

Clustering and External Validity in Randomized Controlled Trials with Stochastic Potential Outcomes*

Antoine Deeb[†] Clément de Chaisemartin[‡]

December 4, 2019

Abstract

In the literature studying randomized controlled trials (RCTs), it is often assumed that the potential outcomes of units participating in the experiment are deterministic. This assumption is unlikely to hold, as stochastic shocks may take place during the experiment. In this paper, we consider the case of an RCT with individual-level treatment assignment, and we allow for individual-level and cluster-level (e.g. village-level) shocks to affect the potential outcomes. We show that one can draw inference on two estimands: the ATE conditional on the realizations of the cluster-level shocks, using heteroskedasticity-robust standard errors; the ATE netted out of those shocks, using cluster-robust standard errors. By clustering, researchers can test if the treatment would still have had an effect, had the stochastic shocks that occurred during the experiment been different.

*We are very grateful to Kelsey Jack, Heather Royer, Dick Startz, Doug Steigerwald, Gonzalo Vazquez-Bare, members of the UCSB econometrics research group, and participants in the UCSB labor lunch for their helpful comments.

[†]University of California at Santa Barbara, antoinedib@ucsb.edu

[‡]University of California at Santa Barbara, clementdechaisemartin@ucsb.edu

1 Introduction

It is well known that in a randomized controlled trial (RCT), one can estimate and draw inference on the average treatment effect, if the potential outcomes of units participating in the experiment are non-stochastic (Neyman, 1923; Imbens and Rubin, 2015; Li and Ding, 2017). In practice, it is often implausible that units' potential outcomes are fixed. For instance, an agricultural household's investment decisions may be affected by the weather conditions in its village during planting season, or by other stochastic shocks. In a model where units' potential outcomes are not fixed but depend on stochastic shocks, the results in Neyman (1923) or Li and Ding (2017) still hold, conditional on the realizations of the shocks affecting units' potential outcomes. One can estimate and draw inference on the average treatment effect (ATE) *given the shocks that occurred during the experiment*. This may not be a parameter of interest, as it lacks in external validity: when evaluating the effect of giving a cash grant to farmers on their investment decisions, one may want to know the grant's effect independent of the specific shocks that arose during the experiment, rather than the grant's effect given those specific shocks.

To fix ideas, we will describe our paper in the context of the farmers' cash grant RCT example, even though our results apply beyond it. We assume that the cash grant is randomly assigned to some households within each village. Then, we relax the assumption of deterministic outcomes and allow household-level as well as village-level shocks to affect farmers' potential investment decisions without and with the grant. Finally, we define two estimands of interest: the ATE conditional on the realization of the village-level shocks and the ATE netted out of those shocks.

We start by showing that researchers can draw inference on the conditional ATE, by regressing farmers' investment on whether they received the cash grant, using the heteroskedasticity-robust variance estimator. Indeed, this variance estimator is conservative for the ATE estimator's variance conditional on the village-level shocks. On the other hand, to draw inference on the unconditional ATE, researchers need to cluster their standard errors at the village level. Indeed, we show that the village-clustered variance estimator is conservative for the ATE estimator's unconditional variance. We also show that owing to the conservative nature of both variance estimators, the expectation of the heteroskedasticity-robust estimator may not be smaller than the expectation of the clustered one, when the treatment effect is more heterogeneous across farmers than across villages. Finally, we show that if one is ready to assume that the village-level shocks affect treated and untreated farmers similarly, then the heteroskedasticity-robust variance estimator is also conservative for the ATE estimator's unconditional variance.

Our paper makes the following contributions to the literature. In randomized experiments without clustering in the treatment assignment, Abadie et al. (2017) have shown that if the potential outcomes are non-stochastic, clustering standard errors is not needed. We show that if there are cluster-level stochastic shocks affecting the potential outcomes, one may still want to cluster, if

one wants to estimate the average treatment effect netted out of the shocks. Rosenzweig and Udry (2019) have argued that with aggregate stochastic shocks affecting the potential outcomes, heteroskedasticity-robust variance estimators may understate the true variance of the ATE estimator in an RCT. The solution they propose to account for aggregate shocks differs from ours. Most importantly, their solution is designed to account for weather shocks in studies of agricultural treatments, while clustering is a generic tool that can be used in any study, to account for any type of cluster-level shock.

We use our results to revisit Karlan et al. (2014), who study the effects of a rainfall insurance and of a cash grant treatment on farmers' investment decisions. That paper was also revisited by Rosenzweig and Udry (2019), who argue that in this context, regional-level weather shocks need to be accounted for. To do so, we cluster standard errors at the level indicated by Rosenzweig and Udry (2019). We do not find very different results from those Karlan et al. (2014) had obtained using heteroskedasticity-robust standard errors, thus showing that their results are robust to accounting for aggregate shocks.

We also revisit Cole et al. (2013), who study the effects of various treatments on farmers' adoption of a rainfall insurance. Using heteroskedasticity-robust standard errors, the authors found that two of their treatments significantly increased adoption. Clustering standard errors at the village level, we find that only one of those two treatments still has a significant effect on adoption. The effect of the second treatment may have been due to the specific village-level shocks that arose during the experiment, and may not replicate under different circumstances.

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows, Section 2 sets up the theoretical framework and presents our finite-sample results, Section 3 presents our large-sample results, Section 4 goes over two empirical applications, and Section 5 concludes.

2 Setup and finite-sample results

2.1 Setup and Notation

To fix ideas, let us consider a randomized controlled trial conducted in multiple villages, that wants to look at the effect of cash grants on farming households' investment in agriculture. In each village, households are randomly divided into a treatment and a control group, and the treatment group will receive a cash grant while the control group will not. The outcomes of interest are households' investments in agriculture such as land preparation costs, value of chemicals used, and acres cultivated. It is arguably implausible to assume that households' potential outcomes are fixed, they may be affected by a wealth of stochastic events that could take place until the time they make their investment decisions. These shocks could be specific

to the households (such as the breadwinner being laid off or injured), or they could be common to all households within a village (such as extreme weather events, economic hardships in the village etc.). We therefore assume that households' potential outcomes without and with the treatment $Y_{ik}(0)$ and $Y_{ik}(1)$ are respectively drawn from distributions with means $y_{ik}(0)$ and $y_{ik}(1)$, and that they satisfy the following equations:

Assumption 1 *Stochastic Potential Outcomes*

$$\begin{aligned} Y_{ik}(0) &= y_{ik}(0) + \eta_k(0) + \epsilon_{ik}(0) \\ Y_{ik}(1) &= y_{ik}(1) + \eta_k(1) + \epsilon_{ik}(1). \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

For $d \in \{0, 1\}$, $\epsilon_{ik}(d)$ is a shock that affects household i in village k if she receives treatment d , and $\eta_k(d)$ is a shock that affects all the households in the village with treatment d . We assume that $\mathbb{E}(\epsilon_{ik}(0)) = \mathbb{E}(\epsilon_{ik}(1)) = \mathbb{E}(\eta_k(0)) = \mathbb{E}(\eta_k(1)) = 0$.

Let K be the number of villages in the experiment. For every $k \in \{1, \dots, K\}$, let n_k be the number of households in village k . Finally, let $n = \sum_{k=1}^K n_k$ denote the total number of households in the K villages. In this framework, we may be more interested in learning

$$ATE = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i,k} [y_{ik}(1) - y_{ik}(0)], \tag{2}$$

rather than

$$ATE(\boldsymbol{\epsilon}(0), \boldsymbol{\epsilon}(1), \boldsymbol{\eta}(0), \boldsymbol{\eta}(1))) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i,k} [Y_{ik}(1) - Y_{ik}(0)], \tag{3}$$

or

$$ATE(\boldsymbol{\eta}(0), \boldsymbol{\eta}(1)) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i,k} [(y_{ik}(1) + \eta_k(1)) - (y_{ik}(0) + \eta_k(0))]. \tag{4}$$

The second parameter is the average effect of the treatment on households' investments, conditional on the specific village and household shocks that arose during the experiment. The third parameter is the average effect of the treatment on households' investments, conditional only on the specific village shocks. The first parameter is the average effect of the treatment, net of those specific shocks. This parameter is more externally valid than the other two, as it applies beyond the specific circumstances that occurred during the experiment.¹

Let D_{ik} be an indicator for whether household i in village k is treated, let \mathbf{D}_k be a vector stacking the treatment indicators of all households in village k , and let \mathbf{D} be a matrix stacking these vectors. We consider the following assumption:

¹On the other hand, ATE still only applies to the villages participating in the experiment. Recent articles that consider treatment effects extrapolation outside of the estimation sample include, e.g., Dehejia et al. (2019) or Bo and Galiani (2019).

Assumption 2 For all i, k ,

1. $V(\epsilon_{ik}(d)) = \sigma_{dik}^2 < +\infty$ for $d = 0, 1$.
2. $\mathbb{E}(|\epsilon_{ik}(1)\epsilon_{ik}(0)|) < +\infty$, and $Cov(\epsilon_{ik}(1), \epsilon_{ik}(0)) = \sigma_{ik01}$.
3. For all $j \neq i$, $(\epsilon_{ik}(0), \epsilon_{ik}(1)) \perp\!\!\!\perp (\epsilon_{jk}(0), \epsilon_{jk}(1))$.
4. $\mathbf{D} \perp\!\!\!\perp (\epsilon_{ik}(0), \epsilon_{ik}(1), \eta_k(0), \eta_k(1))_{1 \leq i \leq n_k, 1 \leq k \leq K}$.
5. $(\epsilon_{ik}(0), \epsilon_{ik}(1))_{1 \leq i \leq n_k} \perp\!\!\!\perp (\eta_k(0), \eta_k(1))_{1 \leq k \leq K}$.
6. $V(\eta_k(1) - \eta_k(0)) < +\infty$

Points 1 and 2 require that $(\epsilon_{ik}(0), \epsilon_{ik}(1))$ have a second moment. Point 3 requires that in each village, the household level shocks be independent. Point 4 requires that the household- and village-level shocks be independent of the treatments, which usually holds by design in a RCT. Point 5 requires that the household- and village-level shocks be independent. Finally, Point 6 requires that the variance of $\eta_k(1) - \eta_k(0)$ exist. Assumption 2 does not require that the shocks $(\epsilon_{ik}(0), \epsilon_{ik}(1))$ and $(\eta_k(0), \eta_k(1))$ be identically distributed: the variance of the shocks may for instance vary across households or villages. Assumption 2 also does not require that $\epsilon_{ik}(0)$ and $\epsilon_{ik}(1)$ be independent, or that $\eta_k(0)$ and $\eta_k(1)$ be independent: one may for instance have $\epsilon_{ik}(0) = \epsilon_{ik}(1)$ and $\eta_k(0) = \eta_k(1)$, if the household- and village-level shocks are the same when treated and untreated.

