

Treatment Effect Models with Strategic Interaction in Treatment Decisions

Tadao Hoshino* and Takahide Yanagi†

This version: August 2020

First version: October 2018

Abstract

This study considers treatment effect models in which others' treatment decisions can affect one's own treatment and outcome. Focusing on the case of two-player interactions, we formulate treatment decision behavior as a complete information game with multiple equilibria. Using a latent index framework and assuming a stochastic equilibrium selection, we prove that the marginal treatment effect from one's own treatment and that from the partner can be identified separately. Based on our constructive identification results, we propose a two-step semiparametric procedure for estimating the marginal treatment effects using series approximation. We show that the proposed estimator is uniformly consistent and asymptotically normally distributed. As an empirical illustration, we investigate the impacts of risky behaviors on adolescents' academic performance.

Keywords: binary games; latent index models; marginal treatment effects; series estimation; strategic interaction.

JEL Classification: C14, C31, C57.

*Corresponding author: School of Political Science and Economics, Waseda University, 1-6-1 Nishi-waseda, Shinjuku, Tokyo 169-8050, Japan. Email: thoshino@waseda.jp.

†Graduate School of Economics, Kyoto University, Yoshida Honmachi, Sakyo, Kyoto, 606-8501, Japan. Email: yanagi@econ.kyoto-u.ac.jp.

1 Introduction

Estimating the marginal treatment effects (MTE) is essential in treatment evaluation with an endogenous treatment. The MTE can provide rich information on how treatment effects vary across economic agents in terms of their observed and unobserved characteristics. Furthermore, after estimating the MTE, researchers can identify many treatment parameters of interest, such as the average treatment effects (ATE), local ATE (LATE), and policy-relevant treatment effects (PRTE) as some weighted averages of the MTE (Heckman and Vytlacil, 1999, 2005). Prior studies clearly demonstrate the usefulness of MTE methods in various empirical fields such as labor economics, health economics, and education economics (e.g., Basu *et al.*, 2007; Carneiro *et al.*, 2011; Cornelissen *et al.*, 2016; Felfe and Lalive, 2018, among others).

An important but often neglected issue in studies of treatment effects is the presence of potential interference between agents. For example, when evaluating the effect of smoking behavior on health outcomes for couples, one partner’s smoking behavior would affect the health outcome of the other. That is, the well-known stable unit treatment value assumption (SUTVA) would not hold due to the treatment spillover. In addition, it is natural to expect that one partner’s smoking behavior interacts “strategically” with the other partner’s smoking behavior, in the sense that one partner’s action can directly affect the utility of smoking of the other partner, and vice versa. This example suggests the presence of two different types of interference that need to be addressed: (i) treatment spillover and (ii) strategic interaction in the treatment decisions.

In reality, the co-existence of treatment spillover and strategic interaction should be fairly common. For example, it is frequently observed that peer behavior such as delinquent activities among close friends has a significant impact on students’ academic performance, invalidating the SUTVA when viewing delinquency as a treatment variable. Additionally, many prior studies empirically show that strategic (social) interaction between friends is a primary cause of delinquency. For another example, consider two large-scale rival retailers, which are deciding whether to enter a given local market. Here, we would be interested in measuring the effects of the entry of these large retailers on other local businesses and communities, similar to Jia (2008). This example is viewed as a special case of endogenous treatment models with the both types of interference.

This study aims to develop identification and estimation procedure for MTE models that allow both treatment spillover and strategic interaction in the treatment decisions. In particular, we focus on an empirically relevant setup in which interactions occur between a pair of agents (e.g., couples, best friends, twins, or duopoly firms). We postulate that they make decisions on their treatment status simultaneously in a binary game of complete information. Within this framework, we formulate a set of sufficient conditions under which it is possible to point-identify the MTE parameters of interest. To this end, we need to address the following two issues. The first issue is the non-applicability of standard (i.e., ordered) *monotonicity* and *unordered monotonicity* (Imbens and Angrist, 1994; Heckman and Vytlacil, 1999, 2005; Heckman and Pinto, 2018). The monotonicity conditions require that shifts in instrumental variables (IVs) determine the direction of changes in the treatment choices uniformly in all agents. As Vytlacil (2002) and Heckman and Pinto (2018) show, these monotonicity conditions are equivalent to assuming a model in which the effects

of the IVs on the treatment decisions are additively separable from unobservable error terms. However, in our case, an agent’s treatment choice nonlinearly depends on another agent’s treatment choice through strategic interaction. Consequently, a shift in one agent’s IV can interact with both his/her and the partner’s unobservables in a non-additive way, implying the failure of the monotonicity conditions. The second issue is the possibility of multiple equilibria in the treatment decisions. The presence of multiple equilibria leads to an *incomplete* econometric model (e.g., [Tamer, 2003](#); [Lewbel, 2007](#); [Ciliberto and Tamer, 2009](#); [Chesher and Rosen, 2020](#), among others) in the sense that the model-consistent treatment assignment is not unique. The issue of incompleteness is a common problem in the literature on game model estimation; however, it is not yet well understood in the context of treatment evaluation.

Our identification strategy, which solves these two issues simultaneously, is a combination of extending the local IV (LIV) method in [Heckman and Vytlacil \(1999, 2005\)](#) and imposing a stochastic equilibrium selection rule in the treatment decision game. The key idea is to use local variations of the pair of IVs that satisfy a relevance condition and an exclusion restriction. Specifically, we require the existence of player-specific continuous IVs that alter players’ treatment status, but do not directly affect their outcomes. Although this is a natural extension of the LIV method to a multidimensional space, it is still insufficient to point-identify the MTEs due to the presence of multiple equilibria. We overcome this issue by explicitly introducing an equilibrium selection rule.

We present the following novel identification results. First, we can point-identify the following MTE parameters: the *direct MTE*, in which only one agent’s treatment status switches from untreated to treated, whereas the partner’s remains unchanged; the *indirect MTE*, in which only the partner’s treatment status switches from untreated to treated, and the focal agent’s status remains unchanged; and the *total MTE*, in which the treatment status of both players switches from untreated to treated. In contrast to the conventional MTE framework, our MTEs can reveal treatment effect heterogeneity in terms of the “pair” of unobservables. Second, we show that the presence of multiple equilibria results in over-identification of MTE parameters. Importantly, this over-identifiability provides an opportunity to improve the efficiency of the MTE estimation and to derive a testable implication for the equilibrium selection assumption. Third, based on the identification of the MTE, we present the identification of the other treatment parameters, including the LATE and PRTE. Finally, while treatment evaluation is our main concern, we also provide new supplementary results for the identification of binary game models of complete information.

Our identification is constructive in that we can estimate the MTEs directly by following the identification strategy. We propose a two-step semiparametric procedure for estimating the MTEs. In the first step, we estimate the parameters in the treatment decision game using a maximum likelihood (ML) approach. Using the ML estimates, we estimate the MTEs in the second step by employing semiparametric series (sieve) techniques to estimate the outcome equation. The proposed estimator is uniformly consistent with the optimal convergence rate and is asymptotically normally distributed. In addition, the estimator possesses an oracle property in the sense that its limiting distribution is the same as that of the infeasible estimator where the parameters in the treatment decision game are treated as known.

To illustrate our methods empirically, we investigate the impacts of an opposite-gender best friend’s delinquency (e.g., smoking and drinking alcohol) on adolescents’ academic outcome (GPA: grade point

average). Following the literature (e.g., [Card and Giuliano, 2013](#)), we model the decision to participate in such risky activities as a complete information game. Our methods reveal new empirical evidences that the direct treatment effect of risky behaviors on GPA is significantly negative for female students and that the total treatment effect is significant for both genders. In particular, we find that an opposite-gender friend’s delinquency more easily influences male students’ GPAs than those of female students.

To our best knowledge, few studies address treatment evaluation in the presence of strategic interaction modeled explicitly as games. One important exception is [Balat and Han \(2019\)](#), who investigate the partial identification of the ATE, differently from our focus on the point identification of the MTEs. The key identification assumptions in [Balat and Han \(2019\)](#) are nonparametric shape restrictions and variations in possibly discrete IVs, while we rely principally on a stochastic equilibrium selection rule and the existence of player-specific continuous IVs to achieve the point identification.

Another closely related study is [Lee and Salanié \(2018\)](#), who show that it is possible to identify MTE parameters by modeling the treatment selection with a set of threshold-crossing rules. Their identification result is obtained by computing the changes in the expected outcome with respect to local variations of “all” threshold variables, even including those irrelevant to a particular treatment status. Appendix C of [Lee and Salanié \(2018\)](#) illustrates how this approach can be used in the case when the treatments are determined in a binary game. In contrast, our approach uses only a set of the threshold variables which are needed to well-define a treatment status of interest. This means that our identification result holds with a fewer number of IVs than theirs, and this distinction would be crucial from a practical perspective (see Remark 3.1 for more details).

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we introduce our model and review the incompleteness problem for discrete game models. In Section 3, we establish the identification of the MTE parameters. We develop our two-step semiparametric estimators for the MTEs and show their asymptotic properties in Section 4. Section 5 presents the numerical illustrations, including a set of Monte Carlo simulations and the empirical analysis of adolescents’ academic performance. Section 6 concludes the paper. The proofs of all theorems are provided in Appendix A, and other supplementary technical results in Appendices B and C. In Appendix D, we discuss the identification of several treatment parameters besides the MTE. Appendix E presents detailed information about the Monte Carlo experiments in Section 5. Finally, we provide the supplementary tables and figures for the empirical analysis in Appendix F.

2 Model

In this section, we introduce our treatment effect model with strategic interaction. We denote a player by $j \in \{1, 2\}$ and his/her partner (or opponent) by $-j$. We aim to evaluate the effects of player j ’s treatment $D_j \in \{0, 1\}$ and/or partner’s treatment $D_{-j} \in \{0, 1\}$ on player j ’s outcome Y_j and/or the partner’s outcome Y_{-j} . The outcomes may or may not be common to both players; that is, we allow both $Y_j = Y_{-j}$ and $Y_j \neq Y_{-j}$.

Let $Y_j^{(d_j, d_{-j})}$ be the potential outcome for player j when his/her own treatment status is $D_j = d_j$ and the partner's is $D_{-j} = d_{-j}$. Then, the observed outcome can be written as $Y_j = \sum_{d_j=0}^1 \sum_{d_{-j}=0}^1 I^{(d_j, d_{-j})} Y_j^{(d_j, d_{-j})}$, where $I^{(d_j, d_{-j})} := \mathbf{1}\{(D_j, D_{-j}) = (d_j, d_{-j})\}$. Suppose that player j 's potential outcome can be written as

$$Y_j^{(d_j, d_{-j})} = \mu_j^{(d_j, d_{-j})} \left(X_j, U_j^{(d_j, d_{-j})} \right), \quad (2.1)$$

where $X_j \in \mathbb{R}^{\dim(X)}$ is a vector of the observable covariates, $U_j^{(d_j, d_{-j})} \in \mathbb{R}$ is an unobservable random variable, and $\mu_j^{(d_j, d_{-j})}$ is an unknown structural function. The covariates X_1 and X_2 may contain common elements as well as some player-specific elements. For simplicity, we assume that the dimensions of X_1 and X_2 are both equal to $\dim(X)$, and the same assumption will be made for the other variables. The model specification (2.1) is fairly general in that $U_j^{(d_j, d_{-j})}$ and $\mu_j^{(d_j, d_{-j})}$ can depend on the player type j and treatment status (d_j, d_{-j}) .

2.1 Strategic interaction in the treatment decisions

To account for the strategic interaction between players, we extend the latent index model of [Heckman and Vytlacil \(1999, 2005\)](#). Suppose that player j 's treatment is determined by

$$D_j = \mathbf{1} \{ \pi_j(D_{-j}, W_j) \geq \varepsilon_j \}, \quad (2.2)$$

where $W_j := (X_j^\top, Z_j^\top)^\top$ is a vector including X_j and the instruments $Z_j \in \mathbb{R}^{\dim(Z)}$, $\varepsilon_j \in \mathbb{R}$ is a continuously distributed unobserved random variable, and π_j is an unknown function. We do not restrict the dependence structure between ε_j and $U_j^{(d_j, d_{-j})}$ for $(d_j, d_{-j}) \in \{0, 1\}^2$, which is the source of endogeneity. Without endogeneity, one may relatively easily identify some causal parameters by standard approaches based on an unconfoundedness assumption, even in the presence of strategic interaction. We assume that the IVs include at least one player-specific variable so that the distribution of Z_j is non-degenerate given Z_{-j} . The instruments Z_j are assumed to be independent of the unobservables ε_j and $U_j^{(d_j, d_{-j})}$ for $(d_j, d_{-j}) \in \{0, 1\}^2$ conditional on $X = (X_1, X_2)$. In addition, when using an LIV method to identify treatment effects, we require that not all the elements of Z_j are discrete.

For the subsequent analysis, it is convenient to transform (2.2) as follows. Firstly, since D_{-j} is a binary variable, we can write

$$\pi_j(D_{-j}, W_j) = \pi_j^0(W_j) + D_{-j} (\pi_j^1(W_j) - \pi_j^0(W_j)), \quad (2.3)$$

where $\pi_j^0(\cdot) := \pi_j(0, \cdot)$ and $\pi_j^1(\cdot) := \pi_j(1, \cdot)$.¹ Let

$$V_j := F_{\varepsilon_j}(\varepsilon_j | X), \quad P_j^0 := F_{\varepsilon_j}(\pi_j^0(W_j) | X), \quad P_j^1 := F_{\varepsilon_j}(\pi_j^1(W_j) | X), \quad (2.4)$$

¹ The expression in (2.3) clearly indicates that the additive separability imposed on the treatment decision model (2.2) implies the interaction effect to be a function of only the observed variables. In the context of our empirical setting, this requires that the impact of friends' delinquency is independent of own unobserved factors, such as his/her latent attitude towards risky activities. With few exceptions (e.g., [Kline, 2015](#)), models where the strategic interaction effects can depend on some unobservables have not been studied in detail in the literature, and how to cope with this issue is an important future task.

where $F_{\varepsilon_j}(\cdot|X)$ is the conditional cumulative distribution function (CDF) of ε_j given X . By construction, V_j is distributed as $\text{Uniform}[0, 1]$ conditional on X . Combining these and (2.3), we can rewrite (2.2) as

$$D_j = \mathbf{1} \{P_j^0 + D_{-j}(P_j^1 - P_j^0) \geq V_j\}. \quad (2.5)$$

The treatment decision (2.5) is equivalent to $D_j(D_{-j})$ almost surely (a.s.), where $D_j(d_{-j}) = \arg\max_{d_j \in \{0,1\}} u_j(d_j, d_{-j})$, and $u_j(d_j, d_{-j}) := d_j \cdot (P_j^0 + d_{-j}(P_j^1 - P_j^0) - V_j)$. That is, we can view $u_j(d_j, d_{-j})$ as the payoff function for player j and $D_j(d_{-j})$ as the best response given $D_{-j} = d_{-j}$.² Here, we implicitly assume a complete information setup, where $(W_j, W_{-j}, \varepsilon_j, \varepsilon_{-j})$ is common knowledge to both players. The set of realized treatments (D_j, D_{-j}) generated by model (2.2) is a fixed point of the best responses; that is, it is a pure strategy Nash equilibrium of the game with the payoff matrix given in Table 1.³

Table 1: Payoff matrix

	$D_2 = 0$	$D_2 = 1$
$D_1 = 0$	$(0, 0)$	$(0, P_2^0 - V_2)$
$D_1 = 1$	$(P_1^0 - V_1, 0)$	$(P_1^1 - V_1, P_2^1 - V_2)$

For simplicity, we assume that whether the treatment decisions are strategic complements or substitutes is known to us a priori. Note that this assumption is empirically testable.⁴ The treatment decisions are complements (resp. substitutes) if and only if the strategic interaction effect $P_j^1 - P_j^0$ is positive (resp. negative). We hereafter restrict our main focus to the case of complementarity.

Assumption 2.1. For both $j = 1$ and 2 , $P_j^1 - P_j^0 > 0$, a.s.

This assumption is in line with our empirical illustration. That is, there is a consensus in the literature that friends' delinquency tend to promote one's own delinquency. It is not difficult to modify our approach for the case of strategic substitutes.

² If players 1 and 2 are collaborating partners such that their payoffs are transferable to each other, the players action may be jointly characterized by $(D_1, D_2) = \arg\max_{(d_1, d_2) \in \{0,1\}^2} [u_1(d_1, d_2) + u_2(d_2, d_1)]$. This type of cooperative decision-making model is proposed in Lewbel (2007). As shown in Lewbel (2007), this model is *complete* (i.e., no multiple model-consistent solutions) and, thus, is analytically simpler than non-cooperative models including (2.5).

³ Most of studies in the game econometrics literature focus on pure strategy Nash equilibria as the solution concept for 2×2 games, except when there are no Nash equilibria in pure strategies, for example, because of asymmetric strategic interaction (cf., e.g., Bjorn and Vuong, 1984; Tamer, 2003; de Paula, 2013). For some motivations of this choice, we refer readers, for example, to Section 6 of Bjorn and Vuong (1984).

⁴ For example, Aradillas-López (2019) has developed nonparametric tests for the presence and the direction of strategic interaction effects in 2×2 games of complete information. For another example, one may use a Vuong-type model selection test for non-nested alternatives (e.g., Hsu and Shi, 2017; Schennach and Wilhelm, 2017).

2.2 Incompleteness

A major difficulty in our model is the *incompleteness* of the treatment decision model. Under strategic complementarity, we have the following relationship between (D_1, D_2) and (V_1, V_2) :

$$\begin{aligned}
 (D_1, D_2) = (1, 1) &\implies V_1 \leq P_1^1, V_2 \leq P_2^1, \\
 (D_1, D_2) = (1, 0) &\iff V_1 \leq P_1^0, V_2 > P_2^1, \\
 (D_1, D_2) = (0, 1) &\iff V_1 > P_1^1, V_2 \leq P_2^0, \\
 (D_1, D_2) = (0, 0) &\implies V_1 > P_1^0, V_2 > P_2^0.
 \end{aligned} \tag{2.6}$$

Figure 1 visually summarizes these relationships. As shown in the figure, the space of $V = (V_1, V_2)$ cannot be partitioned into non-overlapping regions associated with the four alternative realizations of $D = (D_1, D_2)$. Both $D = (1, 1)$ and $D = (0, 0)$ can occur when $P_1^0 < V_1 \leq P_1^1$ and $P_2^0 < V_2 \leq P_2^1$, and in this case, the value of D is not uniquely determined (i.e., multiple equilibria). This non-uniqueness of model-consistent decisions is called incompleteness and has been extensively studied in the literature on simultaneous equation models for discrete outcomes.




Figure 1: Nash equilibrium under strategic complementarity.

To handle this incompleteness problem, there are essentially three approaches to achieve point identification in the literature.⁵ The first approach is to focus only on the outcomes that can occur as unique equilibria (e.g., [Bresnahan and Reiss, 1990](#); [Berry, 1992](#)). The second approach is to use an identification-at-infinity strategy based on large support regressors and exclusion restrictions (e.g., [Tamer, 2003](#); [Bajari et al., 2010](#); [Kline, 2015](#)). The third approach is to explicitly introduce a stochastic (or possibly deterministic) equilibrium selection mechanism (e.g., [Bjorn and Vuong, 1984](#); [Kooreman, 1994](#); [Soetevent and Kooreman, 2007](#); [Bajari et al., 2010](#); [Card and Giuliano, 2013](#); [Khan and Nekipelov, 2018](#)). Especially among them, the last approach allows us to identify the choice behavior in the region of multiplicity and to perform counterfactual exercises.

⁵ Partial identification of game econometric models has been considered, for example, in [Ciliberto and Tamer \(2009\)](#) and [Aradillas-Lopez and Rosen \(2019\)](#). See [de Paula \(2013\)](#) for an excellent survey on this topic.

Since the estimation of treatment effects inherently involves counterfactual inference, it is natural to employ the stochastic equilibrium selection approach in our situation.

Remark 2.1 (Monotonicity). From Figure 1 and (2.6), we can find why the standard monotonicity and unordered monotonicity conditions are not applicable to our situation. Consider the pairs of agents in the region of multiple equilibria and those in the region of $D = (1, 0)$ for a given $Z = z$, where $Z = (Z_1, Z_2)$. Suppose that a shift of Z from z to z' induces the former set of pairs to $D = (0, 1)$ and the latter to the multiple equilibria. In this case, some of the former pairs would switch their treatment statuses from $D = (0, 0)$ to $D = (0, 1)$, while some of the latter pairs would switch from $D = (1, 0)$ to $D = (0, 0)$. Thus, the change in the IV values results in both inflows into $D = (0, 0)$ and outflows from it, implying the violation of the monotonicity conditions.

3 Identification

In this section, the identification of the MTE parameters is discussed. We here refer to the treatment decision game (2.5) as the “first stage” and the realization of the outcome (2.1) as the “second stage”. To focus on the identification of the parameters in the second stage, we treat the parameters in the first stage as known to us. More specifically, we assume the following:

Assumption 3.1.

- (i) For both $j = 1$ and 2 , P_j^0 and P_j^1 are identified.
- (ii) The conditional CDF and density of V given $X = x$, denoted respectively by $H(v_1, v_2|x)$ and $h(v_1, v_2|x)$, are identified (or known) functions.

Assumption 3.1 can be justified by the existing identification results in the literature with minor modifications (e.g., [Bresnahan and Reiss, 1990](#); [Berry, 1992](#); [Tamer, 2003](#); [Kline, 2015](#)). In particular, note that this assumption can be satisfied without imposing auxiliary assumptions on equilibrium selection.

For what follows, we introduce additional notations: $Y = (Y_1, Y_2)$, $W = (W_1, W_2)$, $\varepsilon = (\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2)$, and $U^{(d_1, d_2)} = (U_1^{(d_1, d_2)}, U_2^{(d_2, d_1)})$ for $(d_1, d_2) \in \{0, 1\}^2$. We here introduce the exclusion restriction and relevance condition for the IVs.

Assumption 3.2.

- (i) For all $(d_1, d_2) \in \{0, 1\}^2$, the instruments Z are excluded from the structural functions in (2.1) and are independent of the unobservables $(\varepsilon, U^{(d_1, d_2)})$ given X .
- (ii) For both $j = 1$ and 2 , the instruments Z_j contain a player-specific continuous variable such that $\pi_j^0(W_j)$ and $\pi_j^1(W_j)$ are non-degenerate and continuously distributed given X .

Assumption 3.2(i) requires that the instruments Z do not directly affect the outcomes Y and are conditionally independent of the error terms. By construction, the transformed error V is also conditionally independent of Z given X . Thus, the conditional distributions of V and $U^{(d_1, d_2)}$ given W are identical to

those given X . Assumption 3.2(ii) requires that the instrument Z_j must contain a continuous non-trivial determinant of D_j specific to player j .

We provide below a series of identification results only for player 1 (the results for player 2 are symmetric and thus omitted). We first discuss the identification of the conditional mean of the potential outcome:

$$m_1^{(d_1, d_2)}(x, p_1, p_2) := E[Y_1^{(d_1, d_2)} | X = x, V_1 = p_1, V_2 = p_2]. \quad (3.1)$$

We call this function the marginal treatment response (MTR) function, as in Mogstad *et al.* (2018). Since the number of treatment patterns is four (i.e., $D \in \{(0, 0), (1, 0), (0, 1), (1, 1)\}$), there are six distinct MTE parameters for each player. From the point of view of player 1, the parameters of interest would be the *direct MTE*, *indirect MTE*, and *total MTE*, which are defined as

$$\begin{aligned} \text{MTE}_{\text{direct}}^{(d_2)}(x, p_1, p_2) &:= m_1^{(1, d_2)}(x, p_1, p_2) - m_1^{(0, d_2)}(x, p_1, p_2) \quad \text{for } d_2 \in \{0, 1\}, \\ \text{MTE}_{\text{indirect}}^{(d_1)}(x, p_1, p_2) &:= m_1^{(d_1, 1)}(x, p_1, p_2) - m_1^{(d_1, 0)}(x, p_1, p_2) \quad \text{for } d_1 \in \{0, 1\}, \\ \text{MTE}_{\text{total}}(x, p_1, p_2) &:= m_1^{(1, 1)}(x, p_1, p_2) - m_1^{(0, 0)}(x, p_1, p_2), \end{aligned}$$

respectively. Notably, these MTE parameters are informative about the variation of the treatment effects in terms of the pair of unobservables V_1 and V_2 , in contrast to the conventional MTE framework. The identification of the MTE parameters is straightforward once the MTR function for each (d_1, d_2) is identified.

3.1 Identification of the marginal treatment response functions

We first consider the cases of $D = (1, 0)$ and $D = (0, 1)$. In these cases, V resides in the regions with a unique equilibrium. In the following, we investigate the identification of the MTR functions:

$$\begin{aligned} m_1^{(1, 0)}(x, p_1^0, p_2^1) &\quad \text{for } (p_1^0, p_2^1) \in \text{supp}[P_1^0, P_2^1 | X = x, D = (1, 0)], \\ m_1^{(0, 1)}(x, p_1^1, p_2^0) &\quad \text{for } (p_1^1, p_2^0) \in \text{supp}[P_1^1, P_2^0 | X = x, D = (0, 1)], \end{aligned}$$

where $\text{supp}[P | A = a]$ denotes the conditional support of random variable(s) P given the event $A = a$. The former is the MTR function for player 1 when $D = (1, 0)$ is realized and V is located at point A in Figure 2. At this point, players 1 and 2 are at the “margin” of the actions $D = (1, 0)$, $(1, 1)$, and $(0, 0)$ given that $(P_1^0, P_2^1) = (p_1^0, p_2^1)$ holds. Thus, only a small deviation from (p_1^0, p_2^1) may result in different treatment decisions from $D = (1, 0)$. The latter MTR function can be interpreted similarly at point D. Further, we define the following functions:

$$\begin{aligned} \psi_1^{(1, 0)}(x, p_1^0, p_2^1) &:= E[I^{(1, 0)} Y_1 | X = x, P_1^0 = p_1^0, P_2^1 = p_2^1] \quad \text{for } (p_1^0, p_2^1) \in \text{supp}[P_1^0, P_2^1 | X = x, D = (1, 0)], \\ \psi_1^{(0, 1)}(x, p_1^1, p_2^0) &:= E[I^{(0, 1)} Y_1 | X = x, P_1^1 = p_1^1, P_2^0 = p_2^0] \quad \text{for } (p_1^1, p_2^0) \in \text{supp}[P_1^1, P_2^0 | X = x, D = (0, 1)], \end{aligned}$$

which are directly identified from the data. Hereafter, when there is no confusion, we suppress the subscript 1 from $m_1^{(d_1, d_2)}$ and $\psi_1^{(d_1, d_2)}$ for notational simplicity.




Figure 2: Points at which the MTR functions are identified.

The next theorem presents formal identification results for the MTR functions for $D = (1, 0)$ and $(0, 1)$.⁶

Theorem 3.1. Suppose that Assumptions 2.1, 3.1, and 3.2 hold. Then, if $m^{(1,0)}(x, v_1, v_2)$, $m^{(0,1)}(x, v_1, v_2)$, and $h(v_1, v_2|x)$ are continuous in (v_1, v_2) , the MTR functions for $D = (1, 0)$ and $D = (0, 1)$ can be identified as

$$m^{(1,0)}(x, p_1^0, p_2^1) = -\frac{1}{h(p_1^0, p_2^1|x)} \frac{\partial^2 \psi^{(1,0)}(x, p_1^0, p_2^1)}{\partial p_1^0 \partial p_2^1},$$

$$m^{(0,1)}(x, p_1^1, p_2^0) = -\frac{1}{h(p_1^1, p_2^0|x)} \frac{\partial^2 \psi^{(0,1)}(x, p_1^1, p_2^0)}{\partial p_1^1 \partial p_2^0}.$$

A sketch of the proof for $m^{(1,0)}(x, p_1^0, p_2^1)$ would be helpful to illustrate the identification strategy used here. It can be shown that

$$\begin{aligned} \psi^{(1,0)}(x, p_1^0, p_2^1) &= E[Y_1^{(1,0)}|X = x, V_1 \leq p_1^0, V_2 > p_2^1] \cdot \Pr[V_1 \leq p_1^0, V_2 > p_2^1|X = x] \\ &= \int_{p_2^1}^1 \int_0^{p_1^0} m^{(1,0)}(x, v_1, v_2) h(v_1, v_2|x) dv_1 dv_2. \end{aligned}$$

Partially differentiating both sides with respect to p_1^0 and p_2^1 yields the desired result. In this derivation, we need Assumption 2.1 so that the treatment status $D = (1, 0)$ may be uniquely linked with the region of V (i.e., the upper left region in Figures 1 and 2). Assumption 3.2(i) is required so that the first equality may be derived and the conditions by P_1^0 and P_2^1 be ignored. Assumption 3.2(ii) ensures that the partial differentiation with respect to p_1^0 and p_2^1 is well defined.

