

# Group Average Treatment Effects for Observational Studies\*

Daniel Jacob<sup>†</sup>    Wolfgang Karl Härdle<sup>†‡§</sup>    Stefan Lessmann<sup>†</sup>

This Draft: December 13, 2019

## Abstract

The paper proposes an estimator to make inference of heterogeneous treatment effects sorted by impact groups (GATES) for non-randomised experiments. Observational studies are standard in policy evaluation from labour markets, educational surveys and other empirical studies. To control for a potential selection-bias we implement a doubly-robust estimator in the first stage. Keeping the flexibility, we can use any machine learning method to learn the conditional mean functions as well as the propensity score. We also use machine learning methods to learn a function for the conditional average treatment effect. The group average treatment effect, is then estimated via a parametric linear model to provide p-values and confidence intervals. To control for confounding in the linear model we use Neyman-orthogonal moments to partial out the effect that covariates have on both, the treatment assignment and the outcome. The result is a best linear predictor for effect heterogeneity based on impact groups. We introduce inclusion-probability weighting as a form of cross-splitting and averaging for each observation to avoid biases through sample splitting. The advantage of the proposed method is a robust linear estimation of heterogeneous group treatment effects in observational studies.

**JEL classification:** C01, C14, C31, C63

**Keywords:** *causal inference, machine learning, simulation study, confidence intervals, multiple splitting, sorted group ATE (GATES), doubly-robust estimator*

---

\*Financial support from the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft via the IRTG 1792 “High Dimensional Non Stationary Time Series”, Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin, is gratefully acknowledged. All correspondence may be addressed to the author by e-mail at [daniel.jacob@hu-berlin.de](mailto:daniel.jacob@hu-berlin.de).

<sup>†</sup>School of Business and Economics, Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin, Spandauer Straße 1, 10178 Berlin, Germany.

<sup>‡</sup>Sim Kee Boon Institute for Financial Economics, Singapore Management University, 50 Stamford Road, 178899 Singapore, Singapore

<sup>§</sup>W.I.S.E. - Wang Yanan Institute for Studies in Economics, Xiamen University, 422 Siming S Rd, 361005 Fujian, China

# 1 Introduction

When evaluating a causal effect of some policy, marketing action or another treatment indicator, it might not be sufficient to only report the average treatment effect (ATE). The estimation of heterogeneous effects, e.g. the conditional (on covariates) average treatment effect (CATE), provides further insight into causal mechanisms and helps researchers and practitioners to actively adjust the treatment assignment towards an efficient allocation. The more information in terms of characteristics i.e. covariates we are provided with, the better can heterogeneity be observed. If we have little deterministic information it might be that heterogeneity effects are overlooked. The trade-off here is that the more covariates datasets have, the more complex they get. This is why parametric models are often insufficient when applied on high-dimensional, non-linear datasets [Chernozhukov, Chetverikov, Demirer, Duflo, Hansen, Newey, and Robins \(2018a\)](#). Therefore, recent methods for treatment effect estimation use machine learning models that have shown to be superior in high-dimensional prediction problems [Hastie, Tibshirani, and Friedman \(2009\)](#). The idea is to learn nuisance functions and regularize the parameter space while making as little assumptions as possible. This is especially helpful when the data does not come from randomised experiments where treatment is randomly assigned to the individuals. In observational studies, self-selection into treatment can arise which introduces a bias that has to be corrected for (i.e. self-selection bias) ([Heckman, Ichimura, Smith, and Todd, 1998](#)). For the ATE one would use the nuisance parameter to orthogonalize the effect that covariates have on both, the treatment assignment and the outcome variable. See [Chernozhukov et al. \(2018a\)](#) for a recent approach which they call double machine learning.

The two most prominent methods used to estimate the CATE may be the general random forest, which builds on the idea of controlling for observed confounders through a tree structure and then estimates the CATE within each final leaf ([Athey, Wager, and Tibshirani, 2019](#)). The results from each tree are then weighted over the trees within the forest to get a final estimate. The second one is causal boosting, which uses boosted trees to increase performance ([Powers, Qian, Jung, Schuler, Shah, Hastie, and Tibshirani, 2018](#)). What the aforementioned methods lack, however, is that they are built on tree algorithms and therefore do not allow a flexible estimation of heterogeneous treatment effects in terms of the model choice. A recent method called R-learner does provide such flexibility and shows competitive performance in the estimation of the CATE to other existing proposals ([Nie and Wager, 2017](#)). Other models, known as meta-learners, decompose the modelling procedure into sub-regression functions, which can be solved using any supervised learning method. This can e.g. be done by a two-model approach (TMA) where a response function (conditional mean) on the treated and another one on the non-treated observations is trained. In randomised experiments, the difference between the two functions can thus be interpreted as the CATE. ([Künzel, Sekhon, Bickel, and Yu, 2019](#)). Applying the two-model approach on data from non-randomized experiments would incorporate a potential bias. One way to address the problem is to use a doubly-robust estimator as proposed by ([Robins and Rotnitzky, 1995](#)). Using the estimates from the two-model approach in combination

with inverse probability weighting (IPW) decreases the variance of the estimator and controls for observed confounding (see e.g. [Lunceford and Davidian \(2004\)](#)). Additional orthogonalization using the two conditional mean functions produced by the TMA further decreases the bias of the parameter of interest ([Lee, Okui, and Whang, 2017](#)). The doubly-robust estimator can be used in high-dimensional settings to estimate a reduced dimensional conditional average treatment effect function. Functional limit theory can be derived for the case where the nuisance functions are trained via machine learning methods which are then applied on the doubly-robust estimator. The reduced functional form can then be found using a traditional kernel regression ([Fan, Hsu, Lieli, and Zhang, 2019](#)). Recent papers study and evaluate different models that are designed for the estimation of heterogeneous treatment effects (see e.g. [Knaus, Lechner, and Strittmatter \(2018\)](#); [Künzel et al. \(2019\)](#); [Powers et al. \(2018\)](#)).

