

Robust Inference Using Inverse Probability Weighting

Xinwei Ma

Jingshen Wang

Department of Economics
University of Michigan

Department of Statistics
University of Michigan

Abstract

Inverse Probability Weighting (IPW) is widely used in program evaluation and other empirical economics applications. As Gaussian approximations perform poorly in the presence of “small denominators,” trimming is routinely employed as a regularization strategy. However, ad hoc trimming of the observations renders usual inference procedures invalid for the target estimand, even in large samples. In this paper, we propose an inference procedure that is robust not only to small probability weights entering the IPW estimator, but also to a wide range of trimming threshold choices. Our inference procedure employs resampling with a novel bias correction technique. Specifically, we show that both the IPW and trimmed IPW estimators can have different (Gaussian or non-Gaussian) limiting distributions, depending on how “close to zero” the probability weights are and on the trimming threshold. Our method provides more robust inference for the target estimand by adapting to these different limiting distributions. This robustness is partly achieved by correcting a non-negligible trimming bias. We demonstrate the finite-sample accuracy of our method in a simulation study, and we illustrate its use by revisiting a dataset from the National Supported Work program.

Keywords: Inverse probability weighting, Trimming, Robust inference, Bias correction, Heavy tail.

JEL Codes: C12, C13, C21

We are deeply grateful to Matias Cattaneo for the comments and suggestions that significantly improved the manuscript. We are indebted to Andreas Hagemann, Lutz Kilian and Rocío Titiunik for thoughtful discussions. We also thank Sebastian Calonico, Max Farrell, Yingjie Feng, Xuming He, Michael Jansson, Jose Luis Montiel Olea, Kenichi Nagasawa and Gonzalo Vazquez-Bare for their valuable feedback and suggestions. Auxiliary lemmas, additional results and all proofs are collected in the online Supplement.

1 Introduction

Inverse Probability Weighting (IPW) is widely used in program evaluation settings, such as instrumental variables, difference-in-differences and counterfactual analysis. Other applications of IPW include survey adjustment, data combination, and models involving missing data or measurement error. In practice, it is common to observe small probability weights entering the IPW estimator. This renders inference based on the standard Gaussian approximation invalid, even in large samples, because these approximations rely crucially on the probability weights being well-separated from zero. In a recent study, [Busso, DiNardo and McCrary \(2014\)](#) investigated the finite sample performance of commonly used IPW treatment effect estimators, and documented that small probability weights can be detrimental to statistical inference. In response to this problem, observations with probability weights below a certain threshold are often excluded from subsequent statistical analysis. The exact amount of trimming, however, is usually ad hoc and will affect the performance of the IPW estimator and the corresponding confidence interval in nontrivial ways.

In this paper, we show that both the IPW and trimmed IPW estimators can have different (Gaussian or non-Gaussian) limiting distributions, depending on how “close to zero” the probability weights are and on how the trimming threshold is specified. We propose an inference procedure that adapts to these different limiting distributions, making it robust not only to small probability weights, but also to a wide range of trimming threshold choices. To achieve this “two-way robustness,” our method employs a resampling technique combined with a novel bias correction, which remains valid for the target estimand even when trimming induces a non-negligible bias. In addition, we propose an easy-to-implement method for choosing the trimming threshold by minimizing an empirical analogue of the asymptotic mean squared error.

To understand why standard inference procedures are not robust to small probability weights, we first consider the large-sample properties of the IPW estimator

$$\hat{\theta}_n = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{D_i Y_i}{\hat{e}(X_i)}, \quad (1)$$

where $D_i \in \{0, 1\}$ is binary, Y_i is the outcome of interest, and $e(X_i) = \mathbb{P}[D_i = 1|X_i]$ is the probability weight conditional on the covariates, with $\hat{e}(X_i)$ being its estimate. The asymptotic

framework we employ is general and allows, but does not require that the probability weights have a heavy tail near zero. If the probability weights are bounded away from zero, the IPW estimator is \sqrt{n} -consistent with a limiting Gaussian distribution. Otherwise, a slower-than- \sqrt{n} convergence rate and a non-Gaussian limiting distribution can emerge, for which regular large-sample approximation no longer applies. Specifically, in the latter case,

$$\frac{n}{a_n}(\hat{\theta}_n - \theta_0) \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{L}(\gamma_0, \alpha_+(0), \alpha_-(0)), \quad (2)$$

where θ_0 is the parameter of interest and $a_n \rightarrow \infty$ is a sequence of normalizing factors. The limiting distribution, $\mathcal{L}(\cdot)$, depends on three parameters. The first parameter γ_0 is related to the “tail behavior” of the probability weights near zero. Only if the tail is relatively thin, the limiting distribution will be Gaussian; otherwise it will be a Lévy stable distribution. In the non-Gaussian case, the limiting distribution does not need to be symmetric, with its two tails characterized by $\alpha_+(0)$ and $\alpha_-(0)$. Another complication in the non-Gaussian case is that the convergence rate, n/a_n , is typically unknown, and depends again on how “close to zero” the probability weights are.

In an effort to circumvent this problem, practitioners typically use trimming as a regularization strategy. The idea is to exclude observations with small probability weights from the analysis. However, the performance of standard inference procedures is sensitive to the amount of trimming. We study the trimmed IPW estimator

$$\hat{\theta}_{n,b_n} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{D_i Y_i}{\hat{e}(X_i)} \mathbb{1}_{\hat{e}(X_i) \geq b_n}. \quad (3)$$

The large-sample properties of this estimator depend heavily on the choice of the trimming threshold, b_n . In particular,

$$\frac{n}{a_{n,b_n}}(\hat{\theta}_{n,b_n} - \theta_0 - \mathbf{B}_{n,b_n}) \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{L}(\gamma_0, \alpha_+(\cdot), \alpha_-(\cdot)). \quad (4)$$

Compared to (2), the most noticeable change is that a trimming bias \mathbf{B}_{n,b_n} emerges. This bias has order $\mathbb{P}[e(X) \leq b_n]$, hence it will vanish asymptotically if the trimming threshold shrinks to zero. However, the trimming bias can still contribute to the mean squared error of the estimator nontrivially. Furthermore, it can be detrimental to statistical inference, since the limiting distri-

bution is shifted away from the target estimand by $\frac{n}{a_{n,b_n}}\mathbf{B}_{n,b_n}$, which may not vanish even in large samples. Indeed, in a simple simulation setting with sample size $n = 2,000$ and a trimming threshold $b_n = 0.036$, the bias \mathbf{B}_{n,b_n} is already so severe that a nominal 95% confidence interval has less than 25% empirical coverage. Another noticeable change with trimming is that the normalizing factor, a_{n,b_n} , can depend on the trimming threshold. As a result, the trimmed IPW estimator may have a different convergence rate compared to the untrimmed estimator. An extreme case is fixed trimming ($b_n = b > 0$), which forces the probability weights to be well-separated from zero. In this case, the trimmed estimator converges to a pseudo-true parameter at the usual parametric rate $n/a_{n,b_n} = \sqrt{n}$. Finally, the form of the limiting distribution also changes and can depend on two infinite dimensional objects, $\alpha_+(\cdot)$ and $\alpha_-(\cdot)$, making inference based on the estimated limiting distribution prohibitively difficult.

As the large-sample properties of both the IPW and trimmed IPW estimators are sensitive to small probability weights and to the amount of trimming, it is important to develop an inference procedure that automatically adapts to the relevant limiting distributions. However, it is difficult to base inference on estimates of the nuisance parameters in (2) or (4), and the standard nonparametric bootstrap is known to fail in our setting (Athreya, 1987; Knight, 1989). We instead propose the use of subsampling (Politis and Romano, 1994). In particular, we show that subsampling provides valid approximations to the limiting distribution in (2) for the IPW estimator, and automatically adapts to the distribution in (4) under trimming. With self-normalization (i.e., subsampling a Studentized statistic), it also overcomes the difficulty of having a possibly unknown convergence rate.

Subsampling alone does not suffice for valid inference due to the bias induced by trimming. A desirable inference procedure should be valid even when the trimming bias is nonnegligible. That is, it should be robust not only to small probability weights but also to a wide range of trimming threshold choices. To achieve this “two-way robustness,” we combine subsampling with a novel bias correction method based on local polynomial regression. Specifically, our method regresses the outcome variable on a polynomial of the probability weight in a region local to 0, and estimates the trimming bias with the regression coefficients. In the current context, however, local polynomial regressions cannot be analyzed with standard techniques available in the literature (Fan and Gijbels, 1996), as the density of the probability weights can be arbitrarily close to zero in the subsample $D = 1$. Both the variance and bias of the local polynomial regression change considerably. In the

online Supplement, we discuss the large-sample properties of the local polynomial regression as a technical by-product.

Finally, we address the question of how to choose the trimming threshold. One extreme possibility is fixed trimming ($b_n = b > 0$). Although fixed trimming helps restore asymptotic Gaussianity by forcing the probability weights to be bounded away from zero, this practice is difficult to justify, unless one is willing to re-interpret the estimation and inference result completely (Crump, Hotz, Imbens and Mitnik, 2009). We instead propose to determine the trimming threshold by taking into consideration both the bias and variance of the trimmed IPW estimator. We suggest an easy-to-implement method to choose the trimming threshold by minimizing an empirical analogue of the asymptotic mean squared error.

From a practical perspective, this paper relates to the large literature on program evaluation and causal inference (Imbens and Rubin, 2015; Abadie and Cattaneo, 2018; Hernán and Robins, 2018). Inverse weighting type estimators are widely used in missing data models (Robins, Rotnitzky and Zhao, 1994; Wooldridge, 2007) and for estimating treatment effects (Hirano, Imbens and Ridder, 2003; Cattaneo, 2010). They also feature in settings such as instrumental variables (Abadie, 2003), difference-in-differences (Abadie, 2005), counterfactual analysis (DiNardo, Fortin and Lemieux, 1996) and survey sampling adjustment (Wooldridge, 1999). From a theoretical perspective, the IPW estimator is known to behave poorly when the probability weights are close to zero (Khan and Tamer, 2010). Some attempts have been made to deal with this problem. Chaudhuri and Hill (2016) propose a trimming strategy based on the absolute magnitude of $|DY/e(X)|$. However, their method only allows the trimming of a few observations. Moreover, both inference and bias correction rely on estimates of certain tail features, which can be difficult to obtain. In a potential-outcome setting, Hong, Leung and Li (2018) study limited overlap by modeling how fast the smallest propensity score approaches zero. Sasaki and Ura (2018) consider the problem of estimating the mean of a ratio of two random variables, which encompasses the IPW as a special case. However, these two studies effectively require the IPW estimator to have a finite variance, which permits regular inference based on the Gaussian approximation (see Remark 3 and 4 below).

Trimming has also been studied in the literature on heavy-tailed random variables. As in our setting, different limiting distributions can emerge (Csörgő, Haeusler and Mason, 1988; Hahn and Weiner, 1992; Berkes, Horváth and Schauer, 2012). However, the focus in that literature has been

almost exclusively on extreme order statistics. Hence, the results do not apply to the trimming strategy which practitioners use. [Crump, Hotz, Imbens and Mitnik \(2009\)](#) and [Yang and Ding \(2018\)](#) are two exceptions. They consider the probability weight based trimming, as we do in this paper, but both studies assume that the probability weights are already bounded away from zero.

With the IPW estimator as a special case, [Cattaneo and Jansson \(2018\)](#) and [Cattaneo, Jansson and Ma \(2018\)](#) show how an asymptotic bias can arise in a two-step semiparametric setting where the first step employs small bandwidths, which corresponds to undersmoothing, or many covariates, which corresponds to overfitting. Along another direction, [Chernozhukov, Escanciano, Ichimura, Newey and Robins \(2018\)](#) develop robust inference procedures against oversmoothing bias. The first-order bias we document in this paper is both qualitatively and quantitatively different, as it emerges due to trimming and will be present even when the probability weights are directly observed (making the estimator a one-step procedure), and certainly will not disappear with model selection or machine learning methods ([Athey, Imbens and Wager, 2018](#); [Belloni, Chernozhukov, Chetverikov, Hansen and Kato, 2018](#); [Farrell, 2015](#); [Farrell, Liang and Misra, 2018](#)).

In Section 2, we study the large-sample properties of the IPW estimator and give precise statements for equation (2). We show that subsampling provides valid distributional approximations. In Section 3, we extend our analysis to the trimmed IPW estimator. We discuss in detail the bias correction required for our robust inference procedure. We also propose a data-driven method to choose the trimming threshold. Section 4 shows how our framework can be extended to the average treatment effect, and parameters defined through a nonlinear moment condition. Section 5 provides numerical evidence from a wide array of simulation designs and an empirical example. Section 6 concludes. Auxiliary lemmas, additional results and all proofs are collected in the online Supplement.

2 The IPW Estimator

Let (Y_i, D_i, X_i) , $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$ be a random sample from $Y \in \mathbb{R}$, $D \in \{0, 1\}$ and $X \in \mathbb{R}^{d_x}$. Recall that the probability weight is defined as $e(X) = \mathbb{P}[D = 1|X]$. Define the conditional moments of the outcome variable as

$$\mu_s(e(X)) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathbb{E}[Y^s | e(X), D = 1], \quad s > 0,$$

then the parameter of interest is $\theta_0 = \mathbb{E}[DY/e(X)] = \mathbb{E}[\mu_1(e(X))]$. Other notation is defined in Appendix A. At this level of generality, we do not attach specific interpretations to the parameter and the random variables in our model. To facilitate understanding, one can think of Y as an observed outcome variable and D as an indicator of treatment status, hence the parameter is the population average of one potential outcome (see Section 4.1 for a treatment effect setting).

As previewed in Section 1, the large-sample properties of the IPW estimator $\hat{\theta}_n$ depend on the tail behavior of the probability weight near zero. If $e(X)$ is bounded away from zero, the IPW estimator is \sqrt{n} -consistent and asymptotically Gaussian. In the presence of small probability weights, however, a non-Gaussian limiting distribution can emerge. In this section, we first discuss the assumptions and formalize the notion of probability weights “being close to zero” or “having a heavy tail.” Then we give precise statements on the large-sample properties of the IPW estimator, and propose an inference procedure that is robust to small probability weights.

2.1 Tail Behavior

For an estimator that takes the form of a sample average (or more generally can be linearized into such), distributional approximation based on the central limit theorem only requires a finite variance. The problem with inverse probability weighting with “small denominators,” however, is that the estimator may not have a finite variance. In this case, distributional convergence relies on tail features, which we formalize in the following assumption.

