

Optimal Experimental Design for Staggered Rollouts

Ruoxuan Xiong*

Department of Management Science & Engineering, Stanford University, rxiong@stanford.edu

Susan Athey

Graduate School of Business, Stanford University, athey@stanford.edu

Mohsen Bayati

Graduate School of Business, Stanford University, bayati@stanford.edu

Guido Imbens

Graduate School of Business, Stanford University, imbens@stanford.edu

Experimentation has become an increasingly prevalent tool for guiding policy choices, firm decisions, and product innovation. A common hurdle in designing experiments is the lack of statistical power. In this paper, we study optimal multi-period experimental design under the constraint that the treatment cannot be easily removed once implemented; for example, a government or firm might implement treatment in different geographies at different times, where the treatment cannot be easily removed due to practical constraints. The design problem is to select which units to treat at which time, intending to test hypotheses about the effect of the treatment. When the potential outcome is a linear function of a unit effect, a time effect, and observed discrete covariates, we provide an analytically feasible solution to the design problem where the variance of the estimator for the treatment effect is at most $1 + O\left(\frac{1}{N^2}\right)$ times the variance of the optimal design, where N is the number of units. This solution assigns units in a staggered treatment adoption pattern, where the proportion treated is a linear function of time. In the general setting where outcomes depend on latent covariates, we show that historical data can be utilized in the optimal design. We propose a data-driven local search algorithm with the minimax decision criterion to assign units to treatment times. We demonstrate that our approach improves upon benchmark experimental designs through synthetic experiments on real-world data sets from several domains, including healthcare, finance, and retail. Finally, we consider the case where the treatment effect changes with the time of treatment, showing that the optimal design treats a smaller fraction of units at the beginning and a greater share at the end.

Key words: Experimental Design, Staggered Rollouts, Treatment Effect Estimation, Multi-period, Stratification, Simulated Annealing, Statistical Power, Efficiency, Minimax

1. Introduction

Experimentation is a cornerstone of developing and evaluating new policies. Large technology companies run thousands or even tens of thousands of experiments per year to evaluate the impact of various interventions, design better products, and understand mechanisms (Muchnik et al. 2013, Aral and Walker 2014, Brynjolfsson et al. 2018, 2019, Salganik 2019). In some cases, a variety of

* Alphabetical other than the first author.

firm constraints lead firms to introduce new products or features at different points in time. After such a rollout has occurred, analysts treat this type of “staggered adoption” of the new feature as a “natural experiment” and attempt to estimate causal effects (Athey and Stern 2002, Athey and Imbens 2018, Athey et al. 2018). However, less research has been done to consider how to design such experiments in anticipation of precisely analyzing treatment effects.

In this paper, we study the question of how to optimally design experiments in settings where the experimental designer can choose not just which units to treat, but when to treat them. *Our goal is to minimize the variance of the estimate for the treatment effect, by choosing the optimal multi-period design.* We maintain the assumption that during the course of the experiment, once treated, a unit continues its treatment status until the end of the experiment. This assumption is motivated by practical considerations such as difficulties communicating with experimental subjects or frictions in implementing changes; we also can extend our results to the scenario where the treatment can be removed.¹

We study this question motivated by the fundamental challenge in experimental design: *statistical power* (Kuhfeld 2005, Lawrie et al. 2015, Hemming et al. 2015, Li et al. 2018, Bhat et al. 2019), which is the likelihood to detect the effect of a new policy. In practice, power is low due to a variety of reasons, such as a small sample size. For an important class of questions where the treatment affects market equilibrium, the relevant unit of analysis is a market, such as a city for local service marketplaces, or a category of products in an e-commerce setting. In other settings, interference among experimental subjects motivates experimenting on units such as hospitals or schools (Murray 1998, Murray et al. 2004, Campbell et al. 2012). Randomizing at a higher level of aggregation can effectively avoid contamination and network effects in online platforms or clinical trials. For example, in a trial comparing different weight-loss programs, patients may meet each other in the waiting room and communicate about their respective strategies (Leahey et al. 2014). However, randomizing at these higher levels reduces the number of units, which in turn reduces statistical power. Moreover, power is a challenge when experimentation involves substantial costs for each unit, for example in clinical trials (DiMasi et al. 2016) the sample size is usually small. Third, for some important questions, the treatment effect is small and noisy (Bhat et al. 2019); measuring the effectiveness of advertising is notoriously difficult (Lewis and Rao 2015).

Another reason for the low power in experimental design is the observational noise. One important source of noise for experimentation in commerce or digital platforms is seasonality. Activities such as retail shopping, travel, and the use of ride-sharing fluctuate with holidays, weather, the opening and closing of universities, and local events. Furthermore, if experiments are performed

¹This extension is provided in Appendix A.1.

at the city level, it can be difficult to ensure that treatment and control groups have balance in terms of temporal shocks. Different product categories respond differently to holidays and events. In such settings, a common analytic strategy is to control for pre-experiment time trends in order to adjust for differences across cities or product categories.

Measuring outcomes for units over time allows the experimental designer to improve the statistical power, as repeated observations for the same units allow the analyst to learn key parameters of the data generating process and thus reduce the error in estimating outcomes for units under counterfactual treatment status. However, determining the optimal timing of treatment assignments is challenging for two reasons. First, it is difficult to find an explicit functional form for how the design affects the variance of the treatment effect estimator (Hussey and Hughes 2007, Hemming et al. 2015, Li et al. 2018). Second, in general, the problem of assigning units to either the treated or control group at each point in time is an integer programming problem, which is in general computationally expensive to solve (Bertsimas et al. 2015, Kallus 2018, Bhat et al. 2019). For the first challenge, our analysis is based on best linear unbiased estimator, which provides the explicit functional form and has the smallest variance among all linear unbiased estimators. *The main contributions in this paper are in tackling the second challenge.* The solution we provide is shown to have consistently superior performance for variance reduction of treatment effect estimators when working with real-world data sets.

Our first main contribution is to study the optimal design for the potential outcome with observed or latent covariates. We provide the simple sufficient conditions for the optimal solution. When the observed or latent covariates take finitely many values, from the sufficient conditions, the design is optimal if it has $\frac{2t-1}{2T}$ proportion of treated units for each group with the same covariate value. We can interpret this design matrix as *stratified* randomization in the cross-sectional and time-series dimensions.² When there is no feasible solution allowing a $\frac{2t-1}{2T}$ treated units (for each group), we provide a feasible solution where the variance of the estimator is at most $1 + O\left(\frac{1}{N^2}\right)$ times the variance of the optimal solution, where N is the number of units. Moreover, when covariates can take infinitely many values, we can use clustering approaches, such as K-means, to partition units into a few groups based on covariate values.

Our second main contribution is to propose a data-driven algorithm to efficiently find a better design when covariates are latent or take infinitely many values. Our algorithm exploits covariate information in the historical control data and searches for a better design based on simulated annealing³ and the minimax decision rule, which is justified by our theoretical analysis. We calculate

² By contrast, the conventional A/B testing or the parallel design only randomizes in the cross-section dimension.

³ similar to Nikolaev and Jacobson (2010).

the minimax estimation error for some design matrix by following three steps: 1. Split the historical data into a few sub-matrices; 2. Apply synthetic experiments (with a known treatment effect) based on this design to each sub-matrix; 3. Estimate the treatment effect on each sub-matrix, and calculate the maximum estimation error. We want to find the design such that the maximum error is minimized. We search for this design by simulated annealing: 1. We propose swapping two random rows of the current design matrix in each step; 2. If the maximum error in historical sub-matrices is reduced, we accept this swap; otherwise, we accept this swap with a small probability in order to escape local optima.

We further extend our analysis to the scenario when the treatment has carryover effects, where we are interested in estimating the direct effect as well as the lagged effects. We study the design that minimizes the trace or determinant of the covariance matrix of the estimated direct and lagged effects. In contrast to the optimal design without carryover effects, the optimal treated proportion is nonlinear in time: smaller at the beginning, increasing at a faster rate in the middle, and larger in the end.

We illustrate the practical relevance of our design and algorithm through synthetic experiments on real-world data sets from several domains, including retail, online lending and healthcare. We find that our near-optimal design can significantly and consistently outperform benchmark designs on these real-world data sets. Furthermore, we find that our algorithm can find a superior design and reduce the treatment effect estimation error regardless of the estimation algorithm.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 describes the model and our objective. Main results for the near optimal design are presented in Section 3. Section 4 provides algorithms to efficiently estimate the treatment effect and search for a better design. Finally, in Section 5, we demonstrate the efficiency gains from our results and algorithms in Sections 3 and 4 by analyzing synthetic experiments using three real-world data sets drawn from retail, online lending and health care.

1.1. Related Literature

We study the problem of multi-period experimental design when treated units are prohibited from switching back to the control, which is closely related to what is referred to as the stepped wedge design in clinical trials (Brown and Lilford 2006). In the stepped wedge design, an intervention is sequentially rolled out to participants (more often to clusters than to individuals) over a number of periods. This design is especially relevant when the intervention is more likely to have a positive effect, but it cannot be carried out simultaneously for all participants due to logistical or financial constraints (Brown and Lilford 2006, Mdege et al. 2011). Hemming et al. (2015) point out that the stepped wedge clustered studies tend to have better statistical performance compared to parallel

clustered studies when the intra-cluster correlations are larger. Optimal allocation of clusters in the stepped wedge design has been studied under the linear model with time fixed effects, random cluster effects (Hussey and Hughes 2007, Hemming et al. 2015) and with additional random interaction effects (Li et al. 2018). In the base case, we study the linear model with unit and time fixed effects, where we estimate both effects and obtain the optimal design with staggered linear rollouts. Furthermore, our setting is different mainly in the following two aspects: 1. We allow each unit to have its own (observed or latent) covariates; 2. We study the use of historical control data to find a better design. The first generalization is very common in practice; indeed, linearity in time effects and cluster effects is restrictive. For the second generalization, historical control data is commonly available in digital platforms and clinical trials, so it is natural to leverage that data to enhance experiment design.

Our problem also shares similarities with the literature on experimental design with covariate matching (Cook et al. 2002, Bertsimas et al. 2015, 2017, 2019, Kallus 2018, Bhat et al. 2019). Our setup is different in that we allocate treatment for multiple units over multiple periods and the treatment cannot be removed once allocated. Compared with the literature (Bertsimas et al. 2015, 2017, 2019, Kallus 2018, Bhat et al. 2019), we allow covariates to be latent, and we can find a better design from historical control data that contains information about the latent covariates. Moreover, instead of directly solving the integer programming problem⁴, we propose starting from the analytical solution that is optimal in the model without covariates, and actively improve this solution using the historical data in an efficient way.

Stratification has been used in randomized experiments, such as in clinical trials (Simon 1979, Polit and Beck 2008). Athey and Imbens (2017) suggest the statistical power of the treatment effect estimator can be increased by stratifying the population into small strata⁵, randomizing within the strata and adjusting the standard errors. Recent literature studies the inferential theory (Li et al. 2018, Bugni et al. 2018, 2019) and implementation algorithms (Krieger et al. 2019) in stratified randomized experiments. The main difference between our work and the literature is that we consider a multi-period experimental design.

2. Model

We introduce the potential outcome model under the control and treated in Section 2.1. We describe the problem and our objective in Section 2.2.

⁴ This is in general computationally expensive. This can be infeasible when covariates are latent.

⁵ Strata means the group of units with the same covariates' value.

2.1. Setup

Before we carry out a new policy, we want to evaluate the treatment effect of this new policy. Assume we have N units to apply this new policy to and we can observe their outcomes for T periods. We have the following assumption for the potential outcomes.

ASSUMPTION 1 (Model Assumption). *Assume the potential outcomes for these N units over the T time periods can be modeled as*

$$Y_{it}(z_{it}) = \alpha_i + \beta_t + L_{it} + \tau z_{it} + \varepsilon_{it}, \quad (1)$$

where τ is the treatment effect, $z_{it} \in \{-1, 1\}$ indicates whether unit i at time t is treated ($z_{it} = 1$) or not ($z_{it} = -1$), α_i and β_t are unit and time fixed effects, and ε_{it} is the i.i.d. observational noise with mean 0 and variance σ^2 . Furthermore, we allow the N by T matrix $L = [L_{it}]$ to be in one of the following three cases:

1. $L = 0$;

2. $L = X\theta^\top$, where $X \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times r}$ are observed covariates and $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^{T \times r}$ are unknown coefficients;

3. $L = UV^\top$, where $U = \begin{bmatrix} u_1 \\ \vdots \\ u_N \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times r}$ with $u_i \in \mathbb{R}^r$ are latent covariates, $V = \begin{bmatrix} v_1 \\ \vdots \\ v_T \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{T \times r}$ with $v_t \in \mathbb{R}^r$ are unknown coefficients, $\mathbf{1}^\top U = 0$, $\alpha^\top U = 0$ and $\mathbb{E}[v_t] = 0$.

We also assume that L is low-rank, that is $r \ll \min(N, T)$.

Our paper mainly focuses on the second and third cases: the potential outcomes that have either *observed* or *latent* covariates. We discuss the first case to develop intuition for the second and third cases.

The matrix notation of (1) is

$$Y(Z) = \alpha \mathbf{1}^\top + \mathbf{1} \beta^\top + L + \tau Z + \varepsilon. \quad (2)$$

We assume the treatment effect τ is constant. This assumption is more general than it initially appears. Estimating the average treatment effect is of great interest and importance in observational studies with the cross-sectional data (Rosenbaum and Rubin 1983, Angrist and Imbens 1995, Hirano et al. 2003, Abadie and Imbens 2006) and from the panel data (Abadie et al. 2010, 2015, Doudchenko and Imbens 2016, Li and Bell 2017, Li 2017, Arkhangelsky et al. 2019). If the treatment effect is heterogeneous and time-varying, denoted as τ_{it} , we are interested in estimating the average treatment effect τ , that is

$$\tau_{it} = \tau + \delta_{it},$$

where δ_{it} has mean 0. We can then incorporate δ_{it} into ε_{it} in model (2), and estimate the average treatment effect τ from model (2).

For the third case $L = UV^\top$ (the second case is similar), given that both $\alpha\vec{1}^\top$ and $\vec{1}\beta^\top$ are rank-1 matrices, we can rewrite L as

$$\tilde{L} = [\alpha \vec{1} \ U] \begin{bmatrix} \vec{1}^\top \\ \beta^\top \\ V^\top \end{bmatrix}$$

to incorporate the fixed effects into the low-rank matrix L . The reason that we separate the fixed effects from the low-rank matrix L is that first, we allow the rank r to be 0; second, we jointly estimate the fixed effects and the treatment effect τ to reduce the estimation bias for τ .

In this paper, we focus on the *irreversible* treatment adoption pattern, which is stated in the following assumption. Our results can be extended to the corresponding solution in the scenario where the treatment can be removed in Appendix A.1.

ASSUMPTION 2 (Irreversible Treatment Adoption Pattern). *We assume the treatment adoption pattern is such that once a unit adopts treatment, it stays treated afterwards, that is,*

$$z_{it} \leq z_{i,t+1}, \text{ for all } i \text{ and } 1 \leq t \leq T - 1$$

First, we allow units to progressively adopt treatment. Our setting is different from paired and stratified experiments where the treatment status stays the same throughout the experiment. Our setting is similar to the crossover trial in a longitudinal study. However, we prohibit treated units from switching back to the control, which is closely related to the stepped wedge design in randomized controlled trials (Brown and Lilford 2006, Hussey and Hughes 2007, Woertman et al. 2013, Hemming et al. 2015). This restriction is also closely related to the staggered treatment adoption pattern in observational studies (Athey and Stern 1998, Athey et al. 2018, Athey and Imbens 2018).

We study the scenario in Assumption 2 mainly for two reasons: 1. There are some practical constraints preventing units from switching back and forth between control and treated. For example, policies at the cluster level, such as programs to improve case management skills of health care staff at the hospital level, can hardly be suspended and reactivated frequently. 2. When the treated units switch back to control, they can not return to the original control status. For example, the improvement of case management skills of health care staff can be persistent even if the programs are suspended.

2.2. Objective

Our objective is to estimate the treatment effect τ as precisely as possible. To achieve this, two questions should be addressed:

- **Q1:** How should we estimate τ ?

• **Q2:** Given an estimation approach, how can we find the optimal matrix $Z \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times T}$ that minimizes the variance of the treatment effect estimator $\hat{\tau}$, where the randomness comes from ε in model (2)?

As a preparation to discuss the first question, we state the well-known Gauss-Markov Theorem.

LEMMA 1 (Gauss-Markov Theorem). *Consider a linear model $y = X\beta + \text{noise}$ with $\mathbb{E}[\text{noise}|X] = 0$ and $\text{Cov}[\text{noise}|X] = \Omega$. If $\Omega = \sigma^2 I$, then the ordinary least squares (OLS) estimator $\hat{\beta} = (X^\top X)^{-1} X^\top y$ is the best linear unbiased estimator (BLUE). Otherwise, when Ω is not multiple of the identity matrix, the generalized least squares (GLS) estimator $\hat{\beta} = (X^\top \Omega^{-1} X)^{-1} X^\top \Omega^{-1} y$ is BLUE. Here, “best” means the estimator has the lowest variance among all unbiased linear estimators.*

For Q1, in model (2), if either $L = 0$ or $L = X\theta$ (X are observed covariates), then $\hat{\tau}$ estimated from OLS is BLUE. In model (2), if $L = UV^\top$ (U are latent covariates), we can use GLS to estimate τ

$$Y(Z) = \alpha \vec{1}^\top + \vec{1} \beta^\top + \tau Z + e, \quad (3)$$

where $e = L + \varepsilon$, and L is incorporated into the “error” term. Under case 3 of Assumption 1, $\hat{\tau}$ using GLS is BLUE. Thus, our theoretical analysis is based on either the OLS or GLS estimator depending on the structure of L .

In practice, if the covariance matrix for \vec{e} is unknown, where \vec{e} is the vector that is obtained by concatenating columns of the matrix e from (3), then we can use the feasible generalized least squares (feasible GLS) with the estimated covariance matrix for \vec{e} . The covariance matrix for \vec{e} can be estimated using the residuals from OLS. Although GLS is the most efficient, it is not clear whether feasible GLS is efficient (compared with OLS). When the covariance matrix of errors can be consistently estimated, feasible GLS is asymptotically more efficient than OLS. However, when the dimensions of the covariance matrix are large (dimensions of errors’ covariance matrix are $NT \times NT$, which can be very large), feasible GLS can be less efficient in finite samples. In empirical applications, we propose an alternative estimator (motivated by low-rank matrix estimation literature in machine learning) that can be more efficient but may be biased. The details are presented in Sections 4-5.

For Q2, if we have an explicit function form that shows how the variance of $\hat{\tau}$ changes with the design Z (we will see in Section 3 that for OLS or GLS this is the case), then we can write the optimization problem to find the optimal design matrix $Z \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times T}$ that minimizes $\text{Var}(\hat{\tau})$,

$$\begin{aligned} \min_Z \quad & \text{Var}(\hat{\tau}) \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & z_{it} \leq z_{i,t+1}, \text{ for all } i \text{ and } 1 \leq t \leq T-1 \\ & z_{it} \in \{-1, 1\}, \text{ for all } i \text{ and } t, \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

where here and in the remaining, for notation simplicity, “ $z_{it} \leq z_{i,t+1}$ ” stands for “ $z_{it} \leq z_{i,t+1}$, for all i and $1 \leq t \leq T-1$ ”, and “ $z_{it} \in \{-1, 1\}$ ” stands for “ $z_{it} \in \{-1, 1\}$, for all i and t ”.

In general, solving optimization problem (4) with integer constraints is computationally expensive. Specifically, even in the special case where $T = 1$ and $\hat{\tau}$ is obtained via OLS, we will see later in (7) that problem (4) reduces to the number partitioning problem (Hayes 2002, Mertens 2006) which is NP-hard (the numbers corresponding to Γ that can take infinitely many values).

However, we show in Section 3 that if $\hat{\tau}$ is estimated by OLS or GLS depending on the case of L , we can provide an analytical solution that is near optimal for the integer programming problem (4). Furthermore, this analytical solution has a very simple form and significantly outperforms benchmark design matrices in empirical applications as shown in Section 5.

3. Results

In this section, for any of the three different cases of L (i.e., $L = 0$, $L = X\theta^\top$, $L = UV^\top$), we will provide sufficient conditions for the optimal solution of the integer programming problem (4) when $\hat{\tau}$ is obtained via the BLUE estimator (either OLS or GLS) under mild assumptions. The sufficient conditions require the optimal fraction of treated units (treated proportion) to grow *linearly* in time. Based on the sufficient conditions, we also demonstrate how to find a feasible solution with objective value (variance) at most $1 + O\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{z}}\right)$ times objective value of the global optimum.

When there are observed (or latent) covariates that also take finitely many values, our sufficient conditions require treated proportion to be equal across all groups of units with the same covariate values (aka stratum). We extend our analysis to the case that the treatment has carryover effects and find that the optimal portion is *nonlinear* in time. The details of this latter extension are presented in Appendix A.2. Finally, we discuss the optimal design for the base case $L = 0$ when we can concatenate historical control data with experimental data to estimate τ .

3.1. Observed Covariates

In this section, we study the cases $L = 0$ and $L = X\theta^\top$. Model (1) can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned} Y_{it}(z_{it}) &= \alpha_i + \beta_t + X_i^\top \theta_t + \tau z_{it} + \varepsilon_{it}, \\ &= \underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} z_{it} & \Gamma_{it}^\top \end{bmatrix}}_{1 \times (N+T(r+1))} \underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} \tau \\ \eta \end{bmatrix}}_{(N+T(r+1)) \times 1} + \varepsilon_{it} \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

If $L = 0$, then $r = 0$. In matrix notation, we have

$$\vec{Y} = [\vec{z} \ \Gamma] \begin{bmatrix} \tau \\ \eta \end{bmatrix} + \vec{\varepsilon},$$

where $\vec{Y} = [Y_{:1}^\top \ Y_{:2}^\top \ \cdots \ Y_{:T}^\top]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{NT \times 1}$, $Y_{:t} = [Y_{1t} \ \cdots \ Y_{Nt}]^\top$, $\tilde{I} = [I \ \mathbf{0}]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times (N-1-r)}$,

$$\eta = \begin{bmatrix} \alpha \\ \beta \\ \theta_1 \\ \vdots \\ \theta_T \end{bmatrix}, \quad \alpha = \begin{bmatrix} \alpha_1 \\ \vdots \\ \alpha_{N-1-r} \end{bmatrix}, \quad \beta = \begin{bmatrix} \beta_1 \\ \vdots \\ \beta_T \end{bmatrix}, \quad \text{and } \Gamma = \begin{bmatrix} \Gamma_{:1} \\ \Gamma_{:2} \\ \vdots \\ \Gamma_{:T} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{I} \ \vec{1} & & X & & \\ \tilde{I} & \vec{1} & & X & \\ & & \ddots & & \ddots \\ \tilde{I} & & & \vec{1} & & X \end{bmatrix}.$$

Note that we restrict $\alpha_i = 0$ for $i = N - r, \dots, N$ such that all other α_i and β_t can be uniquely identified. If $L = 0$, then $\eta = \begin{bmatrix} \alpha \\ \beta \end{bmatrix}$ and the last Tr columns in Γ with X are eliminated. We use OLS to estimate τ and η . With some algebra, we have the following expression for the variance of $\hat{\tau}$,

$$\text{Var}(\hat{\tau}) = \frac{\sigma^2}{\vec{z}^\top (I - \Gamma(\Gamma^\top \Gamma)^{-1} \Gamma^\top) \vec{z}}. \quad (6)$$

Details to show (6) are presented in the Appendix. With (6) the optimization problem (4) is simplified to

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{\vec{z}=[z_{it}]} \quad & \vec{z}^\top \Gamma(\Gamma^\top \Gamma)^{-1} \Gamma^\top \vec{z} \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & z_{it} \leq z_{i,t+1} \\ & z_{it} \in \{-1, 1\} \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

We start with the simple case of only having fixed effects (i.e., $L = 0$) to develop intuition for the case of having covariates (i.e., $L = X\theta^\top$). Specifically, we consider Assumptions 1-2, and the special case that potential outcomes satisfy $Y_{it}(z_{it}) = \alpha_i + \beta_t + \tau z_{it} + \varepsilon_{it}$. Next, we will formally define our convex relaxation of (7).

