

RANDOMIZATION-BASED CONFIDENCE INTERVALS FOR THE LOCAL AVERAGE TREATMENT EFFECT

P. M. ARONOW, HAOGUO CHANG, AND PATRICK LOPATTO

ABSTRACT. We consider the problem of generating confidence intervals in randomized experiments with noncompliance. We show that a refinement of a randomization-based procedure proposed by Imbens and Rosenbaum (2005) has desirable properties. Namely, we show that using a studentized Anderson–Rubin-type statistic as a test statistic yields confidence intervals that are finite-sample exact under treatment effect homogeneity, and remain asymptotically valid for the Local Average Treatment Effect when the treatment effect is heterogeneous. We provide a uniform analysis of this procedure.

1. INTRODUCTION

In randomized experiments with noncompliance, the use of an instrumental variables (IV) estimator has become standard practice. When the treatment assignment is actively randomized by the researcher, the IV estimator allows for the consistent estimation of the local average treatment effect (LATE) [IA94], the causal effect of the treatment on subjects that receive treatment only as a result of a randomized encouragement [AI95, AIR96, Blo84]. However, while the IV estimator can be shown to be pointwise consistent under relatively weak assumptions, statistical inference for the LATE can be considerably more difficult.

The standard approach for generating confidence intervals for the LATE relies on asymptotic approximations, namely estimating Wald-type confidence intervals using a normal approximation and linearized variance estimates [AP09]. However, this approach is known to have poor finite-sample properties [NS90, BJB95]. In particular, when the randomized encouragement does not strongly predict treatment take-up, an example of the weak instruments problem, these confidence intervals may have poor coverage properties, even in relatively large samples. The standard solution in the literature involves test inversion, typically with some variant of the Anderson–Rubin test statistic [AR49] in the just-identified case. The validity of this procedure is typically justified under a regression model with additive effects and random errors. Certain optimality properties of this test have been demonstrated in [Mor09].

An alternative approach relies on explicitly using randomization as a basis for inference. Notably, Imbens and Rosenbaum proposed a procedure for generating finite sample-exact confidence intervals under the assumption that causal effects are homogeneous across subjects [IR05]. The Imbens–Rosenbaum procedure proceeds by inverting Fisher’s exact test against a scalar-valued causal model that allows the received treatment to have a constant

effect. The primary benefit of this procedure is that it offers strong finite sample guarantees (under a constant effect assumption), thus avoiding the analytic problems that result from the use of asymptotic approximations. However, it generically offers no asymptotic guarantees when treatment effects are allowed to be heterogeneous across subjects.

This paper shows that a refinement of the Imbens–Rosenbaum procedure has desirable properties in constructing confidence intervals for the LATE. Namely, by choosing as a test statistic a variant of the Anderson–Rubin statistic (the studentized difference-in-means between those assigned to the encouragement and those not assigned to the encouragement), we can guarantee that the resulting confidence intervals are asymptotically valid for the LATE under treatment effect heterogeneity. Although this test statistic is common (see, e.g., [KPK18] for its use in randomization inference), the fact that it provides such a guarantee for the Imbens–Rosenbaum procedure appears to be novel in the literature. Furthermore, we show that these asymptotic guarantees are uniform under mild conditions. In designs with non-degenerate two-sided noncompliance, we can allow the instrument to be arbitrarily weak. In summary, our refinement to the Imbens–Rosenbaum procedure is finite sample-exact under causal effect homogeneity, and can be asymptotically valid for the LATE without assuming either a strong instrument or effect homogeneity. We also provide a regression-adjusted version of this procedure.

1.1. Related Work. Studentized inference for random experiments with full compliance was studied in [WD21, CF22, ZD21]; see also [CR13]. Wald-type inference on the LATE in randomized experiments with covariate adjustment was considered in [ZZ23] and [BGSTM23].

We refer the reader to [ASS19] for a survey of the weak instruments literature. A standard analytical framework in this literature uses a constant effect linear instrumental variable model [SS97, Mor09, Mik10]. Instead, we adopt the potential outcomes framework and use randomization as the sole basis for inference. We provide a uniform analysis of our proposed procedures in the spirit of [Mik10].

1.2. Organization. In the next section, we describe our proposed method and its regression-adjusted refinement. Proofs of their validity are deferred to the appendices.

1.3. Acknowledgments. P. L. is supported by NSF postdoctoral fellowship DMS-2202891.

2. CONFIDENCE SETS

2.1. Confidence Sets Without Regression Adjustment. We begin by describing confidence intervals for the LATE that do not incorporate covariate information. We consider a completely randomized experiment on n subjects with a binary treatment and work in the design-based framework, where the potential outcomes of the experimental subjects are held fixed. The only randomness in our analysis comes from the experimental design.

2.1.1. Notation and Assumptions. More specifically, let $y_i(1)$ and $y_i(0)$ be real numbers denoting the potential outcomes for the i -th unit under assignment to treatment and control, respectively, with $1 \leq i \leq n$. We write $d_i(1) = 0$ if the i -th unit is assigned to treatment but does not receive treatment; we write $d_i(1) = 1$ if it does. The compliance decision $d_i(0)$ under assignment to control is defined analogously.

As in [IA94], we assume that the treatment assignment is randomized and potential outcomes only depend on realized treatment status. That is, if $d_i(1) = d_i(0)$, we require $y_i(1) = y_i(0)$. This is the *exclusion restriction* common in the IV literature. We also assume that $d_i(1) \geq d_i(0)$ (monotonicity), meaning that assignment to treatment does not cause any unit to decline treatment, if that unit would have taken the treatment under assignment to control.

We assign a subset of n_1 units to treatment, chosen uniformly at random among all possible subsets of size n_1 . For all $i \leq n$, we let Z_i be a random variable such that $Z_i = 1$ if unit i is assigned to treatment, and $Z_i = 0$ otherwise. We note that $\mathbb{P}(Z_i = 1) = n_1/n$, and that Z_i and Z_j are dependent for any i, j .

Let \mathcal{C} denote the set of units i such that $d_i(0) = 0$ and $d_i(1) = 1$; such units are called *compliers*. Our inferential target is the LATE in the experimental sample, defined by

$$\text{LATE} = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{C}|} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}} (y_i(1) - y_i(0)).$$

The LATE is sometimes referred to as the *complier average causal effect*, as it is the average treatment effect among compliers. We denote the observed compliance decisions and treatment assignments by $D_i = d_i(Z_i)$ and $Y_i = y_i(Z_i)$, respectively, and set $\pi = n_1/n$.

2.1.2. Studentized Estimator. For all $\beta \in \mathbb{R}$, we define the estimator

$$\hat{\tau}(\beta) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (Y_i - \beta D_i)(Z_i - \pi). \quad (2.1)$$

We remark that a short calculation shows

$$\hat{\tau}(\beta) = \pi(1 - \pi) \left(\frac{1}{n_1} \sum_{i=1}^n Y_i Z_i - \frac{1}{n_0} \sum_{i=1}^n Y_i (1 - Z_i) \right),$$

where $n_0 = n - n_1$, so $\hat{\tau}(\beta)$ is simply a rescaled difference in means statistic. We have chosen the form (2.1) to emphasize its similarity to the Anderson–Rubin statistic. We also define

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{v}_i(1) &= y_i(1) - \beta d_i(1) - \frac{1}{n_1} \sum_{k \in [n]} Z_k (y_k(1) - \beta d_k(1)), \\ \hat{v}_i(0) &= y_i(0) - \beta d_i(0) - \frac{1}{n_0} \sum_{k \in [n]} (1 - Z_k) (y_k(0) - \beta d_k(0)), \end{aligned}$$

suppressing the dependence on β in the notation. Using this notation, we define the variance estimator

$$\hat{\sigma}^2(\beta) = \frac{\pi^2(1-\pi)^2}{n_1^2} \sum_{i \in [n]} Z_i \hat{v}_i^2(1) + \frac{\pi^2(1-\pi)^2}{n_0^2} \sum_{i \in [n]} (1 - Z_i) \hat{v}_i^2(0),$$

and the studentized estimator

$$\hat{\Delta}(\beta) = \frac{\hat{\tau}(\beta)}{\hat{\sigma}(\beta)}.$$

We will use $\hat{\Delta}(\beta)$ as our test statistic, and construct confidence intervals by test inversion.

2.1.3. Critical Values. To choose critical values for $\hat{\Delta}(\beta)$, we use a randomization distribution. Note that $Z = (Z_1, \dots, Z_n)$ is a random vector in $\{0, 1\}^n$. Let Z^* be a random vector with the same distribution as Z , and independent from Z . We use \mathbb{P}^* to denote the probability measure that conditions on Z .

We define $\hat{\tau}^*: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by

$$\hat{\tau}^*(\beta) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (Y_i - \beta D_i)(Z_i^* - \pi),$$

where we recall that Y_i and D_i are defined in terms of Z_i , not Z_i^* . We also define the variance estimator

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\sigma}^*(\beta) = & \frac{\pi^2(1-\pi)^2}{n_1^2} \sum_{i \in [n]} Z_i^* \left(Y_i - \beta D_i - \frac{1}{n_1} \sum_{i \in [n]} Z_i^* (Y_i - \beta D_i) \right)^2 \\ & + \frac{\pi^2(1-\pi)^2}{n_0^2} \sum_{i \in [n]} (1 - Z_i^*) \left(Y_i - \beta D_i - \frac{1}{n_0} \sum_{i \in [n]} (1 - Z_i^*) (Y_i - \beta D_i) \right)^2. \end{aligned}$$

Finally, we define the studentized estimator

$$\hat{\Delta}^*(\beta) = \frac{\hat{\tau}^*(\beta)}{\hat{\sigma}^*(\beta)}.$$

The distribution of $|\Delta^*(\beta)|$ under \mathbb{P}^* , which is a function of Z , is discrete and supported on $[0, \infty)$. This implies that for all $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, there exists a smallest real number $\hat{\eta}_{1-\alpha}(\beta, Z)$ in $[0, \infty)$ such that

$$\mathbb{P}^* (|\Delta^*(\beta)| \leq \hat{\eta}_{1-\alpha}(\beta, Z)) \geq 1 - \alpha.$$

Our confidence region is defined as

$$\hat{I}_{1-\alpha}(Z) = \{\beta \in \mathbb{R} : |\Delta(\beta)| \leq \hat{\eta}_{1-\alpha}(\beta, Z)\}.$$

2.1.4. *Computation.* Given the observed values of Y_i , D_i , and Z_i , the critical value $\hat{\eta}_{1-\alpha}$ may be computed by Monte Carlo simulation with a suitably large number of random permutations to approximate the distribution of $\Delta^*(\beta)$. Exact enumeration of this distribution is typically infeasible, since Z^* takes $\binom{n}{n_1}$ values, which grows exponentially large if n_1 is proportional to n .

Once $\hat{\eta}_{1-\alpha}$ has been found, $\hat{I}_{1-\alpha}$ may be computed by computing $\Delta^*(\beta)$ along a sufficiently fine discrete mesh of real numbers. We note that $\hat{I}_{1-\alpha}$ may not be an interval, but is generically a finite union of intervals.

2.1.5. *Theoretical Guarantees.* As noted in [IR05], the confidence regions $\hat{I}_{1-\alpha}$ are valid confidence intervals at level $1 - \alpha$ (that is, contain the true LATE with probability at least $1 - \alpha$), regardless of the value of n , if there exists some $\tilde{\beta}$ such that constant effects condition

$$y_i(1) - y_i(0) = \tilde{\beta}(d_i(1) - d_i(0)) \quad (2.2)$$

holds for all units.

Additionally, we show below in Appendix A that the confidence intervals $\hat{I}_{1-\alpha}$ are valid asymptotically, as $n \rightarrow \infty$, under mild conditions on the potential outcomes and potential compliance decisions. The necessary assumptions are enumerated in Definition A.3, and the result on asymptotic validity is given in Theorem A.5. The convergence is uniform over configurations of y_i and d_i such that for each $a \in \{0, 1\}$, either

$$d_i(a) = a \text{ for all } i, \quad (2.3)$$

or

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (d_i(a) - \mu_{d(a)})^2 \geq \varepsilon \quad (2.4)$$

for a parameter $\varepsilon > 0$, along with a few other regularity conditions. Here $\mu_{d(a)}$ denotes the mean of the length n vector with entries $d_i(a)$.

To explain the meaning of (2.3) and (2.4), we consider a few examples. In the case of an experiment with full compliance, (2.3) holds for both $a \in \{0, 1\}$, and our theorem implies a uniform version of a previous result about studentized permutation tests for such experiments [WD21]. For an experiment with one-sided noncompliance, (2.3) holds by definition for $a = 0$. Then (2.4) requires that the strength of the instrument be bounded below and above. For an experiment with two-sided noncompliance, (2.3) is violated for both $a \in \{0, 1\}$, and we must rely on (2.4). In this case, uniform convergence holds even for instruments that are arbitrarily weak, as long as the proportions of subjects who comply and do not comply with their assignment in each group are non-negligible.

2.2. Confidence Sets With Regression Adjustment.

2.2.1. *Notation and Assumptions.* We now show how to modify the construction in the previous section to incorporate pre-treatment covariates via regression adjustment, a common method for improving the efficiency of testing procedures. We retain the previous

notation and additionally suppose that each unit i comes equipped with a vector $x_i \in \mathbb{R}^k$ of covariates for some $k \in \mathbb{N}$. We suppose that each x_i is demeaned, meaning that

$$\sum_{i=1}^n x_i = 0_k, \quad (2.5)$$

where 0_k is the zero vector in \mathbb{R}^k . We make this assumption without loss of generality, since given an arbitrary set of covariate vectors, one can enforce (2.5) by subtracting the mean of the vectors from each x_i .

Given a $\beta \in \mathbb{R}$, and a treatment assignment vector Z , consider the linear regression

$$Y_i - \beta D_i \sim (1 - Z_i)\varphi_0 + Z_i\varphi_1 + (1 - Z_i)x_i'\gamma_0 + Z_i x_i'\gamma_1. \quad (2.6)$$

In short, this is an interacted linear regression that regresses $Y_i - \beta D_i$ on

$$((1 - Z_i), Z_i, (1 - Z_i)x_i, Z_i x_i)$$

without an intercept. For each β , denote the ordinary least squares estimators by $\hat{\varphi}(0, \beta)$, $\hat{\varphi}(1, \beta)$, $\hat{\gamma}(0, \beta)$, and $\hat{\gamma}(1, \beta)$ in the order they appear in (2.6). We define the randomization statistics $\hat{\varphi}^*(0, \beta)$, $\hat{\varphi}^*(1, \beta)$, $\hat{\gamma}^*(0, \beta)$, and $\hat{\gamma}^*(1, \beta)$ similarly by using Z^* instead of Z .

2.2.2. Studentized Estimators. We define the covariate-adjusted difference in means statistic as

$$\hat{\tau}_{\text{adj}}(\beta) = \frac{1}{n_1} \sum_{i \in [n]} Z_i (Y_i - \beta D_i - x_i' \hat{\gamma}(1, \beta)) - \frac{1}{n_0} \sum_{i \in [n]} (1 - Z_i) (Y_i - \beta D_i - x_i' \hat{\gamma}(0, \beta)),$$

and we define the covariate-adjusted randomization estimator $\hat{\tau}_{\text{adj}}^*(\beta)$ analogously, again replacing Z_i by Z_i^* , and $\hat{\varphi}(0, \beta)$ and $\hat{\varphi}(1, \beta)$ by their randomization analogues. The addition of the regression terms aims to improve the precision of $\hat{\tau}_{\text{adj}}(\beta)$ relative to $\hat{\tau}(\beta)$ and consequently decrease the length of the resulting confidence intervals.