Assumption 1 (Regularly varying tail)

For some $\gamma_0 > 1$, the probability weight has a regularly varying tail with index $\gamma_0 - 1$ at zero:

$$\lim_{t \downarrow 0} \frac{\mathbb{P}[e(X) \leq tx]}{\mathbb{P}[e(X) \leq t]} = x^{\gamma_0 - 1}, \quad \text{for all } x > 0.$$

Assumption 1 only imposes a local restriction on the tail behavior of the probability weights, and is common when dealing with sums of heavy-tailed random variables. This assumption encompasses the special case that $\mathbb{P}[e(X) \leq x] = c(x)x^{\gamma_0 - 1}$ with $\lim_{x \downarrow 0} c(x) > 0$ (i.e., approximately polynomial tail).¹ To see how the tail index γ_0 features in data, Figure 1 shows the distribution

¹Assumption 1 is equivalent to $\mathbb{P}[e(X) \leq x] = c(x)x^{\gamma_0 - 1}$ with $c(x)$ being a slowly varying function (see the online Supplement for a precise definition). Because $c(x)$ does not need to have a well-defined limit as $x \downarrow 0$, Assumption 1 is more general than assuming an approximately polynomial tail.




Figure 1. Illustration of γ_0

Note. Sample size: $n = 2,000$. $\mathbb{P}[e(X) \leq x] = x^{\gamma_0 - 1}$ with $\gamma_0 = 1.5$. (a) Distribution of the probability weights. (b) Distribution of the probability weights, separately for subgroups $D = 1$ (red) and $D = 0$ (blue).

of the probability weights simulated with $\gamma_0 = 1.5$. There, it is clear that the probability weights exhibit a heavy tail near 0 (more precisely, the density of $e(X)$, if it exists, diverges to infinity). In Figure 2, we illustrate this point with estimated probability weights from an empirical example (Section 5.2), and a similar pattern emerges. Later in Theorem 1, we show that $\gamma_0 = 2$ is the boundary case that separates the Gaussian and the non-Gaussian limiting distributions for the IPW estimator. With $\gamma_0 = 2$, the probability weight is approximately uniformly distributed, a fact that can be used in practice as a rough guidance on the magnitude of this tail index.

Remark 1 (Identification) The requirement $\gamma_0 > 1$ ensures point identification of the parameter θ_0 , as it implies $\mathbb{P}[e(X) = 0] = 0$. \parallel

Remark 2 (Tail property of the inverse weight) Assumption 1 can be equivalently rewritten as a tail condition of the inverse weight: $\mathbb{P}[D/e(X) \geq x] \approx x^{-\gamma_0}$, as $x \uparrow \infty$. (Precisely, $D/e(X)$ has a regularly varying tail at ∞ with index $-\gamma_0$.) Therefore, γ_0 determines what moments the inverse weight possesses. For our purpose, it is more instructive to have a result on the tail behavior of




Figure 2. Estimated probability weights from the National Supported Work dataset

Note. Sample size: $n = 1,342$ (185 observations in the NSW treated group and 1,157 in the PSID comparison group). The probability weight is estimated in a Logit model with: **age**, **education**, **earn1974**, **earn1975**, **age**², **education**², **earn1974**², **earn1975**², three indicators for **married**, **black** and **hispanic**, and an interaction term between **black** and unemployment status in 1974: **black** \times **u74**. See Section 5.2 for more detail. (a) Distribution of the estimated probability weights (propensity scores). (b) Distribution of the estimated probability weights, separately for the treatment ($D = 1$, red) and control ($D = 0$, blue) group.

$DY/e(X)$. This is made precise in Lemma 1, for which an additional assumption is needed. \parallel

Assumption 1 characterizes the tail behavior of the probability weights. However, it alone does not suffice for the IPW estimator to have a limiting distribution. The reason is that, for sums of random variables without finite variance to converge in distribution, one needs not only a restriction on the shape of the tail, but also a “tail balance condition.” This should be compared to the asymptotically Gaussian case, in which no tail restriction is necessary beyond a finite variance.

Assumption 2 (Conditional distribution of Y)

(i) For some $\varepsilon > 0$, $\mathbb{E}[|Y|^{(\gamma_0 \vee 2) + \varepsilon} | e(X) = x, D = 1]$ is uniformly bounded. (ii) There exists a probability distribution F , such that for all bounded and continuous $\ell(\cdot)$, $\mathbb{E}[\ell(Y) | e(X) = x, D = 1] \rightarrow \int_{\mathbb{R}} \ell(y) F(dy)$ as $x \downarrow 0$.

This assumption has two parts. The first part requires the tail of Y to be thinner than that

of $D/e(X)$, therefore the tail behavior of $DY/e(X)$ is largely driven by the “small denominator $e(X)$.” As our primary focus is the implication of small probability weights entering the IPW estimator rather than a heavy-tailed outcome variable, we maintain this assumption. The second part requires convergence of the conditional distribution of Y given $e(X)$ and $D = 1$. Together, they help characterize the tail behavior of $DY/e(X)$. Specifically, the two tails of $DY/e(X)$ are balanced.

Lemma 1 (Tail property of $DY/e(X)$)

Under Assumptions 1 and 2,

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \frac{x \mathbb{P}[DY/e(X) > x]}{\mathbb{P}[e(X) < x^{-1}]} = \frac{\gamma_0 - 1}{\gamma_0} \alpha_+(0), \quad \lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \frac{x \mathbb{P}[DY/e(X) < -x]}{\mathbb{P}[e(X) < x^{-1}]} = \frac{\gamma_0 - 1}{\gamma_0} \alpha_-(0),$$

where

$$\alpha_+(x) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \mathbb{E} \left[|Y|^{\gamma_0} \mathbf{1}_{Y > x} \middle| e(X) = t, D = 1 \right], \quad \alpha_-(x) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \mathbb{E} \left[|Y|^{\gamma_0} \mathbf{1}_{Y < x} \middle| e(X) = t, D = 1 \right].$$

Assuming the distribution of the outcome variable is nondegenerate conditional on the probability weights being small (i.e., $\alpha_+(0) + \alpha_-(0) > 0$), Lemma 1 shows that $DY/e(X)$ has regularly varying tails with index $-\gamma_0$. As a result, γ_0 determines which moment of the IPW estimator is finite: for $s < \gamma_0$, $\mathbb{E}[|DY/e(X)|^s] < \infty$, and for $s > \gamma_0$, the moment is infinite. Thanks to Assumption 2(ii), Lemma 1 also implies that $DY/e(X)$ has balanced tails: the ratio $\frac{\mathbb{P}[DY/e(X) > x]}{\mathbb{P}[|DY/e(X)| > x]}$ tends to a finite constant. It turns out that without a finite variance, the limiting distribution of the IPW estimator is non-Gaussian, and the limiting distribution depends on both the left and right tails of $DY/e(X)$. This should be compared to the asymptotically Gaussian case, where delicate tail properties do not feature in the asymptotic distribution beyond a finite second moment. Thus, tail balancing (and Assumption 2(ii)) is indispensable for developing a large sample theory allowing small probability weights entering the IPW estimator.

Lemma 1 also helps clarify different consequences of small probability weights/small denominators. If $\gamma_0 > 2$, the IPW estimator is asymptotically Gaussian: $\sqrt{n}(\hat{\theta}_n - \theta_0) \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(0, \mathbb{W}[DY/e(X)])$, although the probability weights can still be close to zero. The reason is that, with large $\gamma_0 > 2$, small denominators appear so infrequently that they will not affect the large-sample properties.

For $\gamma_0 \in (1, 2]$, the IPW estimator no longer has finite variance, and without further restrictions on the data generating process, the parameter is not \sqrt{n} -estimable. Since the distribution of $e(X)$ does not approach zero fast enough (or equivalently, the density of $e(X)$, if it exists, diverges to infinity), it represents the empirical difficulty of dealing with small probability weights entering the IPW estimator, for which regular asymptotic analysis no longer applies. In the following, we compare our setting with some recent work tackling a similar issue, although from different perspectives.

Remark 3 (Limited overlap) When estimating treatment effects (see Section 4.1 for a setup), it is possible that covariates are distributed very differently across the treatment and the control group. Even worse, for some region in the covariates distribution, one may observe abundant units from one group, yet units from the other group are scarce. This is commonly referred to as “limited overlap,” and is one instance in which extreme probability weights (propensity scores) can arise (Imbens and Rubin, 2015, Chapter 14).

Hong, Leung and Li (2018) consider a setting where observations fall into finitely many strata (hence the propensity score has a finite support), and propose to use the quantity “ $n \min_{1 \leq i \leq n} e(X_i)$ ” as the measure of the effective sample size (severity of limited overlap). They require this measure to diverge in large samples, which is equivalent to $\gamma_0 > 2$ in our setting. To see this connection,

$$\mathbb{P}\left[n \min_{1 \leq i \leq n} e(X_i) > x\right] = \left(1 - \mathbb{P}[e(X) \leq n^{-1}x]\right)^n \asymp \left(1 - (n^{-1}x)^{\gamma_0-1}\right)^n,$$

so that $n \min_{1 \leq i \leq n} e(X_i) \xrightarrow{P} \infty$ if and only if $\gamma_0 > 2$, which guarantees that the IPW estimator is \sqrt{n} -consistent and asymptotically Gaussian. \parallel

Remark 4 (Implied tail of X) To see how the tail behavior of the probability weights is related to that of the covariates X , we consider a Logit model: $e(X) = \exp(X^T \pi_0) / (1 + \exp(X^T \pi_0))$. Note that when the index $X^T \pi_0$ approaches $-\infty$, the probability weight approaches zero, and

$$\mathbb{P}[e(X) \leq x] = \mathbb{P}\left[\frac{1}{1 + \exp(-X^T \pi_0)} \leq x\right] = \mathbb{P}\left[X^T \pi_0 < -\log(x^{-1} - 1)\right].$$

As a result, Assumption 1 is equivalent to that, for all x large enough, $\mathbb{P}[X^T \pi_0 < -x] \approx e^{-(\gamma_0-1)x}$, meaning that the (left) tail of $X^T \pi_0$ is approximately sub-exponential.

Sasaki and Ura (2018) employ the Logit model for the probability weights and study the IPW estimator. Their conditions, however, require γ_0 to be no less than 5, for which the IPW estimator has at least a finite fourth moment, and regular asymptotic analysis based on the standard Gaussian approximation applies. \parallel

2.2 Large Sample Properties of the IPW Estimator

The following theorem characterizes the limiting distribution of the IPW estimator. To make the result concise, we assume the oracle (rather than estimated) probability weights are used, making the IPW estimator a one-step procedure. We extend the theorem to estimated probability weights in the next subsection.

Theorem 1 (Large sample properties of the IPW estimator)

Assume Assumptions 1 and 2 hold with $\alpha_+(0) + \alpha_-(0) > 0$. Let a_n be defined from

$$\frac{n}{a_n^2} \mathbb{E} \left[\left| \frac{DY}{e(X)} - \theta_0 \right|^2 \mathbf{1}_{|DY/e(X)| \leq a_n} \right] \rightarrow 1.$$

Then (2) holds with $\mathcal{L}(\gamma_0, \alpha_+(0), \alpha_-(0))$ being:

- (i) the standard Gaussian distribution if $\gamma_0 \geq 2$; and
- (ii) the Lévy stable distribution if $\gamma_0 < 2$, with characteristic function:

$$\psi(\zeta) = \exp \left\{ \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{e^{i\zeta x} - 1 - i\zeta x}{x^2} M(dx) \right\},$$

$$\text{where } M(dx) = dx \left[\frac{2 - \gamma_0}{\alpha_+(0) + \alpha_-(0)} |x|^{1-\gamma_0} \left(\alpha_+(0) \mathbf{1}_{x \geq 0} + \alpha_-(0) \mathbf{1}_{x < 0} \right) \right].$$

This theorem demonstrates how a non-Gaussian limiting distribution can emerge when the IPW estimator does not have a finite variance ($\gamma_0 < 2$). The limiting Lévy stable distribution is generally not symmetric (unless the outcome variable is conditionally symmetrically distributed), and has tails much heavier than that of a Gaussian distribution. As a result, inference procedures based on the standard Gaussian approximation perform poorly.

Theorem 1 also shows how the convergence rate of the IPW estimator depends on the tail index γ_0 . For $\gamma_0 > 2$, the IPW estimator converges at the usual parametric rate $n/a_n = \sqrt{n}$. This extends to the $\gamma_0 = 2$ case, except that an additional slowly varying factor is present in the

convergence rate. For $\gamma_0 < 2$, a_n is only implicitly defined from a truncated second moment, and generally does not have an explicit formula. One can consider the special case that the probability weights have an approximately polynomial tail: $\mathbb{P}[e(X) \leq x] \asymp x^{\gamma_0-1}$, for which a_n can be set to n^{1/γ_0} (this coincides with the optimal minimax rate derived in [Ma 2018](#)). As a result, the IPW estimator will have a slower convergence rate if the probability weights have a heavier tail at zero (i.e., smaller γ_0). Fortunately, the (unknown) convergence rate is captured by self-normalization (Studentization), which we employ in our robust inference procedure.

As a technical remark, the characteristic function in Theorem 1(ii) has an equivalent representation, from which we deduce several properties of the limiting Lévy stable distribution. In particular,

$$\psi(\zeta) = -|\zeta|^{\gamma_0} \frac{\Gamma(3 - \gamma_0)}{\gamma_0(\gamma_0 - 1)} \left[-\cos\left(\frac{\gamma_0\pi}{2}\right) + i \frac{\alpha_+(0) - \alpha_-(0)}{\alpha_+(0) + \alpha_-(0)} \text{sgn}(\zeta) \sin\left(\frac{\gamma_0\pi}{2}\right) \right],$$

where $\Gamma(\cdot)$ is the gamma function and $\text{sgn}(\cdot)$ is the sign function. First, this distribution is not symmetric unless $\alpha_+(0) = \alpha_-(0)$. Second, the characteristic function has a sub-exponential tail, meaning that the limiting stable distribution has a smooth density function (although in general it does not have a closed-form expression). Finally, the above characteristic function is continuous in γ_0 , in the sense that as $\gamma_0 \uparrow 2$, it reduces to the standard Gaussian characteristic function.