Let n_{1k} and n_{0k} respectively denote the number of households in the treatment and control groups in village k . Let $Y_{ik} = D_{ik}Y_{ik}(1) + (1 - D_{ik})Y_{ik}(0)$ denote the observed outcome of household i . For any variable x_{ik} defined for every $i \in \{1, \dots, n_k\}$ and $k \in \{1, \dots, K\}$, let $\bar{x}_k = \frac{1}{n_k} \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} x_{ik}$ denote the average value of x_{ik} in village k , let $\bar{x}_{1k} = \frac{1}{n_{1k}} \sum_{i=1}^{n_{1k}} D_{ik}x_{ik}$ and $\bar{x}_{0k} = \frac{1}{n_{0k}} \sum_{i=1}^{n_{0k}} (1 - D_{ik})x_{ik}$ respectively denote the average value of x_{ik} among the treated and untreated households in village k , and let $\bar{x} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i,k} x_{ik}$ denote the average value of x_{ik} across all households.

Then let $\bar{n} = \frac{n}{K}$, and let

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{ATE}_k &= \bar{Y}_{1k} - \bar{Y}_{0k} \\ \widehat{ATE} &= \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K \frac{n_k}{\bar{n}} \widehat{ATE}_k, \end{aligned}$$

respectively denote the standard difference in means estimator of the average treatment effect in village k , and the estimated average treatment effect in the K villages.

For any variable x_{ik} defined for every $i \in \{1, \dots, n_k\}$ and $k \in \{1, \dots, K\}$, let $S_{x,k}^2 = \frac{1}{n_k-1} \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} (x_{ik} - \bar{x}_k)^2$ denote the variance of x_{ik} in village k , and let $S_{x,1,k}^2 = \frac{1}{n_{1k}-1} \sum_{i=1}^{n_{1k}} D_{ik}(x_{ik} - \bar{x}_{1k})^2$ and

$S_{x,0,k}^2 = \frac{1}{n_{0k}-1} \sum_{i=1}^{n_{0k}} (1 - D_{ik})(x_{ik} - \bar{x}_{0k})^2$ respectively denote the variance of x_{ik} among the treated and untreated households in village k . Then let,

$$\begin{aligned}\widehat{V}_{rob}(\widehat{ATE}_k) &= \frac{1}{n_{1k}} S_{Y,1,k}^2 + \frac{1}{n_{0k}} S_{Y,0,k}^2 \\ \widehat{V}_{rob}(\widehat{ATE}) &= \frac{1}{K^2} \sum_{k=1}^K \left(\frac{n_k}{\bar{n}}\right)^2 \widehat{V}_{rob}(\widehat{ATE}_k),\end{aligned}$$

respectively denote the robust estimators of the variances of \widehat{ATE}_k and \widehat{ATE} (Eicker et al., 1963; Huber et al., 1967; White et al., 1980).

We assume that the treatment is randomly assigned at the household level in each village:

Assumption 3 *Stratified completely randomized experiment*

For all k , $\sum_{i=1}^{n_k} D_{ik} = n_{1k}$, and for every $(d_1, \dots, d_{n_k}) \in \{0, 1\}^{n_k}$, $P(D_k = (d_1, \dots, d_{n_k})) = \frac{1}{\binom{n_k}{n_{1k}}}$.

Finally, we make the following assumption:

Assumption 4 *The vectors $(\mathbf{D}_k, \eta_k(1), \eta_k(0), (\epsilon_{ik}(0), \epsilon_{ik}(1))_{1 \leq i \leq n_k})$ are mutually independent.*

Assumption 4 requires that the variables attached to different villages be mutually independent.

2.2 Finite-sample results

We can now state our first result.

Theorem 1 *If Assumptions 1, 2, 3, and 4 hold,*

1. $\mathbb{E}(\widehat{ATE} | (\eta_k(0), \eta_k(1))_{1 \leq k \leq K}) = ATE(\boldsymbol{\eta}(0), \boldsymbol{\eta}(1))$
2. $V(\widehat{ATE} | (\eta_k(0), \eta_k(1))_{1 \leq k \leq K}) = \frac{1}{K^2} \sum_{k=1}^K \left(\frac{n_k}{\bar{n}}\right)^2 V(\widehat{ATE}_k | (\eta_k(0), \eta_k(1))_{1 \leq k \leq K})$, where

$$V(\widehat{ATE}_k | (\eta_k(0), \eta_k(1))_{1 \leq k \leq K}) = \frac{1}{n_{0k}} S_{y(0),k}^2 + \frac{1}{n_{1k}} S_{y(1),k}^2 - \frac{1}{n_k} S_{y(1)-y(0),k}^2 + \frac{1}{n_{1k}} \overline{\sigma_{1k}^2} + \frac{1}{n_{0k}} \overline{\sigma_{0k}^2}$$
3. $V(\widehat{ATE} | (\eta_k(0), \eta_k(1))_{1 \leq k \leq K}) \leq \mathbb{E}(\widehat{V}_{rob}(\widehat{ATE}) | (\eta_k(0), \eta_k(1))_{1 \leq k \leq K})$, with equality if there is no treatment effect heterogeneity within village: $S_{y(1)-y(0),k}^2 = 0$ for all k .

Point 1 of Theorem 1 shows that \widehat{ATE} is an unbiased estimator of $ATE(\boldsymbol{\eta}(0), \boldsymbol{\eta}(1))$, conditional on the village-level shocks. Point 2 gives a formula for the variance of \widehat{ATE} conditional on the village-level shocks. Point 3 shows that the robust variance estimator is a conservative estimator of that conditional variance.

In our set-up, the result in Neyman (1923) implies that conditional on the household- and village-level shocks, \widehat{ATE} is an unbiased estimator, and the robust variance estimator is a conservative estimator of the variance of \widehat{ATE} . Theorem 1 extends this result, by showing that it still holds when one only conditions on the village-level shocks.²

In our cash-grant example, Theorem 1 implies that if the researcher uses robust standard errors and finds a statistically significant effect, she can conclude that $ATE(\boldsymbol{\eta}(0), \boldsymbol{\eta}(1)) \neq 0$: the treatment had an effect, given the specific village-level shocks that arose during the experiment. $ATE(\boldsymbol{\eta}(0), \boldsymbol{\eta}(1))$ does not depend on the household-level shocks that arose during the experiment, but it does depend on the village-level shocks. Therefore, the researcher cannot say whether the treatment would still have had an effect if different village-level shocks had occurred. To answer that question, one needs to draw inference on ATE . We now show that this can be achieved, by clustering standard errors at the village level. Let

$$\widehat{V}_{clu}(\widehat{ATE}) = \frac{1}{K(K-1)} \sum_{k=1}^K \left(\frac{n_k}{\bar{n}} \widehat{ATE}_k - \widehat{ATE} \right)^2$$

be the cluster-robust estimator of the variance of \widehat{ATE} (Liang and Zeger, 1986).

Theorem 2 *If Assumptions 1, 2, 3, and 4 hold,*

1. $\mathbb{E}(\widehat{ATE}) = ATE$
 2. $V(\widehat{ATE}) = \frac{1}{K^2} \sum_{k=1}^K \left(\frac{n_k}{\bar{n}} \right)^2 \left[\frac{1}{n_{0k}} S_{y(0),k}^2 + \frac{1}{n_{1k}} S_{y(1),k}^2 - \frac{1}{n_k} S_{y(1)-y(0),k}^2 + \frac{1}{n_{1k}} \overline{\sigma}_{1k}^2 + \frac{1}{n_{0k}} \overline{\sigma}_{0k}^2 + V(\eta_k(1) - \eta_k(0)) \right]$
 3. $V(\widehat{ATE}) \leq \mathbb{E}[\widehat{V}_{clu}(\widehat{ATE})]$, with equality when $n_k = \bar{n}$ and $ATE_k = ATE$,
- where $ATE_k = \frac{1}{n_k} \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} [y_{ik}(1) - y_{ik}(0)]$.

Point 1 of Theorem 2 shows that \widehat{ATE} is an unbiased estimator of ATE . Point 2 gives a formula for the unconditional variance of \widehat{ATE} . Point 3 shows that the cluster-robust variance estimator is a conservative estimator of that variance.

In our cash-grant example, Theorem 2 states that if the researcher uses the cluster-robust standard errors and finds a statistically significant effect, she can conclude that $ATE \neq 0$. ATE does

²It has also been shown (see Imbens and Rubin, 2015) that when the potential outcomes are i.i.d., the robust variance estimator is an unbiased estimator of $V(\widehat{ATE})$. This result can also be obtained from Theorem 1. Assume that $\eta_k(0) = \eta_k(1) = 0$, thus ensuring that the potential outcomes are independent, and that $y_{ik}(d) = y(d)$ and $\sigma_{dik}^2 = \sigma_d^2$, thus ensuring that they are identically distributed. Then, Point 3 implies that $V(\widehat{ATE}) = \mathbb{E}(\widehat{V}_{rob}(\widehat{ATE}))$.

not depend on the household- and village-level shocks that arose during the experiment. Therefore, this conclusion is not dependent on the specific shocks that arose during the experiment, but holds when the shocks are set at their average value.

We also consider the following assumption.

Assumption 5 *Homogeneous clustered shocks*

For all k , $\eta_k(1) = \eta_k(0)$.

Assumption 5 requires that treated and untreated households are affected similarly by the village-level shocks.³ Under Assumption 5, $ATE(\boldsymbol{\eta}(0), \boldsymbol{\eta}(1)) = ATE$ and $V(\widehat{ATE}) = V(\widehat{ATE} | (\eta_k(0), \eta_k(1))_{1 \leq k \leq K})$ so Theorem 1 and 2 imply that the robust variance estimator is conservative for $V(\widehat{ATE})$. This shows that under Assumption 5, one can draw inference on ATE using the robust variance estimator. However, Assumption 5 may not always be plausible. In the cash-grant example, receiving a cash grant can affect the way households' investments respond to village specific weather shocks. For instance, in the face of a negative weather shock, treated households may choose to spend more money on land preparation costs in order to offset the negative shock. But there may be other instances where Assumption 5 is plausible. If Assumption 5 is satisfied, it follows from Theorems 1 and 2 that:

$$V(\widehat{ATE} | (\eta_k(0), \eta_k(1))_{1 \leq k \leq K}) = V(\widehat{ATE}),$$

and we now have two conservative estimators for $V(\widehat{ATE})$. The bias term for the heteroskedasticity robust variance estimator is

$$\frac{1}{K^2} \sum_{k=1}^K \left(\frac{n_k}{\bar{n}}\right)^2 \frac{1}{n_k} S_{y(1)-y(0),k}^2, \quad (5)$$

so $\widehat{V}_{rob}(\widehat{ATE})$ is unbiased when the treatment effect is constant for all households in the same village, namely $y_{ik}(1) - y_{ik}(0) = \tau_k$ for all $i \in \{1, \dots, n_k\}$ and for all k . The bias term for the cluster robust variance estimator is

$$\frac{1}{K(K-1)} \left[\sum_{k=1}^K \left(\frac{n_k}{\bar{n}}\right)^2 \mathbb{E}(\widehat{ATE}_k)^2 - K \left[\frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K \left(\frac{n_k}{\bar{n}}\right) \mathbb{E}(\widehat{ATE}_k) \right]^2 \right], \quad (6)$$

so $\widehat{V}_{clu}(\widehat{ATE})$ is unbiased when there is no treatment heterogeneity across villages ($ATE_k = ATE$) and villages are of similar size ($n_k = \bar{n}$). Therefore, if the bias in Equation (5) is larger than that in Equation (6), $\mathbb{E}(\widehat{V}_{clu}(\widehat{ATE}))$ will be lower than $\mathbb{E}(\widehat{V}_{rob}(\widehat{ATE}))$.