The residual estimators associated with (2.6) are

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\varepsilon}(\beta) &= Y_i - \beta D_i - \hat{\varphi}(Z_i, \beta) - x_i' \hat{\gamma}(Z_i, \beta), \\ \hat{\varepsilon}^*(\beta) &= Y_i - \beta D_i - \hat{\varphi}^*(Z_i^*, \beta) - x_i' \hat{\gamma}^*(Z_i^*, \beta). \end{aligned}$$

We use these to define the variance estimators

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\sigma}_{\text{adj}}^2(\beta) &= \frac{1}{n_1^2} \sum_{i \in [n]} Z_i \hat{\varepsilon}_i(\beta)^2 + \frac{1}{n_0^2} \sum_{i \in [n]} (1 - Z_i) \hat{\varepsilon}_i(\beta)^2, \\ \hat{\sigma}_{\text{adj},*}^2(\beta) &= \frac{1}{n_1^2} \sum_{i \in [n]} Z_i^* \hat{\varepsilon}_i^*(\beta)^2 + \frac{1}{n_0^2} \sum_{i \in [n]} (1 - Z_i^*) \hat{\varepsilon}_i^*(\beta)^2. \end{aligned}$$

The adjusted studentized difference in means estimators are

$$\hat{\Delta}_{\text{adj}}(\beta) = \frac{\hat{\tau}_{\text{adj}}(\beta)}{\hat{\sigma}_{\text{adj}}^2(\beta)}, \quad \hat{\Delta}_{\text{adj}}^*(\beta) = \frac{\hat{\tau}_{\text{adj}}^*(\beta)}{\hat{\sigma}_{\text{adj},*}^2(\beta)}. \quad (2.7)$$

2.2.3. Critical Values. Given the definitions in (2.7), our confidence interval construction is similar to the previous case. Given $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, define $\hat{\eta}_{1-\alpha}^{\text{adj}}(\beta, Z)$ as the smallest real number in $[0, \infty)$ such that

$$\mathbb{P}^* \left(|\Delta_{\text{adj}}^*(\beta)| \leq \hat{\eta}_{1-\alpha}^{\text{adj}}(\beta, Z) \right) \geq 1 - \alpha.$$

Our proposed confidence region is

$$\hat{I}_{1-\alpha}^{\text{adj}}(Z) = \{\beta \in \mathbb{R} : |\Delta(\beta)| \leq \hat{\eta}_{1-\alpha}^{\text{adj}}(\beta, Z)\}.$$

The practical computation of this interval may be dealt with as in the unadjusted case.

2.2.4. Theoretical Guarantees. A straightforward extension of the reasoning in [IR05] shows that the confidence regions $\hat{I}_{1-\alpha}^{\text{adj}}$ are valid if the constant effects condition (2.2) holds, regardless of the value of n . Further, we show below in Appendix C that the confidence intervals $\hat{I}_{1-\alpha}^{\text{adj}}$ are asymptotically valid under mild regularity conditions (where, in particular, we keep k fixed as n grows large). The necessary assumptions are enumerated in Definition C.2, and the result on asymptotic validity is given in Theorem C.3.

2.3. Extensions. Our confidence interval constructions naturally extend to experimental designs beyond complete randomization, for example Bernoulli designs. They are also straightforwardly adapted to designs with continuous doses, where $d_i(0)$ and $d_i(1)$ take values in the real numbers and effects of interest suitably defined. We leave the details of these generalizations to future work.

APPENDIX A. CONFIDENCE INTERVALS WITHOUT COVARIATE ADJUSTMENT

In order to keep these appendices self-contained, we repeat some definitions made in the previous sections.

A.1. Notation. We let \mathbb{Z}_+ denote the positive integers and $[n]$ denote the set $\{1, \dots, n\}$. We let $C > 0$ denote a constant (not depending on n), which may change line to line and depend on various other parameters. We use the standard asymptotic notation $X_n = O(Y_n)$ for n -dependent quantities X_n and Y_n , with $Y > 0$, to mean that

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{|X|_n}{Y_n} < \infty. \tag{A.8}$$

We also write $X_n \lesssim Y_n$ for $X_n = O(Y_n)$. We similarly write $X = o(Y_n)$ if the limit in (A.8) is 0. When we write $X_n = O(Y_n)$ or $X_n = o(Y_n)$ for random quantities, we mean that the relevant limiting statement holds almost surely. We use O_p and o_p for the analogues defined using convergence in probability.

A.1.1. *Experiments.* Our main results concern a formal notion of a two-arm random experiment, which is defined in Definition A.1. In this definition,

- n represents the number of units in the experiment,
- n_1 represents the number of units assigned to the treatment group,
- $d_i: \{0, 1\} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ represents the potential compliance decisions for the i -th unit,
- $y_i: \{0, 1\} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ represents the potential outcomes for the i -th unit.

We always code the control group as 0 and the treatment group as 1, so that $d_i(0)$ is the compliance decision made by the i -th unit when assigned to control, $d_i(1)$ is the compliance decision made by the i -th unit when assigned to treatment, and likewise for the potential outcomes $y_i(0)$ and $y_i(1)$.

Definition A.1. An *experiment* is a 4-tuple $\theta = (n, n_1, d, y)$, where $n, n_1 \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ with $n_1 \leq n$, and $d = (d_1, \dots, d_n)$ and $y = (y_1, \dots, y_n)$ are vectors whose entries are functions $d_i: \{0, 1\} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ and $y_i: \{0, 1\} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ for all $i \in [n]$. We call n the number of units in θ .

Definition A.2. A *sequence of experiments* is a sequence $\{\theta_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ of experiments such that θ_n has n units for every $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$.

When discussing limits associated with sequences of experiments, we often omit the dependence of certain quantities on the indexing variable n . See Remark B.3 for details.

Given an experiment θ , we define the set $\mathcal{C} \subset [n]$ of compliers by

$$\mathcal{C} = \{i \in [n] : d_i(0) = 0, d_i(1) = 1\}, \quad (\text{A.9})$$

and the local average treatment effect by

$$\text{LATE}(\theta) = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{C}|} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}} (y_i(1) - y_i(0)). \quad (\text{A.10})$$

We also define a set \mathcal{A} of always-takers and a set \mathcal{B} of never-takers by

$$\mathcal{A} = \{i \in [n] : d_i(0) = 1, d_i(1) = 1\}, \quad \mathcal{B} = \{i \in [n] : d_i(0) = 0, d_i(1) = 0\}. \quad (\text{A.11})$$

Suppose additionally that $\beta \in \mathbb{R}$ is given. Then we define, for each $j \in \{0, 1\}$, a vector of adjusted potential outcomes $w(j)$ by

$$w(j) = (w_1(j), \dots, w_n(j)), \quad w_i(j) = y_i(j) - \beta d_i(j). \quad (\text{A.12})$$

In the definitions (A.9) through (A.12), we have sometimes omitted the dependence on θ and β in the notation. We will continue this throughout the paper whenever the relevant parameters are clear from context.

A.1.2. *Random Outcomes.* Given $\theta = (n, n_1, d, y)$, define

$$\mathcal{Z}_n(k) = \left\{ z \in \{0, 1\}^n : \sum_{i=1}^n z_i = k \right\}, \quad (\text{A.13})$$

and let Z denote a random vector uniformly distributed on $\mathcal{Z}_n(n_1)$. Here Z represents the uniform random assignment of a binary instrument to a group of n_1 units. We also set $n_0 = n - n_1$.

We let

$$D_i = d_i(Z_i), \quad Y_i = y_i(Z_i) \quad (\text{A.14})$$

denote random variables representing the observed compliance decision and observed outcome for the i -th unit, respectively. For every $\beta \in \mathbb{R}$ and $i \in [n]$, we set

$$W_i(\beta) = Y_i - \beta D_i, \quad W(\beta) = (W_1, \dots, W_n). \quad (\text{A.15})$$

We sometimes abbreviate $W_i = W_i(\beta)$ when the value of β is clear.

A.1.3. Variances and Covariances. For any vector $q = (q_i)_{i=1}^n \in \mathbb{R}^n$, we define the population mean and variance by

$$\mu_q = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n q_i, \quad \sigma_q^2 = \frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (q_i - \mu_q)^2. \quad (\text{A.16})$$

We also define within-group variances for each $G \in \{\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}, \mathcal{C}\}$ by

$$\sigma_{q,G}^2 = \frac{1}{|G|-1} \sum_{i \in G} (q_i - \mu_q)^2, \quad (\text{A.17})$$

if $|G| \geq 2$, and set $\sigma_{q,G}^2 = 0$ otherwise.

Given an additional vector $\tilde{q} = (\tilde{q}_i)_{i=1}^n \in \mathbb{R}^n$, we define the population covariance by

$$\sigma_{q\tilde{q}} = \frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (q_i - \mu_q)(\tilde{q}_i - \mu_{\tilde{q}}), \quad (\text{A.18})$$

and the within-group covariances by

$$\sigma_{q\tilde{q},G} = \frac{1}{|G|-1} \sum_{i \in G} (q_i - \mu_q)(\tilde{q}_i - \mu_{\tilde{q}}), \quad (\text{A.19})$$

A.1.4. Estimators. Given an experiment θ , we define $\hat{\tau}: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by

$$\hat{\tau}(\beta) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (Y_i - \beta D_i)(Z_i - \mathbb{E}[Z_i]). \quad (\text{A.20})$$

We will use the abbreviation $\pi = \mathbb{E}[Z_i]$ (which is independent of the choice of i). Then $\hat{\tau}(\beta)$ can be written more compactly as

$$\hat{\tau}(\beta) = \sum_{i=1}^n W_i(\beta)(Z_i - \pi). \quad (\text{A.21})$$

For each $j \in \{0, 1\}$, define

$$v(j) = (v_1(j), \dots, v_n(j)), \quad v_i(j) = w_i(j) - \mu_{w(j)}, \quad (\text{A.22})$$

which are centered versions of the $w(j)$. We also define

$$\hat{v}_i(1) = y_i(1) - \beta d_i(1) - \frac{1}{n_1} \sum_{k \in [n]} Z_k (y_k(1) - \beta d_k(1)), \quad (\text{A.23})$$

$$\hat{v}_i(0) = y_i(0) - \beta d_i(0) - \frac{1}{n_0} \sum_{k \in [n]} (1 - Z_k) (y_k(0) - \beta d_k(0)). \quad (\text{A.24})$$

We define the variance estimator

$$\hat{\sigma}^2(\beta) = \frac{\pi^2(1-\pi)^2}{n_1^2} \sum_{i \in [n]} Z_i \hat{v}_i^2(1) + \frac{\pi^2(1-\pi)^2}{n_0^2} \sum_{i \in [n]} (1 - Z_i) \hat{v}_i^2(0). \quad (\text{A.25})$$

We further define the studentized estimator

$$\hat{\Delta}(\beta) = \frac{\hat{\tau}(\beta)}{\hat{\sigma}(\beta)}. \quad (\text{A.26})$$

A.1.5. Permutation Distribution. Let Z^* be a random vector with the same distribution as Z , and independent from Z . We use \mathbb{P}^* to denote the probability measure that conditions on Z , and \mathbb{E}^* and Var^* to denote expectation and variance with respect to \mathbb{P}^* .

We define $\hat{\tau}^*: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by

$$\hat{\tau}^*(\beta) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (Y_i - \beta D_i) (Z_i^* - \mathbb{E}[Z_i^*]). \quad (\text{A.27})$$

and the variance estimator

$$\hat{\sigma}^*(\beta) = \frac{\pi^2(1-\pi)^2}{n_1^2} \sum_{i \in [n]} Z_i^* \left(W_i(\beta) - \frac{1}{n_1} \sum_{i \in [n]} Z_i^* W_i(\beta) \right)^2 \quad (\text{A.28})$$

$$+ \frac{\pi^2(1-\pi)^2}{n_0^2} \sum_{i \in [n]} (1 - Z_i^*) \left(W_i(\beta) - \frac{1}{n_0} \sum_{i \in [n]} (1 - Z_i^*) W_i(\beta) \right)^2. \quad (\text{A.29})$$

We also define the studentized estimator

$$\hat{\Delta}^*(\beta) = \frac{\hat{\tau}^*(\beta)}{\hat{\sigma}^*(\beta)}. \quad (\text{A.30})$$

The distribution of $|\Delta^*(\beta)|$ under \mathbb{P}^* , which is a function of Z , is discrete and supported on $[0, \infty)$. Given $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, we define $\hat{\eta}_{1-\alpha}(\beta, Z)$ to be the smallest real number in $[0, \infty)$ such that

$$\mathbb{P}^* (|\Delta^*(\beta)| \leq \hat{\eta}_{1-\alpha}(\beta, Z)) \geq 1 - \alpha. \quad (\text{A.31})$$

We define the confidence region

$$\hat{I}_{1-\alpha}(Z) = \{\beta \in \mathbb{R} : |\Delta(\beta)| \leq \hat{\eta}_{1-\alpha}(\beta, Z)\}. \quad (\text{A.32})$$

A.1.6. *Normal Quantiles.* Let \mathcal{N} be a mean zero, variance one normal random variable. We frequently denote its distribution by $N(0, 1)$. For all $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, define $z_{1-\alpha} \in \mathbb{R}$ as the value such that

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{N} > z_{1-\alpha}) = \alpha. \quad (\text{A.33})$$

A.2. **Assumptions.** We consider the following two assumptions on experiments θ .

Assumption 1 (Exclusion Restriction). For all $i \in [n]$, if $d_i(1) = d_i(0)$, then $y_i(0) = y_i(1)$.

Assumption 2 (Monotonicity). For all $i \in [n]$, we have $d_i(1) \geq d_i(0)$.

We now define a set of experiments on which our main result holds. In this definition, we think of ε as a parameter close to 0 and δ as a parameter close to 1.

Definition A.3. Given $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, $r \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$, $\delta, \varepsilon \in (0, 1)$, and $A > 0$, we define $\Theta_n(\varepsilon, \delta, r, A)$ as the set of experiments $\theta = (n, n_1, d, y)$ such that Assumption 1, Assumption 2, and the following conditions hold.

(i) We have

$$n_1 \in [rn, (1-r)n]. \quad (\text{A.34})$$

(ii) We have

$$\sigma_{y(1), y(0), \mathcal{C}} \geq -\delta \cdot \sigma_{y(1), \mathcal{C}} \cdot \sigma_{y(0), \mathcal{C}}. \quad (\text{A.35})$$

(iii) For each $a \in \{0, 1\}$,

$$\sigma_{d(a), y(a)} \leq \delta \cdot \sigma_{d(a)} \cdot \sigma_{y(a)}. \quad (\text{A.36})$$

(iv) For each $a \in \{0, 1\}$, at least one of the following two claims hold. Either

$$d_i(a) = a \text{ for all } i, \quad (\text{A.37})$$

or

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (d_i(a) - \mu_{d(a)})^2 \geq \varepsilon. \quad (\text{A.38})$$

(v) For each $a \in \{0, 1\}$,

$$\left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n |y_i(a) - \mu_{y(a)}|^4 \right)^{1/4} \leq A \sigma_{y(a)}. \quad (\text{A.39})$$

Remark A.4. Condition (A.35) rules out an extreme correlation between the potential treatment and control outcomes of the compliers, an common assumption in the design-based setting. Condition (A.36) is analogous, preventing extreme correlations between the potential outcomes and compliance decisions in the entire population. Condition (A.38) requires a non-negligible amount of variation in the compliance decisions. Condition (A.39) is a standard technical condition that arises when applying the central limit theorem for triangular arrays, and may be thought of as excluding heavy-tailed data.

A.3. Result. The following theorem is our main result for confidence intervals without covariate adjustment. Its proof is given at the end of Appendix B.

Theorem A.5. Fix $\alpha, \varepsilon_0, \delta_0 \in (0, 1)$, $r \in (0, 1/2)$, and $A > 0$, and set $\Theta_n = \Theta_n(\varepsilon_0, \delta_0, r, A)$. Then

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \inf_{\beta \in \mathbb{R}} \inf_{\{\theta \in \Theta_n : \text{LATE}(\theta) = \beta\}} \mathbb{P}_\theta(\beta \in \widehat{I}_{1-\alpha}(Z)) \geq 1 - \alpha. \quad (\text{A.40})$$

APPENDIX B. PROOF OF THEOREM A.5

Throughout this section, we let $\varepsilon_0, \delta_0, r, A$ be the constants fixed in the statement of Theorem A.5, and set $\Theta_n = \Theta_n(\varepsilon_0, \delta_0, r, A)$.