2.3 Estimated Probability Weights

The probability weights are usually unknown and are estimated in a first step, which are then plugged into the IPW estimator, making it a two-step estimation problem. In this subsection, we discuss how estimating the probability weights in a first step will affect the results of Theorem 1. To start, consider the following expansion:

$$\frac{n}{a_n} (\hat{\theta}_n - \theta_0) = \underbrace{\frac{1}{a_n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\frac{D_i Y_i}{e(X_i)} - \theta_0 \right)}_{\text{Theorem 1}} + \underbrace{\frac{1}{a_n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{D_i Y_i}{e(X_i)} \left(\frac{e(X_i)}{\hat{e}(X_i)} - 1 \right)}_{\text{Proposition 1}},$$

where the first term is already captured by Theorem 1. At this level of generality, it is not possible to determine whether the second term in the above expansion has a nontrivial (first order) impact.

In fact, nothing prevents the second term from being dominant in large samples, which happens, for example, when the probability weights are estimated at a rate slower than n/a_n . Even if the probability weights are estimated at the usual parametric rate, the difference between their inverses may not be small at all (due to the presence of “small estimated denominators”). In this subsection, we first impose high-level assumptions and discuss the impact of employing estimated probability weights. Then we specialize to generalized linear models, and verify the high-level assumptions for Logit and Probit models which are widely used in applied work.

Assumption 3 (First step)

The probability weights are parametrized as $e(X, \pi)$ with $\pi \in \Pi$, and $e(\cdot)$ is continuously differentiable with respect to π . Let $e(X) = e(X, \pi_0)$ and $\hat{e}(X) = e(X, \hat{\pi}_n)$. Further,

(i) $\sqrt{n}(\hat{\pi}_n - \pi_0) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n h(D_i, X_i) + o_p(1)$, where $h(D_i, X_i)$ is mean zero and has a finite variance.

(ii) For some $\varepsilon > 0$, $\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{\pi: |\pi - \pi_0| \leq \varepsilon} \left| \frac{e(X_i)}{e(X_i, \pi)^2} \frac{\partial e(X_i, \pi)}{\partial \pi} \right| \right] < \infty$.

Now we state the analogue of Theorem 1 but with the probability weights estimated in a first step.

Proposition 1 (IPW estimator with estimated probability weights)

Assume Assumptions 1–3 hold with $\alpha_+(0) + \alpha_-(0) > 0$. Let a_n be defined from

$$\frac{n}{a_n^2} \mathbb{E} \left[\left| \frac{DY}{e(X)} - \theta_0 - A_0 h(D, X) \right|^2 \mathbf{1}_{|DY/e(X) - A_0 h(D, X)| \leq a_n} \right] \rightarrow 1,$$

where $A_0 = \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\mu_1(e(X))}{e(X)} \frac{\partial e(X, \pi)}{\partial \pi} \Big|_{\pi = \pi_0} \right]$. Then the IPW estimator has the following linear representation:

$$\frac{n}{a_n} \left(\hat{\theta}_n - \theta_0 \right) = \frac{1}{a_n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\frac{D_i Y_i}{e(X_i)} - \theta_0 - A_0 h(D_i, X_i) \right) + o_p(1),$$

and the conclusions of Theorem 1 hold with estimated probability weights.

To understand Proposition 1, we again consider two cases. In the first case, $\mathbb{W}[DY/e(X)] < \infty$, and estimating the probability weights in a first step will contribute to the asymptotic variance. The second case corresponds to $\mathbb{W}[DY/e(X)] = \infty$, implying that the final estimator, $\hat{\theta}_n$, has a slower

convergence rate compared to the first-step estimated probability weights. As a result, the two definitions of the scaling factor a_n (in Theorem 1 and in the above proposition) are asymptotically equivalent, and the limiting distribution will be the same regardless of whether the probability weights are known or estimated.

Now we consider generalized linear models (GLMs) for the probability weights, and show that Assumption 3 holds under very mild primitive conditions.

Lemma 2 (Primitive conditions for GLMs)

Assume Assumptions 1 holds with $e(X, \pi_0) = \mathfrak{L}(X^T \pi_0)$. Further,

- (i) π_0 is the unique minimizer of $\mathbb{E}[|D - \mathfrak{L}(X^T \pi)|^2]$ in the interior of the compact parameter space Π , and $\hat{\pi}_n = \arg\min_{\pi \in \Pi} \sum_{i=1}^n |D_i - \mathfrak{L}(X_i^T \pi)|^2$.
- (ii) For some $\varepsilon > 0$, $\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{\pi: |\pi - \pi_0| \leq \varepsilon} \left| \frac{\mathfrak{L}(X_i^T \pi_0) \mathfrak{L}^{(1)}(X_i^T \pi)}{\mathfrak{L}(X_i^T \pi)^2} X \right| \right] < \infty$.
- (iii) $\mathbb{E}[\mathfrak{L}^{(1)}(X^T \pi_0)^2 X X^T]$ is nonsingular.

Then Assumption 3 holds with

$$h(D_i, X_i) = \left(\mathbb{E} \left[\mathfrak{L}^{(1)}(X^T \pi_0)^2 X X^T \right] \right)^{-1} (D_i - \mathfrak{L}(X_i^T \pi_0)) \mathfrak{L}^{(1)}(X_i^T \pi_0) X_i.$$

This lemma provides sufficient conditions to verify Assumption 3 when the probability weight takes a generalized linear form, hence also justifies the result in Proposition 1. Most of the conditions in Lemma 2 are standard, except for part (ii). In the following remark we discuss in detail how this condition can be justified in Logit and Probit models.

Remark 5 (Logit and Probit models) Assuming a Logit model for the probability weights: $e(X_i, \pi) = e^{X_i^T \pi} / (1 + e^{X_i^T \pi})$, we show in the online Supplement that a sufficient condition for Lemma 2(ii) is the covariates having a sub-exponential tail: $\mathbb{E}[e^{\varepsilon|X|}] < \infty$ for some (small) $\varepsilon > 0$. This should be compared to Remark 4, where we show that for Assumption 1 to hold in a Logit model, the index $X^T \pi_0$ needs to have a sub-exponential left tail. Therefore, this sufficient condition is fully compatible with, and in a sense is “implied” by Assumption 1.

As for the Probit model, condition (ii) in Lemma 2 is implied by a sub-Gaussian tail of the covariates: $\mathbb{E}[e^{\varepsilon|X|^2}] < \infty$ for some (small) $\varepsilon > 0$. Again, it is possible to show that Assumption 1 implies a sub-Gaussian left tail for the index $X^T \pi_0$. Thus, the requirement $\mathbb{E}[e^{\varepsilon|X|^2}] < \infty$ is fairly weak and does not contradict Assumption 1. \parallel

2.4 Robust Inference

The limiting distribution of the IPW estimator can be quite complicated, and depends on multiple nuisance parameters which are usually difficult to estimate. In addition, the usual nonparametric bootstrap fails to provide a valid distributional approximation when $\gamma_0 < 2$ (Athreya, 1987; Knight, 1989). As a result, conducting statistical inference is particularly challenging. Subsampling is a powerful data-driven method to approximate the (limiting) distribution of a statistic. It draws samples of size $m \ll n$ and recomputes the statistic with each subsample. Therefore, subsampling provides distributional approximation as if many independent sets of random samples were available. Following is the detailed algorithm.

Algorithm 1 (Robust inference using the IPW estimator)

Let $\hat{\theta}_n$ be defined as in (1), and

$$S_n = \sqrt{\frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\frac{D_i Y_i}{\hat{e}(X_i)} - \hat{\theta}_n \right)^2}.$$

Step 1. Sample $m \ll n$ observations from the original data without replacement, denoted by $(Y_i^*, D_i^*, X_i^*), i = 1, 2, \dots, m$.

Step 2. Construct the IPW estimator with the new subsample, and the self-normalized statistic as

$$T_m^* = \sqrt{m} \frac{\hat{\theta}_m^* - \hat{\theta}_n}{S_m^*}, \quad S_m^* = \sqrt{\frac{1}{m-1} \sum_{i=1}^m \left(\frac{D_i^* Y_i^*}{\hat{e}^*(X_i^*)} - \hat{\theta}_m^* \right)^2}.$$

Step 3. Repeat Step 1 and 2, and a $(1 - \alpha)\%$ -confidence interval can be constructed as

$$\left[\hat{\theta}_n - S_n \cdot q_{1-\frac{\alpha}{2}}(T_m^*), \quad \hat{\theta}_n - S_n \cdot q_{\frac{\alpha}{2}}(T_m^*) \right],$$

where $q_{(\cdot)}(T_m^*)$ denotes the quantile of the statistic T_m^* . ||

Subsampling validity typically relies on the existence of a limiting distribution (Politis and Romano, 1994; Romano and Wolf, 1999). We follow this approach, and justify our robust inference procedure by showing that the self-normalized statistic, $T_n = \sqrt{n}(\hat{\theta}_n - \theta_0)/S_n$, converges in distri-

bution. Under $\gamma_0 > 2$, the term S_n in Algorithm 1 converges in probability, and T_n converges to a Gaussian distribution by the Slutsky theorem. Asymptotic Gaussianity of T_n continues to hold for $\gamma_0 = 2$. Under $\gamma_0 < 2$, T_n still converges in distribution, although the limit is neither Gaussian nor Lévy stable. We characterize this limiting distribution in the proof of the following theorem (available in the online Supplement).

Theorem 2 (Validity of robust inference)

Under the assumptions of Theorem 1 (or Proposition 1 with estimated probability weights), and assume $m \rightarrow \infty$ and $m/n \rightarrow 0$. Then

$$\sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}} \left| \mathbb{P}[T_n \leq t] - \mathbb{P}^*[T_m^* \leq t] \right| \xrightarrow{P} 0.$$

Before closing this section, we address several practical issues when applying the robust inference procedure. First, it is desirable to have an automatic and adaptive procedure to capture the possibly unknown convergence rate n/a_n , as the convergence rate depends on the tail index γ_0 . In the subsampling algorithm, this is achieved by self-normalization (Studentization).

Second, one has to choose the subsample size m . Some suggestions have been made in the literature: Arcones and Giné (1991) suggest to use $m = \lfloor n/\log \log(n)^{1+\varepsilon} \rfloor$ for some $\varepsilon > 0$, although they consider the m -out-of- n bootstrap. Romano and Wolf (1999) propose a calibration technique. We use $m = \lfloor n/\log(n) \rfloor$ which performs quite well in our simulation study. Other choices such as $m = \lfloor n^{2/3} \rfloor$ and $\lfloor n^{1/2} \rfloor$ yield similar performance.

Finally, the denominator for self-normalization does not include all terms in the asymptotic linear representation stated in Proposition 1. For example, with the probability weights estimated in a first step, an alternative is to use

$$S_n = \sqrt{\frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\frac{D_i Y_i}{\hat{e}(X_i)} - \hat{\theta}_n - \hat{A}_n \hat{h}(D_i, X_i) \right)^2},$$

where \hat{A}_n and $\hat{h}(\cdot)$ are plug-in estimates of A_0 and $h(\cdot)$. This alternative Studentization can be appealing for higher-order accuracy concerns (i.e., asymptotic refinements, Horowitz 2001; Politis, Romano and Wolf 1999). On the other hand, Algorithm 1 is easier to implement since no additional estimation is needed.

3 Trimming

In response to small probability weights entering the IPW estimator, trimming is routinely employed as a regularization strategy. In this section, we first study the large-sample properties of the trimmed IPW estimator. It is shown that different limiting distributions can emerge, depending on how the trimming threshold is specified. Next, we study in detail the trimming bias, and show that for inference purpose it is typically nonnegligible or even explosive. These two findings explain why the point estimate is sensitive to the choice of the trimming threshold, and more importantly, why inference procedures based on the standard Gaussian approximation perform poorly. One extreme example is fixed trimming $b_n = b > 0$, for which the trimmed IPW estimator is \sqrt{n} -consistent and asymptotically Gaussian. However, it induces a bias that does not vanish even in large samples, forcing the researcher to change the target estimand and to re-interpret standard confidence intervals such as “point estimate $\pm 1.96 \times$ standard error.”

As a remedy, we propose to combine resampling with a novel bias correction technique, where the latter employs local polynomial regression to approximate the trimming bias. Our inference procedure is robust not only to small probability weights but also to a wide range of trimming threshold choices. We also introduce a method to choose the trimming threshold by minimizing an empirical mean squared error, and discuss how our trimming threshold selector can be modified in a disciplined way if the researcher prefers to discard more observations.

3.1 Large Sample Properties of the trimmed IPW Estimator

If the untrimmed IPW estimator is already asymptotically Gaussian ($\gamma_0 \geq 2$, Theorem 1(i)), so is the trimmed estimator. Therefore we restrict our attention to the $\gamma_0 < 2$ case. Also to make the result concise, we assume the probability weights are known. In the next subsection, we discuss the impact of estimating the probability weights in a first step. Following is the main theorem characterizing the large-sample properties of the trimmed IPW estimator.

Theorem 3 (Large sample properties of the trimmed IPW estimator)

Assume Assumptions 1 and 2 hold with $\gamma_0 < 2$ and $\alpha_+(0) + \alpha_-(0) > 0$. Further, let a_n be defined as in Theorem 1.

(i) **Light trimming:** For $b_n a_n \rightarrow 0$, (4) holds with $a_{n,b_n} = a_n$, and the limiting distribution is the Lévy stable distribution in Theorem 1(ii).

(ii) **Heavy trimming:** For $b_n a_n \rightarrow \infty$, (4) holds with $a_{n,b_n} = \sqrt{n\mathbb{W}[DY/e(X)\mathbf{1}_{e(X) \geq b_n}]}$, and the limiting distribution is the standard Gaussian distribution.

(iii) **Moderate trimming:** For $\frac{b_n}{a_n} \rightarrow t \in (0, \infty)$, (4) holds with $a_{n,b_n} = a_n$, and the limiting distribution is infinitely divisible with characteristic function:

$$\psi(\zeta) = \exp \left\{ \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{e^{i\zeta x} - 1 - i\zeta x}{x^2} M(dx) \right\},$$

$$\text{where } M(dx) = dx \left[\frac{2 - \gamma_0}{\alpha_+(0) + \alpha_-(0)} |x|^{1-\gamma_0} \left(\alpha_+(tx) \mathbf{1}_{x \geq 0} + \alpha_-(tx) \mathbf{1}_{x < 0} \right) \right].$$

For light trimming in part (i), b_n shrinks to zero fast enough so that asymptotically trimming becomes negligible, and the limiting distribution is Lévy stable as if there were no trimming. In part (ii), the trimming threshold shrinks to zero slowly, hence most of the small probability weights are excluded. This heavy trimming scenario leads to a Gaussian limiting distribution. Part (iii) lies between the two extremes. We refer to it as moderate trimming. On the one hand, a nontrivial number of small probability weights are discarded, making the limit no longer the Lévy stable distribution. On the other hand, the trimming is not heavy enough to restore asymptotic Gaussianity. The limiting distribution in this case is quite complicated, and depends on two (infinitely dimensional) nuisance parameters, $\alpha_+(\cdot)$ and $\alpha_-(\cdot)$. For this reason, inference is extremely challenging. As a technical remark, this limiting distribution is continuous in t , in the sense that as $t \rightarrow \infty$, it reduces to the standard Gaussian distribution; and as $t \downarrow 0$, it becomes the Lévy stable distribution.