Let $\omega_t = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N z_{it}$ for all t . Therefore, it is easy to see that ω_t takes values in $\{-1, -1 + \frac{2}{N}, \dots, 1 - \frac{2}{N}, 1\}$, given the constraints of (7). We then relax the range of ω_t to $-1 \leq \omega_t \leq 1$ and obtain the following convex relaxation problem

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{\vec{\omega} \in \mathbb{R}^T} \quad & \vec{\omega}^\top P_{\vec{1}} \vec{\omega} + 2\vec{d}^\top \vec{\omega} \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & -1 \leq \omega_t \leq 1 \\ & \omega_t \leq \omega_{t+1}, \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

with $P_{\vec{1}} = I - \frac{1}{T} \vec{1} \vec{1}^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{T \times T}$ and $d_t = \frac{T+1-2t}{T}$ for all t . The following theorem provides the optimal design for the optimization problem (8).

THEOREM 1 (Fixed Effects Only). *Under Assumptions 1-2, and when $L = 0$, then an optimal solution for (8) is $\vec{\omega}^* \in \mathbb{R}^T$ that is defined by*

$$\omega_t^* = \frac{2t - 1 - T}{T}, \quad \text{for all } t. \quad (9)$$

Theorem 1 states that we can relax the quadratic integer programming problem (7) with NT decision variables to a quadratic form with only T variables. The analytical optimal solution ω_t^* is *linear* in t . Given ω_t^* , the optimal treated proportion is $\frac{1+\omega_t^*}{2}$. Figure 1 visualizes the optimal treated proportion at every time period for a T -period design problem, where T ranges from 2 to 20. The treated proportion increases at the *constant rate* $\frac{1}{T}$.

Intuition. In order to build intuition for Theorem 1, the following two lemmas provide optimal solution for two special cases of the problem.

LEMMA 2 (Time Fixed Effects Only). *Consider the same assumptions as in Theorem 1, and in addition assume that $Y_{it}(z_{it}) = \beta_t + \tau z_{it} + \varepsilon_{it}$. Then, any design is optimal if it satisfies $\omega_t = 0$ for all t and $z_{it} \leq z_{i,t+1}$ for all i and t .*

Lemma 2 states that if there are only time fixed effects in the potential outcome, the optimal design is the parallel design that the treatment is assigned to half of the units with the remainder functioning as the control for all time periods. The intuition for Lemma 2 is that given the time effect β_t , each time period's observations serve as their own control to estimate τ . Formally, the variance only depends on the *cross-sectional average of z_{it}* . The variance is minimized when there are 50% treated and 50% control at every time period. Rows of Z are exchangeable, so only the treated proportion instead of who to treat matters. An example of the optimal design is illustrated in Table 1a. Lemma 2 implies that, in the conventional A/B tests and placebo tests, randomly and evenly splitting units into the treated and control groups from the beginning is optimal.

LEMMA 3 (Unit Fixed Effects Only). *Consider the same assumptions as in Theorem 1, and in addition assume that $Y_{it}(z_{it}) = \alpha_i + \tau z_{it} + \varepsilon_{it}$. Then, any design is optimal if it satisfies $\omega_t = -1$ for all $t < \frac{T+1}{2}$ and $\omega_t = 1$ for all $t > \frac{T+1}{2}$.*

Lemma 3 states that if there are only unit fixed effects, the optimal design is to allocate treatment to all units at halftime. The intuition for Lemma 3 is symmetric to that for Lemma 2: given the unit effect α_i , each unit's observations serve as their own control to estimate τ . Formally, the variance only depends on the *time-series average of z_{it}* . The variance is minimized when there are 50% treated and 50% control for each unit. An example of the optimal design is illustrated in Table 1b.

Intuitively, when we have both unit and time fixed effects, the optimal design is a mixture of Lemmas 2 and 3. In other words, the variance should depend on both the cross-sectional and time-series average of z_{it} . Under the irreversible treatment adoption pattern, the time-series average is uniquely identified given the cross-sectional average and therefore can be cancelled out. The Hessian of the objective function in (8) is $P_{\bar{1}}$, which is positive semidefinite, so the objective function is convex.

-1	-1
-1	-1
-1	-1
-1	-1
1	1
1	1
1	1
1	1

(a) Time FE

-1	1
-1	1
-1	1
-1	1
-1	1
-1	1
-1	1
-1	1

(b) Unit FE

-1	-1
-1	-1
-1	1
-1	1
-1	1
-1	1
-1	1
1	1
1	1

(c) Two-way FE

Table 1 An optimal design with $N = 8$ and $T = 2$ under time fixed effect, unit fixed effect and two-way fixed effect models. Each row denotes a unit and each column denotes a time period. FE denotes fixed effects.

The analytical optimal solution ω_t^* is linear in t , balancing the learning of both unit and time fixed effects. If we aggregation the observations for all time periods, there are 50% control and 50% treated. An example of the optimal design is illustrated in Table 1c.

The optimal solution in Theorem 1, $\omega_t^* = \frac{2t-1-T}{T}$, is equivalent to $\frac{N(2t-1)}{2T}$ treated units at time t . However, $\frac{N(2t-1)}{2T}$ may not be an integer. In order to get a feasible solution for (4), we use the following nearest integer rounding rule.

Nearest integer rounding rule: We obtain a feasible solution \tilde{Z} by rounding $\frac{N(2t-1)}{2T}$ to the nearest integer. When the fraction is 0.5, we round it down when $\frac{2t-1}{2T} < \frac{1}{2}$ and we round it up when $\frac{2t-1}{2T} \geq \frac{1}{2}$. Specifically, $\tilde{Z} = [\tilde{z}_{it}]$ is a design satisfying the constraints in (4) and

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \tilde{z}_{it} = \begin{cases} \lfloor \frac{N(2t-1)}{2T} \rfloor & \text{if } \frac{N(2t-1)}{2T} < \frac{1}{2} \text{ or } \frac{N(2t-1)}{2T} = \frac{1}{2} \text{ with } \frac{2t-1}{2T} < \frac{1}{2} \\ \lceil \frac{N(2t-1)}{2T} \rceil & \text{if } \frac{N(2t-1)}{2T} > \frac{1}{2} \text{ or } \frac{N(2t-1)}{2T} = \frac{1}{2} \text{ with } \frac{2t-1}{2T} \geq \frac{1}{2} \end{cases}$$

The following theorem provides an upper bound for $Var(\hat{\tau})$, when design \tilde{Z} is used.

THEOREM 2. Under the Assumptions 1, let Z^* be the optimal solution for (4) and \tilde{Z} be the feasible solution for (4) using the nearest integer rounding rule. Denote the variance of $\hat{\tau}$ using the design Z as $h_{\hat{\tau}}(Z)$. We have

$$h_{\hat{\tau}}(\tilde{Z}) \leq \frac{1}{1 - 1/N^2} h_{\hat{\tau}}(Z^*).$$

Theorem 2 states that the nearest integer rounding rule outputs a solution that approximates the global optimum within a factor of $1 + O(\frac{1}{N^2})$.

Now, we are ready to present one of our first *main results*, sufficient conditions and optimal design for the general case $L = X\theta^\top$.

THEOREM 3 (Observed Covariates and Fixed Effects). Suppose Assumptions 1-2 hold and potential outcomes follow $Y_{it}(z_{it}) = \alpha_i + \beta_t + X_i^\top \theta_t + \tau z_{it} + \varepsilon_{it}$. If $\sum_{i=1}^N X_i = \vec{0}$, then Z is an optimal design if Z satisfies the constraints in (4) and

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N z_{it} = \frac{2t-1-T}{T}, \quad \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N X_i z_{it} = \mu, \quad \text{for all } t \quad (10)$$




Figure 1 Optimal treated percentage at every time period for a T -period design problem. The legends with different colors denote the number of periods T . For example, the leftmost blue line represents the optimal treated percentage for a 2-period design problem.

for some $\mu \in \mathbb{R}^r$. Furthermore, if X_i can only take G different values (G is finite), denoted as $x_1, \dots, x_G \in \mathbb{R}^p$, each with positive probability bounded away from 0, we define $\omega_{g,t} = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{O}_g|} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{O}_g} z_{it}$, where $\mathcal{O}_g = \{i : X_i = x_g\}$. Any design Z is optimal if it satisfies the constraints in (4) and

$$\omega_{g,t} = \frac{2t-1-T}{T}, \text{ for all } t \text{ and } g. \quad (11)$$

The assumption $\sum_{i=1}^N X_i = \vec{0}$ (X is orthogonal to $\vec{1}$) holds without loss of generality because we can always use the Gram-Schmidt procedure⁶ to decompose $[\vec{1} \ X] = QR \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times (r+1)}$. Then the first column in Q is $\vec{1}$. The second to last columns in Q are orthogonal to $\vec{1}$, which can be used as the observed covariates in (5).

Theorem 3 states that when observed covariates X_i can only take finitely many values, there exists an optimal design that has *linear* staggered rollouts with *stratification*. In other words, for each strata, the group of units with the same covariate value, we randomize the treatment allocation over time such that the treated proportion is $\frac{2t-1}{2T}$ at time t . If we aggregate all stratum, the *overall* treated proportion satisfies $\frac{2t-1}{2T}$ at time t , which is the same as Theorem 1. An example of the optimal design is illustrated in Table 2a.

Sketch of Proof. The main intermediate step is to show that the objective function in (4) can be simplified to

$$\underbrace{(\vec{\omega}^{(1)})^\top P_{\vec{1}} \vec{\omega}^{(1)} + 2\vec{d}^\top \vec{\omega}^{(1)}}_{\text{I}} + \underbrace{\sum_{j=2}^{r+1} (\vec{\omega}^{(j)})^\top P_{\vec{1}} \vec{\omega}^{(j)}}_{\text{II}},$$

where $\vec{\omega}_t^{(1)} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N z_{it}$ and $\vec{\omega}_t^{(j+1)} = X_{ij} z_{it}$. If we can find a solution that separately minimizes I and II, then this solution minimizes their sum.

⁶ Equivalent to QR decomposition

I depends on the *cross-sectional average* of z_{it} , which is the same as the objective function in Theorem 1. From Theorem 1, if Z satisfies $\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N z_{it} = \frac{2t-1-T}{T}$, then I is minimized.

II depends on the *weighted cross-sectional average* of z_{it} by X_i .⁷ The minimum value of II is zero, because $P_{\vec{1}}$ is positive semidefinite. Since $P_{\vec{1}}$'s null space is $\vec{1}$, if Z satisfies $\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N X_i z_{it} = \mu$, equivalently $\vec{\omega}^{(j+1)} = \mu \vec{1}$, II is minimized.

If X_i can only take G different values with $\omega_{g,t} = \frac{2t-1-T}{T}$, the sufficient conditions hold following

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N z_{it} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{g=1}^G |\mathcal{O}_g| w_{g,t} = \frac{2t-1-T}{T}, \quad \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N X_i z_{it} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{g=1}^G |\mathcal{O}_g| x_g w_{g,t} = 0.$$

□

Note that for each strata, $\frac{|\mathcal{O}_g|(2t-1)}{2T}$ may not be an integer and therefore there does not exist a Z to satisfy (11). We use the nearest integer rounding rule⁸ to get a feasible design \tilde{Z} for (4). Then we have the following theorem to provide a guarantee for \tilde{Z} .

THEOREM 4. *Under the assumptions in Theorem 3, let Z^* be the optimal solution for (4) and \tilde{Z} be the feasible solution for (4) using the nearest integer rounding rule. Denote the variance of $\hat{\tau}$ using the design Z as $h_{\hat{\tau}}(Z)$, $x_{j,\max} = \max_g |x_{gj}|$ and $N_{\min} = \min_g |\mathcal{O}_g|$. Assume $(1 + \sum_{j=1}^r x_{j,\max}^2)/N_{\min}^2 < 1$, we have*

$$h_{\hat{\tau}}(\tilde{Z}) \leq \frac{1}{1 - (1 + \sum_{j=1}^r x_{j,\max}^2)/N_{\min}^2} h_{\hat{\tau}}(Z^*).$$

Theorem 4 states the nearest integer rounding rule outputs a feasible solution that is at most $1 + O\left(\frac{1}{N_{\min}^2}\right)$ ⁹ times the global optimum when r and $x_{j,\max}$ are bounded. Hence, if G is large compared with N , the feasible solution may not be close to the global optimum. We suggest to use partition methods, such as K-means, to partition units into G' groups based on their covariates' values.¹⁰ Within each group, we can randomize the treatment allocation such that (11) is satisfied.

We present the optimal solution for the special case that we do not have the time fixed effects, which provides us with additional insights for the problem.

LEMMA 4. *Under all the assumptions in Theorem 3 except that potential outcomes follow $Y_{it}(z_{it}) = \alpha_i + X_i^\top \theta_t + \tau z_{it} + \varepsilon_{it}$. Z is an optimal design if Z satisfies the constraints in (4) and*

$$\omega_{g,t} = -1, \text{ for } t < \frac{T+1}{2}, \quad \omega_{g,t} = 1, \text{ for } t > \frac{T+1}{2}$$

⁷ The intuition for II comes from Lemma 2: when we estimate β_t , the variance depends on the *cross-sectional average*; similarly when we estimate θ_t , the variance depends on the *weighted cross-sectional average*.

⁸ We round $\frac{|\mathcal{O}_g|(2t-1)}{2T}$ in the same rule as that to round $\frac{N(2t-1)}{2T}$.

⁹ Note that each realization of X_i takes positive probability bounded away from 0. Thus, as $N \rightarrow \infty$, $1 + O\left(\frac{1}{N_{\min}^2}\right) = 1 + O\left(\frac{1}{N^2}\right)$

¹⁰ Similarly, if X_i takes infinitely many values, we also suggest to use this method.

$$X_i = 1 \begin{cases} \begin{bmatrix} -1 & -1 \\ -1 & 1 \\ -1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \\ X_i = -1 \begin{cases} \begin{bmatrix} -1 & -1 \\ -1 & 1 \\ -1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \end{cases} \end{cases}$$

(a) Two-way FE with X_i

$$u_i = 1 \begin{cases} \begin{bmatrix} -1 & -1 \\ -1 & 1 \\ -1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \\ u_i = -1 \begin{cases} \begin{bmatrix} -1 & -1 \\ -1 & 1 \\ -1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \end{cases} \end{cases}$$

(b) Two-way FE with u_i

Table 2 An optimal design with $N = 8$ and $T = 2$ under the model with either observed or latent covariates. X_i and u_i denote the observed and latent covariates respectively. In this toy example, there are two stratum,

$$X_i(\text{or } u_i) = 1 \text{ and } X_i(\text{or } u_i) = -1.$$

Regardless of whether we have time fixed effects or not, the optimal treated proportion is the same for all groups. If we aggregate all stratum, the overall treated proportion is the same as that in the model without the observed covariates X_i . This result is closely related to stratified randomized experiments to randomize within each stratum for the efficiency concern.¹¹

3.2. Latent Covariates

In this section, we study the case $L = UV^\top$ that is most widely used in practice, where covariates U are latent. Model (1) can be rewritten as

$$Y_{it}(z_{it}) = \alpha_i + \beta_t + \tau z_{it} + \underbrace{u_i^\top v_t + \varepsilon_{it}}_{e_{it}}, \quad (12)$$

where u_i is fixed and v_t is random following the literature on large dimensional factor modeling (Bai and Ng 2002, Bai 2003). Since e_{it} has a factor structure, e_{it} are correlated in the cross-section dimension. We use GLS to estimate τ , because GLS is BLUE when errors are correlated. Then we have the following theorem that provides the sufficient conditions and optimal design for model (12).

THEOREM 5 (Latent Covariates and Fixed Effects). *Suppose columns in U have $\sum_{i=1}^N u_i = 0$, v_t is random with mean 0 and variance I , $\text{cov}(v_t, v_{t-q}) = 0$ for any q , $\text{cov}(v_t, \varepsilon_{is}) = 0$ for any s, t and i , and $\sigma = 1$. Z is the optimal design if it satisfies*

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N z_{it} = \frac{2t-1-T}{T}, \quad \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N u_i z_{it} = \mu, \text{ for all } t \quad (13)$$

for some $\mu \in \mathbb{R}^r$. Moreover u_i can only take G different values, denoted as $u_{0,1}, \dots, u_{0,G} \in \mathbb{R}^p$, each with positive probability, we define $\omega_{g,t} = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{O}_g|} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{O}_g} z_{it}$, where $\mathcal{O}_g = \{i : u_i = u_{0,g}\}$. Then any design Z is optimal if it satisfies the constraints in (4) and

$$\omega_{g,t} = \frac{2t-1-T}{T}, \text{ for all } t \text{ and } g \quad (14)$$

¹¹ For example, Athey and Imbens (2017).

The assumptions in Theorem 5 hold without loss of generality. If v_t has mean 0 and variance Σ_V for any positive definite matrix Σ_V , we can right multiply u_i^\top by $\Sigma_V^{1/2}$ and left multiply v_t by $\Sigma_V^{-1/2}$ so that v_t has variance I . Moreover, we can multiply both u_i and ε_{it} by $1/\sigma$ so that the variance of ε_{it} is 1 and the optimal design does not change by this scaling.

Surprisingly, regardless of the covariates to be observed or latent, the sufficient conditions and optimal design are the *same* as shown in Theorems 3 and 5. Table 2b provides an example of the optimal design with latent covariates.

However, we need to know the covariate values in order to stratify. If we have no information about the covariates, the best thing we could do is to randomly select a design with treated proportion $\frac{2t-1}{2T}$. In many applications, we have the historical control data, which contains information about the latent covariates. In Section 4, we propose an algorithm to mimic stratification using historical control data.

Sketch of Proof. The optimal weighting matrix to use in GLS is $W = \Sigma_e^{-1}$, where Σ_e is the covariance matrix of the vectorization of e .¹² We can show that $\text{Var}(\hat{\tau}) = \bar{z}^\top (\Sigma_e^{-1} - \Sigma_e^{-1}\Gamma(\Gamma^\top\Sigma_e^{-1}\Gamma)^{-1}\Gamma^\top\Sigma_e^{-1})\bar{z}$. The next main intermediate step is to show that minimizing $\text{Var}(\hat{\tau})$ can be simplified to minimize

$$\underbrace{\bar{\omega}^\top P_{\bar{\Gamma}}\bar{\omega} + 2\bar{d}^\top\bar{\omega}}_{\text{I}} + \underbrace{\frac{1}{N} \sum_{t=1}^T z_t^\top U(I + U^\top U)^{-1} U^\top z_t - \frac{1}{NT} \left(\sum_{t=1}^T z_t \right) U(I + U^\top U)^{-1} U^\top \left(\sum_{t=1}^T z_t \right)}_{\text{II}}$$

with $P_{\bar{\Gamma}} = I - \frac{1}{T} \bar{\Gamma} \bar{\Gamma}^\top$ and $d_t = \frac{T+1-2t}{T}$. The following steps are similar as the proof of Theorem 3. I is minimized when $\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N z_{it} = \frac{2t-1-T}{T}$. For the term II, the Hessian is $P_{\bar{\Gamma}} \otimes U(I + U^\top U)^{-1} U^\top$, which is positive semidefinite and $\bar{\Gamma} \otimes \mu$ is in its null space for any $\mu \in \mathbb{R}^r$. II's minimum value is 0. Thus, II is minimized when $\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N u_i z_{it} = \mu$, for all t . Thus, when both conditions are satisfied, $\text{Var}(\hat{\tau})$ is minimized. Similarly, when $\omega_{g,t} = \frac{2t-1-T}{T}$, the sufficient conditions hold following the proof of Theorem 3. \square

Remark: Consider a symmetric case for Theorem 5 that V is fixed with columns to be orthogonal with $\bar{\Gamma}$, U is random with u_i to have mean 0 and variance I , $\text{cov}(u_i, u_j) = 0$ for any $i \neq j$ and $\Sigma_{e_i} = V \text{cov}(u_i, u_i) V^\top + I = V V^\top + I$. In this case, errors are cross-sectional independent but time-series correlated and units are exchangeable. By symmetricity, we have the sufficient conditions for the optimal solution in this case (similar to Theorem 5),

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N z_{it} = \frac{2t-1-T}{T}, \quad \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T v_t z_{it} = \mu, \quad \text{for all } i$$

¹² In practice, if we do not know Σ_e , we can first run OLS and then use the residual to estimate Σ_e , which is a consistent estimator for Σ_e .

for some $\mu \in \mathbb{R}^r$. When z_{it} is the same for all i , $\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T v_t z_{it} = \mu$ is satisfied. However, this design violates the first condition $\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N z_{it} = \frac{2t-1-T}{T}$. When V has a strong time trend and v_t for small t is very different from v_s for large s , for example, GDP and stock indices over time, there may not exist a Z to satisfies the sufficient conditions. Intuitively, the optimal Z balances the two sufficient conditions, which is closer to the design in Lemma 3 rather than that in Lemma 2.

3.3. Extension to the Treatment Effect Estimation with Historical Control Data

In many cases, we have some historical control data for the units which we are going to run an experiment on. One method to use the historical control data is to concatenate it with the experimental data when estimating the treatment effect. Assume the potential outcome has both time and unit fixed effects but without (observed or latent) covariates ($L = 0$)

$$Y_{it}(z_{it}) = \alpha_i + \beta_t + \tau z_{it} + \varepsilon_{it}.$$

The following lemma provides the treated proportion in the optimal design that minimizes $\text{Var}(\hat{\tau})$, where $\hat{\tau}$ is estimated from OLS.

LEMMA 5. *Suppose Assumptions 1-2 holds, potential outcomes follow $Y_{it}(z_{it}) = \alpha_i + \beta_t + \tau z_{it} + \varepsilon_{it}$ and there are T_{hist} periods of the historical control data. Let $\omega_t = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N z_{it}$ for all t . Any design is optimal if it satisfies the constraints in (4) and*

$$\omega_t^* = \frac{2t - 1 - T}{T + T_{hist}} \quad (15)$$

Figure 2 visualizes the optimal treated proportion $\frac{1+\omega_t^*}{2}$ at every period for a T -period design problem, where T ranges from 2 to 20, with historical control data available for the treatment effect estimation. When T_{hist} is larger, the optimal treated proportion shifts towards 50%, i.e., ω_t^* shifts to 0. The intuition of this result is that the historical control data is helpful to estimate unit fixed effects but not time fixed effects. Hence, we allocate more efforts to estimate the time fixed effects on the experimental data so the optimal solution gets closer to the parallel design as in Lemma 2.

4. Algorithms

In this section, we focus on the potential outcomes that have latent covariates, which is most widely used in practice,

$$Y(Z) = \alpha \bar{\mathbf{1}}^\top + \bar{\mathbf{1}} \beta^\top + UV^\top + \tau Z + \varepsilon. \quad (16)$$

For notation simplicity, we write L as UV^\top in this section.

We propose algorithms to tackle two challenges:

1. How can we find the optimal design in practice, given that we do not observe the covariates?




Figure 2 Optimal treated percentage in each period for a T -period design problem with T_{hist} periods of the historical control data available for the treatment effect estimation. The legends with different colors denote T . If the history is longer, the optimal treated proportion shifts more towards 50%. The total treated proportion is still 50%.

2. Is there an alternative (potentially nonlinear) estimation approach for τ that may have a smaller variance?

For the first challenge, even though Theorem 5 provides the sufficient conditions for the optimal design, we still lack the knowledge of covariates. However, in practice one usually have access to historical control data that contains information about the latent covariates. In Section 4.1, we introduce a local search heuristic (motivated by the sufficient conditions in Theorem 5) that addresses this challenge by leveraging historical control data.

For the second challenge, in Section 4.2, we leverage advances on low-rank matrix estimation in machine learning literature to introduce a non-linear and biased estimator for τ that may have a smaller variance. We refer this estimator as the low rank matrix estimation with fixed effects (LRME).

4.1. A Data-driven Local Search Heuristic for Finding a Better Design

Since the optimal design depends on the values of latent covariates from Theorem 5, the historical control data with covariates' information could help us find a better design. In order to achieve this, we need to (a) find a method to approximate $Var(\hat{\tau})$ using a robust surrogate when we use estimation approaches for which a closed-form expression for $Var(\hat{\tau})$ is not available, and (b) find an approximate solution to the NP-hard integer program of (finding optimal Z that minimizes $Var(\hat{\tau})$). We propose Algorithm 1 that addresses (a) and (b) as follows:

- For (a), in Algorithm 1 we approximate $Var(\hat{\tau})$ using a robust measure, which consists of two phases:

- (i) Split the historical control data into sub-matrices: we use a moving window approach to split the historical data $Y^{hist,All}$ into k sub-matrices $Y^{hist,(1)}, \dots, Y^{hist,(k)}$ of dimension $N \times T$.

