

---

# DETECTING TREATMENT EFFECT MODIFIERS IN SOCIAL NETWORKS

---

A PREPRINT

Amir Gilad\*, Harsh Parikh\*, Sudeepa Roy, Babak Salimi

## ABSTRACT

We study *treatment effect modifiers* for causal analysis in a social network, where neighbors' characteristics or network structure may affect the outcome of a unit, and the goal is to identify sub-populations with varying treatment effects using such network properties. We propose a novel framework called *Testing-for-Effect-Modifier (TEEM)* for this purpose that facilitates data-driven decision making by testing hypotheses about complex effect modifiers in terms of network features or network patterns (e.g., characteristics of neighbors of a unit or belonging to a triangle), and by identifying sub-populations for which a treatment is likely to be effective or harmful. We describe a hypothesis testing approach that accounts for unit's covariates, their neighbors' covariates and patterns in the social network, and devise an algorithm incorporating ideas from causal inference, hypothesis testing, and graph theory to verify a hypothesized effect modifier. We perform extensive experimental evaluations with a real development economics dataset about the treatment effect of belonging to a financial support network called self-help groups on risk tolerance, and also with a synthetic dataset with known ground truths simulating a vaccine efficacy trial, to evaluate our framework and algorithms.

## 1 Introduction

Causal inference is at the heart of empirical research and principled decision-making in natural and social sciences, and is practically indispensable in epidemiology [48], clinical research [9], public policy [39], economics [8], and other domains [2, 3]. In causal inference, we go beyond establishing correlation or prediction, and are interested in making causal statements using the concepts of *counterfactuals* and *interventions* about a *treatment* (e.g., administering a vaccine) on some *outcome* of interest (e.g., not being infected by the targeted disease). While a *randomized controlled trial*, which divides the participating *units* or *subjects* into *treatment* and *control groups* at random and evaluates the difference of outcome in these two groups, is considered the gold standard for causal analysis, due to cost or ethics concerns, we often need to rely on *observational causal studies* using collected data under various assumptions as studied in the literature in statistics (e.g., Rubin's potential outcome framework [51]) or AI (e.g., Pearl's probabilistic causal model [44]).

A typical assumption made in the causality literature is *no-interference* or *independence* among units, meaning that the assigned treatment of one unit should *not* affect the outcome of another unit (called *interference* or *spill-over effects*) [41, 54]<sup>2</sup>. However, in many studies in social science, the units may directly or indirectly interact with each other in different ways and as a result, a unit's outcome might be influenced by the behavior, states, or characteristics of its social ties in a network, which leads to violation of the no-interference assumption [65]. Examples of such interference include detecting evidence of indirect protection from cholera vaccines when the vaccination rate of individuals in the social network is high [49], or showing that indirect reciprocity inherent in closed triads is linked to cooperation between individuals [47].

This paper focuses on the study of *treatment effect modifiers* [45] or *effect heterogeneity for causal analysis in a social network*. In a causal study, different units may exhibit different levels of response to the applied treatment based on

---

\*Both authors contributed equally to this research.

<sup>2</sup>Rubin's potential outcome framework [51], which is a prominent approach for causal inference in statistical studies, relies on the "*Stable Unit Treatment Value Assumption (SUTVA)*", which includes the assumption of no-interference.

Table 1: A toy table of units for Example 1.1.

ID	Occupation ( $O$ )	Election Card ( $E$ )	SHG ( $T$ )	Loan ( $Y$ )	TE
1	Farm Labour	Yes	Yes	No	0
2	Factory worker	No	No	Yes	0.5
3	Farm Labour	Yes	Yes	No	0
4	Farm Labour	No	Yes	Yes	1
5	Farm Labour	Yes	Yes	Yes	0.5
6	Farm Labour	No	No	No	1
7	Farm Labour	Yes	Yes	Yes	0
8	Factory worker	Yes	Yes	Yes	0
9	Factory worker	No	No	Yes	0
10	Factory worker	No	Yes	Yes	0




Figure 1: An example network of social contacts corresponding to the units in Table 1 for Example 1.1.

their characteristics, and the effect heterogeneity problem aims to infer this degree of causal effects on different units. As an example, one of the key objectives in clinical research is not only to discover effects of medical treatments at the entire population-level, but also to ascertain treatment effects on different sub-populations (e.g., whether a new vaccine is beneficial or harmful based on age or previous health conditions of individuals). While different hypothesis tests for the heterogeneity of a population in a study have been proposed in the literature [68, 5], along with a large body of work on testing statistical hypotheses (e.g., [59, 70, 37, 56, 38]), such tests do not take into account the context of the social network like possible effects of the neighbors' covariates or the network structure on the outcome. On the other hand, while there has been a recent surge of interest in causal inference in social networks [41, 6, 58], they have not focused on the effect heterogeneity problem. Indeed, reasoning about effect modification and heterogeneity in social networks poses new conceptual and computational challenges. We illustrate a possible scenario in the following example.

**Example 1.1** *In developing countries like India, it is challenging for many poor households to have access to financial instruments such as loans and insurance plans due to lack of assets, monetary support, or the necessary knowledge. In this situation, self-help groups (SHG) or saving groups have become quite popular across villages in India and are also promoted by the government. A SHG [33] is a voluntary community-based group with a small number of members (typically 10-20, and often comprising women from similar social and economic backgrounds), who pool their resources to become financially stable, taking loans from their collective savings in times of emergency, important life events, or to purchase assets. Often, individuals who are part of an SHG can use the pooled wealth as mortgage for loans. We use a 2010 survey data from 77 villages in Karnataka, India [32, 7] to examine the causal effect of belonging to an SHG on financial risk tolerance (measured as the presence of outstanding loans). The survey contains data about individuals in two forms: their social interactions with non-relatives (a toy example of the social network is shown in Figure 1), along with information about each person (shown in Table 1). The information displayed for each person in Table 1 includes the occupation of that person, whether they have an election card (an identity proof for Indian citizens), whether they have savings, whether they belong to an SHG, and whether they have outstanding loans. A causal inference algorithm can then estimate for each person, the effect of being in an SHG (treatment) on having outstanding loans (outcome). This estimated treatment effect (TE) is shown in the gray column in Table 1 that we formally define in Section 2.*

Notice that there are three distinct values in the gray column, namely 0, 0.5, and 1, thus, there is heterogeneity in the treatment effect. Furthermore, consider the Election Card ( $E$ ) column. All people with election cards have treatment effect  $\leq 0.5$  (in particular, there are those with treatment effect 0), while all people without them have treatment effect  $\geq 0.5$  (in particular, there are those with treatment effect 1). Thus, splitting the population into two groups: those with an election card and those without it will split the treatment effect as well, suggesting election card is a potential effect modifier.

Suppose we are further interested in testing whether two other properties are effect modifiers: (1) interactions with people who work in Farm Labour, and (2) being part of a triad (i.e., belong to a 3-clique). This requires analysis that goes beyond knowing the properties of each person given in Table 1 since we also have to consider the features of the neighbors as well as local network structure of each person as shown in Figure 1.

## Our Contributions

We propose a novel framework called **Testing-for-Effect-Modifier (TEEM)** for the estimation of treatment effect heterogeneity and detecting effect modifiers, tailored to causal inference in social networks. With our framework, researchers can create and test hypotheses about complex effect modifiers in terms of network features or network patterns, e.g., whether agents might financially cooperate due to indirect reciprocity relying on social capital [47]. The TEEM framework facilitates decision makings and effective interventions by allowing

1. testing for existence or lack of existence for various kinds of heterogeneous treatment effects using summarized properties of network features or neighborhood structures,
2. identification of sub-populations for which a treatment is effective, neutral, or harmful, and
3. generalization of causal effect estimates and causal conclusions obtained from a study sample to a target population based on relative distributions of different sub-populations.

Our technical contributions in the paper are as follows.

**Model and framework:** We define a causal model for social networks that captures complex effect modifiers that may arise because of complex social interaction between the units, i.e., effect modifiers associated with the neighbors' covariates on the outcome and the network structure associated with each unit. We then propose a novel hypothesis testing approach based on the standard  $I^2$  test [29] that accounts for neighbors' covariates and patterns in the social network. Since the number of neighbors of each unit in the network may be different, we use the concept of covariate summary proposed in [54]. Given a covariate of a unit in the social network, we aggregate this covariate across all neighbors into a single summarized number (e.g., the percentage of neighbors who work as Farm Labour). We further define a desideratum for matching network patterns to parts of the social network. Intuitively, we define a network pattern with a specific distinguished node and say that a network pattern matches the local network structure of a unit if there is a subgraph isomorphism from the pattern to the subgraph where the distinguished node is mapped to the unit.