Despite the limiting distribution taking on a complicated form, the trimming threshold choice in Theorem 3(iii) is highly relevant, as it balances the bias and variance and leads to a mean squared error improvement over the untrimmed IPW estimator. In addition, unless one employs a very large trimming threshold, it is unclear how well the Gaussian approximation performs in samples of moderate size.

3.2 Estimated Probability Weights

Estimating the probability weights in a first step can affect the large-sample properties of the trimmed IPW estimator through two channels: the estimated weights enter the final estimator through both inverse weighting and the trimming function. More precisely, we have the following expansion:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{n}{a_{n,b_n}} \left(\hat{\theta}_{n,b_n} - \theta_0 - B_{n,b_n} \right) &= \underbrace{\frac{1}{a_n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\frac{D_i Y_i}{e(X_i)} \mathbf{1}_{e(X_i) \geq b_n} - \theta_0 - B_{n,b_n} \right)}_{\text{Theorem 3}} \\ &+ \underbrace{\frac{1}{a_{n,b_n}} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{D_i Y_i}{e(X_i)} \left(\frac{e(X_i)}{\hat{e}(X_i)} - 1 \right) \mathbf{1}_{\hat{e}(X_i) \geq b_n}}_{\text{Proposition 1}} + \underbrace{\frac{1}{a_{n,b_n}} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{D_i Y_i}{e(X_i)} \left(\mathbf{1}_{\hat{e}(X_i) \geq b_n} - \mathbf{1}_{e(X_i) \geq b_n} \right)}_{\text{Proposition 2}}. \end{aligned}$$

Proposition 2 shows that, despite the estimated probability weights entering both the denominator and the trimming function, the second channel is asymptotically negligible under an additional assumption, which turns out to be very mild in applications.

Assumption 4 (Trimming threshold)

The trimming threshold satisfies $c_n \sqrt{b_n \mathbb{P}[e(X_i) \leq b_n]} \rightarrow 0$, where c_n is a positive sequence such that, for any $\varepsilon > 0$,

$$c_n^{-1} \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \sup_{|\pi - \pi_0| \leq \varepsilon / \sqrt{n}} \left| \frac{1}{e(X_i)} \frac{\partial e(X_i, \pi)}{\partial \pi} \right| = o_p(1).$$

Remark 6 (Logit and Probit models) To verify Assumption 4, it suffices to set $c_n = \log^2(n)$ for Logit and Probit models. Therefore, we only require the trimming threshold shrinking to zero faster than a logarithmic rate. \parallel

Proposition 2 (Trimmed IPW estimator with estimated probability weights)

Assume Assumptions 1–4 hold with $\gamma_0 < 2$ and $\alpha_+(0) + \alpha_-(0) > 0$, and let a_n be defined as in Proposition 1. Then the conclusions of Theorem 3 hold with estimated probability weights.

From this proposition, estimating the probability weights in a first step does not lead to any first order impact beyond what has been stated in Proposition 1. Equivalently, one can always assume that the true probability weights are used for trimming.

3.3 Balancing Bias and Variance

If the sole purpose of trimming is to stabilize the IPW estimator, one can argue that only a fixed trimming rule, $b_n = b \in (0, 1)$, should be used. Such practice, however, completely ignores the bias introduced by trimming, forcing the researcher to change the target estimand and re-interpret the estimation/inference result (see, for example [Crump, Hotz, Imbens and Mitnik 2009](#)). Practically, the trimming threshold can be chosen by minimizing the asymptotic mean squared error. For this purpose, we characterize the bias and variance of the trimmed IPW estimator in the following lemma.

Lemma 3 (Bias and Variance of $\hat{\theta}_{n,b_n}$)

Assume Assumptions 1 and 2 hold with $\gamma_0 < 2$. Further, assume that $\mu_1(\cdot)$ and $\mu_2(\cdot)$ do not vanish near 0. Then the bias and variance of $\hat{\theta}_{n,b_n}$ are:

$$\begin{aligned} B_{n,b_n} &= -\mathbb{E}[\mu_1(e(X))\mathbf{1}_{e(X) \leq b_n}] = -\mu_1(0)\mathbb{P}[e(X) \leq b_n](1 + o(1)), \\ V_{n,b_n} &= \frac{1}{n}\mathbb{E}\left[\frac{\mu_2(e(X))}{e(X)}\mathbf{1}_{e(X) \geq b_n}\right](1 + o(1)) = \mu_2(0)\frac{1}{n}\mathbb{E}[e(X)^{-1}\mathbf{1}_{e(X) \geq b_n}](1 + o(1)). \end{aligned}$$

In addition, $B_{n,b_n}^2/V_{n,b_n} \asymp nb_n\mathbb{P}[e(X) \leq b_n]$.

A natural question is how b_n can be chosen in practice. One possibility is to consider the leading mean squared error:

$$\begin{aligned} B_{n,b_n}^2 + V_{n,b_n} &\approx [\mathbb{P}[e(X) \leq b_n] \cdot \mu_1(0)]^2 + \frac{1}{n}\mathbb{E}[e(X)^{-1}\mathbf{1}_{e(X) \geq b_n}] \cdot \mu_2(0) \\ &= \left[\int_0^{b_n} d\mathbb{P}[e(X) \leq x] \cdot \mu_1(0)\right]^2 + \frac{1}{n}\int_{b_n}^1 x^{-1}d\mathbb{P}[e(X) \leq x] \cdot \mu_2(0), \end{aligned}$$

and by taking derivative with respect to b_n , we have,

$$b_n^\dagger \cdot \mathbb{P}[e(X) \leq b_n^\dagger] = \frac{1}{2n} \frac{\mu_2(0)}{\mu_1(0)^2}, \quad (5)$$

which gives the optimal trimming threshold.

The (mean squared error) optimal trimming b_n^\dagger helps understand the three scenarios in Theorem 3: light, moderate and heavy trimming. More importantly, it helps clarify whether (and

when) the trimming bias features in the limiting distribution. (The trimming bias B_{n,b_n} vanishes as long as $b_n \rightarrow 0$. Scaled by the convergence rate, however, it may not be negligible even in large samples.) b_n^\dagger corresponds to the moderate trimming scenario, and since it balances the leading bias and variance, the limiting distribution of the trimmed IPW estimator is not centered at the target estimand (i.e., it is asymptotically biased). A trimming threshold that shrinks more slowly than the optimal one corresponds to the heavy trimming scenario, where the bias dominates in the asymptotic distribution. The only scenario in which one can ignore the trimming bias for inference purposes is when light trimming is used. That is, the trimming threshold shrinks faster than b_n^\dagger . In large samples, however, no observation will be discarded. Overall, the trimming bias cannot be ignored if one wants to develop an inference procedure that is valid for the target estimand using the trimmed IPW estimator. In the next subsection, we propose an inference procedure that is valid for the target estimand under a range of trimming threshold choices. This is achieved by explicitly estimating and correcting the trimming bias with a novel application of local polynomial regression.

The following theorem shows that, under very mild regularity conditions, the optimal trimming threshold can be implemented in practice by solving the sample analogue of (5). In addition, it also provides a disciplined method for choosing the trimming threshold if the researcher prefers to employ a heavy trimming.

Theorem 4 (Optimal trimming: implementation)

Assume Assumption 1 holds, and $0 < \mu_2(0)/\mu_1(0)^2 < \infty$. For any $s > 0$, define b_n and \hat{b}_n as:

$$b_n^s \mathbb{P}[e(X) \leq b_n] = \frac{1}{2n} \frac{\mu_2(0)}{\mu_1(0)^2}, \quad \hat{b}_n^s \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{1}_{e(X) \leq \hat{b}_n} \right) = \frac{1}{2n} \frac{\hat{\mu}_2(0)}{\hat{\mu}_1(0)^2},$$

where $\hat{\mu}_1(0)$ and $\hat{\mu}_2(0)$ are some consistent estimates of $\mu_1(0)$ and $\mu_2(0)$, respectively. Then \hat{b}_n is consistent for b_n , in the sense that:

$$\frac{\hat{b}_n}{b_n} \xrightarrow{P} 1.$$

Therefore, for $0 < s < 1$, $s = 1$ and $s > 1$, we have that \hat{b}_n/b_n^\dagger converges in probability to 0, 1 and ∞ , respectively.

If in addition Assumption 3 holds, and for any $\varepsilon > 0$,

$$\max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \sup_{|\pi - \pi_0| \leq \varepsilon / \sqrt{n}} \left| \frac{1}{e(X_i)} \frac{\partial e(X_i, \pi)}{\partial \pi} \right| = o_p \left(\sqrt{\frac{n}{\log(n)}} \right),$$

then \hat{b}_n can be constructed with estimated probability weights.

This theorem states that, as long as we can construct a consistent estimator for the ratio $\mu_2(0)/\mu_1(0)^2$, the optimal trimming threshold can be implemented in practice with the unknown distribution $\mathbb{P}[e(X) \leq x]$ replaced by the standard empirical estimate. Although (5) and its sample analogue do not have closed-form solutions, finding \hat{b}_n is quite easy, by first searching over the order statistics of the probability weights, and then performing a grid search in a interval with length of order n^{-1} .

In addition, Theorem 4 allows the use of estimated probability weights for constructing \hat{b}_n . The extra condition turns out to be quite weak, and is easily satisfied if the probability weights are estimated in a Logit or Probit model. (See Remark 6, and the online Supplement for further discussion.)

Remark 7 (Bias-variance trade-off when $\gamma_0 \geq 2$) The characterization of leading variance in Lemma 3 only applies to $\gamma_0 < 2$. The trimming threshold in (5), however, remains to be mean squared error optimal even for $\gamma_0 \geq 2$. To show this, we need to characterize a higher order variance term. Assume for simplicity that $\gamma_0 > 2$, then the variance of the trimmed IPW estimator is

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{W} \left[\frac{DY}{e(X)} \mathbf{1}_{e(X) \geq b_n} \right] &= \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{DY^2}{e(X)^2} \right] - \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{DY^2}{e(X)^2} \mathbf{1}_{e(X) \leq b_n} \right] - \frac{1}{n} (\theta_0 + B_{n, b_n})^2 \\ &= \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{W} \left[\frac{DY}{e(X)} \right] - \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{DY^2}{e(X)^2} \mathbf{1}_{e(X) \leq b_n} \right] (1 + o(1)), \end{aligned}$$

provided that $\mu_2(0) > 0$. In this case, the (asymptotic) mean squared error optimal trimming threshold is defined as the minimizer of:

$$\left[\int_0^{b_n} d\mathbb{P}[e(X) \leq x] \cdot \mu_1(0) \right]^2 - \frac{1}{n} \int_0^{b_n} x^{-1} d\mathbb{P}[e(X) \leq x] \cdot \mu_2(0),$$

which can be found by solving a first order condition and coincides with (5). The $\gamma_0 = 2$ case can be analyzed similarly, although one has to take extra care on a slowly varying term in the variance

expansion. Finally, we note that Theorem 4 remains valid and can be employed to estimate this optimal trimming threshold for $\gamma_0 \geq 2$. \parallel

3.4 Bias Correction and Robust Inference

To motivate our bias correction technique, recall that the bias is $B_{n,b_n} = -\mathbb{E}[\mu_1(e(X))\mathbf{1}_{e(X) \leq b_n}]$, where $\mu_1(\cdot)$ is the expectation of the outcome Y conditional on the probability weight and $D = 1$. Next, we replace the expectation by a sample average, and the unknown conditional expectation by a p -th order polynomial expansion, and the bias is approximated by

$$-\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\sum_{j=0}^p \frac{1}{j!} \mu_1^{(j)}(0) e(X_i)^j \right) \mathbf{1}_{e(X_i) \leq b_n}.$$

Here, $\mu_1^{(j)}(0)$ is the j -th derivative of $\mu_1(\cdot)$ evaluated at 0, and has to be estimated. Given that we do not impose parametric assumptions on the conditional expectation beyond certain degree of smoothness, we employ local polynomial regression (Fan and Gijbels, 1996).

Our procedure takes two steps. In the first step, one implements a p -th order local polynomial regression of the outcome variable on the probability weight using the $D = 1$ subsample in a region $[0, h_n]$, where $(h_n)_{n \geq 1}$ is a bandwidth sequence. In the second step, the estimated bias is constructed by replacing the unknown conditional expectation function and its derivatives by the first-step estimates. Following is the detailed algorithm, which is illustrated in Figure 3.

Algorithm 2 (Bias estimation)

Step 1. With the $D = 1$ subsample, regress the outcome variable Y_i on the (estimated) probability weight in a region $[0, h_n]$:

$$\left[\hat{\beta}_0, \hat{\beta}_1, \dots, \hat{\beta}_p \right]' = \underset{\beta_0, \beta_1, \dots, \beta_p}{\operatorname{argmin}} \sum_{i=1}^n D_i \left[Y_i - \sum_{j=0}^p \beta_j \hat{e}(X_i)^j \right]^2 \mathbf{1}_{\hat{e}(X_i) \leq h_n}.$$

Step 2. Construct the bias correction term as

$$\hat{B}_{n,b_n} = -\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\sum_{j=0}^p \hat{\beta}_j \hat{e}(X_i)^j \right) \mathbf{1}_{\hat{e}(X_i) \leq b_n},$$




Figure 3. Local polynomial bias correction

Note. (a) Illustration of the trimmed IPW estimator. Circles: trimmed observations. Solid dots: observations included in the estimator. Solid curve: conditional expectation function $\mathbb{E}[Y|e(X), D=1]$. (b) Illustration of the local polynomial regression. Solid dots: observations used in the local polynomial regression. Solid straight line: local linear regression function.

so that the bias-corrected estimator is $\hat{\theta}_{n,b_n}^{\text{bc}} = \hat{\theta}_{n,b_n} - \hat{\mathbf{B}}_{n,b_n}$. \parallel

By inspecting the bias-corrected estimator, our procedure can be understood as a “local regression adjustment,” since we replace the trimmed observations by its conditional expectation, which is further approximated by a local polynomial. In the local polynomial regression step, it is possible to incorporate other kernel functions: we use the uniform kernel $\mathbf{1}_{\hat{e}(X_i) \leq h_n}$ to avoid introducing additional notation, but all the main conclusions continue to hold with other commonly employed kernel functions, such as the triangular and Epanechnikov kernels. As for the order of local polynomial regression, common choices are $p = 1$ and 2, which reduce the bias to a satisfactory level without introducing too much additional variation.