The difficulty, however, is that machine learning methods are often a black box that is not easy to interpret. This fact hinders the information on drivers for effect heterogeneity. In this paper, we, therefore, build on the ideas of [Chernozhukov, Demirer, Duflo, and Fernandez-Val \(2018b\)](#) who concentrate to estimate group average treatment effects (GATE) in randomised experiments. The groups are built on the distribution from the CATE (e.g. quantiles to get five groups). A parametric model is then used to identify the best linear predictor for the group treatment effect, providing standard errors and confidence intervals. The heterogeneity between the groups can further be interpreted through covariates which shed some light on the question of what characteristics determine the differences between groups. In this paper, we extend the approach to estimating the GATE parameter towards the use in observational studies and also towards the possibility to estimate a best linear CATE based on the group heterogeneity. The advantage of the proposed method is a robust estimation of heterogeneous treatment effect that is comparable with other models thus keeping its flexibility in the choice of machine learning methods and at the same time its ability to interpret the results. The latter is especially useful in all areas of empirical economics like policy or labour markets. It also has the advantage to control for potential self-selection bias. The idea of going beyond the average, but not as deep as to estimate conditional average treatment effects for many covariates, is first considered in [Chernozhukov, Fernández-Val, and Luo \(2018c\)](#). They provide standard errors and confidence bands for the estimated sorted group effects and related classification analysis and provide confidence sets for the most and least affected groups. While they only use parametric estimators, a nonparametric attempt to estimate group average treatment effects and also provide insights from the heterogeneity in terms of observed covariates is proposed by [Zimmert and Lechner \(2019\)](#). They use a two-step estimator of which the second step consists of a kernel estimator. Our contribution is to keep machine learning methods to learn the nuisance parameter in the first step but use a parametric model in the last step. This allows us to make inference and limit the degree of uncertainty in observational studies. This paper consists of three parts. First, we state the methodology for randomized experiments and second, the extensions to deliver robust results in observational studies. Third, we simulate data that include selection bias and are high-dimensional and non-linear. We compare the results for the

GATE obtained with the two-model approach and the extended doubly-robust method. Through averaging of the results for each observation we report the mean absolute error from the true heterogeneous treatment effects for both methods.

## 2 Generic Machine Learning for Group ATE

### 2.1 Potential Outcome Assumptions

Throughout this paper, we make use of the potential outcome theorem (Rosenbaum and Rubin, 1983) and state four necessary assumptions. The first assumption is the ignorability of treatment, conditional on observed covariates ( $X$ ), from the two potential outcomes. It is also known as unconfoundedness or simply conditional independence:

$$(Y_i^1, Y_i^0) \perp\!\!\!\perp D_i | X_i. \quad (1)$$

With  $Y^1$  denoting the potential outcome under treatment and  $Y^0$  if not being treated.  $D$  is the treatment assignment variable.

The second assumption, the Stable Unit Treatment Value Assumption (SUTVA), guarantees that the potential outcome of an individual is unaffected by changes in the treatment assignment of others. This assumption might be violated if individuals can interact with each other (peer and social effects). In randomised controlled experiments, the first two assumptions are fulfilled by design or, at least, cancel out.

The third assumption, called overlap, guarantees that for all  $x \in \text{supp}(X)$ , the probability of being in the treatment group (i.e. the propensity score,  $e(x)$ ), is bounded away from 0 and 1:

$$\begin{aligned} 0 < P(D = 1 | X = x) < 1. \\ e(x) = P(D = 1 | X = x). \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

We control for the common support by estimating the propensity score and balance the treatment and control group based on the distribution. We hence exclude all observations that have a propensity score lower 0.02 or higher than 0.98. The fundamental problem of causal inference is that we only observe one of the two potential outcomes at the same time. The counterfactual for a nontreated (treated) person, namely, what would have happened if this person were (not) treated, is always missing. We can represent this statement through a switching regression where the observed outcome ( $Y_i$ ) depends on the two potential outcomes and the treatment assignment:

$$Y_i = Y_i^0 + D(Y_i^1 - Y_i^0). \quad (3)$$

We further assume that, for the estimation of standard errors, the following moments exist:  $E[|Y^j|^q] < \infty$  for  $q \geq 4$  and  $j = 0, 1$ .

## 2.2 Randomized Control Trial

To provide valid estimation and inference for a causal interpretation of parameters, [Chernozhukov et al. \(2018b\)](#) focus on features of the CATE. One of the main features is the **Sorted Group Average Treatment Effect**. The idea is to find groups of observations depending on the estimated treatment effect heterogeneity. Their proposed method relies on a two-model approach in the first step. Here, two response functions are trained separately for the treated and non-treated observations. This approach can be biased if the data sample is from an observational study. In randomized control trials, the difference between the two functions provides an estimate of the treatment effect for every observation. To denote that this function might not be consistent or unbiased it is further called score-function ( $S(X)$ ):

$$\begin{aligned}\tau(X) &= \mathbb{E}[Y|D = 1, X] - \mathbb{E}[Y|D = 0, X], \\ S(X) &= g_1(X, \alpha_1) - g_0(X, \alpha_0).\end{aligned}\tag{4}$$