³It is not testable without imposing other assumptions. Under the assumption that ATE_k does not vary across k , one can test whether the \widehat{ATE}_k s significantly differ. If they do, that implies that $\eta_k(1) \neq \eta_k(0)$ for some k .

Clustering can also reduce standard errors, even when Assumption 5 fails. This will happen if:

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{K^2} \sum_{k=1}^K \left(\frac{n_k}{\bar{n}}\right)^2 \frac{1}{n_k} S_{y(1)-y(0),k}^2 - \frac{1}{K(K-1)} \left[\sum_{k=1}^K \left(\frac{n_k}{\bar{n}}\right)^2 \mathbb{E} \left(\widehat{ATE}_k \right)^2 - K \left[\frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K \left(\frac{n_k}{\bar{n}}\right) \mathbb{E} \left(\widehat{ATE}_k \right) \right]^2 \right] \\ & \geq \frac{1}{K^2} \sum_{k=1}^K \left(\frac{n_k}{\bar{n}}\right)^2 [V(\eta_k(1) - \eta_k(0))], \end{aligned}$$

namely if the additional variance in \widehat{ATE} coming from the village-level shocks, is lower than the difference between the bias of the heteroskedasticity- and cluster-robust variance estimators.

3 Large-sample results

We now derive the asymptotic distribution of \widehat{ATE} considering a case where the number of villages K goes to infinity. First let:

$$AD_k = \frac{n_k}{\bar{n}} \widehat{ATE}_k,$$

and consider the following assumption:

Assumption 6 *Regularity conditions to derive the asymptotic distribution of \widehat{ATE}*

For some $\epsilon > 0$,

1. For every k , $\mathbb{E}(AD_k^{2+\epsilon}) \leq M < +\infty$, for some $M > 0$.
2. $\lim_{K \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{S_K^{2+\epsilon}} \sum_{k=1}^K \mathbb{E}[|AD_k - E(AD_k)|^{2+\epsilon}] = 0$, where $S_K^2 = \sum_{k=1}^K V(AD_k)$.
3. $\frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K \mathbb{E}(AD_k)$, $\frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K \mathbb{E}(AD_k^2)$, and $\frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K \mathbb{E}(AD_k)^2$ converge towards finite limits when $K \rightarrow \infty$.

Assumption 6 contains the regularity conditions needed to apply the strong law of large numbers in Lemma 1 of Liu et al. (1988) and the Lyapunov CLT. Also let:

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma^2 &= \lim_{K \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K \mathbb{E}(AD_k^2) - \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K \mathbb{E}(AD_k)^2, \\ \sigma_+^2 &= \lim_{K \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K \mathbb{E}(AD_k^2) - \left(\frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K \mathbb{E}(AD_k) \right)^2. \end{aligned}$$

We show:

Theorem 3 *If Assumptions 1, 2, 3, 4, and 6 hold,*

1. $\sqrt{K} \left(\widehat{ATE} - ATE \right) \xrightarrow{d} N(0, \sigma^2).$
2. $K\widehat{V}_{clu} \left(\widehat{ATE} \right) \xrightarrow{p} \sigma_+^2 \geq \sigma^2.$

Point 1 of Theorem 3 shows that \widehat{ATE} is an asymptotically normal estimator of ATE when the number of villages goes to infinity. Point 2 shows that $K\widehat{V}_{clu} \left(\widehat{ATE} \right)$ converges to a finite upper bound of the asymptotic variance of \widehat{ATE} and can be used to construct conservative confidence intervals for ATE .

4 Applications

4.1 Agricultural Decisions After Relaxing Credit And Risk Constraints

In this section we reexamine the results from Table 4 of Karlan et al. (2014). It presents the effects of having rainfall index insurance, receiving a capital grant, and having both treatments on investment decisions and harvests of farmers. The results are obtained from a two-year randomized controlled trial that was run in Ghana. In the first year of the experiment the authors randomly assigned households to one of four groups: the cash grant group, the insurance group, the cash grant and insurance group, and the control group. In the second year, the cash grant experiment was still present but the insurance grant experiment was replaced by an insurance pricing experiment. Insurance prices were randomized at the community level but every community also had control households without access to the insurance with the randomization being at the household level. For farmers that were offered insurance, insurance take-up is instrumented using the price offered to them (see Karlan et al., 2014).

In a re-analysis of the data from this experiment, Rosenzweig and Udry (2019) divide communities into 11 regions, and show that the returns to farmers' investments strongly respond to the weather shocks affecting their region \times year. They therefore argue that the stochastic nature of those weather shocks should be accounted for when deriving confidence intervals of the treatment effect. To do so, they propose a method that differs from the simple clustering method we propose. They find that accounting for those region-level shocks significantly widens the confidence intervals of returns to farmers' investments. In Table 1 below, we revisit the results in Karlan et al.'s Table 4, clustering standard errors at the region \times year level suggested by Rosenzweig and Udry (2019).⁴ Our results are not directly comparable to theirs, as we do not focus on the same

⁴In Section 2, we assumed that the aggregate shocks take place at the same level as the experiment is stratified, while here they take place at a more aggregate level. All of our results in Section 2 still hold if the aggregate shocks take place at a more aggregate level than the randomization strata.

treatment effect parameters: Karlan et al.'s Table 4 presents the ATE of the insurance and cash grant treatments on investment decisions and harvest value, while Rosenzweig and Udry (2019) use those treatments as instruments to estimate returns to investments.

Table 1 below presents the results of our replication. Panel A is identical to the results in Karlan et al. (2014), as it uses heteroskedasticity-robust variance estimators. In Panel B, we instead use cluster-robust variance estimators. However, there are only 21 clusters in the data, and Theorem 3 relies on an asymptotic approximation where the number of clusters goes to infinity. Accordingly, in Panel C we present p-values computed using the wild-bootstrap test proposed in Cameron et al. (2008), and that has been shown to have better properties when the number of clusters is small.

Results with and without clustering are pretty similar. Clustering even seems to reduce p-values for some outcomes, which may suggest that the treatment effect is less heterogeneous across than within region \times year. Overall, it seems that the results in this experiment are not driven by the specific region \times year shocks that arose during the experiment, and that for most of the outcomes for which we can reject $ATE(\eta(0), \eta(1)) = 0$, we can also reject $ATE = 0$.

Table 1: Effects in Karlan et al. (2014), without and with clustering.

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
	Land Preparation Costs	# of Acres Cultivated	Value of Chemicals Used	Wages Paid to Hired Labor	Opportunity Cost of Family Labor	Total Costs	Value of Harvest
A: Robust SE							
Insured	25.528** (12.064) [0.034]	1.024** (0.420) [0.015]	37.904** (14.854) [0.011]	83.537 (59.623) [0.161]	98.161 (84.349) [0.245]	266.146** (134.229) [0.047]	104.274 (81.198) [0.199]
Insured*Capital Grant	15.767 (13.040) [0.227]	0.257 (0.445) [0.563]	66.440*** (15.674) [0.000]	39.760 (65.040) [0.541]	-52.653 (86.100) [0.541]	72.137 (138.640) [0.603]	129.243 (81.389) [0.112]
Capital Grant	15.362 (13.361) [0.250]	0.088 (0.480) [0.854]	55.631*** (17.274) [0.001]	75.609 (68.914) [0.273]	-130.562 (92.217) [0.157]	2.438 (148.553) [0.987]	64.822 (89.764) [0.470]
B: Clustered SE							
Insured	25.528** (12.798) [0.046]	1.024*** (0.349) [0.003]	37.904** (16.382) [0.021]	83.537 (61.437) [0.174]	98.161 (68.301) [0.151]	266.146*** (100.616) [0.008]	104.274* (60.940) [0.087]
Insured*Capital Grant	15.767 (11.922) [0.186]	0.257 (0.305) [0.399]	66.440*** (12.137) [0.000]	39.760 (51.063) [0.436]	-52.653 (70.261) [0.454]	72.137 (115.185) [0.531]	129.243* (66.948) [0.054]
Capital Grant	15.362 (17.803) [0.388]	0.088 (0.536) [0.869]	55.631** (22.544) [0.014]	75.609 (60.312) [0.210]	-130.562 (114.272) [0.253]	2.438 (215.165) [0.991]	64.822 (121.371) [0.593]
C: Wild Bootstrap							
Insured	25.528* [0.053]	1.024** [0.0170]	37.904* [0.0781]	83.537 [0.236]	98.161 [0.229]	266.146** [0.044]	104.274 [0.111]
Insured*Capital Grant	15.767 [0.192]	0.257 [0.442]	66.440*** [0.002]	39.760 [0.474]	-52.653 [0.469]	72.137 [0.554]	129.243* [0.096]
Capital Grant	15.362 [0.428]	0.088 [0.869]	55.631** [0.043]	75.609 [0.249]	-130.562 [0.292]	2.438 [0.988]	64.822 [0.660]
<i>N</i>	2320	2320	2320	2320	2320	2320	2320

Standard errors in parentheses, p-values in brackets. The results in this table are based on Table 4 from Karlan et al. (2014), in year 2 Insured is instrumented using a full set of prices. Total costs (column (6)) includes sum of chemicals, land preparatory costs (e.g., equipment rental but not labor), hired labor, and family labor (valued at gender/community/year-specific wages). Harvest value includes own-produced consumption, valued at community-specific market value. All specifications include controls for full set of sample frame and year interactions. *** p < 0.01 ** p < 0.05 * p < 0.1.