Standard results from the local polynomial regression literature require the density of the design variable to be bounded away from zero, which is not satisfied in our context. When the probability weight is close to zero, it becomes very difficult to observe $D = 1$. Equivalently, in the subsample which we use for the local polynomial regression, the distribution of the probability

weights quickly vanishes near the origin.² As a result, nonstandard scaling is needed to derive large-sample properties of $\hat{\mu}_1^{(j)}(0)$. See the online Supplement for a precise statement.

The following theorem shows the validity of our bias correction procedure.

Theorem 5 (Large sample properties of the estimated bias)

Assume Assumptions 1 and 2 (and in addition Assumption 3 and 4 with estimated probability weights) hold. Further, assume (i) $\mu_1(\cdot)$ is $p + 1$ times continuously differentiable; (ii) $\mu_2(0) - \mu_1(0)^2 > 0$; (iii) the bandwidth sequence satisfies $nh_n^{2p+3}\mathbb{P}[e(X) \leq h_n] \asymp 1$; (iv) $nb_n^{2p+3}\mathbb{P}[e(X) \leq b_n] \rightarrow 0$. Then the bias correction is valid, and does not affect the asymptotic distribution:

$$\hat{\theta}_{n,b_n}^{\text{bc}} - \theta_0 = \left(\hat{\theta}_{n,b_n} - \mathbf{B}_{n,b_n} - \theta_0 \right) (1 + o_p(1)).$$

Theorem 5 has several important implications. First, our bias correction is valid for a wide range of trimming threshold choices, as long as the trimming threshold does not shrink to zero too slowly: $nb_n^{2p+3}\mathbb{P}[e(X) \leq b_n] \rightarrow 0$. However, fixed trimming $b_n = b \in (0, 1)$ is ruled out (except for the trivial case where the probability weight is already bounded away from zero). This is not surprising, since under fixed trimming the correct scaling is \sqrt{n} , and generally the bias cannot be estimated at this rate without additional parametric assumptions.

Second, it gives a guidance on how the bandwidth for the local polynomial regression can be chosen. In practice, this is done by solving $n\hat{h}_n^{2p+3}\hat{\mathbb{P}}[e(X) \leq \hat{h}_n] = c$ for some $c > 0$, so that the resulting bandwidth makes the (squared) bias and variance of the local polynomial regression the same order. A simple strategy is to set $c = 1$. It is also possible to construct a bandwidth that minimizes the leading mean squared error of the local polynomial regression, for which c has to be estimated in a pilot step (see the online Supplement for a complete characterization of the leading bias and variance of the local polynomial regression).

Finally, it shows how trimming and bias correction together can help improve the convergence rate of the (untrimmed) IPW estimator. From Theorem 3(ii), we have $|\hat{\theta}_{n,b_n} - \theta_0 - \mathbf{B}_{n,b_n}| = O_p((n/a_{n,b_n})^{-1})$, where the convergence rate $n/a_{n,b_n}$ is typically faster when a heavier trimming is employed. This, however, should not be interpreted as a real improvement, as the trimming bias

²More precisely, $\mathbb{P}[e(X) \leq x|D = 1] \prec x$ as $x \downarrow 0$, meaning that in the $D = 1$ subsample, the density of the probability weights (if it exists) tends to zero: $f_{e(X)|D=1}(0) = 0$.

can be so large that the researcher effectively changes the target estimand to $\theta_0 - \mathbb{B}_{n,b_n}$. with bias correction, it is possible to achieve a faster rate of convergence for the target estimand, since under the assumptions of Theorem 5, one has $|\hat{\theta}_{n,b_n}^{\text{bc}} - \theta_0| = O_p((n/a_{n,b_n})^{-1})$, which is valid for a wide range of trimming threshold choices.

Together with our bias correction technique, subsampling can be employed to conduct statistical inference and to construct confidence intervals that are valid for the target estimand. Although Theorem 5 states that estimating the bias does not have a first order contribution to the limiting distribution, it may still introduce additional variability in finite samples (Calonico, Cattaneo and Farrell, 2018). Therefore, we recommend subsampling the bias-corrected statistic.

Algorithm 3 (Robust inference using the trimmed IPW estimator)

Let $\hat{\theta}_{n,b_n}^{\text{bc}}$ be defined as in Algorithm 2, and

$$S_{n,b_n} = \sqrt{\frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\frac{D_i Y_i}{\hat{e}(X_i)} \mathbb{1}_{\hat{e}(X_i) \geq b_n} - \hat{\theta}_{n,b_n}^{\text{bc}} \right)^2}.$$

Step 1. Sample $m \ll n$ observations from the original data without replacement, denoted by (Y_i^*, D_i^*, X_i^*) , $i = 1, 2, \dots, m$.

Step 2. Construct the trimmed IPW estimator and the bias correction term from the new subsample, and the bias-corrected and self-normalized statistic as

$$T_{m,b_m}^* = \sqrt{m} \frac{\hat{\theta}_{m,b_m}^{*\text{bc}} - \hat{\theta}_{n,b_n}^{\text{bc}}}{S_{m,b_m}}, \quad S_{m,b_m} = \sqrt{\frac{1}{m-1} \sum_{i=1}^m \left(\frac{D_i^* Y_i^*}{\hat{e}^*(X_i^*)} \mathbb{1}_{\hat{e}^*(X_i^*) \geq b_m} - \hat{\theta}_{m,b_m}^{*\text{bc}} \right)^2}.$$

Step 3. Repeat Step 1 and 2, and a $(1 - \alpha)\%$ -confidence interval can be constructed as

$$\left[\hat{\theta}_{n,b_n}^{\text{bc}} - S_{n,b_n} \cdot q_{1-\frac{\alpha}{2}}(T_{m,b_m}^*) \quad , \quad \hat{\theta}_{n,b_n}^{\text{bc}} - S_{n,b_n} \cdot q_{\frac{\alpha}{2}}(T_{m,b_m}^*) \right],$$

where $q_{(\cdot)}(T_{m,b_m}^*)$ denotes the quantile of the statistic T_{m,b_m}^* . ||

Same as Theorem 2, the validity of our inference procedure relies on establishing a limiting distribution for the self-normalized statistic, $T_{n,b_n} = \sqrt{n}(\hat{\theta}_{n,b_n}^{\text{bc}} - \theta_0)/S_{n,b_n}$. This is relatively easy if $\gamma_0 \geq 2$ or a heavy trimming is employed, in which case T_{n,b_n} is asymptotically Gaussian. With light or moderate trimming under $\gamma_0 < 2$, the limiting distribution of T_{n,b_n} depends on the trimming

threshold and is quite complicated. This technical by-product generalizes [Logan, Mallows, Rice and Shepp \(1973\)](#). We leave the details to the online Supplement.

Theorem 6 (Validity of robust inference)

Under the assumptions of Theorem 1 (or Proposition 2 with estimated probability weights) and Theorem 5, and assume $m \rightarrow \infty$ and $m/n \rightarrow 0$. Then

$$\sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}} \left| \mathbb{P}[T_{n,b_n} \leq t] - \mathbb{P}^*[T_{m,b_m}^* \leq t] \right| \xrightarrow{P} 0.$$

4 Extensions

In this section, we discuss two extensions of the current framework. In the first extension, we consider the problem of estimating the average treatment effect under selection on observables. In the second extension, we consider a general estimating equation where the parameter is defined by a possibly nonlinear moment condition, not necessarily a population mean.

4.1 Average Treatment Effect

Given the prominent role of the average treatment effect (ATE) in program evaluation and causal inference, we consider how the IPW framework can be generalized to provide robust inference for the ATE. Let the binary indicator denote a treatment status, $D = 1$ for the treatment group and 0 for the control group. The corresponding potential outcomes are denoted by $Y(1)$ and $Y(0)$, respectively, so that the observed outcome is $Y = DY(1) + (1 - D)Y(0)$. Throughout this subsection, we maintain the selection on observables assumption that, conditional on the covariates X , D and $(Y(1), Y(0))$ are independent. Following the convention in the literature, we use the terminology “propensity score” rather than probability weight.

Assumption 1 has to be generalized, since in this context both small and large propensity scores pose challenges for estimation and inference.

Assumption ATE-1

For some $\gamma_0 > 1$ and $\omega \in [0, 1]$,

$$\lim_{t \downarrow 0} \frac{\mathbb{P}[e(X) \leq t]}{\mathbb{P}[e(X) \leq t] + \mathbb{P}[1 - e(X) \leq t]} = \omega,$$

$$\text{and } \lim_{t \downarrow 0} \frac{\mathbb{P}[e(X) \leq tx] + \mathbb{P}[1 - e(X) \leq tx]}{\mathbb{P}[e(X) \leq t] + \mathbb{P}[1 - e(X) \leq t]} = x^{\gamma_0 - 1}, \quad \text{for all } x > 0.$$

Note that we do not require the two tails having the same index, since it is possible to have $\omega = 0$ or 1. Asymptotically, the heavier tail “wins.” As discussed before, the above condition implies $\mathbb{P}[e(X) = 0] = \mathbb{P}[e(X) = 1] = 0$, meaning that the ATE is identified by $\theta_0 = \mathbb{E}[Y(1) - Y(0)] = \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{(2D-1)Y}{1-D+(2D-1)e(X)}\right]$, which also motivates the following inverse weighting estimator:

$$\hat{\theta}_n = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left[\frac{D_i Y_i}{e(X_i)} - \frac{(1 - D_i) Y_i}{1 - e(X_i)} \right] = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{(2D_i - 1) Y_i}{1 - D_i + (2D_i - 1)e(X_i)}. \quad (6)$$

Assumption 2 also needs to be modified to take into account that both potential outcomes can affect the tail behavior of the estimator.

Assumption ATE-2

For some $\varepsilon > 0$, $\mathbb{E}[|Y(1) + Y(0)|^{(\gamma_0 \vee 2) + \varepsilon} | e(X) = x]$ is uniformly bounded. Further, there exist probability distributions, $F_{(1)}$ and $F_{(0)}$, such that for all bounded and continuous $\ell(\cdot)$, $\mathbb{E}[\ell(Y(1)) | e(X) = x] \rightarrow \int \ell(y) F_{(1)}(dy)$ and $\mathbb{E}[\ell(Y(0)) | e(X) = 1 - x] \rightarrow \int \ell(y) F_{(0)}(dy)$ as $x \downarrow 0$.

Together, Assumption ATE-1 and ATE-2 suffice to give a tail condition on $\frac{(2D-1)Y}{(1-D+(2D-1)e(X))}$. For future reference, define

$$\alpha_{(1),+}(x) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \mathbb{E}\left[|Y(1)|^{\gamma_0} \mathbf{1}_{Y(1) > x} \middle| e(X) = t\right], \quad \alpha_{(1),-}(x) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \mathbb{E}\left[|Y(1)|^{\gamma_0} \mathbf{1}_{Y(1) < x} \middle| e(X) = t\right]$$

$$\alpha_{(0),+}(x) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \mathbb{E}\left[|Y(0)|^{\gamma_0} \mathbf{1}_{Y(0) > x} \middle| e(X) = 1 - t\right], \quad \alpha_{(0),-}(x) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \mathbb{E}\left[|Y(0)|^{\gamma_0} \mathbf{1}_{Y(0) < x} \middle| e(X) = 1 - t\right],$$

and re-define $\alpha_+(x)$ and $\alpha_-(x)$ as:

$$\alpha_+(x) = \omega \alpha_{(1),+}(x) + (1 - \omega) \alpha_{(0),-}(-x), \quad \alpha_-(x) = \omega \alpha_{(1),-}(x) + (1 - \omega) \alpha_{(0),+}(-x).$$

Proposition 3 (Large sample properties of the ATE estimator)

Assume Assumptions [ATE-1](#) and [ATE-2](#) hold with $\alpha_+(0) + \alpha_-(0) > 0$. Let a_n be defined from

$$\frac{n}{a_n^2} \mathbb{E} \left[\left| \frac{(2D-1)Y}{1-D+(2D-1)e(X)} - \theta_0 \right|^2 \mathbf{1}_{\left| \frac{(2D-1)Y}{1-D+(2D-1)e(X)} \right| \leq a_n} \right] \rightarrow 1.$$

Then $\frac{n}{a_n}(\hat{\theta}_n - \theta_0)$ converges in distribution, with the limit being:

(i) the standard Gaussian distribution if $\gamma_0 \geq 2$; and

(ii) the Lévy stable distribution if $\gamma_0 < 2$, with characteristic function:

$$\psi(\zeta) = \exp \left\{ \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{e^{i\zeta x} - 1 - i\zeta x}{x^2} M(dx) \right\},$$

$$\text{where } M(dx) = dx \left[\frac{2 - \gamma_0}{\alpha_+(0) + \alpha_-(0)} |x|^{1-\gamma_0} \left(\alpha_+(0) \mathbf{1}_{x \geq 0} + \alpha_-(0) \mathbf{1}_{x < 0} \right) \right].$$

Proposition [3](#) and Theorem [1](#) share common features. For example, the limiting distribution can be both Gaussian and non-Gaussian depending on the tail behavior of the propensity score (probability weight). In the latter case, the limiting distribution is smooth, heavy-tailed but not necessarily symmetric (and usually does not have a closed-form density function).

For ATE estimation, trimming can lead to further complications beyond affecting the limiting distribution and introducing a bias: different trimming thresholds can be applied to the treatment and control groups. For the treatment group ($D = 1$), it is natural to discard observations with small propensity scores, while for the control group ($D = 0$) observations with large propensity scores will be dropped. To see how having two trimming thresholds can complicate the asymptotic analysis, assume $\omega = 1$ so that the propensity score has a heavier left tail, and Proposition [3](#) essentially reduces to Theorem [1](#). When different trimming thresholds are applied to small and large propensity scores in the treatment and control groups, however, the relative magnitude of the two tails can be overturned. To see this, consider the extreme scenario where fixed trimming is applied to the treatment group but no trimming for the control group. Then the trimmed ATE estimator will be greatly influenced by the relatively heavier right tail of the propensity score (i.e., “small denominators” in the $D = 0$ subsample). To avoid cumbersome notation and lengthy discussions on each possible scenarios, we instead focus on a concrete trimming strategy, which illuminates how trimming affects the IPW-based ATE estimator, yet does not complicate

the analysis too much. We consider the following trimmed ATE estimator:

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{\theta}_{n,b_n} &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left[\frac{D_i Y_i}{e(X_i)} \mathbf{1}_{e(X_i) \geq b_n} - \frac{(1-D_i) Y_i}{1-e(X_i)} \mathbf{1}_{e(X_i) \leq 1-b_n} \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{(2D_i - 1) Y_i}{1 - D_i + (2D_i - 1)e(X_i)} \mathbf{1}_{1-D_i+(2D_i-1)e(X_i) \geq b_n}.\end{aligned}\quad (7)$$

The above trimming strategy can be understood as “discarding observations with small denominators.” It is different, however, from “discarding observations with small or large propensity scores,” since an observation in the control group is never trimmed because of a small propensity score, and similarly, an observation in the treatment group is not trimmed even if it has a large propensity score.