We move on to the identification of the MTR functions for $D = (0, 0)$ and $D = (1, 1)$. In contrast to the

⁶ Similarly, replacing Y_1 in $\psi^{(1,0)}(x, p_1^0, p_2^1)$ with 1 leads to $h(p_1^0, p_2^1|x) = -\partial^2 \Pr[D = (1, 0)|X = x, P_1^0 = p_1^0, P_2^1 = p_2^1]/(\partial p_1^0 \partial p_2^1)$. Similar results hold for the other realizations of D ; as such, they can be used to check the specification of the distribution of V imposed in Assumption 3.1.

above cases, the treatment statuses $D = (0, 0)$ and $D = (1, 1)$ are not uniquely selected when V is in the multiple equilibria region. Hence, we introduce an assumption on the equilibrium selection that leads to the point identification of the parameters of interest. Write the region of V where multiple equilibria occur as $\mathcal{V}_{\text{mul}}(\mathbf{P}) := \{(v_1, v_2) \in [0, 1]^2 : P_1^0 < v_1 \leq P_1^1, P_2^0 < v_2 \leq P_2^1\}$, where $\mathbf{P} = (P_1^0, P_1^1, P_2^0, P_2^1)$. Further, denote the region of V where $D = (0, 0)$ is uniquely selected by $\mathcal{V}_{\text{uni}}^{(0,0)}(\mathbf{P}) := \{(v_1, v_2) \in [0, 1]^2 : P_1^0 < v_1, P_2^0 < v_2\} \setminus \mathcal{V}_{\text{mul}}(\mathbf{P})$. For notational convenience, we often write $\mathcal{V}_{\text{mul}} = \mathcal{V}_{\text{mul}}(\mathbf{p})$ and $\mathcal{V}_{\text{uni}}^{(0,0)} = \mathcal{V}_{\text{uni}}^{(0,0)}(\mathbf{p})$ by suppressing their dependence on $\mathbf{P} = \mathbf{p}$.

Assumption 3.3.

- (i) There exist a constant $\lambda \in [0, 1]$ and an unobserved random variable ϵ distributed as $\text{Uniform}[0, 1]$ independent of $(W, \epsilon, U^{(d_1, d_2)})$ for $(d_1, d_2) \in \{0, 1\}^2$ such that when $V \in \mathcal{V}_{\text{mul}}(\mathbf{P})$, $D = (0, 0)$ occurs if and only if $\epsilon \leq \lambda$; that is, $D = (0, 0) \iff V \in \mathcal{V}_{\text{uni}}^{(0,0)}(\mathbf{P}) \vee (V \in \mathcal{V}_{\text{mul}}(\mathbf{P}) \wedge \epsilon \leq \lambda)$.
- (ii) $\lambda \in [0, 1]$ is an identified (or known) parameter.

This assumption states that $D = (0, 0)$ is observed with probability $\lambda \in [0, 1]$ in the multiple equilibria situation. Similarly to Assumption 3.1, we assume that λ is identifiable or known. For example, some authors assume that under multiple equilibria, one of model-consistent actions is selected uniformly at random (e.g., Bjorn and Vuong, 1984; Soetevent and Kooreman, 2007). In particular, Card and Giuliano (2013) introduce this assumption in their empirical application on risky behaviors. If we adopt the same assumption, we can set $\lambda = 0.5$ a priori. For another example, one may assume that the realized treatment status corresponds to the “largest” Nash equilibrium, as in Xu and Lee (2015). In this case, since $u_j(1, 1) > u_j(0, 0)$ in the multiple equilibria region for both players, $D = (1, 1)$ holds almost surely (i.e., $\lambda = 0$). Although we introduce Assumption 3.3 for tractability, we can instead consider a more general structure on the equilibrium selection. For example, we can establish point identification results even when the assumption is relaxed to allow λ to depend on X . In more general case, λ may depend also on some unobservable factors that are possibly correlated with other variables; nevertheless, it would be difficult to identify such very general selection from data alone (cf. Jun and Pinkse, 2019). Even without any assumptions on the equilibrium selection, it would be possible to partially identify some causal parameters, as in Balat and Han (2019); see also Remark 3.3 below.

To state the next theorem, define the following function which can be identified from the data:

$$\psi^{(d_1, d_2)}(x, \mathbf{p}) := E[I^{(d_1, d_2)} Y_1 | X = x, \mathbf{P} = \mathbf{p}] \quad \text{for } \mathbf{p} \in \text{supp}[\mathbf{P} | X = x, D = (d_1, d_2)].$$

Theorem 3.2. Suppose that Assumptions 2.1, 3.1, 3.2, and 3.3 hold. Then, if $m^{(0,0)}(x, v_1, v_2)$, $m^{(1,1)}(x, v_1, v_2)$, and $h(v_1, v_2 | x)$ are continuous in (v_1, v_2) , the MTR functions for $D = (0, 0)$ and $D = (1, 1)$ can be identified as

$$\begin{aligned} m^{(0,0)}(x, p_1^0, p_2^0) &= \frac{1}{\lambda h(p_1^0, p_2^0 | x)} \frac{\partial^2 \psi^{(0,0)}(x, \mathbf{p})}{\partial p_1^0 \partial p_2^0} && \text{for } \lambda > 0, \\ m^{(0,0)}(x, p_1^{d_1}, p_2^{d_2}) &= \frac{1}{(1 - \lambda) h(p_1^{d_1}, p_2^{d_2} | x)} \frac{\partial^2 \psi^{(0,0)}(x, \mathbf{p})}{\partial p_1^{d_1} \partial p_2^{d_2}} && \text{for } \lambda < 1 \text{ and } d_1 \neq d_2, \end{aligned}$$

$$m^{(0,0)}(x, p_1^1, p_2^1) = -\frac{1}{(1-\lambda)h(p_1^1, p_2^1|x)} \frac{\partial^2 \psi^{(0,0)}(x, \mathbf{p})}{\partial p_1^1 \partial p_2^1} \quad \text{for } \lambda < 1,$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} m^{(1,1)}(x, p_1^0, p_2^0) &= -\frac{1}{\lambda h(p_1^0, p_2^0|x)} \frac{\partial^2 \psi^{(1,1)}(x, \mathbf{p})}{\partial p_1^0 \partial p_2^0} && \text{for } \lambda > 0, \\ m^{(1,1)}(x, p_1^{d_1}, p_2^{d_2}) &= \frac{1}{\lambda h(p_1^{d_1}, p_2^{d_2}|x)} \frac{\partial^2 \psi^{(1,1)}(x, \mathbf{p})}{\partial p_1^{d_1} \partial p_2^{d_2}} && \text{for } \lambda > 0 \text{ and } d_1 \neq d_2, \\ m^{(1,1)}(x, p_1^1, p_2^1) &= \frac{1}{(1-\lambda)h(p_1^1, p_2^1|x)} \frac{\partial^2 \psi^{(1,1)}(x, \mathbf{p})}{\partial p_1^1 \partial p_2^1} && \text{for } \lambda < 1. \end{aligned}$$

These identification results can be visually understood by Figure 2. For example, $m^{(0,0)}(x, p_1^0, p_2^0)$ is the mean of $Y_1^{(0,0)}$ at point C, where the players are at the margin of the actions $D = (0, 0)$ and $(1, 1)$ given that $(P_1^0, P_2^0) = (p_1^0, p_2^0)$ holds. Thus, a small fluctuation around (p_1^0, p_2^0) can change the treatment status of a certain proportion of the players from $D = (0, 0)$ to $(1, 1)$ provided $\lambda > 0$, and we can utilize this local exogenous variation for the identification of the MTR functions. Note that, if $\lambda = 0$, the identification at point C fails because $D = (0, 0)$ is never chosen at this point.

The above identification results are obtained by conditioning the values of all four variables $(P_1^0, P_1^1, P_2^0, P_2^1)$. Recall that Theorem 3.1 required only two out of four values as the conditioning variables, since the point at which identification is achieved is well characterized as the upper left or the lower right corner in the space of V . By contrast, we should fix the values of all four $(P_1^0, P_1^1, P_2^0, P_2^1)$ under multiple equilibria because these four points are required for characterizing the multiple equilibria region. Nonetheless, the parameter to be identified here, namely $m^{(0,0)}(x, p_1^0, p_2^0)$, relates to only two values, p_1^0 and p_2^0 , and it is thus irrelevant to p_1^1 and p_2^1 . As shown in the next section, the computational effort required to estimate $m^{(0,0)}(x, p_1, p_2)$ and $m^{(1,1)}(x, p_1, p_2)$ is no greater than that for $m^{(1,0)}(x, p_1, p_2)$ or $m^{(0,1)}(x, p_1, p_2)$.

Remark 3.1 (Lee and Salanié (2018)). Here, to contrast the treatment decision model and the identification results in this paper with those of Lee and Salanié (2018), we review Appendix C of their paper. Suppose that each player j has payoff $\pi_j^0 = Q_j^0(\mathbf{Z}_j^0) - V_j^0$ when $(D_j, D_{-j}) = (1, 0)$ and payoff $\pi_j^1 = Q_j^1(\mathbf{Z}_j^1) - V_j^1$ when $(D_j, D_{-j}) = (1, 1)$, where $Q_j^0(\mathbf{Z}_j^0)$ and $Q_j^1(\mathbf{Z}_j^1)$ are identifiable functions of IVs, and V_j^0 and V_j^1 are unobserved variables. Under strategic complementarity $\pi_j^0 < \pi_j^1$ for both $j = 1$ and 2 ,⁷ if only player 1 takes the treatment, for example, then we know that $\pi_1^0 > 0$ and $\pi_2^1 < 0$, i.e., $V_1^0 > Q_1^0(\mathbf{Z}_1^0)$ and $V_2^1 > Q_2^1(\mathbf{Z}_2^1)$. When $\pi_j^0 < 0 < \pi_j^1$ for both $j = 1$ and 2 , both $D = (0, 0)$ and $(1, 1)$ are Nash equilibria. Now, assume that under the multiple equilibria, $D = (0, 0)$ is selected if and only if $V_3 \leq Q_3(\mathbf{Z}_3)$. Then, all possible treatment decisions are uniquely characterized by the set of threshold crossing rules determined by $\mathbf{Q} = (Q_1^0(\mathbf{Z}_1^0), Q_1^1(\mathbf{Z}_1^1), Q_2^0(\mathbf{Z}_2^0), Q_2^1(\mathbf{Z}_2^1), Q_3(\mathbf{Z}_3))$ and $\mathbf{V} = (V_1^0, V_1^1, V_2^0, V_2^1, V_3)$. Theorem 3.1 in Lee

⁷ Lee and Salanié (2018) originally assume strategic substitutes, but we focus on the case of strategic complements in line with our setting.

and Salanié (2018) implies that

$$E[Y_1^{(d_1, d_2)} | X = x, \mathbf{V} = \mathbf{q}] = \frac{\partial_{\mathbf{q}} E[I^{(d_1, d_2)} Y_1 | X = x, \mathbf{Q} = \mathbf{q}]}{\partial_{\mathbf{q}} \Pr[D = (d_1, d_2) | X = x, \mathbf{Q} = \mathbf{q}]},$$

where $\partial_{\mathbf{q}} := \partial^5 / (\partial q_1^0 \partial q_1^1 \partial q_2^0 \partial q_2^1 \partial q_3)$ denotes the differential operator with $\mathbf{q} = (q_1^0, q_1^1, q_2^0, q_2^1, q_3)$. It should be noted that this result requires at least five distinct IVs, which would be a strong requirement in practice. Moreover, even if there are rich IVs, the resulting estimator based on the above equality will suffer from the curse of dimensionality.

Remark 3.2 (Over-identification). We can achieve over-identification for $m^{(0,0)}(x, p_1, p_2)$ and $m^{(1,1)}(x, p_1, p_2)$.⁸ For example, assume that some $(p_1, p_2) \in \text{supp}[P_1^0, P_2^0 | X = x, D = (0, 0)] \cap \text{supp}[P_1^1, P_2^1 | X = x, D = (0, 0)]$ exists. Then, if $0 < \lambda < 1$, we can identify $m^{(0,0)}(x, p_1, p_2)$ in at least two ways:

$$\begin{aligned} m^{(0,0)}(x, p_1, p_2) &= \frac{1}{\lambda h(p_1, p_2 | x)} \frac{\partial^2 \psi^{(0,0)}(x, p_1, p_1^1, p_2, p_2^1)}{\partial p_1 \partial p_2} \\ &= - \frac{1}{(1 - \lambda) h(p_1, p_2 | x)} \frac{\partial^2 \psi^{(0,0)}(x, p_1^0, p_1, p_2^0, p_2)}{\partial p_1 \partial p_2}, \end{aligned}$$

where (p_1^1, p_2^1) and (p_1^0, p_2^0) can be any value as long as they are consistent with the value of (p_1, p_2) . This over-identification result enables us to improve the estimation efficiency (see Remark 4.1). In addition, it gives us a testable implication for the validity of Assumption 3.3 since there is no guarantee that the over-identification holds without Assumption 3.3.

3.2 Identification of the marginal treatment effects

Given Theorems 3.1 and 3.2, the identification of MTE is rather straightforward. Here, it is sufficient to discuss only the identification of the direct MTE and total MTE since $\text{MTE}_{\text{indirect}}^{(0)}(x, p_1, p_2) = \text{MTE}_{\text{total}}(x, p_1, p_2) - \text{MTE}_{\text{direct}}^{(1)}(x, p_1, p_2)$ and $\text{MTE}_{\text{indirect}}^{(1)}(x, p_1, p_2) = \text{MTE}_{\text{total}}(x, p_1, p_2) - \text{MTE}_{\text{direct}}^{(0)}(x, p_1, p_2)$. Moreover, for the direct MTE, we focus only on the case of $d_2 = 0$ for exposition purposes.

From Theorems 3.1 and 3.2, assuming that $\lambda < 1$, we can write the direct MTE as

$$\text{MTE}_{\text{direct}}^{(0)}(x, p_1^0, p_2^1) = - \frac{1}{h(p_1^0, p_2^1 | x)} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial p_1^0 \partial p_2^1} \left(\psi^{(1,0)}(x, p_1^0, p_2^1) + \frac{\psi^{(0,0)}(x, \mathbf{p})}{1 - \lambda} \right),$$

which measures the average direct treatment effect on player 1's outcome for the individuals who are at the margin of the actions $D = (1, 0)$, $(1, 1)$, and $(0, 0)$. Recall that the value of $\psi^{(1,0)}(x, p_1^0, p_2^1)$ cannot be identified from the data if $(p_1^0, p_2^1) \notin \text{supp}[P_1^0, P_2^1 | X = x, D = (1, 0)]$. Similarly, if $\mathbf{p} \notin \text{supp}[\mathbf{P} | X = x, D = (0, 0)]$, $\psi^{(0,0)}(x, \mathbf{p})$ is not obtained. However, as p_1^1 and p_2^0 are irrelevant to the value of $m^{(0,0)}(x, p_1^0, p_2^1)$, they can take any values as long as $(p_1^0, p_2^1) \in \text{supp}[P_1^0, P_2^1 | X = x, D = (0, 0)]$. Consequently, the identification of this MTE parameter requires that the support of (P_1^0, P_2^1) for players

⁸ Note that, if the treatment decisions are substitutes, the over-identification results for $m^{(0,0)}(x, p_1, p_2)$ and $m^{(1,1)}(x, p_1, p_2)$ do not hold; rather, similar results hold for $m^{(1,0)}(x, p_1, p_2)$ and $m^{(0,1)}(x, p_1, p_2)$.

satisfying $D = (1, 0)$ overlaps with that of (P_1^0, P_2^1) for players satisfying $D = (0, 0)$ conditional on $X = x$. In practice, the observations for which (P_1^0, P_2^1) is not contained in the common support should be dropped when the MTE is computed.

For identification of the total MTE, assuming that $\lambda > 0$, we have

$$\text{MTE}_{\text{total}}(x, p_1^0, p_2^0) = -\frac{1}{\lambda h(p_1^0, p_2^0 | x)} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial p_1^0 \partial p_2^0} \left(\psi^{(1,1)}(x, \mathbf{p}) + \psi^{(0,0)}(x, \mathbf{p}) \right).$$

In this case, the conditional support of (P_1^0, P_2^0) for $D = (1, 1)$ and that for $D = (0, 0)$ must overlap.

Remark 3.3 (Partial identification of MTE without equilibrium selection). As shown above, the MTR functions for $D = (1, 0)$ and $(0, 1)$ can be point-identified without using the equilibrium selection assumption. When no assumptions are imposed on the equilibrium selection, λ can take any value in $[0, 1]$ non-uniformly (possibly depending on other random variables) over the multiple equilibria region. Thus, as can be seen from Theorem 3.2, the identified set of the MTR functions for $D = (0, 0)$ and $(1, 1)$ are typically unbounded. However, since λ is non-negative, we can still identify the sign of these MTR functions. Therefore, for example, if $m^{(1,0)}(x, p_1, p_2)$ is point-identified as a positive value and the sign of $m^{(0,0)}(x, p_1, p_2)$ is identified as non-positive, then we can obtain an informative lower bound of $\text{MTE}_{\text{direct}}^{(0)}(x, p_1, p_2)$ by the inequality $\text{MTE}_{\text{direct}}^{(0)}(x, p_1, p_2) \geq m^{(1,0)}(x, p_1, p_2)$.

4 Estimation and Asymptotics

In this section, we propose a two-step semiparametric procedure for estimating the MTE parameters given the data $\{(Y_{ji}, D_{ji}, W_{ji})\}_{j=1}^n$ are observed. In the subsequent analysis, for empirical tractability, we consider the following parametric treatment decision model:

Assumption 4.1.

- (i) Each player j decides his/her treatment by $D_{ji} = \mathbf{1}\{W_{ji}^\top \gamma_0 + D_{-j,i} \cdot \eta(W_{ji}^\top \gamma_1) \geq \varepsilon_{ji}\}$, where $\gamma = (\gamma_0^\top, \gamma_1^\top)^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{2\dim(W)}$ is a vector of unknown parameters and η is a known positive function.
- (ii) The random variables $\varepsilon = (\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2)$ are independent of W and continuously distributed with known marginal CDFs F_{ε_1} and F_{ε_2} , respectively. Their joint distribution is represented by a copula H_ρ such that $\Pr(\varepsilon_1 \leq a_1, \varepsilon_2 \leq a_2) = H_\rho(F_{\varepsilon_1}(a_1), F_{\varepsilon_2}(a_2))$, where $\rho \in [\underline{c}_\rho, \bar{c}_\rho]$ is a correlation parameter between ε_1 and ε_2 , and $\underline{c}_\rho$ and $\bar{c}_\rho$ are real numbers whose values depend on the choice of the copula function. The copula H_ρ has a density function h_ρ .

In Assumption 4.1(i), we assume a strictly positive interaction effect $\eta > 0$ to ensure strategic complementarity as in Assumption 2.1. In the literature, it has typically been assumed that the interaction effect is a constant value. However, such a model specification cannot be adopted here because the constancy of the interaction effect implies that the conditional support of P_j^1 given P_j^0 degenerates to a singleton. We also assume that the coefficients γ are common to both players for simplicity. In Assumption 4.1(ii), we assume that the error terms $(\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2)$ are continuously distributed and that their joint distribution function is known

up to a parameter ρ . A typical example satisfying this assumption is a standard bivariate normal distribution. In this case, the copula H_ρ corresponds to the Gaussian copula $H_\rho(v_1, v_2) = \Phi_2(\Phi^{-1}(v_1), \Phi^{-1}(v_2); \rho)$, where $\Phi_2(\cdot, \cdot; \rho)$ is the standard bivariate normal CDF with correlation ρ , and $\Phi(\cdot)$ denotes the standard normal CDF. As another example, [Aradillas-Lopez \(2010\)](#) uses the Farlie–Gumbel–Morgenstern (FGM) copula $H_\rho(v_1, v_2) = v_1 v_2 [1 + \rho(1 - v_1)(1 - v_2)]$ in a context similar to ours. Importantly, as recently shown by [Khan and Nekipelov \(2018\)](#), when the marginal CDFs of $(\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2)$ are unknown, it is generally impossible to estimate the interaction effect at the parametric rate $n^{-1/2}$. For completeness, in Appendix C, we provide primitive conditions to verify Assumptions 3.1 and 3.3(ii) under the setup in Assumption 4.1 by extending the identification result for the generalized bivariate probit model in [Han and Vytlacil \(2017\)](#), where our model can be seen as a game-econometric extension of theirs.

To facilitate the analysis, for the potential outcomes as well, we assume a linear parametric model. The following assumption is stronger than necessary for identification of the MTE, but is a popular setup in the literature (e.g., [Carneiro and Lee, 2009](#); [Felfe and Lalive, 2018](#)).

Assumption 4.2.

- (i) For each player j , the potential outcome $Y_{ji}^{(d_j, d_{-j})}$ is determined by $Y_{ji}^{(d_j, d_{-j})} = X_{ji}^\top \beta_j^{(d_j, d_{-j})} + U_{ji}^{(d_j, d_{-j})}$, where $\beta_j^{(d_j, d_{-j})} \in \mathbb{R}^{\dim(X)}$ is a vector of unknown parameters.
- (ii) The random variables $U^{(d_1, d_2)}$ are independent of W for $(d_1, d_2) \in \{0, 1\}^2$.

4.1 Two-step estimation

First step: Estimation of the treatment decision game. In accordance with (2.4), we write $V_{ji} = F_{\varepsilon_j}(\varepsilon_{ji})$, $P_{ji}^0(\gamma) = F_{\varepsilon_j}(W_{ji}^\top \gamma_0)$, $P_{ji}^1(\gamma) = F_{\varepsilon_j}(W_{ji}^\top \gamma_0 + \eta(W_{ji}^\top \gamma_1))$, and $\mathbf{P}_i(\gamma) = (P_{1i}^0(\gamma), P_{1i}^1(\gamma), P_{2i}^0(\gamma), P_{2i}^1(\gamma))$. Further, let $\theta = (\gamma^\top, \rho, \lambda)^\top$, and $\theta^* = (\gamma^{*\top}, \rho^*, \lambda^*)^\top$ be the true value of θ . For a given θ , the conditional probability that the i -th pair of players is in the multiple equilibria region is given by

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{mul},i}(\theta) := H_\rho(P_{1i}^1(\gamma), P_{2i}^1(\gamma)) - H_\rho(P_{1i}^1(\gamma), P_{2i}^0(\gamma)) - H_\rho(P_{1i}^0(\gamma), P_{2i}^1(\gamma)) + H_\rho(P_{1i}^0(\gamma), P_{2i}^0(\gamma)).$$

Then, letting the probability that they choose an action $D_i = (d_1, d_2)$ be $\mathcal{L}_i^{(d_1, d_2)}(\theta)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_i^{(1,0)}(\theta) &= P_{1i}^0(\gamma) - H_\rho(P_{1i}^0(\gamma), P_{2i}^1(\gamma)), & \mathcal{L}_i^{(1,1)}(\theta) &= H_\rho(P_{1i}^1(\gamma), P_{2i}^1(\gamma)) - \lambda \cdot \mathcal{L}_{\text{mul},i}(\theta), \\ \mathcal{L}_i^{(0,1)}(\theta) &= P_{2i}^0(\gamma) - H_\rho(P_{1i}^1(\gamma), P_{2i}^0(\gamma)), & \mathcal{L}_i^{(0,0)}(\theta) &= 1 - \sum_{(d_1, d_2) \neq (0,0)} \mathcal{L}_i^{(d_1, d_2)}(\theta). \end{aligned} \quad (4.1)$$

The ML estimator $\hat{\theta}_n$ of θ^* is obtained by maximizing the log-likelihood function $\sum_{i=1}^n \ell_i(\theta)$ with respect to θ , where $\ell_i(\theta) := \sum_{d_1=0}^1 \sum_{d_2=0}^1 I_i^{(d_1, d_2)} \log \mathcal{L}_i^{(d_1, d_2)}(\theta)$. Once the estimator $\hat{\theta}_n$ is obtained, we can estimate $P_{ji}^0 = P_{ji}^0(\gamma^*)$ and $P_{ji}^1 = P_{ji}^1(\gamma^*)$ by $\hat{P}_{ji}^0 = P_{ji}^0(\hat{\gamma}_n)$ and $\hat{P}_{ji}^1 = P_{ji}^1(\hat{\gamma}_n)$, respectively. Similarly, the true joint CDF and density of (V_1, V_2) , which we denote by $H = H_{\rho^*}$ and $h = h_{\rho^*}$, can be respectively estimated as $\hat{H} = H_{\hat{\rho}_n}$ and $\hat{h} = h_{\hat{\rho}_n}$. Moreover, we can estimate the probabilities in (4.1) evaluated at the true θ^* , namely, $\mathcal{L}_i^{(d_1, d_2)} = \mathcal{L}_i^{(d_1, d_2)}(\theta^*)$ and $\mathcal{L}_{\text{mul},i} = \mathcal{L}_{\text{mul},i}(\theta^*)$, by $\hat{\mathcal{L}}_i^{(d_1, d_2)} = \mathcal{L}_i^{(d_1, d_2)}(\hat{\theta}_n)$ and $\hat{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{mul},i} = \mathcal{L}_{\text{mul},i}(\hat{\theta}_n)$, respectively.

Second step: Estimation of the MTE. As discussed in Section 3, a variety of treatment effect parameters can be identified. We here specifically discuss the estimation of $\text{MTE}_{\text{direct}}^{(0)}(x, p_1^0, p_2^1)$. The estimation of $\text{MTE}_{\text{total}}(x, p_1^0, p_2^0)$ can be performed similarly (see Appendix B.1).

Recall that $\text{MTE}_{\text{direct}}^{(0)}(x, p_1^0, p_2^1)$ is the difference of the MTR functions $m^{(1,0)}(x, p_1^0, p_2^1)$ and $m^{(0,0)}(x, p_1^0, p_2^1)$. We first discuss estimating $m^{(1,0)}(x, p_1^0, p_2^1)$. Assumption 4.2 implies that

$$m^{(1,0)}(x, p_1^0, p_2^1) = x_1^\top \beta_1^{(1,0)} + E[U_1^{(1,0)} | V_1 = p_1^0, V_2 = p_2^1].$$

Since $U_1^{(1,0)}$ may be correlated with (V_1, V_2) , $E[U_1^{(1,0)} | V_1, V_2] \neq 0$ in general. Observe that

$$E[I^{(1,0)} Y_1 | I^{(1,0)}, X, P_1^0, P_2^1] = I^{(1,0)} X_1^\top \beta_1^{(1,0)} + I^{(1,0)} E[U_1^{(1,0)} | V_1 \leq P_1^0, V_2 > P_2^1].$$

Letting $g_1^{(1,0)}(p_1^0, p_2^1) := \int_0^{p_1^0} \int_{p_2^1}^1 E[U_1^{(1,0)} | V_1 = v_1, V_2 = v_2] h(v_1, v_2) dv_1 dv_2$, the same argument as in the proof of Theorem 3.1 can show that $E[U_1^{(1,0)} | V_1 \leq p_1^0, V_2 > p_2^1] = g_1^{(1,0)}(p_1^0, p_2^1) / \mathcal{L}^{(1,0)}(p_1^0, p_2^1; \theta^*)$, where $\mathcal{L}^{(1,0)}(p_1^0, p_2^1; \theta^*) = p_1^0 - H_{\rho^*}(p_1^0, p_2^1)$ as in (4.1) and we will use analogous notations such as $\mathcal{L}^{(0,0)}(\mathbf{p}; \theta^*)$ below. Then, we have the following semiparametric partially linear regression model:

$$I^{(1,0)} Y_1 = I^{(1,0)} X_1^\top \beta_1^{(1,0)} + T^{(1,0)} g_1^{(1,0)}(P_1^0, P_2^1) + e_1^{(1,0)}, \quad (4.2)$$

where $T^{(1,0)} := I^{(1,0)} / \mathcal{L}^{(1,0)}$, and $E[e_1^{(1,0)} | I^{(1,0)}, X, P_1^0, P_2^1] = 0$ by construction. Here, note that since $\mathcal{L}^{(1,0)}$ may take an arbitrarily small value close to zero, the weight term $T^{(1,0)}$ can be extremely large for some observations. To deal with this issue, we exclude such observations from the analysis. Specifically, we introduce a non-negative smoothed indicator function $\tau_\varpi(\mathcal{L}^{(1,0)})$ such that (i) $\tau_\varpi : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$ is a non-decreasing function and $\tau_\varpi(a) = 0$ if and only if $a < \varpi$ for a small constant $\varpi > 0$, and (ii) τ_ϖ is continuously differentiable with a bounded derivative. Multiplying both sides of (4.2) by $\tau_\varpi(\mathcal{L}^{(1,0)})$ gives

$$\tilde{I}^{(1,0)} Y_1 = \tilde{I}^{(1,0)} X_1^\top \beta_1^{(1,0)} + \tilde{T}^{(1,0)} g_1^{(1,0)}(P_1^0, P_2^1) + \tilde{e}_1^{(1,0)}, \quad (4.3)$$

where $\tilde{I}^{(1,0)} := \tau_\varpi(\mathcal{L}^{(1,0)}) I^{(1,0)}$, $\tilde{T}^{(1,0)} := \tilde{I}^{(1,0)} / \mathcal{L}^{(1,0)}$, and $\tilde{e}_1^{(1,0)} := \tau_\varpi(\mathcal{L}^{(1,0)}) e_1^{(1,0)}$. Since $\mathcal{L}^{(1,0)}$ is a function of P_1^0 and P_2^1 , $E[\tilde{e}_1^{(1,0)} | I^{(1,0)}, X, P_1^0, P_2^1] = 0$ holds.