Here  $g_D(X, \alpha_D) = \mathbb{E}(Y|D, X)$  is the regression model of the outcome variable on  $X$  separately for  $D \in \{0, 1\}$  and  $\alpha_D$  represents the parameters for treatment and control group. The two functions can be estimated with a broad range of supervised machine learning methods. The target parameters are

$$\mathbb{E}[\tau(X)|G_k] \quad G_k : k^{th} \text{ n-tile of } S(X),\tag{5}$$

where  $G$  is an indicator of a group membership. The groups are ex-post defined by the predicted score function in the first stage. If the treatment effect for the groups are consistent, it asymptotically holds that

$$\mathbb{E}[\tau(X)|G_1] \leq \mathbb{E}[\tau(X)|G_2] \leq \dots \leq \mathbb{E}[\tau(X)|G_k],\tag{6}$$

which is the monotonicity restriction. Furthermore, it can be tested whether there is a homogeneous effect if  $\mathbb{E}[\tau(X)|G_k]$  would be equal for all  $k$  groups. The weighted linear projection equation to recover the GATES parameter is:

$$YH = \beta^\top A_1 H + \gamma \times (D - e(X)) \times \mathbf{I}(S(X) \in I_k) + \nu,\tag{7}$$

with  $A_1 = (1, B(X))$  and  $B(X) = \mathbb{E}[Y|D = 0, X]$  being the baseline function without treatment.  $S(X) = \mathbb{E}[Y|D = 1, X] - \mathbb{E}[Y|D = 0, X]$  is the treatment effect projection.  $I_k = [\ell_{k-1}, \ell_k)$  and  $\ell_k$  is the  $k/K$ -quantile of  $\{S_i\}_{i \in M}$ . Subscript  $M$  denotes that these are all out-of-sample predictions. We will for readability not always refer to the sets but always make use of sample splitting when using machine learning methods. This becomes clearer in the pseudo-code of Algorithm 1, which describes the implementation of this method. The weights  $H$  represent the Horvitz-Thompson transformation ([Horvitz and Thompson, 1952](#)):

$$H = H(D, Z) = \frac{D - e(X)}{e(X)(1 - e(X))}. \quad (8)$$

This estimator, which is applied to account for different proportions of observations within strata in a target population, is equivalent to the simple inverse probability weighting estimator. These estimators, however, might exhibit a high variance if the identification (the precision) of the propensity scores is lacking (Lunceford and Davidian, 2004).

The main identification result is that the projection coefficients  $\gamma_k$  can be represented in the following way:

$$\gamma = (\gamma)_{k=1}^K = (E[\tau(X)|G_k])_{k=1}^K. \quad (9)$$

---

**Algorithm 1: GATES**

---

```

1 for  $b=1$  to  $B$  do
2   Split Data in  $k = 2$  samples:  $I^a$  and  $M$  with  $I^a \cup M$ 
3   Train  $Y_i^0 = g_0(X_i, D = 0) + U_{0i}$ , with  $i \in I^a$ 
4   Train  $Y_i^1 = g_1(X_i, D = 1) + U_{1i}$ , with  $i \in I^a$ 
5     Predict  $\hat{Y}_i^0 = \hat{g}_0(X_i)$ , with  $i \in M$ 
6     Predict  $\hat{Y}_i^1 = \hat{g}_1(X_i)$ , with  $i \in M$ 
7     Calculate  $S_b(X|i) = \hat{Y}_i^1 - \hat{Y}_i^0$ 
8   Train  $D_i = e_0(X_i) + V$ , with  $i \in I^a$ 
9     Predict  $\hat{D}_i = \hat{e}(X_i)$ , with  $i \in M$ 
10    Calculate  $\hat{V}_i = D_i - \hat{e}(X_i)$ , with  $i \in M$ 
11  Estimate GATES parameters  $(\gamma)$  with weighted OLS using  $M$  (see equation
12  7)
13 end
14 Average  $\gamma$  over  $B$  iterations:  $\tilde{\gamma} = \text{median}\{\gamma\}$ 

```

---

There are two potential sources of uncertainty. One is estimation uncertainty regarding our parameter of interest, keeping sample splitting fixed whereas the second source is exactly due to the sample splitting. To account for this, the p-values, as well as the confidence intervals, need to be adjusted. (Chernozhukov et al., 2018b) show, that sample-splitting-adjusted p-values can have the following form.

$$\mathbb{P}(p_A \leq \alpha/2 | \text{Data}) \geq 1/2 \quad (10)$$

with  $p_A$  being the realized p-value given the auxiliary sample and  $\alpha$  is the significance level. Given that we use medians to average the parameters  $\gamma_k$  over  $B$  bootstrap repetitions it holds that for at least 50% of the random data splits out of  $B$ , the p-value is at largest  $\alpha/2$ . Small values provide evidence that the group parameter is different from zero.

## 2.3 Observational Studies

To use the best linear predictor for group heterogeneity in observational studies, we need to change and extend the first and second stage. First, we replace the two-model approach by a doubly-robust estimator. This means we not only weight by the inverse of the propensity score but also orthogonalize the outcome variable by subtracting the conditional mean. We also make use of sample splitting as a form of cross-fitting. The auxiliary sample is applied to estimate the score function via the doubly-robust estimator and the main sample to predict the final score function, which is used in the parametric step. In this way, we limit the danger of overfitting. The resulting function is a more robust version of the CATE for each individual as well as for the GATE function. The two steps are described in more detail in the following.

The separate estimation of the outcome conditioning on the treatment assignment only works for randomised experiments. Assume that in observational studies individual's self-select themselves into the treatment. If this is the case, then the distribution of the covariates is different given treatment status. As a consequence, the estimated score-function might not reflect the treatment effect rather than observed differences based on the covariates. We replace the simple two-model approach by a doubly-robust estimator, which accounts for this potential bias via an extension of inverse probability weighting and by using the residuals between the outcome variable  $Y_i$  and the conditional expectation functions  $\hat{g}_D(X_i, \hat{\alpha}_D)$  for  $D \in \{0, 1\}$  (see equation 11).