The “symmetric trimming” in (7) is easy to analyze and implement, but employing different trimming thresholds is also justified in practice. As discussed, trimming introduces a bias which is generally non-negligible. For estimating the ATE, however, it is possible to achieve “small bias” by choosing the two trimming thresholds appropriately. To see this, the trimming bias in (7) is $B_{n,b_n} = \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[Y(0)|e(X)] \mathbf{1}_{e(X) \geq 1-b_n} - \mathbb{E}[Y(1)|e(X)] \mathbf{1}_{e(X) \leq b_n}] \approx \mathbb{E}[Y(0)|e(X) = 1] \mathbb{P}[e(X) \geq 1 - b_n] - \mathbb{E}[Y(1)|e(X) = 0] \mathbb{P}[e(X) \leq b_n]$. Assuming that the propensity score has similar tails at the two ends and that the two conditional expectations have the same sign and magnitude, then it is possible to use different trimming thresholds so that the two components in the bias formula cancel each other. However, this strategy is not always feasible, especially when the two tails of the propensity scores behave very differently.

Proposition 4 (Large sample properties of the trimmed ATE estimator)

Assume Assumptions [ATE-1](#) and [ATE-2](#) hold with $\gamma_0 < 2$ and $\alpha_+(0) + \alpha_-(0) > 0$. Further, let a_n be defined as in Theorem 1.

- (i) For $b_n a_n \rightarrow 0$, let $a_{n,b_n} = a_n$, then $\frac{n}{a_{n,b_n}}(\hat{\theta}_{n,b_n} - \theta_0 - B_{n,b_n})$ converges to the Lévy stable distribution in Proposition 3(ii).
- (ii) For $b_n a_n \rightarrow \infty$, let $a_{n,b_n} = \sqrt{n \mathbb{W}[\frac{(2D-1)Y}{(1-D+(2D-1)e(X))} \mathbf{1}_{1-D+(2D-1)e(X) \geq b_n}]}$, then $\frac{n}{a_{n,b_n}}(\hat{\theta}_{n,b_n} - \theta_0 - B_{n,b_n})$ converges to the standard Gaussian distribution.
- (iii) For $\frac{b_n}{a_n} \rightarrow t \in (0, \infty)$, let $a_{n,b_n} = a_n$, then $\frac{n}{a_{n,b_n}}(\hat{\theta}_{n,b_n} - \theta_0 - B_{n,b_n})$ converges to an infinitely

divisible distribution with characteristic function:

$$\psi(\zeta) = \exp \left\{ \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{e^{i\zeta x} - 1 - i\zeta x}{x^2} M(dx) \right\},$$

$$\text{where } M(dx) = dx \left[\frac{2 - \gamma_0}{\alpha_+(0) + \alpha_-(0)} |x|^{1-\gamma_0} \left(\alpha_+(tx) \mathbf{1}_{x \geq 0} + \alpha_-(tx) \mathbf{1}_{x < 0} \right) \right].$$

Bias correction can be implemented according to Algorithm 2 with a straightforward modification: one first runs two local polynomial regressions, one for the treatment group and another for the control group:

$$\begin{aligned} [\hat{\beta}_0^1, \hat{\beta}_1^1, \dots, \hat{\beta}_p^1]' &= \underset{\beta_0, \beta_1, \dots, \beta_p}{\operatorname{argmin}} \sum_{i=1}^n D_i \left[Y_i - \sum_{j=0}^p \beta_j \hat{e}(X_i)^j \right]^2 \mathbf{1}_{\hat{e}(X_i) \leq h_n} \\ [\hat{\beta}_0^r, \hat{\beta}_1^r, \dots, \hat{\beta}_p^r]' &= \underset{\beta_0, \beta_1, \dots, \beta_p}{\operatorname{argmin}} \sum_{i=1}^n (1 - D_i) \left[Y_i - \sum_{j=0}^p \beta_j \hat{e}(X_i)^j \right]^2 \mathbf{1}_{\hat{e}(X_i) \geq 1 - h_n}. \end{aligned}$$

Then the bias is estimated by

$$\hat{B}_{n, b_n} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=0}^p \left(\hat{\beta}_j^r \mathbf{1}_{\hat{e}(X_i) \geq 1 - b_n} - \hat{\beta}_j^1 \mathbf{1}_{\hat{e}(X_i) \leq b_n} \right) \hat{e}(X_i)^j.$$

We assume the same bandwidth h_n is used for the two local polynomial regressions for simplicity, although in practice different bandwidths can be employed.

4.2 General Estimating Equation

We employ the same notation used in Section 1, but instead of assuming the parameter being a population mean, θ_0 is defined by a possibly nonlinear moment condition $\mathbb{E}[\mu_1(e(X), \theta_0)] = 0$, where $\mu_1(e(X), \theta) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathbb{E}[g(Y, X, \theta) | e(X), D = 1]$, and g is a known function. Alternatively, we have $\mathbb{E}[Dg(Y_i, X_i, \theta_0)/e(X)] = 0$. For ease of exposition, we assume that both the parameter and the moment condition are univariate. To estimate θ_0 , one can solve the following sample analogue of the moment condition:

$$0 = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{D_i g(Y_i, X_i, \hat{\theta}_n)}{e(X_i)}.$$

To interpret the parameter, consider a missing data model where a true outcome variable Y° is observed if and only if $D = 1$. Then the parameter is alternatively defined as the solution of the infeasible moment condition: $\mathbb{E}[g(Y_i^\circ, X_i, \theta_0)] = 0$.

Consistency of $\hat{\theta}_n$ can be established with a uniform law of large numbers (see, for example, [Newey and McFadden 1994](#)). Given that $\hat{\theta}_n$ is consistent, it is possible to employ a Taylor expansion provided that $g(\cdot)$ is continuously differentiable in θ , and under mild regularity conditions, one can show

$$\frac{n}{a_n}(\hat{\theta}_n - \theta_0) = \frac{\Sigma_0}{a_n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{D_i g(Y_i, X_i, \theta_0)}{e(X_i)} + o_p(1), \quad \Sigma_0 = \left(-\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \mu_1(e(X), \theta_0) \right] \right)^{-1}, \quad (8)$$

where n/a_n is a normalizing sequence which we specify in [Proposition 5](#). Once the estimator has been linearized as above, we can prove a result similar to [Theorem 1](#). To economize notation, define the random variables $G_i(\theta) = g(Y_i, X_i, \theta)$ and $G_i = G_i(\theta_0)$. We make the following assumption.

Assumption GEE-1

- (i) θ_0 is the unique root of $\mathbb{E}[\mu_1(e(X), \theta)] = 0$ in the interior of a compact parameter space Θ .
- (ii) $g(Y, X, \theta)$ is continuously differentiable in θ , and $\mathbb{E}[\sup_{\theta \in \Theta} |g(Y_i, X_i, \theta)| \vee |\frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} g(Y_i, X_i, \theta)|] < \infty$.
- (iii) For some $\varepsilon > 0$, $\mathbb{E}[|G|^{(\gamma_0 \vee 2) + \varepsilon} | e(X) = x, D = 1]$ is uniformly bounded.
- (iv) There exists a probability distribution F , such that for any bounded and continuous function ℓ , $\mathbb{E}[\ell(G) | e(X) = x, D = 1] \rightarrow \int_{\mathbb{R}} \ell(y) F(dy)$ as $x \downarrow 0$.

For future reference, define

$$\alpha_{G,+}(x) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \mathbb{E} \left[|G|^{\gamma_0} \mathbf{1}_{G > x} \middle| e(X) = t, D = 1 \right], \quad \alpha_{G,-}(x) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \mathbb{E} \left[|G|^{\gamma_0} \mathbf{1}_{G < x} \middle| e(X) = t, D = 1 \right].$$

The following proposition characterizes the large-sample properties of the (IPW-based) GEE estimator $\hat{\theta}_n$.

Proposition 5 (Large sample properties of the GEE estimator)

Assume [Assumptions 1](#) and [GEE-1](#) hold with $\alpha_{G,+}(0) + \alpha_{G,-}(0) > 0$. Let a_n be such that

$$\frac{n}{a_n^2} \mathbb{E} \left[\left| \frac{DG}{e(X)} \right|^2 \mathbf{1}_{|DG/e(X)| \leq a_n} \right] \rightarrow 1,$$

then (8) holds, with the limiting distribution being:

(i) $\mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma_0^2)$ if $\gamma_0 \geq 2$; and

(ii) the Lévy stable distribution if $\gamma_0 < 2$, with characteristic function:

$$\psi(\zeta) = \exp \left\{ \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{e^{i\Sigma_0\zeta x} - 1 - i\Sigma_0\zeta x}{x^2} M(dx) \right\},$$

$$\text{where } M(dx) = dx \left[\frac{2 - \gamma_0}{\alpha_{G,+}(0) + \alpha_{G,-}(0)} |x|^{1-\gamma_0} \left(\alpha_{G,+}(0) \mathbf{1}_{x \geq 0} + \alpha_{G,-}(0) \mathbf{1}_{x < 0} \right) \right].$$

When applied in applications, Proposition 5 has to be interpreted carefully. This is especially true for Assumption GEE-1(iv), given that now it is possible for the covariates to enter g . To fully understand the scope and limitations of this condition, we consider two concrete situations. In the first case, we assume $g(Y, X, \theta) = g(Y, \theta)$, so that the moment function does not depend on the covariates explicitly. Then Assumption 2 and that g is continuous in Y together are sufficient to justify Assumption GEE-1(iv), thanks to the continuous mapping theorem. In the second case, we assume (for notational simplicity) the covariate is also univariate, and the probability weight takes a logistic form: $e(X) = e^{-X}/(1 + e^{-X})$. Then conditioning on the probability weight being close to zero requires the covariate diverging to infinity. Depending on how the covariate enters the moment function g , Assumption GEE-1(iv) needs to be checked in each case. One possibility is to let g be jointly continuous in Y and X , and $\lim_{x \downarrow 0} g(y, x, \theta_0) = \tilde{g}(y, \theta_0)$, for some function \tilde{g} . In cases where \tilde{g} is degenerate or explosive, one needs to establish an analogous result of Lemma 1 to characterize the tail behavior of the ratio $DG/e(X)$, which now can be affected by both the probability weight and G . Nevertheless, Proposition 5 is the first step we take to extend the IPW framework to handling a general and possibly nonlinear estimating equation.

Trimming can be implemented in an obvious way, as

$$0 = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{D_i g(Y_i, X_i, \hat{\theta}_{n,b_n})}{e(X_i)} \mathbf{1}_{e(X_i) \geq b_n}.$$

As long as the trimming threshold b_n shrinks to zero as the sample size increases, $\hat{\theta}_{n,b_n}$ will be consistent for θ_0 . Assuming this is the case, we can again employ a Taylor expansion and linearize

the estimator:

$$\frac{n}{a_{n,b_n}}(\hat{\theta}_{n,b_n} - \theta_0 - \Sigma_0 \mathbf{B}_{n,b_n}) = \frac{\Sigma_0}{a_{n,b_n}} \sum_{i=1}^n \left[\frac{D_i G_i}{e(X_i)} \mathbf{1}_{e(X_i) \geq b_n} - \mathbf{B}_{n,b_n} \right] + o_p(1),$$

where $\mathbf{B}_{n,b_n} = -\mathbb{E}[\mu_1(e(X), \theta_0) \mathbf{1}_{e(X) \leq b_n}]$. (9)

In this case, the bias term we recover only represents the leading bias in an asymptotic linear expansion, with higher order bias absorbed into the $o_p(1)$ term. The bias arises because after trimming the estimating equation may not have a zero mean in finite samples. Assuming $\mu_1(\cdot)$ is continuous in its first argument, the bias can be further simplified as $\mathbf{B}_{n,b_n} = -\mu_1(0, \theta_0) \mathbb{P}[e(X) \leq b_n]$, which gives its precise order. From this, one can immediately see that if $\mu_1(x, \theta_0) = 0$ for all x small enough, trimming does not induce any bias, and at the same time can greatly improve the performance of the IPW estimator. Such “small bias” scenario, however, is difficult to justify in practice because it requires that the information provided by observations with small probability weights does not feature in the estimating equation.

Proposition 6 (Large sample properties of the trimmed GEE estimator)

Assume Assumptions 1 and GEE-1 hold with $\gamma_0 < 2$ and $\alpha_{G,+}(0) + \alpha_{G,-}(0) > 0$. Let a_n be defined as in Proposition 5.

- (i) For $b_n a_n \rightarrow 0$, let $a_{n,b_n} = a_n$, then (9) holds and converges to the Lévy stable distribution in Proposition 5(ii).
- (ii) For $b_n a_n \rightarrow \infty$, let $a_{n,b_n} = \sqrt{n \mathbb{W}[DG/e(X) \mathbf{1}_{e(X) \geq b_n}]}$, then (9) holds and converges to the Gaussian distribution $\mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma_0^2)$.
- (iii) For $\frac{b_n}{a_n} \rightarrow t \in (0, \infty)$, let $a_{n,b_n} = a_n$. Then (9) holds and converges to an infinitely divisible distribution, with characteristic function:

$$\psi(\zeta) = \exp \left\{ \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{e^{i \Sigma_0 \zeta x} - 1 - i \Sigma_0 \zeta x}{x^2} M(dx) \right\},$$

where $M(dx) = dx \left[\frac{2 - \gamma_0}{\alpha_{G,+}(0) + \alpha_{G,-}(0)} |x|^{1-\gamma_0} \left(\alpha_{G,+}(tx) \mathbf{1}_{x \geq 0} + \alpha_{G,-}(tx) \mathbf{1}_{x < 0} \right) \right]$.

Both Proposition 5 and 6 can be further generalized to a vector-valued parameter. As long as the moment condition permits identification (and consistent estimation), one can employ the

Cramér-Wold device to characterize the limiting distribution.