Based on (4.3), we consider estimating $\beta_1^{(1,0)}$ and $g_1^{(1,0)}$ using the series (sieve) method. Let $b_K(\cdot, \cdot) = (b_{1K}(\cdot, \cdot), \dots, b_{KK}(\cdot, \cdot))^\top$ be a $K \times 1$ vector of bivariate basis functions. We assume that $g_1^{(1,0)}$ can be well approximated by a linear combination of the basis functions: $g_1^{(1,0)}(\cdot, \cdot) \approx b_K(\cdot, \cdot)^\top \alpha_1^{(1,0)}$ for some coefficient vector $\alpha_1^{(1,0)}$ with sufficiently large K . Then, letting $\hat{I}_i^{(1,0)} := \tau_\varpi(\hat{\mathcal{L}}_i^{(1,0)}) I_i^{(1,0)}$ and $\hat{T}_i^{(1,0)} := \hat{I}_i^{(1,0)} / \hat{\mathcal{L}}_i^{(1,0)}$, we have

$$\hat{I}_i^{(1,0)} Y_{1i} \approx \hat{I}_i^{(1,0)} X_{1i}^\top \beta_1^{(1,0)} + \hat{T}_i^{(1,0)} b_K(\hat{P}_{1i}^0, \hat{P}_{2i}^1)^\top \alpha_1^{(1,0)} + \tilde{e}_{1i}^{(1,0)}.$$

Let $(\hat{\beta}_{1n}^{(1,0)}, \hat{\alpha}_{1n}^{(1,0)})$ be the least squares (LS) estimator of $(\beta_1^{(1,0)}, \alpha_1^{(1,0)})$ obtained by regressing $\hat{I}_i^{(1,0)} Y_{1i}$ on $(\hat{I}_i^{(1,0)} X_{1i}, \hat{T}_i^{(1,0)} b_K(\hat{P}_{1i}^0, \hat{P}_{2i}^1))$. Then, the estimator of $g_1^{(1,0)}(p_1^0, p_2^1)$ can be obtained by $\hat{g}_1^{(1,0)}(p_1^0, p_2^1) := b_K(p_1^0, p_2^1)^\top \hat{\alpha}_{1n}^{(1,0)}$. For the estimation of $E[U_1^{(1,0)} | V_1 = p_1^0, V_2 = p_2^1]$, applying the same argument as in

Theorem 3.1 yields

$$E[U_1^{(1,0)}|V_1 = p_1^0, V_2 = p_2^1] = -\frac{1}{h(p_1^0, p_2^1)} \frac{\partial^2 g_1^{(1,0)}(p_1^0, p_2^1)}{\partial p_1^0 \partial p_2^1}.$$

Replacing the unknown parameters by their estimators, we can estimate it by

$$\hat{E}_n[U_1^{(1,0)}|V_1 = p_1^0, V_2 = p_2^1] := -\frac{1}{\hat{h}(p_1^0, p_2^1)} \frac{\partial^2 \hat{g}_1^{(1,0)}(p_1^0, p_2^1)}{\partial p_1^0 \partial p_2^1} = -\frac{\ddot{b}_K(p_1^0, p_2^1)^\top \hat{\alpha}_{1n}^{(1,0)}}{\hat{h}(p_1^0, p_2^1)}, \quad (4.4)$$

where $\ddot{b}_K(p_1, p_2) := \partial^2 b_K(p_1, p_2)/(\partial p_1 \partial p_2)$. Finally, we can estimate $m^{(1,0)}(x, p_1^0, p_2^1)$ by

$$\hat{m}^{(1,0)}(x, p_1^0, p_2^1) := x_1^\top \hat{\beta}_{1n}^{(1,0)} + \hat{E}_n[U_1^{(1,0)}|V_1 = p_1^0, V_2 = p_2^1]. \quad (4.5)$$

Next, we describe the estimation of the MTR function $m^{(0,0)}(x, p_1^0, p_2^1)$. As above, we have

$$m^{(0,0)}(x, p_1^0, p_2^1) = x_1^\top \beta_1^{(0,0)} + E[U_1^{(0,0)}|V_1 = p_1^0, V_2 = p_2^1]$$

under Assumption 4.2. Observe that

$$E[I^{(0,0)} Y_1 | I^{(0,0)}, X, \mathbf{P}] = I^{(0,0)} X_1^\top \beta_1^{(0,0)} + I^{(0,0)} E[U_1^{(0,0)} | I^{(0,0)} = 1, \mathbf{P}].$$

Further, if $E[U_1^{(0,0)}|V_1 = v_1, V_2 = v_2]h(v_1, v_2)$ is continuous in (v_1, v_2) , it turns out that there exist the bivariate real-valued functions $g_{11}^{(0,0)}, g_{12}^{(0,0)}, g_{13}^{(0,0)}$, and $g_{14}^{(0,0)}$ satisfying

$$E[U_1^{(0,0)} | I^{(0,0)} = 1, \mathbf{P} = \mathbf{p}] = \frac{g_{11}^{(0,0)}(p_1^0, p_2^0) + g_{12}^{(0,0)}(p_1^1, p_2^0) + g_{13}^{(0,0)}(p_1^0, p_2^1) + g_{14}^{(0,0)}(p_1^1, p_2^1)}{\mathcal{L}^{(0,0)}(\mathbf{p}; \theta^*)}. \quad (4.6)$$

Hence, similarly to (4.3), we obtain the following semiparametric partially linear additive regression model:

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{I}^{(0,0)} Y_1 &= \tilde{I}^{(0,0)} X_1^\top \beta_1^{(0,0)} + \tilde{T}^{(0,0)} g_{11}^{(0,0)}(P_1^0, P_2^0) + \tilde{T}^{(0,0)} g_{12}^{(0,0)}(P_1^1, P_2^0) \\ &\quad + \tilde{T}^{(0,0)} g_{13}^{(0,0)}(P_1^0, P_2^1) + \tilde{T}^{(0,0)} g_{14}^{(0,0)}(P_1^1, P_2^1) + \tilde{e}_1^{(0,0)}, \end{aligned} \quad (4.7)$$

where $\tilde{I}^{(0,0)} := \tau_\omega(\mathcal{L}^{(0,0)})I^{(0,0)}$, $\tilde{T}^{(0,0)} := \tilde{I}^{(0,0)}/\mathcal{L}^{(0,0)}$, and $E[\tilde{e}_1^{(0,0)} | I^{(0,0)}, X, \mathbf{P}] = 0$ holds by construction. Assuming again that each $g_{1l}^{(0,0)}$, $l = 1, \dots, 4$, can be approximated by $g_{1l}^{(0,0)}(\cdot, \cdot) \approx b_K(\cdot, \cdot)^\top \alpha_{1l}^{(0,0)}$ and replacing $\tilde{I}^{(0,0)}$, $\tilde{T}^{(0,0)}$, and $\mathbf{P} = (P_1^0, P_1^1, P_2^0, P_2^1)$ with their estimators $\hat{I}^{(0,0)} := \tau_\omega(\hat{\mathcal{L}}^{(0,0)})I^{(0,0)}$, $\hat{T}^{(0,0)} := \hat{I}^{(0,0)}/\hat{\mathcal{L}}^{(0,0)}$, and $\hat{\mathbf{P}} = (\hat{P}_1^0, \hat{P}_1^1, \hat{P}_2^0, \hat{P}_2^1)$, respectively, $\beta_1^{(0,0)}$ and $\alpha_{1l}^{(0,0)}$'s can be estimated by an LS regression.⁹ Let $\hat{\beta}_{1n}^{(0,0)}$ and $\hat{\alpha}_{1ln}^{(0,0)}$ be the resulting LS estimators. Then, each $g_{1l}^{(0,0)}(p_1, p_2)$ can be

⁹ It is possible to use different orders of basis terms to approximate each component of the functions $g_{1l}^{(0,0)}$'s for $l = 1, \dots, 4$, but we use the same order K for all, for simplicity. Also note that the “locations” of the functions $g_{1l}^{(0,0)}$'s are not identified without further restrictions. To simplify our presentation, we postulate that an appropriate location normalization is made implicitly.

estimated by $\hat{g}_{1l}^{(0,0)}(p_1, p_2) := b_K(p_1, p_2)^\top \hat{\alpha}_{1ln}^{(0,0)}$. Moreover, Theorem 3.2 and (4.6) imply that

$$E[U_1^{(0,0)} | V_1 = p_1^0, V_2 = p_2^1] = \frac{1}{(1-\lambda)h(p_1^0, p_2^1)} \frac{\partial^2 g_{13}^{(0,0)}(p_1^0, p_2^1)}{\partial p_1^0 \partial p_2^1},$$

and thus we can estimate this by

$$\hat{E}_n[U_1^{(0,0)} | V_1 = p_1^0, V_2 = p_2^1] := \frac{1}{(1-\hat{\lambda}_n)\hat{h}(p_1^0, p_2^1)} \frac{\partial^2 \hat{g}_{13}^{(0,0)}(p_1^0, p_2^1)}{\partial p_1^0 \partial p_2^1} = \frac{\ddot{b}_K(p_1^0, p_2^1)^\top \hat{\alpha}_{13n}^{(0,0)}}{(1-\hat{\lambda}_n)\hat{h}(p_1^0, p_2^1)}. \quad (4.8)$$

Consequently, $m^{(0,0)}(x, p_1^0, p_2^1)$ can be estimated by

$$\hat{m}^{(0,0)}(x, p_1^0, p_2^1) := x_1^\top \hat{\beta}_{1n}^{(0,0)} + \hat{E}_n[U_1^{(0,0)} | V_1 = p_1^0, V_2 = p_2^1]. \quad (4.9)$$

The above estimator corresponds to the identification result at the upper left corner (point A in Figure 2), and the estimation at the other points is analogous. Finally, $\text{MTE}_{\text{direct}}^{(0)}(x, p_1^0, p_2^1)$ can be estimated by

$$\widehat{\text{MTE}}_{\text{direct}}^{(0)}(x, p_1^0, p_2^1) := \hat{m}^{(1,0)}(x, p_1^0, p_2^1) - \hat{m}^{(0,0)}(x, p_1^0, p_2^1). \quad (4.10)$$

4.2 Asymptotics

In this subsection, we derive the asymptotic properties of the proposed estimators. We mainly investigate the estimator of the MTR function for $D = (1, 0)$. Analogous arguments apply to the other cases.

For subsequent discussion, we introduce the following notations. Denote $\mathcal{S}^{(1,0)} := \text{supp}[P_1^0, P_2^1 | D = (1, 0)]$. For a positive integer a , $\mathbf{I}_a$ denotes the $a \times a$ identity matrix. For positive integers a_1 and a_2 , $\mathbf{0}_{a_1 \times a_2}$ denotes the $a_1 \times a_2$ zero matrix. For a matrix A , $\|A\| = \sqrt{\text{tr}\{A^\top A\}}$ denotes its Frobenius norm, where $\text{tr}\{\cdot\}$ is the trace. When A is a square matrix, we use $\chi_{\max}(A)$ and $\chi_{\min}(A)$ to denote its largest and smallest eigenvalues, respectively. We denote a symmetric generalized inverse of a matrix A by A^- .

Assumption 4.3. The data $\{(Y_{ji}, D_{ji}, W_{ji})\}_{j=1}^n$ are independent and identically distributed across i .

Assumption 4.4.

- (i) $\|\hat{\theta}_n - \theta^*\| = O_P(n^{-1/2})$ and $\max_{1 \leq i \leq n} |\hat{P}_{ji}^d - P_{ji}^d| = O_P(n^{-1/2})$ for $j = 1, 2$ and $d = 0, 1$.
- (ii) $H_\rho(p_1, p_2)$ is Lipschitz continuous with respect to ρ in the neighborhood of ρ^* .
- (iii) For all ρ in the neighborhood of ρ^* , $h_\rho(p_1, p_2)$ is continuous in $(p_1, p_2) \in [0, 1]^2$, bounded away from zero uniformly in $(p_1, p_2) \in \mathcal{S}^{(1,0)}$, and Lipschitz continuous in ρ .

Assumption 4.3 is a standard and relatively weak condition for microeconomic applications. We do not restrict the dependence between the variables for j and those for $-j$. Assumption 4.4(i) is the $\sqrt{n}$ -consistency of the ML estimator. This is a high-level condition; however, it is standard for parametric ML estimation under mild regularity conditions. Assumption 4.4(iii) ensures that $\hat{h}$ is uniformly bounded away from zero and infinity with probability approaching one (w.p.a.1) in conjunction with (i).

We introduce the following notations: $\mathbf{Y}_1^{(1,0)} = (\tilde{I}_1^{(1,0)} Y_{11}, \dots, \tilde{I}_n^{(1,0)} Y_{1n})^\top$, $\hat{\mathbf{Y}}_1^{(1,0)} = (\hat{I}_1^{(1,0)} Y_{11}, \dots, \hat{I}_n^{(1,0)} Y_{1n})^\top$, $R_{K,i}^{(1,0)} := (\tilde{I}_i^{(1,0)} X_{1i}^\top, \tilde{I}_i^{(1,0)} b_K(P_{1i}^0, P_{2i}^1)^\top)^\top$, $\hat{R}_{K,i}^{(1,0)} := (\hat{I}_i^{(1,0)} X_{1i}^\top, \hat{I}_i^{(1,0)} b_K(\hat{P}_{1i}^0, \hat{P}_{2i}^1)^\top)^\top$, $\mathbf{R}_K^{(1,0)} = (R_{K,1}^{(1,0)}, \dots, R_{K,n}^{(1,0)})^\top$, and $\hat{\mathbf{R}}_K^{(1,0)} = (\hat{R}_{K,1}^{(1,0)}, \dots, \hat{R}_{K,n}^{(1,0)})^\top$. Then, our estimator of $\delta_1^{(1,0)} := (\beta_1^{(1,0)\top}, \alpha_1^{(1,0)\top})^\top$ is written as (4.11):

$$\hat{\delta}_{1n}^{(1,0)} = \left(\hat{\beta}_{1n}^{(1,0)\top}, \hat{\alpha}_{1n}^{(1,0)\top} \right)^\top := \left[\hat{\mathbf{R}}_K^{(1,0)\top} \hat{\mathbf{R}}_K^{(1,0)} \right]^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{R}}_K^{(1,0)\top} \hat{\mathbf{Y}}_1^{(1,0)}, \quad (4.11)$$

$$\tilde{\delta}_{1n}^{(1,0)} = \left(\tilde{\beta}_{1n}^{(1,0)\top}, \tilde{\alpha}_{1n}^{(1,0)\top} \right)^\top := \left[\mathbf{R}_K^{(1,0)\top} \mathbf{R}_K^{(1,0)} \right]^{-1} \mathbf{R}_K^{(1,0)\top} \mathbf{Y}_1^{(1,0)}, \quad (4.12)$$

while the one in (4.12) is an “infeasible” estimator with the true parameters in the first stage being treated as known. The infeasible estimators of $g_1^{(1,0)}(p_1^0, p_2^1)$, $E[U_1^{(1,0)} | V_1 = p_1^0, V_2 = p_2^1]$, and $m^{(1,0)}(x, p_1^0, p_2^1)$ can be defined similarly, which we denote by $\tilde{g}_1^{(1,0)}(p_1^0, p_2^1)$, $\tilde{E}_n[U_1^{(1,0)} | V_1 = p_1^0, V_2 = p_2^1]$, and $\tilde{m}^{(1,0)}(x, p_1^0, p_2^1)$, respectively. Furthermore, define $\Psi_K^{(1,0)} := E[R_K^{(1,0)} R_K^{(1,0)\top}]$, $\Psi_{nK}^{(1,0)} := \mathbf{R}_K^{(1,0)\top} \mathbf{R}_K^{(1,0)} / n$, $\hat{\Psi}_{nK}^{(1,0)} := \hat{\mathbf{R}}_K^{(1,0)\top} \hat{\mathbf{R}}_K^{(1,0)} / n$, and $\Sigma_K^{(1,0)} := E\left[\left(\tilde{e}_1^{(1,0)}\right)^2 R_K^{(1,0)} R_K^{(1,0)\top}\right]$.

Assumption 4.5.

- (i) There exist positive constants $\underline{c}_\Psi$ and $\bar{c}_\Psi$ such that $0 < \underline{c}_\Psi \leq \chi_{\min}(\Psi_K^{(1,0)}) \leq \chi_{\max}(\Psi_K^{(1,0)}) \leq \bar{c}_\Psi < \infty$ uniformly in K .
- (ii) There exist positive constants $\underline{c}_\Sigma$ and $\bar{c}_\Sigma$ such that $0 < \underline{c}_\Sigma \leq \chi_{\min}(\Sigma_K^{(1,0)}) \leq \chi_{\max}(\Sigma_K^{(1,0)}) \leq \bar{c}_\Sigma < \infty$ uniformly in K .

Assumption 4.6. $E[(e_1^{(1,0)})^4 | W, D]$ is bounded.

Assumption 4.5(i) ensures the existence of the inverse matrices $[\Psi_{nK}^{(1,0)}]^{-1}$ and $[\hat{\Psi}_{nK}^{(1,0)}]^{-1}$ w.p.a.1. Assumption 4.6 is introduced to conveniently derive the limiting distribution of our estimator. Note that under this assumption, $E[(\tilde{e}_1^{(1,0)})^4 | W, D]$ is also bounded by the definition of τ_ϖ .

To state the next assumption, we introduce the following notation. For a sufficiently smooth function $g(p_1, p_2)$ and a vector of non-negative integers $\mathbf{a} = (a_1, a_2)$, let $\partial^{\mathbf{a}} g(p_1, p_2) := \partial^{|\mathbf{a}|} g(p_1, p_2) / (\partial^{a_1} p_1 \partial^{a_2} p_2)$, where $|\mathbf{a}| = a_1 + a_2$. If $|\mathbf{a}| = 0$, then $\partial^{\mathbf{a}} g(p_1, p_2) = g(p_1, p_2)$.

Assumption 4.7. For some integer $s \geq 2$, the functions $g_1^{(1,0)}$ and b_K are at least s -times continuously differentiable, and there exists a sequence of vectors $\alpha_1^{(1,0)} \in \mathbb{R}^K$ such that $\sup_{(p_1, p_2) \in [0, 1]^2} |\partial^{\mathbf{a}} g_1^{(1,0)}(p_1, p_2) - \partial^{\mathbf{a}} b_K(p_1, p_2)^\top \alpha_1^{(1,0)}| = O(K^{(|\mathbf{a}| - s)/2})$.

Assumption 4.7 clearly restricts the smoothness of $g_1^{(1,0)}$ and choice of the basis functions b_K . For example, Lemma 2 in Holland (2017) shows that when $g_1^{(1,0)}$ is s -times continuously differentiable on $[0, 1]^2$, Assumption 4.7 is satisfied by tensor-product B-splines of order r (degree $r - 1$) for $r - 2 \geq s$. For slightly more refined results, when $g_1^{(1,0)}$ is in a Hölder space of smoothness s , B-splines, wavelets, and Cattaneo and Farrell’s local polynomial partitioning series can satisfy Assumption 4.7 (for details, see Chen and Christensen, 2018, Corollary 3.1, and Cattaneo and Farrell, 2013, Lemma A.2).

Assumption 4.8. As $n \rightarrow \infty$, (i) $\zeta_0(K) \sqrt{(\log K)/n} \rightarrow 0$, and (ii) $\zeta_1(K) / \sqrt{n} \rightarrow 0$, where $\zeta_d(K) := \max_{|\mathbf{a}| \leq d} \sup_{(p_1, p_2) \in [0, 1]^2} \|\partial^{\mathbf{a}} b_K(p_1, p_2)\|$.

Assumption 4.8(i) is used to prove the convergence of the matrix $\Psi_{nK}^{(1,0)}$ to $\Psi_K^{(1,0)}$, and 4.8(ii) is additionally introduced to ensure the convergence of $\widehat{\Psi}_{nK}^{(1,0)}$ to $\Psi_K^{(1,0)}$. The bound of $\zeta_0(K)$ is well known for several basis functions, which is typically $\zeta_0(K) = O(\sqrt{K})$ (e.g., [Chen, 2007](#); [Belloni et al., 2015](#)). By contrast, there are fewer readily available results for the bound of $\zeta_1(K)$. For example, Cattaneo and Farrell’s local polynomial partitioning series satisfies $\zeta_1(K) = O(K)$ (see [Cattaneo and Farrell, 2013](#), Lemma A.1). In Appendix B.2, we show that the tensor-product B-spline also satisfies $\zeta_1(K) = O(K)$.

Next, consider a generic random vector $Q \in \text{supp}[Q] \subset \mathbb{R}^{\dim(Q)}$ with a finite dimension $\dim(Q)$. Denote the set of uniformly bounded continuous functions on $\mathcal{D}$ as $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{D})$. We define the linear operator $\mathcal{P}_{nK}$ that maps a given function $g \in \mathcal{C}(\text{supp}[Q])$ to the sieve space defined by b_K as follows:

$$\mathcal{P}_{nK}g = b_K(\cdot, \cdot)^\top \mathbb{S}_K \left[\Psi_{nK}^{(1,0)} \right]^{-1} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n R_{K,i}^{(1,0)} g(Q_i),$$

where $\mathbb{S}_K := (\mathbf{0}_{K \times \dim(X)}, \mathbf{I}_K)$. The operator norm of $\mathcal{P}_{nK}$ restricted on $\mathcal{S}^{(1,0)}$ is defined as

$$\|\mathcal{P}_{nK}\|_\infty := \sup \left\{ \sup_{(p_1, p_2) \in \mathcal{S}^{(1,0)}} |(\mathcal{P}_{nK}g)(p_1, p_2)| : g \in \mathcal{C}(\text{supp}[Q]), \sup_{q \in \text{supp}[Q]} |g(q)| = 1 \right\}.$$

Assumption 4.9. (i) $\|\mathcal{P}_{nK}\|_\infty = O_P(1)$. (ii) $\zeta_0(K)\zeta_1(K)/\sqrt{n} = O(1)$.

Assumption 4.10. $\sup_{(p_1, p_2) \in \mathcal{S}^{(1,0)}} |\partial^{\mathbf{a}} b_K(p_1, p_2)^\top \alpha| = O(K^{|\mathbf{a}|/2}) \sup_{(p_1, p_2) \in \mathcal{S}^{(1,0)}} |b_K(p_1, p_2)^\top \alpha|$ for any $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^K$.

Assumption 4.9(i) is a stability condition for the projection operator $\mathcal{P}_{nK}$. [Huang \(2003\)](#) shows that a similar condition holds true for spline bases under some mild regularity conditions. In addition, wavelets can satisfy such a condition, as shown in Theorem 5.2 in [Chen and Christensen \(2015\)](#). For a direct verification of Assumption 4.9(i) under a particular choice of basis functions, see Appendix B.3. Assumption 4.9(ii) is used to show that the operator norm of the “feasible” version of $\mathcal{P}_{nK}$ is also bounded in probability (see Lemma A.3). In the proof of Corollary 3.1 of [Chen and Christensen \(2018\)](#), it is shown that Assumption 4.10 holds for splines and wavelets.

Assumption 4.11.

- (i) There exist finite constants $c_b > 0$ and $\omega \geq 0$ such that $\|b_K(p_1, p_2) - b_K(p'_1, p'_2)\| \leq c_b K^\omega \|(p_1, p_2) - (p'_1, p'_2)\|$ for all $(p_1, p_2), (p'_1, p'_2) \in [0, 1]^2$.
- (ii) $\zeta_0^2(K) \sqrt{(\log n)/n} \rightarrow 0$.

The next theorem establishes the uniform convergence rate of the MTR estimators.

Theorem 4.1. Suppose that Assumptions 4.1–4.4, 4.5(i), and 4.6–4.11 hold. Then, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{(i)} \quad & \sup_{(p_1, p_2) \in \mathcal{S}^{(1,0)}} \left| \tilde{m}^{(1,0)}(x, p_1, p_2) - m^{(1,0)}(x, p_1, p_2) \right| = O_P(\zeta_0(K)K\sqrt{\log n/n}) + O_P(K^{(2-s)/2}), \\ \text{(ii)} \quad & \sup_{(p_1, p_2) \in \mathcal{S}^{(1,0)}} \left| \hat{m}^{(1,0)}(x, p_1, p_2) - m^{(1,0)}(x, p_1, p_2) \right| = O_P(\zeta_0(K)K\sqrt{\log n/n}) + O_P(K^{(2-s)/2}). \end{aligned}$$

The proof of the theorem is straightforward from Lemmas A.2 and A.5, and thus it is omitted. When $\zeta_0(K) \asymp \sqrt{K}$, by choosing $K \asymp (\log n/n)^{-1/(1+s)}$, we can obtain

$$\sup_{(p_1, p_2) \in \mathcal{S}^{(1,0)}} \left| \hat{m}^{(1,0)}(x, p_1, p_2) - m^{(1,0)}(x, p_1, p_2) \right| = O_P \left((\log n/n)^{\frac{s-2}{2s+2}} \right).$$

The above result implies that our MTR estimator can converge at the optimal uniform rate of Stone (1982). This fact is consistent with the finding recently shown by Chen and Christensen (2018).

The next theorem shows that the asymptotic distribution of the feasible estimator for the MTR function $m^{(1,0)}(x, p_1, p_2)$ is equivalent to that of the infeasible oracle estimator.

Theorem 4.2. Suppose that Assumptions 4.1–4.11 hold. For a given $(p_1^0, p_2^1) \in \mathcal{S}^{(1,0)}$, if in addition $K/\|\ddot{b}_K(p_1^0, p_2^1)\| \rightarrow 0$, $\zeta_0(K)\sqrt{K/n} \rightarrow 0$, and $\sqrt{n}K^{(2-s)/2} = O(1)$ hold, then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{(i)} \quad & \frac{\sqrt{n} (\tilde{m}^{(1,0)}(x, p_1^0, p_2^1) - m^{(1,0)}(x, p_1^0, p_2^1))}{\sigma_K^{(1,0)}(p_1^0, p_2^1)} \xrightarrow{d} N(0, 1), \\ \text{(ii)} \quad & \frac{\sqrt{n} (\hat{m}^{(1,0)}(x, p_1^0, p_2^1) - m^{(1,0)}(x, p_1^0, p_2^1))}{\sigma_K^{(1,0)}(p_1^0, p_2^1)} \xrightarrow{d} N(0, 1), \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\sigma_K^{(1,0)}(p_1^0, p_2^1) := \frac{\sqrt{\ddot{b}_K(p_1^0, p_2^1)^\top \mathbb{S}_K \left[\Psi_K^{(1,0)} \right]^{-1} \Sigma_K^{(1,0)} \left[\Psi_K^{(1,0)} \right]^{-1} \mathbb{S}_K^\top \ddot{b}_K(p_1^0, p_2^1)}}{h(p_1^0, p_2^1)}.$$

The standard deviation $\sigma_K^{(1,0)}(p_1^0, p_2^1)$ can be easily estimated by a sample analog, replacing the true values and functions with their estimates.

Let us briefly discuss the asymptotic properties of the estimators for $D = (0, 0)$. Define $\hat{\mathbf{Y}}_1^{(0,0)} = (\hat{I}_1^{(0,0)} Y_{11}, \dots, \hat{I}_n^{(0,0)} Y_{1n})^\top$ and $\hat{\mathbf{R}}_K^{(0,0)} = (\hat{R}_{K,1}^{(0,0)}, \dots, \hat{R}_{K,n}^{(0,0)})^\top$, where

$$\hat{R}_{K,i}^{(0,0)} := (\hat{I}_i^{(0,0)} X_{1i}^\top, \hat{T}_i^{(0,0)} b_K(\hat{P}_{1i}^0, \hat{P}_{2i}^0)^\top, \hat{T}_i^{(0,0)} b_K(\hat{P}_{1i}^1, \hat{P}_{2i}^0)^\top, \hat{T}_i^{(0,0)} b_K(\hat{P}_{1i}^0, \hat{P}_{2i}^1)^\top, \hat{T}_i^{(0,0)} b_K(\hat{P}_{1i}^1, \hat{P}_{2i}^1)^\top)^\top.$$

The estimator of $\delta_1^{(0,0)} = (\beta_1^{(0,0)\top}, \alpha_{11}^{(0,0)\top}, \dots, \alpha_{14}^{(0,0)\top})^\top$ can be written as

$$\hat{\delta}_{1n}^{(0,0)} = \left(\hat{\beta}_{1n}^{(0,0)\top}, \hat{\alpha}_{11n}^{(0,0)\top}, \dots, \hat{\alpha}_{14n}^{(0,0)\top} \right)^\top := \left[\hat{\mathbf{R}}_K^{(0,0)\top} \hat{\mathbf{R}}_K^{(0,0)} \right]^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{R}}_K^{(0,0)\top} \hat{\mathbf{Y}}_1^{(0,0)}, \quad (4.13)$$

and the estimator of the MTR function for $D = (0, 0)$ can be obtained by (4.9). Under conditions similar to those in Theorem 4.2, we can show the following asymptotic normality result:

$$\frac{\sqrt{n} (\widehat{m}^{(0,0)}(x, p_1^0, p_2^1) - m^{(0,0)}(x, p_1^0, p_2^1))}{\sigma_K^{(0,0)}(p_1^0, p_2^1)} \xrightarrow{d} N(0, 1),$$

where

$$\sigma_K^{(0,0)}(p_1^0, p_2^1) := \frac{\sqrt{\ddot{b}_K(p_1^0, p_2^1)^\top \mathbb{S}_{3K} [\Psi_K^{(0,0)}]^{-1} \Sigma_K^{(0,0)} [\Psi_K^{(0,0)}]^{-1} \mathbb{S}_{3K}^\top \ddot{b}_K(p_1^0, p_2^1)}}{(1 - \lambda)h(p_1^0, p_2^1)},$$

and $\mathbb{S}_{3K} := (\mathbf{0}_{K \times \dim(X)}, \mathbf{0}_{K \times 2K}, \mathbf{I}_K, \mathbf{0}_{K \times K})$. The definitions of the matrices $\Psi_K^{(0,0)}$ and $\Sigma_K^{(0,0)}$ should be clear from the context.