(ii) We choose a synthetic treatment effect τ (can be 0) and use Z in each sub-matrix to obtain estimates $\hat{\tau}^{(j)}$, $j = 1, \dots, k$ of τ . Then calculate the *maximum estimation error*, $\max_j |\hat{\tau}^{(j)} - \tau|$, as a robust surrogate for $Var(\hat{\tau})$.

- For (b), we start from a random design Z with cross-sectional average at time t equal $\frac{2t-1-T}{T}$, $z_{it} \leq z_{i,t+1}$, and $z_{it} \in \{-1, 1\}$. Then execute the following local search heuristic to improve Z (motivated by *simulated annealing*) for a fixed number of iteration (or till Z converges):

(i) Swap two random rows in Z at every iteration and call the new design Z^{new} (note that the cross-sectional average remains unchanged at $\frac{2t-1-T}{T}$ at time t).

(ii) Evaluate the maximum estimation error $|\hat{\tau} - \tau|$ when design Z^{new} is used on $Y^{\text{hist},(1)}, \dots, Y^{\text{hist},(k)}$. If the maximum estimation error $|\hat{\tau} - \tau|$ is reduced, replace Z by Z^{new} . Otherwise, keep Z unchanged with probability $1 - p_{\text{escape}}$ but still replace Z by Z^{new} with probability p_{escape} . Here, p_{escape} is a small positive number.

(iii) At the end of each iteration, define Z^{opt} to be the matrix Z (among all designs from the first iteration) whose maximum estimation error $|\hat{\tau} - \tau|$ is the smallest. Once the algorithm stops (maximum number of iterations is reached or Z is converged) return Z^{opt} .

REMARK 1. We used maximum estimation error $|\hat{\tau} - \tau|$ instead of the mean-squared error of $\hat{\tau} - \tau$ because it is more robust to outliers.

REMARK 2. In the local search heuristic, when we swap the rows in Z , the cross-sectional average does not change. This guarantees that one of the sufficient conditions of the optimal solution in Theorem 5 (i.e., $\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N z_{it} = \frac{2t-1-T}{T}$) is always satisfied. Therefore, the only other goal of the algorithm is to find a design Z that satisfies the other sufficient conditions (i.e., $\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N u_i z_{it} = \mu$).

REMARK 3. In the local search heuristic, we replace Z by Z^{new} with some small probability p_{escape} following the idea of the simulated annealing algorithm, to escape potential local minima that can trap Z .

4.2. An Alternative Estimation Approach for τ

Instead of incorporating L into the error term, we could estimate L jointly with τ using the following objective function,

$$\hat{\tau}, \hat{\alpha}, \hat{\beta}, \hat{L} = \arg \min_{\tau, \alpha, \beta, L} \frac{1}{NT} \left\| Y - \alpha \bar{1}^\top - \bar{1} \beta^\top - L - \tau Z \right\|_F^2 + \mu \|L\|_* , \quad (17)$$

that we denote by low rank matrix estimation with fixed effects (LRME). Here, $\|L\|_*$ is the nuclear norm (or trace norm) of matrix L which is equal to sum of its singular values. Also, $\|\cdot\|_F$ refers to Frobenious norm of matrices that equivalent to Euclidean norm if we view the N by T matrix as a large NT by 1 vector. The larger the regularization parameter μ is, rank of \hat{L} tend to be smaller. It is known in matrix estimation literature that such a bias on estimating L leads to lower variance

Algorithm 1: A data-driven local search heuristic for Z

Inputs : $Y^{hist,(1)}, \dots, Y^{hist,(k)}, Z, \tau, t_{init}, t_{min}, v, steps_{max}, r, thres, t_{max}$
 $Z^{cur} \leftarrow Z;$
for $l = 1, \dots, k$ **do**

| Estimate $\hat{\tau}^{(l)}, \hat{\alpha}^{(l)}, \hat{\beta}^{(l)}$ from $Y^{hist,(l)}$ by OLS/GLS ;

end
 $v^{cur} \leftarrow \max_l |\hat{\tau}^{(l)} - \tau|;$
 $Z^{opt} \leftarrow Z^{cur}, v^{opt} \leftarrow v^{cur}, t \leftarrow t_{init}, i \leftarrow 1;$
while $t > t_{min}$ **or** $i < steps_{max}$ **do**

| Randomly select $i_1, i_2 \in [N]$, where $i_1 \neq i_2$;

| $Z^{new} \leftarrow Z^{cur}, Z_{i_1,:}^{new} \leftarrow Z_{i_2,:}^{cur}, Z_{i_2,:}^{new} \leftarrow Z_{i_1,:}^{cur};$
for $l = 1, \dots, k$ **do**

| Estimate $\hat{\tau}^{(l)}, \hat{\alpha}^{(l)}, \hat{\beta}^{(l)}$ from $Y^{hist,(l)}$ by OLS/GLS ;

end
 $v^{new} \leftarrow \max_l |\hat{\tau}^{(l)} - \tau|;$
 $dE = v^{new} - v^{cur};$
if $v^{new} < v^{opt}$ **then**

| $v^{cur} \leftarrow v^{new}, Z^{cur} \leftarrow Z^{new}, Z^{opt} \leftarrow Z^{new};$
else

| **if** $\exp(dE/t) > \text{random}(0,1)$ **then** $v^{cur} \leftarrow v^{new}, Z^{cur} \leftarrow Z^{new};$

| $t \leftarrow t \times v;$
end
 $i \leftarrow i + 1;$
end
Outputs: Z^{opt}

Candes and Recht (2009), Candes and Plan (2010). Therefore, we expect the lower variance in estimating \hat{L} will also lower the variance of τ . In empirical applications, we compare $Var(\hat{\tau})$ from LRME with that from the BLUE estimator in Section 5.

The objective function (17) is convex in τ, α, β and L , which has $NT + N + T + 1$ variables in total. Finding the global optimal solution of (17) could be slow with off-the-shelf software for convex optimization problems such as `cvxpy`. Alternatively, we propose using the *iterative singular value thresholding and least squares (iterative SVT and LS)* algorithm to efficiently solve (17). The details of this algorithm are described in Algorithm 2. The rationale to use SVT follows Theorem 1 in Hastie et al. (2015) that shows the optimal solution for

$$\hat{L} = \arg \min_{\text{rank}(L) \leq r} \frac{1}{2} \|Y - L\|_F^2 + \mu \|L\|_*,$$

is $\hat{L} = U_r S_\mu(D_r) V_r^\top$, where the rank- r SVD of Y is $U_r D_r V_r^\top$ and S_μ is a diagonal r by r matrix with its diagonal entries equal to $(\sigma_1 - \mu)_+, \dots, (\sigma_r - \mu)_+$. When we have the historical control data, we can use cross-validation to find the optimal μ by the grid search algorithm whose details are provided in Appendix B.1.

Algorithm 2: Iterative SVT and LS

Inputs : $Y, Z, r, \mu_{NT}, thres$ and t_{\max}

$\hat{\tau}^{(-1)} \leftarrow 0$;

At $t = 0$, $\hat{\tau}^{(0)}, \hat{\alpha}^{(0)}, \hat{\beta}^{(0)} \leftarrow \arg \min_{\tau, \alpha, \beta} \frac{1}{2} \left\| Y - \alpha \bar{\mathbf{1}}^\top - \bar{\mathbf{1}} \beta^\top - \tau Z \right\|_F^2$ by LS ;

$\hat{Y}_e^{(0)} \leftarrow Y - \hat{\alpha}^{(0)} \bar{\mathbf{1}}^\top - \bar{\mathbf{1}} (\hat{\beta}^{(0)})^\top - \hat{\tau}^{(0)} Z$;

while $|\hat{\tau}^{(t)} - \hat{\tau}^{(t-1)}| > thres$ or $t > t_{\max}$ **do**

The rank- r SVD of $\hat{Y}_e^{(t)}$ is $U_r^{(t)} D_r^{(t)} (V_r^{(t)})^\top$, where $D_r^{(t)} = \text{diag}(d_1^{(t)}, \dots, d_r^{(t)})$;

$S_{\mu_{NT}}(D_r^{(t)}) \leftarrow \text{diag}((d_1^{(t)} - \mu_{NT})_+, \dots, (d_r^{(t)} - \mu_{NT})_+)$;

$\hat{L}^{(t+1)} = U_r^{(t)} S_{\mu_{NT}}(D_r^{(t)}) (V_r^{(t)})^\top$;

$\hat{\tau}^{(t+1)}, \hat{\alpha}^{(t+1)}, \hat{\beta}^{(t+1)} = \arg \min_{\tau, \alpha, \beta} \frac{1}{2} \left\| Y - \alpha \bar{\mathbf{1}}^\top - \bar{\mathbf{1}} \beta^\top - \tau Z - \hat{L}^{(t+1)} \right\|_F^2$;

$\hat{Y}_e^{(t+1)} = Y - \hat{\alpha}^{(t+1)} \bar{\mathbf{1}}^\top - \bar{\mathbf{1}} (\hat{\beta}^{(t+1)})^\top - \hat{\tau}^{(t+1)} Z$;

$t \leftarrow t + 1$;

end

Outputs: $\hat{\tau}^{(t-1)}, \hat{\alpha}^{(t-1)}, \hat{\beta}^{(t-1)}, \hat{L}^{(t-1)}$

5. Empirical Results

In this section, we demonstrate the superior performances of our solution in Section 3 and our algorithm in Section 4 compared with some benchmark design matrices via the synthetic experiments on real-world data sets, including purchases from a large grocery store (anonymized for data privacy reasons), Lending Club loan data, and medical visits collects by a home medical services company.

5.1. Data Description

In this section, we describe the details of the data sets and some interesting policies or interventions to study.

Purchases from a Large Grocery Store. This data set contains 17,880,248 transactions between May 2005 and May 2007, which is available to researchers at Stanford and Berkeley by application and has been studied in many papers such as Che et al. (2012), Ruiz et al. (2017).¹³ In this work, we aggregate the data and compute the weekly household net expenditure. There

¹³ Other papers that use this data set is available at <https://are.berkeley.edu/SGDC/publications.html>.

are 63,375 households over 97 weeks in this aggregated panel data with 85.4% entries in this panel data to be 0.

We are interested in studying if some new approaches could incentivize households to increase their expenditure in this grocery store. These new approaches could be: 1. offering extra reward points or discounts (if they spend a certain amount of money in a shopping trip); 2. increasing the marginal redemption rates if customers redeem more reward points; 3. offering personalized promotions on the categories that customers shop less frequently.

Our analysis focuses on frequent shoppers because they are more familiar and tend to pay more attention to the changes in the reward or loyalty program. We define frequent shoppers as the households that had expenditure in at least half of the weeks in the data set, that is, more than 48 of the 97 total weeks. There are 7,130 frequent households. We want to study if a new approach can increase frequent households expenditure.

Lending Club Loan Data. This data set contains 2,260,668 loans issued from June 2007 to December 2018, which is publicly available on kaggle.¹⁴ This data set contains information, such as the current loan status (Current, Late, Fully Paid, etc.), latest payment information, first three digits of zip codes and issued month. We count the number of loans issued at the level of the first three digits of zip codes and we get a panel of 956 units over 139 months with 38.1% entries to be 0.

Effective marketing strategies can help Lending Club to get more customers and grow with the emergence of more peer-to-peer lending marketplaces. Common marketing strategies include direct mail marketing, advertising through social media, radio advertisement and personalized emails. We study if improving the marketing strategies can increase the number of loans issued by Lending Club.

Visits of a Home Medical Services Company. This data set has 40,079 records of home medical visits from Jan 2016 to Dec 2018, collected by a Home Medical Services Company located in the metropolitan area of Barcelona Spain, which is publicly available on kaggle.¹⁵ The purpose of this kaggle challenge is to find out how the environmental factors adversely affect “sensitive” people who are more vulnerable to environmental agents (climate, pollution, etc).

Based on the motivation for this kaggle challenge, we are interested in studying if some new environmental policies are helpful to reduce the home medical visits. The environmental policies could be: 1. providing tax credits or subsidizing electric vehicles; 2. replacing road surfaces by low noise surfaces; 3. banning private cars in certain areas or restricting the number of parking spaces in city centers; 4. investing in cycling infrastructure and public transport.

¹⁴ This data set can be downloaded at <https://www.kaggle.com/wendykan/lending-club-loan-data>

¹⁵ This data set can be downloaded at <https://www.kaggle.com/HackandHealth/home-medical-visits-healthcare>

Most environmental policies are carried out at the city level. Hence we aggregate this data set by the city level at the weekly frequency and count the number of home visits for every city per week. This aggregated data has 102 cities over 180 weeks with 57.8% entries to be 0. We calculate the moving average of the number of home visits as the visit rates in the past 16 weeks.¹⁶ We select the cities with positive visit rates from the 37th week to the 180th week.¹⁷ Then we have a panel of 61 cities across 144 weeks with all entries to be positive.

Additional Data Sets. We also compare different design matrices and estimation methods on additional data sets, including the weekly unemployment rate at the statement level and the number of home medical visits, as a support for the empirical findings in Section 5.3. Due to the page limit, we present the details of the data sets and the results in Appendix G.

5.2. Experiment Setups

In this section, we present the models and estimation methods we consider, the metrics to evaluate designs, and the specification used in the synthetic experiments.

Model Assumptions and Estimation Methods. Since we do not know the data generating process of the real-world data sets, we consider two models: one is the two-way fixed effect model $Y_{it}(z_{it}) = \alpha_i + \beta_t + \tau z_{it} + \varepsilon_{it}$, and the other one is the latent factor model $Y_{it}(z_{it}) = \alpha_i + \beta_t + u_i^\top v_t + \tau z_{it} + \varepsilon_{it}$. For the two-way fixed effect model, we use OLS (BLUE estimator) to estimate τ , denoted as **FE**. For the latent factor model, we use two methods to estimate τ : one is feasible GLS¹⁸, denoted as **FM**, and the other one is **LRME** presented in Section 4.2.

Design Matrices. We compare the different design matrices in the synthetic experiments. Denote ω_t as the cross-sectional average of the design Z at time t and

$$\omega_t = \begin{cases} -1 & \text{all control} \\ 0 & \text{half treated} \\ 1 & \text{all treated} \end{cases}$$

The design matrices include

1. Benchmark designs:

- (a) Z_{FF} (fifty-fifty): Z_{FF} satisfies $\omega_t = 0$ for all t . Z_{FF} is optimal when the potential outcome only has time fixed effects, as shown in Lemma 2.¹⁹

¹⁶ Our findings are robust if we calculate the moving average using more or fewer weeks. The considerations to calculate the visit rates are provided in Appendix G.

¹⁷ We select 37-th week because that is when most cities start to have nonzero rates. Our findings are robust if we select an earlier or later week.

¹⁸ GLS is the BLUE estimator, but is infeasible. We provide the details to implement feasible GLS in Appendix B.2.

¹⁹ When Z_{FF} satisfies $\omega_t = 0$ for all t , \vec{z} will be in the span of Γ in (5) so τ can not be uniquely identified. Hence, we randomly select one more unit as control in the first time period and one more unit as treated in the last time period to uniquely identify τ .

(b) Z_{BA} (before-after): Z_{BA} satisfies $\omega_t = -1$ for $t < \frac{T+1}{2}$ and $\omega_t = 1$ for $t > \frac{T+1}{2}$. Z_{BA} is optimal when the potential outcome only has unit fixed effects, as shown in Lemma 3.²⁰

(c) Z_{FF+BA} (fifty-fifty with before-after): Z_{FF+BA} satisfies $\omega_t = -1$ for $t < \frac{T+1}{2}$ and $\omega_t = 0$ for $t > \frac{T+1}{2}$, implying half of the units switch from control to treated at halftime.

2. Z_{OPT} : Z_{OPT} satisfies $\omega_t = \frac{2t-1-T}{T}$ for all t . Z_{OPT} is optimal when the potential outcome has both unit and time fixed effects, as shown in Theorem 3.

3. $Z_{K=2}$ (or $Z_{K=3}$, partition and stratification): the design that satisfies $\omega_t = \frac{2t-1-T}{T}$ for each group, where groups are formed by partitioning units based on their value in the largest singular vector estimated from the historical data.

4. Z_{OPT+} : the design returned from Algorithm 1 with the input of Algorithm 1 to be Z_{OPT} .

5. Z_{OPT}^{hist} : a random design $Z_{OPT}^{hist} = [Z^C \ Z_{OPT,adj}] \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times (T_{hist}+T)}$, where $Z^C = [-1]^{N \times T_{hist}}$ denotes the control status of all units in the historical data and $Z_{OPT,adj}$ satisfies $\omega_t = \frac{2t-1-T}{T+T_{hist}}$, which is optimal as shown in Lemma 5. We also use the historical control data for the treatment effect estimation.

Evaluation Metrics. For each empirical data set, we randomly select m blocks each with dimension $N \times \tilde{T}$. For each block, the first $\tilde{T} - T$ time periods are the historical control data and we apply the synthetic experiment to the last $N \times T$ time periods. For each design Z and each block, the estimated treatment effect is denoted as $\hat{\tau}_Z^{(j)}$, where $j = 1, \dots, m$. We report the following metrics for each design Z :

$$RMSE_Z = \sqrt{\frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m \left(\hat{\tau}_Z^{(j)} - \tau \right)^2}, \quad \bar{\tau}_Z = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m \hat{\tau}_Z^{(j)}, \quad Var(\hat{\tau}_Z) = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m \left(\hat{\tau}_Z^{(j)} - \bar{\tau}_Z \right)^2.$$

Specification. In this section, the results are calculated based on 100 randomly selected blocks that are divided into the historical control and synthetic experimental data. For the grocery data,²¹ we set the treatment effect as $\tau = 10$. Note that the median expenditure is 43.54 so the scale of the treatment effect is about 20% of the median expenditure.²² For the Lending Club data,²³ we set the treatment effect as $\tau = 1$, which is about 10% of the median number of loans.²⁴ For the home

²⁰ When Z_{BA} satisfies $\omega_t = -1$ for $t < \frac{T+1}{2}$ and $\omega_t = 1$ for $t > \frac{T+1}{2}$, \bar{z} will be in the span of Γ in (5) so τ can not be uniquely identified. Hence, we randomly select one more unit as treated in time period $\frac{T}{2}$ and one more unit as control in time period $\frac{T}{2} + 1$ to uniquely identify τ .

²¹ For the grocery data, we present the results for $N = 50$ and $T = 20$ and delegate results for other configurations of N and T to Appendix G. The results are robust to the configuration of N and T .

²² Our findings are robust to the value of τ for all three data sets.

²³ For the Lending Club data We present the results for $N = 25$ and $T = 20$ and delegate results for other configurations of N and T to Appendix G. The results are robust to the configuration of N and T .

²⁴ The median number of loans is 11.

medical visit data,²⁵ we set the treatment effect as $\tau = -0.05$.²⁶ For the two data sets presented in Appendix G, we set the treatment effect as $\tau = -0.5$ for the unemployment rate data and as $\tau = 2$ for the number of home visits.

5.3. Results

In this section, we demonstrate three main findings from the synthetic experiments on all the real-world data sets:

1. The linear staggered design Z_{OPT} can significantly outperform all benchmark designs.
2. Our data-driven local search heuristic provides an even better design Z_{OPT+} compared with Z_{OPT} .
3. When historical data is available, we suggest to use the data to search for a better design rather than to estimate the treatment effect using the historical data and an adjusted design (closer to the parallel design).

Linear Staggered Design Outperforms Benchmark Designs. We first compare the RMSE of the optimal design matrix Z_{OPT} with the benchmark designs Z_{FF} , Z_{BA} and Z_{FF+BA} for all models and estimation methods. Table 3 summarizes the RMSE for the three data sets.²⁷ Figure 3 demonstrates the bias and variance of benchmark designs and Z_{OPT} for the grocery data.²⁸ We have the following findings:

1. Z_{OPT} can consistently outperform benchmark matrices under both the two-way fixed effect model and the latent factor model (estimated from feasible GLS and LRME).²⁹
2. The latent factor model outperforms the two-way fixed effect model on all the data sets.
3. For both the grocery and loan data, feasible GLS (FM) is a better estimation method. For the home medical visit data, LRME is a better estimation method.

Remark: One possible reason for the BLUE estimator to perform worse than LRME on the home visit data is the high time-series correlation of the visit rates by construction. Figures 8-10 in Appendix G show the histograms of time-series autocorrelations for the three data sets. As a contrast for the grocery and loan data, the time-series autocorrelations are closer to 1 for the visit rates. We calculate errors' covariance matrix based on the assumption that errors are time-series uncorrelated. Hence feasible GLS is less efficient. However, without the uncorrelatedness

²⁵ For the home medical visit data, we present the results for $N = 50$ and $T = 20$ and delegate results for other configurations of N and T to Appendix G. The results are robust to the configuration of N and T .

²⁶ The minimum rate is 0.0625 and the medium rate is 1.3125 so the rate is still above 0 with the treatment.

²⁷ Table 6-8 in Appendix G present the RMSE for the three data sets for other configurations of N and T respectively.

²⁸ The bias and variance of benchmark designs and Z_{OPT} for other data sets can be found in Figures 6 and 7 in Appendix G. The results are very similar.

²⁹ Note that in Table 8, the RMSE for Z_{OPT} is larger than the RMSE for Z_{BA} for $N = 25$ and $T = 20$. If we do not modify Z_{BA} as in the footnote 20, the RMSE for Z_{BA} is much larger than Z_{OPT} .

Method Design		Data Sets		
		Grocery	Loan	Home visits
FE	Z_{FF}	26.2835	3.0741	1.0173
	Z_{BA}	22.7694	2.2975	0.2158
	Z_{FF+BA}	4.2707	0.9837	0.2909
	Z_{OPT}	4.1762	0.8540	0.1632
FM	Z_{FF}	26.7306	1.5837	0.6761
	Z_{BA}	16.7602	1.5585	0.0669
	Z_{FF+BA}	2.3725	0.4492	0.2194
	Z_{OPT}	1.8763	0.3083	0.0625
LRME	Z_{FF}	29.5855	1.7620	0.6513
	Z_{BA}	25.6778	1.7768	0.0746
	Z_{FF+BA}	4.3226	0.4516	0.2063
	Z_{OPT}	3.8292	0.4042	0.0190

Table 3 Comparison between linear staggered design (Z_{OPT}) and benchmark designs. Number in bold means the best model (and estimation method) and the best design. Z_{OPT} consistently outperforms benchmark designs.

assumption, we need to estimate much more parameters ($NT \times NT$ instead of $N \times N$). As a result, RMSE is much larger than the corresponding RMSE in Table 3 and Tables 6-8 in Appendix G.^{30,31}

An Even Better Design Using the Local Search Heuristic. If the potential outcome has either observed or latent covariates, Theorems 3 and 5 show that the cross-sectional averages for Z_{OPT} (number of treated units from time periods 1 to T) satisfy one of the two sufficient conditions for the optimal design. Algorithm 1 is a local search heuristic to mimic stratification in order to satisfy the other one of the two sufficient conditions.

Table 4 presents the RMSE of Z_{OPT} , $Z_{K=2}$, $Z_{K=3}$, and Z_{OPT+} returned from Algorithm 1 for the three data sets.³³ Figure 3 demonstrates the bias and variance of these four designs for the grocery data³⁴. For both models (fixed effect and factor model models) on three data sets, Z_{OPT+} has a smaller RMSE than Z_{OPT} . Similarly for the data sets in Appendix G, Z_{OPT+} has a smaller RMSE. Moreover, Z_{OPT+} has a smaller RMSE than $Z_{K=2}$ and $Z_{K=3}$ in general. In empirical applications, we may not have the information about how many groups to partition units into, i.e., $K = 2, 3$ or some larger number. Thus, we suggest to use Z_{OPT+} .

An Adjusted Design with Historical Control Data. In Section 3.3, we show that the design matrix Z_{OPT}^{hist} is optimal if we use the historical control data together with the experimental

³⁰ Due to the page limit, we do not report the RMSE without the assumption that errors' are time-series uncorrelated. The results are available upon request.