The function is calculated using the training data (the  $I^a$  sample). In a second step, a new supervised model is trained on the transformed outcome using  $I^a$  while predictions are made on the test set  $M$  to get an unbiased estimate (see equation 12). Algorithm 2 describes this process.

$$\hat{S}_i = \hat{g}_1(X_i, \hat{\alpha}_1) - \hat{g}_0(X_i, \hat{\alpha}_0) + \frac{D_i(Y_i - \hat{g}_1(X_i, \hat{\alpha}_1))}{\hat{e}(X_i)} - \frac{(1 - D_i)(Y_i - \hat{g}_0(X_i, \hat{\alpha}_0))}{(1 - \hat{e}(X_i))} \quad (11)$$

$$\hat{S}_i = l(X_i) + \omega \quad (12)$$

In equation 11,  $\hat{g}_1(X_i, \hat{\alpha}_1) - \hat{g}_0(X_i, \hat{\alpha}_0)$  is equivalent to the score-function from the two-model approach. Simulation evidence from [Knaus et al. \(2018\)](#) suggests that estimators based on  $\hat{S}_i$  might be more stable because of the doubly-robust property and that the performance is competitive for the estimation of heterogeneous treatment effects in observational studies. The doubly-robust property states that the estimator is consistent and unbiased if only one of the models, the regression or the propensity score, is correctly specified ([Robins, Rotnitzky, and Zhao, 1994](#); [Robins and Rotnitzky, 1995](#)). [Lunceford and Davidian \(2004\)](#); [Williamson, Forbes, and White \(2014\)](#); [Belloni, Chernozhukov, and Hansen \(2014\)](#) study the theoretical properties and highlight implications for practice. One of the findings is that the variance can be decreased when using the doubly-robust estimator instead of a simple inverse probability estimator ([Lunceford and Davidian, 2004](#)). [Chernozhukov and Semenova \(2018\)](#) show that equation 11 is conditionally locally robust to the estimation error of the nuisance parameter.

Next we state some asymptotic results to recover the CATE. From equation 4 it follows that

$$\tau(X) = \mathbb{E}\{\mathbb{E}[Y|D = 1, X] - \mathbb{E}[Y|D = 0, X]|X = x_i\} \quad (13)$$

Let  $\eta(X) := (e(X), g_1(X_i, \alpha_1), g_0(X_i, \alpha_0))$  be the true high dimensional nuisance parameters. Following [Fan et al. \(2019\)](#) we can define

$$\begin{aligned} \psi(D, Y, X, \eta(X)) = & g_1(X_i, \alpha_1) - g_0(X_i, \alpha_0) \\ & + \frac{D_i(Y_i - g_1(X_i, \alpha_1))}{e(X_i)} - \frac{(1 - D_i)(Y_i - g_0(X_i, \alpha_0))}{(1 - e(X_i))} \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

**Theorem 2.1**

(i) under Assumptions 1,2,3,4

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\left[g_1(X_i, \alpha_1) + \frac{D_i(Y_i - g_1(X_i, \alpha_1))}{e(X_i)}|X = x_i\right] &= \mathbb{E}[Y^1|X = x_i], \\ \mathbb{E}\left[g_0(X_i, \alpha_0) + \frac{(1 - D_i)(Y_i - g_0(X_i, \alpha_0))}{1 - e(X_i)}|X = x_i\right] &= \mathbb{E}[Y^0|X = x_i] \end{aligned}$$

(ii)  $\mathbb{E}[\psi(D, Y, X, \eta(X)) - \tau(X)|X = x_i] = 0$  given (i).

This moment condition satisfies the Neyman-orthogonality condition. Neyman-orthogonality is a key component in ensuring that the CATE estimators are robust to the regularization bias inherent for the nuisance functions which are learned via machine learning models.

Next, we set up a linear model for the estimation of the low-dimensional parameters of interest  $\gamma_k$ . Suppose that the data generating process follows a partial linear model that has the following form:

$$Y = \tau(X)D + \mu_0(X) + U, \quad \mathbb{E}[U|X, D] = 0, \quad (15)$$

$$D = e_0(X) + V, \quad \mathbb{E}[V|X] = 0, \quad (16)$$

$$\tau(X) = \frac{1}{K} \sum \gamma_k \quad (17)$$

The outcome variable  $Y$  depends not only on the treatment effect parameter but also on observed covariates through the function  $\mu_0(X)$ . The second equation displays the setting in observational studies, namely that the treatment assignment also depends on observed covariates through the function  $e_0(X)$ . In randomized control trials, it is sufficient to directly learn the regression function  $\hat{\tau}(X)D$ . We do not need to include the function  $\mu_0(X)$  since in RCT the distribution of the covariates are assumed to be



the same for both, the control and the treatment group. The linear model in section 2.2 does exactly this but also takes into account that the treatment assignment might be different for strata in the covariate space.