Finally, the limiting distribution of $\widehat{\text{MTE}}_{\text{direct}}^{(0)}(x, p_1^0, p_2^1)$ can be characterized as follows:

$$\frac{\sqrt{n} \left(\widehat{\text{MTE}}_{\text{direct}}^{(0)}(x, p_1^0, p_2^1) - \text{MTE}_{\text{direct}}^{(0)}(x, p_1^0, p_2^1) \right)}{\sqrt{\left[\sigma_K^{(1,0)}(p_1^0, p_2^1) \right]^2 + \left[\sigma_K^{(0,0)}(p_1^0, p_2^1) \right]^2}} \xrightarrow{d} N(0, 1).$$

The limiting distributions of the other MTE estimators can be derived similarly.

Remark 4.1 (An over-identified estimator). If the intersection of the supports of (P_1^0, P_2^0) , (P_1^1, P_2^0) , (P_1^0, P_2^1) , and (P_1^1, P_2^1) conditional on $D = (0, 0)$ is non-empty, we may estimate the MTR function $m^{(0,0)}(x, p_1, p_2)$ in four ways, as shown in Theorem 3.2: $\widehat{m}_l^{(0,0)}(x, p_1, p_2) := x_1^\top \widehat{\beta}_{1n}^{(0,0)} + \widehat{E}_{ln}[U_1^{(0,0)} | V_1 = p_1, V_2 = p_2]$ for $l = 1, 2, 3, 4$, where $\widehat{E}_{ln}[U_1^{(0,0)} | V_1 = p_1, V_2 = p_2] := \widehat{\kappa}_{ln} \ddot{b}_K(p_1, p_2)^\top \widehat{\alpha}_{1ln}^{(0,0)}$ with $\widehat{\kappa}_{1n} := 1/(\widehat{\lambda}_n \widehat{h}(p_1, p_2))$, $\widehat{\kappa}_{2n} = \widehat{\kappa}_{3n} := 1/((1 - \widehat{\lambda}_n) \widehat{h}(p_1, p_2))$, and $\widehat{\kappa}_{4n} := -1/((1 - \widehat{\lambda}_n) \widehat{h}(p_1, p_2))$. Let $w = (w_1, w_2, w_3, w_4)^\top \in [0, 1]^4$ be a vector of fixed weights such that $\sum_{l=1}^4 w_l = 1$. Then, $m^{(0,0)}(x, p_1, p_2)$ can be estimated by the weighted average of the four estimators: $\widehat{m}_{\text{over-id}}^{(0,0)}(x, p_1, p_2; w) := \sum_{l=1}^4 w_l \widehat{m}_l^{(0,0)}(x, p_1, p_2)$. In the same manner as in the proof of Theorem 4.2, we can show

$$\frac{\sqrt{n} \left(\widehat{m}_{\text{over-id}}^{(0,0)}(x, p_1, p_2; w) - m^{(0,0)}(x, p_1, p_2) \right)}{\sigma_{\text{over-id}, K}^{(0,0)}(p_1, p_2; w)} \xrightarrow{d} N(0, 1),$$

where $[\sigma_{\text{over-id}, K}^{(0,0)}(p_1, p_2; w)]^2 = w^\top \Upsilon w$, and $\Upsilon = (\Upsilon_{lm})$ is the 4×4 symmetric matrix with its (l, m) -th element $\Upsilon_{lm} := \kappa_l \kappa_m \ddot{b}_K(p_1, p_2)^\top \mathbb{S}_{lK} [\Psi_K^{(0,0)}]^{-1} \Sigma_K^{(0,0)} [\Psi_K^{(0,0)}]^{-1} \mathbb{S}_{mK}^\top \ddot{b}_K(p_1, p_2)$. Since the asymptotic variance has a quadratic form, we can easily find the “optimal” weights that attain the minimum asymptotic variance in the class of the weighted average estimators $\widehat{m}_{\text{over-id}}^{(0,0)}(x, p_1, p_2; w)$ by quadratic programming. Although the matrix Υ is unknown in practice, we can estimate the optimal weights by minimizing $w^\top \widehat{\Upsilon}_n w$ with a consistent estimator $\widehat{\Upsilon}_n$ of Υ .

5 Numerical Illustrations

5.1 Summary of the Monte Carlo simulation results

In order to evaluate the finite sample performance of our MTE estimator, we conduct a set of Monte Carlo simulations based on the over-identified estimator in Remark 4.1. To save space, we here briefly report the summary of the results, and detailed information about the designs and results of the experiments are provided in Appendix E.

The simulation results provide us with several practical guidelines as follows. First, when comparing bivariate power series and tensor-product B-splines for the basis functions, we find that the power-series-based estimator achieves smaller RMSE (root mean squared error) than the B-splines-based estimator, especially when the sample size is not large. For this result, note that the power series is a globally-supported series (unlike the B-splines), and thus the power-series estimator tends to have smaller variance at the cost of lower flexibility than the B-splines estimator. Theoretically speaking, B-splines estimators have a better approximation property than power-series estimators, and in fact the latter may not attain the optimal convergence rate. Hence, the above result may be due to the chosen sample sizes in this simulation setup. Second, in terms of RMSE, the MTE parameters can be more precisely estimated by ridge regression with a small regularization parameter.¹⁰ Remarkably, using the ridge regression often reduces the bias for the B-splines estimator. Since the tensor-product B-splines involves a large number of basis terms, which causes a severe multicollinearity problem for the non-regularized estimators, there is a higher risk of generating extremely outlying estimates compared with the regularized estimators. Thus, it would be desirable to employ a regularized regression in practical situations with moderate sample size. Note that adding a sufficiently small regularization factor does not alter our asymptotic results.

5.2 Empirical illustration

As an empirical illustration, we estimate the impacts of risky behaviors such as smoking and drinking alcohol on adolescents' academic performance. The empirical analysis is performed on the National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health (Add Health) data that provide nationally representative information on 7–12th graders in the U.S. The in-school survey was conducted during the 1994–1995 school year. The survey elicits information on variables such as the social and demographic characteristics of the respondents, education levels and occupations of their parents, and friendship connections.

In this analysis, similarly to Card and Giuliano (2013), we focus on the interactions among pairs of closest opposite-gender friends. In the survey, each respondent was asked to list up to five friends of each gender in order from best to 5th best friend. We first exclude missing nomination data (caused by non-response or because the nominee was not included in the Add Health data) and identify each respondent's closest opposite-gender friend in the available dataset. Since a student's closest friend's friends might not include the student him/herself, we consider that the pair is formed only when his/her best friend nominates him/her

¹⁰ To further improve the results, one may consider a more sophisticated penalization scheme, however it is beyond the scope of this analysis.

either in the first place or second place, except for missing nominees. This procedure results in 7,631 opposite-gender pairs of students.

The treatment variable (D_j) is defined as the student's participation in risky behaviors including smoking, drinking, truancy, and fighting, and the outcome variable (Y_j) is the natural log of the student's GPA score. Table F.1 in Appendix F summarizes the explanatory variables used (X_j) and their definitions. For the choice of IVs (Z_j), we suppose that the delinquent activities are often group activities. Indeed, Lee *et al.* (2014) find that adolescents' smoking behavior is significantly influenced by the characteristics of their friends, including non-best friends. Then, we construct Z_j based on the average of the selected explanatory variables over the 3rd–5th best friends of both genders; note that, at the same time, we are assuming that the 3rd–5th best friends do not have direct influence on the student's own GPA. After excluding observations with missing values for (D, X, Z), the size of the resulting sample used in the estimation of the treatment decision model is 6,053. When estimating the MTR functions, observations with missing values for Y_j are further excluded.

To save space, the detailed estimation results of the treatment decision model are omitted here and are provided in Table F.2 in Appendix F. A noteworthy finding is that about 80% of the pairs choose $D = (0, 0)$ in the multiple equilibria situation. Figure F.1 in Appendix F shows the histograms of the estimated (P_j^0, P_j^1) for $j = 1$ (male) and 2 (female). These figures suggest that the overlapping support condition can hardly hold outside the interval $[0.2, 0.8]$, implying that MTE estimates might not be reliable when V_j is outside this interval.

Now, we present our main results of estimating the MTE parameters. Since our sample size is not very large, following the suggestion from the Monte Carlo results, we employ the over-identified estimator in Remark 4.1 with a third-order bivariate power series for the basis function and use ridge regression for the parameter estimation with penalty equal to n^{-1} . Figures 3 and 4 summarize the estimated direct MTE and total MTE, respectively. For the value of X_j , the MTEs are evaluated at the median over all observations of men and women altogether. Figure 3 shows that the direct MTE is significantly negative for female students only. For male students, the direct impact of the delinquent activities is less significant and almost independent of the female partner's V (partially due to the regularization). The direct MTE for the female students tend to have a weak negative slope with respect to the male partner's V . That is, when both of the pair have stronger hesitation in participating in risky activities, the direct MTE on the female students' GPA becomes larger. Interestingly, this phenomenon is not persistent in the total MTE. Figure 4 illustrates that the total MTE is significantly negative for both male and female students. In particular, the total MTE for male students is clearly larger in magnitude than their direct MTE. This result would imply that male students' academic performances are more easily influenced by their opposite-gender peers' delinquent behavior than females.

6 Conclusion

This study developed treatment effect models that admit both the treatment spillover and strategic interaction in the treatment decisions within a pair of economic agents. We first demonstrated that the interaction in




Figure 3: Estimated direct MTE.




Figure 4: Estimated total MTE.

the treatment decisions can be modeled as a binary game of complete information with multiple equilibria. Assuming an empirically reasonable equilibrium selection rule, we showed that the MTE can be over-identified using an extended version of the LIV method. Based on our identification results, we proposed a two-step semiparametric series estimator for MTE parameters. We showed that the proposed MTE estimator is uniformly consistent and asymptotic normal, and also that its limiting distribution is the same as that of the infeasible oracle estimator.

The results of this study suggest several extensions that would be promising to investigate, some of which have been mentioned above. In addition, it would be worth extending our results to the case of strategic interaction among more than two players. In the literature on game econometrics, only a few studies address point identification of game models of complete information with more than two players. The main reason for this is that the characterization of the equilibrium is extremely complicated compared with the case of two-player games; in general, the number of multiple equilibria regions is increasing in the number of players (see, e.g., [Soetevent and Kooreman, 2007](#)). Accordingly, the direct applicability of our point-identification approach to such cases is unclear. It also would be interesting to extend our approach to situations where not only the individual treatment decision but also the pair formation itself is endogenously determined

jointly in a simultaneous game, as in [Badev \(2013\)](#). Finally, it may be beneficial to develop treatment evaluation techniques under treatment decision games of incomplete information. These topics are left for future research.

Acknowledgments

The authors are grateful to Yoichi Arai, Sukjin Han, Hiroaki Kaido, Shin Kanaya, Hiroyuki Kasahara, Toru Kitagawa, Tatsushi Oka, Ryo Okui, Yuya Sasaki, Yuta Toyama, Takuya Ura, Haiqing Xu, and the participants of AMES, ESAM, EEA-ESEM, IAAE, SETA, and seminars at various institutions for their valuable comments and suggestions. This work was supported by JSPS KAKENHI Grant Numbers 15K17039, 17K13715, and 19H01473. This research uses data from Add Health, a program project directed by Kathleen Mullan Harris and designed by J. Richard Udry, Peter S. Bearman, and Kathleen Mullan Harris at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, and funded by grant P01-HD31921 from the Eunice Kennedy Shriver National Institute of Child Health and Human Development, with cooperative funding from 23 other federal agencies and foundations. Special acknowledgment is due Ronald R. Rindfuss and Barbara Entwisle for assistance in the original design. Information on how to obtain the Add Health data files is available on the Add Health website (<http://www.cpc.unc.edu/addhealth>). No direct support was received from grant P01-HD31921 for this analysis.

Supplementary Appendix for “Treatment Effect Models with Strategic Interaction
in Treatment Decisions”
(Not for publication)

Tadao Hoshino* and Takahide Yanagi†

* School of Political Science and Economics, Waseda University.

† Graduate School of Economics, Kyoto University.

A Appendix: Proofs of Theorems

A.1 Proofs of the theorems in Section 3

A.1.1 Proof of Theorem 3.1

We provide the proof for $m^{(1,0)}(x, p_1^0, p_2^1)$ only, as the proof for $m^{(0,1)}(x, p_1^1, p_2^0)$ is analogous. From the law of iterated expectations, the relationship (2.6) implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \psi^{(1,0)}(x, p_1^0, p_2^1) &= E[I^{(1,0)}Y_1|X = x, P_1^0 = p_1^0, P_2^1 = p_2^1] \\ &= E[Y_1^{(1,0)}|X = x, P_1^0 = p_1^0, P_2^1 = p_2^1, D = (1, 0)] \cdot \Pr[D = (1, 0)|X = x, P_1^0 = p_1^0, P_2^1 = p_2^1] \\ &= E[Y_1^{(1,0)}|X = x, P_1^0 = p_1^0, P_2^1 = p_2^1, V_1 \leq p_1^0, V_2 > p_2^1] \cdot \Pr[V_1 \leq p_1^0, V_2 > p_2^1|X = x, P_1^0 = p_1^0, P_2^1 = p_2^1] \\ &= E[Y_1^{(1,0)}|X = x, V_1 \leq p_1^0, V_2 > p_2^1] \cdot \Pr[V_1 \leq p_1^0, V_2 > p_2^1|X = x], \end{aligned}$$

where we used Assumption 3.2(i) in the last equality. Here, it holds that

$$E[Y_1^{(1,0)}|X = x, V_1 \leq p_1^0, V_2 > p_2^1] = \frac{1}{\Pr[V_1 \leq p_1^0, V_2 > p_2^1|X = x]} \int_{p_2^1}^1 \int_0^{p_1^0} m^{(1,0)}(x, v_1, v_2) h(v_1, v_2|x) dv_1 dv_2.$$

As a result, the cross-partial differentiation of $\psi^{(1,0)}(x, p_1^0, p_2^1)$ with respect to p_1^0 and p_2^1 leads to

$$\begin{aligned} \psi^{(1,0)}(x, p_1^0, p_2^1) &= \int_{p_2^1}^1 \int_0^{p_1^0} m^{(1,0)}(x, v_1, v_2) h(v_1, v_2|x) dv_1 dv_2 \\ \implies \frac{\partial^2 \psi^{(1,0)}(x, p_1^0, p_2^1)}{\partial p_1^0 \partial p_2^1} &= -m^{(1,0)}(x, p_1^0, p_2^1) h(p_1^0, p_2^1|x), \end{aligned}$$

by the Leibniz integral rule provided that $m^{(1,0)}(x, v_1, v_2) h(v_1, v_2|x)$ is continuous in (v_1, v_2) . Rearranging the above equation, we obtain the desired result for $m^{(1,0)}(x, p_1^0, p_2^1)$. $\square$

A.1.2 Proof of Theorem 3.2

We prove only the case of $m_1^{(0,0)}(x, p_1^0, p_2^0)$, as the proofs for the other cases are similar. From the law of iterated expectations,

$$\begin{aligned}\psi^{(0,0)}(x, \mathbf{p}) &= E[I^{(0,0)}Y_1|X = x, \mathbf{P} = \mathbf{p}] \\ &= E[Y_1^{(0,0)}|X = x, \mathbf{P} = \mathbf{p}, D = (0, 0)] \cdot \Pr[D = (0, 0)|X = x, \mathbf{P} = \mathbf{p}].\end{aligned}$$

For notational simplicity, we write $\mathcal{V}_{\text{uni}}^{(0,0)} = \mathcal{V}_{\text{uni}}^{(0,0)}(\mathbf{p})$ and $\mathcal{V}_{\text{mul}} = \mathcal{V}_{\text{mul}}(\mathbf{p})$ by suppressing the dependence on $\mathbf{p}$. As $\mathcal{V}_{\text{uni}}^{(0,0)}$ and $\mathcal{V}_{\text{mul}}$ are disjoint, by Assumptions 3.2(i) and 3.3, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}E[Y_1^{(0,0)}|X = x, \mathbf{P} = \mathbf{p}, D = (0, 0)] &= E[Y_1^{(0,0)}|X = x, V \in \mathcal{V}_{\text{uni}}^{(0,0)} \vee (V \in \mathcal{V}_{\text{mul}} \wedge \epsilon \leq \lambda)] \\ &= E[Y_1^{(0,0)}|X = x, V \in \mathcal{V}_{\text{uni}}^{(0,0)}] \cdot \frac{\Pr[V \in \mathcal{V}_{\text{uni}}^{(0,0)}|X = x]}{\Pr[V \in \mathcal{V}_{\text{uni}}^{(0,0)} \vee (V \in \mathcal{V}_{\text{mul}} \wedge \epsilon \leq \lambda)|X = x]} \\ &\quad + E[Y_1^{(0,0)}|X = x, (V \in \mathcal{V}_{\text{mul}} \wedge \epsilon \leq \lambda)] \cdot \frac{\Pr[(V \in \mathcal{V}_{\text{mul}} \wedge \epsilon \leq \lambda)|X = x]}{\Pr[V \in \mathcal{V}_{\text{uni}}^{(0,0)} \vee (V \in \mathcal{V}_{\text{mul}} \wedge \epsilon \leq \lambda)|X = x]} \\ &= E[Y_1^{(0,0)}|X = x, V \in \mathcal{V}_{\text{uni}}^{(0,0)}] \cdot \frac{\Pr[V \in \mathcal{V}_{\text{uni}}^{(0,0)}|X = x]}{\Pr[V \in \mathcal{V}_{\text{uni}}^{(0,0)}|X = x] + \lambda \cdot \Pr[V \in \mathcal{V}_{\text{mul}}|X = x]} \\ &\quad + E[Y_1^{(0,0)}|X = x, V \in \mathcal{V}_{\text{mul}}] \cdot \frac{\lambda \cdot \Pr[V \in \mathcal{V}_{\text{mul}}|X = x]}{\Pr[V \in \mathcal{V}_{\text{uni}}^{(0,0)}|X = x] + \lambda \cdot \Pr[V \in \mathcal{V}_{\text{mul}}|X = x]}.\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, we also have

$$\Pr[D = (0, 0)|X = x, \mathbf{P} = \mathbf{p}] = \Pr[V \in \mathcal{V}_{\text{uni}}^{(0,0)}|X = x] + \lambda \cdot \Pr[V \in \mathcal{V}_{\text{mul}}|X = x].$$

As a result, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\psi^{(0,0)}(x, \mathbf{p}) &= E[Y_1^{(0,0)}|X = x, V \in \mathcal{V}_{\text{uni}}^{(0,0)}] \cdot \Pr[V \in \mathcal{V}_{\text{uni}}^{(0,0)}|X = x] \\ &\quad + \lambda \cdot E[Y_1^{(0,0)}|X = x, V \in \mathcal{V}_{\text{mul}}] \cdot \Pr[V \in \mathcal{V}_{\text{mul}}|X = x].\end{aligned}$$

Further, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}E[Y_1^{(0,0)}|X = x, V \in \mathcal{V}_{\text{uni}}^{(0,0)}] \cdot \Pr[V \in \mathcal{V}_{\text{uni}}^{(0,0)}|X = x] &= \int_{p_2^0}^1 \int_{p_1^0}^1 m^{(0,0)}(x, v_1, v_2) h(v_1, v_2|x) dv_1 dv_2 - \int_{p_2^0}^{p_2^1} \int_{p_1^0}^{p_1^1} m^{(0,0)}(x, v_1, v_2) h(v_1, v_2|x) dv_1 dv_2,\end{aligned}$$

and

$$E[Y_1^{(0,0)}|X = x, V \in \mathcal{V}_{\text{mul}}] \cdot \Pr[V \in \mathcal{V}_{\text{mul}}|X = x] = \int_{p_2^0}^{p_2^1} \int_{p_1^0}^{p_1^1} m^{(0,0)}(x, v_1, v_2) h(v_1, v_2|x) dv_1 dv_2.$$

Hence, we have

$$\psi^{(0,0)}(x, \mathbf{p}) = \int_{p_2^0}^1 \int_{p_1^0}^1 m^{(0,0)}(x, v_1, v_2) h(v_1, v_2 | x) dv_1 dv_2 - (1 - \lambda) \int_{p_2^0}^{p_2^1} \int_{p_1^0}^{p_1^1} m^{(0,0)}(x, v_1, v_2) h(v_1, v_2 | x) dv_1 dv_2.$$

Partially differentiating both sides with respect to p_1^0 and p_2^0 and rearranging the equation, the Leibniz integral rule and continuity of $m^{(0,0)}(x, v_1, v_2) h(v_1, v_2 | x)$ in (v_1, v_2) lead to the desired result:

$$m^{(0,0)}(x, p_1^0, p_2^0) = \frac{1}{\lambda h(p_1^0, p_2^0 | x)} \frac{\partial^2 \psi^{(0,0)}(x, \mathbf{p})}{\partial p_1^0 \partial p_2^0}.$$

□

A.2 Proofs of the theorems in Section 4

For notational simplicity, when there is no confusion, we often suppress the superscript $(1, 0)$ in the rest of this section. Here, we introduce additional notations as follows. Let $\mathbb{S}_a$ be a selection matrix of dimension $a \times (\dim(X) + K)$ such that $\mathbb{S}_a \delta_1^{(1,0)}$ is the corresponding $a \times 1$ subvector of $\delta_1^{(1,0)}$. Specifically, we write $\mathbb{S}_X \delta_1^{(1,0)} = \beta_1^{(1,0)}$ and $\mathbb{S}_K \delta_1^{(1,0)} = \alpha_1^{(1,0)}$ with $\mathbb{S}_X = \mathbb{S}_{\dim(X)} := (\mathbf{I}_{\dim(X)}, \mathbf{0}_{\dim(X) \times K})$ and $\mathbb{S}_K := (\mathbf{0}_{K \times \dim(X)}, \mathbf{I}_K)$.

In addition, we introduce the following notations:

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mathbf{e}}_1^{(1,0)} &= (\tilde{e}_{11}^{(1,0)}, \dots, \tilde{e}_{1n}^{(1,0)})^\top & \hat{\mathbf{e}}_1^{(1,0)} &= (\hat{e}_{11}^{(1,0)}, \dots, \hat{e}_{1n}^{(1,0)})^\top, \text{ where } \hat{e}_1^{(1,0)} := \tau_\omega(\hat{\mathcal{L}}^{(1,0)})e_1^{(1,0)} \\ \mathbf{g}_1^{(1,0)} &= (g_1^{(1,0)}(P_{11}^0, P_{21}^1), \dots, g_1^{(1,0)}(P_{1n}^0, P_{2n}^1))^\top & \hat{\mathbf{g}}_1^{(1,0)} &= (g_1^{(1,0)}(\hat{P}_{11}^0, \hat{P}_{21}^1), \dots, g_1^{(1,0)}(\hat{P}_{1n}^0, \hat{P}_{2n}^1))^\top \\ \mathbf{X}_1^{(1,0)} &= (\tilde{I}_1^{(1,0)} X_{11}, \dots, \tilde{I}_n^{(1,0)} X_{1n})^\top & \hat{\mathbf{X}}_1^{(1,0)} &= (\hat{I}_1^{(1,0)} X_{11}, \dots, \hat{I}_n^{(1,0)} X_{1n})^\top \\ \tilde{\mathbf{T}}^{(1,0)} &= \text{diag}(\tilde{T}_1^{(1,0)}, \dots, \tilde{T}_n^{(1,0)}) & \hat{\mathbf{T}}^{(1,0)} &= \text{diag}(\hat{T}_1^{(1,0)}, \dots, \hat{T}_n^{(1,0)}) \\ \check{\mathbf{T}}^{(1,0)} &= \text{diag}(\check{T}_1^{(1,0)}, \dots, \check{T}_n^{(1,0)}), \text{ where } \check{T}^{(1,0)} := \tau_\omega(\hat{\mathcal{L}}^{(1,0)})T^{(1,0)} \\ \mathbf{b}_K^{(1,0)} &= (b_K(P_{11}^0, P_{21}^1), \dots, b_K(P_{1n}^0, P_{2n}^1))^\top & \hat{\mathbf{b}}_K^{(1,0)} &= (b_K(\hat{P}_{11}^0, \hat{P}_{21}^1), \dots, b_K(\hat{P}_{1n}^0, \hat{P}_{2n}^1))^\top \\ \mathbf{u}_1^{(1,0)} &= \mathbf{g}_1^{(1,0)} - \mathbf{b}_K^{(1,0)} \alpha_1^{(1,0)} & \hat{\mathbf{u}}_1^{(1,0)} &= \hat{\mathbf{g}}_1^{(1,0)} - \hat{\mathbf{b}}_K^{(1,0)} \alpha_1^{(1,0)} \end{aligned}$$

By definition, $\mathbf{R}_K^{(1,0)} = (\mathbf{X}_1^{(1,0)}, \tilde{\mathbf{T}}^{(1,0)} \mathbf{b}_K^{(1,0)})$ and $\hat{\mathbf{R}}_K^{(1,0)} = (\hat{\mathbf{X}}_1^{(1,0)}, \hat{\mathbf{T}}^{(1,0)} \hat{\mathbf{b}}_K^{(1,0)})$. By (4.3), the infeasible estimator $\mathbb{S}_a \tilde{\delta}_{1n}^{(1,0)}$ defined in (4.12) can be decomposed as follows:

$$\mathbb{S}_a \left(\tilde{\delta}_{1n}^{(1,0)} - \delta_1^{(1,0)} \right) = \mathbb{S}_a \Psi_{nK}^{-1} \mathbf{R}_K^\top \tilde{\mathbf{T}} \mathbf{u}_1 / n + \mathbb{S}_a \Psi_{nK}^{-1} \mathbf{R}_K^\top \tilde{\mathbf{e}}_1 / n. \quad (\text{A.1})$$

Next, by (4.2), we can write

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{I}^{(1,0)} Y_1 &= \tau_\omega(\hat{\mathcal{L}}^{(1,0)}) \left(I^{(1,0)} X_1^\top \beta_1^{(1,0)} + T^{(1,0)} g_1^{(1,0)}(P_1^0, P_2^1) + e_1^{(1,0)} \right) \\ &= \hat{R}_K^{(1,0)\top} \delta_1^{(1,0)} + \check{T}^{(1,0)} \left(g_1^{(1,0)}(P_1^0, P_2^1) - g_1^{(1,0)}(\hat{P}_1^0, \hat{P}_2^1) \right) \\ &\quad + \left(\check{T}^{(1,0)} - \hat{T}^{(1,0)} \right) g_1^{(1,0)}(\hat{P}_1^0, \hat{P}_2^1) + \hat{T}^{(1,0)} \left(g_1^{(1,0)}(\hat{P}_1^0, \hat{P}_2^1) - b_K(\hat{P}_1^0, \hat{P}_2^1)^\top \alpha_1^{(1,0)} \right) + \hat{e}_1^{(1,0)}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, the feasible estimator $\mathbb{S}_a \hat{\delta}_{1n}^{(1,0)}$ defined in (4.11) can be decomposed as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{S}_a \left(\hat{\delta}_{1n}^{(1,0)} - \delta_1^{(1,0)} \right) &= \mathbb{S}_a \hat{\Psi}_{nK}^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{R}}_K^\top \check{\mathbf{T}} \left(\mathbf{g}_1^{(1,0)} - \hat{\mathbf{g}}_1^{(1,0)} \right) / n + \mathbb{S}_a \hat{\Psi}_{nK}^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{R}}_K^\top \left(\check{\mathbf{T}} - \hat{\mathbf{T}} \right) \hat{\mathbf{g}}_1^{(1,0)} / n \\ &\quad + \mathbb{S}_a \hat{\Psi}_{nK}^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{R}}_K^\top \hat{\mathbf{T}} \hat{\mathbf{u}}_1 / n + \mathbb{S}_a \hat{\Psi}_{nK}^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{R}}_K^\top \hat{\mathbf{e}}_1 / n. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.2})$$

A.2.1 Proof of Theorem 4.2

We first show that there exists a constant $0 < c_\sigma < \infty$ such that for a given $(p_1^0, p_2^1) \in \mathcal{S}^{(1,0)}$,

$$\sigma_K^{(1,0)}(p_1^0, p_2^1) \geq c_\sigma \cdot \|\ddot{b}_K(p_1^0, p_2^1)\|. \quad (\text{A.3})$$

By Assumptions 4.4(iii) and 4.5, noting that $\mathbb{S}_K \mathbb{S}_K^\top = \mathbf{I}_K$, we observe

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\sigma_K^{(1,0)}(p_1^0, p_2^1) \right)^2 &= \frac{1}{h^2(p_1^0, p_2^1)} \ddot{b}_K(p_1^0, p_2^1)^\top \mathbb{S}_K \Psi_K^{-1} \Sigma_K \Psi_K^{-1} \mathbb{S}_K^\top \ddot{b}_K(p_1^0, p_2^1) \\ &\geq \underbrace{\frac{c_\Sigma}{\bar{c}_\Psi^2 \cdot h^2(p_1^0, p_2^1)}}_{>0} \cdot \|\ddot{b}_K(p_1^0, p_2^1)\|^2, \end{aligned}$$

which implies (A.3). Hence, $K/\sigma_K^{(1,0)}(p_1^0, p_2^1) \rightarrow 0$ under the assumption $K/\|\ddot{b}_K(p_1^0, p_2^1)\| \rightarrow 0$.