**Algorithm for testing:** We devise an algorithm for testing effect modifiers. The algorithm incorporates ideas from causal inference, hypothesis testing, and graph theory. In particular, our solution uses existing causal inference techniques from the literature to compute the treatment effect for each unit (conditional treatment effect) and subgraph isomorphism concepts to compute the value of the hypothesized effect modifier for each unit. Once these are computed, our solution estimates the influence of the covariate on the treatment effect.

**Experimental study:** We provide an extensive experimental evaluation using the real social network described in our example [32, 7] as well as synthetic data with known ground truth, simulating a vaccine efficacy trial. Through the synthetic data, we examine the effect of the number of units and the noise in the potential outcome on our test. Our results indicate that as the number of units increases, the true effect modifiers become more evident and that our solution becomes relatively insensitive to high levels of noise. Through the real data, we demonstrate a use-case, showing our system's performance and its ability to find effect modifiers in a large scale network ( $\sim 17K$  units).

**Roadmap.** In the rest of the paper, we review some background concepts (Section 2), describe our TEEM framework (Section 3), give algorithms (Section 4), describe the experimental study (Section 5), review related work (Section 6), and conclude with future research directions (Section 7).

## 2 Causal Inference on Social Networks

In this section, we introduce and discuss relevant concepts about causal inference and social networks. As a convention, capital letters are used to denote random variables and **bold** capital letters are used to denote sets or vectors.

**Social networks:** A social network  $G$  is defined as a tuple comprising a set of units  $V$ , a set of ties  $E$ , and a set of observed variables  $Z$  corresponding to the units in  $V$ . We denote the set of all covariates corresponding to unit  $i \in V$  as  $Z_i \subseteq Z$  such that for all  $i \neq j \in V$ ,  $Z_i \cap Z_j = \emptyset$  and  $Z = \bigcup_{i \in V} Z_i$ . For all  $i \in V$ , all  $Z_i$  have the same set of covariates corresponding to the respective unit, i.e., if for a unit  $i \in V$  there is a variable  $X_i \in Z_i$ , then there is a corresponding variable  $X_k \in Z_k$  for any  $k \in V$  with an analogous interpretation. If  $|V| = n$  then we consider  $|E| = n^2$  such that for  $E_{i,j} \in E$ , if  $E_{i,j} = 1$  then there is a tie between units  $i$  and  $j$ , and if  $E_{i,j} = 0$  then the tie between units  $i$  and  $j$  is absent. By default, we assume  $E_{i,i} = 1$  and  $E_{i,j} = E_{j,i}$  for all  $i, j \in V$ . Intuitively, the ties in a social network work as information pathway such that, if  $E_{i,j} = 1$ , some observed covariate  $A_i \in Z_i$  corresponding to unit  $i \in V$  can be correlated with a covariate  $B_j \in Z_j$  corresponding to unit  $j \in V$ . For a unit  $i \in V$ , the *ego*-

Table 2: Notations

$\mathcal{G}$	Social Network
$E_{i,j}$	Random indicator variable of a tie between $i$ and $j$
$\mathcal{N}(i)$	The neighbors of unit $i$ in the network
$\mathcal{G}[\mathcal{N}(i)]$	The subgraph of the social network induced by $\mathcal{N}(i)$
$\mathcal{G}$	Causal DAG
$\mathbf{Z}_i$	Vector of random variables for unit $i$
$T_i$	Treatment/intervention choice for unit $i$
$Y_i$	Observed outcome for unit $i$
$Y_i(t, \mathbf{t}_{\mathcal{N}(i)})$	Potential outcome for unit $i$ under the treatment choice $t$ and the neighbors' treatment choice $\mathbf{t}_{\mathcal{N}(i)}$
$\tau(x)$	Average direct effect (ADE)
$\tau(x)$	Conditional direct effect (CDE) conditioned on $x$

*centric social network* (or in short, *ego-centric network*) is a sub-network  $\mathcal{G}[\mathcal{N}(i)] = (\mathbf{V}[\mathcal{N}(i)], \mathbf{E}[\mathcal{N}(i)], \mathbf{Z}[\mathcal{N}(i)])$  such that  $\mathbf{V}[\mathcal{N}(i)] = \{j \mid E_{i,j} = 1\}$ ,  $\mathbf{E}[\mathcal{N}(i)] = \{E_{j,k} \mid j, k \in \mathbf{V}[\mathcal{N}(i)]\}$ , and  $\mathbf{Z}[\mathcal{N}(i)] = \bigcup_{k \in \mathbf{V}[\mathcal{N}(i)]} \mathbf{Z}_k$ .

## 2.1 Probabilistic Causal Model and Graph

We use Pearl's probabilistic causal models to define a data generative model for social networks that enable us to reason about the effects of interventions. (We refer the reader to [44] for basics of probabilistic causal models).

**Causal models for social networks.** A probabilistic causal model for a social network  $\mathcal{G}$  is a tuple  $\mathcal{M} = (\epsilon, \mathbf{Z}, \mathbf{E}, Pr_\epsilon, \phi, \rho)$ , where  $\epsilon$  is a set of unobserved *exogenous* variables distributed according to  $Pr_\epsilon$ ,  $\mathbf{E}$  is a set of observed *network variables* for each tie in the social network,  $\mathbf{Z}$  is a set of *observed (endogenous)* variables, and  $\phi$  and  $\rho$  are (sets of) *structural equation(s)* that respectively describe the network and covariate generative process as follows. We assume that the network generative process is exogenous to covariate generative process, i.e., the network ties are generated according to an *structural equation*  $\rho : \text{Dom}(\epsilon) \rightarrow \text{Dom}(\mathbf{E})$  where  $\text{Dom}$  denotes the domain. Furthermore, we assume covariates  $X \in \mathbf{Z}$  are generated according to structural equations of the form  $\phi_X : \text{Dom}(Pa_{\mathbf{Z}}(X)) \times \text{Dom}(Pa_{\mathbf{E}}(X)) \times \text{Dom}(Pa_\epsilon(X)) \rightarrow \text{Dom}(X)$ , where  $Pa_\epsilon(X) \subseteq \epsilon$ ,  $Pa_{\mathbf{Z}}(X) \subseteq \mathbf{Z} - \{X\}$  and  $Pa_{\mathbf{E}}(X) \subseteq \mathbf{E}$ .

**Causal Graph:** A probabilistic causal model is associated with a *causal graph*  $\mathcal{G}$ , whose nodes are the endogenous variables  $\mathbf{Z}$  and network variables  $\mathbf{E}$ , and whose edges are all pairs  $(Z, X)$  (directed edges) such that  $Z \in Pa_{\mathbf{E}}(X) \cup Pa_{\mathbf{Z}}(X)$ . Therefore, we refer to  $Pa_{\mathbf{Z}}(X)$  and  $Pa_{\mathbf{E}}(X)$ , respectively as *endogenous parents* and *network parents* of  $X$ . In this paper, we limit our discussions to probabilistic causal models corresponding to acyclic causal graph.

The probability distribution  $Pr_\epsilon$  induces a probability distribution over endogenous variables and network variables, denoted  $Pr_{\mathbf{Z}}$  and  $Pr_{\mathbf{E}}$ , respectively. The causal DAG hides exogenous variables (since they are unobserved) and instead captures their effect on endogenous and structural variable by defining a probability distribution  $Pr_\epsilon$ . We assume the social network data is generated according to a probabilistic causal model  $\mathcal{M}$  and we use it to estimate the parameters of  $Pr_\epsilon$  required for causal analysis (see Section 2.3).