In observational settings confounding through covariates leads to a bias that we have to account for. We wish to partialling out the effect from  $X$  on  $D$  as well as the effect from  $X$  on  $Y$ . Following Chernozhukov et al. (2018a) we again can make use of Neyman-orthogonal moments which leads to the orthogonalized regressors  $\hat{U} = Y - \hat{\mu}(X)$  and  $\hat{V} = D - \hat{e}(X)$ . The terms  $\hat{U}$  and  $\hat{V}$  are the residuals that we use in the linear projection function in Equation 19. The propensity-score estimates ( $\hat{e}(X)$ ) can be derived by using the main sample on the already estimated propensity-score function which is used in the doubly-robust step. The function  $\hat{\mu}(X)$  is estimated using any machine learning model on the auxiliary sample. For the estimation of the average treatment effect  $\hat{\tau}$  the residualized regression function has the following form:

$$\hat{\tau}_0 = \left( \sum_{i \in I^a} \hat{V}_i D_i \right)^{-1} \sum_{i \in I^a} \hat{D}_i (Y_i - \hat{\mu}_0(X_i)) \quad (18)$$

In our case, we are not specifically interested in the average treatment effect but the average effect given the quantiles of the CATE function. This leads to the linear projection function that estimates the average treatment effect for each group  $k$  using the main sample of observations.

$$(Y - \hat{\mu}(X)) = \hat{\gamma} \times (D - \hat{e}(x)) \times \mathbf{I}(\tilde{S}(X) \in I_k) + \nu, \quad (19)$$

with  $\tilde{S}(X) = \hat{l}(X)$ .

Through orthogonalization, we can overcome the regularization bias, common when employing ML models to train the functions  $e_0(X)$  and  $\mu_0(X)$ . Note that we can use different ML algorithms for each function. A trade-off to regularization bias is overfitting which we take into account by again using sample splitting to train and evaluate our models. Through sample splitting, we can only use  $N - n$  observations, given that  $n$  observations are in the training data. To account for the uncertainty through sample splitting we include the estimation of the functions  $e_0(X)$  and  $\mu_0(X)$  in the bootstrap process.

The third extension is to weight each individual based on the group inclusion probability. Instead of taking the median over  $B$  repetitions for each of the  $K$  groups we store the information about the group estimate for each individual  $i$  over the  $B$  repetitions. The median is then taken over  $B$  repetitions for each individual rather than the groups. This allows us to not only have a more robust GATE for each group but also to get an estimate for each individual which can be used for comparison with other methods and to make predictions. Naturally, we can do the same in the first step and apply this weighting procedure on the score-function. Algorithm 2 shows the steps to identify the group treatment effect for each individual. We also state another version on how to estimate the groups from the CATE function which can be used in

the linear model. The idea is to estimate a robust version of the group membership by averaging the estimates for each individual over  $b$  repetitions. The result is a density for each observation (see Figure 3.1) where we take medians to get point estimates of the group membership. We would then use this estimates in the linear model. This version is, however, experimental.

---

**Algorithm 2:** Extended GATES

---

```

1 for  $b=1$  to  $B$  do
2   Split Data in  $k = 2$  samples:  $I^a$  and  $M$  with  $I^a \cup M$ 
3   Train  $Y_i^0 = g_0(X_i, D = 0) + U_{0i}$ , with  $i \in I^a$ 
4   Train  $Y_i^1 = g_1(X_i, D = 1) + U_{1i}$ , with  $i \in I^a$ 
5   Train  $D_i = e_0(X_i) + V_i$ , with  $i \in I^a$ 
6   Train  $Y_i = \mu(X_i) + U_i$ , with  $i \in I^a$ 
7     Predict  $\hat{Y}_i^0 = \hat{g}_0(X_i)$ , with  $i \in I^a$ 
8     Predict  $\hat{Y}_i^1 = \hat{g}_1(X_i)$ , with  $i \in I^a$ 
9     Predict  $\hat{D}_i = \hat{e}(X_i)$ , with  $i \in I^a$ 
10    Predict  $\hat{Y}_i = \hat{\mu}(X_i)$ , with  $i \in M$ 
11    Calculate doubly-robust estimator (see equation 11)
12    Train  $\hat{S}_i = l(X_i) + W$  with  $i \in I^a$ 
13    Predict  $\tilde{S}_i = \hat{l}(X_i)$  with  $i \in M$ 
14      Calculate  $\hat{V}_i = D_i - \hat{e}(X_i)$ , with  $i \in M$ 
15      Calculate  $\hat{U}_i = Y_i - \hat{\mu}(X_i)$ , with  $i \in M$ 
16      Store  $S_b^*(X)|i = \tilde{S}_i(X)|b$  (experimental)
17    Estimate GATES parameters ( $\gamma$ ) with OLS using  $M$  (see equation 19)
18 end
19 Average  $\gamma$  over  $B$  iterations for each  $i$ :  $\tilde{\gamma}_i = \text{median}\{\gamma_i\}$ 
20 Calculate Density for every  $i$ :  $\hat{S}_i(X)$  given  $S_b^*(X)|i$  over  $b$  (experimental)
21 Calculate Final score-function ( $\tilde{S}_i(X)$ ) given density of medians for  $i = 1$  to  $N$ 
    (experimental)

```

---

### 3 Simulation Study

To evaluate the proposed extensions i) doubly-robust first stage ii) orthogonal parametric second stage and iii) inclusion probability weighting, we use simulated data where the true treatment effects are known. In the following we describe the data generating process (DGP) in detail and show the variations that we consider. The purpose of this simulation is first, to show that the bias which arises through the presence of observed confounders can be decreased by applying the aforementioned extensions and second, to produce benchmark error estimates for further comparison. Note that since the main purpose of the method is to stay in a linear setting which gives guidance about the efficiency of the estimator, we do not aim to get the lowest

error rates. Other methods that estimate a CATE function might produce lower rates but are harder to interpret.

### 3.1 Data Generating Process

We generate the covariates  $X \in \mathbb{R}^p$  in a way that they are partially correlated among each other. The process is described in Algorithm 3.

