
- D’Haultfoeulle, Xavier. 2011. On the completeness condition in nonparametric instrumental problems. *Econometric Theory*, **27**(3), 460–471.
- Evdokimov, Kirill. 2009. *Identification and Estimation of a Nonparametric Panel Data Model with Unobserved Heterogeneity*.
- Freyberger, Joachim. 2018. Non-parametric panel data models with interactive fixed effects. *Review of Economic Studies*, **85**(3), 1824–1851.
- Fruehwirth, Jane Cooley, Navarro, Salvador, & Takahashi, Yuya. 2016. How the Timing of Grade Retention Affects Outcomes: Identification and Estimation of Time-Varying Treatment Effects. *Journal of Labor Economics*, **34**, 979–1021.
- Hall, Peter, & Horowitz, Joel L. 2005. Nonparametric methods for inference in the presence of instrumental variables. *The Annals of Statistics*, **33**, 2904–2929.
- Hausman, Jerry A., & Taylor, William E. 1981. Panel Data and Unobservable Individual Effects. *Econometrica*, **49**, 1377.
- Holtz-Eakin, Douglas, Newey, Whitney, & Rosen, Harvey S. 1988. Estimating Vector Autoregressions with Panel Data. *Econometrica*, **56**, 1371.
- Hu, Yingyao, & Schennach, Susanne M. 2008. Instrumental Variable Treatment of Nonclassical Measurement Error Models. *E*, **76**, 195–216.
- Hu, Yingyao, & Shiu, Ji-Liang. 2018. Nonparametric identification using instrumental variables: sufficient conditions for completeness. *Econometric Theory*, **34**(3), 659–693.

- Ichimura, Hidehiko, & Newey, Whitney K. 2017. *The influence function of semiparametric estimators*.
- Jimerson, Shane R. 2001. Meta-analysis of grade retention research: Implications for practice in the 21st century. *School psychology review*, **30**(3), 420–437.
- Kress, Rainer. 1999. *Linear Integral Equations*. Springer.
- Kuroki, Manabu, & Pearl, Judea. 2014. Measurement Bias and Effect Restoration in Causal Inference. *Biometrika*.
- Lewbel, Arthur. 2008. Engel Curves. In: *The New Palgrave Dictionary of Economics, 2nd Edition*. Palgrave.
- Miao, Wang, Geng, Zhi, & Tchetgen, Eric J. Tchetgen. 2018. Identifying causal effects with proxy variables of an unmeasured confounder. *Biometrika*, **105**, 987–993.
- Newey, Whitney K., & Powell, James L. 2003. Instrumental Variable Estimation of Nonparametric Models. *Econometrica*, **71**, 1565–1578.
- Rokkanen, Miikka AT. 2015. *Exam schools, ability, and the effects of affirmative action: Latent factor extrapolation in the regression discontinuity design*. Working paper.
- Severini, Thomas A., & Tripathi, Gautam. 2012. Efficiency bounds for estimating linear functionals of nonparametric regression models with endogenous regressors. *Journal of Econometrics*, **170**, 491–498.
- Sunder, Viakalathur Shankar. 2016. *Operators on Hilbert space*. Vol. 71. Springer.
- VanderWeele, Tyler J., & Shpitser, Ilya. 2013. On the definition of a confounder. *The Annals of Statistics*, **41**, 196–220.