Proof of (i). By the definition of the infeasible estimator $\tilde{m}^{(1,0)}(x, p_1^0, p_2^1)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\tilde{m}^{(1,0)}(x, p_1^0, p_2^1) - m^{(1,0)}(x, p_1^0, p_2^1) \\ &= x_1^\top \left(\tilde{\beta}_{1n}^{(1,0)} - \beta_1^{(1,0)} \right) - \frac{1}{h(p_1^0, p_2^1)} \ddot{b}_K(p_1^0, p_2^1)^\top \left(\tilde{\alpha}_{1n}^{(1,0)} - \alpha_1^{(1,0)} \right) + \frac{1}{h(p_1^0, p_2^1)} \left(\frac{\partial^2 g_1^{(1,0)}(p_1^0, p_2^1)}{\partial p_1 \partial p_2} - \ddot{b}_K(p_1^0, p_2^1)^\top \alpha_1^{(1,0)} \right) \\ &= -\frac{1}{h(p_1^0, p_2^1)} \ddot{b}_K(p_1^0, p_2^1)^\top \left(\tilde{\alpha}_{1n}^{(1,0)} - \alpha_1^{(1,0)} \right) + O_P(n^{-1/2}) + O(K^{(2-s)/2}) \\ &= A_{1n} + A_{2n} + O_P(n^{-1/2}), \end{aligned}$$

by Lemma A.2(i), and Assumption 4.7, where

$$A_{1n} := -\frac{1}{h(p_1^0, p_2^1)} \ddot{b}_K(p_1^0, p_2^1)^\top \mathbb{S}_K \Psi_{nK}^{-1} \mathbf{R}_K^\top \tilde{\mathbf{T}} \mathbf{u}_1 / n, \quad A_{2n} := -\frac{1}{h(p_1^0, p_2^1)} \ddot{b}_K(p_1^0, p_2^1)^\top \mathbb{S}_K \Psi_{nK}^{-1} \mathbf{R}_K^\top \tilde{\mathbf{e}}_1 / n.$$

By Assumptions 4.4(iii), 4.7, 4.9, and 4.10, we have

$$|A_{1n}| \leq O(K) \cdot \|\mathcal{P}_{nK}\|_\infty \cdot O(K^{-s/2}) = O_P(K^{(2-s)/2}). \quad (\text{A.4})$$

Define

$$A'_{2n} := -\frac{1}{h(p_1^0, p_2^1)} \ddot{b}_K(p_1^0, p_2^1)^\top \mathbb{S}_K \Psi_K^{-1} \mathbf{R}_K^\top \tilde{\mathbf{e}}_1 / n.$$

It is easy to see that $|A_{2n} - A'_{2n}| \leq O(1) \cdot \|\ddot{b}_K(p_1^0, p_2^1) \mathbb{S}_K(\Psi_{nK}^{-1} - \Psi_K^{-1}) \mathbf{R}_K^\top \tilde{\mathbf{e}}_1/n\| = \|\ddot{b}_K(p_1^0, p_2^1)\| \cdot o_P(n^{-1/2})$ by (A.7), Lemma A.1(iii) and Assumption 4.4(iii). Thus, by (A.3), we obtain

$$\frac{\sqrt{n} (\tilde{m}^{(1,0)}(x, p_1^0, p_2^1) - m^{(1,0)}(x, p_1^0, p_2^1))}{\sigma_K^{(1,0)}(p_1^0, p_2^1)} = \frac{\sqrt{n}(A_{1n} + A_{2n})}{\sigma_K^{(1,0)}(p_1^0, p_2^1)} + o_P(1) = \frac{\sqrt{n}A'_{2n}}{\sigma_K^{(1,0)}(p_1^0, p_2^1)} + o_P(1).$$

We now show the asymptotic normality of $\sqrt{n}A'_{2n}/\sigma_K^{(1,0)}(p_1^0, p_2^1)$. Let $\xi_i := -\Pi_K(p_1^0, p_2^1)R_{K,i}\tilde{\mathbf{e}}_{1i}/\sqrt{n}$, where

$$\Pi_K(p_1^0, p_2^1) := \left[\sigma_K^{(1,0)}(p_1^0, p_2^1) \cdot h(p_1^0, p_2^1) \right]^{-1} \ddot{b}_K(p_1^0, p_2^1)^\top \mathbb{S}_K \Psi_K^{-1},$$

so that $\sum_{i=1}^n \xi_i = \sqrt{n}A'_{2n}/\sigma_K^{(1,0)}(p_1^0, p_2^1)$. By construction, $E[\xi_i] = 0$ and $E[\xi_i^2] = n^{-1}$ hold. Then, Assumption 4.6 and the law of iterated expectations yield

$$\begin{aligned} E[\xi_i^4] &= n^{-2} E \left[\Pi_K(p_1^0, p_2^1) R_{K,i} R_{K,i}^\top \Pi_K(p_1^0, p_2^1)^\top \Pi_K(p_1^0, p_2^1) R_{K,i} R_{K,i}^\top \Pi_K(p_1^0, p_2^1)^\top E[\tilde{\mathbf{e}}_{1i}^4 | W_i, D_i] \right] \\ &\leq O(n^{-2}) \cdot E \left[\Pi_K(p_1^0, p_2^1) R_{K,i} R_{K,i}^\top \Pi_K(p_1^0, p_2^1)^\top \Pi_K(p_1^0, p_2^1) R_{K,i} R_{K,i}^\top \Pi_K(p_1^0, p_2^1)^\top \right] \\ &\leq O(n^{-2}) \cdot \chi_{\max} \left(\Pi_K(p_1^0, p_2^1)^\top \Pi_K(p_1^0, p_2^1) \right) E \left[\text{tr} \left\{ R_{K,i} R_{K,i}^\top \Pi_K(p_1^0, p_2^1)^\top \Pi_K(p_1^0, p_2^1) R_{K,i} R_{K,i}^\top \right\} \right] \\ &\leq O(n^{-2}) \cdot \left[\chi_{\max} \left(\Pi_K(p_1^0, p_2^1)^\top \Pi_K(p_1^0, p_2^1) \right) \right]^2 E \left[\text{tr} \left\{ R_{K,i} R_{K,i}^\top R_{K,i} R_{K,i}^\top \right\} \right] \\ &= O(\zeta_0^2(K)K/n^2) \cdot \left[\chi_{\max} \left(\Pi_K(p_1^0, p_2^1)^\top \Pi_K(p_1^0, p_2^1) \right) \right]^2, \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality follows from $E[\text{tr}\{R_{K,i} R_{K,i}^\top R_{K,i} R_{K,i}^\top\}] \leq \zeta_0^2(K) \text{tr}\{E[R_{K,i} R_{K,i}^\top]\} = O(\zeta_0^2(K)K)$ under Assumption 4.5(i). Since (A.3) and Assumption 4.4(iii) imply that

$$\begin{aligned} \chi_{\max} \left(\Pi_K(p_1^0, p_2^1)^\top \Pi_K(p_1^0, p_2^1) \right) &\leq \text{tr} \left\{ \Pi_K(p_1^0, p_2^1)^\top \Pi_K(p_1^0, p_2^1) \right\} \\ &\leq O(1) \cdot \|\ddot{b}_K(p_1^0, p_2^1)\|^{-2} \cdot \ddot{b}_K(p_1^0, p_2^1)^\top \mathbb{S}_K \Psi_K^{-2} \mathbb{S}_K^\top \ddot{b}_K(p_1^0, p_2^1) = O(1), \end{aligned}$$

we have $\sum_{i=1}^n E[\xi_i^4] = O(\zeta_0^2(K)K/n) = o(1)$. Hence, result (i) follows from Lyapunov's central limit theorem.

Proof of (ii). From the definition of the feasible estimator $\hat{m}^{(1,0)}(x, p_1^0, p_2^1)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\hat{m}^{(1,0)}(x, p_1^0, p_2^1) - m^{(1,0)}(x, p_1^0, p_2^1) \\ &= x_1^\top \left(\hat{\beta}_{1n}^{(1,0)} - \beta_1^{(1,0)} \right) - \frac{1}{\hat{h}(p_1^0, p_2^1)} \ddot{b}_K(p_1^0, p_2^1)^\top \left(\hat{\alpha}_{1n}^{(1,0)} - \alpha_1^{(1,0)} \right) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{\hat{h}(p_1^0, p_2^1)} \left(\frac{\partial^2 g_1^{(1,0)}(p_1^0, p_2^1)}{\partial p_1 \partial p_2} - \ddot{b}_K(p_1^0, p_2^1)^\top \alpha_1^{(1,0)} \right) + \left(\frac{1}{\hat{h}(p_1^0, p_2^1)} - \frac{1}{h(p_1^0, p_2^1)} \right) \frac{\partial^2 g_1^{(1,0)}(p_1^0, p_2^1)}{\partial p_1 \partial p_2} \\ &= -\frac{1}{\hat{h}(p_1^0, p_2^1)} \ddot{b}_K(p_1^0, p_2^1)^\top \left(\hat{\alpha}_{1n}^{(1,0)} - \alpha_1^{(1,0)} \right) + O_P(n^{-1/2}) + O_P(K^{(2-s)/2}) \end{aligned}$$

$$= C_{1n} + C_{2n} + C_{3n} + C_{4n} + O_P(n^{-1/2}),$$

by (A.16), Lemma A.2(iii), and Assumption 4.7, where

$$\begin{aligned} C_{1n} &:= -\frac{1}{\widehat{h}(p_1^0, p_2^1)} \ddot{b}_K(p_1^0, p_2^1)^\top \mathbb{S}_K \widehat{\Psi}_{nK}^{-1} \widehat{\mathbf{R}}_K^\top \check{\mathbf{T}} \left(\mathbf{g}_1^{(1,0)} - \widehat{\mathbf{g}}_1^{(1,0)} \right) / n, \\ C_{2n} &:= -\frac{1}{\widehat{h}(p_1^0, p_2^1)} \ddot{b}_K(p_1^0, p_2^1)^\top \mathbb{S}_K \widehat{\Psi}_{nK}^{-1} \widehat{\mathbf{R}}_K^\top \left(\check{\mathbf{T}} - \widehat{\mathbf{T}} \right) \widehat{\mathbf{g}}_1^{(1,0)} / n, \\ C_{3n} &:= -\frac{1}{\widehat{h}(p_1^0, p_2^1)} \ddot{b}_K(p_1^0, p_2^1)^\top \mathbb{S}_K \widehat{\Psi}_{nK}^{-1} \widehat{\mathbf{R}}_K^\top \widehat{\mathbf{T}} \widehat{\mathbf{u}}_1 / n, \\ C_{4n} &:= -\frac{1}{\widehat{h}(p_1^0, p_2^1)} \ddot{b}_K(p_1^0, p_2^1)^\top \mathbb{S}_K \widehat{\Psi}_{nK}^{-1} \widehat{\mathbf{R}}_K^\top \widehat{\mathbf{e}}_1 / n. \end{aligned}$$

The fact that $1/\widehat{h}(p_1^0, p_2^1) = O_P(1)$ and Assumption 4.10 imply that

$$|C_{1n}| \leq O_P(K) \cdot \sup_{(p_1, p_2) \in \mathcal{S}^{(1,0)}} \left| \ddot{b}_K(p_1, p_2)^\top \mathbb{S}_K \widehat{\Psi}_{nK}^{-1} \widehat{\mathbf{R}}_K^\top \check{\mathbf{T}} \left(\mathbf{g}_1^{(1,0)} - \widehat{\mathbf{g}}_1^{(1,0)} \right) / n \right| = O_P(K/\sqrt{n}),$$

where the last equality follows from (A.15). Analogously, we can observe that $|C_{2n}| = O_P(K/\sqrt{n})$. In addition, the same argument as in (A.4) implies that $|C_{3n}| = O_P(K^{(2-s)/2})$ by Lemma A.3. Further,

$$\begin{aligned} C_{4n} &= -\frac{1}{\widehat{h}(p_1^0, p_2^1)} \ddot{b}_K(p_1^0, p_2^1)^\top \mathbb{S}_K \Psi_{nK}^{-1} \mathbf{R}_K^\top \widetilde{\mathbf{e}}_1 / n \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{\widehat{h}(p_1^0, p_2^1)} \left(\ddot{b}_K(p_1^0, p_2^1)^\top \mathbb{S}_K \widehat{\Psi}_{nK}^{-1} \widehat{\mathbf{R}}_K^\top \widehat{\mathbf{e}}_1 / n - \ddot{b}_K(p_1^0, p_2^1)^\top \mathbb{S}_K \Psi_{nK}^{-1} \mathbf{R}_K^\top \widehat{\mathbf{e}}_1 / n \right) \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{\widehat{h}(p_1^0, p_2^1)} \ddot{b}_K(p_1^0, p_2^1)^\top \mathbb{S}_K \Psi_{nK}^{-1} \mathbf{R}_K^\top (\widehat{\mathbf{e}}_1 - \widetilde{\mathbf{e}}_1) / n - \left(\frac{1}{\widehat{h}(p_1^0, p_2^1)} - \frac{1}{h(p_1^0, p_2^1)} \right) \ddot{b}_K(p_1^0, p_2^1)^\top \mathbb{S}_K \Psi_{nK}^{-1} \mathbf{R}_K^\top \widetilde{\mathbf{e}}_1 / n \\ &= \underbrace{-\frac{1}{\widehat{h}(p_1^0, p_2^1)} \ddot{b}_K(p_1^0, p_2^1)^\top \mathbb{S}_K \Psi_{nK}^{-1} \mathbf{R}_K^\top \widetilde{\mathbf{e}}_1 / n}_{=A_{2n}} + \|\ddot{b}_K(p_1^0, p_2^1)\| \cdot o_P(n^{-1/2}) + \|\ddot{b}_K(p_1^0, p_2^1)\| \cdot O_P(n^{-1}), \end{aligned}$$

by Lemma A.1(iii), (A.6), $\max_{1 \leq i \leq n} |\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_i^{(1,0)} - \mathcal{L}_i^{(1,0)}| = O_P(n^{-1/2})$, and (A.16).

Summarizing these results, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\sqrt{n} (\widehat{m}^{(1,0)}(x, p_1^0, p_2^1) - m^{(1,0)}(x, p_1^0, p_2^1))}{\sigma_K^{(1,0)}(p_1^0, p_2^1)} &= \frac{\sqrt{n}(C_{1n} + C_{2n} + C_{3n} + C_{4n})}{\sigma_K^{(1,0)}(p_1^0, p_2^1)} + o_P(1) \\ &= \frac{\sqrt{n}A_{2n}}{\sigma_K^{(1,0)}(p_1^0, p_2^1)} + o_P(1), \end{aligned}$$

by (A.3). Then, the remaining part of the proof follows by the same argument as in result (i). $\square$

A.3 Lemmas

For a matrix A , we denote $\|A\|_2 = \sqrt{\chi_{\max}(A^\top A)}$ as its spectral norm.

Lemma A.1. Suppose that Assumptions 4.1–4.4, 4.5(i), and 4.8 hold. Then, we have

- (i) $\left\| \Psi_{nK}^{(1,0)} - \Psi_K^{(1,0)} \right\|_2 = O_P(\zeta_0(K)\sqrt{(\log K)/n}) = o_P(1),$
- (ii) $\left\| \widehat{\Psi}_{nK}^{(1,0)} - \Psi_K^{(1,0)} \right\|_2 = O_P(\zeta_0(K)\sqrt{(\log K)/n}) + O_P(\zeta_1(K)/\sqrt{n}) = o_P(1),$
- (iii) $\left\| \left[\Psi_{nK}^{(1,0)} \right]^{-1} - \left[\Psi_K^{(1,0)} \right]^{-1} \right\|_2 = O_P(\zeta_0(K)\sqrt{(\log K)/n}) = o_P(1),$
- (iv) $\left\| \left[\widehat{\Psi}_{nK}^{(1,0)} \right]^{-1} - \left[\Psi_K^{(1,0)} \right]^{-1} \right\|_2 = O_P(\zeta_0(K)\sqrt{(\log K)/n}) + O_P(\zeta_1(K)/\sqrt{n}) = o_P(1).$

Proof. (i) Let $\Xi_i := (R_{K,i}^{(1,0)} R_{K,i}^{(1,0)\top} - E[R_{K,i}^{(1,0)} R_{K,i}^{(1,0)\top}])/n$. By Bernstein's inequality for random matrices (Tropp, 2012, Theorem 1.6), it holds that

$$\Pr \left(\left\| \sum_{i=1}^n \Xi_i \right\|_2 \geq t_n \right) \leq \exp \left(\log(2\dim(X) + 2K) + \frac{-t_n^2/2}{\sigma_n^2 + t_n \cdot r_n/3} \right),$$

for any $t_n \geq 0$, where r_n is any non-negative value such that $\max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \|\Xi_i\|_2 \leq r_n$, and $\sigma_n^2 := \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n E[\Xi_i \Xi_i^\top] \right\|_2$. Since $\widehat{T}_i^{(1,0)}$ is bounded, we obtain $r_n = O(\zeta_0^2(K)/n)$ and similarly $\sigma_n^2 = O(\zeta_0^2(K)/n)$ by Assumption 4.5(i). The rest of the proof follows immediately from Corollary 4.1 of Chen and Christensen (2015).

(ii) The triangle inequality leads to

$$\|\widehat{\Psi}_{nK} - \Psi_K\|_2 \leq \|\widehat{\Psi}_{nK} - \Psi_{nK}\|_2 + \|\Psi_{nK} - \Psi_K\|_2.$$

The second term is $O_P(\zeta_0(K)\sqrt{(\log K)/n})$ by (i). For the first term, the triangle inequality implies

$$\begin{aligned} \|\widehat{\Psi}_{nK} - \Psi_{nK}\|_2 &\leq \|\widehat{\Psi}_{nK} - \Psi_{nK}\| \\ &\leq \left\| \left(\widehat{\mathbf{R}}_K^\top - \mathbf{R}_K^\top \right) \left(\widehat{\mathbf{R}}_K - \mathbf{R}_K \right) / n \right\| + 2 \left\| \mathbf{R}_K^\top \left(\widehat{\mathbf{R}}_K - \mathbf{R}_K \right) / n \right\|. \end{aligned}$$

By the mean value theorem, Assumptions 4.4(i)–(iii) yield

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{T}_i^{(1,0)} - \widetilde{T}_i^{(1,0)} &= \mathbf{1}\{D_i = (1, 0)\} \left(\frac{\tau_{\varpi}(\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_i^{(1,0)})}{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_i^{(1,0)}} - \frac{\tau_{\varpi}(\mathcal{L}_i^{(1,0)})}{\mathcal{L}_i^{(1,0)}} \right) \\ &= O(1) \cdot (\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_i^{(1,0)} - \mathcal{L}_i^{(1,0)}) \cdot \frac{\mathbf{1}\{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_i^{(1,0)} \geq \varpi\}}{(\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_i^{(1,0)})^2} \\ &= O(1) \cdot \left(\widehat{P}_{1i}^0 - P_{1i}^0 - H_{\widehat{\rho}_n}(\widehat{P}_{1i}^0, \widehat{P}_{2i}^1) + H_{\rho^*}(P_{1i}^0, P_{2i}^1) \right) = O_P(n^{-1/2}), \end{aligned} \tag{A.5}$$

where $\bar{\mathcal{L}}_i^{(1,0)} \in [\hat{\mathcal{L}}_i^{(1,0)}, \mathcal{L}_i^{(1,0)}]$. Further, the mean value expansion and Assumption 4.4(i) lead to

$$b_K(\hat{P}_{1i}^0, \hat{P}_{2i}^1) - b_K(P_{1i}^0, P_{2i}^1) = \left\{ \frac{\partial b_K(\bar{P}_{1i}^0, \bar{P}_{2i}^1)}{\partial p_1} + \frac{\partial b_K(\bar{P}_{1i}^0, \bar{P}_{2i}^1)}{\partial p_2} \right\} \cdot O_P(n^{-1/2}),$$

where $\bar{P}_{1i}^0 \in [\hat{P}_{1i}^0, P_{1i}^0]$ and $\bar{P}_{2i}^1 \in [\hat{P}_{2i}^1, P_{2i}^1]$. Thus, by the triangle inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| (\hat{\mathbf{R}}_K - \mathbf{R}_K) / \sqrt{n} \right\| &\leq \left\| (\hat{\mathbf{T}} - \tilde{\mathbf{T}}) \hat{\mathbf{b}}_K / \sqrt{n} \right\| + \left\| \tilde{\mathbf{T}} (\hat{\mathbf{b}}_K - \mathbf{b}_K) / \sqrt{n} \right\| + O_P(1/\sqrt{n}) \\ &\leq O_P(n^{-1/2}) \cdot \left\{ \left\| \hat{\mathbf{b}}_K / \sqrt{n} \right\| + \left\| \partial_1 \bar{\mathbf{b}}_K / \sqrt{n} \right\| + \left\| \partial_2 \bar{\mathbf{b}}_K / \sqrt{n} \right\| \right\} + O_P(1/\sqrt{n}) \\ &= O_P(\zeta_0(K)/\sqrt{n}) + O_P(\zeta_1(K)/\sqrt{n}) + O_P(1/\sqrt{n}) = O_P(\zeta_1(K)/\sqrt{n}), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.6})$$

where $\partial_j \bar{\mathbf{b}}_K := (\partial b_K(\bar{P}_{11}^0, \bar{P}_{21}^1)/\partial p_j, \dots, \partial b_K(\bar{P}_{1n}^0, \bar{P}_{2n}^1)/\partial p_j)^\top$ for $j = 1, 2$. Hence, the first term satisfies $\|(\hat{\mathbf{R}}_K^\top - \mathbf{R}_K^\top)(\hat{\mathbf{R}}_K - \mathbf{R}_K)/n\| \leq \|(\hat{\mathbf{R}}_K - \mathbf{R}_K)/\sqrt{n}\|^2 = O_P(\zeta_1^2(K)/n)$.

For the second term, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \mathbf{R}_K^\top (\hat{\mathbf{R}}_K - \mathbf{R}_K) / n \right\|^2 &= \text{tr} \left\{ (\hat{\mathbf{R}}_K^\top - \mathbf{R}_K^\top) \mathbf{R}_K \mathbf{R}_K^\top (\hat{\mathbf{R}}_K - \mathbf{R}_K) / n^2 \right\} \\ &\leq [\bar{c}_\Psi + o_P(1)] \cdot \text{tr} \left\{ (\hat{\mathbf{R}}_K^\top - \mathbf{R}_K^\top) (\hat{\mathbf{R}}_K - \mathbf{R}_K) / n \right\} \\ &= [\bar{c}_\Psi + o_P(1)] \cdot \|(\hat{\mathbf{R}}_K - \mathbf{R}_K)/\sqrt{n}\|^2 = O_P(\zeta_1^2(K)/n), \end{aligned}$$

since result (i) and Assumption 4.5(i) imply that

$$0 < \underline{c}_\Psi + o_P(1) \leq \chi_{\min}(\Psi_{nK}) \leq \chi_{\max}(\Psi_{nK}) \leq \bar{c}_\Psi + o_P(1) < \infty, \quad \text{w.p.a.1.} \quad (\text{A.7})$$

Thus, result (ii) holds by

$$\|\hat{\Psi}_{nK} - \Psi_{nK}\|_2 = O_P(\zeta_1(K)/\sqrt{n}) + O_P(\zeta_1^2(K)/n) = O_P(\zeta_1(K)/\sqrt{n}). \quad (\text{A.8})$$

(iii) We first note that $\Psi_{nK}^{-1} - \Psi_K^{-1} = \Psi_K^{-1}(\Psi_K - \Psi_{nK})\Psi_{nK}^{-1}$. Then, (A.7) and result (i) imply the desired result: $\|\Psi_{nK}^{-1} - \Psi_K^{-1}\|_2 \leq \|\Psi_K^{-1}\|_2 \|\Psi_K - \Psi_{nK}\|_2 \|\Psi_{nK}^{-1}\|_2 \stackrel{p}{\asymp} \|\Psi_K - \Psi_{nK}\|_2$.

(iv) The proof is the same as in result (iii) by noting that result (ii) and Assumption 4.5(i) imply

$$0 < \underline{c}_\Psi + o_P(1) \leq \chi_{\min}(\hat{\Psi}_{nK}) \leq \chi_{\max}(\hat{\Psi}_{nK}) \leq \bar{c}_\Psi + o_P(1) < \infty, \quad \text{w.p.a.1.} \quad (\text{A.9})$$

□

Lemma A.2. Suppose that Assumptions 4.1–4.4, 4.5(i), and 4.6–4.8 hold. If in addition $\sqrt{n}K^{-s/2} = O(1)$

holds, then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{(i)} \quad & \left\| \tilde{\beta}_{1n}^{(1,0)} - \beta_1^{(1,0)} \right\| = O_P(n^{-1/2}), \quad \text{(ii)} \quad \left\| \tilde{\alpha}_{1n}^{(1,0)} - \alpha_1^{(1,0)} \right\| = O_P(\sqrt{K/n}), \\ \text{(iii)} \quad & \left\| \hat{\beta}_{1n}^{(1,0)} - \beta_1^{(1,0)} \right\| = O_P(n^{-1/2}), \quad \text{(iv)} \quad \left\| \hat{\alpha}_{1n}^{(1,0)} - \alpha_1^{(1,0)} \right\| = O_P(\sqrt{K/n}). \end{aligned}$$

Proof. (i)–(ii) We first show that the first term on the right-hand side of (A.1) is of order $O_P(n^{-1/2})$ for any choice of $\mathbb{S}_a$. Since each element of the diagonal matrix $\tilde{\mathbf{T}}$ is bounded, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbb{S}_a \Psi_{nK}^{-1} \mathbf{R}_K^\top \tilde{\mathbf{T}} \mathbf{u}_1 / n\|^2 &= \text{tr} \left\{ \mathbf{u}_1^\top \tilde{\mathbf{T}} \mathbf{R}_K \Psi_{nK}^{-1} \mathbb{S}_a^\top \mathbb{S}_a \Psi_{nK}^{-1} \mathbf{R}_K^\top \tilde{\mathbf{T}} \mathbf{u}_1 \right\} / n^2 \\ &\leq \text{tr} \left\{ \mathbf{u}_1^\top \tilde{\mathbf{T}} \mathbf{R}_K \Psi_{nK}^{-2} \mathbf{R}_K^\top \tilde{\mathbf{T}} \mathbf{u}_1 \right\} / n^2 \\ &\leq [\underline{c}_\Psi + o_P(1)]^{-2} \cdot \text{tr} \left\{ \mathbf{u}_1^\top \tilde{\mathbf{T}} \left(\mathbf{R}_K \mathbf{R}_K^\top / n \right) \tilde{\mathbf{T}} \mathbf{u}_1 \right\} / n = O_P(1) \cdot \|\mathbf{u}_1\|^2 / n, \end{aligned}$$

where the second and last equalities follow from (A.7). From Assumption 4.7,

$$\|\mathbf{u}_1\|^2 \leq n \cdot \left[\sup_{(p_1, p_2) \in [0, 1]^2} \left| g_1^{(1,0)}(p_1, p_2) - b_K(p_1, p_2)^\top \alpha_1^{(1,0)} \right| \right]^2 = O(nK^{-s}),$$

implying that

$$\|\mathbb{S}_a \Psi_{nK}^{-1} \mathbf{R}_K^\top \tilde{\mathbf{T}} \mathbf{u}_1 / n\| = \underbrace{O_P(K^{-s/2})}_{O_P(n^{-1/2})}. \quad (\text{A.10})$$

For the second term in (A.1), Assumptions 4.3 and 4.6 and (A.7) imply that

$$\begin{aligned} E \left[\left\| \mathbb{S}_a \Psi_{nK}^{-1} \mathbf{R}_K^\top \tilde{\mathbf{e}}_1 / n \right\|^2 \middle| \{W_i, D_i\}_{i=1}^n \right] &= \text{tr} \left\{ \mathbb{S}_a \Psi_{nK}^{-1} \mathbf{R}_K^\top E \left[\tilde{\mathbf{e}}_1 \tilde{\mathbf{e}}_1^\top \middle| \{W_i, D_i\}_{i=1}^n \right] \mathbf{R}_K \Psi_{nK}^{-1} \mathbb{S}_a^\top \right\} / n^2 \\ &= O_P(1) \cdot \text{tr} \left\{ \mathbb{S}_a \Psi_{nK}^{-1} \mathbb{S}_a^\top \right\} / n = O_P(a/n). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, we have

$$\left\| \mathbb{S}_a \Psi_{nK}^{-1} \mathbf{R}_K^\top \tilde{\mathbf{e}}_1 / n \right\| = O_P(\sqrt{a/n}), \quad (\text{A.11})$$

by Markov's inequality. Results (i) and (ii) follow by noting that they are the cases when $a = \dim(X)$ and $a = K$, respectively.