Selecting the trimming threshold is slightly more complicated than before, since now the conditional first and second moment cannot be estimated directly. A three-step procedure can be employed. In the first step, one constructs either the untrimmed IPW estimator or the trimmed estimator using some pilot trimming threshold. Next, one can estimate the conditional moments with the local polynomial regression approach using either $G_i(\hat{\theta}_n)$ or $G_i(\hat{\theta}_{n,b_n})$ as the dependent variable. In the final step, the trimming threshold is chosen by plugging the second-step estimates into the procedure in Theorem 4.

As a final remark, bias correction is still feasible in this setting by exploiting the asymptotic linear representation in (9). To form the bias estimate, one can employ the local polynomial regression technique and regress $G_i(\hat{\theta}_{n,b_n})$ on the probability weights to form an estimate of the bias B_{n,b_n} (Algorithm 2). Then the final bias estimator can be constructed as $\hat{\Sigma}_n B_{n,b_n}$, where $\hat{\Sigma}_n$ estimates Σ_0 as a sample average.

5 Numerical Evidence

This section studies the performance of our inference procedures developed in Section 2 and 3 with a Monte Carlo experiment. We highlight how trimming can introduce a nonnegligible bias, which in turn leads to severe under-coverage/over-rejection of conventional confidence intervals. We further showcase our bias correction technique and how it satisfactorily restores the empirical coverage of subsampling-based confidence intervals to the nominal level. Finally, we apply our inference procedures to a dataset from the National Supported Work program.

5.1 Simulation Study

The probability weight is distributed according to $\mathbb{P}[e(X) \leq x] = x^{\gamma_0-1}$ with $\gamma_0 = 1.5$. A typical realization is given in Figure 1, which resembles the distribution of the estimated probability weights in our empirical application (Figure 2). With $\gamma_0 = 1.5$, the convergence rate of the IPW estimator is $n^{1/3}$. Conditional on the weight and $D = 1$, the outcome variable is distributed according to $\mu_1(e(X)) + \eta$, where the mean equation is either $\cos(2\pi e(X))$ or $1 - e(X)$, and the error η follows a chi-square distribution with four degrees of freedom, centered and scaled to have a zero mean and

unit variance. The first specification represents the empirical difficulty of “small denominators” combined with unrestricted conditional mean heterogeneity of the outcome variable, as the conditional mean function is nonlinear in the probability weight. A typical realization of the outcome variable is given in Figure 3. In the second specification, the leading bias remains the same, but the conditional mean function is linear in the probability weight. Our bias correction technique is therefore expected to perform well. Throughout, we use 5,000 Monte Carlo repetitions, and for each repetition, 1,000 subsampling iterations are used with subsample size $m = \lfloor n/\log(n) \rfloor$, and the full sample size is $n \in \{2,000, 5,000, 10,000\}$. Additional simulation evidence is available in the online Supplement. We follow Theorem 4 to set the trimming threshold, by solving $\hat{b}_n^s \hat{\mathbb{P}}[e(X_i) \leq \hat{b}_n] = (2n)^{-1}$ with $s \in \{1, 1.5, 2, 3\}$. For $s = 1$, the trimming threshold is rate optimal (in terms of the leading mean squared error) and corresponds to moderate trimming. The other cases fall into the heavy trimming category. Bias correction is based on Algorithm 2, for which we employ a local linear regression.

The simulation results are collected in Table 1 and 2. We compute the bias, standard deviation, root mean squared error, empirical coverage of a nominal 95% confidence interval, and the average confidence interval length. Note that the bias, standard deviation, root mean squared error and the average confidence interval length are scaled by $n^{1-1/\gamma_0} = n^{1/3}$. In the following, we highlight several observations from the simulation results in Table 1.

First, the trimming threshold is quite small even with heavy trimming. This is in stark contrast to the common practice to fix the trimming threshold, say, at 0.1. Indeed, in a sample of size 2,000, using 0.1 as the trimming threshold will lead to a bias that is so severe that a nominal 95% confidence interval will have practically zero coverage. This shows why it is important to combine bias correction with a disciplined method to choose the trimming threshold, and how ad hoc trimming can be detrimental for statistical inference: the researcher essentially changes the target estimand.

Second, it is not surprising that employing a larger trimming threshold can help stabilize the estimator, leading to a smaller empirical standard deviation and a shorter confidence interval length. However, the mean squared error increases due to the trimming bias. Indeed, by comparing the scaled bias across the three panels in Table 1, it is clear that the bias is explosive when heavy trimming is used.

Third, despite the fact that the conditional mean function is highly nonlinear, our bias correction procedure successfully removes most of the bias, and helps to restore the empirical coverage of the subsampling-based confidence intervals to the 95% nominal level. The performance of our inference procedure is quite robust across a range of trimming threshold choices. For the very heavy trimming case, under-coverage remains to be an issue even with bias correction, because it is quite difficult to estimate a nonlinear function local to a point where observations are sparse. In addition, bias correction may introduce extra variability in samples of moderate size. This is again confirmed by our simulation results, and is why we recommend to conduct bias correction not only for the main estimator, but also in each subsampling iteration.

Now we consider how the form of the conditional mean function affects the performance of our procedure. In Table 2, the conditional mean is a linear function of the probability weight. If this is known a priori, a better estimation strategy is to fit a global linear regression and extrapolate to observations with small probability weights. Such regression-based estimator will converge at the \sqrt{n} -rate and be asymptotically Gaussian. In practice, however, the shape of the conditional mean function is rarely known, so the setting in Table 2 is best understood as a favorable situation in which our bias correction and inference procedure are expected to perform well. Indeed, the remaining bias is almost zero, and the subsampling-based confidence interval has empirical coverage very close to the nominal 95% level.

5.2 Empirical Application

In this section, we revisit a dataset from the National Supported Work (NSW) program. Our aim is neither to give a thorough evaluation of the program nor to discuss to what extent experimental estimates can be recovered by nonexperimental methods. Rather, we use it as an empirical illustration of how small probability weights may affect the performance of the IPW estimator and to showcase our robust inference procedures.

The NSW is a labor training program implemented in 1970's by providing work experience, from 6 to 18 months, to individuals who face social or economic difficulties. It has been analyzed in multiple studies and along different directions since LaLonde (1986). We use the same dataset employed in Dehejia and Wahba (1999), and refer interested readers to the original work for detailed discussion on institutional background, variable definition, and sample inclusion. Briefly, our

sample consists of the treated individuals in the NSW experimental group (sample size 185), and a nonexperimental comparison group from the Panel Study of Income Dynamics (PSID, sample size 1,157). Besides the binary treatment indicator ($D = 1$ for NSW treated units and 0 for PSID comparison units) and the main outcome variable (Y) of post-intervention earning measured in 1978, information on age, education, marital status, ethnicity and earnings in 1974 and 1975 are also available as pre-intervention individual characteristics (X). We follow the literature and estimate the probability weight in a Logit model with `age`, `education`, `earn1974`, `earn1975`, `age`², `education`², `earn1974`², `earn1975`², three indicators for `married`, `black` and `hispanic`, and an interaction term between `black` and unemployment status in 1974: `black` \times `u74`. The average treatment effect (see Section 4.1) is then estimated by:

$$\hat{\tau}_{n,b_n} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left[\frac{DY}{\hat{e}(X_i)} \mathbf{1}_{\hat{e}(X_i) \geq b_n} - \frac{(1-D)Y}{1 - \hat{e}(X_i)} \mathbf{1}_{\hat{e}(X_i) \leq 1-b_n} \right],$$

where b_n is the common trimming threshold used to protect against small and large probability weights. Figure 2 plots the distribution of the estimated probability weights. Since $\gamma_0 = 2$ roughly corresponds to uniformly distributed probability weights, the tail index in the NSW dataset should be well below 2, suggesting that standard inference procedures based on the Gaussian approximation may not perform well.

In Figure 4, we plot the bias-corrected average treatment effect estimates (solid triangles) and the robust 95% confidence intervals (solid vertical lines) with different trimming thresholds b_n . For comparison, we also show conventional point estimates and confidence intervals (solid dots and dashed vertical lines) using the same trimming thresholds.³ Without trimming, the point estimate is \$2,792 with an extremely wide confidence interval $[-1,440, 114,108]$. In addition, the robust confidence interval is asymmetric around the point estimate, a feature also predicted by our theory: small probability weights affect the estimation of $\mathbb{E}[Y(1)]$ and will subsequently contribute to a long right tail for the estimator, since the outcome variable is nonnegative (we also observe

³The conventional estimator is constructed as

$$\frac{1}{\#\{b_n \leq \hat{e}(X_i) \leq 1 - b_n\}} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left[\frac{DY}{\hat{e}(X_i)} - \frac{(1-D)Y}{1 - \hat{e}(X_i)} \right] \mathbf{1}_{b_n \leq \hat{e}(X_i) \leq 1 - b_n},$$

where $\#\{b_n \leq \hat{e}(X_i) \leq 1 - b_n\}$ is the effective sample size. Confidence intervals are obtained by the standard nonparametric bootstrap.




Figure 4. Empirical illustration: average treatment effect estimation and inference

Note. Estimated treatment effects with different trimming thresholds. Numbers below the horizontal axis show (i) the trimming threshold and (ii) the effective number of trimmed observations.

some probability weights close to 1 in Figure 2, but they are far less prominent compared to the cluster of probability weights near 0).

For the trimmed IPW estimator, the trimming thresholds are chosen following Theorem 4, and the bandwidths used for bias correction are $h_n = 0.25$ and 0.63 , respectively. Under the mean squared error optimal trimming, units in the treatment group with probability weights below 0.003 (one observation) and units in the control group with probability weights above 0.997 (zero observation) are discarded. Compared to the untrimmed case, the robust confidence interval becomes shorter and more symmetric.

In this empirical example, a noteworthy feature of our method is that both the bias-corrected point estimates and the robust confidence intervals remain quite stable for a range of trimming

threshold choices. This is in stark contrast to conventional confidence intervals. First, conventional large sample approximations fail to adapt to the non-Gaussian limiting distributions we documented in Theorem 1 and 3, leading to confidence intervals that are overly optimistic/narrow. Second, by ignoring the trimming bias, conventional large sample approximations are only valid for a pseudo-true parameter implicitly defined by the trimming threshold. As a result, the researcher changes the target estimand each time a different trimming threshold is used, making conventional confidence intervals very sensitive to b_n .

In the online Supplement, we also report results obtained with (i) different trimming thresholds for small and large probability weights, and (ii) only small probability weights being trimmed. Our main findings and conclusions remain the same.

6 Conclusion

We study the large-sample properties of the Inverse Probability Weighting (IPW) estimator. We show that this estimator may have a slower-than- \sqrt{n} convergence rate and a non-Gaussian distribution can emerge in the presence of small probability weights. We also study the effect of discarding observations with small probability weights, and show that such trimming not only complicates the limiting distribution, but also causes a non-negligible bias. As a consequence, inference based on the standard Gaussian approximation can be highly unreliable when ad hoc trimming rules are used. We consider two extensions of our basic framework, one for the average treatment effect and the other for parameters defined by a nonlinear estimating equation, and show that the aforementioned conclusions continue to hold more generally.

We propose an inference procedure that is robust not only to small probability weights entering the IPW estimator but also to a range of trimming threshold choices. The “two-way robustness” is achieved by combining resampling with a novel local polynomial-based bias-correction technique. We also propose a method to choose the trimming threshold by minimizing an empirical analogue of the asymptotic mean squared error. Both our robust inference procedure and trimming threshold selector can be easily implemented. As the probability weights are typically unknown in applications, we allow the probability weights to be estimated in a first step. In particular, we show that the two workhorse models, Logit and Probit, can be employed under mild regularity conditions.

More generally, our results shed light on the reliability of conventional inference procedures using inverse weighting type estimators. One important insight is that with “small denominators,” conventional inference procedures can be unreliable regardless of whether trimming is employed or not. It will be interesting to explore the possibility of estimating the denominator in a first step, perhaps with a nonparametric method or a high-dimensional model. The problem is considerably more challenging, because in both cases the estimated denominator can be highly volatile and its tail behavior can deviate significantly from the regular variation setting.

A Notation

$\mathbb{1}_A$ is the indicator function which equals 1 if A is true and 0 otherwise. \mathbb{P} , \mathbb{E} and \mathbb{V} are the probability, expectation and variance operators, respectively. The Euclidean norm will be denoted by $|\cdot|$. The j -th derivative of a function $f(\cdot)$ is denoted by $f^{(j)}(\cdot)$. The maximum and minimum of two numbers a and b are represented by $a \vee b$ and $a \wedge b$, respectively. Regular convergence is denoted by \rightarrow , and convergence in probability and in distribution are $\xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}}$ and $\xrightarrow{\mathbb{d}}$, respectively. The Gaussian distribution is denoted by $\mathcal{N}(\mu, \sigma^2)$ with μ and σ^2 being its mean and variance. For two sequences a_n and a'_n , $a_n \lesssim a'_n$ implies $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} |a_n/a'_n| < \infty$, and $a_n \prec a'_n$ implies $|a_n/a'_n| \rightarrow 0$. The notation $a_n \asymp a'_n$ means both $a_n \lesssim a'_n$ and $a'_n \lesssim a_n$. For random variables, $X_n = O_p(a_n)$ if $|X_n/a_n|$ is asymptotically bounded in probability, and $X_n = o_p(a_n)$ if $|X_n/a_n| \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} 0$. For two sequences of random variables, we use $X_n \lesssim_p X'_n$ to denote $X_n/X'_n = O_p(1)$, and $X_n \prec_p X'_n$ for $|X_n/X'_n| = o_p(1)$, and $X_n \asymp_p X'_n$ means both $X_n \lesssim_p X'_n$ and $X'_n \lesssim_p X_n$.

References

- ABADIE, ALBERTO, (2003). “Semiparametric instrumental variable estimation of treatment response models,” *Journal of Econometrics*, 113(2), pp. 231–263.
- ABADIE, ALBERTO, (2005). “Semiparametric difference-in-differences estimators,” *Review of Economic Studies*, 72(1), pp. 1–19.
- ABADIE, ALBERTO AND MATIAS D. CATTANEO, (2018). “Econometric methods for program evaluation,” *Annual Review of Economics*, 10, pp. 465–503.
- ARCONES, MIGUEL A. AND EVARIST GINÉ, (1991). “Additions and correction to ‘The bootstrap of the mean with arbitrary bootstrap sample size’,” *Annals of the Institute Henri Poincaré*, 27(4), pp. 583–595.
- ATHEY, SUSAN, GUIDO W. IMBENS, AND STEFAN WAGER, (2018). “Approximate residual balancing: Debiased inference of average treatment effects in high dimensions,” *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B*, 80(4), pp. 597–623.