---

**Algorithm 3:** Correlation Matrix

---

- 1 **Generate** random positive definite covariance matrix  $\Sigma$  based on a uniform distribution over the space  $p \times p$  of the correlation matrix
  - 2 **Scale** covariance matrix. This equals the correlation matrix and can be seen as the covariance matrix of the standardised random variables  $\Sigma = \frac{X}{\sigma(X)}$ .
  - 3 **Generate** random normal distributed variables  $X_{N \times p}$  with mean = 0 and variance =  $\Sigma$
- 

An illustration of the distribution for  $p = 10$  and  $N = 5000$  observations is given in Figure A.1 in the Appendix. It shows the degree of correlation among the covariates. This is guaranteed through the uniform distribution of the covariance matrix which is then transformed to a correlation matrix. This assumption is more common in real datasets and helps to investigate the performance of machine learning algorithms, especially the regularization bias, in a more realistic manner.

The basic model used in this simulation study is a partially linear regression model based on [Robinson \(1988\)](#) with extensions:

$$Y = \tau(X)D + \mu_0(X) + U, \quad E[U|X, D] = 0, \quad (20)$$

$$D = e_0(X) + V, \quad E[V|X] = 0, \quad (21)$$

$$\tau(X) = t_0(Z) + W \quad E[W|Z] = 0, Z \subset X \quad (22)$$

with  $Y$  being a continuous outcome variable.  $\tau(X)$  is the true treatment effect or population uplift, while  $D$  is the treatment status. The vector  $X = (X_1, \dots, X_p)$  consists of  $p$  different features, covariates or confounders, while the vector  $Z$  is a subspace of  $X$  and represents the variables on which the treatment effect is dependent.  $U$ ,  $V$  and  $W$  are unobserved covariates which follow a random normal distribution =  $N(0, 1)$ .

Equation 21 is the propensity score. In the case of completely random treatment assignment the propensity score  $e_0(X_i) = c$  for all units ( $i = 1, \dots, N$ ). The scalar  $c$  can take any value between the interval  $(0,1)$ . Here we use  $c = 0.5$  (balanced assignment).

The function  $\mu_0(X)$  is calculated via a trigonometric function to make the covariates non-linear and potentially complicated for estimation.

$$\mu_0(X) = \cos(X \times b)^2 + X_{k/2} + X_{k/4} \times X_{k/10} \quad (23)$$

The vector  $b = \frac{1}{l}$  with  $l \in \{1, 2, \dots, k\}$  represents weights for every covariate. Next, a description of how to build the function  $e_0(X)$  as well as how to create a heterogeneous treatment effect is given. A varying treatment effect implies that its strength differs among the observations and is therefore conditioned on some covariates  $Z$ . Regarding the treatment assignment, two options are considered. Option 1 assumes  $D$  to be completely random assigned among the observations. In this case,  $D$  is just a vector of random numbers with values 0 or 1. In the second option, the treatment assignment is dependent on the covariates. The functions are generated as follows:

---

**Algorithm 4:** Treatment Assignment

---

```

1 if random assignment then
2   | Generate  $D \stackrel{ind.}{\sim} \text{Bernoulli}(c)$ , with  $c \in (0, 1)$  ;
3 else
4   | Create Vector Multiply the matrix  $X$  by vector  $b = \frac{1}{l}$  with  $l \in \{1, 2, \dots, p\}$  to
   | get vector  $a_1$ .
5   | Add covariates  $a_2 = a_1 + X_4 \times X_8 + \sin(X_5) + X_2$ 
6   | Calculate probability distribution for the vector  $a$  from the normal
   | distribution function:
   |
   | 
$$e_0(X) = \Phi\left(\frac{a_2 - \mu(a_2)}{\sigma(a_2)}\right) \tag{24}$$

7   | Apply random number generator from a Binomial function  $B(N, k, p)$  with
   | probability ( $p$ ) for success equals  $e_0(X)$ . This creates a vector  $D \in \{0; 1\}$ 
   | such that  $D \stackrel{ind.}{\sim} \text{Bernoulli}(e_0(X))$ .
8 end

```

---

Regarding the treatment effect, we consider different options. First,  $\tau(X)$  is constant for every unit. Second,  $\tau(X)$  depends linear on a subset  $Z$  of the covariates and is continuous. The third option is a non-linear dependence of all covariates and continuous. Fourth,  $\tau(X)$  again depends on some space  $Z$  of the covariates and further takes only two different values. We describe the generation of the treatment effect in algorithm 5. Through the standardization, we approximate  $E(\tau(X))$  to be around 0.5, the same as for the constant effect.

---

**Algorithm 5:** Treatment Effect

---

1 **if** *constant effect* **then**

2 |  $\tau(X) = c$  with  $c \in [0.1, 1]$  ;

3 **else if** *simple heterogeneous effect* **then**

4 | **Generate**  $\tau(X) \sim N(\mu, \sigma)$

5 |  $\tau(X) = X_1 + (X_2 > 0) + N(0, 0.1)$  ;

6 **else if** *non-linear heterogeneous effect* **then**

7 | **Apply** trigonometric function:

$$\tau(X) = \sin(X \times b) + W, \quad (25)$$

$$W \sim (N(0, 0.1)) \quad (26)$$

8 **else**

9 | **Define**  $Z$  as some feature space of  $X$  and apply CDF as in 24 and run Bernoulli trials:

$$Z = (X_6 \circ (X_1 \times X_5) \circ X_2)^2 \quad (27)$$

$$t_0(Z) = \Phi\left(\frac{Z - \mu(Z)}{\sigma(Z)}\right) \quad (28)$$

$$\tau(Z) \stackrel{ind.}{\sim} \text{Bernoulli}(t_0(Z)) \quad (29)$$

**Standardise** the treatment effect within the set  $\{0.1, +1\}$ .

$$\tau(X) = \frac{\tau(Z) - \min(\tau(Z))}{\max(\tau(Z)) - \min(\tau(Z))} (1 + 0.1) - 0.1 \quad (30)$$


10 **end**

---

## 3.2 Simulation Results

Figure 3.1 shows the estimates from the conditional average treatment effect over  $B = 100$  bootstrap iterations (sample splittings). The simulated data, in this case, has the following properties.  $N = 1000$ ,  $X = \mathbb{R}^{20}$ ,  $e(X) = 0.5$  and  $\tau(X) \in [0.1, 0.3]$ . The densities for 49 randomly selected observations show that even in randomised experiments, the point estimates differ due to the sample splitting in the first step. Averaging them by taking the median leads to a more stable conditional treatment effect function.