B.1. Preliminary Results.

B.1.1. Variance Representation. The following lemma is an immediate consequence of [IR15, Theorem 6.2].

Lemma B.1. For all $\beta \in \mathbb{R}$, the variance of $\widehat{\tau}(\beta)$ is

$$\text{Var}(\widehat{\tau}(\beta)) = \frac{S_1^2(\beta)}{n_1} + \frac{S_0^2(\beta)}{n_0} - \frac{S_{10}^2(\beta)}{n}, \quad (\text{B.41})$$

where

$$S_1^2(\beta) = \frac{\pi^2(1-\pi)^2}{n-1} \sum_{i \in [n]} v_i(1)^2, \quad (\text{B.42})$$

$$S_0^2(\beta) = \frac{\pi^2(1-\pi)^2}{n-1} \sum_{i \in [n]} v_i(0)^2, \quad (\text{B.43})$$

$$S_{10}^2(\beta) = \frac{\pi^2(1-\pi)^2}{n-1} \sum_{i \in [n]} (v_i(1) - v_i(0))^2. \quad (\text{B.44})$$

B.1.2. Combinatorial Central Limit Theorem. Given an experiment θ , we define the difference in means estimator

$$\widehat{\omega}(\theta) = \frac{1}{n_1} \sum_{i \in [n]} Z_i Y_i(1) - \frac{1}{n_0} \sum_{i \in [n]} (1 - Z_i) Y_i(0).$$

The following theorem is [LD17, Theorem 4].

Theorem B.2. Let $\{\theta_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ be a sequence of experiments such that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \max_{a \in \{0,1\}} \frac{1}{n_a^2} \frac{\max_{i \in [N]} |y_i(a) - \mu_{y(a)}|^2}{\text{Var}(\widehat{\omega})} = 0. \quad (\text{B.45})$$

Using the notation $\omega_n = \omega(\theta_n)$, we have

$$\frac{\widehat{\omega}_n - \mathbb{E}[\widehat{\omega}_n]}{\sqrt{\text{Var}(\widehat{\omega}_n)}} \xrightarrow{d} N(0, 1).$$

Remark B.3. In (B.45), the y_i in the n -th term of the limit are the potential outcome functions from θ_n . However, we have omitted the n -dependence in order to streamline the expressions. We adopt this convention for the y_i , d_i , a_i , and w_i in all limits below.

B.2. Difference in Means Estimator. Our first lemma follows from a standard computation, so we omit the proof.

Lemma B.4. For any experiment θ , we have $\mathbb{E}[\hat{\tau}(\beta)] = 0$ when $\beta = \text{LATE}(\theta)$.

Lemma B.5 derives a bound on the ratio between the maximum deviation of potential outcomes from their means and the variances of those outcomes.

Lemma B.5. For all $\theta \in \Theta_n$ and $a \in \{0, 1\}$,

$$\frac{\max_{i \in [n]} |y_i(a) - \mu_{y(a)}|}{\sigma_{y(a)}} \leq An^{1/4}.$$

Proof. For all $a \in \{0, 1\}$, we have

$$\max_{i \in [n]} |y_i(a) - \mu_{y(a)}| = \max_{i \in [n]} (|y_i(a) - \mu_{y(a)}|^4)^{1/4} \quad (\text{B.46})$$

$$\leq n^{1/4} \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in [n]} |y_i(a) - \mu_{y(a)}|^4 \right)^{1/4} \quad (\text{B.47})$$

$$\leq An^{1/4} \sigma_{y(a)}, \quad (\text{B.48})$$

where (B.48) is by (A.39). \square

Lemma B.6. For all $\theta \in \Theta_n$, if $\beta = \text{LATE}(\theta)$, then

$$\text{Var}(\hat{\tau}(\beta)) \geq (1 - \delta) \left(\frac{n_0}{nn_1} S_1^2(\beta) + \frac{n_1}{nn_0} S_0^2(\beta) \right). \quad (\text{B.49})$$

Proof. For the sum over the indices in (B.44) corresponding to compliers, we find

$$\frac{1}{|\mathcal{C}| - 1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}} (v_i(1) - v_i(0))^2 \quad (\text{B.50})$$

$$\leq \sigma_{v(1), \mathcal{C}}^2 + \sigma_{v(0), \mathcal{C}}^2 - 2\sigma_{v(1), v(0), \mathcal{C}} \quad (\text{B.51})$$

$$\leq \sigma_{v(0), \mathcal{C}}^2 + \sigma_{v(0), \mathcal{C}}^2 + 2\delta\sigma_{v(1), \mathcal{C}} \cdot \sigma_{v(0), \mathcal{C}} \quad (\text{B.52})$$

$$\leq \sigma_{v(0), \mathcal{C}}^2 + \sigma_{v(0), \mathcal{C}}^2 + \frac{\delta n_0}{n_1} \sigma_{v(1), \mathcal{C}}^2 + \frac{\delta n_1}{n_0} \sigma_{v(0), \mathcal{C}}^2 \quad (\text{B.53})$$

$$= \left(1 + \frac{\delta n_0}{n_1}\right) \sigma_{v(0), \mathcal{C}}^2 + \left(1 + \frac{\delta n_1}{n_0}\right) \sigma_{v(0), \mathcal{C}}^2 \quad (\text{B.54})$$

$$= \left(1 + \frac{\delta n_0}{n_1}\right) \frac{1}{|\mathcal{C}| - 1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}} v_i^2(1) + \left(1 + \frac{\delta n_1}{n_0}\right) \frac{1}{|\mathcal{C}| - 1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}} v_i^2(0). \quad (\text{B.55})$$

In (B.52) we used (A.35), and in (B.53) we used the elementary inequality $2ab \leq a^2 + b^2$.

Note that if $\beta = \text{LATE}(\theta)$, then

$$\sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}} (v_i(1) - v_i(0)) = 0. \quad (\text{B.56})$$

and therefore

$$\sum_{i \in \mathcal{A} \cup \mathcal{B}} v_i(1) - v_i(0) = 0, \quad (\text{B.57})$$

because $v(1)$ and $v(0)$ have mean zero, by definition. Since $v_i(1) - v_i(0)$ is independent of i for $i \in \mathcal{A} \cup \mathcal{B}$, this implies that for such i we have $v_i(1) = v_i(0)$. Therefore (B.55) implies

$$S_{10}^2(\beta) \leq \frac{\pi^2(1-\pi)^2}{n-1} \left(\left(1 + \frac{\delta n_1}{n_0}\right) \sum_{i \in [n]} v_i^2(1) + \left(1 + \frac{\delta n_0}{n_1}\right) \sum_{i \in [n]} v_i^2(0) \right). \quad (\text{B.58})$$

The claim then follows by combining (B.58) and (B.41). \square

Lemma B.7. For each $a \in \{0, 1\}$,

$$\sum_{i \in [n]} v_i(a)^2 \geq (1 - \delta^2) \max \left\{ \sum_{i \in [n]} (y_i(a) - \mu_{y(a)})^2, \beta^2 \sum_{i \in [n]} (d_i(a) - \mu_{d(a)})^2 \right\}. \quad (\text{B.59})$$

Proof. Notice that the left-hand side of the inequality is a quadratic function of β . Minimizing this function using elementary calculus (or recognizing it as a single-variable least-squares problem) yields the minimizer

$$\hat{\beta} = \frac{\sum_{i \in [n]} (y_i(a) - \mu_{y(a)}) (d_i(a) - \mu_{d(a)})}{\sum_{i \in [n]} (d_i(a) - \mu_{d(a)})^2}, \quad (\text{B.60})$$

where we set $\hat{\beta} = 0$ if the denominator vanishes. Then

$$\min_{\beta \in \mathbb{R}} \sum_{i \in [n]} (y_i(a) - \mu_{y(a)} - \beta d_i(a) - \beta \mu_{d(a)})^2 \quad (\text{B.61})$$

$$\geq \sum_{i \in [n]} (y_i(a) - \mu_{y(a)})^2 - \frac{\left(\sum_{i \in [n]} (y_i(a) - \mu_{y(a)}) (d_i(a) - \mu_{d(a)}) \right)^2}{\sum_{i \in [n]} (d_i(a) - \mu_{d(a)})^2} \quad (\text{B.62})$$

$$\geq \sum_{i \in [n]} (y_i(a) - \mu_{y(a)})^2 - \delta^2 \sum_{i \in [n]} (y_i(a) - \mu_{y(a)})^2 \quad (\text{B.63})$$

$$= (1 - \delta^2) \sum_{i \in [n]} (y_i(a) - \mu_{y(a)})^2. \quad (\text{B.64})$$

where (B.62) follows from (A.36). For the other part of the inequality, we may suppose that $\beta \neq 0$. We have

$$\beta^2 \sum_{i \in [n]} \left(\frac{1}{\beta} y_i(a) - \frac{1}{\beta} \mu_{y(a)} - d_i(a) - \mu_{d(a)} \right)^2 \quad (\text{B.65})$$

$$\geq \beta^2 \min_{\alpha \in \mathbb{R}} \sum_{i \in [n]} (\alpha y_i(a) - \alpha \mu_{y(a)} - d_i(a) - \mu_{d(a)})^2 \quad (\text{B.66})$$

$$\geq \beta^2 (1 - \delta^2) \sum_{i \in [n]} (d_i(a) - \mu_{d(a)})^2, \quad (\text{B.67})$$

where the last line is justified by the same calculations leading to (B.64). \square

Lemma B.8. Let $\{\theta_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ be a sequence of experiments such that $\theta_n \in \Theta_n$ for all $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$. Then for each $a \in \{0, 1\}$, we have

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n_a^2} \frac{\max_{i \in [n]} |y_i(a) - \mu_{y(a)} - \beta (d_i(a) - \mu_{d(a)})|^2}{\text{Var}(\hat{\tau}(\beta))} = 0, \quad (\text{B.68})$$

where $\beta = \text{LATE}(\theta_n)$.

Proof. We abbreviate $\beta = \beta_n$. By Lemma B.6, there exists a constant $c > 0$ independent of n , but dependent on the parameters used to define Θ , such that

$$(n-1) \text{Var}(\hat{\tau}(\beta)) \geq c \left(\frac{1}{n_1} \sum_{i \in [n]} v_i^2(1) + \frac{1}{n_0} \sum_{i \in [n]} v_i^2(0) \right). \quad (\text{B.69})$$

Hence, for each $a \in \{0, 1\}$,

$$\frac{1}{n_a^2} \frac{\max_{i \in [n]} |y_i(a) - \mu_{y(a)} - \beta (d_i(a) - \mu_{d(a)})|^2}{\text{Var}(\hat{\tau}(\beta))} \quad (\text{B.70})$$

$$\leq \frac{n-1}{cn_a^2} \frac{\max_{i \in [n]} |y_i(a) - \mu_{y(a)} - \beta (d_i(a) - \mu_{d(a)})|^2}{n_1^{-1} \sum_{i \in [n]} v_i^2(1) + n_0^{-1} \sum_{i \in [n]} v_i^2(0)} \quad (\text{B.71})$$

$$\leq \frac{2n}{cn_a} \frac{\max_{i \in [n]} |y_i(a) - \mu_{y(a)}|^2 + |\beta (d_i(a) - \mu_{d(a)})|^2}{\sum_{i \in [n]} v_i^2(a)} \quad (\text{B.72})$$

$$\lesssim \frac{\max_{i \in [n]} |y_i(a) - \mu_{y(a)}|^2}{\sum_{i \in [n]} (y_i(a) - \mu_{y(a)})^2} + \frac{\beta^2 \max_{i \in [n]} |d_i(a) - \mu_{d(a)}|^2}{\beta^2 \sum_{i \in [n]} (d_i(a) - \mu_{d(a)})^2} \quad (\text{B.73})$$

$$\lesssim n^{-1/2} + n^{-1}, \quad (\text{B.74})$$

which implies the claim since (B.74) is $o(1)$. Here (B.71) is by (B.69); (B.72) is an algebraic manipulation; (B.73) is by Lemma B.7; and (B.74) is by (A.38) and Lemma B.5. The proof under (A.37) is similar. \square

Theorem B.9. For every $\alpha \in (0, 1)$,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \inf_{\beta \in \mathbb{R}} \inf_{\{\theta \in \Theta_n : \text{LATE}(\theta) = \beta\}} \mathbb{P}_\theta \left(\frac{\hat{\tau}(\beta)}{\sqrt{\text{Var}(\hat{\tau}(\beta))}} > z_{1-\alpha} \right) = \alpha. \quad (\text{B.75})$$

Proof. We proceed by contradiction. Suppose (B.75) does not hold. Then there exists a subsequence of experiments $\{\theta_{n_k}\}_{k=1}^\infty$ and $\kappa > 0$ such that

$$\left| \mathbb{P}_{\theta_k} \left(\frac{\hat{\tau}(\beta)}{\sqrt{\text{Var}(\hat{\tau}(\beta))}} > z_{1-\alpha} \right) - \alpha \right| > \delta,$$

infinitely often (as $k \rightarrow \infty$).

However, by Lemma B.8 and Theorem B.2, we have (after embedding the subsequence in an arbitrary sequence with $\theta_n \in \Theta_n$ for all n)

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}_{\theta_k} \left(\frac{\hat{\tau}(\beta)}{\sqrt{\text{Var}(\hat{\tau}(\beta))}} > z_{1-\alpha} \right) = \alpha.$$

Hence we have a contradiction and the theorem is proved. \square

B.3. Variance Estimator.

Lemma B.10. Let $\{\theta_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ be a sequence of experiments such that $\theta_n \in \Theta_n$ for all $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, and set $\beta_n = \text{LATE}(\theta_n)$. Then

$$\frac{\hat{\sigma}^2(\beta_n)}{n_1^{-1} S_1^2(\beta_n) + n_0^{-1} S_0^2(\beta_n)} \xrightarrow{p} 1. \quad (\text{B.76})$$

Proof. We begin by showing

$$\frac{\pi^2(1-\pi)^2 n_1^{-1} (n_1 - 1)^{-1} \sum_{i \in [n]} Z_i \hat{v}_i^2(1)}{n_1^{-1} S_1^2(\beta_n)} \xrightarrow{p} 1, \quad (\text{B.77})$$

where $\hat{v}_i(1)$ is defined using the value β_n . The analogous limit holds for the control group, by similar reasoning, and together these claims imply (B.76) and complete the proof. To show (B.77), it suffices to show

$$\frac{\pi^2(1-\pi)^2 n_1^{-1} \sum_{i \in [n]} Z_i \hat{v}_i^2(1)}{S_1^2(\beta_n)} \xrightarrow{p} 1, \quad (\text{B.78})$$

by our hypothesis (A.34) on n_1 .