4.2 Barriers to Household Risk Management: Evidence from India

In this section we reexamine the results in Cole et al. (2013), who conducted an experiment in India to study the effect of price and nonprice factors in the adoption of an innovative rainfall insurance product. The authors estimate the impact of the following treatments on the decision to purchase insurance: whether the household is visited by an insurance educator; whether the educator was endorsed by local agents that have close relationships with rural villages; whether the educator presented an additional education module about the financial product; and whether the visited household received a high cash reward. The treatments were assigned at the household level, within each of the 37 villages participating in their experiment.⁵

Table 5 of Cole et al. (2013) presents the results of that experiment using robust variance estimators. In Table 2 below, we replicate their results, using the same variance variance estimators first, and then clustering standard errors at the village level. As Cole et al. (2013) find no effect for the endorsement and education treatments, we only report results for the other treatments.

Table 2: Conditional and Unconditional Results.

Dependent Variable: Insurance Take-Up		
	Robust s.e.	Clustered s.e.
Visit	0.115*** (0.043)	0.115 (0.089)
High reward	0.394*** (0.034)	0.394*** (0.045)
Household controls	Yes	Yes
Village FEs	Yes	Yes
N	1047	1047
Mean of Dep Var	0.282	0.282

The results in this table are based on specification 3 of Table 5 from Cole et al. (2013). The dependent variable in the regression is an indicator for whether the household purchased an insurance policy. The treatment variables are indicators for whether the household was visited by an insurance educator; whether the educator was endorsed by an LSA; whether the educator presented the education module; and whether the visited household received a high cash reward. Household controls are the same as in Cole et al. (2013). Robust standard errors are shown in parentheses in the first column. Standard errors clustered at the village level are shown in the second column.

* p<0.10 ** p<0.05 *** p<0.01.

The first column of Table 2 presents results using robust standard errors. The effects of both treatments are significant, so for both of them we can reject $ATE(\boldsymbol{\eta}(0), \boldsymbol{\eta}(1)) = 0$: conditional

⁵The endorsement treatment was only assigned in two-thirds of the villages.

on the village-shocks that arose during the experiment, the treatment had an effect. Assumption 5 is likely to fail in this application: receiving a visit from an educator that describes features of the insurance and answers the household’s questions can affect how these households’ insurance decisions respond to village specific economic and weather shocks. Therefore, using robust standard errors may not be appropriate to test $ATE = 0$, one may instead have to use clustered standard errors. With clustered errors, the second column of the Table shows that the effect of the high-reward treatment is still significant. We can reject $ATE = 0$ for that treatment: its effect does not seem to be driven by the specific village-level shocks that arose during the experiment. On the other hand, the effect of the visit treatment is no longer significant with clustering. We cannot reject $ATE = 0$ for that treatment: its effect may have been driven by the village-level shocks that occurred during the experiment.

5 Conclusion

In this paper we consider RCTs with household-level treatment assignment and household- as well as village-level shocks affecting the potential outcomes. We define two estimands of interest: the ATE conditional on the realizations of the village-level shocks and the ATE netted out of those shocks. By regressing the outcome on the treatment and using the heteroskedasticity-robust variance estimator, researchers can draw inference on the conditional ATE. Indeed, we show that this variance estimator is conservative for the variance of the ATE estimator conditional on the village-level shocks. On the other hand, to draw inference on the unconditional ATE, researchers need to cluster their standard errors at the village level. Indeed, we show that the village-clustered variance estimator is conservative for the unconditional variance of the ATE estimator. Finally, we reexamine the results of two RCTs. While results in the first are robust to accounting for cluster-level shocks, results in the second are not fully robust. That paper’s findings may then be specific to the village-level shocks that arose during the experiment, and may not replicate in different circumstances.

References

- Abadie, A., Athey, S., Imbens, G. W., and Wooldridge, J. (2017). When should you adjust standard errors for clustering? Technical report, National Bureau of Economic Research.
- Bo, H. and Galiani, S. (2019). Assessing external validity. Technical report, National Bureau of Economic Research.
- Cameron, A. C., Gelbach, J. B., and Miller, D. L. (2008). Bootstrap-based improvements for inference with clustered errors. *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, 90(3):414–427.
- Cole, S., Giné, X., Tobacman, J., Topalova, P., Townsend, R., and Vickery, J. (2013). Barriers to household risk management: Evidence from india. *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics*, 5(1):104–35.
- Dehejia, R., Pop-Eleches, C., and Samii, C. (2019). From local to global: External validity an a fertility natural experiment. *Journal of Business & Economic Statistics*, (just-accepted):1–48.
- Eicker, F. et al. (1963). Asymptotic normality and consistency of the least squares estimators for families of linear regressions. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, 34(2):447–456.
- Huber, P. J. et al. (1967). The behavior of maximum likelihood estimates under nonstandard conditions. In *Proceedings of the fifth Berkeley symposium on mathematical statistics and probability*, volume 1, pages 221–233. University of California Press.
- Imbens, G. W. and Rubin, D. B. (2015). *Causal inference in statistics, social, and biomedical sciences*. Cambridge University Press.
- Karlan, D., Osei, R., Osei-Akoto, I., and Udry, C. (2014). Agricultural decisions after relaxing credit and risk constraints. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 129(2):597–652.
- Li, X. and Ding, P. (2017). General forms of finite population central limit theorems with applications to causal inference. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 112(520):1759–1769.
- Liang, K.-Y. and Zeger, S. L. (1986). Longitudinal data analysis using generalized linear models. *Biometrika*, 73(1):13–22.
- Liu, R. Y. et al. (1988). Bootstrap procedures under some non-iid models. *The Annals of Statistics*, 16(4):1696–1708.
- Neyman, J. (1923). On the application of probability theory to agricultural experiments. essay on principles. section 9. translated in *Statistical Science* 5(4), 465-472, 1990.

Rosenzweig, M. R. and Udry, C. (2019). External Validity in a Stochastic World: Evidence from Low-Income Countries. *The Review of Economic Studies*.

White, H. et al. (1980). A heteroskedasticity-consistent covariance matrix estimator and a direct test for heteroskedasticity. *econometrica*, 48(4):817–838.

6 Appendix

6.1 Useful Results

Under Assumption 3, one has that for all i, k

$$P(D_{ik} = 1) = \frac{n_{1k}}{n_k}, \quad (7)$$

and for all $j \neq i$

$$\mathbb{E}(D_{ik}D_{jk}) = \frac{n_{1k}(n_{1k} - 1)}{n_k(n_k - 1)}. \quad (8)$$

6.2 Proof of Theorem 1

6.2.1 Conditional Unbiasedness of \widehat{ATE}

Let $(\boldsymbol{\eta}(0), \boldsymbol{\eta}(1)) = (\eta_k(0), \eta_k(1))_{1 \leq k \leq K}$.

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\left(\widehat{ATE}_k \mid (\boldsymbol{\eta}(0), \boldsymbol{\eta}(1))\right) &= \mathbb{E}\left(\frac{1}{n_{1k}} \sum_i D_{ik} Y_{ik}(1) - \frac{1}{n_{0k}} \sum_i (1 - D_{ik}) Y_{ik}(0) \mid (\boldsymbol{\eta}(0), \boldsymbol{\eta}(1))\right) \\ &= \frac{1}{n_{1k}} \sum_i \mathbb{E}(D_{ik} Y_{ik}(1) \mid (\boldsymbol{\eta}(0), \boldsymbol{\eta}(1))) - \frac{1}{n_{0k}} \sum_i \mathbb{E}((1 - D_{ik}) Y_{ik}(0) \mid (\boldsymbol{\eta}(0), \boldsymbol{\eta}(1))) \\ &= \frac{1}{n_{1k}} \sum_i \mathbb{E}(D_{ik} \mid (\boldsymbol{\eta}(0), \boldsymbol{\eta}(1))) \mathbb{E}(Y_{ik}(1) \mid (\boldsymbol{\eta}(0), \boldsymbol{\eta}(1))) \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{n_{0k}} \sum_i \mathbb{E}(1 - D_{ik} \mid (\boldsymbol{\eta}(0), \boldsymbol{\eta}(1))) \mathbb{E}(Y_{ik}(0) \mid (\boldsymbol{\eta}(0), \boldsymbol{\eta}(1))) \\ &= \frac{1}{n_{1k}} \sum_i \frac{n_{1k}}{n_k} (y_{ik}(1) + \eta_k(1)) - \frac{1}{n_{0k}} \sum_i \frac{n_{0k}}{n_k} (y_{ik}(0) + \eta_k(0)) \\ &= (\eta_k(1) - \eta_k(0)) + \frac{1}{n_k} \sum_i (y_{ik}(1) - y_{ik}(0)). \end{aligned}$$

The first equality holds because we observe $Y_i(1)$ for treated units and $Y_i(0)$ for untreated units, the third equality follows from Assumption 1 and Point 4 of Assumption 2, and the fourth equality follows from Assumption 1 and Points 4 and 5 of Assumption 2 and Equation (7).

Now $\widehat{ATE} = \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K \frac{n_k}{n} \widehat{ATE}_k$, therefore :

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E} \left(\widehat{ATE} \middle| (\boldsymbol{\eta}(0), \boldsymbol{\eta}(1)) \right) &= \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K \frac{n_k}{\bar{n}} \mathbb{E} \left(\widehat{ATE}_k \middle| (\boldsymbol{\eta}(0), \boldsymbol{\eta}(1)) \right) \\
&= \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K \frac{n_k}{\bar{n}} \left[(\eta_k(1) - \eta_k(0)) + \frac{1}{n_k} \sum_i (y_{ik}(1) - y_{ik}(0)) \right] \\
&= ATE(\boldsymbol{\eta}(0), \boldsymbol{\eta}(1)).
\end{aligned}$$

QED.

6.2.2 Conditional Variance of \widehat{ATE}

We begin by deriving the conditional variance of \widehat{ATE}_k .