For our simulation, we consider different settings as described in Table 3.1. Setting A:D show results for non-randomized treatment allocation with different parameters whereas in setting E and F the treatment assignment is random and balanced to 0.5. While setting A:F might be considered as low-dimensional we multiply the number of covariates by a factor 10 in setting G:L, leaving everything else constant.




**Figure 3.1:** Distribution of scores ( $\hat{S}(X)$ ) for 49 randomly selected individuals.

**Table 3.1:** Settings and Monte Carlo averages.

Scenarios	A/G	B/H	C/I	D/J	E/K	F/L
N	1000	1000	2000	2000	2000	2000
$\mathbb{R}^p$	10	20	10	20	20	20
$P(D = 1)$	$e(X)$	$e(X)$	$e(X)$	$e(X)$	0.5	0.5
$\tau(X)$	constant	linear	non-linear	binary	non-linear	binary
Average error TMA GATES	0.81/0.52	0.56/0.61	0.75/0.65	0.55/0.88	0.32/0.48	0.48/0.53
Average error DO GATES	0.48/0.43	0.37/0.50	0.53/0.53	0.37/0.64	0.31/0.39	0.46/0.48

*Notes:* Averages over  $S = 10$  Monte Carlo simulations. Setting G to L consists of  $\mathbb{R}^{p*10}$ -covariates.

Figure 3.2 shows the results from the simulation given the DGP in Table 3.1. We use inclusion probability weighting to assign a group average treatment effect to every observation. We use these estimates to report the mean absolute error from the true treatment effects. This is done for both methods, the two-model approach (TMA GATES) and the DO GATES (we refer to the name DO GATES as for Double Orthogonal GATES). For each data generating process, we use Monte Carlo resampling 10 times and show the single results in Figure 3.2. Points below the 45-degree line are in favour of the DO GATES method since it shows a smaller MAE compared to the two-model approach. We also state the average result (error) for each data generating process in Table 3.1. A two-sample Welch t-test confirms that the hypothesis of equal means can be rejected based on a significance level of  $\leq 1\%$  for each setting except for the processes that mimic a randomized control trial. We find, that if the treatment effect is a constant (setting A and G) we do best among the settings. In any case, we can decrease the regularization bias. We also clearly see, that in settings with randomized treatment assignment (E, F, K and L) there is no significant difference between the methods. This is simply because, if the sample size is increasing, there is



**Figure 3.2:** Comparison of Two model approach and double orthogonal. Axes show mean absolute error between estimates and true individual treatment effects. 45-degree line indicates the equality of both methods.

no bias since the distribution of covariates is equal in the treatment and control group. The more high-dimensional the dataset is, the more difficult it gets for this assumption to hold which is why the sample size should increase at an even higher speed. We might see such small deviations in setting K and L where for some data sets a significant difference in MAE arises. Note that K and L consist of  $\mathbb{R}^{p \times 10}$  i.e. they are by factor 10 higher in dimension. Algorithm 6 describes the assignment of the treatment effects based on the  $k$  groups from the GATES as well as the MAE estimation over  $S$  datasets.

---

**Algorithm 6:** Inclusion Probability Weighting and MAE estimation

---

```
1 for  $s=1$  to  $S$  do
2   for  $b=1$  to  $B$  do
3     Assign group average treatment effect from group  $k$  to observations in
4     group  $k$ 
5     Store results in some matrix  $R_{n \times B}$ 
6   end
7     Average Take median for each observation over  $B$  bootstraps
8     Estimate final GATE based on relative group membership
9     Estimate mean absolute error (MAE) from true treatment effect
10    for both estimators
11    Store results in some matrix  $Q_{S \times 2}$ 
12  Resample keeping specifications constant (Monte Carlo study)
13 end
14 Average errors over  $S$  iterations
```

---

## 4 Conclusion

In this paper, we propose a method to estimate group average treatment effects in the combination of machine learning methods and parametric estimation for non-randomized control trials. Since flexibility in terms of the model choice, as well as interpretability of the results, is of main interest, we extend the idea of the GATES approach towards the use of a doubly-robust estimator in the first, the non-parametric, step. In the second step, the linear projection function, we use Neyman-orthogonal moments to overcome the regularization bias due to the dependency of the covariates on the outcome and the treatment assignment parameter. This ensures to control for self-selection into treatment which is a realistic challenge in observational studies. We further develop a new weighting procedure for the group estimates resulting from the CATE function. We propose inclusion probability weighting to identify the GATE value for each individual in a robust way by taking medians for each observation over  $B$  bootstraps rather than medians for each group. This allows us to make inference even on the individual level which we use to evaluate our method. Note that even if we only have  $k$  groups, the estimates for the observations have more levels than  $k$ . This results through the inclusion probability weighting which is used for comparison with the true heterogeneous treatment effects. To get only  $k$  group estimates we weight each group over the  $B$  iterations and take medians. These groups can then be used for empirical studies where one interesting parameter might be the difference between the most and least affected groups (as proposed by [Chernozhukov et al. \(2018b\)](#)).