³¹ For the weekly unemployment rate data, LRME is the best estimation approach. The unemployment rate is the high time-series correlation by construction³² as shown in . On the other hand, for the number of home visits data, BLUE is a better estimation method. The number of home visits is less time-series correlated as shown in Figure 12.

³³ Table 9-11 in Appendix G present the RMSE for the three data sets for other configurations of N and T respectively.

³⁴ The bias and variance of these four designs for other data sets can be found in Figures 6 and 7 in Appendix G. The results are very similar.

Method Design		Data Sets		
		Grocery	Loan	Home visits
FE	Z_{OPT}	4.1762	0.8540	0.1632
	$Z_{K=2}$	4.0106	0.5540	0.1016
	$Z_{K=3}$	3.7857	0.6319	0.0792
	Z_{OPT+}	3.4222	0.6180	0.0640
FM	Z_{OPT}	1.8763	0.3083	0.0625
	$Z_{K=2}$	1.7690	0.2459	0.0423
	$Z_{K=3}$	1.9059	0.2731	0.0355
	Z_{OPT+}	1.7387	0.2283	0.0296
LRME	Z_{OPT}	3.8292	0.4042	0.0190
	$Z_{K=2}$	3.3775	0.4270	0.0202
	$Z_{K=3}$	3.7028	0.4198	0.0184
	Z_{OPT+}	3.3480	0.3582	0.0179

Table 4 Comparison between linear staggered design (Z_{OPT}) and the designs using historical control data, $Z_{K=2}$, $Z_{K=3}$ and Z_{OPT+} . Number in bold means the best model (and estimation method) and the best design.

Z_{OPT+} consistently outperforms Z_{OPT} .




Figure 3 Grocery data: average $\hat{\tau}$ and standard deviation of $\hat{\tau}$ calculated from $m = 100$ randomly sampled blocks. The height of the bar shows the average estimated treatment effect $\bar{\tau}_Z$, while the error bar indicates the standard deviation of the treatment effect $\sqrt{Var(\hat{\tau}_Z)}$. The red dash line indicates the true value of $\tau = 10$. The green dash lines shows $\bar{\tau}_{Z_{OPT}} \pm \sqrt{Var(\hat{\tau}_{Z_{OPT}})}$ from FM with feasible GLS.

Method Design		Data Sets			
		T_{hist}	Grocery	Loan	Home visits
OLS	Z_{OPT}	0	4.1762	0.8540	0.1632
	$Z_{OPT,adj}^{hist}$	5	3.2059	0.8535	0.1902
		10	2.9452	1.0561	0.2423
		15	2.8406	1.2516	0.2824
GLS	Z_{OPT}	0	1.8763	0.3083	0.0625
	$Z_{OPT,adj}^{hist}$	5	1.6923	0.2960	0.1163
		10	1.7156	0.3684	0.1685
		15	1.6259	0.4616	0.2008
MF+FE	Z_{OPT}	0	3.8292	0.4240	0.0190
	$Z_{OPT,adj}^{hist}$	5	2.9549	0.3427	0.0203
		10	2.8557	0.3354	0.0227
		15	2.6718	0.3220	0.0288

Table 5 Comparison between linear staggered design (Z_{OPT}) and the adjusted designs with historical control data. Number in bold means the best model (estimation method) and the best design. The adjusted design $Z_{OPT,adj}^{hist}$ with historical control data cannot consistently outperform Z_{OPT}

data to estimate treatment effects. In this section, we study if Z_{OPT}^{hist} can reduce the RMSE. Table 5 presents the RMSE of Z_{OPT} and Z_{OPT}^{hist} (with T_{hist} ranging from 5 to 15) for the three data sets.³⁵ We find that

1. For the grocery data, Z_{OPT}^{hist} has a smaller RMSE than Z_{OPT} for both the two-way fixed effect and the latent factor models.
2. For the Lending Club data, Z_{OPT}^{hist} has a smaller RMSE than Z_{OPT} for the two-way fixed effect and for the latent factor models when a proper length of the historical data is used.
3. For the home medical visit data, Z_{OPT}^{hist} has a larger RMSE than Z_{OPT} for both the two-way fixed effect and the latent factor models.

A possible reason why using historical data with Z_{OPT}^{hist} cannot consistently reduce RMSE is also the high time-series correlation of number of loans and visit rates. We find the same evidence on the two data sets in Appendix G: Z_{OPT}^{hist} has a larger RMSE on the unemployment rate data while Z_{OPT}^{hist} has a smaller RMSE on the data of number of home medical visits, where the unemployment rate is highly time-series correlated and the number of visits is less correlated. From the remark of Theorem 5, the optimal design is closer to Z_{BA} when errors have a time trend. Given that Z_{OPT}^{hist} is closer to Z_{FF} , instead of Z_{BA} , it is not surprising that Z_{OPT}^{hist} has a larger RMSE.

³⁵ Table 12-14 in Appendix G present the RMSE for the three data sets for other configurations of N and T respectively.

6. Concluding Remarks

In this paper, we study the optimal multi-period design of experiments, where our goal is to maximize the statistical power of our estimate for the treatment effect. Formally, we minimize the variance of the best linear unbiased estimator of the treatment effect. We assume that the treated units cannot switch back to the control state during the experiment. In the simplest case, we assume potential outcomes follow a two-way fixed effect linear model; in extensions, we consider additional observed or latent covariates. We find a set of sufficient conditions for the optimal design. When the potential outcome model without covariates or with covariates that can take only finitely many values, we can provide an analytical feasible solution that approximates the global optimum within a factor of $1 + O\left(\frac{1}{N^2}\right)$ based on the sufficient conditions. When covariates take infinitely different values, we propose a local search algorithm based on the minimax decision rule to find a better design based on the sufficient conditions. In the end, we demonstrate the practical relevance of our results through synthetic experiments on real-world data sets from several domains, including healthcare, finance and retail. The analytical solution can significantly outperform benchmark designs independent of the model assumption and the treatment effect estimation approach. If we have historical control data, there are two directions that we can use it: 1. use our local search algorithm to find a better design; 2. estimate the treatment effect using historical data and an adjusted design (closer to the parallel design). We suggest to follow the first direction, which can consistently reduce the RMSE.

Future directions One interesting direction is how we can dynamically adjust the design to improve the efficiency based on the currently available experimental data and historical control data, under the constraint that the treatment cannot be removed once implemented or the switching cost from treated to control is high. This direction is related to online learning or multi-arm/contextual bandit problems, but the objective is different and there exists the constraint about switching from treated to control. Another interesting extension is to generalize and formalize the results of the optimal design when the treatment has carryover effects, for example, whether the analytical solution exists if our objective is to estimate the direct effect, some lagged effect or some linear combination of direct and lagged effects, as precisely as possible.

References

- Abadie, Alberto, Alexis Diamond, Jens Hainmueller. 2010. Synthetic control methods for comparative case studies: Estimating the effect of californias tobacco control program. *Journal of the American statistical Association* **105**(490) 493–505.
- Abadie, Alberto, Alexis Diamond, Jens Hainmueller. 2015. Comparative politics and the synthetic control method. *American Journal of Political Science* **59**(2) 495–510.
- Abadie, Alberto, Guido W Imbens. 2006. Large sample properties of matching estimators for average treatment effects. *Econometrica* **74**(1) 235–267.
- Angrist, Joshua, Guido Imbens. 1995. Identification and estimation of local average treatment effects.
- Aral, Sinan, Dylan Walker. 2014. Tie strength, embeddedness, and social influence: A large-scale networked experiment. *Management Science* **60**(6) 1352–1370.
- Arkhangelsky, Dmitry, Susan Athey, David A Hirshberg, Guido W Imbens, Stefan Wager. 2019. Synthetic difference in differences. Tech. rep., National Bureau of Economic Research.
- Assmus, Gert, John U Farley, Donald R Lehmann. 1984. How advertising affects sales: Meta-analysis of econometric results. *Journal of Marketing Research* **21**(1) 65–74.
- Athey, S, S Stern. 2002. The impact of information technology on emergency health care outcomes. *The Rand Journal of Economics* **33**(3) 399.
- Athey, Susan, Mohsen Bayati, Nikolay Doudchenko, Guido Imbens, Khashayar Khosravi. 2018. Matrix completion methods for causal panel data models. Tech. rep., National Bureau of Economic Research.
- Athey, Susan, Guido W Imbens. 2017. The econometrics of randomized experiments. *Handbook of Economic Field Experiments*, vol. 1. Elsevier, 73–140.
- Athey, Susan, Guido W Imbens. 2018. Design-based analysis in difference-in-differences settings with staggered adoption. Tech. rep., National Bureau of Economic Research.
- Athey, Susan, Scott Stern. 1998. An empirical framework for testing theories about complementarity in organizational design. Tech. rep., National Bureau of Economic Research.
- Bai, Jushan. 2003. Inferential theory for factor models of large dimensions. *Econometrica* **71**(1) 135–171.
- Bai, Jushan, Serena Ng. 2002. Determining the number of factors in approximate factor models. *Econometrica* **70**(1) 191–221.
- Bertsimas, Dimitris, Mac Johnson, Nathan Kallus. 2015. The power of optimization over randomization in designing experiments involving small samples. *Operations Research* **63**(4) 868–876.
- Bertsimas, Dimitris, Nikita Korolko, A Weinstein. 2017. Covariate-adaptive optimization in online clinical trials. *Operations Research*, under review .
- Bertsimas, Dimitris, Nikita Korolko, Alexander M Weinstein. 2019. Covariate-adaptive optimization in online clinical trials. *Operations Research* .

-
- Bhat, Nikhil, Vivek F Farias, Ciamac C Moallemi, Deeksha Sinha. 2019. Near optimal ab testing. *Management Science* .
- Brown, Celia A, Richard J Lilford. 2006. The stepped wedge trial design: a systematic review. *BMC medical research methodology* **6**(1) 54.
- Brynjolfsson, Erik, Avinash Collis, Felix Eggers. 2019. Using massive online choice experiments to measure changes in well-being. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **116**(15) 7250–7255.
- Brynjolfsson, Erik, Felix Eggers, Avinash Gannamaneni. 2018. Measuring welfare with massive online choice experiments: A brief introduction. *AEA Papers and Proceedings*, vol. 108. 473–76.
- Bugni, Federico A, Ivan A Canay, Azeem Shaikh. 2019. Inference under covariate-adaptive randomization with multiple treatments. *University of Chicago, Becker Friedman Institute for Economics Working Paper* (2019-19).
- Bugni, Federico A, Ivan A Canay, Azeem M Shaikh. 2018. Inference under covariate-adaptive randomization. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **113**(524) 1784–1796.
- Campbell, Marion K, Gilda Piaggio, Diana R Elbourne, Douglas G Altman. 2012. Consort 2010 statement: extension to cluster randomised trials. *Bmj* **345** e5661.
- Candes, Emmanuel, Benjamin Recht. 2009. Exact matrix completion via convex optimization. *Communications of the ACM* **55**(6) 111–119.
- Candes, Emmanuel J, Yaniv Plan. 2010. Matrix completion with noise. *Proceedings of the IEEE* **98**(6) 925–936.
- Che, Hai, Xinlei Chen, Yuxin Chen. 2012. Investigating effects of out-of-stock on consumer stockkeeping unit choice. *Journal of Marketing Research* **49**(4) 502–513.
- Cleophas, TJM. 1993a. Carry-over biases in clinical pharmacology. *Clinical Chemistry and Laboratory Medicine* **31**(12) 803–810.
- Cleophas, Ton J. 1999. *Human Experimentation: Methodologic Issues Fundamental to Clinical Trials*. Springer Science & Business Media.
- Cleophas, Ton JM. 1993b. Carryover bias in clinical investigations. *The Journal of Clinical Pharmacology* **33**(9) 799–804.
- Cook, Thomas D, Donald Thomas Campbell, William Shadish. 2002. *Experimental and quasi-experimental designs for generalized causal inference*. Houghton Mifflin Boston, MA.
- DiMasi, Joseph A, Henry G Grabowski, Ronald W Hansen. 2016. Innovation in the pharmaceutical industry: new estimates of r&d costs. *Journal of Health Economics* **47** 20–33.
- Doudchenko, Nikolay, Guido W Imbens. 2016. Balancing, regression, difference-in-differences and synthetic control methods: A synthesis. Tech. rep., National Bureau of Economic Research.

-
- Hastie, Trevor, Rahul Mazumder, Jason D Lee, Reza Zadeh. 2015. Matrix completion and low-rank svd via fast alternating least squares. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research* **16**(1) 3367–3402.
- Hayes, Brian. 2002. Computing science: The easiest hard problem. *American Scientist* **90**(2) 113–117.
- Hemming, Karla, Terry P Haines, Peter J Chilton, Alan J Girling, Richard J Lilford. 2015. The stepped wedge cluster randomised trial: rationale, design, analysis, and reporting. *Bmj* **350** h391.
- Hirano, Keisuke, Guido W Imbens, Geert Ridder. 2003. Efficient estimation of average treatment effects using the estimated propensity score. *Econometrica* **71**(4) 1161–1189.
- Hussey, Michael A, James P Hughes. 2007. Design and analysis of stepped wedge cluster randomized trials. *Contemporary Clinical Trials* **28**(2) 182–191.
- Kallus, Nathan. 2018. Optimal a priori balance in the design of controlled experiments. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)* **80**(1) 85–112.
- Krieger, Abba M, David Azriel, Adam Kapelner. 2019. Nearly random designs with greatly improved balance. *Biometrika* **106**(3) 695–701.
- Kuhfeld, Warren F. 2005. Experimental design, efficiency, coding, and choice designs. *Marketing Research Methods in SAS: Experimental Design, Choice, Conjoint, and Graphical Techniques* 47–97.
- Lawrie, Jock, John B Carlin, Andrew B Forbes. 2015. Optimal stepped wedge designs. *Statistics & Probability Letters* **99** 210–214.
- Leahey, Tricia M, Graham Thomas, Joseph L Fava, Leslee L Subak, Michael Schembri, Katie Krupel, Rajiv Kumar, Brad Weinberg, Rena R Wing. 2014. Adding evidence-based behavioral weight loss strategies to a statewide wellness campaign: a randomized clinical trial. *American Journal of Public Health* **104**(7) 1300–1306.
- Leone, Robert P. 1995. Generalizing what is known about temporal aggregation and advertising carryover. *Marketing Science* **14**(3 supplement) G141–G150.
- Lewis, Randall A, Justin M Rao. 2015. The unfavorable economics of measuring the returns to advertising. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* **130**(4) 1941–1973.
- Li, Fan, Elizabeth L Turner, John S Preisser. 2018. Optimal allocation of clusters in cohort stepped wedge designs. *Statistics & Probability Letters* **137** 257–263.
- Li, Kathleen T. 2017. Statistical inference for average treatment effects estimated by synthetic control methods. Tech. rep., working paper.
- Li, Kathleen T, David R Bell. 2017. Estimation of average treatment effects with panel data: Asymptotic theory and implementation. *Journal of Econometrics* **197**(1) 65–75.
- Mdege, Noreen D, Mei-See Man, Celia A Taylor, David J Torgerson. 2011. Systematic review of stepped wedge cluster randomized trials shows that design is particularly used to evaluate interventions during routine implementation. *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology* **64**(9) 936–948.

- Mertens, Stephan. 2006. The easiest hard problem: Number partitioning. *Computational Complexity and Statistical Physics* **125**(2) 125–139.
- Muchnik, Lev, Sinan Aral, Sean J Taylor. 2013. Social influence bias: A randomized experiment. *Science* **341**(6146) 647–651.
- Murray, David M. 1998. *Design and analysis of group-randomized trials*, vol. 29. Monographs in Epidemiology & B.
- Murray, David M, Sherri P Varnell, Jonathan L Blitstein. 2004. Design and analysis of group-randomized trials: a review of recent methodological developments. *American Journal of Public Health* **94**(3) 423–432.
- Nikolaev, Alexander G, Sheldon H Jacobson. 2010. Simulated annealing. *Handbook of Metaheuristics*. Springer, 1–39.
- Polit, Denise F, Cheryl Tatano Beck. 2008. *Nursing research: Generating and assessing evidence for nursing practice*. Lippincott Williams & Wilkins.
- Rosenbaum, Paul R, Donald B Rubin. 1983. The central role of the propensity score in observational studies for causal effects. *Biometrika* **70**(1) 41–55.
- Ruiz, Francisco JR, Susan Athey, David M Blei. 2017. Shopper: A probabilistic model of consumer choice with substitutes and complements. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1711.03560* .
- Salganik, Matthew. 2019. *Bit by bit: Social research in the digital age*. Princeton University Press.
- Simon, Richard. 1979. Restricted randomization designs in clinical trials. *Biometrics* 503–512.
- Willan, Andrew R, Joseph L Pater. 1986. Carryover and the two-period crossover clinical trial. *Biometrics* 593–599.
- Woertman, Willem, Esther de Hoop, Mirjam Moerbeek, Sytse U Zuidema, Debby L Gerritsen, Steven Teerenstra. 2013. Stepped wedge designs could reduce the required sample size in cluster randomized trials. *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology* **66**(7) 752–758.

Appendix A: Additional Theoretical Results

A.1. Treatment is Reversible

LEMMA 6. *When the treatment is reversible, let $\omega_t = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N z_{it}$ and $\zeta_i = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T z_{it}$*

1. *Assume $Y_{it}(z_{it}) = \beta_t + \tau z_{it} + \varepsilon_{it}$. Any design is optimal if it satisfies*

$$\omega_t = 0.$$

2. *Assume $Y_{it}(z_{it}) = \alpha_i + \tau z_{it} + \varepsilon_{it}$. Any design is optimal if it satisfies*

$$\zeta_i = 0.$$

3. *Assume $Y_{it}(z_{it}) = \alpha_i + \beta_t + \tau z_{it} + \varepsilon_{it}$. Any design is optimal if it satisfies*

$$\omega_t = 0, \quad \zeta_i = 0$$

4. *Assume $Y_{it}(z_{it}) = \alpha_i + \beta_t + X_i^\top \theta_t + \tau z_{it} + \varepsilon_{it}$. Under the assumptions in Theorem 3, $\omega_{g,t} = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{O}_g|} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{O}_g} z_{it}$, where $\mathcal{O}_g = \{i : X_i = x_g\}$. Any design is optimal if it satisfies*

$$\omega_{g,t} = 0, \text{ for all } t \text{ and } g, \quad \zeta_i = 0$$

5. *Assume $Y_{it}(z_{it}) = \alpha_i + \beta_t + u_i^\top v_t + \tau z_{it} + \varepsilon_{it}$. Under the assumptions in Theorem 5, let $\omega_{g,t} = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{O}_g|} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{O}_g} z_{it}$, where $\mathcal{O}_g = \{i : u_i = u_{0,g}\}$. Any design is optimal if it satisfies*

$$\omega_{g,t} = 0, \text{ for all } t \text{ and } g, \quad \zeta_i = 0$$

Proof of Lemma 6 The proof is a direct extension of Appendix C and Appendix D. The major difference is that when the treatment can be reversed, the value of $\sum_{i=1}^N \zeta_i^2$ is not unique given ω_t . $\sum_{i=1}^N \zeta_i^2$ is minimized at $\zeta_i = 0$. Moreover, the Hessian of the part with ω_t ($\omega_{g,t}$) is positive semi-definite. Thus, it is minimized at $\omega_t = 0$ ($\omega_{g,t} = 0$). \square

A.2. Extension to Carryover Treatment Effects

In some cases, the effect of a treatment depends on the number of periods for which a unit has adopted the treatment. For example, the advertising effect on sales usually has a duration (Assmus et al. 1984), typically between six and nine months as shown by Leone (1995). In clinical trials, researchers often concern that the effect of a treatment carries on after the treatment is withdrawn, which may bias the evaluation of the effect of a second treatment (Willan and Pater 1986, Cleophas 1993a,b, 1999). In this section, we study the case that the treatment has carryover effects, which is modeled as

$$Y_{it}(z_{it}) = \alpha_i + \beta_t + \tau_1 z_{it} + \tau_2 z_{i,t-1} + \cdots + \tau_{L+1} z_{i,t-L} + \varepsilon_{it}, \quad (18)$$

where $\varepsilon_{it} \stackrel{i.i.d.}{\sim} (0, \sigma^2)$. In this model, we want to estimate $\tau_1, \dots, \tau_{L+1}$ and minimize their estimation variances by finding the optimal design matrix Z . We use OLS to estimate $\tau_1, \dots, \tau_{L+1}$. We stack the observations Y_{it} from time $L+1$ to T together and obtain $\vec{Y} = [Y_{1,L+1} \cdots Y_{N,L+1} \ Y_{1,L+2} \cdots Y_{N,L+2} \cdots Y_{1,T} \cdots Y_{N,T}]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{N(T-L)}$. Similarly, we stack the treatment variables from time l to $T-L-1+l$ together and get $\vec{z}^{(l)} =$

$[z_{1,l} \cdots z_{N,l} z_{1,l+1} \cdots z_{N,l+1} \cdots z_{1,T-L-1+l} \cdots z_{N,T-L-1+l}]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{N(T-L)}$ for $1 \leq l \leq L+1$. In the vector form, we have

$$\vec{Y} = [\mathcal{Z} \ \Gamma] \begin{bmatrix} \vec{\tau} \\ \eta \end{bmatrix} + \vec{\varepsilon},$$

where $\vec{\tau} = [\tau_{L+1} \cdots \tau_1]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{L+1}$, $\mathcal{Z} = [\vec{z}^{(1)} \cdots \vec{z}^{(L+1)}] \in \mathbb{R}^{N(T-L) \times (L+1)}$, $\eta = [\alpha^\top \ \beta^\top] \in \mathbb{R}^{N+T-1}$, α and β are the same as those in (5). Moreover, Γ is the same the Γ in model (5) when $L=0$. Our objective is to minimize $Var(\hat{\vec{\tau}})$ and

$$Var(\hat{\vec{\tau}}) = (\mathcal{Z}^\top (I - \Gamma(\Gamma^\top \Gamma)^{-1} \Gamma^\top) \mathcal{Z})^{-1}.$$

Note that $Var(\hat{\vec{\tau}})$ is a matrix and minimizing a matrix is not a well-defined problem. We can apply a function $f: \mathbb{S}_{++}^{L+1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ to $Var(\hat{\vec{\tau}})$ such that $f(Var(\hat{\vec{\tau}}))$ is scalar and then minimizing $f(Var(\hat{\vec{\tau}}))$ is a well-defined problem, where $\mathbb{S}_{++}^{L+1} = \{X \in \mathbb{R}^{(L+1) \times (L+1)} | X \succ 0, X = X^\top\}$ is the set of positive definite matrices.

The objects that we care about in this problem are the variances of each $\hat{\tau}_l$ for $l = 1, \dots, L+1$, i.e., the diagonal entries in $Var(\hat{\vec{\tau}})$. A natural measure is to minimize $tr(Var(\hat{\vec{\tau}}))$. A surrogate for minimizing $tr(Var(\hat{\vec{\tau}}))$ is to minimize

$$f(Var(\hat{\vec{\tau}})) = -tr(Var(\hat{\vec{\tau}})^{-1}) = tr(\mathcal{Z}^\top \Gamma(\Gamma^\top \Gamma)^{-1} \Gamma^\top \mathcal{Z}) - NT(L+1),$$

which is equivalent to solving

$$\begin{aligned} \min_Z \quad & tr(\mathcal{Z}^\top \Gamma(\Gamma^\top \Gamma)^{-1} \Gamma^\top \mathcal{Z}) \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & z_{it} \leq z_{i,t+1} \\ & z_{it} \in \{-1, 1\} \end{aligned} \tag{19}$$

We name the optimal solution Z of the optimization problem (19) as the **T**(race)-optimal design. We then have the convex relaxation for (19) as shown in Lemma 7.