## 2.2 Assumptions

Here we list some intuitive assumptions for causal models in social network in this work as standard in the literature; we refer to [41, 58, 54] for formal definitions. **Observability:** We assume that we observe all endogenous variables and network variables described in the causal graph, and the causal graph is exhaustive. This is equivalent to no unobserved confounder assumption which is common in causal inference literature [52]. **Unit homogeneity:** All endogenous variables of the same kind for all units have analogous generative process (as functions of their respective parents), i.e., under unit homogeneity, if for unit  $i$  there is an  $X_i \in \mathbf{Z}_i$  generated with structural equation  $\phi_X$  then for all  $j \in \mathbf{V}$ , there is an analogous  $X_j \in \mathbf{Z}_j$  generated with the same structural equation  $\phi_X$ .

**Scope of influence:** Intuitively, the scope of influence refers to the minimum distance between two units in a social network that can influence each other (i.e., the minimum number of ties to reach a unit from the other). If the scope of influence is  $r$ , then for any variable  $X_i \in \mathbf{Z}_i$ ,  $Pa_{\mathbf{Z}}(X_i) \cap \mathbf{Z}_k = \emptyset$ , for all  $k$  for which the social network distance between  $k$  and  $i$  is  $> r$ . If  $r = 0$ , we are in the classic case where one unit's variables are independent of the others and there is no interference. In this work, we restrict our analysis to  $r = 1$  (i.e., we consider only the direct neighbors' influence), however our framework can be generalized to support  $r > 1$ .

**Distribution preserving covariate summary:** In a social network setting where the scope of influence  $r > 0$ , the number of endogenous and network parents for each covariate can vary across units, because the number of neighbors

of each unit may differ. Previous work [54, 41] suggested using embeddings or summary functions to summarize the values of the neighbors' covariates for each unit. We employ a similar idea of distribution-preserving covariate summary function  $\psi_X$  on neighbors' covariates  $X_j$  as follows. For a unit  $i \in \mathbf{V}$  and covariates  $X_j$ 's, where  $j$ 's are neighbors of  $i$ ,  $\psi_X$  maps a variable-size set with elements from the domain of  $X_j$ 's to a real number such that if for another covariate  $Y_i$  of  $i$ , if  $X_j$ 's are parents of  $Y_i$  in  $\mathcal{G}$ , then the probability distribution  $Pr_{Y_i}$  before and after this summarization of  $X_j$ 's using  $\psi_X$  remains the same.

### 2.3 Potential Outcomes and Treatment Effects

**Interventions and potential outcomes:** An *intervention* or *treatment* on a variable  $T_i$ , denoted  $T_i \leftarrow t$ , is an operation that *modifies* the underlying probabilistic causal model by replacing the structural equations associated with  $T_i$  with a constant  $t$ . The *potential outcome* of a variable  $Y_i$  after the intervention  $T_i \leftarrow t$ , denoted  $Y_i(t)$ , is the *solution* to  $Y_i$  in the modified set of structural equations. In the context of social networks, to measure the interference or spill-over effects of treatment, we are interested in potential outcomes  $Y_i(t, t_{N(i)})$  that represents the outcome  $Y_i$  after an interventions in which a unit  $i$  received the treatment  $t$ , i.e.,  $T_i \leftarrow t$ , and its neighbors  $N(i)$  received the (vector of) treatments  $t_{N(i)}$ . From now on, for simplicity, we will refer to the outcome for any unit  $i \in \mathbf{V}$  as  $Y_i$ , treatment as  $T_i$ , and all the other endogenous variables as the vector  $\mathbf{X}_i = \mathbf{Z}_i \setminus \{Y_i, T_i\}$ . We also restrict our discussions to binary treatments as standard in the literature, i.e.,  $T_i \in \{0, 1\}$ .

**Example 2.1** Consider the covariates in Table 1 and social network shown in Figure 1. Here, for unit 4, we are interested in understanding the effect of participation in an SHG on financial risk tolerance. Thus, here our treatment is  $T_4 = SHG_4$  and outcome  $Y_4 = Loan_4$ . Then,  $Y_4(1, t_{N(4)})$  is the potential loan status of unit 4 if it is participating in a SHG and  $Y_4(0, t_{N(4)})$  is the potential loan status if it is not participating in a SHG, where  $t_{N(4)}$  is the treatment choice of unit 4's neighbors. However, the observed outcome is  $Y_4 = T_4 Y_4(1) + (1 - T_4) Y_4(0)$ . Thus, we only observe  $Y_4(1)$  if the unit participates in a SHG and  $Y_4(0)$  if the unit does not participate in a SHG.

**Treatment effect:** The effect of a binary treatment  $T_i$  on an outcome  $Y_i$  can be measured by comparing the distribution of the potential outcomes  $Y_i(1)$  and  $Y_i(0)$ . The difference between their expectations measures the Average Treatment Effect (ATE)  $\mathbb{E}[Y_i(1) - Y_i(0)]$  [51]. Further, in a social network, we can distinguish between the direct effect (the effect due to one's own treatment) and the spill-over effect (the effect due to its neighbors' treatments) by *Average Direct Effect (ADE)* and *Average Indirect Effect (AIE)* as follows [54]:

$$\begin{aligned} ADE_i &= \mathbb{E}[Y_i(1, t_{N(i)}) - Y_i(0, t_{N(i)})] \\ AIE_i &= \mathbb{E}[Y_i(t, t_{N(i)}) - Y_i(t, t'_{N(i)})] \end{aligned}$$

**Example 2.2** In our running example, consider unit 7 which is connected to unit 8 via a network tie as shown in Figure 1. The potential outcome of unit 7 when unit 7 has treatment  $t_7$  and unit 8 has treatment choice  $t_8$  is  $Y_7(t_7, t_8)$ . Here, the direct effect for unit 7 when unit 8 has treatment choice  $t_8$  is  $ADE_7 = Y_7(1, t_8) - Y_7(0, t_8)$ , and analogously the indirect effect for unit 7 when unit 7 has treatment choice  $t_7$  is  $AIE_7 = Y_7(t_7, 1) - Y_7(t_7, 0)$ .

In this paper, we primarily focus on the direct effect, which is often the primary quantity of interest in social and epidemiological sciences [40]. Extending ADE, we measure the *Conditional Direct Effect (CDE)* for sub-population with  $\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{x}$ :

$$CDE_{i, \mathbf{X}=\mathbf{x}} = \mathbb{E}[Y_i(1, t_{N(i)}) - Y_i(0, t_{N(i)}) | \mathbf{X} = \mathbf{x}]$$

As a shorthand, we will denote  $ADE_i$  and  $CDE_{i, \mathbf{X}=\mathbf{x}}$  respectively by  $\bar{\tau}_i$  and  $\tau_i(\mathbf{x})$ . From the unit homogeneity assumption, potential outcomes and treatment effects for each unit  $i \in \mathbf{V}$  have equivalent and homogeneous interpretation. Thus, for simplicity, we drop the subscript when it is clear from the context, i.e.,  $\forall i \in \mathbf{V}$ ,  $\tau_i(\mathbf{x}) = \tau(\mathbf{x})$ .

## 3 Framework

In this section, we describe our Testing-for-Effect-Modifier (TEEM) framework for effect heterogeneity. First, we define a social network pattern and the corresponding subgraph isomorphism problem, and then we discuss treatment effect heterogeneity and formalize the concept of effect modifiers. Then, we introduce the concept of *hypothesized effect modifiers* and the TEEM criterion.

**Network patterns:** We begin by defining a network pattern as a graph that is isomorphic to a sub-network induced by the neighbors of a unit in the network.

**Definition 3.1 (Network pattern)** A network pattern  $P$  is a network with a covariate vector for each node and one distinguished node  $v_p^* \in P$ .

This definition is reminiscent of the notion of *structural equivalence* [69], previously devised in the context of social networks. Intuitively, a network pattern serves as an implicit effect modifier that influences heterogeneity.

**Example 3.2** A 3-clique (a ‘triangle’) over the nodes  $a, b, c$  with  $a$  as the distinguished node is a network pattern.

**Definition 3.3 (Pattern preserving isomorphism)** Given a unit in a social network  $i$ , a network pattern  $P$  with a distinguished node  $v_p^* \in P$ , a pattern-preserving isomorphism is an isomorphism  $f : P \rightarrow G'$  where  $G'$  is a subgraph of  $G[N(i)]$  and  $f(v_p^*) = i$ .

**Example 3.4** Consider the network in Figure 1 with the node 4 and the triangle network pattern described in Example 3.2. A pattern-preserving isomorphism  $f$  can be defined as follows.  $f(a) = 4$ ,  $f(b) = 5$ ,  $f(c) = 6$ .