We start with:

$$\begin{aligned}
V \left(\widehat{ATE}_k \middle| (\boldsymbol{\eta}(0), \boldsymbol{\eta}(1)) \right) &= V \left(\mathbb{E} \left(\widehat{ATE}_k \middle| \mathbf{D}_k, (\boldsymbol{\eta}(0), \boldsymbol{\eta}(1)) \right) \middle| (\boldsymbol{\eta}(0), \boldsymbol{\eta}(1)) \right) \\
&\quad + \mathbb{E} \left(V \left(\widehat{ATE}_k \middle| \mathbf{D}_k, (\boldsymbol{\eta}(0), \boldsymbol{\eta}(1)) \right) \middle| (\boldsymbol{\eta}(0), \boldsymbol{\eta}(1)) \right). \quad (9)
\end{aligned}$$

Now begin with the first term:

$$\begin{aligned}
&V \left(\mathbb{E} \left(\widehat{ATE}_k \middle| \mathbf{D}_k, (\boldsymbol{\eta}(0), \boldsymbol{\eta}(1)) \right) \middle| (\boldsymbol{\eta}(0), \boldsymbol{\eta}(1)) \right) \\
&= V \left(\frac{1}{n_{1k}} \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} D_{ik} y_{ik}(1) + \eta_k(1) \frac{1}{n_{1k}} \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} D_{ik} - \frac{1}{n_{0k}} \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} (1 - D_{ik}) y_{ik}(0) - \eta_k(0) \frac{1}{n_{0k}} \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} (1 - D_{ik}) \middle| (\boldsymbol{\eta}(0), \boldsymbol{\eta}(1)) \right) \\
&= V \left(\frac{1}{n_{1k}} \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} D_{ik} y_{ik}(1) + \eta_k(1) - \frac{1}{n_{0k}} \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} (1 - D_{ik}) y_{ik}(0) - \eta_k(0) \middle| (\boldsymbol{\eta}(0), \boldsymbol{\eta}(1)) \right) \\
&= V \left(\frac{1}{n_{1k}} \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} D_{ik} y_{ik}(1) - \frac{1}{n_{0k}} \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} (1 - D_{ik}) y_{ik}(0) \middle| (\boldsymbol{\eta}(0), \boldsymbol{\eta}(1)) \right). \quad (10)
\end{aligned}$$

The second equality comes from the fact that:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E} [D_{ik} Y_{ik}(1) | \mathbf{D}_k, (\boldsymbol{\eta}(0), \boldsymbol{\eta}(1))] &= D_{ik} \mathbb{E} [Y_{ik}(1) | \mathbf{D}_k, (\boldsymbol{\eta}(0), \boldsymbol{\eta}(1))] \\
&= D_{ik} \mathbb{E} [y_{ik}(1) + \epsilon_{ik}(1) + \eta_k(1) | \mathbf{D}_k, (\boldsymbol{\eta}(0), \boldsymbol{\eta}(1))] \\
&= D_{ik} (y_{ik}(1) + \eta_k(1)).
\end{aligned}$$

The second equality follows from Assumption 1, the third equality follows from Points 4 and 5 of Assumption 2. Similarly, one can show that $\mathbb{E} ((1 - D_{ik}) Y_{ik}(0) | \mathbf{D}_k, (\boldsymbol{\eta}(0), \boldsymbol{\eta}(1))) = (1 - D_{ik})(y_{ik}(0) + \eta_k(0))$.

By Point 4 of Assumption 2, $\frac{1}{n_{1k}} \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} D_{ik} y_{ik}(1) - \frac{1}{n_{0k}} \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} (1 - D_{ik}) y_{ik}(0)$ is independent of $(\boldsymbol{\eta}(0), \boldsymbol{\eta}(1))$, so:

$$\begin{aligned} & V \left(\frac{1}{n_{1k}} \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} D_{ik} y_{ik}(1) - \frac{1}{n_{0k}} \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} (1 - D_{ik}) y_{ik}(0) \middle| (\boldsymbol{\eta}(0), \boldsymbol{\eta}(1)) \right) \\ &= V \left(\frac{1}{n_{1k}} \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} D_{ik} y_{ik}(1) - \frac{1}{n_{0k}} \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} (1 - D_{ik}) y_{ik}(0) \right). \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

The right hand side of the previous equation is the variance of the estimated average treatment effect in the case of deterministic potential outcomes. Then, it follows from Equations (10) and (11) and from Neyman (1923) that:

$$V \left(\mathbb{E} \left(\widehat{ATE}_k | \mathbf{D}_k, (\boldsymbol{\eta}(0), \boldsymbol{\eta}(1)) \right) \middle| (\boldsymbol{\eta}(0), \boldsymbol{\eta}(1)) \right) = \frac{1}{n_{0k}} S_{y(0),k}^2 + \frac{1}{n_{1k}} S_{y(1),k}^2 - \frac{1}{n_k} S_{y(1)-y(0),k}^2 \quad (12)$$

Moving to the second term :

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} \left(V \left(\widehat{ATE}_k \middle| \mathbf{D}_k, (\boldsymbol{\eta}(0), \boldsymbol{\eta}(1)) \right) \middle| (\boldsymbol{\eta}(0), \boldsymbol{\eta}(1)) \right) \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left(V \left(\frac{1}{n_{1k}} \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} D_{ik} \epsilon_{ik}(1) - \frac{1}{n_{0k}} \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} (1 - D_{ik}) \epsilon_{ik}(0) \middle| \mathbf{D}_k, (\boldsymbol{\eta}(0), \boldsymbol{\eta}(1)) \right) \middle| (\boldsymbol{\eta}(0), \boldsymbol{\eta}(1)) \right) \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left(\frac{1}{n_{1k}^2} \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} D_{ik}^2 \sigma_{1i}^2 + \frac{1}{n_{0k}^2} \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} (1 - D_{ik})^2 \sigma_{0i}^2 \middle| (\boldsymbol{\eta}(0), \boldsymbol{\eta}(1)) \right) \\
&\quad - E \left(\frac{1}{n_{0k} n_{1k}} Cov \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n_k} D_{ik} \epsilon_{ik}(1), \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} (1 - D_{ik}) \epsilon_{ik}(0) \middle| \mathbf{D}_k, (\boldsymbol{\eta}(0), \boldsymbol{\eta}(1)) \right) \middle| (\boldsymbol{\eta}(0), \boldsymbol{\eta}(1)) \right) \\
&= \frac{1}{n_{1k}^2} \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} \mathbb{E} (D_{ik}^2) \sigma_{1i}^2 + \frac{1}{n_{0k}^2} \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} \mathbb{E} [(1 - D_{ik})^2] \sigma_{0i}^2 - \\
&\quad \frac{1}{n_{0k} n_{1k}} \mathbb{E} \left(Cov \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n_k} D_{ik} \epsilon_{ik}(1), \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} (1 - D_{ik}) \epsilon_{ik}(0) \middle| \mathbf{D}_k, (\boldsymbol{\eta}(0), \boldsymbol{\eta}(1)) \right) \middle| (\boldsymbol{\eta}(0), \boldsymbol{\eta}(1)) \right) \\
&= \frac{1}{n_{1k}^2} \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} \frac{n_{1k}}{n_k} \sigma_{1i}^2 + \frac{1}{n_{0k}^2} \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} \frac{n_{0k}}{n_k} \sigma_{0i}^2 \\
&\quad - \frac{1}{n_{0k} n_{1k}} \mathbb{E} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n_k} Cov (D_{ik} \epsilon_{ik}(1), (1 - D_{ik}) \epsilon_{ik}(0) \middle| \mathbf{D}_k, (\boldsymbol{\eta}(0), \boldsymbol{\eta}(1))) \middle| (\boldsymbol{\eta}(0), \boldsymbol{\eta}(1)) \right) \\
&= \frac{1}{n_{1k}} \overline{\sigma_{1k}^2} + \frac{1}{n_{0k}} \overline{\sigma_{0k}^2} \\
&\quad - \frac{1}{n_{0k} n_{1k}} \mathbb{E} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n_k} D_{ik} (1 - D_{ik}) Cov (\epsilon_{ik}(1), \epsilon_{ik}(0) \middle| \mathbf{D}_k, (\boldsymbol{\eta}(0), \boldsymbol{\eta}(1))) \middle| (\boldsymbol{\eta}(0), \boldsymbol{\eta}(1)) \right) \\
&= \frac{1}{n_{1k}} \overline{\sigma_{1k}^2} + \frac{1}{n_{0k}} \overline{\sigma_{0k}^2}. \tag{13}
\end{aligned}$$

The first equality holds because conditional on \mathbf{D}_k and $(\boldsymbol{\eta}(0), \boldsymbol{\eta}(1))$ there is no randomness in $(1 - D_{ik})(y_{ik}(0) + \eta_k(0))$ and $D_{ik}(y_{ik}(1) + \eta_k(1))$. The second equality holds by Points 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 of Assumption 2, which imply that $V(\epsilon_{ik}(d) | \mathbf{D}_k, (\boldsymbol{\eta}(0), \boldsymbol{\eta}(1))) = V(\epsilon_{ik}(d)) = \sigma_{dik}^2$ and $Cov(\epsilon_{ik}(d), \epsilon_{jk}(d) | \mathbf{D}_k, (\boldsymbol{\eta}(0), \boldsymbol{\eta}(1))) = Cov(\epsilon_{ik}(d), \epsilon_{jk}(d)) = 0$. The third equality holds by Point 4 of Assumption 2. The fourth equality holds since D_{ik} is binary therefore $D_{ik}^2 = D_{ik}$, and because by Points 3, 4, and 5 of Assumption 2, $Cov(\epsilon_{ik}(1), \epsilon_{jk}(0) | \mathbf{D}_k, (\boldsymbol{\eta}(0), \boldsymbol{\eta}(1))) = Cov(\epsilon_{ik}(1), \epsilon_{jk}(0)) = 0$. The last equality holds since $D_{ik}(1 - D_{ik}) = 0$.

Combining Equations (9), (12), and (13) shows that:

$$V \left(\widehat{ATE}_k \middle| (\boldsymbol{\eta}(0), \boldsymbol{\eta}(1)) \right) = \frac{1}{n_{0k}} S_{y(0),k}^2 + \frac{1}{n_{1k}} S_{y(1),k}^2 - \frac{1}{n} S_{y(1)-y(0),k}^2 + \frac{1}{n_{1k}} \overline{\sigma_{1k}^2} + \frac{1}{n_{0k}} \overline{\sigma_{0k}^2}. \tag{14}$$

Now by Points 4 and 5 of Assumption 2, we have that \mathbf{D} , $(\epsilon_{ik}(0), \epsilon_{ik}(1))_{1 \leq i \leq n_k, 1 \leq k \leq K}$, and $(\eta_k(0), \eta_k(1))_{1 \leq k \leq K}$ are mutually independent.