- ATHREYA, K. B., (1987). “Bootstrap of the mean in the infinite variance case,” *Annals of Statistics*, 15(2), pp. 724–731.
- BELLONI, ALEXANDRE, VICTOR CHERNOZHUKOV, DENIS CHETVERIKOV, CHRISTIAN HANSEN, AND KENGO KATO, (2018). “High-dimensional econometrics and regularized GMM,” *arXiv:1806.01888*.
- BERKES, ISTVAN, LAJOS HORVÁTH, AND JOHANNES SCHAUER, (2012). “Asymptotic behavior of trimmed sums,” *Stochastics and Dynamics*, 12(1), pp. 12–29.
- BUSO, MATIAS, JOHN DINARDO, AND JUSTIN MCCRARY, (2014). “New evidence on the finite sample properties of propensity score matching and reweighting estimators,” *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 96(5), pp. 885–897.
- CALONICO, SEBASTIAN, MATIAS D. CATTANEO, AND MAX H. FARRELL, (2018). “On the effect of bias estimation on coverage accuracy in nonparametric inference,” *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 113(522), pp. 767–779.
- CATTANEO, MATIAS D., (2010). “Efficient semiparametric estimation of multi-valued treatment effects under ignorability,” *Journal of Econometrics*, 155(2), pp. 138–154.
- CATTANEO, MATIAS D. AND MICHAEL JANSSON, (2018). “Kernel-based semiparametric estimators: Small bandwidth asymptotics and bootstrap consistency,” *Econometrica*, 86(3), pp. 955–995.
- CATTANEO, MATIAS D., MICHAEL JANSSON, AND XINWEI MA, (2018). “Two-step estimation and inference with possibly many included covariates,” *Review of Economic Studies*, forthcoming.
- CHAUDHURI, SARASWATA AND JONATHAN B. HILL, (2016). “Heavy tail robust estimation and inference for average treatment effects,” *Working Paper*.
- CHERNOZHUKOV, VICTOR, JUAN CARLOS ESCANCIANO, HIDEHIKO ICHIMURA, WHITNEY K. NEWEY, AND JAMES M. ROBINS, (2018). “Locally robust semiparametric estimation,” *arXiv:1608.00033*.
- CRUMP, RICHARD K., V. JOSEPH HOTZ, GUIDO W. IMBENS, AND OSCAR A. MITNIK, (2009). “Dealing with limited overlap in estimation of average treatment effects,” *Biometrika*, 96(1), pp. 187–199.
- CSÖRGÖ, SÁNDOR, ERICH HAEUSLER, AND DAVID M. MASON, (1988). “The asymptotic distribution of trimmed sums,” *Annals of Probability*, 16(2), pp. 672–699.
- DEHEJIA, RAJEEV H. AND SADEK WAHBA, (1999). “Causal effects in nonexperimental studies: Reevaluating the evaluations of training programs,” *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 94(448), pp. 1053–1062.

- DiNARDO, JOHN, NICOLE M. FORTIN, AND THOMAS LEMIEUX, (1996). “Labor market institutions and the distribution of wages, 1973-1992: A semiparametric approach,” *Econometrica*, 64(5), pp. 1001–1044.
- FAN, JIANQING AND IRENE GIJBELS, (1996). *Local Polynomial Modelling and Its Applications*: Chapman & Hall/CRC.
- FARRELL, MAX H., (2015). “Robust inference on average treatment effects with possibly more covariates than observations,” *Journal of Econometrics*, 189(1), pp. 1–23.
- FARRELL, MAX H., TENGYUAN LIANG, AND SANJOG MISRA, (2018). “Deep neural networks for estimation and inference: Application to causal effects and other semiparametric estimands,” *arXiv:1809.09953*.
- HAHN, MARJORIE G. AND DANIEL C. WEINER, (1992). “Asymptotic behavior of self-normalized trimmed sums: Nonnormal limits,” *Annals of Probability*, 20(1), pp. 455–482.
- HERNÁN, MIGUEL A. AND JAMES M. ROBINS, (2018). *Causal Inference*: Chapman & Hall/CRC, forthcoming.
- HIRANO, KEISUKE, GUIDO W. IMBENS, AND GEERT RIDDER, (2003). “Efficient estimation of average treatment effects using the estimated propensity score,” *Econometrica*, 71(4), pp. 1161–1189.
- HONG, HAN, MICHAEL LEUNG, AND JESSIE LI, (2018). “Inference on finite population treatment effects under limited overlap,” *ssrn.3128546*.
- HOROWITZ, JOEL L., (2001). “The bootstrap,” In J. J. Heckman and E. Leamer (eds.) *Handbook of Econometrics, Volume V*: Elsevier Science B.V. pp. 3159–3228.
- IMBENS, GUIDO W. AND DONALD B. RUBIN, (2015). *Causal Inference in Statistics, Social, and Biomedical Sciences*: Cambridge University Press.
- KHAN, SHAKEEB AND ELIE TAMER, (2010). “Irregular identification, support conditions, and inverse weight estimation,” *Econometrica*, 78(6), pp. 2021–2042.
- KNIGHT, KEITH, (1989). “On the bootstrap of the sample mean in the infinite variance case,” *Annals of Statistics*, 17(3), pp. 1168–1175.
- LALONDE, ROBERT J., (1986). “Evaluating the econometric evaluations of training programs with experimental data,” *American Economic Review*, 76(4), pp. 604–620.
- LOGAN, B. F., C. L. MALLOWS, S. O. RICE, AND L. A. SHEPP, (1973). “Limit distributions of self-normalized sums,” *Annals of Probability*, 1(5), pp. 788–809.
- MA, XINWEI, (2018). “On the minimax rate for estimating the mean of the ratio of random variables,” *Working Paper*.

- NEWHEY, WHITNEY K. AND DANIEL L. MCFADDEN, (1994). “Large sample estimation and hypothesis testing,” In R. F. Engle and D. L. McFadden (eds.) *Handbook of Econometrics, Volume IV*: Elsevier Science B.V. pp. 2111–2245.
- POLITIS, DIMITRIS N. AND JOSEPH P. ROMANO, (1994). “Large sample confidence regions based on subsamples under minimal assumptions,” *Annals of Statistics*, 22(4), pp. 2031–2050.
- POLITIS, DIMITRIS N., JOSEPH P. ROMANO, AND MICHAEL WOLF, (1999). *Subsampling*: Springer.
- ROBINS, JAMES M., ANDREA ROTNITZKY, AND LUE PING ZHAO, (1994). “Estimation of regression coefficients when some regressors are not always observed,” *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 89(427), pp. 846–866.
- ROMANO, JOSEPH P. AND MICHAEL WOLF, (1999). “Subsampling inference for the mean in the heavy-tailed case,” *Metrika*, 50(1), pp. 55–69.
- SASAKI, YUYA AND TAKUYA URA, (2018). “Inference for moments of ratios with robustness against large trimming bias and unknown convergence rate,” *arXiv:1709.00981*.
- WOOLDRIDGE, JEFFREY M., (1999). “Asymptotic properties of weighted M-estimators for variable probability samples,” *Econometrica*, 67(6), pp. 1385–1406.
- WOOLDRIDGE, JEFFREY M., (2007). “Inverse probability weighted estimation for general missing data problems,” *Journal of Econometrics*, 141(2), pp. 1281–1301.
- YANG, S. AND P. DING, (2018). “Asymptotic inference of causal effects with observational studies trimmed by the estimated propensity scores,” *Biometrika*, 105(2), pp. 487–493.

Table 1. Simulation.
 $\gamma_0 = 1.5$, $\mathbb{E}[Y|e(X), D = 1] = \cos(2\pi e(X))$.

(a) $n = 2,000$

trimming		$\hat{\theta}_{n,b_n}$					$\hat{\theta}_{n,b_n}^{\text{bc}} (\hat{h}_n = 0.377)$				
\hat{b}_n	$n_{\leq \hat{b}_n}$	bias	sd	rmse	cov	ci	bias	sd	rmse	cov	ci
—	—	0.131			0.844	21.235					
0.004	0.170	0.800	1.493	1.694	0.856	6.155	0.238	1.565	1.583	0.924	7.387
0.016	1.338	1.576	0.979	1.855	0.698	3.932	0.465	1.169	1.258	0.926	5.757
0.036	4.606	2.373	0.741	2.486	0.244	2.805	0.628	1.064	1.236	0.913	4.973
0.094	19.225	3.718	0.503	3.752	0.000	1.831	0.711	0.999	1.226	0.906	4.219

(b) $n = 5,000$

trimming		$\hat{\theta}_{n,b_n}$					$\hat{\theta}_{n,b_n}^{\text{bc}} (\hat{h}_n = 0.319)$				
\hat{b}_n	$n_{\leq \hat{b}_n}$	bias	sd	rmse	cov	ci	bias	sd	rmse	cov	ci
—	—	0.025			0.869	37.240					
0.002	0.173	0.764	1.546	1.724	0.888	6.445	0.259	1.592	1.613	0.928	7.196
0.010	1.689	1.697	0.966	1.953	0.691	3.968	0.485	1.103	1.205	0.916	5.233
0.025	6.653	2.692	0.714	2.785	0.145	2.801	0.696	0.961	1.187	0.891	4.457
0.072	32.182	4.484	0.478	4.510	0.000	1.787	0.883	0.894	1.257	0.846	3.780

(c) $n = 10,000$

trimming		$\hat{\theta}_{n,b_n}$					$\hat{\theta}_{n,b_n}^{\text{bc}} (\hat{h}_n = 0.281)$				
\hat{b}_n	$n_{\leq \hat{b}_n}$	bias	sd	rmse	cov	ci	bias	sd	rmse	cov	ci
—	—	0.053			0.862	59.629					
0.001	0.168	0.781	1.575	1.758	0.886	6.421	0.213	1.609	1.623	0.922	6.944
0.007	1.994	1.812	0.975	2.058	0.663	3.912	0.441	1.086	1.172	0.910	4.870
0.019	8.752	2.971	0.708	3.054	0.075	2.746	0.668	0.916	1.134	0.877	4.097
0.059	47.837	5.175	0.466	5.196	0.000	1.739	0.895	0.831	1.221	0.817	3.490

Note. (i) \hat{b}_n : trimming threshold. (ii) $n_{\leq \hat{b}_n}$: effective number of trimmed observations. (iii) bias: bias of the estimator, scaled by n^{1-1/γ_0} . (iv) sd: standard deviation of the estimator, scaled by n^{1-1/γ_0} . (v) rmse: root mean squared error of the estimator, scaled by n^{1-1/γ_0} . (vi) cov: coverage probability (nominal level 0.95). (vii) |ci|: confidence interval length, scaled by n^{1-1/γ_0} . (viii) \hat{h}_n : bandwidth for local polynomial based bias correction. Number of Monte Carlo repetitions: 5000. Number of subsampling iterations: 1000. Subsample size: $\lfloor n/\log(n) \rfloor$.

Table 2. Simulation.
 $\gamma_0 = 1.5$, $\mathbb{E}[Y|e(X), D = 1] = 1 - e(X)$.

(a) $n = 2,000$

trimming		$\hat{\theta}_{n,b_n}$					$\hat{\theta}_{n,b_n}^{\text{bc}} (\hat{h}_n = 0.377)$				
\hat{b}_n	$n_{\leq \hat{b}_n}$	bias	sd	rmse	cov	ci	bias	sd	rmse	cov	ci
—	—	0.132			0.864	22.017					
0.004	0.170	0.800	1.490	1.691	0.888	6.518	0.012	1.569	1.569	0.939	7.755
0.016	1.338	1.569	0.977	1.849	0.772	4.229	0.003	1.172	1.172	0.957	6.029
0.036	4.606	2.357	0.747	2.472	0.356	3.076	0.001	1.063	1.063	0.964	5.228
0.094	19.225	3.730	0.510	3.764	0.000	2.036	0.017	0.984	0.984	0.967	4.530

(b) $n = 5,000$

trimming		$\hat{\theta}_{n,b_n}$					$\hat{\theta}_{n,b_n}^{\text{bc}} (\hat{h}_n = 0.319)$				
\hat{b}_n	$n_{\leq \hat{b}_n}$	bias	sd	rmse	cov	ci	bias	sd	rmse	cov	ci
—	—	0.025			0.873	37.233					
0.002	0.173	0.763	1.549	1.726	0.895	6.495	0.031	1.600	1.601	0.935	7.334
0.010	1.689	1.692	0.967	1.949	0.717	4.039	0.015	1.112	1.112	0.956	5.346
0.025	6.653	2.676	0.719	2.771	0.175	2.892	0.015	0.967	0.967	0.963	4.559
0.072	32.182	4.467	0.491	4.494	0.000	1.894	0.019	0.890	0.890	0.964	3.958

(c) $n = 10,000$

trimming		$\hat{\theta}_{n,b_n}$					$\hat{\theta}_{n,b_n}^{\text{bc}} (\hat{h}_n = 0.281)$				
\hat{b}_n	$n_{\leq \hat{b}_n}$	bias	sd	rmse	cov	ci	bias	sd	rmse	cov	ci
—	—	0.045			0.863	59.692					
0.001	0.168	0.773	1.571	1.751	0.888	6.404	0.019	1.609	1.609	0.928	7.017
0.007	1.994	1.801	0.973	2.047	0.675	3.921	0.005	1.092	1.092	0.952	4.943
0.019	8.752	2.949	0.710	3.033	0.083	2.778	0.003	0.923	0.923	0.958	4.152
0.059	47.837	5.136	0.474	5.158	0.000	1.799	0.006	0.829	0.829	0.964	3.588

Note. (i) \hat{b}_n : trimming threshold. (ii) $n_{\leq \hat{b}_n}$: effective number of trimmed observations. (iii) bias: bias of the estimator, scaled by n^{1-1/γ_0} . (iv) sd: standard deviation of the estimator, scaled by n^{1-1/γ_0} . (v) rmse: root mean squared error of the estimator, scaled by n^{1-1/γ_0} . (vi) cov: coverage probability (nominal level 0.95). (vii) |ci|: confidence interval length, scaled by n^{1-1/γ_0} . (viii) \hat{h}_n : bandwidth for local polynomial based bias correction. Number of Monte Carlo repetitions: 5000. Number of subsampling iterations: 1000. Subsample size: $\lfloor n/\log(n) \rfloor$.