**Heterogeneous effects and effect modifiers:** Given a set of endogenous variables or network variables  $W \in Z \cup E$ , if there exist two values  $w$  and  $w'$  in  $Dom(W)$  such that the  $\tau(w) \neq \tau(w')$ , i.e., the CDE varies according to the two sub-populations with  $W = w$  and  $W = w'$ , the treatment effect is called *heterogeneous* and the variables  $W$  is called treatment *effect modifier* [27, 66].

**Example 3.5** Continuing our running example, consider the treatment effect (TE) column in Table 1. In Example 1.1, we hypothesized that the unit covariate Election Card ( $E$ ) is an effect modifier. Furthermore, if we consider the contrast of treatment effects for units with a triangle(s) in their egocentric network and the units without any triangle in their egocentric network, then the units that have triangle(s) have higher treatment effect on average compared to the other unit. Thus, both election card and network pattern ‘triangle’ are possible effect modifiers.

**Definition 3.6 (Hypothesized Effect Modifiers)** Given social network  $G = (V, E, Z)$ , for all unit  $i \in V$ , a hypothesized effect modifier is a random variable which can be one of (1) a covariate of the unit  $i$ ,  $X_i \in X_i$ , (2) a summarized covariate for unit  $i$ ’s neighbors  $\psi_X(X_{N(i)})$ , or (3) an indicator of a network pattern  $P$  in  $G[N(i)]$ .

**Example 3.7** Reconsider the 3-clique pattern defined in Example 3.2. The random variable  $H = \text{“Is there a pattern preserving isomorphism between the triangle pattern and the ego-centric network of the unit?”}$  is a hypothesized covariate (of type (3) above). Other examples include the possession of an election card by the individual as shown in Example 1.1 (of type (1) above), and the average number of neighbors possessing election cards (of type (2) above).

**Criterion for TEEM:** Intuitively, we are interested in checking whether a hypothesized covariate  $H$  is an effect modifier or not. Let  $\tau(h) = \mathbb{E}[Y_i(1, t_{N(i)}) - Y_i(0, t_{N(i)}) | H = h]$ ,  $\bar{\tau} = \mathbb{E}[\tau(h)]$ , and  $\nu^2(h) = \mathbb{E}[(Y_i(1, t_{N(i)}) - Y_i(0, t_{N(i)}))^2 | H = h] - \tau^2(h)$ . It is easy to verify that if  $H$  is an effect modifier then  $\Delta_H^2 = \mathbb{E}[(\tau(h) - \bar{\tau})^2] > 0$ , otherwise  $\Delta_H^2 = 0$ .

The described question of test for hypothesized covariate (along with the assumptions) is analogous to the problem of testing for heterogeneity in meta-analysis. Thus, we adapt the  $I^2$  measure, proposed by [28, 29], as a test statistic to answer our question. The definition of  $I^2$  relies on the seminal work of Cochran [13], namely, Cochran’s  $Q$  measure of heterogeneity and the statistical degree of freedom (df):  $I^2 = \frac{Q - df}{Q}$ . If the computed value of  $I^2$  is negative, it is rounded up to zero. Intuitively,  $I^2$  describes the percentage of total variation across studies that is due to heterogeneity.

We adapt these measures to the causal inference and social network framework to test for effect modifiers, and also handle continuous covariates. For the given social network  $G = (V, E)$  and a hypothesized covariate  $H$ , we measure the heterogeneity due to  $H$  using  $\iota^2$  which is analogous to the normalized version of Cochran’s  $Q$  [28, 29, 13].

$$\delta_H^2 = \int_h \frac{(\tau(h) - \bar{\tau})^2}{\nu^2(h)} p_H(h) dh$$

where  $p_H$  is the probability density function for covariate  $H$ . The null hypothesis for the test for treatment effect modifier for the hypothesized covariate  $H$  is the absence of heterogeneity across the strata of  $H$ . The test rejects the null hypothesis if the estimated  $\iota_H^2 = \frac{\delta_H^2 - 1}{\delta_H^2}$  using the observed data is larger than or equal to a predetermined threshold  $I_0$  (in our experiments, we observed that setting  $I_0 = 0$  gives accurate results).

We delineate out estimation and testing procedure in Algorithm 1 described in Section 4.

## 4 Testing for Effect Modifiers

We next detail the components of our algorithm and show how we combine them to estimate whether a hypothesized effect modifier is an effect modifier using  $\iota^2$  described in the previous section.

**Checking graph patterns:** As a building block for our hypothesis testing solution, we use the following approach to check whether a given pattern has a pattern-preserving isomorphism to a subgraph in the ego-centric network of a unit in the social network (for a detailed description, see Section 8.1). Given a social network  $G$ , a network pattern  $P$ , and a unit  $i$  in  $G$ , the algorithm enumerates the isomorphisms that exist from  $P$  to subgraphs of  $G[N(i)]$  (in our implementation we use the ISMAGS algorithm [31]).

Next, the algorithm iterates over every isomorphism and checks whether the distinguished node in  $P$ ,  $u$  is mapped by the isomorphism to the unit of interest  $i$  and returns True if and only if this is the case.

**Generating a hypothesized vector/matrix:** The procedure for generating a hypothesized vector is given a social network  $G$  and a hypothesized effect modifier  $H$ . It computes the value of the hypothesized effect modifier for each unit and returns it as a vector. There are three scenarios depending on the type of hypothesized effect modifier: (1) if the hypothesized effect modifier is an existing variable in  $Z$ , we map the corresponding covariate to  $H$ , (2) if the hypothesized effect modifier is a summary of neighbors' covariates, we first compute the summarized values for each unit using  $E$  and  $Z$ , then map the summarized values to  $H$ , and (3) if the hypothesized effect modifier is a network pattern, we use the algorithm to check graph patterns (Algorithm 2 in Appendix 8.1). If there are multiple hypothesized effect modifiers, the procedure returns a matrix  $H$  where  $H_i$  is the vector of hypothesized effect modifiers for unit  $i$ .

**Causal effect estimation:** We adapt the framework described in [54] and extend it to allow inferring individualized conditional direct effects for our setup. Unlike in our work, [54] does not include structural equations with network patterns. We extend their framework by adding nodes in causal graphs for network variables. Next, we take the causal query of interest (i.e. effect of variable  $T$  on  $Y$ ) and the causal graph  $\mathcal{G}$ , to identify the set of confounders we need to control for, to satisfy backdoor criteria, and to estimate potential outcomes [44]. If the confounders also include neighbors' covariates, we use the defined summary functions for each covariate (given by the distribution preserving assumption) to map the relevant set of neighbors' covariates to a scalar. We use the identified confounders to form a table of confounder of  $U_{con}$  for each unit  $i \in V$ . Under the no-unobserved-confounders assumptions, potential outcomes are independent of treatment assignment if the *backdoor criterion* is satisfied [44]. Next, using the causal graph  $\mathcal{G}$ , we verify if controlling for the hypothesized effect modifiers  $H$  will not introduce M-bias, butterfly-bias, or collider-bias in the treatment effect estimates [45]. (Identification of potential outcomes using backdoor criterion, and biases in causal inference are well studied in the causal inference literature [44, 45, 15], however we will not discuss these concepts in detail in this paper) We update  $H$  by dropping the hypotheses that might introduce bias. We concatenate  $U_{con}$  with  $H$  to form unit table  $U$  where the  $i^{th}$  row corresponds to the covariates for unit  $i$ . We then use bayesian additive regression trees method [12] to estimate causal direct effects. However, more interpretable methods such as ridge regression [11], nearest neighbors matching with learned distance metrics [42], or other standard causal inference methods [61] to estimate CDE corresponding to covariates for each unit may be used as well.

**Projection:** We project the posterior distribution of the CDE estimated using the causal effect estimation method on to the space of hypothesized effect modifier(s). To do so, we use gradient boosting regression [18], but other machine learning algorithms can be used, e.g., gaussian process regression [46], bayesian additive regression trees [12]. The projection is helpful in smoothing the conditional treatment effects and enables the estimation of conditional variance by using the prediction intervals returned by the regression.