This implies that $(\mathbf{D}, (\epsilon_{ik}(0), \epsilon_{ik}(1))_{1 \leq i \leq n_k, 1 \leq k \leq K}) \perp\!\!\!\perp (\eta_k(0), \eta_k(1))_{1 \leq k \leq K}$. Then:

$$\begin{aligned}
& Cov \left(\widehat{ATE}_k, \widehat{ATE}_{k'} \middle| (\boldsymbol{\eta}(0), \boldsymbol{\eta}(1)) \right) \\
&= Cov \left(\frac{1}{n_{1k}} \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} D_{ik} Y_{ik}(1) - \frac{1}{n_{0k}} \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} (1 - D_{ik}) Y_{ik}(0), \right. \\
&\quad \left. \frac{1}{n_{1k'}} \sum_{i=1}^{n_{k'}} D_{ik'} Y_{ik'}(1) - \frac{1}{n_{0k'}} \sum_{i=1}^{n_{k'}} (1 - D_{ik'}) Y_{ik'}(0) \middle| (\boldsymbol{\eta}(0), \boldsymbol{\eta}(1)) \right) \\
&= Cov \left(\frac{1}{n_{1k}} \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} D_{ik} (y_{ik}(1) + \epsilon_{ik}(1)) - \frac{1}{n_{0k}} \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} (1 - D_{ik}) (y_{ik}(0) + \epsilon_{ik}(0)), \right. \\
&\quad \left. \frac{1}{n_{1k'}} \sum_{i=1}^{n_{k'}} D_{ik'} (y_{ik'}(1) + \epsilon_{ik'}(1)) - \frac{1}{n_{0k'}} \sum_{i=1}^{n_{k'}} (1 - D_{ik'}) (y_{ik'}(0) + \epsilon_{ik'}(0)) \middle| (\boldsymbol{\eta}(0), \boldsymbol{\eta}(1)) \right) \\
&= Cov \left(\frac{1}{n_{1k}} \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} D_{ik} (y_{ik}(1) + \epsilon_{ik}(1)) - \frac{1}{n_{0k}} \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} (1 - D_{ik}) (y_{ik}(0) + \epsilon_{ik}(0)), \right. \\
&\quad \left. \frac{1}{n_{1k'}} \sum_{i=1}^{n_{k'}} D_{ik'} (y_{ik'}(1) + \epsilon_{ik'}(1)) - \frac{1}{n_{0k'}} \sum_{i=1}^{n_{k'}} (1 - D_{ik'}) (y_{ik'}(0) + \epsilon_{ik'}(0)) \right) \\
&= 0
\end{aligned}$$

where the second equality holds by Assumption 1 and the fact that conditional on $(\boldsymbol{\eta}(0), \boldsymbol{\eta}(1))$ there is no randomness in $\eta_k(0)$, $\eta_k(1)$, $\eta_{k'}(0)$, and $\eta_{k'}(1)$. The third equality holds because Points 4 and 5 of Assumption 2 imply that $(\mathbf{D}, (\epsilon_{ik}(0), \epsilon_{ik}(1))_{1 \leq i \leq n_k, 1 \leq k \leq K}) \perp\!\!\!\perp (\eta_k(0), \eta_k(1))_{1 \leq k \leq K}$. The fourth equality holds by Assumption 4.

Therefore:

$$Cov \left(\widehat{ATE}_k, \widehat{ATE}_{k'} \middle| (\boldsymbol{\eta}(0), \boldsymbol{\eta}(1)) \right) = 0 \quad (15)$$

for all $k \neq k'$.

Finally, combining the fact that $\widehat{ATE} = \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K \frac{n_k}{\bar{n}} \widehat{ATE}_k$ and Equation (15) we get:

$$V \left(\widehat{ATE} \middle| (\boldsymbol{\eta}(0), \boldsymbol{\eta}(1)) \right) = \frac{1}{K^2} \sum_{k=1}^K \left(\frac{n_k}{\bar{n}} \right)^2 V \left(\widehat{ATE}_k \middle| (\boldsymbol{\eta}(0), \boldsymbol{\eta}(1)) \right)$$

QED.

6.2.3 Estimating an Upper Bound for the Variance of \widehat{ATE}

We begin by showing that $\widehat{V}_{rob} \left(\widehat{ATE}_k \right)$ is a conservative estimator of $V \left(\widehat{ATE}_k \middle| (\boldsymbol{\eta}(0), \boldsymbol{\eta}(1)) \right)$.

$$\widehat{V}_{rob} \left(\widehat{ATE}_k \right) = \frac{1}{n_{1k}} \left[\frac{1}{n_{1k} - 1} \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} D_{ik} (Y_{ik}(1) - \bar{Y}_{1k})^2 \right] + \frac{1}{n_{0k}} \left[\frac{1}{n_{0k} - 1} \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} (1 - D_{ik}) (Y_{ik}(0) - \bar{Y}_{0k})^2 \right].$$

We will prove that the expectation of the first term is $\frac{1}{n_{1k}}S_{y(1),k}^2 + \frac{1}{n_{1k}}\overline{\sigma_{1k}^2}$ and a mirror proof would show that the expectation of the second term is $\frac{1}{n_{0k}}S_{y(0),k}^2 + \frac{1}{n_{0k}}\overline{\sigma_{0k}^2}$.

We have:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{n_{1k}} \left[\frac{1}{n_{1k} - 1} \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} D_{ik} (Y_{ik}(1) - \bar{Y}_{1k})^2 \right] \\
&= \frac{1}{n_{1k}} \left[\frac{1}{n_{1k} - 1} \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} D_{ik} \left(Y_{ik}(1)^2 - 2Y_{ik}(1)\bar{Y}_{1k} + \bar{Y}_{1k}^2 \right) \right] \\
&= \frac{1}{n_{1k}} \frac{1}{n_{1k} - 1} \left[\sum_{i=1}^{n_k} D_{ik} Y_{ik}(1)^2 - 2\bar{Y}_{1k} \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} D_{ik} Y_{ik}(1) + \bar{Y}_{1k}^2 \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} D_{ik} \right] \\
&= \frac{1}{n_{1k}} \frac{1}{n_{1k} - 1} \left[\sum_{i=1}^{n_k} D_{ik} Y_{ik}(1)^2 - n_{1k} \bar{Y}_{1k}^2 \right] \\
&= \frac{1}{n_{1k}} \frac{1}{n_{1k} - 1} \left[\sum_{i=1}^{n_k} D_{ik} \left(y_{ik}(1)^2 + 2\epsilon_{ik}(1)y_{ik}(1) + \epsilon_{ik}^2(1) + \eta_k^2(1) + 2y_{ik}(1)\eta_k(1) + 2\eta_k(1)\epsilon_{ik}(1) \right) \right] \\
&\quad - \frac{1}{n_{1k}} \frac{1}{n_{1k} - 1} \left[\frac{\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n_k} D_{ik} y_{ik}(1) + \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} D_{ik} \epsilon_{ik}(1) + \eta_k(1) \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} D_{ik} \right)^2}{n_{1k}} \right] \\
&= \frac{1}{n_{1k}} \frac{1}{n_{1k} - 1} \left[\sum_{i=1}^{n_k} D_{ik} y_{ik}(1)^2 + 2 \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} D_{ik} \epsilon_{ik}(1) y_{ik}(1) + \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} D_{ik} \epsilon_{ik}^2(1) + \eta_k^2(1) \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} D_{ik} \right] \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{n_{1k}} \frac{1}{n_{1k} - 1} \left[2\eta_k(1) \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} D_{ik} \epsilon_{ik}(1) + 2\eta_k(1) \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} D_{ik} y_{ik}(1) \right] \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{n_{1k}} \frac{1}{n_{1k} - 1} \left[-\frac{1}{n_{1k}} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n_k} D_{ik} y_{ik}(1) \right)^2 - \frac{2}{n_{1k}} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n_k} D_{ik} y_{ik}(1) \right) \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n_k} D_{ik} \epsilon_{ik}(1) \right) - \frac{1}{n_{1k}} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n_k} D_{ik} \epsilon_{ik}(1) \right)^2 \right] \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{n_{1k}} \frac{1}{n_{1k} - 1} \left[-\frac{1}{n_{1k}} \left(\eta_k(1) \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} D_{ik} \right)^2 - \frac{2}{n_{1k}} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n_k} D_{ik} y_{ik}(1) \right) \left(\eta_k(1) \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} D_{ik} \right) \right] \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{n_{1k}} \frac{1}{n_{1k} - 1} \left[-\frac{2}{n_{1k}} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n_k} D_{ik} \epsilon_{ik}(1) \right) \left(\eta_k(1) \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} D_{ik} \right) \right] \\
&= A + B + C + D + E + F
\end{aligned}$$

where the fourth equality holds because of Assumption 1 and:

$$A = \frac{1}{n_{1k}} \frac{1}{n_{1k} - 1} \left[\sum_{i=1}^{n_k} D_{ik} y_{ik}(1)^2 - \frac{\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n_k} D_{ik} y_{ik}(1) \right)^2}{n_{1k}} \right], \quad (16)$$

$$B = \frac{1}{n_{1k}} \frac{1}{n_{1k} - 1} \left[\sum_{i=1}^{n_k} D_{ik} \epsilon_{ik}^2(1) - \frac{\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n_k} D_{ik} \epsilon_{ik}(1) \right)^2}{n_{1k}} \right], \quad (17)$$

$$C = \frac{1}{n_{1k}} \frac{2}{n_{1k} - 1} \left[\sum_{i=1}^{n_k} D_{ik} y_{ik}(1) \epsilon_{ik}(1) - \frac{\left(\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n_k} D_{ik} y_{ik}(1) \right) \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n_k} D_{ik} \epsilon_{ik}(1) \right) \right)}{n_{1k}} \right], \quad (18)$$

and

$$D = \frac{1}{n_{1k}} \frac{1}{n_{1k} - 1} \left[\eta_k^2(1) \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} D_{ik} - \frac{1}{n_{1k}} \left(\eta_k(1) \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} D_{ik} \right)^2 \right] = 0,$$

$$E = \frac{1}{n_{1k}} \frac{1}{n_{1k} - 1} \left[2\eta_k(1) \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} D_{ik} y_{ik}(1) - \frac{2}{n_{1k}} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n_k} D_{ik} y_{ik}(1) \right) \left(\eta_k(1) \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} D_{ik} \right) \right] = 0,$$

$$F = \frac{1}{n_{1k}} \frac{1}{n_{1k} - 1} \left[2\eta_k(1) \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} D_{ik} \epsilon_{ik}(1) - \frac{2}{n_{1k}} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n_k} D_{ik} \epsilon_{ik}(1) \right) \left(\eta_k(1) \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} D_{ik} \right) \right] = 0.$$

We now show that $\mathbb{E}(A | (\boldsymbol{\eta}(0), \boldsymbol{\eta}(1))) = \frac{1}{n_{1k}} S_{y(1),k}^2$, $\mathbb{E}(B | (\boldsymbol{\eta}(0), \boldsymbol{\eta}(1))) = \frac{1}{n_{1k}} \overline{\sigma_{1k}^2}$, and $\mathbb{E}(C | (\boldsymbol{\eta}(0), \boldsymbol{\eta}(1))) = 0$.

To ease notation let $\mathbb{E}^*(X) = \mathbb{E}(X | (\boldsymbol{\eta}(0), \boldsymbol{\eta}(1)))$.