LEMMA 7. *The convex relaxation for the optimization problem (19) is*

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{\vec{\omega}} \quad & \sum_{j=1}^{L+1} \left[\sum_{t=j}^{T-L-1+j} \omega_t^2 - \frac{1}{T-L} \left(\sum_{t=j}^{T-L-1+j} \omega_t \right)^2 + \frac{T-L}{2} \sum_{t=1}^T (v_{T+1-t} - v_{T-t}) \omega_t \right] \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & -1 \leq \omega_t \leq 1 \\ & \omega_t \leq \omega_{t+1} \end{aligned} \tag{20}$$

and v_t has

$$v_t = \begin{cases} 1 & t \leq L+1-k \\ -\left(-1 + \frac{2(t-1-L+k)}{T-L}\right) & L+1-k < t \leq L+1-j \\ \left(-1 + \frac{2(t-1-L+k)}{T-L}\right) \left(-1 + \frac{2(t-1-L+j)}{T-L}\right) & L+1-j < t \leq T+1-k \\ \left(-1 + \frac{2(t-1-L+j)}{T-L}\right) & T+1-k < t \leq T+1-j \\ 1 & T+1-j < t \end{cases}$$

The objective function in (20) is a sum of $L + 1$ convex and quadratic problems. If we minimize each one of these $L + 1$ problems, the optimal solution is the same as Theorem 1 but the number of time periods is $T - L$. Figure 4 shows the optimal treated percentage for a $T = 10$ period problem. If there are more lags in the carryover effects, the optimal treated percentages are smaller at the beginning and are larger in the end. The intuition for this pattern is that the solution is an aggregation of the solutions to the $L + 1$ sub-problems. The treated percentages are larger in the end because we want to have sufficiently many observations to estimate the lagged treatment effects well. The treated percentages are smaller at the beginning because we only use the observations from $L + 1$ to T to estimate $\vec{\tau}$ and η , so the increments of the treated percentages at the beginning only minutely affect the efficiency. Also, the objective function in (20), denoted as $f(\omega_1, \dots, \omega_T)$, has the property $f(\omega_1, \dots, \omega_T) = f(-\omega_T, \dots, -\omega_1)$, so the optimal solution is symmetric with respect to $(\frac{T+1}{2}, 0.5)$ as shown in Figure 4.




Figure 4 T-optimal design: Optimal treated percentage in each period for a T -period design in the presence of carryover treatment effects, where $T = 10$. Different colors represent the number of lags L in the carryover effects.

If we also care about the covariance between the treatment effects for different lags, i.e., $cov(\hat{\tau}_l, \hat{\tau}_{l'})$, then a natural measure is to minimize the determinant of $Var(\hat{\vec{\tau}})$, which is equivalent to maximizing $det(\mathcal{Z}^\top (I - \Gamma(\Gamma^\top \Gamma)^{-1} \Gamma^\top) \mathcal{Z})$ or minimizing $-det(\mathcal{Z}^\top (I - \Gamma(\Gamma^\top \Gamma)^{-1} \Gamma^\top) \mathcal{Z})$. The corresponding optimization problem is

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{\mathcal{Z}=[z_{it}]} \quad & -det(\mathcal{Z}^\top (I - \Gamma(\Gamma^\top \Gamma)^{-1} \Gamma^\top) \mathcal{Z}) \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & z_{it} \leq z_{i,t+1} \\ & z_{it} \in \{-1, 1\} \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

We name the optimal solution Z of the optimization problem (21) as the **D**(eterminant)-optimal design. We then have the convex relaxation for (21), which is summarized in Lemma 8.

LEMMA 8. The convex relaxation for the optimization problem (21) is

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{\vec{\omega}} \quad & -det(\Theta) \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & -1 \leq \omega_t \leq 1 \\ & \omega_t \leq \omega_{t+1}, \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

where Θ has

$$\Theta_{jk} = \begin{cases} -N \left[\sum_{t=j}^{T-L-1+j} \omega_t^2 - \frac{1}{T-L} \left(\sum_{t=j}^{T-L-1+j} \omega_t \right)^2 + \frac{T-L}{2} \sum_{t=1}^T (v_{T+1-t} - v_{T-t}) \omega_t \right] & j = k \\ -N \left[\sum_{t=j}^{T-L-1+j} \omega_t \omega_{t+k-j} - \frac{1}{T-L} \left(\sum_{t=j}^{T-L-1+j} \omega_t \right) \left(\sum_{t=k}^{T-L-1+k} \omega_t \right) \right. \\ \quad \left. + \frac{T-L}{2} \sum_{t=1}^T (v_{T+1-t} - v_{T-t}) \omega_t - \sum_{t=j}^{k-1} (\omega_t - \omega_{T-L+t}) \right] & j < k \\ -N \left[\sum_{t=j}^{T-L-1+j} \omega_t \omega_{t+k-j} - \frac{1}{T-L} \left(\sum_{t=j}^{T-L-1+j} \omega_t \right) \left(\sum_{t=k}^{T-L-1+k} \omega_t \right) \right. \\ \quad \left. + \frac{T-L}{2} \sum_{t=1}^T (v_{T+1-t} - v_{T-t}) \omega_t - \sum_{t=j}^{k-1} (\omega_t - \omega_{T-L+t}) \right] & j < k \\ \Theta_{kj} & j > k \end{cases}$$

and ν_t is the same as the ν_t in Lemma 7.

Note that each entry in Θ is a quadratic function of ω_t , the cross-sectional average of the treatment variables. However, the objective function in (22) is not a convex function of ω_t . However, we can use the off-the-shelf software to find the optimal ω_t to this nonconvex optimization problem for a $T = 10$ -period design in the presence of carryover effects, which is plotted in Figure 5. Similar as all the previous results, the treated percentages are symmetric with respect to the coordinate $(\frac{T+1}{2}, 0.5)$, so if we aggregate all observations, there are 50% treated and 50% control observations. Similar as the optimal treated percentages for the \mathbf{T} -optimal design, if there are more lags in the carryover effects, in general, the optimal treated percentages are smaller at the beginning, increase at a faster rate in the middle, and are larger in the end. The intuition is that the diagonal entries in the objective function in (22) are larger than the off-diagonal entries and are primary to be optimized.




Figure 5 D-optimal design: Optimal treated percentage in each period for a T -period design in the presence of carryover treatment effects, where $T = 10$. Different colors represent the number of lags L in the carryover effects.

Appendix B: Additional Algorithm

B.1. Grid Search the Tuning Parameter in Low Rank Matrix Estimation with Fixed Effects

When we use LRME to estimate the treatment effect τ given a design matrix Z , we need to specify the regularization parameter μ . If we have the historical control data, we could use *grid search* to find the optimal

μ . The details are described in Algorithm 3. Similar as Section 4.1, we split the historical data into sub-matrices. Given a design matrix Z , we apply the synthetic experiment to each of these sub-matrices and use LRME to estimate τ using a particular μ . The optimal μ minimizes $\max_j |\hat{\tau}^{(j)} - \tau|$ where $\hat{\tau}^{(j)}$ is estimated from the j -th sub-matrix. The next step is to use this design matrix Z to generate the experimental data and use the optimal μ to estimate τ by LRME.

Algorithm 3: Grid search optimal μ

Inputs : $Y^{hist,(1)}, \dots, Y^{hist,(k)}, Z, \tau, \mu_{\max}, \mu_{\min}, N_{grids}, r, thres$ and t_{\max}

$\vec{\mu} \leftarrow \text{logspace}(\mu_{\min}, \mu_{\max}, N_{grids});$

for $l = 1, \dots, k$ **do**

$\hat{\tau}^{(l)}, \hat{\alpha}^{(l)}, \hat{\beta}^{(l)}, \hat{L}^{(l)} \leftarrow \text{Algorithm 2}(Y^{hist,(l)}, Z, r, \mu_{\max}, thres \text{ and } t_{\max});$

end

$v^{opt} \leftarrow \max_l |\hat{\tau}^{(l)} - \tau|;$

$\mu^{opt} = \mu_{\max};$

for $\tau \in \vec{\tau}$ **do**

for $l = 1, \dots, k$ **do**

$\hat{\tau}^{(l)}, \hat{\alpha}^{(l)}, \hat{\beta}^{(l)}, \hat{L}^{(l)} \leftarrow \text{Algorithm 2}(Y^{hist,(l)}, Z, r, \mu, thres \text{ and } t_{\max});$

end

$v^{cur} \leftarrow \max_l |\hat{\tau}^{(l)} - \tau|;$

if $v^{cur} < v^{opt}$ **then**

$v^{opt} \leftarrow v^{cur}, \mu^{opt} \leftarrow \mu;$

end

end

Outputs: μ^{opt}

B.2. Feasible GLS

In feasible GLS, we first estimate τ and residuals from OLS, then estimate errors' covariance matrix using the residuals, and in the end estimate τ from a weighted regression by errors' covariance matrix. We estimate errors' covariance matrix following three assumptions: 1. errors are time-series uncorrelated; 2. errors have the same covariance matrix over time; 3. errors' covariance matrix is the sum of a low-rank matrix and a diagonal matrix (the same assumptions as Theorem 5). We estimate errors' covariance matrix Ω at a particular time period by

$$U, S, U^\top = \text{SVD} \left(\frac{1}{T} \hat{e} \hat{e}^\top \right), \quad \hat{\Omega} = U_{:,1:r} S_{1:r,1:r} U_{:,1:r}^\top + \text{diag} \left(\frac{1}{T} \hat{e} \hat{e}^\top - U_{:,1:r} S_{1:r,1:r} U_{:,1:r}^\top \right),$$

where S is a diagonal matrix with diagonal entries to be the singular values of $\frac{1}{T} \hat{e} \hat{e}^\top$ in descending order, $\text{diag} \left(\frac{1}{T} \hat{e} \hat{e}^\top - U_{:,1:r} S_{1:r,1:r} U_{:,1:r}^\top \right)$ is a diagonal matrix with diagonal entries to be the diagonal entries of

$\frac{1}{T}\hat{e}\hat{e}^T - U_{:,1:r}S_{1:r,1:r}U_{:,1:r}^\top$ and $r < T$.³⁶ The full estimated errors' covariance matrix ($NT \times NT$) is a block diagonal matrix with each block to be $\hat{\Omega}$. By assuming errors' are time-series uncorrelated, we estimate fewer parameters and each parameter is estimated by T observations.

Appendix C: Covariates are Observed

Proof of Equation (6). We use linear regression to estimate τ and η , so

$$\begin{aligned} \begin{bmatrix} \hat{\tau} \\ \hat{\eta} \end{bmatrix} &= \left(\begin{bmatrix} \bar{z}^\top \\ \Gamma^\top \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \bar{z} \\ \Gamma \end{bmatrix} \right)^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} \bar{z}^\top \\ \Gamma^\top \end{bmatrix} \bar{Y} \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} \tau \\ \eta \end{bmatrix} + \left(\begin{bmatrix} \bar{z}^\top \bar{z} & \bar{z}^\top \Gamma \\ \Gamma^\top \bar{z} & \Gamma^\top \Gamma \end{bmatrix} \right)^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} \bar{z}^\top \\ \Gamma^\top \end{bmatrix} \bar{\varepsilon} \end{aligned}$$

Since $\text{Var}(\bar{\varepsilon}) = \sigma^2 I$,

$$\text{Var} \left(\begin{bmatrix} \hat{\tau} \\ \hat{\eta} \end{bmatrix} \right) = \sigma^2 \left(\begin{bmatrix} \bar{z}^\top \bar{z} & \bar{z}^\top \Gamma \\ \Gamma^\top \bar{z} & \Gamma^\top \Gamma \end{bmatrix} \right)^{-1}$$

From block matrix inversion

$$\text{Var}(\hat{\tau}) = \sigma^2 \left(\bar{z}^\top \bar{z} - \bar{z}^\top \Gamma (\Gamma^\top \Gamma)^{-1} \Gamma^\top \bar{z} \right)^{-1},$$

which is equivalent to (6). \square

Proof of Lemma 2. When there is only time fixed effect, Γ can be simplified to

$$\Gamma = \begin{bmatrix} \bar{1} & & & \\ & \bar{1} & & \\ & & \ddots & \\ & & & \bar{1} \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{NT \times N}, \quad \text{where } \bar{1} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \\ \vdots \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^N$$

Thus, $\Gamma^\top \Gamma = NI$. $\frac{1}{N} \bar{z}^\top \Gamma = [\omega_1 \cdots \omega_T]$, where $\omega_t = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N z_{it}$. The objective function in (7) has

$$\bar{z}^\top \Gamma (\Gamma^\top \Gamma)^{-1} \Gamma^\top \bar{z} = N \sum_{t=1}^T \omega_t^2$$

It is minimized at $\omega_t = 0$. Thus, any design is optimal if it satisfies $\omega_t = 0$ for all t and $z_{it} = z_{i,t+1}$ for all i and t .

In detail, if N is even, the minimum is achieved at $\omega_t = 0$ implying 50% of z_{it} to be 1 and the other 50% of z_{it} to be -1 . If N is odd, the minimum is achieved at $|\omega_t| = \frac{1}{N}$, implying $z_{it} = 1$ for all t and for $\frac{N-1}{2}$ units, $z_{it} = -1$ for all t and for $\frac{N-1}{2}$ units, and z_{it} can be either -1 or 1 for the remaining one unit as long as $z_{it} \leq z_{i,t+1}$ is satisfied. \square

Proof of Lemma 3. When there are only unit fixed effects, Γ can be simplified to

$$\Gamma = \begin{bmatrix} I \\ I \\ \vdots \\ I \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{NT \times T}$$

³⁷ Thus, $\Gamma^\top \Gamma = TI$. $\frac{1}{T} \bar{z}^\top \Gamma = [\zeta_1 \cdots \zeta_N]$, where $\zeta_i = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T z_{it}$. The objective function in (7) has

$$\bar{z}^\top \Gamma (\Gamma^\top \Gamma)^{-1} \Gamma^\top \bar{z} = T \sum_{i=1}^N \zeta_i^2.$$

³⁶ r can be a preset value or can be chosen in a data-driven manner.

³⁷ Here we do not assume $\alpha_N = 0$ when we do not have time fixed effects and do not have the identification problem.

It is minimized at $\omega_t = 0$. Thus, any design is optimal if it satisfies $\zeta_i = 0$ for all i . Given Assumption 2, the equivalent statement is any design is optimal if it satisfies $\omega_t = -1$ for all $t < \frac{T+1}{2}$ and $\omega_t = 1$ for all $t > \frac{T+1}{2}$.

In detail, if T is even, the minimum is achieved at $\zeta_i = 0$ for all i implying all units are untreated in the first half time periods and they all switch to treated in the second half time periods. If T is odd, the minimum is achieved at $|\zeta_i| = \frac{1}{T}$, implying all units are untreated units for all $t \leq \frac{T-1}{2}$, they can be either untreated or untreated at time period $t = \frac{T+1}{2}$ and they are all treated units for all $t > \frac{T+1}{2}$. \square

Proof of Theorem 1. Denote $\zeta_i = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T z_{it}$ for all i and $\omega_t = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N z_{it}$ for all t .

There are two steps to show Theorem 1:

1. The objective function in (7), $\bar{z}^\top \Gamma (\Gamma^\top \Gamma)^{-1} \Gamma^\top \bar{z}$, can be simplified to $\bar{\omega}^\top P_{\bar{\Gamma}} \bar{\omega} + 2\bar{d}^\top \bar{\omega}$ with $P_{\bar{\Gamma}} = I - \frac{1}{T} \bar{\Gamma} \bar{\Gamma}^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{T \times T}$ and $d_t = \frac{T+1-2t}{T}$ for all t .

2. $\omega_t^* = \frac{2t-1-T}{T}$ is the optimal solution by using the first order condition (FOC) of $\bar{\omega}^\top P_{\bar{\Gamma}} \bar{\omega} + 2\bar{d}^\top \bar{\omega}$.

Now we start with the first step. There are two main intermediate steps

1. **Express $\bar{z}^\top \Gamma (\Gamma^\top \Gamma)^{-1} \Gamma^\top \bar{z}$ in terms of ω_t and ζ_i .** When potential outcomes follow $Y_{it}(z_{it}) = \alpha_i + \beta_t + \tau z_{it} + \varepsilon_{it}$, we have

$$\Gamma = \begin{bmatrix} \Gamma_{:1} \\ \Gamma_{:2} \\ \vdots \\ \Gamma_{:T} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \bar{\Gamma} & \bar{\Gamma} \\ \bar{\Gamma} & \bar{\Gamma} \\ \vdots & \ddots \\ \bar{\Gamma} & \bar{\Gamma} \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{NT \times (N+T-1)}.$$

In $\bar{z}^\top \Gamma (\Gamma^\top \Gamma)^{-1} \Gamma^\top \bar{z}$, we have

$$(\Gamma^\top \Gamma)^{-1} = \begin{bmatrix} \Xi_{11} & \Xi_{12} \\ \Xi_{21} & \Xi_{22} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} M & -\frac{1}{N} M M_{\bar{\Gamma}} \\ -\frac{1}{N} M_{\bar{\Gamma}}^\top M & \frac{1}{N} I + \frac{1}{N^2} M_{\bar{\Gamma}}^\top M M_{\bar{\Gamma}} \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{(N+T-1) \times (N+T-1)},$$

where $\Xi_{11} = M$, $\Xi_{12} = -\frac{1}{N} M M_{\bar{\Gamma}}$, $\Xi_{21} = -\frac{1}{N} M_{\bar{\Gamma}}^\top M$, $\Xi_{22} = \frac{1}{N} I + \frac{1}{N^2} M_{\bar{\Gamma}}^\top M M_{\bar{\Gamma}}$ and

$$M = \frac{1}{T} \left(I - \frac{1}{N} \bar{\Gamma} \bar{\Gamma}^\top \right)^{-1} = \frac{1}{T} (I + \bar{\Gamma} \bar{\Gamma}^\top) \quad M_{\bar{\Gamma}} = [\bar{\Gamma} \dots \bar{\Gamma}] \in \mathbb{R}^{(N-1) \times T}.$$

Furthermore

$$z^\top \Gamma = [\sum_{t=1}^T z_{1t} \dots \sum_{t=1}^T z_{N-1,t} \quad \sum_{i=1}^N z_{i1} \dots \sum_{i=1}^N z_{iT}] = [T\zeta_1 \dots T\zeta_{N-1} \quad N\omega_1 \dots N\omega_T],$$

We let $\phi = [T\zeta_1 \dots T\zeta_{N-1}]^\top$ and $\iota = [N\omega_1 \dots N\omega_T]^\top$. Then $z^\top \Gamma = [\phi^\top \quad \iota^\top]$. Then

$$z^\top \Gamma (\Gamma^\top \Gamma)^{-1} \Gamma^\top z = \phi^\top \Xi_{11} \phi + 2\phi^\top \Xi_{12} \iota + \iota^\top \Xi_{22} \iota.$$

For each term,

$$\begin{aligned} \phi^\top \Xi_{11} \phi &= \frac{1}{T} \phi^\top (I + \bar{\Gamma} \bar{\Gamma}^\top) \phi = T \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} \zeta_i^2 + T \left(\sum_{i=1}^{N-1} \zeta_i \right)^2 \\ \phi^\top \Xi_{12} \iota &= -\frac{1}{T} \phi^\top (I + \bar{\Gamma} \bar{\Gamma}^\top) \bar{\Gamma} \left(\sum_{t=1}^T \omega_t \right) = -\frac{N}{T} \phi^\top \bar{\Gamma} \left(\sum_{t=1}^T \omega_t \right) = -N \left(\sum_{i=1}^{N-1} \zeta_i \right) \left(\sum_{t=1}^T \omega_t \right) \\ \iota^\top \Xi_{22} \iota &= N \sum_{t=1}^T \omega_t^2 + \frac{N(N-1)}{T} \left(\sum_{t=1}^T \omega_t \right)^2 \end{aligned}$$

From the definitions of ζ_i and ω_t , $T \sum_{i=1}^N \zeta_i = N \sum_{t=1}^T \omega_t$. Then $\sum_{i=1}^{N-1} \zeta_i = \frac{N}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \omega_t - \zeta_N$. Then we have

$$z^\top \Gamma (\Gamma^\top \Gamma)^{-1} \Gamma^\top z = T \sum_{i=1}^N \zeta_i^2 - \frac{N}{T} \left(\sum_{t=1}^T \omega_t \right)^2 + N \sum_{t=1}^T \omega_t^2. \quad (23)$$

2. **Express** $\bar{z}^\top \Gamma(\Gamma^\top \Gamma)^{-1} \Gamma^\top \bar{z}$ in terms of ω_t . Following Assumption 2, $\sum_{i=1}^N \zeta_i^2$ is fixed given ω_t . Given ω_t , it implies that there are $\frac{N(1+\omega_1)}{2}, \frac{N(1+\omega_2)}{2}, \dots, \frac{N(1+\omega_T)}{2}$ treated units in period $1, 2, \dots, T$. It is equivalent to $\frac{N(1+\omega_1)}{2}, \frac{N(\omega_2-\omega_1)}{2}, \dots, \frac{N(\omega_T-\omega_{T-1})}{2}$ units to start the treatment in period $1, 2, \dots, T$ and $\frac{N(1-\omega_T)}{2}$ units to stay in the control group in the end. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^N \zeta_i^2 &= N \left[\frac{1+\omega_1}{2} \cdot 1 + \frac{\omega_2-\omega_1}{2} \left(\frac{T-2}{T} \right)^2 + \frac{\omega_3-\omega_2}{2} \left(\frac{T-4}{T} \right)^2 + \dots \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{\omega_T-\omega_{T-1}}{2} \left(-1 + \frac{2}{T} \right)^2 + \frac{1-\omega_T}{2} \cdot 1 \right] \\ &= N \left[1 + \left(2 - \frac{2}{T} \right) \frac{\omega_1}{T} + \left(2 - \frac{6}{T} \right) \frac{\omega_2}{T} + \dots + \left(2 - \frac{4T-2}{T} \right) \frac{\omega_T}{T} \right] \\ &= \frac{2N}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \frac{T+1-2t}{T} \omega_t \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$f(\bar{\omega}) = \bar{z}^\top \Gamma(\Gamma^\top \Gamma)^{-1} \Gamma^\top \bar{z} = N \sum_{t=1}^T \omega_t^2 - \frac{N}{T} \left(\sum_{t=1}^T \omega_t \right)^2 + \frac{2N}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T (T+1-2t) \omega_t = N \left(\bar{\omega}^\top P_{\bar{\Gamma}} \bar{\omega} + 2\bar{d}^\top \bar{\omega} \right).$$

Next we show the second step. Let $f_1(\bar{\omega}) = \sum_{t=1}^T \omega_t^2$, $f_2(\bar{\omega}) = -\frac{1}{T} (\sum_{t=1}^T \omega_t)^2$ and $f_3(\bar{\omega}) = 2 \sum_{t=1}^T \frac{T+1-2t}{T} \omega_t$. Then we have $f(\bar{\omega}) = f_1(\bar{\omega}) + f_2(\bar{\omega}) + f_3(\bar{\omega})$. We first take the second order derivative

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla^2 f_1(\bar{\omega}) &= 2I \\ \nabla^2 f_2(\bar{\omega}) &= -\frac{2}{T} \bar{\Gamma} \bar{\Gamma}^\top \\ \nabla^2 f_3(\bar{\omega}) &= 0 \end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$\nabla^2 f(\bar{\omega}) = \nabla^2 f_1(\bar{\omega}) + \nabla^2 f_2(\bar{\omega}) + \nabla^2 f_3(\bar{\omega}) \geq 0$$

is convex. Next we take the first order derivative

$$\nabla f(\bar{\omega}) = [2\omega_1 + \frac{2(T-1)}{T} - \frac{2}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \omega_t \quad 2\omega_2 + \frac{2(T-3)}{T} - \frac{2}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \omega_t \quad \dots \quad 2\omega_T - \frac{2(T-1)}{T} - \frac{2}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \omega_t]$$

When $\omega_t^* = \frac{2t-1}{T} - 1$, $\nabla f(\bar{\omega}^*) = 0$. Thus, $\bar{\omega}^*$ is a local optimal solution. Since $f(\bar{\omega})$ is convex, every local minimum is global minimum. Thus, $\bar{\omega}^*$ is the global optimal solution. \square

Proof of Theorem 2 Denote the objective function (8) in the optimization problem as $f(\bar{\omega})$. The variance of τ is

$$g(\bar{\omega}) = \text{Var}(\hat{\tau}) = \frac{\sigma^2}{\bar{z}^\top (I - \Gamma(\Gamma^\top \Gamma)^{-1} \Gamma^\top) \bar{z}} = \frac{\sigma^2}{N(T - f(\bar{\omega}))}$$

The optimal solution in Theorem 1 is $\omega_t^* = \frac{2t-1}{T} - 1$. Thus

$$f(\bar{\omega}^*) = - \sum_{t=1}^T \left(\frac{T+1-2t}{T} \right)^2 = - \frac{(T+1)(T-1)}{3T}$$

and the corresponding $\bar{\omega}$ is denoted as $\tilde{\omega}$. We have $|\tilde{\omega}_t - \omega_t^*| \leq \frac{1}{N}$ and $|\sum_{t=1}^T \tilde{\omega}_t| \leq \frac{1}{N}$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} f(\tilde{\omega}) &= \sum_{t=1}^T \left(\tilde{\omega}_t + \frac{T+1-2t}{T} \right)^2 - \frac{1}{T} \left(\sum_{t=1}^T \tilde{\omega}_t \right)^2 - \sum_{t=1}^T \left(\frac{T+1-2t}{T} \right)^2 \\ &\leq \frac{T}{N^2} - \frac{(T+1)(T-1)}{3T} \end{aligned}$$

We have

$$\frac{g(\tilde{\omega})}{g(\tilde{\omega}^*)} = \frac{T - f(\tilde{\omega}^*)}{T - f(\tilde{\omega})} \leq \frac{(4T^2 - 1)/(3T)}{(4T^2 - 1)/(3T) - T/N^2} = \frac{4T^2 - 1}{4T^2 - 1 - 3T^2/N^2} \leq \frac{1}{1 - 1/N^2}$$

following $3T^2 \leq 4T^2 - 1$ for all T . Note that $f(\tilde{\omega}^*)$ is the optimal solution to the convex relaxation problem so $f(\tilde{\omega}^*)$ is the lower bound for the optimal solution to the original integer programming problem. Thus, $g(\tilde{\omega}^*) \leq h_{\hat{\tau}}(Z^*)$ and we have

$$h_{\hat{\tau}}(\tilde{Z}) \leq \frac{1}{1 - 1/N^2} h_{\hat{\tau}}(Z^*)$$

□

C.1. Two-way Fixed Effects with Observed Covariates

Proof of Theorem 3. We can combine β_t with $X_i^\top \theta_t$, that is,

$$Y_{it}(z_{it}) = \alpha_i + \underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} 1 & X_i^\top \end{bmatrix}}_{\tilde{X}_i^\top} \begin{bmatrix} \beta_t \\ \theta_t \end{bmatrix} + \tau z_{it} + \varepsilon_{it},$$

and denote $p = r + 1$ so $\tilde{X}_i \in \mathbb{R}^p$. Denote $\zeta_i = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T z_{it}$ for all i and $\tilde{\omega}_t = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \tilde{X}_i z_{it} \in \mathbb{R}^p$ for all t .