We have the identity

$$\frac{1}{n_1} \sum_{i \in [n]} Z_i \hat{v}_i^2(1) = \frac{1}{n_1} \sum_{i \in [n]} Z_i v_i^2(1) - \left(\frac{1}{n_1} \sum_{i \in [n]} Z_i (y_i(1) - \beta_n d_i(1)) - \mu_{y(1)} - \beta_n \mu_{d(1)} \right)^2,$$

which we use to expand the numerator in (B.78), creating two terms. The second term in this expansion converges to zero in probability, by Markov's inequality and the estimate

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\left(n_1^{-1} \sum_{i \in [n]} Z_i (y_i(1) - \beta_n d_i(1)) - \mu_{y(1)} - \beta_n \mu_{d(1)} \right)^2}{S_1^2(\beta_n)} \right] &= \frac{n_0}{n_1 n (n-1)} \frac{\sum_{i \in [n]} v_i^2(1)}{S_1^2(\beta_n)} \\ &\leq \frac{C n_0}{n_1 n} = o(1). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.79})$$

For the other term in the expansion of (B.77), note that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{n_1} \sum_{i \in [n]} Z_i v_i^2(1) \right] = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in [n]} v_i^2(1), \quad (\text{B.80})$$

which implies

$$\frac{n-1}{n_1} \frac{\mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{i \in [n]} Z_i v_i^2(1) \right]}{\sum_{i \in [n]} v_i^2(1)} = 1 - \frac{1}{n}. \quad (\text{B.81})$$

Further,

$$\text{Var} \left(\frac{1}{n_1} \frac{\sum_{i \in [n]} Z_i v_i^2(1)}{S_1^2(\beta)} \right) \leq \frac{n_0}{n_1 n (n-1)} \frac{\sum_{i \in [n]} v_i^4(1)}{\sigma_{v(1)}^4} \quad (\text{B.82})$$

$$= \frac{1}{n-1} \frac{\sum_{i \in [n]} v_i^2(1)}{\sigma_{v(1)}^2} \cdot \frac{n_0}{n_1 n} \frac{\max_i |v_i(1)|^2}{\sigma_{v(1)}^2} \quad (\text{B.83})$$

$$= o(1), \quad (\text{B.84})$$

where the maximum in (B.83) is bounded as in the lines leading to (B.74). Combining these results implies (B.77). \square

Theorem B.11. For all $\alpha \in (0, 1)$,

$$\lim_{\kappa \rightarrow 0^+} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \inf_{\beta \in \mathbb{R}} \inf_{\{\theta \in \Theta_n : \text{LATE}(\theta) = \beta\}} \mathbb{P}_\theta (|\Delta(\beta)| > |z_{1-\alpha/2}| + \kappa) \leq \alpha. \quad (\text{B.85})$$

Proof. For all $x, y > 0$, we have

$$\mathbb{P}_\theta (|\Delta(\beta)| > y) \leq \mathbb{P}_\theta \left(\frac{\sqrt{\text{Var}(\hat{\tau}(\beta))}}{\hat{\sigma}_\beta} \geq 1 + x \right) + \mathbb{P}_\theta \left(\left| \frac{\hat{\tau}(\beta)}{\sqrt{\text{Var}(\hat{\tau}(\beta))}} \right| > \frac{y}{1+x} \right). \quad (\text{B.86})$$

Denote

$$\tilde{\sigma}_\beta = \frac{S_1^2(\beta)}{n_1} + \frac{S_0^2(\beta)}{n_0}. \quad (\text{B.87})$$

We claim that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \inf_{\beta \in \mathbb{R}} \inf_{\{\theta \in \Theta_n : \text{LATE}(\theta) = \beta\}} \mathbb{P}_\theta \left(\frac{\sqrt{\text{Var}(\hat{\tau}(\beta))}}{\hat{\sigma}_\beta} \geq 1 + x \right) = 0. \quad (\text{B.88})$$

This claim holds because

$$\frac{\text{Var}(\hat{\tau}(\beta))}{\tilde{\sigma}_\beta} \leq 1, \quad (\text{B.89})$$

by Lemma B.1, and

$$\frac{\tilde{\sigma}_\beta}{\hat{\sigma}_\beta} \xrightarrow{p} 1 \quad (\text{B.90})$$

by Lemma B.10, after arguing by contradiction as in Theorem B.9.

Let \mathcal{N} be a standard normal random variable. We have

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow 0} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \inf_{\beta \in \mathbb{R}} \inf_{\{\theta \in \Theta_n : \text{LATE}(\theta) = \beta\}} \mathbb{P}_\theta \left(\left| \frac{\hat{\tau}(\beta)}{\sqrt{\text{Var}(\hat{\tau}(\beta))}} \right| > \frac{y}{1+x} \right) = \mathbb{P}(|\mathcal{N}| \geq y) \quad (\text{B.91})$$

by Theorem B.9 and the continuity of the quantile function of the absolute value of a normal distribution. Since the left-hand side of (B.86) is independent of x , we have

$$\lim_{\kappa \rightarrow 0} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \inf_{\beta \in \mathbb{R}} \inf_{\{\theta \in \Theta_n : \text{LATE}(\theta) = \beta\}} \mathbb{P}_\theta (|\Delta(\beta)| > |z_{1-\alpha}| + \kappa) \leq \alpha, \quad (\text{B.92})$$

as desired. \square

B.4. Randomization Critical Values. To begin, we note that by Lemma B.4, we have

$$\mathbb{E}^*[\hat{\tau}^*(\beta)] = 0, \quad (\text{B.93})$$

and by Lemma B.1,

$$\text{Var}^*(\hat{\tau}^*(\beta)) = \frac{S_1^{*2}(\beta)}{n_1} + \frac{S_0^{*2}(\beta)}{n_0}, \quad (\text{B.94})$$

where

$$S_1^{*2}(\beta) = S_0^{*2}(\beta) = \frac{\pi^2(1-\pi)^2}{n-1} \sum_{i \in [n]} (W_i(\beta) - \mu_{W(\beta)})^2. \quad (\text{B.95})$$

Let $\mathcal{T}(1), \mathcal{T}(0) \subset [n]$ denote the sets of units in the treatment and control groups defined by Z , respectively. For each $a \in \{0, 1\}$, we define the estimators

$$\hat{\mu}_{y(a)} = \frac{1}{n_a} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{T}(a)} Y_i, \quad \hat{\mu}_{d(a)} = \frac{1}{n_a} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{T}(a)} D_i, \quad (\text{B.96})$$

and set

$$\hat{T}(a) = \frac{1}{n_a} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{T}(a)} (y_i(a) - \hat{\mu}_{y(a)})(d_i(a) - \hat{\mu}_{d(a)}). \quad (\text{B.97})$$

The following lemma is adapted from [WD21, Lemma A.3]. It describes the almost sure behavior of realized data moments.

Lemma B.12. Let $\{\theta_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ be a sequence of experiments such that $\theta_n \in \Theta_n$ for all $n \in \mathbb{Z}$. Then we have the following almost sure convergence statements for each $a \in \{0, 1\}$:

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\sigma_{y(a)}} \left| \frac{1}{n_a} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{T}(a)} y_i(a) - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in [n]} y_i(a) \right| = 0, \quad (\text{B.98})$$

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\sigma_{y(a)}^2} \left| \frac{1}{n_a} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{T}(a)} (y_i(a) - \hat{\mu}_{y(a)})^2 - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in [n]} (y_i(a) - \mu_{y(a)})^2 \right| = 0, \quad (\text{B.99})$$

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\sigma_{d(a)}^2} \left| \frac{1}{n_a} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{T}(a)} (d_i(a) - \hat{\mu}_{d(a)})^2 - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in [n]} (d_i(a) - \mu_{d(a)})^2 \right| = 0, \quad (\text{B.100})$$

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\sigma_{y(a)} \sigma_{d(a)}} \left| \hat{T}(a) - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in [n]} (y_i(a) - \mu_{y(a)}) (d_i(a) - \mu_{d(a)}) \right| = 0. \quad (\text{B.101})$$

Proof. The proof of (B.98) is a straightforward adaptation of the proof of [WD21, Lemma A3(i)], so we omit it. The inequality (B.99) follows from [WD21, Lemma A3(ii)], after noting that (A.39) implies

$$\frac{\sum_{i \in [n]} (y_i(a) - \mu_{y(a)})^4}{n \sigma_{y(a)}^4} \leq A^4. \quad (\text{B.102})$$

The arguments for (B.100) and (B.101) similar to the one for (B.99) after using (A.38). We observe that both of these claims are trivial under (A.37). \square

We note that (B.99) and (B.101) can be written as

$$\frac{n_a^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{T}(a)} (y_i(a) - \hat{\mu}_{y(a)})^2}{\sigma_{y(a)}^2} = 1 + o(1), \quad (\text{B.103})$$

and

$$\frac{n_a^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{T}(a)} (y_i(a) - \hat{\mu}_{y(a)}) (d_i(a) - \hat{\mu}_{d(a)})}{\sigma_{y(a)} \sigma_{d(a)}} = \frac{\sigma_{y(a), d(a)}}{\sigma_{y(a)} \sigma_{d(a)}} + o(1). \quad (\text{B.104})$$

Lemma B.13 and Lemma B.14 record some useful algebraic identities for later use.

Lemma B.13. For every experiment θ ,

$$\hat{\mu}_{y(1)} - \beta \hat{\mu}_{d(1)} - (\mu_Y - \beta \mu_D) = \frac{n_0}{n} (\hat{\mu}_{y(1)} - \hat{\mu}_{y(0)} - \beta (\hat{\mu}_{d(1)} - \hat{\mu}_{d(0)})), \quad (\text{B.105})$$

and

$$\hat{\mu}_{y(0)} - \beta \hat{\mu}_{d(0)} - (\mu_Y - \beta \mu_D) = \frac{n_1}{n} (\hat{\mu}_{y(0)} - \hat{\mu}_{y(1)} - \beta (\hat{\mu}_{d(0)} - \hat{\mu}_{d(1)})). \quad (\text{B.106})$$

Proof. The identities are purely algebraic. Equation (B.105) follows from

$$\hat{\mu}_{y(1)} - \beta \hat{\mu}_{d(1)} - (\mu_Y - \beta \mu_D) \quad (\text{B.107})$$

$$= \hat{\mu}_{y(1)} - \beta \hat{\mu}_{d(1)} - \left(\frac{n_1}{n} \hat{\mu}_{y(1)} + \frac{n_0}{n} \hat{\mu}_{y(0)} - \beta \left(\frac{n_1}{n} \hat{\mu}_{d(1)} + \frac{n_0}{n} \hat{\mu}_{d(0)} \right) \right) \quad (\text{B.108})$$

$$= \frac{n_0}{n} (\hat{\mu}_{y(1)} - \hat{\mu}_{y(0)} - \beta (\hat{\mu}_{d(1)} - \hat{\mu}_{d(0)})). \quad (\text{B.109})$$

Equation (B.106) follows from a similar algebraic manipulation. \square

Lemma B.14. For any experiment θ with n units, for every unit $i \in [n]$ and $a \in \{0, 1\}$, the following holds. On the event $Z_i = a$,

$$|Y_i - \mu_Y - \beta(D_i - \mu_D)| \leq |y_i(a) - \mu_{y(a)} - \beta(d_i(a) - \mu_{d(a)})| \quad (\text{B.110})$$

$$+ \frac{n - n_a}{n} |\hat{\mu}_{y(1)} - \hat{\mu}_{y(0)} - \beta(\hat{\mu}_{d(1)} - \hat{\mu}_{d(0)})| \quad (\text{B.111})$$

$$+ |\hat{\mu}_{y(a)} - \mu_{y(a)} - \beta(\hat{\mu}_{d(a)} - \mu_{d(a)})| \quad (\text{B.112})$$

Proof. We give the proof only for the case $Z_i = 1$, since the other case is similar. By (B.105), we have

$$\begin{aligned} & |Y_i - \mu_Y - \beta(D_i - \mu_D)| \\ &= \left| y_i(1) - \frac{n_1}{n} \hat{\mu}_{y(1)} - \frac{n_0}{n} \hat{\mu}_{y(0)} - \beta \left(d_i(1) - \frac{n_1}{n} \hat{\mu}_{d(1)} - \frac{n_0}{n} \hat{\mu}_{d(0)} \right) \right| \\ &= \left| y_i(1) - \hat{\mu}_{y(1)} + \frac{n_0}{n} (\hat{\mu}_{y(1)} - \hat{\mu}_{y(0)}) - \beta \left(d_i(1) - \hat{\mu}_{d(1)} + \frac{n_0}{n} (\hat{\mu}_{d(1)} - \hat{\mu}_{d(0)}) \right) \right| \\ &\leq |y_i(1) - \hat{\mu}_{y(1)} - \beta(d_i(1) - \hat{\mu}_{d(1)})| + \frac{n_0}{n} |\hat{\mu}_{y(1)} - \hat{\mu}_{y(0)} - \beta(\hat{\mu}_{d(1)} - \hat{\mu}_{d(0)})| \\ &\leq |y_i(1) - \mu_{y(1)} - \beta(d_i(1) - \mu_{d(1)})| + \frac{n_0}{n} |\hat{\mu}_{y(1)} - \hat{\mu}_{y(0)} - \beta(\hat{\mu}_{d(1)} - \hat{\mu}_{d(0)})| \\ &\quad + |\hat{\mu}_{y(1)} - \mu_{y(1)} - \beta(\hat{\mu}_{d(1)} - \mu_{d(1)})|. \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof. \square

Lemma B.15. Let $\{\theta_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ be a sequence of experiments such that $\theta_n \in \Theta_n$ for all $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$. Then for each $a \in \{0, 1\}$, we have the almost sure limit

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n_a^2} \frac{\max_{i \in [n]} |Y_i - \mu_Y - \beta_n(D_i - \mu_D)|^2}{\text{Var}^*(\hat{\tau}^*(\beta_n))} = 0, \quad (\text{B.113})$$

where $\beta_n = \text{LATE}(\theta_n)$.

Proof. First, observe that Lemma B.13 implies

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i \in [n]} (Y_i - \mu_Y - \beta D_i + \beta \mu_D)^2 &= \sum_{a \in \{0, 1\}} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{T}(a)} (y_i(a) - \hat{\mu}_{y(a)} - \beta d_i(a) + \beta \hat{\mu}_{d(a)})^2 \\ &\quad + \sum_{a \in \{0, 1\}} n_a (\hat{\mu}_{y(a)} - \beta \hat{\mu}_{d(a)} - \mu_Y + \beta \mu_D)^2 \\ &= \sum_{a \in \{0, 1\}} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{T}(a)} (y_i(a) - \hat{\mu}_{y(a)} - \beta d_i(a) + \beta \hat{\mu}_{d(a)})^2 \\ &\quad + 2 \frac{n_0 n_1}{n} (\hat{\mu}_{y(1)} - \hat{\mu}_{y(0)} - \beta(\hat{\mu}_{d(1)} - \hat{\mu}_{d(0)}))^2. \quad (\text{B.114}) \end{aligned}$$

For all $a \in \{0, 1\}$, we have by (B.103), (B.104), and (A.36) that

$$\min_{\beta \in \mathbb{R}} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{T}(a)} (y_i(a) - \hat{\mu}_{y(a)} - \beta d_i(a) + \beta \hat{\mu}_{d(a)})^2 \quad (\text{B.115})$$

$$\geq \left(\sum_{i \in \mathcal{T}(a)} (y_i(a) - \hat{\mu}_{y(a)})^2 - \frac{\left(\sum_{i \in \mathcal{T}(a)} (y_i(a) - \hat{\mu}_{y(a)}) (d_i(a) - \hat{\mu}_{d(a)}) \right)^2}{\sum_{i \in \mathcal{T}(a)} (d_i(a) - \hat{\mu}_{d(a)})^2} \right) \quad (\text{B.116})$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\geq n_a \left(\frac{1}{n_a} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{T}(a)} (y_i(a) - \hat{\mu}_{y(a)})^2 - \frac{\left(n_a^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{T}(a)} (y_i(a) - \hat{\mu}_{y(a)}) (d_i(a) - \hat{\mu}_{d(a)}) \right)^2}{n_a^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{T}(a)} (d_i(a) - \hat{\mu}_{d(a)})^2} \right) \\ &\geq n_a \left(\sigma_{y(a)}^2 (1 + o(1)) - \left(\frac{\sigma_{y(a), d(a)}}{\sigma_{y(a)} \sigma_{d(a)}} \right)^2 \frac{\sigma_{y(a)}^2 \sigma_{d(a)}^2}{\sigma_{d(a)}^2} (1 + o(1)) \right) \\ &\geq n_a \left(\sigma_{y(a)}^2 (1 - \delta^2) (1 + o(1)) \right). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.117})$$