Starting with A :

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}^*(A) &= \frac{1}{n_{1k}(n_{1k}-1)} \left[\sum_{i=1}^{n_k} \mathbb{E}^*(D_{ik}) y_{ik}(1)^2 - \frac{\mathbb{E}^* \left(\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n_k} D_{ik} y_{ik}(1) \right)^2 \right)}{n_{1k}} \right] \\
&= \frac{1}{n_{1k}(n_{1k}-1)} \left[\sum_{i=1}^{n_k} \mathbb{E}^*(D_{ik}) y_{ik}^2(1) - \frac{1}{n_{1k}} \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} \mathbb{E}^*(D_{ik}^2) y_{ik}^2(1) - \frac{1}{n_{1k}} \sum_{i \neq j} \sum_{j=1}^{n_k} \mathbb{E}^*(D_{ik} D_{jk}) y_{ik}(1) y_{jk}(1) \right] \\
&= \frac{1}{n_{1k}(n_{1k}-1)} \left[\frac{n_{1k}}{n_k} \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} y_{ik}^2(1) - \frac{1}{n_{1k}} \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} \frac{n_{1k}}{n_k} y_{ik}^2(1) - \frac{1}{n_{1k}} \sum_{i \neq j} \sum_{j=1}^{n_k} \frac{n_{1k}}{n_k} \frac{n_{1k}-1}{n_k-1} y_{ik}(1) y_{jk}(1) \right] \\
&= \frac{1}{n_{1k}(n_{1k}-1)} \left[\frac{n_{1k}-1}{n_k} \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} y_{ik}^2(1) - \frac{n_{1k}-1}{n_k(n_k-1)} \sum_{i \neq j} \sum_{j=1}^{n_k} y_{ik}(1) y_{jk}(1) \right] \\
&= \frac{1}{n_{1k}(n_{1k}-1)} \left[\frac{n_{1k}-1}{n_k} \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} y_{ik}^2(1) + \frac{n_{1k}-1}{n_k(n_k-1)} \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} y_{ik}^2(1) - \frac{n_{1k}-1}{n_k(n_k-1)} \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} \sum_{j=1}^{n_k} y_{ik}(1) y_{jk}(1) \right] \\
&= \frac{1}{n_{1k}(n_{1k}-1)} \left[\frac{(n_{1k}-1)(n_k-1) + (n_{1k}-1)}{n_k(n_k-1)} \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} y_{ik}^2(1) - \frac{n_k(n_{1k}-1)}{(n_k-1)} \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} \sum_{j=1}^{n_k} \frac{y_{ik}(1)}{n_k} \frac{y_{jk}(1)}{n_k} \right] \\
&= \frac{1}{n_{1k}} \left[\frac{1}{n_k-1} \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} y_{ik}^2(1) - \frac{n_k}{n_k-1} \bar{y}_k^2(1) \right] \\
&= \frac{1}{n_{1k}} S_{y(1),k}^2.
\end{aligned}$$

The third equality holds since $D_{ik}^2 = D_{ik}$, and by Equations (7), (8) and by Point 4 of Assumption 2 we have that $\mathbb{E}^*(D_{ik} D_{jk}) = \mathbb{E}(D_{ik} D_{jk}) = \frac{n_{1k}(n_{1k}-1)}{n_k(n_k-1)}$ and $\mathbb{E}^*(D_{ik}) = \mathbb{E}(D_{ik}) = \frac{n_{1k}}{n_k}$.

Now for B :

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}^*(B) &= \frac{1}{n_{1k}(n_{1k} - 1)} \left[\sum_{i=1}^{n_k} \mathbb{E}^*(D_{ik}) \mathbb{E}^*(\epsilon_{ik}^2(1)) - \frac{\mathbb{E}^* \left(\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n_k} D_{ik} \epsilon_{ik}(1) \right)^2 \right)}{n_{1k}} \right] \\
&= \frac{1}{n_{1k}(n_{1k} - 1)} \left[\sum_{i=1}^{n_k} \mathbb{E}^*(D_{ik}) \mathbb{E}^*(\epsilon_{ik}^2(1)) - \frac{1}{n_{1k}} \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} \mathbb{E}^*(D_{ik}^2) \mathbb{E}^*(\epsilon_{ik}^2(1)) \right. \\
&\quad \left. - \frac{1}{n_{1k}} \sum_{i \neq j} \mathbb{E}^*(D_{ik} D_{jk}) \mathbb{E}^*(\epsilon_{ik}(1) \epsilon_{jk}(1)) \right] \\
&= \frac{1}{n_{1k}(n_{1k} - 1)} \left[\frac{n_{1k}}{n_k} \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} \sigma_{1i}^2 - \frac{1}{n_{1k}} \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} \frac{n_{1k}}{n_k} \sigma_{1i}^2 \right] \\
&= \frac{1}{n_{1k}(n_{1k} - 1)} \left[\frac{n_{1k} - 1}{n_k} \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} \sigma_{1ik}^2 \right] \\
&= \frac{1}{n_{1k}} \overline{\sigma_{1k}^2}.
\end{aligned}$$

The first equality holds by Points 1 and 4 of Assumption 2. The second equality holds by Points 1 and 4 of Assumption 2. The third equality holds since $D_{ik}^2 = D_{ik}$ and by Points 1, 3, 4, and 5 of Assumption 2 as well as by Equation (7), which imply $\mathbb{E}^*(D_{ik}) = \mathbb{E}(D_{ik}) = \frac{n_{1k}}{n_k}$, $E^*(\epsilon_{ik}^2(1)) = E(\epsilon_{ik}^2(1)) = \sigma_{1i}^2$, and $\mathbb{E}^*(\epsilon_{ik}(1) \epsilon_{jk}(1)) = \mathbb{E}(\epsilon_{ik}(1) \epsilon_{jk}(1)) = 0$.

Finally for C :

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}^*(C) &= \frac{1}{n_{1k}} \frac{2}{n_{1k} - 1} \left[\sum_{i=1}^{n_k} \mathbb{E}^*(D_{ik}) y_{ik}(1) \mathbb{E}^*(\epsilon_{ik}(1)) - \frac{\mathbb{E}^* \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n_k} D_{ik} y_{ik}(1) \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} D_{ik} \epsilon_{ik}(1) \right)}{n_{1k}} \right] \\
&= \frac{1}{n_{1k}} \frac{2}{n_{1k} - 1} \left[- \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} \mathbb{E}^*(D_{ik}^2) y_{ik}(1) \mathbb{E}^*(\epsilon_{ik}(1)) - \sum_{i \neq j} \mathbb{E}^*(D_{ik} D_{jk}) y_{ik}(1) \mathbb{E}^*(\epsilon_{jk}(1)) \right] \\
&= 0.
\end{aligned}$$

The first equality holds by Point 4 of Assumption 2. The second equality holds by Points 4 and 5 of Assumption 2, which imply $\mathbb{E}^*(\epsilon_{ik}(1)) = \mathbb{E}(\epsilon_{ik}(1)) = 0$. The third equality holds by Points 4 and 5 of Assumption 2, which imply $\mathbb{E}^*(\epsilon_{ik}(1)) = \mathbb{E}(\epsilon_{ik}(1)) = 0$.

Combining this with the mirror proof for the second term proves $V \left(\widehat{ATE}_k | (\boldsymbol{\eta}(0), \boldsymbol{\eta}(1)) \right) \leq \mathbb{E}^* \left(\widehat{V}_{rob} \left(\widehat{ATE}_k \right) \right)$.

So we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{K^2} \sum_{k=1}^K \left(\frac{n_k}{\bar{n}}\right)^2 \left[V \left(\widehat{ATE}_k | (\boldsymbol{\eta}(0), \boldsymbol{\eta}(1)) \right) \right] &\leq \frac{1}{K^2} \sum_{k=1}^K \left(\frac{n_k}{\bar{n}}\right)^2 \mathbb{E}^* \left(\widehat{V}_{rob} \left(\widehat{ATE}_k \right) \right) \\
V \left(\widehat{ATE} | (\boldsymbol{\eta}(0), \boldsymbol{\eta}(1)) \right) &\leq E^* \left(\frac{1}{K^2} \sum_{k=1}^K \left(\frac{n_k}{\bar{n}}\right) \widehat{V}_{rob} \left(\widehat{ATE}_k \right) \right) \\
V \left(\widehat{ATE} | (\boldsymbol{\eta}(0), \boldsymbol{\eta}(1)) \right) &\leq E \left(\widehat{V}_{rob} \left(\widehat{ATE} \right) | (\boldsymbol{\eta}(0), \boldsymbol{\eta}(1)) \right).
\end{aligned}$$

QED.

6.3 Proof of Theorem 2

6.3.1 Unbiasedness of \widehat{ATE}

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E} \left(\widehat{ATE} \right) &= \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{E} \left(\widehat{ATE} | (\eta_k(0), \eta_k(1))_{1 \leq k \leq K} \right) \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E} [ATE(\boldsymbol{\eta}(0), \boldsymbol{\eta}(1))] \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K \frac{n_k}{\bar{n}} \sum_{i=0}^{n_k} [(y_{ik}(1) + \eta_k(1)) - (y_{ik}(0) + \eta_k(0))] \right] \\
&= \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K \frac{n_k}{\bar{n}} \sum_{i=0}^{n_k} [y_{ik}(1) - y_{ik}(0)] \\
&= ATE.
\end{aligned} \tag{19}$$

Where the first equality holds by the law of iterated expectations, and the second equality holds by Theorem 1.

6.3.2 Unconditional Variance of \widehat{ATE}

We start with:

$$V \left(\widehat{ATE} \right) = \mathbb{E} \left(V \left(\widehat{ATE} | (\eta_k(0), \eta_k(1))_{1 \leq k \leq K} \right) \right) + V \left(\mathbb{E} \left(\widehat{ATE} | (\eta_k(0), \eta_k(1))_{1 \leq k \leq K} \right) \right). \tag{20}$$

Now begin with the first term:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E} \left(V \left(\widehat{ATE} | (\eta_k(0), \eta_k(1))_{1 \leq k \leq K} \right) \right) &= \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{K^2} \sum_{k=1}^K \left(\frac{n_k}{\bar{n}}\right)^2 V \left(\widehat{ATE}_k | (\eta_k(0), \eta_k(1))_{1 \leq k \leq K} \right) \right] \\
&= \frac{1}{K^2} \sum_{k=1}^K \left(\frac{n_k}{\bar{n}}\right)^2 V \left(\widehat{ATE}_k | (\eta_k(0), \eta_k(1))_{1 \leq k \leq K} \right).
\end{aligned} \tag{21}$$

Where the first equality holds by Theorem 1, and the second equality holds because $V\left(\widehat{ATE}_k | (\eta_k(0), \eta_k(1))_{1 \leq k \leq K}\right)$ contains no stochastic components, as shown in Point 2 of Theorem 1.