**Testing the hypotheses:** Algorithm 1 describes our approach for hypothesis testing. Given a social network  $G$ , a causal graph  $\mathcal{G}$ , a hypothesized effect modifier set  $H$  and a threshold  $I_0$ , the algorithm first computes the CDE for all units and its mean (lines 1–2). Then, it iterates over all the hypothesized effect modifiers  $H$  in  $H$ . In each iteration, the algorithm generates the hypothesized effect modifier set in line 4 and computes the projection of the posterior distribution of the CDE estimated on the space of hypothesized effect modifier in line 5. It then computes the  $\delta^2$  value for the hypothesized effect modifier  $H$ , and the  $\iota^2$  measure from it (lines 6–7). Since in practice, the data is finite, the algorithm computes the sum instead of the integral defined in Section 3. For each hypothesized effect modifier  $H \in H$ , if  $\iota_H^2$  is larger than the threshold  $I_0$ , the algorithm rejects the null hypothesis, and otherwise it fails to do so (lines 8–13).

**Example 4.1** *Reconsider our running example. We demonstrate Algorithm 1 where the input is the social network  $G$  shown in Figure 1 with table of covariates  $Z$  shown in Table 1, the causal graph (part of which is shown in Figure 7 in Section 8.2), the set of hypothesized effect modifiers  $H$  containing a single covariate indicating whether the ego-centric network of a unit contains a 3-clique, and the threshold  $I_0 = 0$ . The algorithm first computes the hypothesized vector for 3-clique over all units. In this case, it is  $(1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 0, 0, 0, 0)$  since only units 1,2,3,4,5,6 are part of a*

**Algorithm 1:** Test hypothesized effect modifiers

---

**input** : Social network  $\mathcal{G}$ , causal graph  $\mathcal{G}$ , a vector of all possible hypothesized effect modifiers  $\mathbf{H}$ , a threshold for effect modifiers  $I_0$

**output**: For each  $H \in \mathbf{H}$ , True iff  $H$  is an effect modifier w.r.t. the threshold  $I_0$

---

```

1  $CDE, U \leftarrow \text{causalEffectEstimation}(\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{G}, \mathbf{H});$ 
2  $ADE \leftarrow \text{mean}(CDE);$ 
3 foreach  $H \in \mathbf{H}$  do
4    $U^h \leftarrow \text{genHypVector}(U, \mathcal{G}, H);$ 
5    $g \leftarrow \text{project}(CDE, U^h);$ 
6    $\hat{\delta}_H^2 \leftarrow \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{(\text{mean}(g(U_i^h)) - ADE)^2}{\text{var}(g(U_i^h))};$ 
7    $\hat{\iota}_H^2 \leftarrow \max\left(0, 100 \cdot \frac{\hat{\delta}_H^2 - 1}{\hat{\delta}_H^2}\right);$ 
8   if  $\hat{\iota}_H^2 > I_0$  then
9     /* H is an effect modifier */
10    Reject Null Hypothesis for  $H$ ;
11  else
12    /* H is not an effect modifier */
13    Fail to Reject Null for  $H$ ;
```

---

3-clique. Then the algorithm computes the CDE of each unit using a causal inference algorithm to produce the TE column shown in Table 1 (line 1). In line 2, the algorithm computes an estimate ADE which is  $\frac{3}{10}$ . It then iterates over the single covariate in  $\mathbf{H}$ , i.e., the 3-clique hypothesized covariate. In line 4, the above mentioned vector is assigned to  $U^h$ . Then,  $g$  is computed as the projection of the posterior distribution of the CDE (line 5). Finally,  $\delta^2$  and  $\iota^2$  are computed, and since the  $\iota^2$  value larger than 0, the null hypothesis is rejected. We conclude that 3-clique is an effect modifier.

## 5 Experiments

We have conducted both a synthetic data and a real data study to understand the performance of TEEM as a test for effect modifiers. We examine the following questions in our experiments:

1. Can our test detect the true effect modifiers?
2. What is the effect of increasing the number of units and noise levels on the values of  $q$  and  $\iota^2$  in Algorithm 1?
3. What are the effect modifiers discovered by our algorithm for real data?

**Summary of our results:** We observed the following results.

1. Synthetic data: Given a large enough sample, Algorithm 1 output  $\iota^2 > 0$  for the true effect modifiers and  $\iota^2 = 0$  for covariates that were not effect modifiers. Furthermore, the computed  $\iota^2$  was proportional to the influence of the effect modifier (Table 3).
2. Synthetic data: As the number of units increased, the fluctuation in  $\iota^2$  decreased and stabilized for both effect modifiers and non effect modifiers (Figure 2).
3. Synthetic data: Our test is fairly insensitive to relatively large levels of noise, and  $\iota^2$  values decreased with an increase in the level of noise as expected (Figure 3).
4. Real data: Our algorithm estimated several effect modifiers in the data (some related to summarized neighbors' covariates). The network patterns we used were not categorized as effect modifiers by our algorithm (Table 4).

Next we discuss these in detail; we give the configuration, implementation, and running time in Section 8.3 in the appendix.

### 5.1 Synthetic Data: Vaccine Efficacy Trial

We analyze TEEM's performance using synthetic data for which we know the underlying ground truth treatment effects and effect modifiers. For this experiment, we generate a social network for a simulation of a vaccine efficacy



Table 3: Computed  $\iota^2$  and  $\delta^2$  values using the synthetic infection data with  $n = 4096$  and  $\sigma = 1$  for hypothesized covariates

Hypothesized Covariate	$\delta^2$	$\iota^2$
Income	1.1657	14.23
Age	0.0003	0.00
Neighbors' Avg. Income	5.3880	81.44
Neighbors' Avg. Age	0.0020	0.00
Clique-3	5.1922	80.74

trial (see Section 5.1 for details). Specifically, we are interested in studying the efficacy of vaccine, i.e., chances of infection of an individual if vaccinated. The true effect modifiers in the data are (according to their relative weights) the neighbors' average income, 3-clique, and income.

**Testing for effect modifiers:** Table 3 shows the results of running Algorithm 1 with all hypothesized covariates listed in the leftmost column for 4096 units. The algorithm is able to find the true effect modifiers and gives the rest of the covariates an  $\iota^2$  value of 0. When considering the  $\delta^2$  values in the table, we see that these are not necessarily a good litmus test for true effect modifiers, since some of the covariates that are not effect modifiers got non-zero values, and it is not clear which threshold should be used to distinguish between these and the true effect modifiers.

**Effect of increasing the number of units on  $\iota^2$ :** We have increased the number of units, denoted by  $n$ , from 8 to 4098 and computed the  $\iota^2$  values for each of the covariates with Algorithm 1. As shown in Figure 2, for small values of  $n$ , the  $\iota^2$  value estimates have large variance. However as  $n$  grows larger than 200 units, we observe that  $\iota^2$  estimates for the true effect modifiers (income of the individual, average income of her neighbors in the social network and membership in a 3-clique) are greater than 0 and proportional to the size of their contribution to treatment effect (as per the data generative process mentioned above), i.e., membership in 3-clique and the effect of neighbours' average income are largest, followed by the effect due to one's own income. Furthermore, we observed that as the number of units increased, the fluctuation in  $\iota^2$  decreased and stabilized to a value greater than zero for effect modifiers and zero for non effect modifiers (Figure 2)

**Effect of increasing the noise levels on  $\iota^2$ :** In this part of the study we have increased the variance of noise ( $\sigma^2$ ) in the data generative process from 0 to  $2^{12}$ , keeping the number of units constant at  $n = 4000$ . Figure 3 shows that the results of our algorithm are less sensitive to increase in the variance of noise. However, when the variance of noise is extremely large ( $Var(\epsilon) > 2,500$ ), the  $\iota^2$  values of all covariates decrease, but maintain the same relationships. In particular, the  $\iota^2$  value for the average of neighbors' income has decreased from an average 80 to 30. We conclude that our hypothesis testing framework is not highly sensitive to noise in true data generative process, with inference based on  $\iota^2$  estimates being congruent to true data generative process for relatively large variance of noise in the outcome generative process.

## 5.2 Real Data: Micro-finance/Risk Tolerance

We analyze the causal effect of SHG on financial risk tolerance using a 2010 survey data from 77 villages in Karnataka, India initially studied as part of [7, 32].