We note that (B.116) is by an argument similar to the one starting at (B.61). An argument similar to the one leading to (B.67) also yields

$$\min_{\beta \in \mathbb{R}} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{T}(a)} (y_i(a) - \hat{\mu}_{y(a)} - \beta d_i(a) + \beta \hat{\mu}_{d(a)})^2 \geq \beta^2 n_a \left(\sigma_{d(a)}^2 (1 - \delta^2) (1 + o(1)) \right). \quad (\text{B.118})$$

Using the previous two inequalities, the randomization-based variance can be lower-bounded as

$$\text{Var}^*(\hat{\tau}^*(\beta_n)) \quad (\text{B.119})$$

$$= \frac{n}{n_1 n_0} \frac{\pi^2 (1 - \pi)^2}{n - 1} \sum_{i \in [n]} (Y_i - \beta_n D_i - (\mu_Y - \beta_n \mu_D))^2 \quad (\text{B.120})$$

$$\geq \frac{n}{n_1 n_0} \frac{\pi^2 (1 - \pi)^2}{n - 1} \quad (\text{B.121})$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\times \max \left\{ \sum_{a \in \{0, 1\}} n_a \left(\sigma_{y(a)}^2 (1 - \delta^2) \right), \beta_n^2 \sum_{a \in \{0, 1\}} n_a \left(\sigma_{d(a)}^2 (1 - \delta^2) \right) \right\} (1 + o(1)) \\ &\geq \frac{\pi^2 (1 - \pi)^2}{n - 1} \quad (\text{B.122}) \end{aligned}$$

$$\times \max_{a \in \{0, 1\}} \left\{ \max \left\{ \frac{n}{n - n_a} \sigma_{y(a)}^2 (1 - \delta^2), \beta_n^2 \frac{n}{n - n_a} \sigma_{d(a)}^2 (1 - \delta^2) \right\} \right\} (1 + o(1)).$$

Finally, using (B.114), Lemma B.5, Lemma B.12, and Lemma B.13,

$$\frac{1}{n_a^2} \frac{\max_{i \in [n]} |Y_i - \mu_Y - \beta_n(D_i - \mu_D)|^2}{\text{Var}^*(\hat{\tau}^*(\beta_n))} \quad (\text{B.123})$$

$$\lesssim \frac{1}{n^2} \frac{\max_{i \in [n]} |y_i(1) - \mu_{y(1)} - \beta_n(d_i(1) - \mu_{d(1)})|^2}{\text{Var}^*(\hat{\tau}^*(\beta_n))} \quad (\text{B.124})$$

$$+ \frac{1}{n^2} \frac{\max_{i \in [n]} |y_i(0) - \mu_{y(0)} - \beta_n(d_i(0) - \mu_{d(0)})|^2}{\text{Var}^*(\hat{\tau}^*(\beta_n))} \quad (\text{B.125})$$

$$+ \frac{1}{n^2} \frac{|\hat{\mu}_{y(1)} - \hat{\mu}_{y(0)} - \beta_n(\hat{\mu}_{d(1)} - \hat{\mu}_{d(0)})|^2}{\text{Var}^*(\hat{\tau}^*(\beta_n))} \quad (\text{B.126})$$

$$+ \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{a \in \{0,1\}} \frac{|\hat{\mu}_{y(a)} - \mu_{y(a)}|^2}{\text{Var}^*(\hat{\tau}^*(\beta_n))} + \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{a \in \{0,1\}} \beta_n^2 \frac{|\hat{\mu}_{d(a)} - \mu_{d(a)}|^2}{\text{Var}^*(\hat{\tau}^*(\beta_n))} \quad (\text{B.127})$$

$$\lesssim \frac{1}{n} \sum_{a \in \{0,1\}} \frac{\max_{i \in [n]} |y_i(a) - \mu_{y(a)}|^2}{\sigma_{y(a)}^2(1 + o(1))} + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{a \in \{0,1\}} \frac{\max_{i \in [n]} |d_i(a) - \mu_{d(a)}|^2}{\sigma_{d(a)}^2(1 + o(1))} \quad (\text{B.128})$$

$$+ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{a \in \{0,1\}} \frac{|\hat{\mu}_{y(a)} - \mu_{y(a)}|^2}{\sigma_{y(a)}^2} + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{a \in \{0,1\}} \frac{|\hat{\mu}_{d(a)} - \mu_{d(a)}|^2}{\sigma_{d(a)}^2} \quad (\text{B.129})$$

$$+ \frac{1}{n} \frac{(\hat{\mu}_{y(1)} - \hat{\mu}_{y(0)} - \beta_n(\hat{\mu}_{d(1)} - \hat{\mu}_{d(0)}))^2}{(\hat{\mu}_{y(1)} - \hat{\mu}_{y(0)} - \beta_n(\hat{\mu}_{d(1)} - \hat{\mu}_{d(0)}))^2} \quad (\text{B.130})$$

$$= o(1). \quad (\text{B.131})$$

We remark that the term (B.130) comes from (B.126), after using (B.114) to lower bound the variance in the denominator through (B.94). The argument under (A.37) is similar. \square

The following lemma establishes the convergence of the variance estimator $\hat{\sigma}^*(\beta)$.

Lemma B.16. Let $\{\theta_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ be a sequence of experiments such that $\theta_n \in \Theta_n$ for all $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, and set $\beta_n = \text{LATE}(\theta_n)$. Then for every $\kappa > 0$, we have

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow 0} \mathbb{P}^* \left(\left| \frac{\hat{\sigma}^*(\beta_n)}{\text{Var}^*(\hat{\tau}^*(\beta_n))} - 1 \right| \geq \kappa \right) = 0 \quad (\text{B.132})$$

almost surely (with respect to the randomness in Z).

Proof. The proof is similar to that of Lemma B.10, using the Markov and Chebyshev inequalities and the estimates in the proof of Lemma B.15. \square

Proof of Theorem A.5. We begin by showing that for every $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ and $\kappa > 0$,

$$\lim_{\kappa \rightarrow 0^+} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \inf_{\beta \in \mathbb{R}} \inf_{\{\theta \in \Theta_n : \text{LATE}(\theta) = \beta\}} \mathbb{P}_\theta \left(|\hat{u}_{1-\alpha}(\beta, Z) - |z_{1-\alpha/2}|| \geq \kappa \right) = 0. \quad (\text{B.133})$$

We again proceed by contradiction. Suppose (B.133) does not hold. Then there exists a subsequence of experiments $\{\theta_{n_k}\}_{k=1}^\infty$ and $\delta_1 > 0$ such that for all k ,

$$\mathbb{P}(|\hat{u}_{1-\alpha}(\beta, Z) - |z_{1-\alpha/2}|| \geq \kappa) > \delta_1. \quad (\text{B.134})$$

However, by Theorem B.2, Lemma B.15, and Lemma B.16 the distribution of $\Delta^*(\beta)$ under \mathbb{P}^* converges to the normal distribution almost surely. As a consequence of this convergence in distribution and [VdV00, Lemma 21.2], which states that convergence in distribution implies convergence in quantiles, the critical value $\hat{\eta}_{1-\alpha/2}(\beta, Z)$ converges to $|z_{1-\alpha/2}|$ almost surely under \mathbb{P}^* . This is a contradiction, which proves (B.133). The theorem then follows from Theorem B.11 (though another proof by contradiction). \square

APPENDIX C. REGRESSION ADJUSTMENT

C.1. Notation. In this section and the next, we retain the notation and definitions set out in Appendix A.1. To state our result on covariate adjustment, we begin by generalizing our previous definition of an experiment to include covariates.

Definition C.1. An *experiment with covariates* is a 6-tuple $\theta = (n, n_1, k, d, y, X)$, where n, n_1, d , and y are defined as in Definition A.1, $k \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, and $X \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times n}$ is a $k \times n$ matrix. We let x_i denote the i -th column of X , corresponding to the observed covariates for the i -th unit, and x_{ij} denote the (i, j) entry of X . A *sequence of experiments with covariates* is defined analogously to Definition A.2.

C.1.1. Least-Squares Parameters. We define the least-squares regression parameters

$$\varphi(a, \beta): \{0, 1\} \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, \quad \gamma(a, \beta): \{0, 1\} \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^k, \quad (\text{C.135})$$

by

$$(\varphi(a, \beta), \gamma(a, \beta)) = \arg \min_{(s, t) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^k} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (w_i(a, \beta) - s - x_i' t)^2, \quad (\text{C.136})$$

where we interpret t as a column vector and use the notation $w_i(a, \beta) = w_i(a)$ to emphasize the dependence on β (recall (A.12)).¹ We also define the residuals for (C.136) by

$$\varepsilon_i(a, \beta) = w_i(a, \beta) - \varphi(a, \beta) - x_i' \gamma(a, \beta). \quad (\text{C.137})$$

The parameters $\varphi^*(\beta)$ and $\gamma^*(\beta)$ are defined similarly, by replacing $w_i(a, \beta)$ with $W_i(\beta)$ in (C.136), and we define $\varepsilon_i^*(\beta)$ by

$$\varepsilon_i^*(\beta) = W_i(\beta) - \varphi^*(\beta) - x_i' \gamma^*(\beta). \quad (\text{C.138})$$

We also define

$$(\varphi_y(a), \gamma_y(a)) = \arg \min_{(s, t) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^k} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (y_i(a) - s - x_i' t)^2, \quad (\text{C.139})$$

¹When there is not a unique minimizer, we choose one arbitrarily.

$$(\varphi_d(a), \gamma_d(a)) = \arg \min_{(s,t) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^k} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (d_i(a) - s - x'_i t)^2, \quad (\text{C.140})$$

whose associated residuals are

$$u_i(a) = y_i(a) - \varphi_y(a) - x'_i \gamma_y(a), \quad v_i(a) = d_i(a) - \varphi_d(a) - x'_i \gamma_d(a). \quad (\text{C.141})$$

C.1.2. Estimators. Recalling that $\mathcal{T}(a)$ was defined before (B.96), we define, for each $a \in \{0, 1\}$,

$$(\hat{\varphi}(a, \beta), \hat{\gamma}(a, \beta)) = \arg \min_{(s,t) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^k} \frac{1}{n_a} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{T}(a)} (w_i(a, \beta) - s - x'_i t)^2. \quad (\text{C.142})$$

We define $\hat{\varphi}^*(a, \beta)$ and $\hat{\gamma}^*(a, \beta)$ similarly by replacing $\mathcal{T}(a)$ with $\mathcal{T}^*(a)$ in (C.142), where we define $\mathcal{T}^*(a)$ analogously using the Z_i^* in place of the Z_i . The associated residual estimators are

$$\hat{\varepsilon}_i(\beta) = W_i(\beta) - \hat{\varphi}(Z_i, \beta) - x'_i \hat{\gamma}(Z_i, \beta), \quad (\text{C.143})$$

$$\hat{\varepsilon}_i^*(\beta) = W_i(\beta) - \hat{\varphi}^*(Z_i^*, \beta) - x'_i \hat{\gamma}^*(Z_i^*, \beta). \quad (\text{C.144})$$

We also define

$$(\hat{\varphi}_y(a), \hat{\gamma}_y(a)) = \arg \min_{(s,t) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^k} \frac{1}{n_a} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{T}(a)} (Y_i - s - x'_i t)^2, \quad (\text{C.145})$$

$$(\hat{\varphi}_d(a), \hat{\gamma}_d(a)) = \arg \min_{(s,t) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^k} \frac{1}{n_a} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{T}(a)} (D_i - s - x'_i t)^2, \quad (\text{C.146})$$

whose associated residuals are

$$\hat{u}_i = Y_i - \hat{\varphi}_y(Z_i) - x'_i \hat{\gamma}_y(Z_i), \quad \hat{v}_i = D_i - \hat{\varphi}_d(Z_i) - x'_i \hat{\gamma}_d(Z_i). \quad (\text{C.147})$$

We define the covariate-adjusted estimator

$$\hat{\tau}_{\text{adj}}(\beta) = \frac{1}{n_1} \sum_{i \in [n]} Z_i (W_i(\beta) - x'_i \hat{\gamma}(1, \beta)) - \frac{1}{n_0} \sum_{i \in [n]} (1 - Z_i) (W_i(\beta) - x'_i \hat{\gamma}(0, \beta)), \quad (\text{C.148})$$

and we define the covariate-adjusted randomization estimator $\hat{\tau}_{\text{adj}}^*(\beta)$ analogously, again replacing Z_i by Z_i^* . We also define the variance estimators

$$\hat{\sigma}_{\text{adj}}^2(\beta) = \frac{1}{n_1^2} \sum_{i \in [n]} Z_i \hat{\varepsilon}_i(\beta)^2 + \frac{1}{n_0^2} \sum_{i \in [n]} (1 - Z_i) \hat{\varepsilon}_i(\beta)^2, \quad (\text{C.149})$$

$$\hat{\sigma}_{\text{adj},*}^2(\beta) = \frac{1}{n_1^2} \sum_{i \in [n]} Z_i^* \hat{\varepsilon}_i^*(\beta)^2 + \frac{1}{n_0^2} \sum_{i \in [n]} (1 - Z_i^*) \hat{\varepsilon}_i^*(\beta)^2. \quad (\text{C.150})$$

The adjusted studentized difference in means estimators are

$$\hat{\Delta}_{\text{adj}}(\beta) = \frac{\hat{\tau}_{\text{adj}}(\beta)}{\hat{\sigma}_{\text{adj}}^2(\beta)}, \quad \hat{\Delta}_{\text{adj}}^*(\beta) = \frac{\hat{\tau}_{\text{adj}}^*(\beta)}{\hat{\sigma}_{\text{adj},*}^2(\beta)}. \quad (\text{C.151})$$

The distribution of $|\Delta_{\text{adj}}^*(\beta)|$ under \mathbb{P}^* , which is a function of Z , is discrete and supported on $[0, \infty)$. Given $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, we define $\hat{\eta}_{1-\alpha}^{\text{adj}}(\beta, Z)$ to be the smallest real number in $[0, \infty)$ such that

$$\mathbb{P}^* \left(|\Delta_{\text{adj}}^*(\beta)| \leq \hat{\eta}_{1-\alpha}^{\text{adj}}(\beta, Z) \right) \geq 1 - \alpha. \quad (\text{C.152})$$

We define the confidence region

$$\hat{I}_{1-\alpha}^{\text{adj}}(Z) = \{\beta \in \mathbb{R} : \Delta(\beta) \leq \hat{\eta}_{1-\alpha}^{\text{adj}}(\beta, Z)\}. \quad (\text{C.153})$$

C.1.3. Infeasible Estimator. To analyze the asymptotic behavior of $\hat{\tau}_{\text{adj}}(\beta)$, we define the infeasible estimator

$$\tilde{\tau}_{\text{adj}}(\beta) = \frac{1}{n_1} \sum_{i \in [n]} Z_i (w_i(1, \beta) - x_i' \gamma(1, \beta)) - \frac{1}{n_0} \sum_{i \in [n]} (1 - Z_i) (w_i(0, \beta) - x_i' \gamma(0, \beta)). \quad (\text{C.154})$$

The infeasible estimator $\tilde{\tau}_{\text{adj}}^*(\beta)$ is defined similarly, replacing Z_i by Z_i^* .

C.2. Assumptions.

Definition C.2. Given $k, n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, $r \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$, $\delta, \tilde{\varepsilon} \in (0, 1)$, and $A > 0$, we define $\Xi_n(\tilde{\varepsilon}, \delta, r, A, k)$ as the set of experiments with covariates $\theta = (n, n_0, k, d, y, X)$ such that Assumption 1, Assumption 2, and the following conditions hold. We abbreviate $\beta = \text{LATE}(\theta)$.