Moving to the second term :

$$\begin{aligned}
& V\left(\mathbb{E}\left(\widehat{ATE} | (\eta_k(0), \eta_k(1))_{1 \leq k \leq K}\right)\right) \\
&= V(ATE(\boldsymbol{\eta}(0), \boldsymbol{\eta}(1))) \\
&= V\left(\frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K \frac{n_k}{\bar{n}} \frac{1}{n_k} \sum_{i=0}^{n_k} [(y_{ik}(1) + \eta_k(1)) - (y_{ik}(0) + \eta_k(0))]\right) \\
&= \frac{1}{K^2} V\left(\sum_{k=1}^K \frac{1}{\bar{n}} \sum_{i=0}^{n_k} (y_{ik}(1) - y_{ik}(0)) + (\eta_k(1) - \eta_k(0))\right) \\
&= \frac{1}{K^2} V\left(\sum_{k=1}^K \frac{n_k}{\bar{n}} (\eta_k(1) - \eta_k(0)) + \sum_{k=1}^K \frac{1}{\bar{n}} \sum_{i=0}^{n_k} (y_{ik}(1) - y_{ik}(0))\right) \\
&= \frac{1}{K^2} V\left(\sum_{k=1}^K \frac{n_k}{\bar{n}} (\eta_k(1) - \eta_k(0))\right) \\
&= \frac{1}{K^2} \sum_{k=1}^K \left(\frac{n_k}{\bar{n}}\right)^2 V(\eta_k(1) - \eta_k(0)). \tag{22}
\end{aligned}$$

Where the first equality holds by Theorem 1, the fifth equality holds because the $y_{ik}(d)$ are deterministic, and the last equality holds by Assumption 4 and Point 6 of Assumption 2.

Summing the two terms completes the proof.

QED.

6.3.3 Estimating an Upper Bound for the Variance of \widehat{ATE}

We start with:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{K(K-1)} \sum_{k=1}^K \left(\frac{n_k}{\bar{n}} \widehat{ATE}_k - \widehat{ATE} \right)^2 \right] \\
&= \frac{1}{K(K-1)} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{k=1}^K \left(\frac{n_k}{\bar{n}} \right)^2 \widehat{ATE}_k^2 - 2\widehat{ATE} \sum_{k=1}^K \frac{n_k}{\bar{n}} \widehat{ATE}_k + K\widehat{ATE}^2 \right] \\
&= \frac{1}{K(K-1)} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{k=1}^K \left(\frac{n_k}{\bar{n}} \right)^2 \widehat{ATE}_k^2 - 2K\widehat{ATE}^2 + K\widehat{ATE}^2 \right] \\
&= \frac{1}{K(K-1)} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{k=1}^K \left(\frac{n_k}{\bar{n}} \right)^2 \widehat{ATE}_k^2 - K\widehat{ATE}^2 \right] \\
&= \frac{1}{K(K-1)} \left[\sum_{k=1}^K \left(\frac{n_k}{\bar{n}} \right)^2 \mathbb{E} \left(\widehat{ATE}_k^2 \right) - K\mathbb{E} \left(\widehat{ATE}^2 \right) \right] \\
&= \frac{1}{K(K-1)} \left[\sum_{k=1}^K \left(\frac{n_k}{\bar{n}} \right)^2 \left[V \left(\widehat{ATE}_k \right) + \mathbb{E} \left(\widehat{ATE}_k \right)^2 \right] - K \left[V \left(\widehat{ATE} \right) + \mathbb{E} \left(\widehat{ATE} \right)^2 \right] \right] \\
&= \frac{1}{K(K-1)} \left[\sum_{k=1}^K \left(\frac{n_k}{\bar{n}} \right)^2 V \left(\widehat{ATE}_k \right) + \sum_{k=1}^K \left(\frac{n_k}{\bar{n}} \right)^2 \mathbb{E} \left(\widehat{ATE}_k \right)^2 - KV \left(\widehat{ATE} \right) - K\mathbb{E} \left(\widehat{ATE} \right)^2 \right] \\
&= \frac{1}{K(K-1)} \left[K^2 V \left(\widehat{ATE} \right) + \sum_{k=1}^K \left(\frac{n_k}{\bar{n}} \right)^2 \mathbb{E} \left(\widehat{ATE}_k \right)^2 - KV \left(\widehat{ATE} \right) - K\mathbb{E} \left(\widehat{ATE} \right)^2 \right] \\
&= \frac{1}{K(K-1)} \left[K(K-1) V \left(\widehat{ATE} \right) + \sum_{k=1}^K \left(\frac{n_k}{\bar{n}} \right)^2 \mathbb{E} \left(\widehat{ATE}_k \right)^2 - K\mathbb{E} \left(\widehat{ATE} \right)^2 \right] \\
&= V \left(\widehat{ATE} \right) + \frac{1}{K(K-1)} \left[\sum_{k=1}^K \left(\frac{n_k}{\bar{n}} \right)^2 \mathbb{E} \left(\widehat{ATE}_k \right)^2 - K\mathbb{E} \left(\widehat{ATE} \right)^2 \right].
\end{aligned}$$

The first three equalities follow from algebraic manipulations, the fourth equality from the linearity of the expectations operator, the fifth equality follows from the definition of a variance, and the seventh equality follows from the fact that

$$V \left(\widehat{ATE} \right) = \frac{1}{K^2} \sum_{k=1}^K \left(\frac{n_k}{\bar{n}} \right)^2 V \left(\widehat{ATE}_k \right).$$

To complete the proof we need to sign the second term on the last equality.

We know that:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}(\widehat{ATE}) &= \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K \left(\frac{n_k}{\bar{n}}\right) \mathbb{E}(\widehat{ATE}_k) \\ \mathbb{E}(\widehat{ATE})^2 &= \left[\frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K \left(\frac{n_k}{\bar{n}}\right) \mathbb{E}(\widehat{ATE}_k) \right]^2,\end{aligned}$$

and by convexity of $x \rightarrow x^2$ we know that:

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K \left(\frac{n_k}{\bar{n}}\right)^2 \mathbb{E}(\widehat{ATE}_k)^2 &\geq \left[\frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K \left(\frac{n_k}{\bar{n}}\right) \mathbb{E}(\widehat{ATE}_k) \right]^2 \\ \sum_{k=1}^K \left(\frac{n_k}{\bar{n}}\right)^2 \mathbb{E}(\widehat{ATE}_k)^2 &\geq K \left[\frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K \left(\frac{n_k}{\bar{n}}\right) \mathbb{E}(\widehat{ATE}_k) \right]^2 \\ \sum_{k=1}^K \left(\frac{n_k}{\bar{n}}\right)^2 \mathbb{E}(\widehat{ATE}_k)^2 &\geq K \mathbb{E}(\widehat{ATE})^2.\end{aligned}$$

Therefore the second term is positive and we have shown:

$$\begin{aligned}V(\widehat{ATE}) &\leq \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{K(K-1)} \sum_{k=1}^K \left(\frac{n_k}{\bar{n}} \widehat{ATE}_k - \widehat{ATE}\right)^2 \right] \\ V(\widehat{ATE}) &\leq \mathbb{E} \left[\widehat{V}_{clu}(\widehat{ATE}) \right].\end{aligned}\tag{23}$$

QED.

6.4 Proof of Theorem 3

Let:

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{1}{S_K/K} \left[\widehat{ATE} - ATE \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{S_K} K \left[\widehat{ATE} - \mathbb{E}(\widehat{ATE}) \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{S_K} K \left[\frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K AD_k - \mathbb{E} \left(\frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K AD_k \right) \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{S_K} \sum_{k=1}^K [AD_k - \mathbb{E}(AD_k)],\end{aligned}$$

where the first equality holds by Theorem 2.

Under Assumptions 1, 2, 3, 4, ??, and 6, $\sum_{k=1}^K [AD_k - \mathbb{E}(AD_k)]$ is a sum of independent mean 0 random variables with finite variance. Furthermore, by Point 3 of Assumption 6 we know that $\lim_{K \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{S_K^{2+\epsilon}} \sum_{k=1}^K \mathbb{E}[|AD_k - E(AD_k)|^{2+\epsilon}] = 0$ for some $\epsilon > 0$, where $S_K^2 = \sum_{k=1}^K V(AD_k)$. Therefore by the Lyapunov CLT:

$$\frac{1}{S_K} \sum_{k=1}^K [AD_k - \mathbb{E}(AD_k)] \xrightarrow{d} N(0, 1).$$

Now note that:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{S_K/K} [\widehat{ATE} - ATE] &= \frac{\sqrt{K}}{\sqrt{\frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K V(AD_k)}} [\widehat{ATE} - ATE] \\ &= \frac{\sqrt{K}}{\sqrt{KV(\widehat{ATE})}} [\widehat{ATE} - ATE], \end{aligned}$$

then by the Slutsky Lemma and Point 3 of Assumption 6:

$$\sqrt{K} (\widehat{ATE} - ATE) \xrightarrow{d} N(0, \sigma^2).$$

Now we show that $K\widehat{V}_{clu}(\widehat{ATE}) \xrightarrow{p} \sigma_+^2 \geq \sigma^2$:

$$\begin{aligned} &\lim_{K \rightarrow \infty} K\widehat{V}_{clu}(\widehat{ATE}) \\ &= \lim_{K \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{(K-1)} \sum_{k=1}^K (AD_k - \widehat{ATE})^2 \\ &= \lim_{K \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K (AD_k - \widehat{ATE})^2 \\ &= \lim_{K \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{K} \left[\sum_{k=1}^K AD_k^2 - K\widehat{ATE}^2 \right] \\ &= \lim_{K \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K AD_k^2 - \left(\frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K AD_k \right)^2 \end{aligned}$$

Where the second equality holds because in the limit $\frac{1}{K}$ and $\frac{1}{K-1}$ are equivalent. By Assumption 4, Point 1 of Assumption 6, the strong law of large numbers in Lemma 1 of Liu et al. (1988), and the fact that almost sure convergence implies convergence in probability:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K AD_k^2 - \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K \mathbb{E}(AD_k^2) &\xrightarrow{p} 0 \\ \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K AD_k - \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K \mathbb{E}(AD_k) &\xrightarrow{p} 0, \end{aligned}$$

by Point 3 of Assumption 6 $\frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K \mathbb{E}(AD_k^2)$ and $\frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K \mathbb{E}(AD_k)$ converge towards finite limits then:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K AD_k^2 &\xrightarrow{p} \lim_{K \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K \mathbb{E}(AD_k^2) \\ \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K AD_k &\xrightarrow{p} \lim_{K \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K \mathbb{E}(AD_k) \end{aligned}$$

therefore by the continuous mapping theorem:

$$K\widehat{V}_{clu}(\widehat{ATE}) \xrightarrow{p} \lim_{K \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K \mathbb{E}(AD_k^2) - \left(\frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K \mathbb{E}(AD_k) \right)^2 = \sigma_+^2.$$

By the convexity of $x \rightarrow x^2$ we have $\frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K \mathbb{E}(AD_k)^2 \geq \left(\frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K \mathbb{E}(AD_k) \right)^2$, then: $\sigma_+^2 \geq \sigma^2$.
QED.