There are three steps to show Theorem 3:

1. $\tilde{z}^\top \Gamma (\Gamma^\top \Gamma)^{-1} \Gamma^\top \tilde{z}$ can be simplified to a quadratic form in terms of ζ_i and $\tilde{\omega}_t$.
2. Take the first order condition and show the optimality sufficient conditions.
3. Based on the sufficient conditions and finite X_i , show $\omega_{g,t} = \frac{2t-1-T}{T}$ is optimal.

We start with the first step. There are two main intermediate steps.

1. **Express $\tilde{z}^\top \Gamma (\Gamma^\top \Gamma)^{-1} \Gamma^\top \tilde{z}$ in terms of ζ_i and $\tilde{\omega}_t$.** In $\tilde{z}^\top \Gamma (\Gamma^\top \Gamma)^{-1} \Gamma^\top \tilde{z}$, we have

$$(\Gamma^\top \Gamma)^{-1} = \begin{bmatrix} \Xi_{11} & \Xi_{12} \\ \Xi_{21} & \Xi_{22} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} M & -\frac{1}{N} M M_X \\ -\frac{1}{N} M_X^\top M & \frac{1}{N} I + \frac{1}{N^2} M_X^\top M M_X \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{(N+T-p) \times (N+T-p)},$$

where $\Xi_{11} = M$, $\Xi_{12} = -\frac{1}{N} M M_X$, $\Xi_{21} = -\frac{1}{N} M_X^\top M$, $\Xi_{22} = \frac{1}{N} I + \frac{1}{N^2} M_X^\top M M_X$ and

$$M = \frac{1}{T} \left(I - \frac{1}{N} X_{(1)} X_{(1)}^\top \right)^{-1} = \frac{1}{T} (I + X_{(1)} (X_{(2)}^\top X_{(2)})^{-1} X_{(1)}^\top) \quad M_X = [X_{(1)} \cdots X_{(1)}] \in \mathbb{R}^{(N-p) \times T},$$

where $X_{(1)} = [X_1 \ X_2 \ \cdots \ X_{N-p}]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{(N-p) \times p}$ and $X_{(2)} = [X_{N-p+1} \ X_{N-p+2} \ \cdots \ X_N]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times p}$. Furthermore

$$\tilde{z}^\top \Gamma = \left[\sum_{t=1}^T z_{1t} \ \cdots \ \sum_{t=1}^T z_{N-p,t} \ \sum_{i=1}^N z_{i1} \ \cdots \ \sum_{i=1}^N z_{iT} \right] = [T x_1 \ \cdots \ T x_{N-p} \ N \tilde{\omega}_1^\top \ \cdots \ N \tilde{\omega}_T^\top].$$

We let $\phi = [T \zeta_1 \ \cdots \ T \zeta_{N-p}]^\top$ and $\iota = [N \tilde{\omega}_1^\top \ \cdots \ N \tilde{\omega}_T^\top]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{Tp}$. Then $\tilde{z}^\top \Gamma = [\phi^\top \ \iota^\top]$. Then

$$\tilde{z}^\top \Gamma (\Gamma^\top \Gamma)^{-1} \Gamma^\top \tilde{z} = \phi^\top \Xi_{11} \phi + 2 \phi^\top \Xi_{12} \iota + \iota^\top \Xi_{22} \iota.$$

For each term,

$$\begin{aligned} \phi^\top \Xi_{11} \phi &= \frac{1}{T} \phi^\top (I + X_{(1)} (X_{(2)}^\top X_{(2)})^{-1} X_{(1)}^\top) \phi \\ &= T \sum_{i=1}^{N-p} \zeta_i^2 + T \left(\sum_{i=1}^{N-p} \tilde{X}_i^\top \zeta_i \right) (X_{(2)}^\top X_{(2)})^{-1} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{N-p} \tilde{X}_i \zeta_i \right) \\ \phi^\top \Xi_{12} \iota &= -\frac{1}{T} \phi^\top (I + X_{(1)} (X_{(2)}^\top X_{(2)})^{-1} X_{(1)}^\top) X_{(1)} \left(\sum_{t=1}^T \tilde{\omega}_t \right) \\ &= -N \left(\sum_{i=1}^{N-p} \tilde{X}_i^\top \zeta_i \right) (X_{(2)}^\top X_{(2)})^{-1} \left(\sum_{t=1}^T \tilde{\omega}_t \right) \\ \iota^\top \Xi_{22} \iota &= N \sum_{t=1}^T \tilde{\omega}_t^\top \tilde{\omega}_t + \frac{N}{T} \left(\sum_{t=1}^T \tilde{\omega}_t^\top \right) (N (X_{(2)}^\top X_{(2)})^{-1} - I) \left(\sum_{t=1}^T \tilde{\omega}_t \right) \end{aligned}$$

From the definition of x_i and $\tilde{\omega}_t$, $T \sum_{i=1}^N \tilde{X}_i \zeta_i = N \sum_{t=1}^T \tilde{\omega}_t$. Then $\sum_{i=1}^{N-p} \tilde{X}_i \zeta_i = \frac{N}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \tilde{\omega}_t - \sum_{i=N-p+1}^N \tilde{X}_i \zeta_i$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} & z^\top \Gamma (\Gamma^\top \Gamma)^{-1} \Gamma^\top z \\ &= T \sum_{i=1}^N \zeta_i^2 + T [\zeta_{N-p+1} \cdots \zeta_N] (X_{(2)} (X_{(2)}^\top X_{(2)})^{-1} X_{(2)}^\top - I) \begin{bmatrix} \zeta_{N-p+1} \\ \vdots \\ \zeta_N \end{bmatrix} - \frac{N}{T} \left(\sum_{t=1}^T \tilde{\omega}_t^\top \right) \left(\sum_{t=1}^T \tilde{\omega}_t \right) + N \sum_{t=1}^T \tilde{\omega}_t^\top \tilde{\omega}_t \\ &= T \sum_{i=1}^N \zeta_i^2 - \frac{N}{T} \left(\sum_{t=1}^T \tilde{\omega}_t^\top \right) \left(\sum_{t=1}^T \tilde{\omega}_t \right) + N \sum_{t=1}^T \tilde{\omega}_t^\top \tilde{\omega}_t \end{aligned}$$

following $X_{(2)} (X_{(2)}^\top X_{(2)})^{-1} X_{(2)}^\top$ is a project matrix and full rank so it equals I .

2. **Express $z^\top \Gamma (\Gamma^\top \Gamma)^{-1} \Gamma^\top z$ in terms of $\tilde{\omega}_t$.** Let the number of the treated units in period $1, 2, \dots, T$ to be $\frac{N(1+\omega_1)}{2}, \frac{N(1+\omega_2)}{2}, \dots, \frac{N(1+\omega_T)}{2}$. It is equivalent to $\frac{N(1+\omega_1)}{2}, \frac{N(\omega_2-\omega_1)}{2}, \dots, \frac{N(\omega_T-\omega_{T-1})}{2}$ units to start the treatment in period $1, 2, \dots, T$ and $\frac{n(1-\omega_T)}{2}$ units to stay in the control group in the end. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^N \zeta_i^2 &= N \left[\frac{1+\omega_1}{2} \cdot 1 + \frac{\omega_2-\omega_1}{2} \left(\frac{T-2}{T} \right)^2 + \frac{\omega_3-\omega_2}{2} \left(\frac{T-4}{T} \right)^2 + \cdots \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{\omega_T-\omega_{T-1}}{2} \left(-1 + \frac{2}{T} \right)^2 + \frac{1-\omega_T}{2} \cdot 1 \right] \\ &= N \left[1 + \left(2 - \frac{2}{T} \right) \frac{\omega_1}{T} + \left(2 - \frac{6}{T} \right) \frac{\omega_2}{T} + \cdots + \left(2 - \frac{4T-2}{T} \right) \frac{\omega_T}{T} \right] \\ &= \frac{2N}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \frac{T+1-2t}{T} \omega_t \end{aligned}$$

We have

$$\begin{aligned} & z^\top \Gamma (\Gamma^\top \Gamma)^{-1} \Gamma^\top z \\ &= N \sum_{t=1}^T \tilde{\omega}_t^\top \tilde{\omega}_t - \frac{N}{T} \left(\sum_{t=1}^T \tilde{\omega}_t^\top \right) \left(\sum_{t=1}^T \tilde{\omega}_t \right) + 2N \sum_{t=1}^T \frac{T+1-2t}{T} \omega_t \\ &= N \sum_{t=1}^T \tilde{\omega}_{t,1}^2 - \frac{N}{T} \left(\sum_{t=1}^T \tilde{\omega}_{t,1} \right)^2 + 2N \sum_{t=1}^T \frac{T+1-2t}{T} \tilde{\omega}_{t,1} + N \sum_{j=2}^p \sum_{t=1}^T \tilde{\omega}_{t,j}^2 - \frac{N}{T} \sum_{j=2}^p \left(\sum_{t=1}^T \tilde{\omega}_{t,j} \right)^2 \end{aligned}$$

We denote $\vec{\omega}^{(j)} = [\tilde{\omega}_{1,j} \cdots \tilde{\omega}_{T,j}]^\top$ for $j = 1, \dots, p$ and get

$$\underbrace{(\vec{\omega}^{(1)})^\top P_{\Gamma} \vec{\omega}^{(1)} + 2d^\top \vec{\omega}^{(1)}}_{\text{I}} + \underbrace{\sum_{j=2}^{r+1} (\vec{\omega}^{(j)})^\top P_{\Gamma} \vec{\omega}^{(j)}}_{\text{II}}$$

in the Sketch of Proof.

Next we show the second step. It is the same as the Sketch of Proof. We separate minimizes I and II and get the sufficient conditions.

Last is to show the third step. Since there are G strata for $X_i \in \mathbb{R}^p$, that is, G different values for X_i . Then $\omega_t = \sum_{g=1}^G p_g \omega_{g,t}$ and $\omega_t = \sum_{g=1}^G p_g x_{gj} \omega_{g,t}$ for $j = 1, \dots, r$. We have

$$\text{II} = N \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{j=1}^r \left(\sum_{g=1}^G p_g x_{gj} \omega_{g,t} \right)^2 - \frac{N}{T} \sum_{j=1}^r \left(\sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{g=1}^G p_g x_{gj} \omega_{g,t} \right)^2$$

When $\omega_{g,t} = \frac{2t-1-T}{T}$ for all t and g , given X is orthogonal to $\vec{1}$, we have $\sum_{g=1}^G p_g x_{gj} \omega_{g,t} = 0$ and then $\text{II} = 0$ is minimized with value 0. Moreover, $\omega_t = \sum_{g=1}^G p_g \omega_{g,t} = \frac{2t-1-T}{T}$ so $\text{I} = 0$ is minimized as well. Thus, the sum of I and II is minimized. \square

Proof of Theorem 4 Denote

$$f(\omega_t, \omega_{g,t}) = \sum_{t=1}^T \omega_t^2 - \frac{1}{T} \left(\sum_{t=1}^T \omega_t \right)^2 + 2 \sum_{t=1}^T \frac{T+1-2t}{T} \omega_t \\ + \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{j=1}^r \left(\sum_{g=1}^G p_g x_{gj} \omega_{g,t} \right)^2 - \frac{1}{T} \sum_{j=1}^r \left(\sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{g=1}^G p_g x_{gj} \omega_{g,t} \right)^2$$

The variance of τ is

$$g(\omega_t, \omega_{g,t}) = \text{Var}(\hat{\tau}) = \frac{\sigma^2}{\vec{z}^\top (I - \Gamma(\Gamma^\top \Gamma)^{-1} \Gamma^\top) \vec{z}} = \frac{\sigma^2}{N(T - f(\omega_t, \omega_{g,t}))}$$

$f(\omega_t, \omega_{g,t})$ evaluated at the optimal solution in Theorem 3 has

$$f(\omega_t^*, \omega_{g,t}^*) = - \sum_{t=1}^T \left(\frac{T+1-2t}{T} \right)^2 = - \frac{(T+1)(T-1)}{3T},$$

where $\omega_t^* = \omega_{g,t}^* = \frac{2t-1-T}{T}$. When we use the nearest rounding rule to get a feasible \tilde{Z} , the corresponding $\omega_t, \omega_{g,t}$ are denoted as $\tilde{\omega}_t, \tilde{\omega}_{g,t}$. We have $|\tilde{\omega}_{g,t} - \tilde{\omega}_{g,t}^*| \leq \frac{1}{|\mathcal{O}_g|}$, $|\sum_{t=1}^T \tilde{\omega}_{g,t}| \leq \frac{1}{|\mathcal{O}_g|}$,

$$|\tilde{w}_t - w_t^*| = \left| \sum_{g=1}^G p_g (\tilde{\omega}_{g,t} - \tilde{\omega}_{g,t}^*) \right| \leq \sum_{g=1}^G p_g |\tilde{\omega}_{g,t} - \tilde{\omega}_{g,t}^*| \leq \sum_{g=1}^G \frac{p_g}{N_{\min}} = \frac{1}{N_{\min}}$$

and $|\sum_{t=1}^T \tilde{\omega}_t| \leq \frac{1}{N_{\min}}$. We have

$$\sum_{t=1}^T \left(\tilde{\omega}_t + \frac{T+1-2t}{T} \right)^2 - \frac{1}{T} \left(\sum_{t=1}^T \tilde{\omega}_t \right)^2 - \sum_{t=1}^T \left(\frac{T+1-2t}{T} \right)^2 \leq \frac{T}{N_{\min}^2} - \frac{(T+1)(T-1)}{3T}$$

from Theorem 2,

$$\left| \sum_{g=1}^G p_g x_{g,j} w_{g,t} \right| = \left| \sum_{g=1}^G p_g x_{gj} \left(w_{g,t} + \frac{T+1-2t}{T} \right) \right| = \left| \sum_{g:x_{gj}>0} p_g x_{gj} \left(w_{g,t} + \frac{T+1-2t}{T} \right) + \sum_{g:x_{gj}<0} p_g x_{gj} \left(w_{g,t} + \frac{T+1-2t}{T} \right) \right| \\ \leq \max \left(\left| \sum_{g:x_{gj}>0} p_g x_{gj} \left(w_{g,t} + \frac{T+1-2t}{T} \right) \right|, \left| \sum_{g:x_{gj}<0} p_g x_{gj} \left(w_{g,t} + \frac{T+1-2t}{T} \right) \right| \right) \leq \frac{x_{j,\max}}{N_{\min}}$$

and

$$\sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{j=1}^r \left(\sum_{g=1}^G p_g x_{gj} \omega_{g,t} \right)^2 - \frac{1}{T} \sum_{j=1}^r \left(\sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{g=1}^G p_g x_{gj} \omega_{g,t} \right)^2 \leq \frac{T \sum_{j=1}^r x_{j,\max}^2}{N_{\min}^2}.$$

We have

$$\frac{g(\tilde{\omega}_t, \tilde{\omega}_{g,t})}{g(\omega_t^*, \omega_{g,t}^*)} = \frac{T - f(\omega_t^*, \omega_{g,t}^*)}{T - f(\tilde{\omega}_t, \tilde{\omega}_{g,t})} \leq \frac{(4T^2 - 1)/(3T)}{(4T^2 - 1)/(3T) - T(1 + \sum_{j=1}^r x_{j,\max}^2)/N_{\min}^2} \leq \frac{1}{1 - (1 + \sum_{j=1}^r x_{j,\max}^2)/N_{\min}^2}$$

following $3T^2 \leq 4T^2 - 1$ for all T . Note that $f(\omega_t^*, \omega_{g,t}^*)$ is the optimal solution to the convex relaxation problem so $f(\omega_t^*, \omega_{g,t}^*)$ is the lower bound for the optimal solution to the original integer programming problem. Thus, $g(\omega_t^*, \omega_{g,t}^*) \leq h_{\hat{\tau}}(Z^*)$ and we have

$$h_{\hat{\tau}}(\tilde{Z}) \leq \frac{1}{1 - (1 + \sum_{j=1}^r x_{j,\max}^2)/N_{\min}^2} h_{\hat{\tau}}(Z^*)$$

Appendix D: Covariates are Latent

Proof of Theorem 5. First, when we use $W = \Sigma_e^{-1}$ in GLS, we have

$$\text{Var} \left(\begin{bmatrix} \hat{\tau} \\ \hat{\eta} \end{bmatrix} \right) = (X^\top \Sigma_e^{-1} X)^{-1},$$

With some algebra, we have the following expression for the variance of $\hat{\tau}$,

$$\text{Var}(\hat{\tau}) = \bar{z}^\top (\Sigma_e^{-1} - \Sigma_e^{-1} \Gamma (\Gamma^\top \Sigma_e^{-1} \Gamma)^{-1} \Gamma^\top \Sigma_e^{-1}) \bar{z} \quad (24)$$

Details to show (24) are the same as those to show (6).

There are three steps to show Theorem 3:

1. Minimizing $\text{Var}(\hat{\tau})$ can be simplified to minimize

$$\underbrace{\bar{\omega}^\top P_{\bar{\Gamma}} \bar{\omega} + 2\bar{d}^\top \bar{\omega}}_I + \underbrace{\frac{1}{N} \sum_{t=1}^T z_t^\top U (I + U^\top U)^{-1} U^\top z_t - \frac{1}{NT} \left(\sum_{t=1}^T z_t \right) U (I + U^\top U)^{-1} U^\top \left(\sum_{t=1}^T z_t \right)}_{II}$$

2. Take the first order condition and show the optimality sufficient conditions.
3. Based on the sufficient conditions and finite u_i , show $\omega_{g,t} = \frac{2t-1-T}{T}$ is optimal.

We start with the first step. Here are the steps to simplify $\bar{z}^\top (\Sigma_e^{-1} - \Sigma_e^{-1} \Gamma (\Gamma^\top \Sigma_e^{-1} \Gamma)^{-1} \Gamma^\top \Sigma_e^{-1}) \bar{z}$.

1. **Compute** Σ_e^{-1} . Under the assumptions that $v_t \sim (0, I)$, $\text{cov}(v_t, v_{t-q}) = 0$ for any q , $\text{cov}(v_t, \varepsilon_{is}) = 0$ for any s, t and i , and $\sigma = 1$, we have $\Sigma_e^{-1} = \text{diag}(\Psi, \Psi, \dots, \Psi)$, where

$$\Psi = \Sigma_{e_t}^{-1} = (I + UU^\top)^{-1} = I - U(I + U^\top U)^{-1} U^\top$$

2. **Compute** $\bar{z}^\top \Sigma_e^{-1} \bar{z}$. We have $\bar{z}^\top \Sigma_e^{-1} \bar{z} = \sum_{t=1}^T z_t^\top \Psi z_t$.
3. **Compute** $\bar{z}^\top \Sigma_e^{-1} \Gamma$. We have

$$\bar{z}^\top \Sigma_e^{-1} \Gamma = \bar{z}^\top \begin{bmatrix} \Psi \tilde{I} & \Psi \bar{I} \\ \Psi \tilde{I} & \Psi \bar{I} \\ \vdots & \ddots \\ \Psi \tilde{I} & \Psi \bar{I} \end{bmatrix} = [\sum_{t=1}^T z_t^\top \Psi \tilde{I} \quad z_1^\top \Psi \bar{I} \quad \dots \quad z_T^\top \Psi \bar{I}] = [\phi^\top \quad \iota^\top],$$

where $\phi^\top = \sum_{t=1}^T z_t^\top \Psi \tilde{I} = (\sum_{t=1}^T z_t)^\top \Psi \tilde{I}$ and $\iota^\top = [z_1^\top \Psi \bar{I} \quad \dots \quad z_T^\top \Psi \bar{I}]$. Let $\zeta = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T z_t \in \mathbb{R}^N$, then $\phi = T\zeta^\top \Psi \tilde{I}$. Note that U and \bar{I} are orthogonal, we have $\Psi \bar{I} = \bar{I}$ and $\bar{I}^\top \Psi \bar{I} = N$. Then $\iota^\top = [z_1^\top \bar{I} \quad \dots \quad z_T^\top \bar{I}] = [N\omega_1 \quad \dots \quad N\omega_T] = N\omega$, where $\omega_t = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N z_{it}$.