**Data properties and analysis:** The survey data has 19 features for 16,995 individuals across 77 villages including their age, occupation, gender, etc. Furthermore, the data also has 12 different social networks of 69,000 individuals (including 16,995 surveyed individuals) across the same 77 villages such friendships, relatives, social-visit networks, financial exchange etc. We consider all of these connections in the same manner so that we have a homogeneous network, where all edges have the same interpretation. We use the individual's participation in SHG as the treatment indicator while using the indicator for an individual having a current outstanding loan or not, as the proxy indicator of their risk tolerance (i.e., the outcome). It is evident from the data that participation in SHG/savings group and loan status are correlated (see Figure 4).

Some units have relatively low treatment effect between 0 and 2.5, while the other units have higher treatment effect ranging between 2.5 to 5 (this is evident in the bimodal distribution in Figure 6).

**Testing for effect modifiers:** We assume that all pre-treatment covariates of an individual or the individual's social connection can be potential confounders. We further hypothesized that being part of network structures like cliques of size  $3 \leq k \leq 7$  can be potential confounders or effect modifiers. We limit  $k < 8$  because we found that only 0.01% of units as part of a clique of size 8. For our study, the estimand of interest, i.e., the conditional direct effect, is defined as the difference of log probabilities of having an existing loan if an individual participates in an SHG and when an




Figure 2: Analysis of  $\iota^2$  values as a function of the number of units and the level of noise for synthetic data.  $\iota^2$  as a function of the number of units in the data




Figure 3: Analysis of  $\iota^2$  values as a function of the number of units and the level of noise for synthetic data.  $\iota^2$  as a function of noise in the potential outcome (Lines for avg. neighbor age and age are both at zero). The green, purple and blue lines represent the true effect modifiers




Figure 4: Number of individuals who are part of and not part of an SHG and who have outstanding loan or not. Having an outstanding loan is correlated with participation in SHG.

Table 4: Computed  $\iota^2$  and  $\delta^2$  values using microfinance data [8, 7] for hypothesized covariates

Hypothesized Covariate	$\delta^2$	$I^2$
Age	0.032	0.00
Education	0.023	0.00
Savings	2.509	60.15
Election Card	2.053	51.30
% neighbor w/ Election Card	3.941	74.63
% neighbor w/ Savings	1.101	9.16
Ration Card Color	0.883	0.00
Gender	0.076	0.00
Clique-3	0.026	0.00
Clique-4	0.018	0.00
Star-5	0.020	0.00

individual is not a part of an SHG:

$$\tau(\mathbf{X}_i, \mathbf{X}_{N(i)}, E[N(i)], SHG_{N(i)}) = \log \left( \frac{P(Loan_i(1, SHG_{N(i)}) = 1 | \mathbf{X}_i, \mathbf{X}_{N(i)}, E[N(i)], SHG_{N(i)})}{P(Loan_i(0, SHG_{N(i)}) = 1 | \mathbf{X}_i, \mathbf{X}_{N(i)}, E[N(i)], SHG_{N(i)})} \right) \quad (1)$$

Here, we use logistic regressions to control for confounders and stratify estimating potential outcomes (under the positivity assumption). Based on the literature [47], we tested if the triadic financial cooperation, education, income, owning of election card, savings account, some of neighbors' covariates etc. are treatment effect modifiers (i.e., whether triangles are effect modifiers). We test for effect modifier hypotheses using Algorithm 1 with gradient boosting regression for posterior projection (line 5). Table 4 shows the  $\iota^2$  values for hypothesized covariates. We see that having savings accounts, having an election card, the percentage of neighbors with election cards, and the percentage of neighbors with savings are all effect modifiers. Figure 5 shows that the treatment effects are indeed amplified if the participant did not have a savings account or election card, or if their neighbors have savings account or election cards. In addition, we did not find any evidence for the following covariates being effect modifiers: close triad and other network structures, education level, gender etc.

**Implications:** Based on our results shown in Table 4 and Figure 5, we conjecture that SHG are highly beneficial to individuals who either do not have any valid identification (such as election cards), are not familiar with the banking system (no savings account), or do not have a valid introducer to the banking system (neighbors without election card or without savings accounts). Typically these individuals might find it hard to borrow money. However, with the help of SHG such individuals can borrow money at a reasonable rate where the pooled capital of SHG helps them mitigate the risk of a default. Thus, if government or a policy maker were to promote SHG for increasing financial risk tolerance and entrepreneurship in financially weaker section of society, it might be optimal to engage with the population that either is not introduced to the financial system or does not have valid identification documents.




Figure 5: Association between CDE and the treatment effect modifiers with  $\iota^2$  greater than zero in Table 4




Figure 6: Kernel density estimation plot and histogram showing the distribution/frequency of CDE across all units.

## 6 Related Work

There is rich literature on statistical tests for hypothesis testing (e.g., [59, 56, 38, 70, 37]). Snyder et. al. [59] proposes an approach for allowing people to test hypotheses about other people through their social interactions. Multiple hypotheses testing [56, 38] focuses on examining multiple hypotheses simultaneously and includes a consideration of their possible interactions with each other, as well as their closure etc. One common hypothesis is that of heterogeneity in different studies. Therefore, many previous works have devised methods for heterogeneity detection (e.g., [26, 14, 22, 62]). These works develop and evaluate tests that quantify the amount of heterogeneity in experiments w.r.t. the number of experiments included, the total information available, and the distribution of weights among the different experiments. As mentioned in the paper, we rely on the  $I^2$  test for heterogeneity [28, 29].

Effect modification has also been explored in different contexts [34, 23, 36, 64, 66, 27, 10, 50, 55]. Works such as [10, 50, 55] have pointed at the relevance of effect modification to public health, while others [64, 36] focused on the analysis of effect modifiers. In general, these works do not propose a testing framework for effect modifiers that is specifically adapted to social networks.

Multiple previous works has studied causal inference in the presence of interference [20, 24, 25, 67, 4, 57, 41]. These works address applications such as the study of infectious diseases [67, 25] or behavior and, in particular, interactions in social networks [57, 41, 60, 67, 30]. Our work, on the other hand, focuses on developing a framework for testing for causal effect modifiers.

Social network analysis (e.g., [53, 35, 69]) focuses on gaining insights from social networks using graph theory. One considered aspect is the structure of the network and the local neighborhoods of the actors (nodes) in the network. Some structures, such as centrality [63, 19] and triangles [21, 69] are of particular interest as they have been correlated with other semantic traits of the actors in them. In addition, there has been work on detecting the equivalence of actors based on their ego-centric graph [17, 43].

## 7 Conclusions

We have devised and studied a novel test for effect modifiers in social networks. The test is based on the  $I^2$  test for heterogeneity and allows for the consideration of neighbors attributes and the network patterns in social network. We have provided a framework and algorithms for testing whether a covariate is an effect modifier. The algorithms combine approaches from graph theory, causal inference, and heterogeneity testing. Our experimental evaluation suggests that our test and framework are able to detect effect modifiers and avoid false positives, while the use-case we preformed study revealed effect modifiers related to the environment of the units in the social network.

Intriguing directions of future work include the extension of our framework to non-homogeneous social networks where different units and different ties can be interpreted in a different manner (e.g., edges with different labels), and improving the efficiency of checking the graph pattern in Algorithm 2 (e.g., by relying on approaches for graph pattern matching).

## References

- [1] Réka Albert and Albert-László Barabási. Statistical mechanics of complex networks. *CoRR*, cond-mat/0106096, 2001.
- [2] Joshua D Angrist, Guido W Imbens, and Donald B Rubin. Identification of causal effects using instrumental variables. *Journal of the American statistical Association*, 91(434):444–455, 1996.
- [3] Joshua D Angrist and Jörn-Steffen Pischke. *Mostly harmless econometrics: An empiricist’s companion*. Princeton university press, 2008.
- [4] Peter M. Aronow and Cyrus Samii. Estimating average causal effects under general interference, with application to a social network experiment. *Ann. Appl. Stat.*, 11(4):1912–1947, 12 2017.
- [5] Susan Athey and Guido Imbens. Recursive partitioning for heterogeneous causal effects. *PNAS*, 113(27):7353–7360, 2016.
- [6] Usaid Awan, Marco Morucci, Vittorio Orlandi, Sudeepa Roy, Cynthia Rudin, and Alexander Volfovsky. Almost-matching-exactly for treatment effect estimation under network interference. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 3252–3262. PMLR, 2020.
- [7] Abhijit Banerjee, Arun G Chandrasekhar, Esther Duflo, and Matthew O Jackson. Gossip: Identifying central individuals in a social network. Technical report, National Bureau of Economic Research, 2014.