(iii)–(iv) Using (A.9) and the same argument as in (A.10), it holds that $\|\mathbb{S}_a \hat{\Psi}_{nK}^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{R}}_K^\top \hat{\mathbf{T}} \hat{\mathbf{u}}_1 / n\| = O_P(K^{-s/2}) = O_P(n^{-1/2})$ for any $\mathbb{S}_a$. Further, similarly to (A.11), we have

$$\begin{aligned} E \left[\left\| \mathbb{S}_a \hat{\Psi}_{nK}^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{R}}_K^\top \hat{\mathbf{e}}_1 / n \right\|^2 \middle| \{W_i, D_i\}_{i=1}^n \right] &= \text{tr} \left\{ \mathbb{S}_a \hat{\Psi}_{nK}^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{R}}_K^\top E \left[\hat{\mathbf{e}}_1 \hat{\mathbf{e}}_1^\top \middle| \{W_i, D_i\}_{i=1}^n \right] \hat{\mathbf{R}}_K \hat{\Psi}_{nK}^{-1} \mathbb{S}_a^\top \right\} / n^2 \\ &= O_P(1) \cdot \text{tr} \left\{ \mathbb{S}_a \hat{\Psi}_{nK}^{-1} \mathbb{S}_a^\top \right\} / n = O_P(a/n), \end{aligned}$$

by Assumptions 4.3 and 4.6 and (A.9), which leads to $\|\mathbb{S}_a \hat{\Psi}_{nK}^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{R}}_K^\top \hat{\mathbf{e}}_1/n\| = O_P(\sqrt{a/n})$ by Markov's inequality. Therefore, by (A.2),

$$\mathbb{S}_a \left(\hat{\delta}_{1n}^{(1,0)} - \delta_1^{(1,0)} \right) = \mathbb{S}_a \hat{\Psi}_{nK}^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{R}}_K^\top \check{\mathbf{T}} \left(\mathbf{g}_1^{(1,0)} - \hat{\mathbf{g}}_1^{(1,0)} \right) / n + \mathbb{S}_a \hat{\Psi}_{nK}^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{R}}_K^\top \left(\check{\mathbf{T}} - \hat{\mathbf{T}} \right) \hat{\mathbf{g}}_1^{(1,0)} / n + O_P(\sqrt{a/n}). \quad (\text{A.12})$$

By the mean value expansion under Assumptions 4.4(i) and 4.7, we have

$$g_1^{(1,0)}(\hat{P}_{1i}^0, \hat{P}_{2i}^1) - g_1^{(1,0)}(P_{1i}^0, P_{2i}^1) = \left\{ \frac{\partial g_1^{(1,0)}(\bar{P}_{1i}^0, \bar{P}_{2i}^1)}{\partial p_1} + \frac{\partial g_1^{(1,0)}(\bar{P}_{1i}^0, \bar{P}_{2i}^1)}{\partial p_2} \right\} \cdot O_P(n^{-1/2}),$$

where $\bar{P}_{1i}^0 \in [\hat{P}_{1i}^0, P_{1i}^0]$ and $\bar{P}_{2i}^1 \in [\hat{P}_{2i}^1, P_{2i}^1]$. Thus, noting that $\check{T}^{(1,0)} = \tau_\varpi(\hat{\mathcal{L}}^{(1,0)})I^{(1,0)}/\mathcal{L}^{(1,0)}$ is bounded w.p.a.1 since $\hat{\mathcal{L}}^{(1,0)} - \mathcal{L}^{(1,0)} = O_P(n^{-1/2})$, the triangle inequality and (A.9) lead to

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \mathbb{S}_a \hat{\Psi}_{nK}^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{R}}_K^\top \check{\mathbf{T}} \left(\mathbf{g}_1^{(1,0)} - \hat{\mathbf{g}}_1^{(1,0)} \right) / n \right\| &\leq O_P(n^{-1/2}) \cdot \left\{ \left\| \mathbb{S}_a \hat{\Psi}_{nK}^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{R}}_K^\top \check{\mathbf{T}} \partial_1 \hat{\mathbf{g}}_1^{(1,0)} / n \right\| + \left\| \mathbb{S}_a \hat{\Psi}_{nK}^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{R}}_K^\top \check{\mathbf{T}} \partial_2 \hat{\mathbf{g}}_1^{(1,0)} / n \right\| \right\} \\ &\leq O_P(n^{-1/2}) \cdot \sqrt{\text{tr} \left\{ \mathbb{S}_a \hat{\Psi}_{nK}^{-1} \mathbb{S}_a^\top \right\}} = O_P(\sqrt{a/n}), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.13})$$

where $\partial_j \hat{\mathbf{g}}_1^{(1,0)} = (\partial g_1^{(1,0)}(\bar{P}_{11}^0, \bar{P}_{21}^1)/\partial p_j, \dots, \partial g_1^{(1,0)}(\bar{P}_{1n}^0, \bar{P}_{2n}^1)/\partial p_j)^\top$ for $j = 1, 2$, implying that the first term in (A.12) is of order $O_P(\sqrt{a/n})$. For the second term in (A.12), it can be similarly verified that $\|\mathbb{S}_a \hat{\Psi}_{nK}^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{R}}_K^\top (\check{\mathbf{T}} - \hat{\mathbf{T}}) \hat{\mathbf{g}}_1^{(1,0)} / n\| = O_P(\sqrt{a/n})$. This completes the proof. $\square$

To state the next lemma, we define the following linear operator:

$$\hat{\mathcal{P}}_{nK}^{(1,0)} g := b_K(\cdot, \cdot)^\top \mathbb{S}_K \left[\hat{\Psi}_{nK}^{(1,0)} \right]^{-1} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \hat{R}_{K,i}^{(1,0)} g(Q_i),$$

The operator norm of $\hat{\mathcal{P}}_{nK}^{(1,0)}$ (restricted on $\mathcal{S}^{(1,0)}$) is denoted as $\|\hat{\mathcal{P}}_{nK}^{(1,0)}\|_\infty$.

Lemma A.3. Suppose that Assumptions 4.1–4.4, 4.5(i), 4.8, and 4.9 hold. Then, we have

$$\|\hat{\mathcal{P}}_{nK}^{(1,0)}\|_\infty = \|\mathcal{P}_{nK}^{(1,0)}\|_\infty + O_P(1) = O_P(1).$$

Proof. The triangle inequality implies that

$$\left| \|\hat{\mathcal{P}}_{nK}\|_\infty - \|\mathcal{P}_{nK}\|_\infty \right| \leq \sup_{(p_1, p_2) \in \mathcal{S}^{(1,0)}, g \in \mathcal{C}(\text{supp}[Q])} \left| \left(\hat{\mathcal{P}}_{nK} g \right)(p_1, p_2) - \left(\mathcal{P}_{nK} g \right)(p_1, p_2) \right|.$$

For any $(p_1, p_2) \in \mathcal{S}^{(1,0)}$ and $g \in \mathcal{C}(\text{supp}[Q])$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \left(\hat{\mathcal{P}}_{nK} g \right)(p_1, p_2) - \left(\mathcal{P}_{nK} g \right)(p_1, p_2) \right| &\leq \left| b_K(p_1, p_2)^\top \mathbb{S}_K \left(\hat{\Psi}_{nK}^{-1} - \Psi_{nK}^{-1} \right) \hat{\mathbf{R}}_K^\top \mathbf{g} / n \right| \\ &\quad + \left| b_K(p_1, p_2)^\top \mathbb{S}_K \Psi_{nK}^{-1} \left(\hat{\mathbf{R}}_K - \mathbf{R}_K \right)^\top \mathbf{g} / n \right|, \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathbf{g} = (g(Q_1), \dots, g(Q_n))^\top$. For the first term, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left| b_K(p_1, p_2)^\top \mathbb{S}_K \left(\widehat{\Psi}_{nK}^{-1} - \Psi_{nK}^{-1} \right) \widehat{\mathbf{R}}_K^\top \mathbf{g} / n \right| &\leq \|b_K(p_1, p_2)\| \cdot \left\| \mathbb{S}_K \left(\widehat{\Psi}_{nK}^{-1} - \Psi_{nK}^{-1} \right) \widehat{\mathbf{R}}_K^\top \mathbf{g} / n \right\| \\ &\leq \|b_K(p_1, p_2)\| \cdot O_P(\zeta_1(K)/\sqrt{n}) = O_P(\zeta_0(K)\zeta_1(K)/\sqrt{n}), \end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality can be shown by (A.9) and

$$\|\widehat{\Psi}_{nK}^{-1} - \Psi_{nK}^{-1}\|_2 = O_P(\zeta_1(K)/\sqrt{n}), \quad (\text{A.14})$$

which is implied by (A.8) and the same argument as in the proof of Lemma A.1. Similarly, we can show that the second term is $O_P(\zeta_0(K)\zeta_1(K)/\sqrt{n})$ based on (A.6). Thus, under Assumption 4.9(ii),

$$\left| \left(\widehat{\mathcal{P}}_{nK} g \right) (p_1, p_2) - (\mathcal{P}_{nK} g) (p_1, p_2) \right| = O_P(\zeta_0(K)\zeta_1(K)/\sqrt{n}) = O_P(1),$$

uniformly in $(p_1, p_2) \in \mathcal{S}^{(1,0)}$ and $g \in \mathcal{C}(\text{supp}[Q])$. $\square$

Lemma A.4. Suppose that Assumptions 4.1–4.4, 4.5(i), and 4.6–4.11 hold. Then, we have

- (i) $\sup_{(p_1, p_2) \in \mathcal{S}^{(1,0)}} \left| \widetilde{g}_1^{(1,0)}(p_1, p_2) - g_1^{(1,0)}(p_1, p_2) \right| = O_P(\zeta_0(K)\sqrt{(\log n)/n}) + O_P(K^{-s/2}),$
- (ii) $\sup_{(p_1, p_2) \in \mathcal{S}^{(1,0)}} \left| \frac{\partial^2}{\partial p_1 \partial p_2} \left(\widetilde{g}_1^{(1,0)}(p_1, p_2) - g_1^{(1,0)}(p_1, p_2) \right) \right| = O_P(\zeta_0(K)K\sqrt{(\log n)/n}) + O_P(K^{(2-s)/2}),$
- (iii) $\sup_{(p_1, p_2) \in \mathcal{S}^{(1,0)}} \left| \widehat{g}_1^{(1,0)}(p_1, p_2) - g_1^{(1,0)}(p_1, p_2) \right| = O_P(\zeta_0(K)\sqrt{(\log n)/n}) + O_P(K^{-s/2}),$
- (iv) $\sup_{(p_1, p_2) \in \mathcal{S}^{(1,0)}} \left| \frac{\partial^2}{\partial p_1 \partial p_2} \left(\widehat{g}_1^{(1,0)}(p_1, p_2) - g_1^{(1,0)}(p_1, p_2) \right) \right| = O_P(\zeta_0(K)K\sqrt{(\log n)/n}) + O_P(K^{(2-s)/2}).$

Proof. (i) By the triangle inequality, Assumptions 4.7 and 4.9, and (A.1), we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\sup_{(p_1, p_2) \in \mathcal{S}^{(1,0)}} \left| \widetilde{g}_1^{(1,0)}(p_1, p_2) - g_1^{(1,0)}(p_1, p_2) \right| \\ &\leq \sup_{(p_1, p_2) \in \mathcal{S}^{(1,0)}} \left| b_K(p_1, p_2)^\top (\widetilde{\alpha}_{1n}^{(1,0)} - \alpha_1^{(1,0)}) \right| + \sup_{(p_1, p_2) \in \mathcal{S}^{(1,0)}} \left| g_1^{(1,0)}(p_1, p_2) - b_K(p_1, p_2)^\top \alpha_1^{(1,0)} \right| \\ &= \sup_{(p_1, p_2) \in \mathcal{S}^{(1,0)}} \left| b_K(p_1, p_2)^\top (\widetilde{\alpha}_{1n}^{(1,0)} - \alpha_1^{(1,0)}) \right| + O(K^{-s/2}) \\ &\leq \sup_{(p_1, p_2) \in \mathcal{S}^{(1,0)}} \left| b_K(p_1, p_2)^\top \mathbb{S}_K \Psi_{nK}^{-1} \mathbf{R}_K^\top \widetilde{\mathbf{e}}_1 / n \right| + \|\mathcal{P}_{nK}\|_\infty \cdot O(K^{-s/2}) + O(K^{-s/2}) \\ &= \sup_{(p_1, p_2) \in \mathcal{S}^{(1,0)}} \left| b_K(p_1, p_2)^\top \mathbb{S}_K \Psi_{nK}^{-1} \mathbf{R}_K^\top \widetilde{\mathbf{e}}_1 / n \right| + O_P(K^{-s/2}). \end{aligned}$$

Following the proof of Lemma 3.1(ii) of Chen and Christensen (2018), we show that the first term on the right-hand side is of order $O_P(\zeta_0(K)\sqrt{(\log n)/n})$. Firstly, we partition the interval $[0, 1]$ into countably

many sub-intervals of equal length and let the set of the partitioning points (including 0 and 1) be $\mathcal{T}_n$. We can construct the partition such that for any $(p_1, p_2) \in [0, 1]^2$ there exists a point $(t_{p_1}, t_{p_2}) \in \mathcal{T}_n^2$ satisfying

$$\|(p_1, p_2) - (t_{p_1}, t_{p_2})\| \leq c_p \zeta_0(K) K^{-(\omega+1/2)},$$

for some positive constant $c_p > 0$, where ω is as in Assumption 4.11(i). Then, by Assumption 4.11(i), we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{(p_1, p_2) \in \mathcal{S}^{(1,0)}} \left| b_K(p_1, p_2)^\top \mathbb{S}_K \Psi_{nK}^{-1} \mathbf{R}_K^\top \tilde{\mathbf{e}}_1 / n \right| \\ & \leq \max_{(t_1, t_2) \in \mathcal{T}_n^2} \left| b_K(t_1, t_2)^\top \mathbb{S}_K \Psi_{nK}^{-1} \mathbf{R}_K^\top \tilde{\mathbf{e}}_1 / n \right| + \sup_{(p_1, p_2) \in [0, 1]^2} \left| \{b_K(p_1, p_2) - b_K(t_{p_1}, t_{p_2})\}^\top \mathbb{S}_K \Psi_{nK}^{-1} \mathbf{R}_K^\top \tilde{\mathbf{e}}_1 / n \right| \\ & \leq \max_{(t_1, t_2) \in \mathcal{T}_n^2} \left| b_K(t_1, t_2)^\top \mathbb{S}_K \Psi_{nK}^{-1} \mathbf{R}_K^\top \tilde{\mathbf{e}}_1 / n \right| + O(\zeta_0(K) K^{-1/2}) \cdot \left\| \mathbb{S}_K \Psi_{nK}^{-1} \mathbf{R}_K^\top \tilde{\mathbf{e}}_1 / n \right\| \\ & = \max_{(t_1, t_2) \in \mathcal{T}_n^2} \left| b_K(t_1, t_2)^\top \mathbb{S}_K \Psi_{nK}^{-1} \mathbf{R}_K^\top \tilde{\mathbf{e}}_1 / n \right| + O_P(\zeta_0(K) / \sqrt{n}), \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality follows from (A.11).

To examine the first term on the right-hand side, decompose $\tilde{\mathbf{e}}_{1i} = \tilde{\mathbf{e}}_{11i} + \tilde{\mathbf{e}}_{12i}$, where

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mathbf{e}}_{11i} &:= \tilde{\mathbf{e}}_{1i} \mathbf{1}\{|\tilde{\mathbf{e}}_{1i}| \leq M_n\} - E[\tilde{\mathbf{e}}_{1i} \mathbf{1}\{|\tilde{\mathbf{e}}_{1i}| \leq M_n\} | W_i, D_i], \\ \tilde{\mathbf{e}}_{12i} &:= \tilde{\mathbf{e}}_{1i} \mathbf{1}\{|\tilde{\mathbf{e}}_{1i}| > M_n\} - E[\tilde{\mathbf{e}}_{1i} \mathbf{1}\{|\tilde{\mathbf{e}}_{1i}| > M_n\} | W_i, D_i], \end{aligned}$$

and M_n is a sequence of positive numbers diverging to ∞ . Let $\tilde{\mathbf{e}}_{11} = (\tilde{\mathbf{e}}_{111}, \dots, \tilde{\mathbf{e}}_{11n})^\top$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{e}}_{12} = (\tilde{\mathbf{e}}_{121}, \dots, \tilde{\mathbf{e}}_{12n})^\top$. Then, we observe

$$\begin{aligned} & b_K(t_1, t_2)^\top \mathbb{S}_K \Psi_{nK}^{-1} \mathbf{R}_K^\top \tilde{\mathbf{e}}_1 / n \\ & = b_K(t_1, t_2)^\top \mathbb{S}_K \Psi_K^{-1} \mathbf{R}_K^\top \tilde{\mathbf{e}}_1 / n + b_K(t_1, t_2)^\top \mathbb{S}_K (\Psi_{nK}^{-1} - \Psi_K^{-1}) \mathbf{R}_K^\top \tilde{\mathbf{e}}_1 / n \\ & = b_K(t_1, t_2)^\top \mathbb{S}_K \Psi_K^{-1} \mathbf{R}_K^\top \tilde{\mathbf{e}}_{11} / n + b_K(t_1, t_2)^\top \mathbb{S}_K \Psi_K^{-1} \mathbf{R}_K^\top \tilde{\mathbf{e}}_{12} / n + b_K(t_1, t_2)^\top \mathbb{S}_K (\Psi_{nK}^{-1} - \Psi_K^{-1}) \mathbf{R}_K^\top \tilde{\mathbf{e}}_1 / n \\ & = b_K(t_1, t_2)^\top \mathbb{S}_K \Psi_K^{-1} \mathbf{R}_K^\top \tilde{\mathbf{e}}_{11} / n + b_K(t_1, t_2)^\top \mathbb{S}_K \Psi_K^{-1} \mathbf{R}_K^\top \tilde{\mathbf{e}}_{12} / n + \underbrace{O_P(\zeta_0^2(K) \sqrt{(\log K)/n})}_{o_P(\zeta_0(K) \sqrt{(\log n)/n})}, \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality follows from Lemma A.1(iii) and Markov's inequality.

Let $q_i(t_1, t_2) := b_K(t_1, t_2)^\top \mathbb{S}_K \Psi_K^{-1} R_{K,i}$, so that

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n q_i(t_1, t_2) \tilde{\mathbf{e}}_{11i} = b_K(t_1, t_2)^\top \mathbb{S}_K \Psi_K^{-1} \mathbf{R}_K^\top \tilde{\mathbf{e}}_{11} / n.$$

Note that $E[q_i(t_1, t_2) \tilde{\mathbf{e}}_{11i}] = 0$. Furthermore, it is straightforward by the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality that there exist positive constants $c_1, c_2 > 0$ such that $|q_i(t_1, t_2)| \leq \|b_K(t_1, t_2)\| \cdot \|\Psi_K^{-1} R_{K,i}\| \leq c_1 \zeta_0^2(K)$ and that $E[q_i^2(t_1, t_2)] \leq c_2 \zeta_0^2(K)$. Therefore, for all $(t_1, t_2) \in \mathcal{T}_n^2$, we have $|q_i(t_1, t_2) \tilde{\mathbf{e}}_{11i}| \leq c'_1 \zeta_0^2(K) M_n$ and $E[q_i^2(t_1, t_2) \tilde{\mathbf{e}}_{11i}^2] = E[q_i^2(t_1, t_2) E[\tilde{\mathbf{e}}_{11i}^2 | W_i, D_i]] \leq c'_2 \zeta_0^2(K)$ for some $c'_1, c'_2 > 0$ by Assumption 4.6. From

Bernstein's inequality for any non-negative $\varrho_n \geq 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr \left(\max_{(t_1, t_2) \in \mathcal{T}_n^2} \left| b_K(t_1, t_2)^\top \mathbb{S}_K \Psi_K^{-1} \mathbf{R}_K^\top \tilde{\mathbf{e}}_{11} / n \right| > \varrho_n \right) &\leq |\mathcal{T}_n^2| \max_{(t_1, t_2) \in \mathcal{T}_n^2} \Pr \left(\left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n q_i(t_1, t_2) \tilde{e}_{11i} \right| > \varrho_n \right) \\ &\leq 2 \exp \left\{ \log |\mathcal{T}_n^2| - \frac{1}{2} \frac{\varrho_n^2}{c_2' \zeta_0^2(K)/n + c_1' \zeta_0^2(K) M_n \varrho_n / (3n)} \right\} \\ &\leq 2 \exp \left\{ \log |\mathcal{T}_n^2| - \frac{\varrho_n^2}{c_3(\zeta_0^2(K)/n)[1 + M_n \varrho_n]} \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

for some positive constant $c_3 > 0$, where $|\mathcal{T}_n^2|$ denotes the cardinality of the set $\mathcal{T}_n^2$. Then, setting $\varrho_n = C \zeta_0(K) \sqrt{(\log n)/n}$ for a large constant $C > 0$, provided that $|\mathcal{T}_n^2|$ and M_n grow sufficiently slowly so that $M_n \varrho_n = o(1)$, we have

$$\log |\mathcal{T}_n^2| - \frac{\varrho_n^2}{c_3(\zeta_0^2(K)/n)[1 + M_n \varrho_n]} = \log |\mathcal{T}_n^2| - \frac{C^2 \zeta_0^2(K)(\log n)/n}{c_3(\zeta_0^2(K)/n)[1 + o(1)]} \asymp \log \left(\frac{|\mathcal{T}_n^2|}{n^{C^2}} \right) \rightarrow -\infty,$$

as $C \rightarrow \infty$, implying that $\max_{(t_1, t_2) \in \mathcal{T}_n^2} |b_K(t_1, t_2)^\top \mathbb{S}_K \Psi_K^{-1} \mathbf{R}_K^\top \tilde{\mathbf{e}}_{11} / n| = O_P(\zeta_0(K) \sqrt{(\log n)/n})$.

Next, by Markov's inequality and Assumption 4.6, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr \left(\max_{(t_1, t_2) \in \mathcal{T}_n^2} \left| b_K(t_1, t_2)^\top \mathbb{S}_K \Psi_K^{-1} \mathbf{R}_K^\top \tilde{\mathbf{e}}_{12} / n \right| > \varrho_n \right) &\leq \Pr \left(\zeta_0(K) \left\| \Psi_K^{-1} \mathbf{R}_K^\top \tilde{\mathbf{e}}_{12} / n \right\| > \varrho_n \right) \\ &\leq \Pr \left(\frac{c_4 \zeta_0^2(K)}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n |\tilde{e}_{12i}| > \varrho_n \right) \\ &\leq \frac{2c_4 \zeta_0^2(K)}{\varrho_n} E[|\tilde{e}_{1i}| \mathbf{1}\{|\tilde{e}_{1i}| > M_n\}] \\ &\leq \frac{2c_4 \zeta_0^2(K)}{\varrho_n M_n^3} E[\tilde{e}_{1i}^4 \mathbf{1}\{|\tilde{e}_{1i}| > M_n\}] = O \left(\frac{\zeta_0^2(K)}{\varrho_n M_n^3} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Again, setting $\varrho_n = C \zeta_0(K) \sqrt{(\log n)/n}$ for a large constant $C > 0$, if $\zeta_0(K) / \sqrt{(\log n)/n} = O(M_n^3)$,

$$\frac{\zeta_0^2(K)}{\varrho_n M_n^3} = \frac{1}{C} \frac{\zeta_0(K)}{\sqrt{(\log n)/n} M_n^3} \rightarrow 0,$$

as $C \rightarrow \infty$, which implies $\max_{(t_1, t_2) \in \mathcal{T}_n^2} |b_K(t_1, t_2)^\top \mathbb{S}_K \Psi_K^{-1} \mathbf{R}_K^\top \tilde{\mathbf{e}}_{12} / n| = O_P(\zeta_0(K) \sqrt{(\log n)/n})$. It should be noted that $\zeta_0(K) / \sqrt{(\log n)/n} = O(M_n^3)$ is not inconsistent with the requirement $M_n \zeta_0(K) \sqrt{(\log n)/n} = o(1)$ under Assumption 4.11(ii). By combining these results, the proof is completed.

(ii) From the triangle inequality and Assumption 4.7, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\sup_{(p_1, p_2) \in \mathcal{S}^{(1,0)}} \left| \frac{\partial^2}{\partial p_1 \partial p_2} \left(\tilde{g}_1^{(1,0)}(p_1, p_2) - g_1^{(1,0)}(p_1, p_2) \right) \right| \\ &\leq \sup_{(p_1, p_2) \in \mathcal{S}^{(1,0)}} \left| \frac{\partial^2}{\partial p_1 \partial p_2} \left(b_K(p_1, p_2)^\top (\tilde{\alpha}_{1n}^{(1,0)} - \alpha_1^{(1,0)}) \right) \right| + \sup_{(p_1, p_2) \in \mathcal{S}^{(1,0)}} \left| \frac{\partial^2}{\partial p_1 \partial p_2} \left(g_1^{(1,0)}(p_1, p_2) - b_K(p_1, p_2)^\top \alpha_1^{(1,0)} \right) \right| \end{aligned}$$

$$\leq \sup_{(p_1, p_2) \in \mathcal{S}^{(1,0)}} \left| \frac{\partial^2}{\partial p_1 \partial p_2} \left(b_K(p_1, p_2)^\top (\tilde{\alpha}_{1n}^{(1,0)} - \alpha_1^{(1,0)}) \right) \right| + O(K^{(2-s)/2}).$$

Further, by Assumption 4.10, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{(p_1, p_2) \in \mathcal{S}^{(1,0)}} \left| \frac{\partial^2}{\partial p_1 \partial p_2} \left(b_K(p_1, p_2)^\top (\tilde{\alpha}_{1n}^{(1,0)} - \alpha_1^{(1,0)}) \right) \right| &= O(K) \sup_{(p_1, p_2) \in \mathcal{S}^{(1,0)}} \left| b_K(p_1, p_2)^\top (\tilde{\alpha}_{1n}^{(1,0)} - \alpha_1^{(1,0)}) \right| \\ &= O_P(\zeta_0(K) K \sqrt{(\log n)/n}) + O_P(K^{(2-s)/2}), \end{aligned}$$

where the second equality follows from result (i). This completes the proof.

(iii) From (A.2), the triangle inequality, Assumptions 4.7 and 4.9, and Lemma A.3 imply

$$\begin{aligned} &\sup_{(p_1, p_2) \in \mathcal{S}^{(1,0)}} \left| \hat{g}_1^{(1,0)}(p_1, p_2) - g_1^{(1,0)}(p_1, p_2) \right| \\ &\leq \sup_{(p_1, p_2) \in \mathcal{S}^{(1,0)}} \left| b_K(p_1, p_2)^\top (\tilde{\alpha}_{1n}^{(1,0)} - \alpha_1^{(1,0)}) \right| + \sup_{(p_1, p_2) \in \mathcal{S}^{(1,0)}} \left| g_1^{(1,0)}(p_1, p_2) - b_K(p_1, p_2)^\top \alpha_1^{(1,0)} \right| \\ &\leq \sup_{(p_1, p_2) \in \mathcal{S}^{(1,0)}} \left| b_K(p_1, p_2)^\top \mathbb{S}_K \hat{\Psi}_{nK}^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{R}}_K^\top \check{\mathbf{T}} \left(\mathbf{g}_1^{(1,0)} - \hat{\mathbf{g}}_1^{(1,0)} \right) / n \right| \\ &\quad + \sup_{(p_1, p_2) \in \mathcal{S}^{(1,0)}} \left| b_K(p_1, p_2)^\top \mathbb{S}_K \hat{\Psi}_{nK}^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{R}}_K^\top \left(\check{\mathbf{T}} - \hat{\mathbf{T}} \right) \hat{\mathbf{g}}_1^{(1,0)} / n \right| \\ &\quad + \sup_{(p_1, p_2) \in \mathcal{S}^{(1,0)}} \left| b_K(p_1, p_2)^\top \mathbb{S}_K \hat{\Psi}_{nK}^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{R}}_K^\top \hat{\mathbf{e}}_1 / n \right| + \underbrace{\|\hat{\mathcal{P}}_{nK}\|_\infty \cdot O(K^{-s/2})}_{O_P(K^{-s/2})} + O(K^{-s/2}). \end{aligned}$$

By the mean value theorem, it is easy to see that

$$\begin{aligned} &\sup_{(p_1, p_2) \in \mathcal{S}^{(1,0)}} \left| b_K(p_1, p_2)^\top \mathbb{S}_K \hat{\Psi}_{nK}^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{R}}_K^\top \check{\mathbf{T}} \left(\mathbf{g}_1^{(1,0)} - \hat{\mathbf{g}}_1^{(1,0)} \right) / n \right| \\ &= \sup_{(p_1, p_2) \in \mathcal{S}^{(1,0)}} \left| b_K(p_1, p_2)^\top \mathbb{S}_K \hat{\Psi}_{nK}^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{R}}_K^\top \check{\mathbf{T}} \left(\partial_1 \bar{\mathbf{g}}_1^{(1,0)} + \partial_2 \bar{\mathbf{g}}_1^{(1,0)} \right) / n \right| \cdot O_P(n^{-1/2}) \quad (\text{A.15}) \\ &\leq \|\hat{\mathcal{P}}_{nK}\|_\infty \cdot O_P(n^{-1/2}) = O_P(n^{-1/2}), \end{aligned}$$

and that

$$\sup_{(p_1, p_2) \in \mathcal{S}^{(1,0)}} \left| b_K(p_1, p_2)^\top \mathbb{S}_K \hat{\Psi}_{nK}^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{R}}_K^\top \left(\check{\mathbf{T}} - \hat{\mathbf{T}} \right) \hat{\mathbf{g}}_1^{(1,0)} / n \right| = O_P(n^{-1/2}),$$

by Lemma A.3. Further, we can easily find that

$$\left| b_K(p_1, p_2)^\top \mathbb{S}_K \hat{\Psi}_{nK}^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{R}}_K^\top \hat{\mathbf{e}}_1 / n \right| \leq \left| b_K(p_1, p_2)^\top \mathbb{S}_K \Psi_{nK}^{-1} \mathbf{R}_K^\top \tilde{\mathbf{e}}_1 / n \right| + o_P(\zeta_0(K) \sqrt{(\log n)/n}),$$

uniformly in $(p_1, p_2) \in \mathcal{S}^{(1,0)}$. Thus, we obtain

$$\sup_{(p_1, p_2) \in \mathcal{S}^{(1,0)}} \left| \hat{g}_1^{(1,0)}(p_1, p_2) - g_1^{(1,0)}(p_1, p_2) \right| \leq \sup_{(p_1, p_2) \in \mathcal{S}^{(1,0)}} \left| b_K(p_1, p_2)^\top \mathbb{S}_K \Psi_{nK}^{-1} \mathbf{R}_K^\top \tilde{\mathbf{e}}_1 / n \right|$$

$$+ o_P(\zeta_0(K)\sqrt{(\log n)/n}) + O_P(K^{-s/2}).$$

Finally, the result follows from the fact that the first term on the right-hand side is of order $O_P(\zeta_0(K)\sqrt{\log n/n})$, as shown in the proof of result (i).