4. **Compute** $(\Gamma^\top \Sigma_e \Gamma)^{-1}$. Note that

$$(\Gamma^\top \Sigma_e \Gamma)^{-1} = \begin{bmatrix} \Xi_{11} & \Xi_{12} \\ \Xi_{21} & \Xi_{22} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} M & -M\tilde{M} \\ -\tilde{M}^\top M & \bar{M} + \tilde{M}^\top M\tilde{M} \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{(N+T-1) \times (N+T-1)},$$

where $\Xi_{11} = M$, $\Xi_{12} = -M\tilde{M}$, $\Xi_{21} = -\tilde{M}^\top M$, $\Xi_{22} = \bar{M} + \tilde{M}^\top M\tilde{M}$ with

$$\begin{aligned} M &= \frac{1}{T} \left(\tilde{I}^\top \Psi \tilde{I} - \tilde{I}^\top \Psi \bar{I} (\bar{I}^\top \Psi \bar{I})^{-1} \bar{I}^\top \Psi \tilde{I} \right)^{-1} = \frac{1}{T} \left(\tilde{I}^\top \Psi \tilde{I} - \frac{1}{N} \bar{I} \bar{I}^\top \right)^{-1} \in \mathbb{R}^{(N-1) \times (N-1)} \\ \tilde{M} &= [\tilde{I}^\top \Psi \bar{I} (\bar{I}^\top \Psi \bar{I})^{-1} \quad \dots \quad \tilde{I}^\top \Psi \bar{I} (\bar{I}^\top \Psi \bar{I})^{-1}] = [\frac{1}{N} \bar{I} \quad \dots \quad \frac{1}{N} \bar{I}] \in \mathbb{R}^{(N-1) \times T} \\ \bar{M} &= \text{diag}((\bar{I}^\top \Psi \bar{I})^{-1}, (\bar{I}^\top \Psi \bar{I})^{-1}, \dots, (\bar{I}^\top \Psi \bar{I})^{-1}) = \frac{1}{N} I \in \mathbb{R}^{T \times T} \end{aligned}$$

We can simplify $M = \frac{1}{T} \left(\tilde{I}^\top \Psi \tilde{I} - \frac{1}{N} \tilde{I} \tilde{I}^\top \right)^{-1}$ by

$$\begin{aligned} M &= \frac{1}{T} \left[\left(\tilde{I}^\top \Psi \tilde{I} \right)^{-1} + \left(\tilde{I}^\top \Psi \tilde{I} \right)^{-1} \tilde{I} \left(N - \tilde{I}^\top \left(\tilde{I}^\top \Psi \tilde{I} \right)^{-1} \tilde{I} \right)^{-1} \tilde{I}^\top \left(\tilde{I}^\top \Psi \tilde{I} \right)^{-1} \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{T} \left[\left(\tilde{I}^\top \Psi \tilde{I} \right)^{-1} + \frac{1}{N - \tilde{I}^\top \left(\tilde{I}^\top \Psi \tilde{I} \right)^{-1} \tilde{I}} \left(\tilde{I}^\top \Psi \tilde{I} \right)^{-1} \tilde{I} \tilde{I}^\top \left(\tilde{I}^\top \Psi \tilde{I} \right)^{-1} \right] \\ \left(\tilde{I}^\top \Psi \tilde{I} \right)^{-1} &= \left(I - U_{-N} (I + U^\top U)^{-1} U_{-N}^\top \right)^{-1} = I + U_{-N} (I + u_N u_N^\top)^{-1} U_{-N}^\top \end{aligned}$$

where $U_{-N} = [u_1 \ u_2 \ \cdots \ u_{N-1}]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{(N-1) \times r}$.

5. **Compute** $\tilde{z}^\top \Sigma_e^{-1} \Gamma (\Gamma^\top \Sigma_e^{-1} \Gamma)^{-1} \Gamma^\top \Sigma_e^{-1} \tilde{z}$. It is equivalent to compute $[\phi^\top \ \iota^\top] \begin{bmatrix} \Xi_{11} & \Xi_{12} \\ \Xi_{21} & \Xi_{22} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \phi \\ \iota \end{bmatrix} = \phi^\top \Xi_{11} \phi + \phi^\top \Xi_{12} \iota + \iota^\top \Xi_{21} \phi + \iota^\top \Xi_{22} \iota$, where

$$\begin{aligned} \phi^\top \Xi_{11} \phi &= T^2 \zeta^\top \Psi \tilde{I} M \tilde{I}^\top \Psi \zeta \\ \phi^\top \Xi_{12} \iota &= -NT \zeta^\top \Psi \tilde{I} M \tilde{M} \omega = -T \zeta^\top \Psi \tilde{I} M \tilde{I} \left(\sum_{t=1}^T \omega_t \right) \\ \iota^\top \Xi_{21} \phi &= -NT \omega^\top \tilde{M}^\top M \Psi \tilde{I} \zeta = -T \left(\sum_{t=1}^T \omega_t \right) \tilde{I}^\top M \Psi \tilde{I}^\top \zeta \\ \iota^\top \Xi_{22} \iota &= N \sum_{t=1}^T \omega_t^2 + \tilde{I}^\top M \tilde{I} \left(\sum_{t=1}^T \omega_t \right)^2 \end{aligned}$$

We can simplify $\phi^\top \Xi_{11} \phi$, $\phi^\top \Xi_{12} \iota$, $\iota^\top \Xi_{21} \phi$ and $\iota^\top \Xi_{22} \iota$ by calculating the following terms

$$\begin{aligned} G &= \tilde{I} \left(\tilde{I}^\top \Psi \tilde{I} \right)^{-1} \tilde{I}^\top = \begin{bmatrix} I + U_{-N} (I + u_N u_N^\top)^{-1} U_{-N}^\top & \tilde{0} \\ \tilde{0}^\top & 0 \end{bmatrix} \\ \Omega &= \Psi G \Psi = \begin{bmatrix} I & \tilde{0} \\ -u_N^\top (I + u_N u_N^\top)^{-1} U_{-N}^\top & 0 \end{bmatrix} \Psi \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} I - U_{-N} (I + U^\top U)^{-1} U_{-N}^\top & -U_{-N} (I + U^\top U)^{-1} u_N \\ -u_N^\top (I + U^\top U)^{-1} U_{-N}^\top & u_N^\top (I + u_N u_N^\top)^{-1} U_{-N}^\top U_{-N} (I + U^\top U)^{-1} u_N \end{bmatrix} \\ \left(\tilde{I}^\top \Psi \tilde{I} \right)^{-1} \tilde{I} &= \tilde{I} - U_{-N} (I + u_N u_N^\top)^{-1} u_N \\ \tilde{I} \left(\tilde{I}^\top \Psi \tilde{I} \right)^{-1} \tilde{I} &= \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{I} - U_{-N} (I + u_N u_N^\top)^{-1} u_N \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} \\ \delta &= \tilde{I}^\top \left(\tilde{I}^\top \Psi \tilde{I} \right)^{-1} \tilde{I} = N - (1 - u_N^\top (I + u_N u_N^\top)^{-1} u_N) \\ \gamma &= \Psi \tilde{I} \left(\tilde{I}^\top \Psi \tilde{I} \right)^{-1} \tilde{I} = \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{I} \\ u_N^\top (I + u_N u_N^\top)^{-1} u_N \end{bmatrix} \end{aligned}$$

Together with $N \sum_{t=1}^T \omega_t = T \sum_{i=1}^N \zeta_i$ and $N \tilde{I}^\top \omega = T \tilde{I}^\top \zeta$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \phi^\top \Xi_{11} \phi &= T \zeta^\top \left(\Omega + \frac{1}{N - \delta} \gamma \gamma^\top \right) \zeta \\ \phi^\top \Xi_{12} \iota &= -T \zeta^\top \left(\frac{1}{N - \delta} \gamma \tilde{I}^\top \right) \zeta \\ \iota^\top \Xi_{21} \phi &= -T \zeta^\top \left(\frac{1}{N - \delta} \tilde{I} \gamma^\top \right) \zeta \\ \iota^\top \Xi_{22} \iota &= N \sum_{t=1}^T \omega_t^2 + T \zeta^\top \left(\frac{1}{N - \delta} \tilde{I} \tilde{I}^\top \right) \zeta - \frac{N}{T} \left(\sum_{t=1}^T \omega_t \right)^2 \end{aligned}$$

and

$$[\phi^\top \ \iota^\top] \begin{bmatrix} \Xi_{11} & \Xi_{12} \\ \Xi_{21} & \Xi_{22} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \phi \\ \iota \end{bmatrix} = N \sum_{t=1}^T \omega_t^2 - \frac{N}{T} \left(\sum_{t=1}^T \omega_t \right)^2 + T \zeta^\top \left(\Omega + \frac{1}{N-\delta} \gamma \gamma^\top - \frac{1}{N-\delta} \gamma \bar{\Gamma}^\top - \frac{1}{N-\delta} \bar{\Gamma} \gamma^\top + \frac{1}{N-\delta} \bar{\Gamma} \bar{\Gamma}^\top \right) \zeta.$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} & \Omega + \frac{1}{N-\delta} \gamma \gamma^\top - \frac{1}{N-\delta} \gamma \bar{\Gamma}^\top - \frac{1}{N-\delta} \bar{\Gamma} \gamma^\top + \frac{1}{N-\delta} \bar{\Gamma} \bar{\Gamma}^\top \\ &= \Omega + \frac{1}{N-\delta} (\gamma - \bar{\Gamma})(\gamma - \bar{\Gamma})^\top \\ &= \Omega + \begin{bmatrix} 0 & \bar{\mathbf{0}} \\ \bar{\mathbf{0}}^\top & \mathbf{1} - u_N^\top (I + U^\top U)^{-1} u_N \end{bmatrix} \\ &= I - U(I + U^\top U)^{-1} U^\top, \end{aligned}$$

following $U^\top U = U_{-N}^\top U_{-N} + u_N u_N^\top$

$$\begin{aligned} & u_N^\top (I + u_N u_N^\top)^{-1} U_{-N}^\top U_{-N} (I + U^\top U)^{-1} u_N - u_N^\top (I + u_N u_N^\top)^{-1} u_N \\ &= u_N^\top (I + u_N u_N^\top)^{-1} (U_{-N}^\top U_{-N} - I - U^\top U) (I + U^\top U)^{-1} u_N \\ &= u_N^\top (I + U^\top U)^{-1} u_N. \end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$[\phi^\top \ \iota^\top] \begin{bmatrix} \Xi_{11} & \Xi_{12} \\ \Xi_{21} & \Xi_{22} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \phi \\ \iota \end{bmatrix} = N \sum_{t=1}^T \omega_t^2 - \frac{N}{T} \left(\sum_{t=1}^T \omega_t \right)^2 + T \zeta^\top (I - U(I + U^\top U)^{-1} U^\top) \zeta.$$

6. **Compute** $\bar{z}^\top (\Sigma_e^{-1} - \Sigma_e^{-1} \Gamma (\Gamma^\top \Sigma_e^{-1} \Gamma)^{-1} \Gamma^\top \Sigma_e^{-1}) \bar{z}$.

$$\begin{aligned} & \bar{z}^\top \Sigma_e^{-1} \bar{z} - \bar{z}^\top \Sigma_e^{-1} \Gamma (\Gamma^\top \Sigma_e^{-1} \Gamma)^{-1} \Gamma^\top \Sigma_e^{-1} \bar{z} \\ &= NT - \sum_{t=1}^T z_t^\top U (I + U^\top U)^{-1} U^\top z_t - N \sum_{t=1}^T \omega_t^2 + \frac{N}{T} \left(\sum_{t=1}^T \omega_t \right)^2 - T \zeta^\top (I - U(I + U^\top U)^{-1} U^\top) \zeta \end{aligned}$$

Then maximizing $\bar{z}^\top \Sigma_e^{-1} \bar{z} - \bar{z}^\top \Sigma_e^{-1} \Gamma (\Gamma^\top \Sigma_e^{-1} \Gamma)^{-1} \Gamma^\top \Sigma_e^{-1} \bar{z}$ is equivalent to minimizing

$$\bar{\omega}^\top P_1 \bar{\omega} + 2 \bar{d}^\top \bar{\omega} + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{t=1}^T z_t^\top U (I + U^\top U)^{-1} U^\top z_t - \frac{1}{NT} \left(\sum_{t=1}^T z_t \right) U (I + U^\top U)^{-1} U^\top \left(\sum_{t=1}^T z_t \right).$$

following $T \sum_{i=1}^N \zeta_i^2 = \frac{2N}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T (T+1-2t) \omega_t$ from the proof of Theorem 1.

Next is to show the second step. Note that

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{t=1}^T z_t^\top U (I + U^\top U)^{-1} U^\top z_t - \frac{1}{T} \left(\sum_{t=1}^T z_t^\top \right) U (I + U^\top U)^{-1} U^\top \left(\sum_{t=1}^T z_t \right) \\ &= z^\top \left(\left(I - \frac{1}{T} \bar{\Gamma} \bar{\Gamma}^\top \right) \otimes U (I + U^\top U)^{-1} U^\top \right) z \triangleq z^\top M_U z \end{aligned}$$

$I - \frac{1}{T} \bar{\Gamma} \bar{\Gamma}^\top$ is a positive semi-definite matrix with an eigenvalue to be 0 and the corresponding eigenvector to be $\bar{\Gamma}$. Thus, $z^\top M_U z \geq 0$ and the minimum is achieved at $U^\top z_t$ to be the same for all t , which is equivalent to $Z^\top U = \bar{\Gamma} \mu^\top$ for some $\mu \in \mathbb{R}^r$. Furthermore, from Theorem 1, the optimal solution to $T \sum_{i=1}^N \zeta_i^2 + N \sum_{t=1}^T \omega_t^2 - \frac{N}{T} \left(\sum_{t=1}^T \omega_t \right)^2$ is $\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N z_{it} = \frac{2t-1-T}{T}$. Thus, we get the sufficient conditions for the optimal solution

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N z_{it} = \frac{2t-1-T}{T}, \quad \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N u_i z_{it} = \mu, \quad \text{for all } t.$$

Finally we show the third step. It is the same as the last step in Theorem 3. \square

Appendix E: Extension to Treatment Effect Estimation with Historical Control Data

Proof of Lemma 5 From Theorem 1, the corresponding convex relaxation of (7) is

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{\vec{\omega}} \quad & \sum_{t=1}^{T+T_{hist}} \omega_t^2 - \frac{1}{T+T_{hist}} \left(\sum_{t=1}^{T+T_{hist}} \omega_t \right)^2 + 2 \sum_{t=1}^{T+T_{hist}} \frac{T+T_{hist}+1-2t}{T+T_{hist}} \omega_t \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \omega_t = -1, \quad t \leq T_{hist} \\ & -1 \leq \omega_t \leq 1, \quad T_{hist} < t \leq T_{hist} + T \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

Plug $\omega_t = -1$ into the above objective function and set the index $t' = t - T_{hist}$, we get the convex relaxation

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{\vec{\omega}} \quad & \sum_{t=1}^T \omega_t^2 - \frac{1}{T+T_{hist}} \left(\sum_{t=1}^T \omega_t \right)^2 + \sum_{t=1}^T \frac{2(T+1-2t)}{T+T_{hist}} \omega_t \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & -1 \leq \omega_t \leq 1. \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

Denote the objective function (26) in the optimization problem as $f(\omega_1, \omega_2, \dots, \omega_T)$. Then let

$$f(\omega_1, \omega_2, \dots, \omega_T) = f_1(\omega_1, \omega_2, \dots, \omega_T) + f_2(\omega_1, \omega_2, \dots, \omega_T) + f_3(\omega_1, \omega_2, \dots, \omega_T),$$

where $f_1(\omega_1, \omega_2, \dots, \omega_T) = \sum_{t=1}^T \omega_t^2$, $f_2(\omega_1, \omega_2, \dots, \omega_T) = -\frac{1}{T+T_{hist}} (\sum_{t=1}^T \omega_t)^2$ and $f_3(\omega_1, \omega_2, \dots, \omega_T) = \sum_{t=1}^T \frac{2(T+1-2t)}{T+T_{hist}} \omega_t$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla^2 f_1(\omega_1, \omega_2, \dots, \omega_T) &= 2I \\ \nabla^2 f_2(\omega_1, \omega_2, \dots, \omega_T) &= -\frac{2}{T+T_{hist}} \vec{1}\vec{1}^\top \\ \nabla^2 f_3(\omega_1, \omega_2, \dots, \omega_T) &= 0 \end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$\nabla^2 f(\omega_1, \omega_2, \dots, \omega_T) = \nabla^2 f_1(\omega_1, \omega_2, \dots, \omega_T) + \nabla^2 f_2(\omega_1, \omega_2, \dots, \omega_T) + \nabla^2 f_3(\omega_1, \omega_2, \dots, \omega_T) \geq \frac{2T_{hist}}{T+T_{hist}} I$$

is strongly convex. Note that

$$\begin{aligned} & \nabla f(\omega_1, \omega_2, \dots, \omega_T) \\ &= \left[2\omega_1 + \frac{2(T-1)}{T+T_{hist}} - \frac{2}{T+T_0} \sum_{t=1}^T \omega_t \quad 2\omega_2 + \frac{2(T-3)}{T+T_{hist}} - \frac{2}{T+T_{hist}} \sum_{t=1}^T \omega_t \quad \dots \quad 2\omega_T - \frac{2(T-1)}{T+T_{hist}} - \frac{2}{T+T_{hist}} \sum_{t=1}^T \omega_t \right] \end{aligned}$$

When $\omega_t^* = \frac{2t-1-T}{T+T_{hist}}$, $\nabla f(\omega_1^*, \omega_2^*, \dots, \omega_T^*) = 0$. Thus, ω_t^* is a local optimal solution. Since $f(\omega_1, \dots, \omega_T)$ is convex, every local minimum is global minimum. Thus, ω_t^* is the global optimal solution. \square

Appendix F: Extension to Carryover Effects

Proof of Lemmas 7 and 8 Let us first calculate $\Theta_1 = \mathcal{Z}^\top \mathcal{Z}$. For the (j, j) -th entry in Θ_1 , we have $\Theta_{1,jj} = N(T-L)$. For the (j, k) -th entry in $\mathcal{Z}^\top \mathcal{Z}$ ($j < k$), we have

$$\Theta_{1,jk} = N \left[(T-L) + \sum_{t=j}^{k-1} (\omega_t - \omega_{T-L+t}) \right].$$

Next, we calculate $\Theta_2 = \mathcal{Z}^\top \Gamma (\Gamma^\top \Gamma)^{-1} \Gamma^\top \mathcal{Z}$. We have

$$(\Gamma^\top \Gamma)^{-1} = \begin{bmatrix} \Xi_{11} & \Xi_{12} \\ \Xi_{21} & \Xi_{22} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} M & -\frac{1}{N} M M_{\bar{1}} \\ -\frac{1}{N} M_{\bar{1}}^\top M & \frac{1}{N} I + \frac{1}{N^2} M_{\bar{1}}^\top M M_{\bar{1}} \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{(N+T-L-1) \times (N+T-L-1)},$$

where $\Xi_{11} = M$, $\Xi_{12} = -\frac{1}{N}MM_{\bar{1}}$, $\Xi_{21} = -\frac{1}{N}M_{\bar{1}}^{\top}M$, $\Xi_{22} = \frac{1}{N}I + \frac{1}{N^2}M_{\bar{1}}^{\top}MM_{\bar{1}}$ and

$$M = \frac{1}{T-L} \left(I - \frac{1}{N} \bar{\mathbf{1}} \bar{\mathbf{1}}^{\top} \right)^{-1} = \frac{1}{T-L} (I + \bar{\mathbf{1}} \bar{\mathbf{1}}^{\top}) \in \mathbb{R}^{(N-1) \times (N-1)} \quad M_{\bar{1}} = [\bar{\mathbf{1}} \ \dots \ \bar{\mathbf{1}}] \in \mathbb{R}^{(N-1) \times (T-L)}.$$

Furthermore,

$$\begin{aligned} (\bar{z}^{(j)})^{\top} \Gamma &= \left[\sum_{t=j}^{T-L-1+j} z_{1t} \ \dots \ \sum_{t=j}^{T-L-1+j} z_{N-1,t} \ \sum_{i=1}^N z_{ij} \ \dots \ \sum_{i=1}^N z_{i,T-L-1+j} \right] \\ &= \left[(T-L)\zeta_1^{(j)} \ \dots \ (T-L)\zeta_{N-1}^{(j)} \ N\omega_j \ \dots \ N\omega_{T-L-1+j} \right], \end{aligned}$$

where $\zeta_i^{(j)} = \frac{1}{T-L} \sum_{t=j}^{T-L-1+j} z_{it}$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, N$, $j = 1, 2, \dots, L+1$, and $\omega_t = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^T z_{it}$ for $t = 1, 2, \dots, T$.

We let $\alpha^{(j)} = \left[(T-L)\zeta_1^{(j)} \ \dots \ (T-L)\zeta_{N-1}^{(j)} \right]^{\top}$ and

$$\beta = [Ny_j \ \dots \ Ny_{T-L-1+j}]^{\top}. \quad \text{Then } \mathcal{Z}^{\top} \Gamma = \begin{bmatrix} (\alpha^{(1)})^{\top} & (\beta^{(1)})^{\top} \\ \vdots & \vdots \\ (\alpha^{(L+1)})^{\top} & (\beta^{(L+1)})^{\top} \end{bmatrix}. \quad \text{and the } (j,k)\text{-th term of } \Theta_2 =$$

$\mathcal{Z}^{\top} \Gamma (\Gamma^{\top} \Gamma)^{-1} \Gamma^{\top} \mathcal{Z}$ has

$$\Theta_{2,jk} = (\alpha^{(j)})^{\top} \Xi_{11} \alpha^{(k)} + (\alpha^{(j)})^{\top} \Xi_{12} \beta^{(k)} + (\beta^{(j)})^{\top} \Xi_{21} \alpha^{(k)} + (\beta^{(j)})^{\top} \Xi_{22} \beta^{(k)}$$

For each term,

$$\begin{aligned} (\alpha^{(j)})^{\top} \Xi_{11} \alpha^{(k)} &= \frac{1}{T-L} (\alpha^{(j)})^{\top} (I + \bar{\mathbf{1}} \bar{\mathbf{1}}^{\top}) \alpha^{(k)} \\ &= (T-L) \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} \zeta_i^{(j)} \zeta_i^{(k)} + (T-L) \left(\sum_{i=1}^{N-1} \zeta_i^{(j)} \right) \left(\sum_{i=1}^{N-1} \zeta_i^{(k)} \right) \\ (\alpha^{(j)})^{\top} \Xi_{12} \beta^{(k)} &= -\frac{1}{T-L} (\alpha^{(j)})^{\top} (I + \bar{\mathbf{1}} \bar{\mathbf{1}}^{\top}) \bar{\mathbf{1}} \left(\sum_{t=k}^{T-L-1+k} \omega_t \right) = -\frac{N}{T-L} (\alpha^{(j)})^{\top} \bar{\mathbf{1}} \left(\sum_{t=k}^{T-L-1+k} \omega_t \right) \\ &= -N \left(\sum_{i=1}^{N-1} \zeta_i^{(j)} \right) \left(\sum_{t=k}^{T-L-1+k} \omega_t \right) \\ (\beta^{(j)})^{\top} \Xi_{21} \alpha^{(k)} &= -\frac{1}{T-L} (\alpha^{(k)})^{\top} (I + \bar{\mathbf{1}} \bar{\mathbf{1}}^{\top}) \bar{\mathbf{1}} \left(\sum_{t=j}^{T-L-1+j} \omega_t \right) = -\frac{N}{T-L} (\alpha^{(k)})^{\top} \bar{\mathbf{1}} \left(\sum_{t=j}^{T-L-1+j} \omega_t \right) \\ &= -N \left(\sum_{i=1}^{N-1} \zeta_i^{(k)} \right) \left(\sum_{t=j}^{T-L-1+j} \omega_t \right) \\ (\beta^{(j)})^{\top} \Xi_{22} \beta^{(k)} &= N \sum_{t=j}^{T-L-1+j} \omega_t \omega_{t+k-j} + \frac{N(N-1)}{T-L} \left(\sum_{t=j}^{T-L-1+j} \omega_t \right) \left(\sum_{t=k}^{T-L-1+k} \omega_t \right) \end{aligned}$$

From the definition of $\zeta_i^{(j)}$ and ω_t , $(T-L) \sum_{i=1}^N \zeta_i^{(j)} = N \sum_{t=j}^{T-L-1+j} \omega_t$ for $j = 1, 2, \dots, L+1$. Then $\sum_{i=1}^{N-1} \zeta_i^{(j)} = \frac{N}{T-L} \sum_{t=j}^{T-L-1+j} \omega_t - \zeta_N^{(j)}$. Then we have

$$\Theta_2 = (T-L) \sum_{i=1}^N \zeta_i^{(j)} \zeta_i^{(k)} - \frac{N}{T-L} \left(\sum_{t=j}^{T-L-1+j} \omega_t \right) \left(\sum_{t=k}^{T-L-1+k} \omega_t \right) + N \sum_{t=j}^{T-L-1+j} \omega_t \omega_{t+k-j}. \quad (27)$$

There are $T+1$ different values $\zeta_i^{(j)} \zeta_i^{(k)}$ can take, denoted as v_0, v_1, \dots, v_T , where v_t denotes that the treatment starts time $T+1-t$ (v_0 represents that this unit never get treated). Assume $j \leq k$, we have

$$v_t = \begin{cases} 1 & t \leq L+1-k \\ -\left(-1 + \frac{2(t-1-L+k)}{T-L}\right) & L+1-k < t \leq L+1-j \\ \left(-1 + \frac{2(t-1-L+k)}{T-L}\right) \left(-1 + \frac{2(t-1-L+j)}{T-L}\right) & L+1-j < t \leq T+1-k \\ \left(-1 + \frac{2(t-1-L+j)}{T-L}\right) & T+1-k < t \leq T+1-j \\ 1 & T+1-j < t \end{cases}$$