- [8] Abhijit V Banerjee, Abhijit Banerjee, and Esther Duflo. *Poor economics: A radical rethinking of the way to fight global poverty*. Public Affairs, 2011.
- [9] Scarlett L Bellamy, Julia Y Lin, and Thomas R Ten Have. An introduction to causal modeling in clinical trials. *Clinical Trials*, 4(1):58–73, 2007. PMID: 17327246.
- [10] William J Blot and Nicholas E Day. Synergism and interaction: are they equivalent? *American Journal of Epidemiology*, 110(1):99–100, 1979.
- [11] Gavin C Cawley. Causal & non-causal feature selection for ridge regression. In *Causation and Prediction Challenge*, pages 107–128. PMLR, 2008.
- [12] Hugh A Chipman, Edward I George, Robert E McCulloch, et al. Bart: Bayesian additive regression trees. *The Annals of Applied Statistics*, 4(1):266–298, 2010.
- [13] William G Cochran. The combination of estimates from different experiments. *Biometrics*, 10(1):101–129, 1954.
- [14] Richard K Crump, V Joseph Hotz, Guido W Imbens, and Oscar A Mitnik. Nonparametric tests for treatment effect heterogeneity. *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, 90(3):389–405, 2008.
- [15] Peng Ding and Luke W Miratrix. To adjust or not to adjust? sensitivity analysis of m-bias and butterfly-bias. *Journal of Causal Inference*, 3(1):41–57, 2015.
- [16] SN Dorogovtsev and JFF Mendes. Evolution of networks: from biological nets to the internet and www oxford u. press, 2003.
- [17] Martin G Everett, John P Boyd, and Stephen P Borgatti. Ego-centered and local roles: A graph theoretic approach. *Journal of Mathematical Sociology*, 15(3-4):163–172, 1990.
- [18] Jerome H Friedman. Greedy function approximation: a gradient boosting machine. *Annals of statistics*, pages 1189–1232, 2001.
- [19] Scott D Gest, Sandra A Graham-Bermann, and Willard W Hartup. Peer experience: Common and unique features of number of friendships, social network centrality, and sociometric status. *Social development*, 10(1):23–40, 2001.
- [20] Bryan S Graham, Guido W Imbens, and Geert Ridder. Measuring the effects of segregation in the presence of social spillovers: A nonparametric approach. Technical report, National Bureau of Economic Research, 2010.
- [21] Mark S Granovetter. The strength of weak ties. *American journal of sociology*, 78(6):1360–1380, 1973.
- [22] Donald P Green and Holger L Kern. Modeling heterogeneous treatment effects in survey experiments with bayesian additive regression trees. *Public opinion quarterly*, 76(3):491–511, 2012.
- [23] Sander Greenland and Hal Morgenstern. Ecological bias, confounding, and effect modification. *International journal of epidemiology*, 18(1):269–274, 1989.
- [24] M Elizabeth Halloran and Michael G Hudgens. Causal inference for vaccine effects on infectiousness. *The International Journal of Biostatistics*, 8(2):1–40, 2012.
- [25] M Elizabeth Halloran and Claudio J Struchiner. Causal inference in infectious diseases. *Epidemiology*, 6(2):142–151, 1995.
- [26] Rebecca J Hardy and Simon G Thompson. Detecting and describing heterogeneity in meta-analysis. *Statistics in medicine*, 17(8):841–856, 1998.
- [27] Miguel A Hernán and James M Robins. Causal inference, 2010.
- [28] Julian PT Higgins and Simon G Thompson. Quantifying heterogeneity in a meta-analysis. *Statistics in medicine*, 21(11):1539–1558, 2002.
- [29] Julian PT Higgins, Simon G Thompson, Jonathan J Deeks, and Douglas G Altman. Measuring inconsistency in meta-analyses. *Bmj*, 327(7414):557–560, 2003.
- [30] Guanglei Hong and Stephen W Raudenbush. Evaluating kindergarten retention policy: A case study of causal inference for multilevel observational data. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 101(475):901–910, 2006.
- [31] Maarten Houbraken, Sofie Demeyer, Tom Michoel, Pieter Audenaert, Didier Colle, and Mario Pickavet. The index-based subgraph matching algorithm with general symmetries (ismags): exploiting symmetry for faster subgraph enumeration. *PloS one*, 9(5):e97896, 2014.
- [32] Matthew O Jackson, Tomas Rodriguez-Barraquer, and Xu Tan. Social capital and social quilts: Network patterns of favor exchange. *American Economic Review*, 102(5):1857–97, 2012.

- [33] Naila Kabeer. Is microfinance a 'magic bullet' for women's empowerment? analysis of findings from south asia. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 40(44/45):4709—4718, 2005.
- [34] Klea Katsouyanni, Giota Touloumi, Evangelia Samoli, Alexandros Gryparis, Alain Le Tertre, Yannis Monopolis, Giuseppe Rossi, Denis Zmirou, Ferran Ballester, Azedine Boumghar, et al. Confounding and effect modification in the short-term effects of ambient particles on total mortality: results from 29 european cities within the aphea2 project. *Epidemiology*, pages 521–531, 2001.
- [35] David Knoke and Song Yang. *Social network analysis*. Sage Publications, 2019.
- [36] Mirjam J Knol and Tyler J VanderWeele. Recommendations for presenting analyses of effect modification and interaction. *International journal of epidemiology*, 41(2):514–520, 2012.
- [37] Patricio S. La Rosa, Yanjiao Zhou, Erica Sodergren, George Weinstock, and William D. Shannon. Chapter 6 - hypothesis testing of metagenomic data. In Jacques Izard and Maria C. Rivera, editors, *Metagenomics for Microbiology*, pages 81–96. Academic Press, Oxford, 2015.
- [38] John A List, Azeem M Shaikh, and Yang Xu. Multiple hypothesis testing in experimental economics. *Experimental Economics*, 22(4):773–793, 2019.
- [39] Charles F Manski. *Public policy in an uncertain world: analysis and decisions*. Harvard University Press, 2013.
- [40] Daniel M Musher. Pneumococcal vaccine—direct and indirect (“herd”) effects, 2006.
- [41] Elizabeth L Ogburn, Oleg Sofrygin, Ivan Diaz, and Mark J van der Laan. Causal inference for social network data. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1705.08527*, 2017.
- [42] Harsh Parikh, Cynthia Rudin, and Alexander Volfovsky. Malts: Matching after learning to stretch. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1811.07415*, 2018.
- [43] Philippa Pattison and Philippa Philippa. *Algebraic models for social networks*. Number 7. Cambridge University Press, 1993.
- [44] Judea Pearl. Causality: Models, reasoning, and inference. 2000.
- [45] Judea Pearl. Detecting latent heterogeneity. *Sociological Methods & Research*, 46(3):370–389, 2017.
- [46] Joaquin Quinonero-Candela and Carl Edward Rasmussen. A unifying view of sparse approximate gaussian process regression. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 6:1939–1959, 2005.
- [47] Simone Righi and Károly Takács. Social closure and the evolution of cooperation via indirect reciprocity. *Scientific reports*, 8(1):1–9, 2018.
- [48] James M Robins, Miguel Angel Hernan, and Babette Brumback. Marginal structural models and causal inference in epidemiology, 2000.
- [49] Elisabeth D Root, Sophia Giebultowicz, Mohammad Ali, Mohammad Yunus, and Michael Emch. The role of vaccine coverage within social networks in cholera vaccine efficacy. *PLoS One*, 6(7):e22971, 2011.
- [50] Kenneth J Rothman, Sander Greenland, and Alexander M Walker. Concepts of interaction. *American journal of epidemiology*, 112(4):467–470, 1980.
- [51] Donald B Rubin. Estimating causal effects of treatments in randomized and nonrandomized studies. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 66(5):688, 1974.
- [52] Donald B Rubin. Causal inference using potential outcomes: Design, modeling, decisions. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 100(469):322–331, 2005.
- [53] Lee Douglas Sailer. Structural equivalence: Meaning and definition, computation and application. *Social Networks*, 1(1):73–90, 1978.
- [54] Babak Salimi, Harsh Parikh, Moe Kayali, Lise Getoor, Sudeepa Roy, and Dan Suciu. Causal relational learning. In *SIGMOD*, pages 241–256, 2020.
- [55] RODOLFO SARACCI. Interaction and synergism. *American Journal of Epidemiology*, 112(4):465–466, 1980.
- [56] Juliet Popper Shaffer. Multiple hypothesis testing. *Annual review of psychology*, 46(1):561–584, 1995.
- [57] Cosma Rohilla Shalizi and Andrew C Thomas. Homophily and contagion are generically confounded in observational social network studies. *Sociological methods & research*, 40(2):211–239, 2011.
- [58] Eli Sherman and Ilya Shpitser. Intervening on network ties. In Amir Globerson and Ricardo Silva, editors, *UAI*, volume 115 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 975–984. AUAI Press, 2019.
- [59] Mark Snyder and William B Swann. Hypothesis-testing processes in social interaction. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 36(11):1202, 1978.