We find that using a doubly-robust estimator with cross-fitting, in combination with Neyman-orthogonal moments, decreases the mean absolute error compared to the simple two-model approach significantly. The number of groups can of course be increased to e.g. 10 or even more groups. In empirical settings, it would depend on the



sample size. If we want to have at least 30 observations within a group we could have  $\frac{N}{30 \times \Lambda}$  groups, with  $\Lambda$ -splits or folds of the dataset in the first stage used for training and testing. Here we considered only two-folds. However, there is no general relationship between the number of folds in cross-fitting and the precision of the estimator (see Chernozhukov et al. (2018a) for an example with different folds). Due to computational reasons we only use  $B = 10$  bootstrap iterations within the same sample and  $S = 10$  Monte Carlo re-samplings of the same data generating process.

## References


- Susan Athey, Stefan Wager, and Julie Tibshirani. Generalized random forests. *The Annals of Statistics*, 47(2):1148–1178, 2019.
- Alexandre Belloni, Victor Chernozhukov, and Christian Hansen. Inference on treatment effects after selection among high-dimensional controls. *The Review of Economic Studies*, 81(2):608–650, 2014.
- Victor Chernozhukov and Vira Semenova. Simultaneous inference for Best Linear Predictor of the Conditional Average Treatment Effect and other structural functions. CeMMAP working papers CWP40/18, Centre for Microdata Methods and Practice, Institute for Fiscal Studies, July 2018. URL <https://ideas.repec.org/p/ifs/cemmap/40-18.html>.
- Victor Chernozhukov, Denis Chetverikov, Mert Demirer, Esther Duflo, Christian Hansen, Whitney Newey, and James Robins. Double/debiased machine learning for treatment and structural parameters. *The Econometrics Journal*, 21(1):C1–C68, 2018a. ISSN 1368-423X. doi: 10.1111/ectj.12097. URL <http://doi.org/10.1111/ectj.12097>.
- Victor Chernozhukov, Mert Demirer, Esther Duflo, and Ivan Fernandez-Val. Generic machine learning inference on heterogeneous treatment effects in randomized experiments. Preprint at <https://arxiv.org/abs/1712.04802>, 2018b.
- Victor Chernozhukov, Iván Fernández-Val, and Ye Luo. The sorted effects method: Discovering heterogeneous effects beyond their averages. *Econometrica*, 86(6):1911–1938, 2018c. doi: 10.3982/ECTA14415. URL <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.3982/ECTA14415>.
- Qingliang Fan, Yu-Chin Hsu, Robert P Lieli, and Yichong Zhang. Estimation of conditional average treatment effects with high-dimensional data. Preprint at <https://arxiv.org/abs/1908.02399>, 2019.
- Trevor Hastie, Robert Tibshirani, and Jerome Friedman. *The elements of statistical learning: data mining, inference, and prediction*, Springer Series in Statistics. Springer New York, 2009.

- James Heckman, Hidehiko Ichimura, Jeffrey Smith, and Petra Todd. Characterizing selection bias using experimental data. Technical report, National bureau of economic research, 1998.
- Daniel G Horvitz and Donovan J Thompson. A generalization of sampling without replacement from a finite universe. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 47(260):663–685, 1952.
- Michael Knaus, Michael Lechner, and Anthony Strittmatter. Machine learning estimation of heterogeneous causal effects: Empirical monte carlo evidence. *CEPR Discussion Paper No. DP13402*, 2018.
- Sören R Künzel, Jasjeet S Sekhon, Peter J Bickel, and Bin Yu. Metalearners for estimating heterogeneous treatment effects using machine learning. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 116(10):4156–4165, 2019. ISSN 0027-8424.
- Sokbae Lee, Ryo Okui, and Yoon-Jae Whang. Doubly robust uniform confidence band for the conditional average treatment effect function. *Journal of Applied Econometrics*, 32(7):1207–1225, 2017. doi: 10.1002/jae.2574. URL <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/jae.2574>.
- Jared K Lunceford and Marie Davidian. Stratification and weighting via the propensity score in estimation of causal treatment effects: A comparative study. *Statistics in Medicine*, 23(19):2937–2960, 2004. ISSN 1097-0258.
- Xinkun Nie and Stefan Wager. Quasi-oracle estimation of heterogeneous treatment effects. Preprint at <https://arxiv.org/abs/1712.04912>, 2017.
- Scott Powers, Junyang Qian, Kenneth Jung, Alejandro Schuler, Nigam H Shah, Trevor Hastie, and Robert Tibshirani. Some methods for heterogeneous treatment effect estimation in high dimensions. *Statistics in Medicine*, 37(11):1767–1787, 2018.
- James M Robins and Andrea Rotnitzky. Semiparametric efficiency in multivariate regression models with missing data. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 90(429):122–129, 1995.
- James M Robins, Andrea Rotnitzky, and Lue Ping Zhao. Estimation of regression coefficients when some regressors are not always observed. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 89(427):846–866, 1994. ISSN 0162-1459.
- Peter M Robinson. Root-n-consistent semiparametric regression. *Econometrica: Journal of the Econometric Society*, pages 931–954, 1988. ISSN 0012-9682.
- Paul R Rosenbaum and Donald B Rubin. The central role of the propensity score in observational studies for causal effects. *Biometrika*, 70(1):41–55, 1983. ISSN 0006-3444.

Elizabeth J Williamson, Andrew Forbes, and Ian R White. Variance reduction in randomised trials by inverse probability weighting using the propensity score. *Statistics in Medicine*, 33(5):721–737, 2014.

Michael Zimmert and Michael Lechner. Nonparametric estimation of causal heterogeneity under high-dimensional confounding. Preprint at <https://arxiv.org/abs/1908.08779>, 2019.

## A Figures



**Figure A.1:** Correlation Matrix of Covariates. Correlation metric is bravais-pearson.