(i) We have

$$n_1 \in [rn, (1-r)n]. \quad (\text{C.155})$$

(ii) We have

$$\frac{\sigma_{\varepsilon(1, \beta), \varepsilon(0, \beta)}}{\sigma_{\varepsilon(1, \beta)} \sigma_{\varepsilon(0, \beta)}} \geq -\delta. \quad (\text{C.156})$$

(iii) For each $a \in \{0, 1\}$,

$$\frac{\sigma_{u(a), v(a)}}{\sigma_{u(a)} \sigma_{v(a)}} \leq \delta. \quad (\text{C.157})$$

(iv) For each $a \in \{0, 1\}$,

$$\left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in [n]} u_i(a)^4 \right)^{1/4} \leq A \sigma_{u(a)}. \quad (\text{C.158})$$

(v) For each $a \in \{0, 1\}$,

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in [n]} (v_i(a) - \mu_{v(a)})^2 \geq \tilde{\varepsilon}. \quad (\text{C.159})$$

(vi) We have

$$\sum_{i=1}^n x_i = 0_k, \quad (\text{C.160})$$

where 0_k denotes the zero vector in \mathbb{R}^k .

(vii) For all $s \in [k]$,

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n x_{si}^4 \leq A. \quad (\text{C.161})$$

(viii) Let λ_{\min} denote the smallest eigenvalue of $n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n x_i x_i'$. Then

$$\lambda_{\min} \geq \tilde{\varepsilon}. \quad (\text{C.162})$$

If any of the denominators in these conditions are zero, our convention is that the corresponding θ is not contained in Ξ_n .

C.3. Result.

Theorem C.3. Fix $k \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, $\alpha, \varepsilon_0, \delta_0 \in (0, 1)$, $r \in (0, 1/2)$, and $A > 0$, and set $\Xi_n = \Xi_n(\varepsilon_0, \delta_0, r, A, k)$. Then

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \inf_{\beta \in \mathbb{R}} \inf_{\{\theta \in \Xi_n : \text{LATE}(\theta) = \beta\}} \mathbb{P}_\theta(\beta \in \hat{I}_{1-\alpha}^{\text{adj}}(Z)) \geq 1 - \alpha. \quad (\text{C.163})$$

APPENDIX D. PROOF FOR REGRESSION ADJUSTMENT

Throughout this section, we let $\varepsilon_0, \delta_0, r, A, k$ be the constants fixed in the statement of Theorem C.3, and set $\Theta_n = \Theta_n(\varepsilon_0, \delta_0, r, A)$.

D.1. Preliminary Results.

D.1.1. Regression Results. Denote $x_i^\circ = [0, x_i] \in \mathbb{R}^{k+1}$ and $\tilde{x}_i = [1, x_i] \in \mathbb{R}^{k+1}$. For $a \in \{0, 1\}$, define

$$\psi(a, \beta) = \begin{bmatrix} \varphi(a, \beta) \\ \gamma(a, \beta) \end{bmatrix}, \quad \hat{\psi}(a, \beta) = \begin{bmatrix} \hat{\varphi}(a, \beta) \\ \hat{\gamma}(a, \beta) \end{bmatrix}. \quad (\text{D.164})$$

Lemma D.1. Let θ be an experiment with covariates and suppose that (C.160) holds. Then for all $\beta \in \mathbb{R}$, the following claims hold.

(1) We have

$$\hat{\psi}(1, \beta) - \psi(1, \beta) = \left(\frac{1}{n_1} \sum_{i \in [n]} Z_i \tilde{x}_i \tilde{x}_i' \right)^{-1} \frac{1}{n_1} \sum_{i \in [n]} Z_i \tilde{x}_i \varepsilon_i(1, \beta) \quad (\text{D.165})$$

and

$$\hat{\psi}(0, \beta) - \psi(0, \beta) = \left(\frac{1}{n_0} \sum_{i \in [n]} (1 - Z_i) \tilde{x}_i \tilde{x}_i' \right)^{-1} \frac{1}{n_0} \sum_{i \in [n]} (1 - Z_i) \tilde{x}_i \varepsilon_i(0, \beta). \quad (\text{D.166})$$

(2) For each $a \in \{0, 1\}$,

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \tilde{x}_i \varepsilon_i(a, \beta) = 0_{k+1}. \quad (\text{D.167})$$

(3) We have

$$u_i(a) - \beta v_i(a) = \varepsilon_i(a, \beta) \quad (\text{D.168})$$

for each $a \in \{0, 1\}$ and all $i \in [n]$.

Proof. The claim (D.165) follows from the usual ordinary least squares formula, where we simplified the first factor on the left-hand side of the equation using the assumption (C.160). The equality (D.167) follows from the well-known fact that the residuals of the ordinary least squares solution are orthogonal to the column space of the matrix of regressors. The last claim follows by noting that

$$\varphi(a, \beta) = \varphi_y(a) - \beta \varphi_d(a), \quad \gamma(a, \beta) = \gamma_y(a) - \beta \gamma_d(a), \quad (\text{D.169})$$

which in turn follows from the explicit formula for the ordinary least squares solution. \square

D.1.2. Variance Representations. A straightforward adaptation of Lemma B.1 shows that

$$\text{Var}(\tilde{\tau}_{\text{adj}}(\beta)) = \frac{\mathcal{S}_1^2(\beta)}{n_1} + \frac{\mathcal{S}_0^2(\beta)}{n_0} - \frac{\mathcal{S}_{10}^2(\beta)}{n}, \quad (\text{D.170})$$

where

$$\mathcal{S}_1^2(\beta) = \frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{i \in [n]} \varepsilon_i(1, \beta)^2, \quad (\text{D.171})$$

$$\mathcal{S}_0^2(\beta) = \frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{i \in [n]} \varepsilon_i(0, \beta)^2, \quad (\text{D.172})$$

$$\mathcal{S}_{10}^2(\beta) = \frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{i \in [n]} (\varepsilon_i(1, \beta) - \varepsilon_i(0, \beta))^2. \quad (\text{D.173})$$

Similarly,

$$\text{Var}^*(\tilde{\tau}_{\text{adj}}^*(\beta)) = \frac{\mathcal{S}_{1,*}^2(\beta)}{n_1} + \frac{\mathcal{S}_{0,*}^2(\beta)}{n_0}, \quad \mathcal{S}_{1,*}^2(\beta) = \mathcal{S}_{0,*}^2(\beta) = \frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{i \in [n]} \varepsilon_i^*(\beta)^2 \quad (\text{D.174})$$

D.2. Covariate-Adjusted Estimator.

Lemma D.2. Let $\{\theta_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ be a sequence of experiments with covariates such that $\theta_n \in \Xi_n$ for all $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, and set $\beta = \text{LATE}(\theta_n)$. The following claims hold.

(1) For each $a \in \{0, 1\}$,

$$\max_{i \in [n]} \frac{|u_i(a)|}{\sigma_{u(a)}} \leq An^{1/4}. \quad (\text{D.175})$$

(2) We have

$$\text{Var}(\tilde{\tau}_{\text{adj}}(\beta)) \geq (1 - \delta) \frac{n_0}{n_1 n} \mathcal{S}_1^2(\beta) + (1 - \delta) \frac{n_1}{n_0 n} \mathcal{S}_0^2(\beta). \quad (\text{D.176})$$

(3) Let $\tilde{x}_i = (1, x_i) \in \mathbb{R}^{k+1}$. Then

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \max_{i \in [n]} \|\tilde{x}_i\|_2^2 = 0. \quad (\text{D.177})$$

(4) For each $a \in \{0, 1\}$,

$$\frac{1}{n} \frac{\max_{i \in [n]} v_i(a)^2}{\sigma_{v(a)}^2} = o(1). \quad (\text{D.178})$$

(5) For each $a \in \{0, 1\}$,

$$\frac{n_a \max_{i \in [n]} \varepsilon_i(a, \beta)^2}{\sum_{i \in [n]} \varepsilon_i(a, \beta)^2} = o(n), \quad (\text{D.179})$$

and

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n_a^2} \frac{\max_{i \in [n]} \varepsilon_i(a, \beta)^2}{\text{Var}(\tilde{\tau}_{\text{adj}}(\beta))} = 0. \quad (\text{D.180})$$

Proof. The first claim can be proved similarly to Lemma B.5. To prove the second claim, note that assumption (C.156) implies

$$\sum_{i \in [n]} (\varepsilon_i(1, \beta) - \varepsilon_i(0, \beta))^2 \quad (\text{D.181})$$

$$= \sum_{i \in [n]} \varepsilon_i(1, \beta)^2 + \sum_{i \in [n]} \varepsilon_i(0, \beta)^2 - 2 \sum_{i \in [n]} \varepsilon_i(1, \beta) \varepsilon_i(0, \beta) \quad (\text{D.182})$$

$$\leq \left(1 + \frac{\delta n_0}{n_1}\right) \sum_{i \in [n]} \varepsilon_i(1, \beta)^2 + \left(1 + \frac{\delta n_1}{n_0}\right) \sum_{i \in [n]} \varepsilon_i(0, \beta)^2. \quad (\text{D.183})$$

Therefore, recalling (D.170),

$$(n-1) \text{Var}(\tilde{\tau}_{\text{adj}}(\beta)) \quad (\text{D.184})$$

$$= \frac{1}{n_1} \sum_{i \in [n]} \varepsilon_i(1, \beta)^2 + \frac{1}{n_0} \sum_{i \in [n]} \varepsilon_i(0, \beta)^2 - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in [n]} (\varepsilon_i(0, \beta) - \varepsilon_i(1, \beta))^2 \quad (\text{D.185})$$

$$\geq \left(\frac{1}{n_1} - \frac{1}{n} - \frac{\delta n_0}{n_1 n}\right) \sum_{i \in [n]} \varepsilon_i(1, \beta)^2 + \left(\frac{1}{n_0} - \frac{1}{n} - \frac{\delta n_1}{n_0 n}\right) \sum_{i \in [n]} \varepsilon_i(0, \beta)^2 \quad (\text{D.186})$$

$$= \frac{n_0}{n_1 n} (1 - \delta) \sum_{i \in [n]} \varepsilon_i(1, \beta)^2 + \frac{n_1}{n_0 n} (1 - \delta) \sum_{i \in [n]} \varepsilon_i(0, \beta)^2, \quad (\text{D.187})$$

which is (D.176).

For (D.177), note that for all $s \in [k]$, assumption (C.161) implies that

$$\max_{i \in [n]} |x_{si}| \leq (An)^{1/4}, \quad \max_{i \in [n]} \|\tilde{x}_i\|_2^2 = 1 + \sum_{s=1}^k \max_{i \in [n]} |x_{si}|^2 \lesssim n^{1/2}, \quad (\text{D.188})$$

which implies the conclusion.

Next, by the definition of $v_i(a)$, the standard formula for the ordinary least squares estimator, and the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality, we have

$$\frac{1}{n} \frac{\max_{i \in [n]} v_i(a)^2}{\sigma_{v(a)}^2} \quad (\text{D.189})$$

$$\lesssim \frac{1}{n} \frac{\max_{i \in [n]} d_i(a)^2}{\sigma_{v(a)}^2} \quad (\text{D.190})$$

$$+ \frac{1}{n} \frac{\max_{i \in [n]} \|\tilde{x}_i\|_2^2 \times \left\| \left(\sum_{i \in [n]} \tilde{x}_i \tilde{x}_i' \right)^{-1} \times \sum_{i \in [n]} x_i d_i(a) \right\|_2^2}{\sigma_{v(a)}^2} \quad (\text{D.191})$$

$$\leq \frac{1}{n} \frac{\max_{i \in [n]} d_i(a)^2}{\sigma_{v(a)}^2} \quad (\text{D.192})$$

$$+ \frac{1}{n} \frac{\max_{i \in [n]} \|\tilde{x}_i\|_2^2 \times \left\| \left(n^{-1} \sum_{i \in [n]} \tilde{x}_i \tilde{x}_i' \right)^{-1} \right\|_2^2 \times \left\| n^{-1} \sum_{i \in [n]} x_i \right\|_2^2}{\sigma_{v(a)}^2} \quad (\text{D.193})$$

$$= o(1), \quad (\text{D.194})$$

where the last line follows from (C.159), and (C.162), and (D.177),

Next, we note that (D.179) can be proved similarly to Lemma B.8 using (C.158), (D.168), (D.178), and the reasoning in equations (B.70) through (B.73). Then (D.180) follows from using the lower bound in (D.187). \square

The following lemma collects auxiliary results about the estimators $\hat{\tau}_{\text{adj}}$ and $\tilde{\tau}_{\text{adj}}$.

Lemma D.3. Below, we denote $\beta = \text{LATE}(\theta)$. The following claims hold.

(1) For every $\kappa > 0$

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{\theta \in \Xi_n} \mathbb{P}_\theta \left(|\tilde{\tau}_{\text{adj}}(\beta) - \hat{\tau}_{\text{adj}}(\beta)| \geq \kappa \sqrt{\text{Var}(\tilde{\tau}_{\text{adj}}(\beta))} \right) = 0. \quad (\text{D.195})$$

(2) For any $x \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{\theta \in \Xi_n} \left| \mathbb{P}_\theta \left(\left| \frac{\tilde{\tau}_{\text{adj}}(\beta)}{\sqrt{\text{Var}(\tilde{\tau}_{\text{adj}}(\beta))}} \right| \geq x \right) - \mathbb{P}(|\mathcal{N}| \geq x) \right| = 0. \quad (\text{D.196})$$

(3) For every $x \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{\theta \in \Xi_n} \left| \mathbb{P}_\theta \left(\left| \frac{\hat{\tau}_{\text{adj}}(\beta)}{\sqrt{\text{Var}(\hat{\tau}_{\text{adj}}(\beta))}} \right| \geq x \right) - \mathbb{P}(|\mathcal{N}| \geq x) \right| = 0. \quad (\text{D.197})$$

- (4) Let $\{\theta_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ be a sequence of experiments with covariates such that $\theta_n \in \Xi_n$ for all $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$. Then, in probability,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{n_1^{-2} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{T}(1)} \hat{\varepsilon}_i(1, \beta)^2 + n_0^{-2} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{T}(0)} \hat{\varepsilon}_i(0, \beta)^2}{n_1^{-1} \mathcal{S}_1^2(\beta) + n_0^{-1} \mathcal{S}_0^2(\beta)} = 1. \quad (\text{D.198})$$

Proof. We begin with (D.195). By the definitions of $\hat{\tau}_{\text{adj}}(\beta)$ and $\tilde{\tau}_{\text{adj}}(\beta)$,

$$\hat{\tau}_{\text{adj}}(\beta) - \tilde{\tau}_{\text{adj}}(\beta) = \frac{1}{n_1} \sum_{i=1}^n Z_i x_i' (\hat{\gamma}(1, \beta) - \gamma(1, \beta)) - \frac{1}{n_1} \sum_{i=1}^n (1 - Z_i) x_i' (\hat{\gamma}(0, \beta) - \gamma(0, \beta)).$$

Recalling the notation $x_i^\circ = [0, x_i] \in \mathbb{R}^{k+1}$ and $\tilde{x}_i = [1, x_i] \in \mathbb{R}^{k+1}$, and using (D.165), the previous expression becomes

$$\hat{\tau}_{\text{adj}}(\beta) - \tilde{\tau}_{\text{adj}}(\beta) \quad (\text{D.199})$$

$$= \frac{1}{n_1} \sum_{i=1}^n Z_i x_i^{\circ'} \left(\frac{1}{n_1} \sum_{i \in [n]} Z_i \tilde{x}_i \tilde{x}_i' \right)^{-1} \frac{1}{n_1} \sum_{i \in [n]} Z_i \tilde{x}_i \varepsilon_i(1, \beta) \quad (\text{D.200})$$

$$- \frac{1}{n_0} \sum_{i=1}^n (1 - Z_i) x_i^{\circ'} \left(\frac{1}{n_0} \sum_{i \in [n]} (1 - Z_i) \tilde{x}_i \tilde{x}_i' \right)^{-1} \frac{1}{n_0} \sum_{i \in [n]} (1 - Z_i) \tilde{x}_i \varepsilon_i(0, \beta). \quad (\text{D.201})$$

By assumptions (C.161) and (C.162) and the fact that the number of covariates k does not depend on n , we have (with the asymptotic O notation applying entrywise)

$$\frac{1}{n_1} \sum_{i=1}^n Z_i x_i^{\circ'} = O_p \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \right) \quad (\text{D.202})$$

$$\frac{1}{n_0} \sum_{i=1}^n (1 - Z_i) x_i^{\circ'} = O_p \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \right), \quad (\text{D.203})$$

$$\left(\frac{1}{n_1} \sum_{i \in [n]} Z_i \tilde{x}_i \tilde{x}_i' \right)^{-1} = O_p(1), \quad (\text{D.204})$$

$$\left(\frac{1}{n_0} \sum_{i \in [n]} (1 - Z_i) \tilde{x}_i \tilde{x}_i' \right)^{-1} = O_p(1). \quad (\text{D.205})$$

These bounds are justified by observing that the random vectors in (D.202) and (D.203), and the random matrices being inverted in (D.204) and (D.205), each concentrate about their mean by Chebyshev's inequality.