(iv) The proof of result (iv) is analogous to that of result (ii). $\square$

Lemma A.5. Suppose that Assumptions 4.1–4.4, 4.5(i) and 4.6–4.11 hold. Then, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{(i)} \quad & \sup_{(p_1, p_2) \in \mathcal{S}^{(1,0)}} \left| \tilde{E}_n[U_1^{(1,0)} | V_1 = p_1, V_2 = p_2] - E[U_1^{(1,0)} | V_1 = p_1, V_2 = p_2] \right| \\ & = O_P(\zeta_0(K)K\sqrt{\log n/n}) + O_P(K^{(2-s)/2}), \\ \text{(ii)} \quad & \sup_{(p_1, p_2) \in \mathcal{S}^{(1,0)}} \left| \hat{E}_n[U_1^{(1,0)} | V_1 = p_1, V_2 = p_2] - E[U_1^{(1,0)} | V_1 = p_1, V_2 = p_2] \right| \\ & = O_P(\zeta_0(K)K\sqrt{\log n/n}) + O_P(K^{(2-s)/2}). \end{aligned}$$

Proof. (i) The proof of result (i) is immediate from Lemma A.4(ii).

(ii) Assumptions 4.4(i) and (iii) imply that $\hat{h}(p_1, p_2)$ is uniformly consistent for $h(p_1, p_2)$ and that $\hat{h}(p_1, p_2)$ is uniformly bounded away from zero w.p.a.1. Thus, uniformly in $(p_1, p_2) \in \mathcal{S}^{(1,0)}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \frac{1}{h(p_1, p_2)} - \frac{1}{\hat{h}(p_1, p_2)} \right| &= \left| \frac{\hat{h}(p_1, p_2) - h(p_1, p_2)}{h(p_1, p_2) \cdot \hat{h}(p_1, p_2)} \right| \\ &\leq O_P(1) \cdot \left| \hat{h}(p_1, p_2) - h(p_1, p_2) \right| = O_P(1) \cdot |\hat{\rho}_n - \rho^*| = O_P(n^{-1/2}). \end{aligned} \tag{A.16}$$

From the triangle and Cauchy–Schwarz inequalities, (A.16), and Lemma A.4(iv), it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \hat{E}_n[U_1^{(1,0)} | V_1 = p_1, V_2 = p_2] - E[U_1^{(1,0)} | V_1 = p_1, V_2 = p_2] \right| \\ & \leq \left| \frac{1}{\hat{h}(p_1, p_2)} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial p_1 \partial p_2} \left(g_1^{(1,0)}(p_1, p_2) - \hat{g}_1^{(1,0)}(p_1, p_2) \right) \right| + \left| \left(\frac{1}{h(p_1, p_2)} - \frac{1}{\hat{h}(p_1, p_2)} \right) \frac{\partial^2 g_1^{(1,0)}(p_1, p_2)}{\partial p_1 \partial p_2} \right| \\ & = O_P(\zeta_0(K)K\sqrt{\log n/n}) + O_P(K^{(2-s)/2}) + O_P(n^{-1/2}), \end{aligned}$$

uniformly in $(p_1, p_2) \in \mathcal{S}^{(1,0)}$. $\square$

B Appendix: Supplementary Technical Material

B.1 The estimator of the total marginal treatment effect and its limiting distribution

We can estimate $\text{MTE}_{\text{total}}(x, p_1^0, p_2^0) = m^{(1,1)}(x, p_1^0, p_2^0) - m^{(0,0)}(x, p_1^0, p_2^0)$ in the same manner as described in Section 4. The estimator of $m^{(0,0)}(x, p_1^0, p_2^0)$ can be obtained by

$$\hat{m}^{(0,0)}(x, p_1^0, p_2^0) := x_1^\top \hat{\beta}_{1n}^{(0,0)} + \frac{\ddot{b}_K(p_1^0, p_2^0)^\top \hat{\alpha}_{11n}^{(0,0)}}{\hat{\lambda}_n \hat{h}(p_1^0, p_2^0)}.$$

The definitions of $\hat{\beta}_{1n}^{(0,0)}$ and $\hat{\alpha}_{11n}^{(0,0)}$ can be found in (4.13). For the estimation of $m^{(1,1)}(x, p_1^0, p_2^0)$, we first estimate the following partially linear additive regression model:

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{I}^{(1,1)} Y_1 = \tilde{I}^{(1,1)} X_1^\top \beta_1^{(1,1)} + \tilde{T}^{(1,1)} g_{11}^{(1,1)}(P_1^0, P_2^0) + \tilde{T}^{(1,1)} g_{12}^{(1,1)}(P_1^1, P_2^0) \\ + \tilde{T}^{(1,1)} g_{13}^{(1,1)}(P_1^0, P_2^1) + \tilde{T}^{(1,1)} g_{14}^{(1,1)}(P_1^1, P_2^1) + \tilde{e}_1^{(1,1)}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\tilde{I}^{(1,1)} := \tau_\omega(\mathcal{L}^{(1,1)}) I^{(1,1)}$, $\tilde{T}^{(1,1)} := \tilde{I}^{(1,1)} / \mathcal{L}^{(1,1)}$, and $E[\tilde{e}_1^{(1,1)} | I^{(1,1)}, X, \mathbf{P}] = 0$. Using the series approximation $g_{1l}^{(1,1)}(\cdot, \cdot) \approx b_K(\cdot, \cdot)^\top \alpha_{1l}^{(1,1)}$ for each $l = 1, \dots, 4$, the same estimation procedure as in the case of $D = (0, 0)$ gives the LS estimator $(\hat{\beta}_{1n}^{(1,1)}, \hat{\alpha}_{1ln}^{(1,1)})$ of $(\beta_1^{(1,1)}, \alpha_{1l}^{(1,1)})$. Then, we can estimate $m^{(1,1)}(x, p_1^0, p_2^0)$ as

$$\hat{m}^{(1,1)}(x, p_1^0, p_2^0) := x_1^\top \hat{\beta}_{1n}^{(1,1)} + \frac{\ddot{b}_K(p_1^0, p_2^0)^\top \hat{\alpha}_{11n}^{(1,1)}}{\hat{\lambda}_n \hat{h}(p_1^0, p_2^0)}.$$

Finally, $\text{MTE}_{\text{total}}(x, p_1^0, p_2^0)$ can be estimated by

$$\widehat{\text{MTE}}_{\text{total}}(x, p_1^0, p_2^0) := \hat{m}^{(1,1)}(x, p_1^0, p_2^0) - \hat{m}^{(0,0)}(x, p_1^0, p_2^0).$$

Under similar conditions to those in Theorem 4.2, we can have

$$\frac{\sqrt{n} (\hat{m}^{(0,0)}(x, p_1^0, p_2^0) - m^{(0,0)}(x, p_1^0, p_2^0))}{\sigma_K^{(0,0)}(p_1^0, p_2^0)} \xrightarrow{d} N(0, 1) \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{\sqrt{n} (\hat{m}^{(1,1)}(x, p_1^0, p_2^0) - m^{(1,1)}(x, p_1^0, p_2^0))}{\sigma_K^{(1,1)}(p_1^0, p_2^0)} \xrightarrow{d} N(0, 1),$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_K^{(0,0)}(p_1^0, p_2^0) &:= \frac{\sqrt{\ddot{b}_K(p_1^0, p_2^0)^\top \mathbb{S}_{1K} [\Psi_K^{(0,0)}]^{-1} \Sigma_K^{(0,0)} [\Psi_K^{(0,0)}]^{-1} \mathbb{S}_{1K}^\top \ddot{b}_K(p_1^0, p_2^0)}}{\lambda h(p_1^0, p_2^0)}, \\ \sigma_K^{(1,1)}(p_1^0, p_2^0) &:= \frac{\sqrt{\ddot{b}_K(p_1^0, p_2^0)^\top \mathbb{S}_{1K} [\Psi_K^{(1,1)}]^{-1} \Sigma_K^{(1,1)} [\Psi_K^{(1,1)}]^{-1} \mathbb{S}_{1K}^\top \ddot{b}_K(p_1^0, p_2^0)}}{\lambda h(p_1^0, p_2^0)}, \end{aligned}$$

and $\mathbb{S}_{1K} := (\mathbf{0}_{K \times \dim(X)}, \mathbf{I}_K, \mathbf{0}_{K \times 3K})$. The definitions of the matrices $\Psi_K^{(1,1)}$ and $\Sigma_K^{(1,1)}$ are clear from the

context. Consequently, the limiting distribution of $\widehat{\text{MTE}}_{\text{total}}(x, p_1^0, p_2^0)$ can be given by

$$\frac{\sqrt{n} \left(\widehat{\text{MTE}}_{\text{total}}(x, p_1^0, p_2^0) - \text{MTE}_{\text{total}}(x, p_1^0, p_2^0) \right)}{\sqrt{\left[\sigma_K^{(1,1)}(p_1^0, p_2^0) \right]^2 + \left[\sigma_K^{(0,0)}(p_1^0, p_2^0) \right]^2}} \xrightarrow{d} N(0, 1).$$

B.2 Verification of $\zeta_1(K) = O(K)$ for tensor-product B-splines

We consider univariate B-splines of order r with quasi-uniform k internal knots, i.e., $b_r(p) = (b_{r,1}(p), \dots, b_{r,k+r}(p))^\top$ for $p \in [0, 1]$, where the length of each knot interval is proportional to $1/k$ with the internal knots at $\{t_j\}_{j=1}^k$. In the notation of the main text, $b_K(p_1, p_2) = b_r(p_1) \otimes b_r(p_2)$ such that $k^2 \asymp K$. As is well known, the derivatives of B-spline functions can be simply expressed in terms of lower-order B-spline functions. Specifically, the first derivative of $b_r(p)$ can be written as $\partial b_r(p)/\partial p = (r-1)\Delta_r b_{r-1}(p)$ (e.g., [Zhou and Wolfe, 2000](#)), where

$$\Delta_r := \underbrace{\begin{pmatrix} \frac{-1}{t_1-t_{2-r}} & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\ \frac{1}{t_1-t_{2-r}} & \frac{-1}{t_2-t_{3-r}} & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{1}{t_2-t_{3-r}} & \frac{-1}{t_3-t_{4-r}} & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & \frac{1}{t_{k+r-1}-t_k} \end{pmatrix}}_{(k+r) \times (k+r-1)}.$$

Then, since $\chi_{\max}(\Delta_r^\top \Delta_r) = O(k^2)$, we have $\|\partial b_r(p)/\partial p\|^2 = (r-1)^2 \cdot b_{r-1}^\top(p) \Delta_r^\top \Delta_r b_{r-1}(p) \leq O(k^2) \|b_{r-1}(p)\|^2 = O(k^3)$ uniformly in p . Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \frac{\partial b_K(p_1, p_2)}{\partial p_1} \right\|^2 &= \left\| \frac{\partial b_r(p_1)}{\partial p_1} \otimes b_r(p_2) \right\|^2 = \left\| \frac{\partial b_r(p_1)}{\partial p_1} \right\|^2 \cdot \|b_r(p_2)\|^2 \\ &\leq O(k^4) = O(K^2), \end{aligned}$$

uniformly in $(p_1, p_2) \in [0, 1]^2$. This implies the desired result.

B.3 Verification of Assumption 4.9(i)

Below is a sketch of how we can verify Assumption 4.9(i) for basis functions with a locally-supported polynomial structure, such as B-splines and the partitioning polynomial series in [Cattaneo and Farrell \(2013\)](#). Let $\mathbf{g} := (g(Q_1), \dots, g(Q_n))^\top$ for $g \in \mathcal{C}(\text{supp}[Q])$. Assuming that (A.7) holds, we can observe that

$$\begin{aligned} |(\mathcal{P}_{nK} g)(p_1, p_2)|^2 &= n^{-2} \cdot \text{tr} \left\{ \Psi_{nK}^{-1} \mathbf{R}_K \mathbf{g} \mathbf{g}^\top \mathbf{R}_K \Psi_{nK}^{-1} \mathbb{S}_K^\top b_K(p_1, p_2) b_K(p_1, p_2)^\top \mathbb{S}_K \right\} \\ &\leq O_P(n^{-2}) \cdot \text{tr} \left\{ \mathbb{S}_K^\top b_K(p_1, p_2) b_K(p_1, p_2)^\top \mathbb{S}_K \mathbf{R}_K \mathbf{g} \mathbf{g}^\top \mathbf{R}_K \right\} \\ &= O_P(1) \cdot \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n b_K(p_1, p_2)^\top \mathbb{S}_K R_{K,i} g(Q_i) \right|^2, \end{aligned}$$

where the superscript $(1, 0)$ is suppressed for simplicity. Here, by appropriately placing the partitioning knots based on the quantiles of (P_1^0, P_2^1) , for any $(p_1, p_2) \in \mathcal{S}^{(1,0)}$, we can find a cell $\mathcal{R}(p_1, p_2) \subset \mathcal{S}^{(1,0)}$ such that $b_K(p_1, p_2)^\top b_K(P_1^0, P_2^1) = 0$ if $(P_1^0, P_2^1) \notin \mathcal{R}(p_1, p_2)$ and $\Pr((P_1^0, P_2^1) \in \mathcal{R}(p_1, p_2)) = O(1/K)$. Then, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |(\mathcal{P}_{nKg})(p_1, p_2)| &\leq O_P(1) \cdot \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left| b_K(p_1, p_2)^\top b_K(P_{1i}^0, P_{2i}^1) g(Q_i) \right| \\ &\leq O_P(1) \cdot \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{1}\{(P_{1i}^0, P_{2i}^1) \in \mathcal{R}(p_1, p_2)\} \underbrace{\left| b_K(p_1, p_2)^\top b_K(P_{1i}^0, P_{2i}^1) \right|}_{\zeta_0^2(K)=O(K)} \sup_{q \in \text{supp}[Q]} |g(q)| = O_P(1). \end{aligned}$$

Since the above inequality holds for any $(p_1, p_2) \in \mathcal{S}^{(1,0)}$, we obtain the desired result.

C Appendix: Identification of the Treatment Decision Game

In this section, we study the identification of the treatment decision game introduced in Assumption 4.1. As shown in (4.1), we have the following system of the probabilities $\mathcal{L}^{(d_1, d_2)}(w) := \Pr(D = (d_1, d_2) | W = w)$:

$$\begin{cases} \mathcal{L}^{(1,0)}(w) = p_1^0 - H_\rho(p_1^0, p_2^1) \\ \mathcal{L}^{(0,1)}(w) = p_2^0 - H_\rho(p_1^1, p_2^0) \\ \mathcal{L}^{(1,1)}(w) = H_\rho(p_1^1, p_2^1) - \lambda \cdot \mathcal{L}_{\text{mul}}(\mathbf{p}; \rho) \end{cases}$$

where $p_j^0 = F_{\varepsilon_j}(w_j^\top \gamma_0)$, $p_j^1 = F_{\varepsilon_j}(w_j^\top \gamma_0 + \eta(w_j^\top \gamma_1))$, $\mathbf{p} = (p_1^0, p_1^1, p_2^0, p_2^1)$, and $\mathcal{L}_{\text{mul}}(\mathbf{p}; \rho) = H_\rho(p_1^1, p_2^1) - H_\rho(p_1^1, p_2^0) - H_\rho(p_1^0, p_2^1) + H_\rho(p_1^0, p_2^0)$. Note that $\mathcal{L}^{(0,0)}(w)$ is redundant, as it is a linear combination of the other probabilities.

In addition to Assumptions 2.1, 3.3(i), and 4.1, we introduce the following assumptions. Below, we prove that a general parameter value $\theta = (\gamma^\top, \rho, \lambda)^\top$ (treating the true value $\theta^* = (\gamma^{*\top}, \rho^*, \lambda^*)^\top$ as a special case) can be distinguished in the parameter space $\Theta \subset \mathbb{R}^{2\dim(W)} \times (\underline{c}_\rho, \bar{c}_\rho) \times (0, 1)$.

Assumption C.1.

- (i) The interaction function η is strictly increasing and continuous positive function.
- (ii) The marginal CDFs of $(\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2)$, F_{ε_1} and F_{ε_2} , are strictly increasing and continuous.
- (iii) The copula $H_\rho(\cdot, \cdot)$ is twice differentiable in its arguments and $\rho \in [\underline{c}_\rho, \bar{c}_\rho]$.

Assumption C.2.

- (i) There exists a player-specific random variable, say $W_{2,1}$, that is continuously distributed on the whole $\mathbb{R}$, and the following set

$$\{w_1 \in \text{supp}[W_1] : W_{2,1} \text{ has an everywhere positive Lebesgue density conditional on } W_1 = w_1\}$$

is non-empty and does not lie in a proper linear subspace of $\mathbb{R}^{\dim(W)}$ a.s.

(ii) The following set

$$\bigcup_{w_2, \ddot{w}_2 \in \text{supp}[W_2]} \left\{ w_1 \in \text{supp}[W_1 | W_2 = w_2] \cap \text{supp}[W_1 | W_2 = \ddot{w}_2] : w_2^\top \gamma_0 \neq \ddot{w}_2^\top \gamma_0 \right\},$$

is non-empty and does not lie in a proper linear subspace of $\mathbb{R}^{\dim(W)}$ a.s.

Let the two coefficients of $W_{2,1}$, where the one is an element of γ_0 and the other is an element of γ_1 , be $\gamma_{0,1}$ and $\gamma_{1,1}$, respectively.

Assumption C.3.

(i) $\gamma_{0,1}$ is non-zero.

(ii) Either of the following is true: (1) $\gamma_{0,1}$ and $\gamma_{1,1}$ have the same sign, or (2) $F_{\varepsilon_2}(a + \eta(-a)) \rightarrow 0$ as $a \rightarrow -\infty$.

Assumption C.1 is a set of regularity conditions that partly overlap with Assumption 4.4. Assumption C.2(i) requires that the support of W is sufficiently rich so that the identification-at-infinity strategy can be employed. The assumption requires that at least one element of W_2 can tend to $-\infty$ and ∞ , which can reduce the model to a single-agent decision problem in order to identify γ_0 . For Assumption C.3(ii)-(2), note that Assumption C.1(i) is sufficient for $F_{\varepsilon_2}(a + \eta(-a)) \rightarrow 1$ as $a \rightarrow \infty$.

Assumption C.4. The copula $H_\rho(p_1, p_2)$ is strictly more stochastically increasing in the joint distribution with respect to ρ (see Definition 3.3 of Han and Vytlacil (2017)).

This assumption restricts a dependence ordering of the copula function in terms of stochastic monotonicity. In Han and Vytlacil (2017), this property was introduced to identify generalized bivariate probit models, and it was shown that several commonly used copula functions satisfy it (e.g., Gaussian copula and FGM copula). For further discussions on the dependence ordering properties of copula functions, see Han and Vytlacil (2017).

Theorem C.1. Suppose that Assumptions 2.1, 3.3(i), 4.1, and C.1–C.4 hold for a given parameter value $\theta = (\gamma^\top, \rho, \lambda)^\top \in \Theta$. Further, we assume that $\{(w_1^\top \gamma_0 + \eta(w_1^\top \gamma_1), \rho) : \theta \in \Theta\}$ is open and simply connected for any given w_1 . Then, θ is globally identified if γ_0 and γ_1 are non-zero vectors and $\mathcal{L}_{\text{mul}}(\mathbf{p}; \rho) > 0$ for some $\mathbf{p} \in \text{supp}[\mathbf{P}]$.

Proof. By Assumption C.3, if $\gamma_{0,1} > 0$, we observe that $\lim_{w_{2,1} \rightarrow -\infty} H_\rho(p_1^0, p_2^1) = 0$ and, thus, that $\lim_{w_{2,1} \rightarrow -\infty} \mathcal{L}^{(1,0)}(w) = p_1^0$. On the other hand, if $\gamma_{0,1} < 0$, we have $\lim_{w_{2,1} \rightarrow -\infty} H_\rho(p_1^0, p_2^1) = p_1^0$ and, thus, that $\lim_{w_{2,1} \rightarrow -\infty} \mathcal{L}^{(1,0)}(w) = 0$. Note that under Assumption C.2(i), for some w_1 and any $w_{2,1}$, we can identify $\mathcal{L}^{(1,0)}(w)$ directly from data. This implies that we can identify the sign of $\gamma_{0,1}$. Without loss of generality, suppose that $\gamma_{0,1} > 0$. Then, recalling that $p_1^0 = F_{\varepsilon_1}(w_1^\top \gamma_0)$, the strict monotonicity and continuity of F_{ε_1} gives $\lim_{w_{2,1} \rightarrow -\infty} F_{\varepsilon_1}^{-1}(\mathcal{L}^{(1,0)}(w)) = w_1^\top \gamma_0$. This and the rank condition on w_1 imply that γ_0 is identified.

Next, we show the identification of (γ_1, ρ) . We consider any pair of values (w_1, w_2) and $(w_1, \ddot{w}_2)$ such that $p_2^0 \neq \ddot{p}_2^0$, where $\ddot{p}_2^0 = F_{\varepsilon_2}(\ddot{w}_2^\top \gamma_0)$. Such w and $\ddot{w}$ exist by Assumption C.2(ii) and the strict monotonicity of F_{ε_2} . We now have the following system:

$$\begin{cases} \mathcal{L}^{(0,1)}(w_1, w_2) = p_2^0 - H_\rho(p_1^1, p_2^0) \\ \mathcal{L}^{(0,1)}(w_1, \ddot{w}_2) = \ddot{p}_2^0 - H_\rho(p_1^1, \ddot{p}_2^0) \end{cases}.$$

Here, the parameter to be identified is (p_1^1, ρ) , as p_2^0 and $\ddot{p}_2^0$ are already identified by the identification of γ_0 . If this system has a unique solution, we achieve the identification of (p_1^1, ρ) . To proceed, we define

$$G(\vartheta_{w_1}) := \begin{pmatrix} p_2^0 - H_\rho(p_1^1, p_2^0) \\ \ddot{p}_2^0 - H_\rho(p_1^1, \ddot{p}_2^0) \end{pmatrix},$$

where $\vartheta_{w_1} := (p_1^1, \rho)$. The Jacobian of $G(\vartheta_{w_1})$ is given by

$$J_G(\vartheta_{w_1}) := \begin{pmatrix} -H_\rho^{(1)}(p_1^1, p_2^0) & -H_\rho^{(\rho)}(p_1^1, p_2^0) \\ -H_\rho^{(1)}(p_1^1, \ddot{p}_2^0) & -H_\rho^{(\rho)}(p_1^1, \ddot{p}_2^0) \end{pmatrix},$$

where $H_\rho^{(1)}$ and $H_\rho^{(\rho)}$ are the partial derivatives of the copula H_ρ with respect to the first argument and ρ , respectively. Its determinant is given by

$$|J_G(\vartheta_{w_1})| = H_\rho^{(1)}(p_1^1, p_2^0) H_\rho^{(1)}(p_1^1, \ddot{p}_2^0) \left(\frac{H_\rho^{(\rho)}(p_1^1, \ddot{p}_2^0)}{H_\rho^{(1)}(p_1^1, \ddot{p}_2^0)} - \frac{H_\rho^{(\rho)}(p_1^1, p_2^0)}{H_\rho^{(1)}(p_1^1, p_2^0)} \right),$$

which is positive for any $p_2^0 > \ddot{p}_2^0$ and is negative for any $p_2^0 < \ddot{p}_2^0$ under Assumptions C.1(iii) and C.4 (see Lemma 4.1 of [Han and Vytlacil, 2017](#)). This implies that $J_G(\vartheta_{w_1})$ is of full rank when $p_2^0 \neq \ddot{p}_2^0$. Hence, the same arguments as in the proof of Theorem 5.1 in [Han and Vytlacil \(2017\)](#) lead to the identification of ϑ_{w_1} . Moreover, the strict monotonicity of F_{ε_j} and η implies that $w_1^\top \gamma_1 = \eta^{-1}(F_{\varepsilon_1}^{-1}(p_1^1) - w_1^\top \gamma_0)$ and, thus, that γ_1 is identified from p_1^1 and γ_0 under Assumption C.2(ii).

Finally, λ can be identified by $\lambda = (H_\rho(p_1^1, p_2^1) - \mathcal{L}^{(1,1)}(w))/\mathcal{L}_{\text{mul}}(\mathbf{p}; \rho)$ under the assumption that $\mathcal{L}_{\text{mul}}(\mathbf{p}; \rho) > 0$. $\square$

D Appendix: Identification of Several Treatment Parameters

Individual-specific treatment effects. It may be of interest to estimate the treatment effects when only player 1's treatment status switches, whereas that of player 2 is unspecified and subject to change endogenously. The parameter of interest in this situation would be $\text{MTE}_{\text{indiv}}(x, p_1, p_2) := E[Y_1^{(1, D_2)} - Y_1^{(0, D_2)} | X = x, V_1 = p_1, V_2 = p_2]$ where $Y_1^{(d_1, D_2)} := (1 - D_2)Y_1^{(d_1, 0)} + D_2Y_1^{(d_1, 1)}$. We call this MTE parameter the *individual MTE*.¹¹ Let $m^{(d_1, D_2)}(x, v_1, v_2) := E[Y_1^{(d_1, D_2)} | X = x, V_1 = v_1, V_2 = v_2]$. After some calculations,

¹¹ This is somewhat similar to the framework in [Frölich and Huber \(2017\)](#), where the identification of causal models that allow the presence of an endogenous “mediator” variable was investigated. In our model, D_2 may be regarded as the mediator of D_1 .

we can show that

$$\begin{aligned}
m^{(0,D_2)}(x, p_1^{d_1}, p_2^{d_2}) &= m^{(0,0)}(x, p_1^{d_1}, p_2^{d_2}) && \text{for } (d_1, d_2) \neq (1, 0), \\
m^{(0,D_2)}(x, p_1^1, p_2^0) &= \frac{1}{\lambda} \left(m^{(0,1)}(x, p_1^1, p_2^0) - (1 - \lambda) \cdot m^{(0,0)}(x, p_1^1, p_2^0) \right) && \text{for } \lambda > 0, \\
m^{(1,D_2)}(x, p_1^{d_1}, p_2^{d_2}) &= m^{(1,1)}(x, p_1^{d_1}, p_2^{d_2}) && \text{for } (d_1, d_2) \neq (0, 1), \\
m^{(1,D_2)}(x, p_1^0, p_2^1) &= \frac{1}{(1 - \lambda)} \left(m^{(1,0)}(x, p_1^0, p_2^1) - \lambda \cdot m^{(1,1)}(x, p_1^0, p_2^1) \right) && \text{for } \lambda < 1,
\end{aligned}$$

under Assumptions 2.1, 3.2, and 3.3. This implies that the individual MTE can be identified as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{MTE}_{\text{indiv}}(x, p_1^0, p_2^0) &= \text{MTE}_{\text{total}}(x, p_1^0, p_2^0), \\
\text{MTE}_{\text{indiv}}(x, p_1^0, p_2^1) &= \frac{1}{1 - \lambda} \text{MTE}_{\text{direct}}^{(0)}(x, p_1^0, p_2^1) - \frac{\lambda}{1 - \lambda} \text{MTE}_{\text{total}}(x, p_1^0, p_2^1),
\end{aligned}$$

for example. Thus, for the estimation of the individual MTE, it is sufficient to calculate the direct MTE and total MTE, so that no additional estimation is required.

LATE. It is also possible to identify the LATE: the average causal effect for agents whose treatment status is strictly altered by the IVs. To define the LATE parameters in our context, we consider z and z' for the IV. Suppose that the values of $\mathbf{P}$ are $\mathbf{p} = (p_1^0, p_1^1, p_2^0, p_2^1)$ when $Z = z$, and $\mathbf{p}' = (p_1^{0'}, p_1^{1'}, p_2^{0'}, p_2^{1'})$ when $Z = z'$. For illustrative purposes, we assume that $\mathbf{p} > \mathbf{p}'$ (where the inequality is element-wise), as depicted in Figure D.1. Although we can consider several different LATE parameters, as examples, we here focus on the *direct LATE*: $E[Y_1^{(1,0)} - Y_1^{(0,0)} | X = x, p_1^{0'} < V_1 \leq p_1^0, p_2^1 < V_2 \leq 1]$; and the *total LATE*: $E[Y_1^{(1,1)} - Y_1^{(0,0)} | X = x, p_1^{1'} < V_1 \leq p_1^1, p_2^{1'} < V_2 \leq p_2^1]$. The former and latter indicate the average causal effects for the players in regions [A] and [B], respectively. The pairs of players in region [A] change their treatment status from $D = (1, 0)$ to $(0, 0)$ as the value of Z shifts from z to z' . Similarly, the pairs of players in region [B] select $D = (0, 0)$ when $Z = z'$, but $D = (1, 1)$ or $(0, 0)$ when $Z = z$. As in Heckman and Vytlacil (2005), we can write the LATE parameters as the weighted averages of the MTE parameters:

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{Direct LATE} &= \int_{p_2^1}^1 \int_{p_1^{0'}}^{p_1^0} \text{MTE}_{\text{direct}}^{(0)}(x, v_1, v_2) \frac{h(v_1, v_2 | x)}{\Pr[p_1^{0'} < V_1 \leq p_1^0, p_2^1 < V_2 \leq 1 | X = x]} dv_1 dv_2, \\
\text{Total LATE} &= \int_{p_2^{1'}}^{p_2^1} \int_{p_1^{1'}}^{p_1^1} \text{MTE}_{\text{total}}(x, v_1, v_2) \frac{h(v_1, v_2 | x)}{\Pr[p_1^{1'} < V_1 \leq p_1^1, p_2^{1'} < V_2 \leq p_2^1 | X = x]} dv_1 dv_2.
\end{aligned}$$

Because the MTE parameters and weight functions in the integrals are identified, the LATE parameters are also identified.