Given $\omega_1, \omega_2, \dots, \omega_T$, it implies that there are $\frac{N(1+y_1)}{2}, \frac{N(1+y_2)}{2}, \dots, \frac{N(1+\omega_t)}{2}$ treated units in period $1, 2, \dots, T$. It is equivalent to $\frac{N(1+y_1)}{2}, \frac{N(y_2-y_1)}{2}, \dots, \frac{N(\omega_t-y_{T-1})}{2}$ units to start the treatment in period $1, 2, \dots, T$ and $\frac{N(1-\omega_t)}{2}$ units to stay in the control group in the end. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^N \zeta_i^{(j)} \zeta_i^{(k)} &= N \left[\frac{1+y_1}{2} \cdot v_T + \frac{y_2-y_1}{2} v_{T-1} + \dots + \frac{1-\omega_t}{2} \cdot v_0 \right] \\ &= N \left[1 + \frac{v_T - v_{T-1}}{2} y_1 + \frac{v_{T-1} - v_{T-2}}{2} y_2 + \dots + \frac{v_1 - v_0}{2} \omega_t \right], \end{aligned}$$

following $v_0 = v_T = 1$. Thus,

$$\Theta_{2,jk} = N(T-L) + \frac{N(T-L)}{2} \sum_{t=1}^T (v_{T+1-t} - v_{T-t}) \omega_t - \frac{N}{T-L} \left(\sum_{t=j}^{T-L-1+j} \omega_t \right) \left(\sum_{t=k}^{T-L-1+k} \omega_t \right) + N \sum_{t=j}^{T-L-1+j} \omega_t \omega_{t+k-j}$$

Let $\Theta = \Theta_1 - \Theta_2$. We have

$$\Theta_{jj} = -N \left[\sum_{t=j}^{T-L-1+j} \omega_t^2 - \frac{1}{T-L} \left(\sum_{t=j}^{T-L-1+j} \omega_t \right)^2 + \frac{T-L}{2} \sum_{t=1}^T (v_{T+1-t} - v_{T-t}) \omega_t \right]$$

and for $j < k$,

$$\Theta_{jk} = -N \left[\sum_{t=j}^{T-L-1+j} \omega_t \omega_{t+k-j} - \frac{1}{T-L} \left(\sum_{t=j}^{T-L-1+j} \omega_t \right) \left(\sum_{t=k}^{T-L-1+k} \omega_t \right) + \frac{T-L}{2} \sum_{t=1}^T (v_{T+1-t} - v_{T-t}) \omega_t - \sum_{t=j}^{k-1} (\omega_t - \omega_{T-L+t}) \right]$$

and for $j > k$,

$$\Theta_{jk} = \Theta_{kj}$$

Thus, for the **T**-optimal design, the optimization problem is

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{\omega_t} \quad & \sum_{j=1}^{L+1} \left[\sum_{t=j}^{T-L-1+j} \omega_t^2 - \frac{1}{T-L} \left(\sum_{t=j}^{T-L-1+j} \omega_t \right)^2 + \frac{T-L}{2} \sum_{t=1}^T (v_{T+1-t} - v_{T-t}) \omega_t \right] \quad (28) \\ \text{subject to} \quad & -1 \leq \omega_t \leq 1, \quad t = 1, 2, \dots, T \\ & \omega_t \leq \omega_{t+1} \quad t = 1, 2, \dots, T-1 \end{aligned}$$

For the **D**-optimal design, the optimization problem is

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{\omega_t} \quad & -\det(\Theta) \quad (29) \\ \text{subject to} \quad & -1 \leq \omega_t \leq 1, \quad t = 1, 2, \dots, T \\ & \omega_t \leq \omega_{t+1} \quad t = 1, 2, \dots, T-1 \end{aligned}$$

□

Appendix G: Additional Empirical Results

Considerations to Calculate the Home Medical Visit Rates.

1. Home visits can be naturally modeled as a Poisson distribution. We can calculate the visit rate by averaging the number of home visits in the past k weeks, which is an unbiased and consistent estimator for the rate (we use $k = 16$ here). It is natural and reasonable to model the impact of the environmental policies as the impact on the visit rate.

2. We are interested in the environmental policies that can improve peoples health, i.e., reduce the number of home visits. If an entry is 0, there could not have a reduction in the number. However, if we study visit rates, most entries are positive, which can potentially be reduced.

Details of the Additional Data Sets.

1. **Weekly Unemployment Rate at the State Level:** This data set starts from Jan 6, 1990 and ends on Jan 12, 2019. This data set has the unemployment rate for 50 states, DC and Puerto Rico over 1515 weeks in total. The medium unemployment rate is 1.99. The policies that can potentially reduce the unemployment rate include: 1. new education and training program for unemployed workers; 2. employment subsidies or reduction in employment tax; 3. encouraging working sharing.³⁸

2. **Number of Visits of a Home Medical Services Company:** The original data is the same as the previous home medical visit data. However, we study the weekly *number of visits* at the city level, where we have the data of 102 cities over 180 weeks. Some health care improvement policies that could increase the number of home visits include 1. increasing the health insurance reimbursement rate for home medical visits; 2. increasing the number/quality of doctors who take house calls; 3. promoting home medical programs.

Method Design		(N, T)			
		(50,10)	(100,10)	(50,20)	(100,20)
FE	Z_{FF}	32.3242	38.4191	26.2835	34.8146
	Z_{BA}	22.2695	23.5460	22.7694	20.8075
	Z_{FF+BA}	5.3900	4.3714	4.2707	2.7482
	Z_{OPT}	4.5494	3.8074	4.1762	2.5215
FM	Z_{FF}	30.5602	38.6343	26.7306	34.4087
	Z_{BA}	19.5605	19.2177	16.7602	17.6937
	Z_{FF+BA}	2.9645	1.8430	2.3725	1.7116
	Z_{OPT}	2.4557	1.5104	1.8763	1.2509
LRME	Z_{FF}	43.9149	41.9782	29.5855	52.2379
	Z_{BA}	23.2355	21.9985	25.6778	28.3736
	Z_{FF+BA}	5.8030	4.0862	4.3226	2.9655
	Z_{OPT}	4.5397	3.5066	3.8292	2.4064

Table 6 Grocery data: RMSE calculated from $m = 100$ randomly sampled blocks where τ is set to be 10. Comparison between benchmark designs and Z_{OPT} .

³⁸ The most popular policies to reduce unemployment rate include monetary policies, such as cutting interest rates, and fiscal policies, such as cutting taxes. However, monetary and fiscal policies are usually carries out at the national level. Here, we are more interested in the policies implemented at the state/local level.

Method Design		(N, T)			
		(25,10)	(50,10)	(25,20)	(50,20)
FE	Z_{FF}	2.5282	4.1502	3.0741	7.2481
	Z_{BA}	3.1665	4.0585	2.2975	2.7861
	Z_{FF+BA}	1.2291	1.8801	0.9837	1.6406
	Z_{OPT}	1.1167	1.0902	0.8540	0.8158
FM	Z_{FF}	1.3200	1.8767	1.5837	2.0048
	Z_{BA}	1.3625	1.7990	1.5585	1.3681
	Z_{FF+BA}	0.6330	0.8915	0.4492	0.7349
	Z_{OPT}	0.4196	0.3374	0.3083	0.2139
LRME	Z_{FF}	2.2247	2.0828	1.7620	1.7992
	Z_{BA}	2.0508	2.0343	1.7768	1.7832
	Z_{FF+BA}	0.7210	0.7361	0.4516	0.3945
	Z_{OPT}	0.4965	0.4245	0.4042	0.3135

Table 7 Lending Club data: RMSE calculated from $m = 100$ randomly sampled blocks where τ is set to be 1. Comparison between benchmark designs and Z_{OPT} .

Method Design		(N, T)			
		(25,10)	(50,10)	(25,20)	(50,20)
FE	Z_{FF}	0.5685	0.4273	0.9917	1.0173
	Z_{BA}	0.1500	0.1351	0.2366	0.2158
	Z_{FF+BA}	0.2655	0.1436	0.4602	0.2909
	Z_{OPT}	0.1389	0.0681	0.1951	0.1632
FM	Z_{FF}	0.2583	0.1700	0.3012	0.6761
	Z_{BA}	0.0653	0.0693	0.0698	0.0669
	Z_{FF+BA}	0.1957	0.1072	0.3584	0.2194
	Z_{OPT}	0.0582	0.0321	0.0883	0.0625
LRME	Z_{FF}	0.5285	0.3262	0.8748	0.6513
	Z_{BA}	0.0659	0.0662	0.0650	0.0746
	Z_{FF+BA}	0.2002	0.1025	0.4235	0.2063
	Z_{OPT}	0.0262	0.0190	0.0274	0.0190

Table 8 Home medical visit data: RMSE calculated from $m = 100$ randomly sampled blocks where τ is set to be -0.05 . Comparison between benchmark designs and Z_{OPT} .

Method Design		(N, T)			
		(50,10)	(100,10)	(50,20)	(100,20)
FE	Z_{OPT}	4.5494	3.8074	4.1762	2.5215
	$Z_{K=2}$	4.2910	3.7681	4.0106	2.4286
	$Z_{K=3}$	4.3156	3.6830	3.7857	2.5708
	Z_{OPT+}	4.5196	3.4618	3.4222	2.4286
FM	Z_{OPT}	2.4557	1.5104	1.8763	1.2509
	$Z_{K=2}$	2.2002	1.5191	1.7690	1.2670
	$Z_{K=3}$	2.3021	1.4772	1.9059	1.2537
	Z_{OPT+}	2.3145	1.4438	1.7387	1.2262
LRME	Z_{OPT}	4.5397	3.5066	3.8292	2.4064
	$Z_{K=2}$	4.3305	3.4897	3.3775	2.4814
	$Z_{K=3}$	4.4862	3.5437	3.7028	2.3920
	Z_{OPT+}	4.1738	3.1977	3.3480	2.3157

Table 9 Grocery data: RMSE calculated from $m = 100$ randomly sampled blocks where τ is set to be 10.

Comparison between Z_{OPT} , $Z_{K=2}$, $Z_{K=3}$ and Z_{OPT+} .

Method Design		(N, T)			
		(25,10)	(50,10)	(25,20)	(50,20)
FE	Z_{OPT}	1.1167	1.0902	0.8540	0.8158
	$Z_{K=2}$	0.7543	0.7227	0.5540	0.6608
	$Z_{K=3}$	0.7360	0.7427	0.6319	0.4291
	Z_{OPT+}	0.8312	0.9042	0.6180	0.5074
FM	Z_{OPT}	0.4196	0.3374	0.3083	0.2139
	$Z_{K=2}$	0.3467	0.3003	0.2459	0.1916
	$Z_{K=3}$	0.3350	0.2957	0.2731	0.1472
	Z_{OPT+}	0.3501	0.2658	0.2283	0.1533
LRME	Z_{OPT}	0.4965	0.4984	0.4042	0.3135
	$Z_{K=2}$	0.5390	0.4281	0.4270	0.3157
	$Z_{K=3}$	0.4764	0.3999	0.4198	0.2861
	Z_{OPT+}	0.4349	0.4018	0.3582	0.2319

Table 10 Lending Club data: RMSE calculated from $m = 100$ randomly sampled blocks where τ is set to be 1. Comparison between Z_{OPT} , $Z_{K=2}$, $Z_{K=3}$ and Z_{OPT+} .

Method Design		(N, T)			
		(25,10)	(50,10)	(25,20)	(50,20)
FE	Z_{OPT}	0.1389	0.0681	0.1951	0.1632
	$Z_{K=2}$	0.0908	0.0568	0.1183	0.1016
	$Z_{K=3}$	0.1012	0.0556	0.1134	0.0792
	Z_{OPT+}	0.0480	0.0358	0.0873	0.0640
FM	Z_{OPT}	0.0582	0.0321	0.0883	0.0625
	$Z_{K=2}$	0.0424	0.0285	0.0562	0.0423
	$Z_{K=3}$	0.0475	0.0283	0.0487	0.0355
	Z_{OPT+}	0.0343	0.0209	0.0462	0.0296
LRME	Z_{OPT}	0.0262	0.0190	0.0274	0.0190
	$Z_{K=2}$	0.0251	0.0186	0.0296	0.0202
	$Z_{K=3}$	0.0255	0.0169	0.0244	0.0184
	Z_{OPT+}	0.0234	0.0175	0.0262	0.0179

Table 11 Home medical visit data: RMSE calculated from $m = 100$ randomly sampled blocks where τ is set to be -0.05 . Comparison between Z_{OPT} , $Z_{K=2}$, $Z_{K=3}$ and Z_{OPT+} .




Figure 6 Lending club data: average $\hat{\tau}$ and standard deviation of $\hat{\tau}$ calculated from $m = 100$ randomly sampled blocks where $\tau = 5$, $N = 25$ and $T = 10$. The height of the bar shows the average estimated treatment effect $\bar{\tau}_Z$, while the error bar indicates the standard deviation of the treatment effect $\sqrt{\text{Var}(\hat{\tau}_Z)}$. The red dash line indicates the true value of $\tau = 10$. The green dash lines shows $\bar{\tau}_{Z_{OPT}} \pm \sqrt{\text{Var}(\hat{\tau}_{Z_{OPT}})}$ from FM with GLS.

Method Design		(N, T)	T_{hist}	(N, T)			
				(50,10)	(100,10)	(50,20)	(100,20)
OLS	Z_{OPT}		0	4.5494	3.8074	4.1762	2.5215
	$Z_{OPT,adj}^{hist}$	5	5	3.7510	2.8298	3.2059	2.4329
		10	10	3.8356	2.4971	2.9452	2.4842
		15	15	3.7949	2.5968	2.8406	2.1893
GLS	Z_{OPT}		0	2.4557	1.5104	1.8763	1.2509
	Z_{OPT}^{hist}	5	5	1.8117	1.4102	1.6923	1.2875
		10	10	1.8868	1.2987	1.7156	1.2848
		15	15	1.9967	1.2864	1.6259	1.1384
LRME	Z_{OPT}		0	4.5397	3.5066	3.8292	2.4064
	$Z_{OPT,adj}^{hist}$	5	5	3.5751	2.5542	2.9549	2.2141
		10	10	3.4877	2.2227	2.8557	2.1934
		15	15	3.5000	2.3133	2.6718	1.9910

Table 12 Grocery data: RMSE calculated from $m = 100$ randomly sampled blocks where τ is set to be 10.

Comparison between Z_{OPT} and $Z_{OPT,adj}^{hist}$, where T_{hist} ranges from 5 to 15.




Figure 7 Home medical visit data: average τ and standard deviation of τ calculated from $m = 100$ randomly sampled Y^{All} where -0.05 , $N = 50$ and $T = 20$. The height of the bar shows the average estimated treatment effect $\bar{\tau}_Z$, while the error bar shows the standard deviation of the treatment effect $\sqrt{Var(\hat{\tau}_Z)}$. The red dash line shows the true value of $\tau = -0.05$. The green dash lines shows $\bar{\tau}_{Z_{OPT}} \pm \sqrt{Var(\hat{\tau}_{Z_{OPT}})}$ from LRME.

Method Design		(N, T)	T_{hist}				
				(25,10)	(50,10)	(25,20)	(50,20)
FE	Z_{OPT}		0	1.1167	1.0902	0.8540	0.8158
	$Z_{OPT,adj}^{hist}$	5	5	0.9428	1.0300	0.8535	0.9986
		10	10	1.1471	1.3144	1.0561	1.4391
		15	15	1.4257	1.5070	1.2516	1.8023
FM	Z_{OPT}		0	0.4196	0.3374	0.3083	0.2139
	Z_{OPT}^{hist}	5	5	0.3503	0.3471	0.2960	0.2228
		10	10	0.4603	0.4441	0.3684	0.3707
		15	15	0.6088	0.5879	0.4616	0.6070
LRME	Z_{OPT}		0	0.4965	0.4984	0.4240	0.3135
	$Z_{OPT,adj}^{hist}$	5	5	0.4219	0.4430	0.3427	0.2556
		10	10	0.3899	0.3526	0.3354	0.2159
		15	15	0.4091	0.3750	0.3220	0.1988

Table 13 Lending club data: RMSE calculated from $m = 100$ randomly sampled blocks where τ is set to be 1. Comparison between Z_{OPT} and $Z_{OPT,adj}^{hist}$, where T_{hist} ranges from 5 to 15.

Method Design		(N, T)					
		T_{hist}	(25,10)	(50,10)	(25,20)	(50,20)	
FE	Z_{OPT}	0	0.1176	0.0681	0.1951	0.1632	
	$Z_{OPT,adj}^{hist}$	5	0.2072	0.1197	0.2385	0.1902	
		10	0.3296	0.1880	0.3019	0.2423	
		15	0.4169	0.2469	0.3409	0.2824	
FM	Z_{OPT}	0	0.0582	0.0321	0.0883	0.0625	
	$Z_{OPT,adj}^{hist}$	5	0.1181	0.0880	0.0644	0.1163	
		10	0.1866	0.1308	0.1163	0.1685	
		15	0.2341	0.1672	0.1569	0.2008	
LRME	Z_{OPT}	0	0.0262	0.0190	0.0274	0.0190	
	$Z_{OPT,adj}^{hist}$	5	0.0311	0.0226	0.0316	0.0203	
		10	0.0394	0.0238	0.0340	0.0227	
		15	0.0504	0.0291	0.0405	0.0288	

Table 14 Home medical visit data: RMSE calculated from $m = 100$ randomly sampled blocks where τ is set to be -0.05 . Comparison between Z_{OPT} and $Z_{OPT,adj}^{hist}$, where T_{hist} ranges from 5 to 15.

Method Design		(N, T)					
		(25,10)	(50,10)	(25,20)	(50,20)		
FE	Z_{FF}	0.1348	0.1066	0.1606	0.1761		
	Z_{BA}	0.0455	0.0794	0.0666	0.0548		
	Z_{FF+BA}	0.0440	0.0355	0.0645	0.0409		
	Z_{OPT}	0.0262	0.0162	0.0344	0.0283		
FM	Z_{FF}	0.0937	0.0694	0.0775	0.1116		
	Z_{BA}	0.0338	0.0371	0.0498	0.0286		
	Z_{FF+BA}	0.0342	0.0275	0.0510	0.0325		
	Z_{OPT}	0.0163	0.0091	0.0198	0.0158		
LRME	Z_{FF}	0.0863	0.0767	0.0975	0.1153		
	Z_{BA}	0.0459	0.0739	0.0535	0.0337		
	Z_{FF+BA}	0.0203	0.0213	0.0402	0.0217		
	Z_{OPT}	0.0139	0.0089	0.0118	0.0077		

Table 15 Unemployment rate: RMSE calculated from $m = 100$ randomly sampled blocks where τ is set to be -0.5 . Comparison between benchmark designs and Z_{OPT} .

Method Design		(N, T)					
		(25,10)	(50,10)	(25,20)	(50,20)		
FE	Z_{OPT}	0.0262	0.0162	0.0344	0.0283		
	Z_{OPT+}	0.0182	0.0125	0.0300	0.0185		
FM	Z_{OPT}	0.0163	0.0091	0.0198	0.0158		
	Z_{OPT+}	0.0106	0.0086	0.0148	0.0107		
LRME	Z_{OPT}	0.0139	0.0089	0.0118	0.0077		
	Z_{OPT+}	0.0120	0.0082	0.0112	0.0060		

Table 16 Unemployment rate: RMSE calculated from $m = 100$ randomly sampled blocks where τ is set to be -0.5 . Comparison between Z_{OPT} and Z_{OPT+} .

Method Design		(N, T)					
		T_{hist}	(25,10)	(50,10)	(25,20)	(50,20)	
FE	Z_{OPT}	0	0.0262	0.0162	0.0344	0.0283	
	$Z_{OPT,adj}^{hist}$	5	0.0381	0.0254	0.0408	0.0360	
		10	0.0520	0.0368	0.0511	0.0426	
		15	0.0657	0.0484	0.0611	0.0466	
FM	Z_{OPT}	0	0.0163	0.0091	0.0198	0.0158	
	Z_{OPT}^{hist}	5	0.0213	0.0141	0.0228	0.0206	
		10	0.0318	0.0230	0.0292	0.0250	
		15	0.0410	0.0305	0.0359	0.0276	
LRME	Z_{OPT}	0	0.0139	0.0089	0.0118	0.0077	
	$Z_{OPT,adj}^{hist}$	5	0.0143	0.0096	0.0128	0.0080	
		10	0.0181	0.0108	0.0163	0.0095	
		15	0.0220	0.0120	0.0185	0.0099	

Table 17 Unemployment rate: RMSE calculated from $m = 100$ randomly sampled blocks where τ is set to be -0.5 . Comparison between Z_{OPT} and $Z_{OPT,adj}^{hist}$, where T_{hist} ranges from 5 to 15.

Method Design		(N, T)					
		(25,10)	(50,10)	(25,20)	(50,20)		
FE	Z_{FF}	0.7733	1.4132	12.1672	1.2341		
	Z_{BA}	0.8984	0.9175	1.5324	1.1680		
	Z_{OPT}	0.3685	0.2320	0.3211	0.2498		
FM	Z_{FF}	0.6049	1.1688	8.6246	1.0448		
	Z_{BA}	0.4611	0.4538	0.7035	0.4927		
	Z_{OPT}	0.1257	0.0748	0.0783	0.0529		
LRME	Z_{FF}	0.9301	2.0424	12.2722	1.1267		
	Z_{BA}	0.6236	0.8087	0.7802	0.7194		
	Z_{OPT}	0.1817	0.1322	0.1099	0.0882		

Table 18 Home medical visit data (raw number of visits): RMSE calculated from $m = 100$ randomly sampled blocks where τ is set to be 2. Comparison between benchmark designs and Z_{OPT} .

Method Design		(N, T)					
		(25,10)	(50,10)	(25,20)	(50,20)		
FE	Z_{OPT}	0.3685	0.2320	0.3211	0.2498		
	Z_{OPT+}	0.3232	0.2247	0.3076	0.0631		
FM	Z_{OPT}	0.1257	0.0748	0.0783	0.0529		
	Z_{OPT+}	0.0931	0.0683	0.0693	0.0499		
LRME	Z_{OPT}	0.1817	0.1322	0.1099	0.0882		
	Z_{OPT+}	0.1731	0.1317	0.1048	0.0866		

Table 19 Home medical visit data (raw number of visits): RMSE calculated from $m = 100$ randomly sampled blocks where τ is set to be 2. Comparison between Z_{OPT} and Z_{OPT+} .

Method Design		(N, T)	T_{hist}	(N, T)				
				(25,10)	(50,10)	(25,20)	(50,20)	
FE	Z_{OPT}		0	0.3685	0.2320	0.3211	0.2498	
			$Z_{OPT,adj}^{hist}$	5	0.3339	0.2380	0.3727	0.2806
				10	0.3514	0.3005	0.4877	0.2972
				15	0.4085	0.3575	0.5284	0.3264
FM	Z_{OPT}		0	0.1257	0.0748	0.0783	0.0702	
			$Z_{OPT,adj}^{hist}$	5	0.0892	0.0679	0.0953	0.0535
				10	0.1046	0.0859	0.1238	0.0599
				15	0.1221	0.1068	0.1424	0.0713
LRME	Z_{OPT}		0	0.1817	0.1322	0.1099	0.0882	
			$Z_{OPT,adj}^{hist}$	5	0.1609	0.1123	0.1127	0.0826
				10	0.1312	0.0923	0.1075	0.0753
				15	0.1279	0.0975	0.0942	0.0708

Table 20 Home medical visit data (raw number of visits): RMSE calculated from $m = 100$ randomly sampled blocks where τ is set to be 2. Comparison between Z_{OPT} and $Z_{OPT,adj}^{hist}$, where T_{hist} ranges from 5 to 15.




Figure 8 Grocery data: the autocorrelation between Y_{it} and $Y_{i,t+lag}$




Figure 9 Lending club data: the autocorrelation between Y_{it} and $Y_{i,t+lag}$




Figure 10 Home medical visit data: the autocorrelation between Y_{it} and $Y_{i,t+lag}$




Figure 11 Unemployment rate: the autocorrelation between Y_{it} and $Y_{i,t+lag}$




Figure 12 Home medical visit data (without moving average): the autocorrelation between Y_{it} and $Y_{i,t+lag}$