Further, we observe that the random vector

$$\frac{1}{n_1} \sum_{i \in [n]} Z_i \tilde{x}_i \varepsilon_i(1, \beta) \quad (\text{D.206})$$

has mean zero, and a straightforward computation using (D.167) shows that its covariance matrix is

$$\frac{n_0}{n_1 n} \frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{i \in [n]} \tilde{x}_i \tilde{x}_i' \varepsilon_i(1, \beta)^2. \quad (\text{D.207})$$

Next, using (D.176), then (D.179) and (D.188), we find that

$$\frac{n_0}{n_1 n} \frac{1}{n-1} \frac{\|\sum_{i \in [n]} \tilde{x}_i \tilde{x}_i' \varepsilon_i(1, \beta)^2\|_2}{\text{Var}(\tilde{\tau}_\beta)} \quad (\text{D.208})$$

$$\leq \frac{n_0}{n_1 n} \frac{1}{(1-\delta)(n-1)} \left(\frac{\sum_{i \in [n]} \|\tilde{x}_i\|_2^2 \times \max_i \varepsilon_i(1, \beta)^2}{n_0(n_1 n)^{-1} \mathcal{S}_1^2(\beta) + n_1(n_0 n)^{-1} \mathcal{S}_0^2(\beta)} \right) \quad (\text{D.209})$$

$$\leq \frac{\sum_{i \in [n]} \|\tilde{x}_i\|_2^2}{(1-\delta)(n-1)} \frac{\max_i \varepsilon_i(1, \beta)^2}{\sum_{i \in [n]} \varepsilon_i(1, \beta)^2} = o(n). \quad (\text{D.210})$$

In particular, the diagonal (variance) elements of the covariance matrix (D.207) can be controlling using the previous display. After using Chebyshev's inequality to show that they concentrate about their respective means, we get

$$\frac{1}{n_1} \sum_{i \in [n]} Z_i \tilde{x}_i \varepsilon_i(1, \beta) = o_p \left(n \sqrt{\text{Var}(\tilde{\tau}_\beta)} \right). \quad (\text{D.211})$$

Then recalling (D.202) and (D.204), we find

$$\frac{1}{n_1 \sqrt{\text{Var}(\tilde{\tau}_\beta)}} \sum_{i=1}^n Z_i x_i^{\circ'} \left(\frac{1}{n_1} \sum_{i \in [n]} Z_i \tilde{x}_i \tilde{x}_i' \right)^{-1} \frac{1}{n_1} \sum_{i \in [n]} Z_i \tilde{x}_i \varepsilon_i(1, \beta) = o_p(1). \quad (\text{D.212})$$

A similar argument shows that

$$\frac{1}{n_0} \sum_{i=1}^n Z_i x_i^{\circ'} \left(\frac{1}{n_0} \sum_{i \in [n]} (1 - Z_i) \tilde{x}_i \tilde{x}_i' \right)^{-1} \frac{1}{n_0} \sum_{i \in [n]} (1 - Z_i) \tilde{x}_i \varepsilon_i(0, \beta) = o_p(1), \quad (\text{D.213})$$

This proves the first claim.

For the second claim, in (D.196), first notice that

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\tau}_{\text{adj}}^*(\beta) &= \frac{1}{n_1} \sum_{i \in [n]} (w_i(a, \beta) - x_i' \gamma(1, \beta)) - \frac{1}{n_0} \sum_{i \in [n]} (w_i(a, \beta) - x_i' \gamma(0, \beta)) \\ &= \frac{1}{n_1} \sum_{i \in [n]} (w_i(a, \beta) - \varphi(1, \beta) - x_i' \gamma(1, \beta)) - \frac{1}{n_0} \sum_{i \in [n]} (w_i(a, \beta) - \varphi(0, \beta) - x_i' \gamma(0, \beta)) \\ &= \frac{1}{n_1} \sum_{i \in [n]} \varepsilon_i(1, \beta) - \frac{1}{n_0} \sum_{i \in [n]} \varepsilon_i(0, \beta), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D.214})$$

where we use the fact that

$$\varphi(1, \beta) - \varphi(0, \beta) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in [n]} (w_i(1, \beta) - w_i(0, \beta)) = 0, \quad (\text{D.215})$$

which follows from the definition of $\varphi(a, \beta)$ and assumption (C.160). Then (D.3) then follows from Theorem B.2 and (D.179).

The third claim, in (D.197), follows from (D.196) and (D.197) after a routine argument.

To prove the last claim, in (D.198), first notice that by (C.143), we have the identities

$$Z_i \widehat{\varepsilon}_i(\beta)^2 = Z_i (w_i(1, \beta) - \widehat{\varphi}(1, \beta) - x'_i \widehat{\gamma}(1, \beta))^2, \quad (\text{D.216})$$

$$(1 - Z_i) \widehat{\varepsilon}_i(\beta)^2 = (1 - Z_i) (w_i(0, \beta) - \widehat{\varphi}(0, \beta) - x'_i \widehat{\gamma}(0, \beta))^2. \quad (\text{D.217})$$

Then

$$\frac{1}{n_1} \sum_{i \in [n]} Z_i \widehat{\varepsilon}_i(\beta)^2 - \frac{1}{n_1} \sum_{i \in [n]} Z_i \varepsilon_i(1, \beta)^2 \quad (\text{D.218})$$

$$= \frac{1}{n_1} \sum_{i \in [n]} Z_i (w_i(1, \beta) - \widehat{\varphi}(1, \beta) - x'_i \widehat{\gamma}(1, \beta))^2 \quad (\text{D.219})$$

$$- \frac{1}{n_1} \sum_{i \in [n]} Z_i (w_i(1, \beta) - \varphi(1, \beta) - x'_i \gamma(1, \beta))^2 \quad (\text{D.220})$$

$$= \frac{1}{n_1} \sum_{i \in [n]} Z_i (\varphi(1, \beta) + x'_i \gamma(1, \beta) - \widehat{\varphi}(1, \beta) - x'_i \widehat{\gamma}(1, \beta)) \quad (\text{D.221})$$

$$\times (2w_i(1, \beta) - \widehat{\varphi}(1, \beta) - x'_i \widehat{\gamma}(1, \beta) - \varphi(1, \beta) - x'_i \gamma(1, \beta)) \quad (\text{D.222})$$

$$= 2 \left(\frac{1}{n_1} \sum_{i \in [n]} Z_i \varepsilon_i(1, \beta) \tilde{x}_i' \begin{bmatrix} \varphi(1, \beta) - \widehat{\varphi}(1, \beta) \\ \gamma(1, \beta) - \widehat{\gamma}(1, \beta) \end{bmatrix} \right) \quad (\text{D.223})$$

$$- \frac{1}{n_1} \left(\begin{bmatrix} \varphi(1, \beta) - \widehat{\varphi}(1, \beta) \\ \gamma(1, \beta) - \widehat{\gamma}(1, \beta) \end{bmatrix}' \sum_{i \in [n]} Z_i \tilde{x}_i \tilde{x}_i' \begin{bmatrix} \varphi(1, \beta) - \widehat{\varphi}(1, \beta) \\ \gamma(1, \beta) - \widehat{\gamma}(1, \beta) \end{bmatrix} \right). \quad (\text{D.224})$$

To bound (D.223) and (D.224), we use (D.211) along with (D.165), (D.202), and (D.203). This gives

$$\frac{1}{n_1} \frac{(\sum_{i \in [n]} Z_i \widehat{\varepsilon}_i(\beta)^2 - \sum_{i \in [n]} Z_i \varepsilon_i(1, \beta)^2)}{n_1^{-1} \mathcal{S}_1^2(\beta_n) + n_0^{-1} \mathcal{S}_0^2(\beta_n)} = o_p(n), \quad (\text{D.225})$$

An identity analogous to (D.224) holds for

$$\frac{1}{n_0} \sum_{i \in [n]} (1 - Z_i) \widehat{\varepsilon}_i(\beta)^2 - \frac{1}{n_0} \sum_{i \in [n]} (1 - Z_i) \varepsilon_i(0, \beta)^2, \quad (\text{D.226})$$

and we similarly conclude that

$$\frac{1}{n_0} \frac{\left(\sum_{i \in [n]} (1 - Z_i) \widehat{\varepsilon}_i(\beta)^2 - \sum_{i \in [n]} (1 - Z_i) \varepsilon_i(0, \beta)^2 \right)}{n_1^{-1} \mathcal{S}_1^2(\beta_n) + n_0^{-1} \mathcal{S}_0^2(\beta_n)} = o_p(n), \quad (\text{D.227})$$

We write

$$\left(\frac{\mathcal{S}_1^2(\beta)}{n_1} + \frac{\mathcal{S}_0^2(\beta)}{n_0} \right)^{-1} \left(\frac{1}{n_1^2} \sum_{i \in [n]} Z_i \widehat{\varepsilon}_i(\beta)^2 + \frac{1}{n_0^2} \sum_{i \in [n]} (1 - Z_i) \widehat{\varepsilon}_i(\beta)^2 \right) \quad (\text{D.228})$$

$$= \left(\frac{\mathcal{S}_1^2(\beta)}{n_1} + \frac{\mathcal{S}_0^2(\beta)}{n_0} \right)^{-1} \left(\frac{1}{n_1^2} \sum_{i \in [n]} Z_i \varepsilon_i(1, \beta)^2 + \frac{1}{n_0^2} \sum_{i \in [n]} (1 - Z_i) \varepsilon_i(0, \beta)^2 \right) \quad (\text{D.229})$$

$$+ \frac{1}{n_1^2} \left(\frac{\mathcal{S}_1^2(\beta)}{n_1} + \frac{\mathcal{S}_0^2(\beta)}{n_0} \right)^{-1} \sum_{i \in [n]} Z_i (\widehat{\varepsilon}_i(\beta)^2 - \varepsilon_i(1, \beta)^2) \quad (\text{D.230})$$

$$+ \frac{1}{n_0^2} \left(\frac{\mathcal{S}_1^2(\beta)}{n_1} + \frac{\mathcal{S}_0^2(\beta)}{n_0} \right)^{-1} \sum_{i \in [n]} (1 - Z_i) (\widehat{\varepsilon}_i(\beta)^2 - \varepsilon_i(0, \beta)^2) \quad (\text{D.231})$$

Using a similar argument as in the proof of Lemma B.10, specifically (B.80) and the following lines, it is routine to show that (D.229) converges to 1 in probability. We note that this argument uses (D.179) and the assumptions (C.155). The terms in (D.230) and (D.231) converge to 0 in probability by (D.225), (D.227), and assumption (C.155). This completes the proof. \square

Theorem D.4. For every $\alpha \in (0, 1)$,

$$\lim_{\kappa \rightarrow 0} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \inf_{\beta \in \mathbb{R}} \inf_{\{\theta \in \Xi_n : \text{LATE}(\theta) = \beta\}} \mathbb{P} \left(|\widehat{\Delta}_{\text{adj}}(\beta)| > |z_{1-\alpha}| + \kappa \right) \leq \alpha. \quad (\text{D.232})$$

Proof. Given Lemma D.3, the proof of (D.232) is nearly identical to the proof of Theorem B.11, so we omit it. (We recall that the numerator of (D.198) is $\widehat{\sigma}_{\text{adj}}^2(\beta)$, and the denominator is $\text{Var}(\widehat{\tau}_{\text{adj}}(\beta))$.) \square

D.3. Randomization Distribution.

Lemma D.5. Let $\{\theta_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ be a sequence of experiments with covariates such that $\theta_n \in \Xi_n$ for all $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$. Denote $\beta = \text{LATE}(\theta_n)$. The following two claims hold.

(1) For each $a \in \{0, 1\}$, we have

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\sigma_{u(a)}^2} \left| \frac{1}{n_a} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{T}(a)} \widehat{u}_i^2 - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in [n]} u_i(a)^2 \right| = 0, \quad (\text{D.233})$$

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\sigma_{v(a)}^2} \left| \frac{1}{n_a} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{T}(a)} \widehat{v}_i^2 - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in [n]} v_i(a)^2 \right| = 0, \quad (\text{D.234})$$

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\sigma_{v(a)} \sigma_{u(a)}} \left| \frac{1}{n_a} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{T}(a)} \widehat{u}_i \widehat{v}_i - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in N} u_i(a) v_i(a) \right| = 1. \quad (\text{D.235})$$

(2) For each $a \in \{0, 1\}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & (n-1) \text{Var}^* (\tilde{\tau}_{\text{adj}}^*(\beta)) \\ & \geq (1 - \delta^2) \max \left\{ \frac{n}{n - n_a} \sigma_{y(a)}^2, \beta^2 \frac{n}{n - n_a} \sigma_{d(a)}^2 \right\} (1 + o(1)). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D.236})$$

Proof. We begin with the identity

$$\frac{1}{n_a} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{T}(a)} \widehat{u}_i^2 - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in [n]} u_i(a)^2 \quad (\text{D.237})$$

$$= \frac{1}{n_a} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{T}(a)} u_i(a)^2 - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in [n]} u_i(a)^2 \quad (\text{D.238})$$

$$+ \frac{1}{n_a} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{T}(a)} (x'_i(\widehat{\gamma}_y(a) - \gamma_y(a)) + \widehat{\varphi}_y(a) - \varphi_y(1))^2 \quad (\text{D.239})$$

$$+ \frac{2}{n_a} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{T}(a)} u_i(a) (x'_i(\widehat{\gamma}_y(a) - \gamma_y(a)) + \widehat{\varphi}_y(a) - \varphi_y(1)). \quad (\text{D.240})$$

Recalling the definition of \tilde{x}_i from the statement of Lemma D.3, we have by a representation analogous to (D.165) that

$$\begin{bmatrix} \varphi_y(a) - \widehat{\varphi}_y(a) \\ \gamma_y(a) - \widehat{\gamma}_y(a) \end{bmatrix} = \left(\frac{1}{n_a} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{T}(a)} \tilde{x}_i \tilde{x}'_i \right)^{-1} \left(\frac{1}{n_a} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{T}(a)} \tilde{x}_i u_i(a) \right). \quad (\text{D.241})$$

Note that for $s \in [k+1]$, we have by the analogue of (D.167) that

$$\sum_{i \in [n]} \tilde{x}_{si} u_i(a) = 0. \quad (\text{D.242})$$

Further, we note that the sample variance of the collection $(\tilde{x}_{si} u_i(a))_{i=1}^n$ is bounded by the uncentered sample second moment, which is

$$\frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{i \in [n]} (\tilde{x}_{si} u_i(a))^2 \leq \frac{1}{n} \sqrt{\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in [n]} \tilde{x}_{si}^4} \times \sqrt{\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in [n]} u_i(a)^4}. \quad (\text{D.243})$$

Then from our assumptions (C.158) and (C.161), we get

$$\frac{1}{\sigma_{u(a)}^2 n^2} \sum_{i \in [n]} (\tilde{x}_{si} u_i(a))^2 = O\left(\frac{1}{n}\right). \quad (\text{D.244})$$