- [60] Michael E Sobel. What do randomized studies of housing mobility demonstrate? causal inference in the face of interference. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 101(476):1398–1407, 2006.
- [61] Elizabeth A Stuart. Matching methods for causal inference: A review and a look forward. *Statistical science*, 25(1):1, 2010.
- [62] Matt Taddy, Matt Gardner, Liyun Chen, and David Draper. A nonparametric bayesian analysis of heterogenous treatment effects in digital experimentation. *Journal of Business & Economic Statistics*, 34(4):661–672, 2016.
- [63] Thomas W Valente, Kathryn Coronges, Cynthia Lakon, and Elizabeth Costenbader. How correlated are network centrality measures? *Connections (Toronto, Ont.)*, 28(1):16, 2008.
- [64] Tyler J VanderWeele. On the distinction between interaction and effect modification. *Epidemiology*, 20(6):863–871, 2009.
- [65] Tyler J VanderWeele and Weihua An. Social networks and causal inference. *Handbook of causal analysis for social research*, pages 353–374, 2013.
- [66] Tyler J VanderWeele and James M Robins. Four types of effect modification: a classification based on directed acyclic graphs. *Epidemiology*, 18(5):561–568, 2007.
- [67] Tyler J VanderWeele and Eric J Tchetgen Tchetgen. Bounding the infectiousness effect in vaccine trials. *Epidemiology*, 22(5):686, 2011.
- [68] Wolfgang Viechtbauer. Hypothesis tests for population heterogeneity in meta-analysis. *British Journal of Mathematical and Statistical Psychology*, 60(1):29–60, 2007.
- [69] Stanley Wasserman, Katherine Faust, et al. *Social network analysis: Methods and applications*, volume 8. Cambridge university press, 1994.
- [70] Yinglin Xia and Jun Sun. Hypothesis testing and statistical analysis of microbiome. *Genes & diseases*, 4(3):138–148, 2017.



## 8 Appendix

### 8.1 More details about the algorithm for checking network patterns in Section 4

Here we give the pseudo code of the algorithm for checking networks patterns that is described in Section 4. We also provide a demonstration of the algorithm using our running example. We describe an algorithm for checking whether a given pattern has a pattern-preserving isomorphism to a subgraph in the ego-centric network of a unit in the social network. Algorithm 2 operates as follows. Given a social network  $G$ , a network pattern  $P$ , and a unit in  $G$ ,  $i$ , the algorithm starts by enumerating the isomorphisms that exists from  $P$  to subgraphs of  $G[N(i)]$  in line 1 (In our implementation we use the ISMAGS algorithm [31]). Next, the algorithm iterates over every isomorphism and checks whether the distinguished node in  $P$ ,  $u$  is mapped by the isomorphism to the unit of interest  $i$  (lines 2–6). If this is the case, the algorithm returns True. If all isomorphisms do not map  $u$  to  $i$ , it returns False.

---

**Algorithm 2:** Check Network Pattern
 

---

**input :** Social network  $G = (V, E, Z)$ , network pattern  $P$ , a unit in  $i \in V$

**output:** True if there is a pattern-preserving isomorphism between  $P$  and  $G[N(i)]$  w.r.t the node  $i$

---

```

1  $L_{iso} \leftarrow \text{subgraphIso}(G[N(i)], P);$ 
2 foreach  $f \in L_{iso}$  do
3   if  $f(u) = i$  then
4     return True;
5   else
6     continue;
7 return False;
```

---

**Example 8.1** Reconsider the 3-clique graph pattern  $P$  from Example 3.2 and the social network in Figure 1 with the node 4. When this input is given to Algorithm 2, in line 1, the algorithm generates the list of isomorphisms  $L_{iso}$  that contains three functions, since  $G[N(4)]$  and  $P$  are both 3-cliques. The algorithm then iterates over the isomorphisms (line 2) and for each one checks whether the node  $x$  in  $P$  is mapped to the unit 4. In this case, there is one isomorphism that maps  $x$  to 4, so, when considering this isomorphism, inside the loop, the algorithm returns True (line 4). However, if we were to input  $G$  with the unit 8 instead of 4,  $L_{iso}$  would be empty, so the algorithm would skip to line 7 and return False.

### 8.2 Causal DAG example

Figure 7 depicts a part of the causal graph for units 7, 8 described in Table 1. An directed edge from one node to another node in causal graph delineate that the node at the head is causally dependent on node at the tail of the edge. Corresponding to each node in causal graph, there is an associated structural equation which takes in all the parent nodes as input. For instance, in Figure 7,  $T_8$  has an incoming edge from  $X_8$ , this implies that  $T_8$  is causally dependent on  $X_8$ . Further, the structural equation for node  $T_8$  which take  $X_8$  and  $O_8$  as inputs.




Figure 7: A partial causal graph for unit 7, 8, where  $Y$  denotes Loan,  $T$  denotes SHG,  $O$  denotes Occupation, and  $X$  denotes Election Card

### 8.3 Implementation details and runtime for Section 5

The experiments were performed on MacOS Mojave, 64-bit, with 64GB of RAM and Intel i7. The code is implemented in Python 3.6 with the packages numpy, pandas, sklearn.

The runtime for the experiment with the micro-finance data, described in Section 5.2, was 11m 58s. For Section 5.1, we ran hypothesis test for each value of  $n$ , 100 times. For  $n = 4096$ , the average runtime was 18.82s.

### 8.4 Generative process for synthetic data in Section 5.1

We use Barabasi-Albert random graph generating algorithm [1] to sample a random graph  $(\mathbf{V}, \mathbf{E})$  with  $|\mathbf{V}| = n$  nodes. Barabasi-Albert graphs have similar structure to several natural and human-made systems such as social networks, world wide web, citation networks etc [16]. For each unit  $i \in \mathbf{V}$ , we define three attribute: age, income and vaccine (a binary attribute indicating whether that unit was vaccinated or not). We use the following data generative process:  $age_i \sim Uniform(21, 99)$ ,  $income_i \sim Uniform(20, 60) + Normal(\frac{age_i}{50}, 5^2)$ ,  $vaccine_i \sim Bernoulli(1/2)$ . The potential outcome under placebo,  $infect_i(0)$ , is a function of individual's income, average income of her neighbors in the social network, membership in a 3-clique, and a mean zero Gaussian noise with variance  $\sigma^2$ . The potential outcome under vaccination,  $infect_i(1)$ , is constant and equals 0.1. Thus, the true effect modifiers are the income of the individual, average income of her neighbors in the social network and membership in a 3-clique. We define  $\epsilon_i \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2)$ ,  $p_i = \expit(200 - income_i - 4(\frac{\sum_{j \in N(i)} income_j}{|\mathbf{V}[N(i)]|} + 4triangle_i + \epsilon_i))$ ,  $infect_i(0) = Bernoulli(p_i)$ , and  $infect_i(1) = Bernoulli(\frac{1}{10})$ . We generated the synthetic data keeping real world dynamics in mind, i.e. higher income individuals can potentially work from home which will reduce their chances of being infected by SARS-Cov-2 virus. Similarly, if the social connections of an individual have high income, then it will reduce their chances of exposure to the virus. Lastly, if an individual is not part of a 3-clique then they are less likely to meet an individual, which will further reduce the chances of infection. We assume that post-infection an every individual in the population has an equal chances of getting infected which is a small non-zero probability.