PRTE. The PRTE is the difference in the average outcomes when switching from the baseline policy to a counterfactual policy that induces a change in the distribution of IV (Heckman and Vytlacil, 2005). To proceed, we write $I^{(d_1, d_2)} = \mathcal{I}^{(d_1, d_2)}(\mathbf{P}, V, \epsilon; \lambda)$ with a known function $\mathcal{I}^{(d_1, d_2)}$ to clarify the dependence of the treatment decisions on $\mathbf{P}$, V , ϵ , and λ . For example, $I^{(0,0)} = \mathcal{I}^{(0,0)}(\mathbf{P}, V, \epsilon; \lambda) = \mathbf{1}\{V \in \mathcal{V}_{\text{uni}}^{(0,0)}(\mathbf{P})\} +$




Figure D.1: LATE.

$\mathbf{1}\{V \in \mathcal{V}_{\text{mul}}(\mathbf{P}), \epsilon \leq \lambda\}$ as in Assumption 3.3. We consider a counterfactual policy that does alter $\mathbf{P}$ and/or λ but does not affect $Y_1^{(d_1, d_2)}$, X , V , and ϵ . Let $\mathbf{P}^*$ be a counterfactual variable of $\mathbf{P}$ with a known distribution (given $X = x$) and λ^* be a known counterfactual value of λ . We denote the treatment decisions under $(\mathbf{P}^*, \lambda^*)$ as $D^* = (D_1^*, D_2^*)$. The outcome for player 1 under the counterfactual policy is $Y_1^* = \sum_{d_1=0}^1 \sum_{d_2=0}^1 \mathbf{1}\{D^* = (d_1, d_2)\} Y_1^{(d_1, d_2)}$, where $\mathbf{1}\{D^* = (d_1, d_2)\} = \mathcal{I}^{(d_1, d_2)}(\mathbf{P}^*, V, \epsilon; \lambda^*)$. The PRTE (given $X = x$) is defined as $E[Y_1^*|X = x] - E[Y_1|X = x]$. The law of iterated expectations leads to $E[Y_1^*|X = x] = \sum_{d_1=0}^1 \sum_{d_2=0}^1 E[E[\mathbf{1}\{D^* = (d_1, d_2)\} Y_1^{(d_1, d_2)}|X = x, \mathbf{P}^*]|X = x]$. Under the assumptions made here, we can observe that

$$\begin{aligned}
& E \left[\mathbf{1}\{D^* = (d_1, d_2)\} Y_1^{(d_1, d_2)} \middle| X = x, \mathbf{P}^* = \mathbf{p}^* \right] \\
&= E \left[\mathcal{I}^{(d_1, d_2)}(\mathbf{p}^*, V, \epsilon; \lambda^*) Y_1^{(d_1, d_2)} \middle| X = x \right] \\
&= E \left[\mathcal{I}^{(d_1, d_2)}(\mathbf{p}^*, V, \epsilon; \lambda^*) E \left[Y_1^{(d_1, d_2)} \middle| X = x, V, \epsilon \right] \middle| X = x \right] \\
&= \int_0^1 \int_0^1 \int_0^1 \mathcal{I}^{(d_1, d_2)}(\mathbf{p}^*, v, e; \lambda^*) m^{(d_1, d_2)}(x, v_1, v_2) h(v_1, v_2|x) dv_1 dv_2 de.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, it can hold that

$$E[Y_1^*|X = x] = \sum_{d_1=0}^1 \sum_{d_2=0}^1 \int_0^1 \int_0^1 \int_0^1 E \left[\mathcal{I}^{(d_1, d_2)}(\mathbf{p}^*, v, e; \lambda^*) \middle| X = x \right] m^{(d_1, d_2)}(x, v_1, v_2) h(v_1, v_2|x) dv_1 dv_2 de.$$

In the same manner, we can observe the following result for the baseline policy:

$$E[Y_1|X = x] = \sum_{d_1=0}^1 \sum_{d_2=0}^1 \int_0^1 \int_0^1 \int_0^1 E \left[\mathcal{I}^{(d_1, d_2)}(\mathbf{P}, v, e; \lambda) \middle| X = x \right] m^{(d_1, d_2)}(x, v_1, v_2) h(v_1, v_2|x) dv_1 dv_2 de.$$

Therefore, given the identification of the MTR functions $m^{(d_1, d_2)}(x, v_1, v_2)$ for $(d_1, d_2) \in \{0, 1\}^2$ and $(v_1, v_2) \in [0, 1]^2$, the PRTE $E[Y_1^*|X = x] - E[Y_1|X = x]$ can be identified.

E Appendix: Detailed Information on the Monte Carlo Simulations

This section presents the detailed information on the Monte Carlo simulation analysis summarized in Section 5.1. The treatment variable is generated by $D_j = \mathbf{1}\{\gamma_{01} + \gamma_{02}Z_{0j} + D_{-j} \cdot \exp(\gamma_{11} + \gamma_{12}Z_{1j}) \geq \varepsilon_j\}$ where $Z_{0j} \sim \text{Uniform}(-1, 1)$, $Z_{1j} \sim \text{Uniform}(-2, 2)$, and $\varepsilon_j \sim N(0, 1)$. The true values of the parameters are $\gamma_0^* = (\gamma_{01}^*, \gamma_{02}^*) = (-0.5, 1.5)$ and $\gamma_1^* = (\gamma_{11}^*, \gamma_{12}^*) = (-0.3, 0.6)$. The joint distribution of (V_j, V_{-j}) is defined by the FGM copula with the dependence parameter of $\rho^* = 0.7$. As in Assumption 3.3, $D = (0, 0)$ occurs in the region of multiple equilibria if and only if $\epsilon \leq \lambda^*$ with $\epsilon \sim \text{Uniform}[0, 1]$ and $\lambda^* = 0.5$.

The potential outcomes are generated by $Y_j^{(d_j, d_{-j})} = \beta_0^{(d_j, d_{-j})} + X_j \beta_1^{(d_j, d_{-j})} + U_j^{(d_j, d_{-j})}$ where $X_j \sim N(0, 1)$ and $U_j^{(d_j, d_{-j})} = \sigma^{(d_j, d_{-j})} \cdot \varphi(V_1, V_2) + \varsigma_j$ with $\sigma^{(1,1)} = 1.5$, $\sigma^{(1,0)} = \sigma^{(0,1)} = 1$, $\sigma^{(0,0)} = 0.5$, and $\varsigma_j \sim N(0, 0.5^2)$. For the function φ , we consider two designs: $\varphi(V_1, V_2) = V_1 + V_2$ in design 1 and $\varphi(V_1, V_2) = \exp(V_1 + V_2)$ in design 2. The true values of $\beta^{(d_j, d_{-j})} = (\beta_0^{(d_j, d_{-j})}, \beta_1^{(d_j, d_{-j})})$ are set to $\beta^{(1,0)} = \beta^{(0,1)} = (2, 1)$ and $\beta^{(1,1)} = \beta^{(0,0)} = (1, 2)$.

For the above data-generating processes, we consider two sample sizes $n \in \{1500, 6000\}$ for each. We evaluate both the feasible and the infeasible estimators for $\text{MTE}_{\text{direct}}^{(0)}(x, p_1, p_2)$; the feasible estimator is based on the first-stage ML estimates of θ^* , while the infeasible one treats θ^* as known. We fix $x = 0.5$ and $p_1 = 0.5$ and consider four values of $p_2 \in \{0.2, 0.4, 0.6, 0.8\}$, which results in four MTE values as the parameters of interest, labeled respectively as “MTE1”, “MTE2”, and so on. For the choice of basis function, we employ a bivariate power series and tensor-product B-splines of order 3. When $n = 1500$, the order of the bivariate power series is set to 3, and the number of inner knots of the tensor-product B-splines is set to 1 in each coordinate. When $n = 6000$, we consider both 3 and 4 for the orders of the power series and both 1 and 2 for the the number of inner knots of the B-splines. We estimate the MTR functions for $D = (1, 0)$ and $D = (0, 0)$ in two ways: standard least-squares regression and ridge regression. For the ridge regression, we set the regularization parameters equal to n^{-1} and $10 \cdot n^{-1}$ for the estimation based on the power series and the B-splines, respectively.¹² To estimate the MTR function for $D = (0, 0)$, we employ the over-identified estimator introduced in Remark 4.1. For the smoothed indicator function τ_ϖ , we use

$$\tau_\varpi(a) = \mathbf{1}\{\varpi \leq a < 3\varpi\} \left(\frac{\exp(a - 2\varpi)}{1 + \exp(a - 2\varpi)} - \frac{\exp(-\varpi)}{1 + \exp(-\varpi)} \right) \left(\frac{2 + \exp(\varpi) + \exp(-\varpi)}{\exp(\varpi) - \exp(-\varpi)} \right) + \mathbf{1}\{a \geq 3\varpi\},$$

with $\varpi = 0.01$.¹³ The following results are based on 1,000 Monte Carlo replications.

Table E.1 presents the bias and RMSE for the direct MTE estimation. Notably, the performances of the feasible and infeasible estimators are almost identical, which is consistent with our theory. Further, the estimator based on the bivariate power series outperforms that based on the tensor-product B-splines. The precision for the bivariate power series is satisfactory even with the sample size of 1,500, while the

¹² Note that the intercept term should not be penalized (see, e.g., Chapter 3 of [Hastie et al., 2009](#)).

¹³ We observed that about 0.6 percent of the observations are trimmed out on average with this trimming function.

estimator with the tensor-product B-splines is not reliable for small samples. However, the accuracy of the B-splines-based estimator can be improved rapidly as the sample size increases from 1,500 to 6,000. In addition, using the ridge regression can further improve the performance of the estimators, particularly for the B-splines-based estimator with the sample size of 1,500. The performances of the estimators deteriorate when p_2 is near the boundary. Recall that the identification of the MTEs relies on that (p_1, p_2) belongs to the intersection of the conditional supports for $\mathbf{P} = (P_1^0, P_1^1, P_2^0, P_2^1)$, as mentioned in Section 3. Since the realizations around (p_1, p_2) in the intersection are often sparse when (p_1, p_2) is close to the boundary, the above observation is reasonable.

Table E.2 presents the results for the first-stage treatment decision model. The initial values for the ML estimation are randomly chosen from uniform distributions with reasonable ranges. We can observe that both the bias and RMSE are satisfactorily small even for a small sample size. This also demonstrates the validity of the global identification result established in Appendix C.

F Appendix: Supplementary Material for the Empirical Analysis

This appendix provides supplementary tables and figures for the empirical illustration in Section 5.2.




Figure F.1: Histograms of $(\hat{P}_1^0, \hat{P}_1^1)$ and $(\hat{P}_2^0, \hat{P}_2^1)$ in left and right panel, respectively.

Table E.1: Simulation results for the direct MTE estimation

design	n	order/#knots	ridge	Feasible estimator				Infeasible estimator			
				MTE1	MTE2	MTE3	MTE4	MTE1	MTE2	MTE3	MTE4
Bias (bivariate power series)											
1	1500	3	0	-0.022	-0.016	-0.002	0.010	-0.005	-0.004	-0.001	-0.001
1	1500	3	1	-0.093	-0.061	-0.031	-0.002	-0.088	-0.060	-0.033	-0.005
1	6000	3	0	0.001	0.005	0.008	0.013	0.002	0.005	0.007	0.011
1	6000	3	1	-0.039	-0.024	-0.009	0.007	-0.036	-0.023	-0.009	0.005
1	6000	4	0	-0.037	0.009	0.023	-0.003	-0.037	0.007	0.023	0.003
1	6000	4	1	-0.063	-0.038	-0.008	0.028	-0.061	-0.037	-0.009	0.026
2	1500	3	0	-0.125	-0.021	0.046	0.058	-0.105	-0.002	0.056	0.053
2	1500	3	1	-0.192	-0.076	-0.016	-0.018	-0.177	-0.072	-0.018	-0.023
2	6000	3	0	-0.092	0.006	0.048	0.036	-0.090	0.007	0.049	0.035
2	6000	3	1	-0.079	-0.004	0.018	-0.017	-0.069	0.000	0.017	-0.021
2	6000	4	0	-0.089	0.008	0.054	0.015	-0.084	0.002	0.051	0.024
2	6000	4	1	-0.138	-0.062	0.002	0.052	-0.129	-0.058	0.001	0.048
RMSE (bivariate power series)											
1	1500	3	0	0.740	0.448	0.439	0.742	0.729	0.439	0.428	0.722
1	1500	3	1	0.298	0.236	0.245	0.320	0.294	0.235	0.245	0.318
1	6000	3	0	0.311	0.182	0.161	0.271	0.310	0.181	0.158	0.268
1	6000	3	1	0.193	0.124	0.118	0.183	0.192	0.123	0.116	0.181
1	6000	4	0	0.542	0.344	0.346	0.490	0.540	0.341	0.345	0.488
1	6000	4	1	0.222	0.147	0.134	0.257	0.221	0.146	0.132	0.255
2	1500	3	0	1.164	0.680	0.653	1.127	1.150	0.669	0.634	1.089
2	1500	3	1	0.491	0.367	0.376	0.490	0.481	0.363	0.371	0.482
2	6000	3	0	0.507	0.289	0.246	0.406	0.505	0.286	0.241	0.401
2	6000	3	1	0.321	0.198	0.179	0.274	0.317	0.196	0.176	0.271
2	6000	4	0	0.846	0.507	0.530	0.724	0.843	0.500	0.525	0.718
2	6000	4	1	0.376	0.236	0.199	0.375	0.372	0.233	0.194	0.371
Bias (tensor-product B-splines)											
1	1500	1	0	-0.856	-0.137	0.364	-0.245	-0.855	-0.156	0.393	-0.230
1	1500	1	1	-0.586	-0.222	0.070	-0.116	-0.593	-0.227	0.086	-0.119
1	6000	1	0	-0.907	-0.234	0.334	-0.117	-0.904	-0.242	0.329	-0.109
1	6000	1	1	-0.745	-0.251	0.175	-0.129	-0.742	-0.257	0.170	-0.125
1	6000	2	0	-0.691	0.182	0.130	-0.156	-0.647	0.171	0.132	-0.127
1	6000	2	1	-0.883	0.275	0.195	-0.029	-0.887	0.272	0.205	-0.022
2	1500	1	0	-2.267	-0.406	0.824	-0.536	-2.218	-0.430	0.866	-0.537
2	1500	1	1	-1.465	-0.576	0.082	-0.287	-1.477	-0.603	0.108	-0.270
2	6000	1	0	-2.335	-0.550	0.785	-0.226	-2.326	-0.574	0.769	-0.202
2	6000	1	1	-1.917	-0.626	0.368	-0.302	-1.908	-0.646	0.354	-0.287
2	6000	2	0	-1.320	0.356	0.250	-0.348	-1.215	0.349	0.268	-0.300
2	6000	2	1	-2.213	0.623	0.436	-0.061	-2.226	0.624	0.466	-0.045
RMSE (tensor-product B-splines)											
1	1500	1	0	1.402	0.820	1.198	1.784	1.417	0.807	1.190	1.746
1	1500	1	1	0.674	0.357	0.410	0.510	0.677	0.349	0.421	0.499
1	6000	1	0	0.982	0.427	0.508	0.531	0.980	0.420	0.501	0.519
1	6000	1	1	0.779	0.311	0.320	0.373	0.776	0.311	0.313	0.370
1	6000	2	0	2.016	1.542	0.837	1.985	2.010	1.602	0.857	2.089
1	6000	2	1	1.026	0.846	0.537	0.877	1.025	0.856	0.549	0.924
2	1500	1	0	2.799	1.304	1.855	2.513	2.751	1.273	1.853	2.505
2	1500	1	1	1.553	0.729	0.628	0.765	1.559	0.729	0.634	0.747
2	6000	1	0	2.408	0.774	0.987	0.803	2.399	0.775	0.958	0.773
2	6000	1	1	1.951	0.690	0.558	0.594	1.941	0.699	0.528	0.574
2	6000	2	0	3.117	2.284	1.219	2.867	3.097	2.373	1.237	3.015
2	6000	2	1	2.351	1.338	0.835	1.254	2.359	1.340	0.859	1.306

Note: The column labeled “order/#knots” indicates the order of the bivariate power series or the number of inner knots of the univariate B-splines.

The column labeled “ridge” indicates whether the ridge regression is used (1 for “yes” and 0 for “no”).

Table E.2: Simulation results for the ML estimation of the treatment decision game

n	γ_{01}	γ_{02}	γ_{11}	γ_{12}	ρ	λ
Bias						
1500	-0.005	0.001	-0.005	0.007	-0.027	-0.005
6000	0.003	-0.002	-0.017	0.006	0.024	-0.007
RMSE						
1500	0.061	0.060	0.159	0.082	0.303	0.168
6000	0.035	0.031	0.094	0.046	0.174	0.103

Table F.1: Definitions of the variables

Variables	Definitions
Outcome	$\log(\text{GPA} + 1)$
Treatment	1 if at least one of (Smoke, Drink, Skip, Fight) is larger than 2; 0 otherwise.
Smoke	How often the respondent smoked cigarettes. (0: never - 6: nearly every day)
Drink	How often the respondent drank alcohols. (0: never - 6: nearly every day)
Skip	How often the respondent skipped school without excuses. (0: never - 6: nearly everyday)
Fight	How often the respondent got into a physical fight in the past year. (0: never - 4: more than 7 times)
Age	Age
Grade	Grade
White	1 if the respondent is White; 0 otherwise.
Black	1 if the respondent is Black or African; 0 otherwise.
Asian	1 if the respondent is Asian; 0 otherwise.
Mother's education	The respondent's mother's education level in years.
Mother's job (professional)	1 if the respondent's mother is a worker with expertise or a managerial worker; 0 otherwise.
Mother's job (unemployed)	1 if the respondent's mother is not employed (except for housewife); 0 otherwise.
Father's education	The respondent's father's education level in years.
Father's job (professional)	1 if the respondent's father is a worker with expertise or a managerial worker; 0 otherwise.
Father's job (unemployed)	1 if the respondent's father is not employed (except for househusband); 0 otherwise.
Academic club	1 if the respondent belongs to an academic club; 0 otherwise.
Sports club	1 if the respondent belongs to a sport club; 0 otherwise.

Table F.2: Estimation results of the treatment decision model

γ_0				γ_1			
		Estimate	t-value			Estimate	t-value
X	Intercept	-6.522	-9.510	X	Intercept	0.073	0.008
	log(Age)	2.655	8.305	X	log(Age)	-0.380	-0.096
	Grade	-0.078	-3.555	X	Grade	-0.108	-0.407
	White	-0.078	-1.530	X	White	1.389	1.801
	Black	-0.218	-2.741	X	Black	0.018	0.016
	Asian	-0.351	-3.940	X	Asian	2.365	2.448
	log(Mother's education + 1)	-0.048	-1.931	X	log(Mother's education + 1)	-0.339	-1.249
	Mother's job (professional)	-0.060	-1.587	X	Mother's job (professional)	0.325	0.753
	Mother's job (unemployed)	-0.078	-1.045	X	Mother's job (unemployed)	0.256	0.297
	log(Father's education + 1)	-0.077	-5.061	X	log(Father's education + 1)	0.426	1.820
	Father's job (professional)	-0.054	-1.098	X	Father's job (professional)	0.428	0.818
	Father's job (unemployed)	-0.116	-1.428	X	Father's job (unemployed)	0.556	0.717
	Academic club	-0.099	-2.561	X	Academic club	-0.828	-1.417
	Sports club	0.015	0.408	X	Sports club	-1.145	-2.372
Z	Grade	0.022	2.769	Z	Grade	0.110	1.432
	White	-0.062	-0.905	Z	White	0.656	0.863
	Black	-0.278	-2.834	Z	Black	-0.359	-0.271
	Asian	-0.214	-1.842	Z	Asian	0.338	0.292
	log(Mother's education + 1)	0.020	0.502	Z	log(Mother's education + 1)	-0.392	-1.054
	log(Father's education + 1)	-0.034	-1.104	Z	log(Father's education + 1)	-0.582	-1.992
	Academic club	-0.174	-3.048	Z	Academic club	-0.109	-0.169
	Sports club	-0.100	-2.046	Z	Sports club	0.202	0.365
ρ		-0.739	-1.559	Sample size: 6053			
λ		0.834	2.588	Log-likelihood: -7464.680			

Note: The above result is based on the following model: $D_j = \mathbf{1}\{\widetilde{W}_j^\top \gamma_0 + D_{-j} \cdot \exp(W_j^\top \gamma_1)^{0.25} \geq \varepsilon_j\}$, where $\widetilde{W}_j = (X_j, Z_j, \text{School dummies}_j)$, and $W_j = (X_j, Z_j)$. The school dummy variable is introduced only for large schools where the number of respondents in each gender is larger than or equal to 100. The results for the school dummies are omitted to save space. The estimation procedure is the same as in the Monte Carlo experiments.

References

- Aradillas-Lopez, A., 2010. Semiparametric estimation of a simultaneous game with incomplete information, *Journal of Econometrics*, 157 (2), 409–431.
- Aradillas-López, A., 2019. Nonparametric tests for strategic interaction effects with rationalizability, *Economics Letters*, 181, 149–153.
- Aradillas-Lopez, A. and Rosen, A.M., 2019. Inference in ordered response games with complete information, *Working paper*.
- Badev, A., 2013. Discrete games in endogenous networks: Theory and policy, *Working paper*.
- Bajari, P., Hong, H., and Ryan, S.P., 2010. Identification and estimation of a discrete game of complete information, *Econometrica*, 78 (5), 1529–1568.
- Balat, J. and Han, S., 2019. Multiple treatments with strategic interaction, *arXiv preprint arXiv:1805.08275*.
- Basu, A., Heckman, J.J., Navarro-Lozano, S., and Urzua, S., 2007. Use of instrumental variables in the presence of heterogeneity and self-selection: An application to treatments of breast cancer patients, *Health Economics*, 16 (11), 1133–1157.
- Belloni, A., Chernozhukov, V., Chetverikov, D., and Kato, K., 2015. Some new asymptotic theory for least squares series: Pointwise and uniform results, *Journal of Econometrics*, 186 (2), 345–366.
- Berry, S.T., 1992. Estimation of a model of entry in the airline industry, *Econometrica*, 60 (4), 889–917.
- Bjorn, P.A. and Vuong, Q.H., 1984. Simultaneous equations models for dummy endogenous variables: a game theoretic formulation with an application to labor force participation, *Working paper*.
- Bresnahan, T.F. and Reiss, P.C., 1990. Entry in monopoly market, *The Review of Economic Studies*, 57 (4), 531–553.
- Card, D. and Giuliano, L., 2013. Peer effects and multiple equilibria in the risky behavior of friends, *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 95 (4), 1130–1149.
- Carneiro, P., Heckman, J.J., and Vytlacil, E.J., 2011. Estimating marginal returns to education, *American Economic Review*, 101 (6), 2754–81.
- Carneiro, P. and Lee, S., 2009. Estimating distributions of potential outcomes using local instrumental variables with an application to changes in college enrollment and wage inequality, *Journal of Econometrics*, 149 (2), 191–208.
- Cattaneo, M.D. and Farrell, M.H., 2013. Optimal convergence rates, bahadur representation, and asymptotic normality of partitioning estimators, *Journal of Econometrics*, 174 (2), 127–143.
- Chen, X., 2007. Large sample sieve estimation of semi-nonparametric models, in: J.J. Heckman and E.E. Leamer, eds., *Handbook of Econometrics*, Elsevier, vol. 6, chap. 76, 5549–5632.
- Chen, X. and Christensen, T.M., 2015. Optimal uniform convergence rates and asymptotic normality for series estimators under weak dependence and weak conditions, *Journal of Econometrics*, 188 (2), 447–465.

- Chen, X. and Christensen, T.M., 2018. Optimal sup-norm rates and uniform inference on nonlinear functionals of nonparametric iv regression, *Quantitative Economics*, 9 (1), 39–84.
- Chesher, A. and Rosen, A.M., 2020. Structural modeling of simultaneous discrete choice, *cemmap working paper*, CWP9/20.
- Ciliberto, F. and Tamer, E., 2009. Market structure and multiple equilibria in airline markets, *Econometrica*, 77 (6), 1791–1828.
- Cornelissen, T., Dustmann, C., Raute, A., and Schönberg, U., 2016. From late to mte: Alternative methods for the evaluation of policy interventions, *Labour Economics*, 41, 47–60.
- de Paula, A., 2013. Econometric analysis of games with multiple equilibria, *Annual Review of Economics*, 5, 107–131.
- Felfe, C. and Lalive, R., 2018. Does early child care affect children’s development?, *Journal of Public Economics*, 159, 33–53.
- Han, S. and Vytlacil, E.J., 2017. Identification in a generalization of bivariate probit models with dummy endogenous regressors, *Journal of Econometrics*, 199 (1), 63–73.
- Heckman, J.J. and Pinto, R., 2018. Unordered monotonicity, *Econometrica*, 86 (1), 1–35.
- Heckman, J.J. and Vytlacil, E.J., 1999. Local instrumental variables and latent variable models for identifying and bounding treatment effects, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 96 (8), 4730–4734.
- Heckman, J.J. and Vytlacil, E.J., 2005. Structural equations, treatment effects, and econometric policy evaluation, *Econometrica*, 73 (3), 669–738.
- Holland, A.D., 2017. Penalized spline estimation in the partially linear model, *Journal of Multivariate Analysis*, 153, 211–235.
- Hsu, Y.C. and Shi, X., 2017. Model-selection tests for conditional moment restriction models, *The Econometrics Journal*, 20 (1), 52–85.
- Huang, J.Z., 2003. Local asymptotics for polynomial spline regression, *The Annals of Statistics*, 31 (5), 1600–1635.
- Imbens, G.W. and Angrist, J.D., 1994. Identification and estimation of local average treatment effects, *Econometrica*, 62 (2), 467–475.
- Jia, P., 2008. What happens when wal-mart comes to town: An empirical analysis of the discount retailing industry, *Econometrica*, 76 (6), 1263–1316.
- Jun, S.J. and Pinkse, J., 2019. Counterfactual prediction in complete information games: point prediction under partial identification, *Journal of Econometrics*, (forthcoming).
- Khan, S. and Nekipelov, D., 2018. Information structure and statistical information in discrete response models, *Quantitative Economics*, 9 (2), 995–1017.
- Kline, B., 2015. Identification of complete information games, *Journal of Econometrics*, 189 (1), 117–131.
- Kooreman, P., 1994. Estimation of econometric models of some discrete games, *Journal of Applied Econometrics*, 9 (3), 255–268.

- Lee, L.F., Li, J., and Lin, X., 2014. Binary choice models with social network under heterogeneous rational expectations, *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 96 (3), 402–417.
- Lee, S. and Salanié, B., 2018. Identifying effects of multivalued treatments, *Econometrica*, 86 (6), 1939–1963.
- Lewbel, A., 2007. Coherency and completeness of structural models containing a dummy endogenous variable, *International Economic Review*, 48 (4), 1379–1392.
- Mogstad, M., Santos, A., and Torgovitsky, A., 2018. Using instrumental variables for inference about policy relevant treatment parameters, *Econometrica*, 86 (5), 1589–1619.
- Schennach, S.M. and Wilhelm, D., 2017. A simple parametric model selection test, *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 112 (520), 1663–1674.
- Soetevent, A.R. and Kooreman, P., 2007. A discrete-choice model with social interactions: with an application to high school teen behavior, *Journal of Applied Econometrics*, 22 (3), 599–624.
- Stone, C.J., 1982. Optimal global rates of convergence for nonparametric regression, *The Annals of Statistics*, 1040–1053.
- Tamer, E., 2003. Incomplete simultaneous discrete response model with multiple equilibria, *The Review of Economic Studies*, 70 (1), 147–165.
- Vytlacil, E.J., 2002. Independence, monotonicity, and latent index models: An equivalence result, *Econometrica*, 70 (1), 331–341.
- Xu, X. and Lee, L.F., 2015. Estimation of a binary choice game model with network links, *Working paper*.

References

- Cattaneo, M.D. and Farrell, M.H., 2013. Optimal convergence rates, bahadur representation, and asymptotic normality of partitioning estimators, *Journal of Econometrics*, 174 (2), 127–143.
- Chen, X. and Christensen, T.M., 2015. Optimal uniform convergence rates and asymptotic normality for series estimators under weak dependence and weak conditions, *Journal of Econometrics*, 188 (2), 447–465.
- Chen, X. and Christensen, T.M., 2018. Optimal sup-norm rates and uniform inference on nonlinear functionals of nonparametric iv regression, *Quantitative Economics*, 9 (1), 39–84.
- Frölich, M. and Huber, M., 2017. Direct and indirect treatment effects—causal chains and mediation analysis with instrumental variables, *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)*, 79 (5), 1645–1666.
- Han, S. and Vytlačil, E.J., 2017. Identification in a generalization of bivariate probit models with dummy endogenous regressors, *Journal of Econometrics*, 199 (1), 63–73.
- Hastie, T., Tibshirani, R., and Friedman, J., 2009. *The elements of statistical learning: data mining, inference, and prediction*, Springer Science & Business Media.
- Heckman, J.J. and Vytlačil, E.J., 2005. Structural equations, treatment effects, and econometric policy evaluation, *Econometrica*, 73 (3), 669–738.
- Tropp, J.A., 2012. User-friendly tail bounds for sums of random matrices, *Foundations of Computational Mathematics*, 12 (4), 389–434.
- Zhou, S. and Wolfe, D.A., 2000. On derivative estimation in spline regression, *Statistica Sinica*, 10 (1), 93–108.