Hence by [WD21, Lemma A3(i)], we have

$$\frac{1}{\sigma_{u(a)} n_a} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{T}(a)} \tilde{x}_{si} u_i(a) = o(1). \quad (\text{D.245})$$

Further, by (C.161) and [WD21, Lemma A3(i)],

$$\frac{1}{n_a} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{T}(a)} x_i x'_i = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in [n]} x_i x'_i + o(1) = O(1). \quad (\text{D.246})$$

Inserting the previous two displays in (D.241), we conclude that

$$\frac{1}{\sigma_{u(a)}} \left[\varphi_y(a) - \hat{\varphi}_y(a) \right] = o(1). \quad (\text{D.247})$$

Therefore, using (D.246) again,

$$\frac{1}{\sigma_{u(a)}^2 n_a} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{T}(a)} (x'_i (\hat{\gamma}_y(a) - \gamma_y(a)) + \hat{\varphi}_y(a) - \varphi_y(a))^2 \quad (\text{D.248})$$

$$= \frac{1}{\sigma_{u(a)}^2} \left[\varphi_y(a) - \hat{\varphi}_y(a) \right]' \left(\frac{1}{n_a} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{T}(a)} \tilde{x}_i \tilde{x}_i' \right) \left[\varphi_y(a) - \hat{\varphi}_y(a) \right] = o(1). \quad (\text{D.249})$$

Also, note that (D.240) is, after applying (D.241),

$$2 \left(\frac{1}{n_a} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{T}(a)} u_i(a) \tilde{x}_i' \right) \left(\frac{1}{n_a} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{T}(a)} \tilde{x}_i \tilde{x}_i' \right)^{-1} \left(\frac{1}{n_a} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{T}(a)} \tilde{x}_i u_i(a) \right).$$

Then following the previous argument shows that

$$\frac{2}{\sigma_{u(a)}^2 n_a} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{T}(a)} u_i(a) (x'_i (\hat{\gamma}_y(a) - \gamma_y(a)) + \hat{\varphi}_y(a) - \varphi_y(a)) = o(1). \quad (\text{D.250})$$

Using [WD21, Lemma A3(i)] and (C.158), we have

$$\frac{1}{\sigma_{u(a)}^2 n_a} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{T}(a)} u_i(a)^2 - \frac{1}{\sigma_{u(a)}^2 n} \sum_{i \in [n]} u_i(a)^2 = o(1). \quad (\text{D.251})$$

Inserting (D.249), (D.250), and (D.251) into (D.240), we find.

$$\frac{1}{\sigma_{u(a)}^2 n_a} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{T}(a)} \hat{u}_i^2 - \frac{1}{n \sigma_{u(a)}^2} \sum_{i \in [n]} u_i(a)^2 = o(1), \quad (\text{D.252})$$

completes the proof of (D.233).

To prove (D.234), we note that similarly to (D.241), we have

$$\frac{1}{\sigma_{v(a)}} \left[\varphi_d(a) - \hat{\varphi}_d(a) \right] = \left(\frac{1}{n_a} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{T}(a)} \tilde{x}_i \tilde{x}_i' \right)^{-1} \left(\frac{1}{\sigma_{v(a)} n_a} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{T}(a)} \tilde{x}_i v_i(a) \right). \quad (\text{D.253})$$

The first factor on the right-hand side was bounded (almost surely) in (D.246). The second factor corresponds to a simple random sample from a population with zero mean, as in (D.242). Using (C.161) and (D.178), the sample variance is bounded by

$$\frac{1}{\sigma_{v(a)}^2 n^2} \sum_{i \in [n]} (\tilde{x}_{si} v_i(a))^2 \leq \frac{1}{\sigma_{v(a)}^2 n} \sqrt{\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in [n]} \tilde{x}_{si}^4} \times \sqrt{\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in [n]} v_i(a)^4} \quad (\text{D.254})$$

$$\leq \frac{A^{1/2}}{\sigma_{v(a)}^2 n} \cdot o(n \sigma_{v(a)}^2) = o(1). \quad (\text{D.255})$$

Then, following the reasoning that gave (D.247), we get

$$\frac{1}{\sigma_{u(a)}} \left[\frac{\varphi_d(a) - \hat{\varphi}_d(a)}{\gamma_d(a) - \hat{\gamma}_d(a)} \right] = o(1). \quad (\text{D.256})$$

The claim (D.235) can be proved similarly to (D.233) and (D.234).

Now we prove (2). Let ψ^* be defined analogously to (D.164). We have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i \in [n]} \varepsilon_i^*(\beta)^2 &= \sum_{a \in \{0,1\}} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{T}(a)} (w_i(a, \beta) - \tilde{x}'_i \psi^*(\beta))^2 \\ &\geq \sum_{a \in \{0,1\}} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{T}(a)} \left(w_i(a, \beta) - \tilde{x}'_i \hat{\psi}(a, \beta) \right)^2 \\ &\quad + \sum_{a \in \{0,1\}} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{T}(a)} \left(\tilde{x}'_i (\hat{\psi}(a, \beta) - \psi_i^*(\beta)) \right)^2 \\ &\geq \sum_{a \in \{0,1\}} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{T}(a)} (\hat{u}_i(a) - \beta \hat{v}_i(a))^2 \\ &\geq \frac{1 - \delta^2}{n - 1} \max_{a \in \{0,1\}} \left\{ \max \left\{ \frac{n}{n - n_a} \sigma_{u(a)}^2, \beta^2 \frac{n}{n - n_a} \sigma_{v(a)}^2 \right\} \right\} (1 + o(1)). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D.257})$$

In the second line, we used that the cross-terms from expanding the square vanish because for each $\{0, 1\}$,

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{i \in \mathcal{T}(a)} \left[(w_i(a, \beta) - \tilde{x}'_i \hat{\psi}(a, \beta)) \left[\tilde{x}'_i (\hat{\psi}(a, \beta) - \psi_i^*(\beta)) \right] \right] \\ &= \sum_{i \in \mathcal{T}(a)} \hat{\varepsilon}_i \tilde{x}'_i (\hat{\psi}(a, \beta) - \psi_i^*(\beta)) \\ &= 0, \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality is the analogue of (D.167) for the regression problem (C.142). The third line of (D.257) follows from the analogue of (D.168), (C.157) and the last inequality is justified using (1) and an argument analogous to (B.115) to obtain the lower bound involving $\sigma_{u(a)}^2$, and the lower bound involving $\sigma_{v(a)}^2$ follows as in (B.67).

Finally, note that

$$\text{Var}^*(\tilde{\tau}_{\text{adj}}^*(\beta)) = \frac{n}{n_1 n_0} \frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{i \in [n]} \varepsilon_i^*(\beta)^2.$$

Combining the previous two displays completes the proof. \square

Lemma D.6. Let $\{\theta_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ be a sequence of experiments such that $\theta_n \in \Xi_n$ for all $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$. Denote $\beta = \text{LATE}(\theta_n)$. For each $a \in \{0, 1\}$, we have almost surely that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n_a^2} \frac{\max_{i \in [n]} \varepsilon_i^*(\beta)^2}{\text{Var}^*(\tilde{\tau}_{\text{adj}}^*(\beta))} = 0. \quad (\text{D.258})$$

Proof. Recall the definition of ψ and $\hat{\psi}$ in (D.164), and define ψ^* , ψ_d , and ψ_y analogously. Fix $i \in [n]$. If $Z_i = a$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon_i^*(\beta) &= w_i(a, \beta) - \varphi_i^*(\beta) - x_i' \gamma^*(\beta) \\ &= \varepsilon_i(a, \beta) + \varphi(a, \beta) + x_i' \gamma(a, \beta) - \varphi_i^*(\beta) - \gamma_i^*(\beta) \\ &= \varepsilon_i(a, \beta) + \tilde{x}_i'(\psi(a, \beta) - \hat{\psi}(a, \beta)) + (\hat{\psi}(a, \beta) - \psi^*(\beta)). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D.259})$$

We obtain

$$\frac{1}{n_a^2} \frac{\max_i \varepsilon_i^*(\beta)^2}{\text{Var}^*(\tilde{\tau}_{\text{adj}}^*(\beta))} \quad (\text{D.260})$$

$$\lesssim \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{a \in \{0, 1\}} \frac{\max_{i \in [n]} \varepsilon_i(a, \beta)^2}{\text{Var}^*(\tilde{\tau}_{\text{adj}}^*(\beta))} + \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{a \in \{0, 1\}} \frac{\max_{i \in [n]} \left(\tilde{x}_i'(\psi(a, \beta) - \hat{\psi}(a, \beta)) \right)^2}{\text{Var}^*(\tilde{\tau}_{\text{adj}}^*(\beta))} \quad (\text{D.261})$$

$$+ \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{a \in \{0, 1\}} \frac{\max_{i \in [n]} \left(\tilde{x}_i'(\hat{\psi}(a, \beta) - \psi^*(\beta)) \right)^2}{\text{Var}^*(\tilde{\tau}_{\text{adj}}^*(\beta))}. \quad (\text{D.262})$$

We begin by bounding the first sum in (D.261). By (D.168) and (D.236), we have

$$\frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{a \in \{0, 1\}} \frac{\max_{i \in [n]} \varepsilon_i(a, \beta)^2}{\text{Var}^*(\tilde{\tau}_{\text{adj}}^*(\beta))} \leq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{a \in \{0, 1\}} \left(\frac{\max_{i \in [n]} u_i(a)^2}{\sigma_{u(a)}^2} + \frac{\max_{i \in [n]} v_i(a)^2}{\sigma_{v(a)}^2} \right). \quad (\text{D.263})$$

By (D.175) and (D.178), we have that for each $a \in \{0, 1\}$ that

$$\frac{1}{n} \frac{\max_{i \in [n]} u_i(a)^2}{\sigma_{u(a)}^2} = o(1), \quad \frac{1}{n} \frac{\max_{i \in [n]} v_i(a)^2}{\sigma_{v(a)}^2} = o(1). \quad (\text{D.264})$$

Next, we note that

$$\psi(a, \beta) - \hat{\psi}(a, \beta) = \psi_y(a, \beta) - \hat{\psi}_y(a, \beta) + \beta \psi_d(a, \beta) - \beta \hat{\psi}_d(a, \beta), \quad (\text{D.265})$$

which is justified similarly to (D.169). Then using (D.236) and the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality, we conclude that the second sum in (D.261) is bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{n} \sum_{a \in \{0,1\}} \frac{\max_{i \in [n]} \|\tilde{x}_i\|_2^2 \times \|\psi_y(a, \beta) - \hat{\psi}_y(a, \beta)\|_2^2}{\sigma_{u(a)}^2} \\ & + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{a \in \{0,1\}} \frac{\max_{i \in [n]} \|\tilde{x}_i\|_2^2 \times \|\psi_d(a, \beta) - \hat{\psi}_d(a, \beta)\|_2^2}{\sigma_{v(a)}^2}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D.266})$$

Further, from (D.247) and (D.256),

$$\frac{1}{\sigma_{u(a)}} \begin{bmatrix} \varphi_y(a) - \hat{\varphi}_y(a) \\ \gamma_y(a) - \hat{\gamma}_y(a) \end{bmatrix} = o(1), \quad \frac{1}{\sigma_{v(a)}} \begin{bmatrix} \varphi_d(a) - \hat{\varphi}_d(a) \\ \gamma_d(a) - \hat{\gamma}_d(a) \end{bmatrix} = o(1). \quad (\text{D.267})$$

Hence the terms in (D.266) are of $o(1)$. Next, we note that (D.257) implies that

$$\sum_{i \in [n]} \varepsilon_i^*(\beta)^2 \geq \sum_{a \in \{0,1\}} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{T}(a)} [\hat{\psi}(a, \beta) - \psi^*(\beta)]' \tilde{x}_i \tilde{x}_i' [\hat{\psi}(a, \beta) - \psi^*(\beta)]. \quad (\text{D.268})$$

Returning to the second term of (D.261), and using the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality in the numerator and (D.268) in the denominator, we find that it is bounded by

$$\frac{n_1 n_0 (n-1)}{n^3} \sum_{a \in \{0,1\}} \frac{\max_{i \in [n]} \|\tilde{x}_i\|_2^2 \times \|\hat{\psi}(a, \beta) - \psi^*(\beta)\|_2^2}{\sum_{i \in \mathcal{T}(a)} [\hat{\psi}(a, \beta) - \psi^*(\beta)]' \tilde{x}_i \tilde{x}_i' [\hat{\psi}(a, \beta) - \psi^*(\beta)]}. \quad (\text{D.269})$$

Recall that (D.246) states

$$\frac{1}{n_a} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{T}(a)} \tilde{x}_i \tilde{x}_i' = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in [n]} \tilde{x}_i \tilde{x}_i' + o(1). \quad (\text{D.270})$$

By assumption (C.162),

$$[\hat{\psi}(a, \beta) - \psi^*(\beta)]' \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{T}(a)} \tilde{x}_i \tilde{x}_i' \right) [\hat{\psi}(a, \beta) - \psi^*(\beta)] \quad (\text{D.271})$$

$$\geq (\tilde{\varepsilon} + o(1)) \|\hat{\psi}(a) - \psi^*(\beta)\|_2^2. \quad (\text{D.272})$$

Using (D.177), we find that (D.269) is bounded by

$$\frac{1}{n} \max_{i \in [n]} \|\tilde{x}_i\|_2^2 \times O(1) = o(1). \quad (\text{D.273})$$

Then both terms in (D.261) are $o(1)$, which completes the proof. \square

Lemma D.7. Let $\{\theta_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ be a sequence of experiments such that $\theta_n \in \Xi_n$ for all $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$. Denote $\beta = \text{LATE}(\theta_n)$. The following claims hold almost surely with respect to the randomness in Z .

(1) For every $\kappa > 0$,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}^* \left(\left| \hat{\tau}_{\text{adj}}^*(\beta) - \tilde{\tau}_{\text{adj}}^*(\beta) \right| \geq \kappa \sqrt{\text{Var}^* (\tilde{\tau}_{\text{adj}}^*(\beta))} \right) = 0. \quad (\text{D.274})$$

(2) For every $x > 0$,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}^* \left(\left| \tilde{\tau}_{\text{adj}}^*(\beta) \right| \geq x \sqrt{\text{Var}^* (\tilde{\tau}_{\text{adj}}^*(\beta))} \right) = \mathbb{P}(|\mathcal{N}| > x). \quad (\text{D.275})$$

(3) For every $x > 0$,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}^* \left(\left| \hat{\tau}_{\text{adj}}^*(\beta) \right| \geq x \sqrt{\text{Var}^* (\tilde{\tau}_{\text{adj}}^*(\beta))} \right) = \mathbb{P}(|\mathcal{N}| > x). \quad (\text{D.276})$$

(4) For every $\kappa > 0$,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow 0} \mathbb{P}^* \left(\left| \frac{\hat{\sigma}_{\text{adj},*}^2(\beta)}{\text{Var}^* (\hat{\tau}_{\beta}^*)} - 1 \right| \geq \kappa \right) = 0, \quad (\text{D.277})$$

Proof. The proof of (D.274) uses Lemma D.6 is similar to the proof of (D.195), so we omit it. Claim (D.275) is implied by Lemma D.6 and Theorem B.2. Claim (D.276) follows from (D.274) and (D.275). The proof of (D.277) uses Lemma D.6 and is similar to the proof of (D.198), so we omit it. \square

Proof of Theorem C.3. Given Lemma D.7, this proof is similar to that of Theorem A.5, so we omit the details. \square

REFERENCES

- [AI95] Joshua D. Angrist and Guido W. Imbens. Two-stage least squares estimation of average causal effects in models with variable treatment intensity. *Journal of the American statistical Association*, 90(430):431–442, 1995.
- [AIR96] 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.
- [AP09] Joshua D. Angrist and Jörn-Steffen Pischke. *Mostly Harmless Econometrics: An Empiricist's Companion*. Princeton university press, 2009.
- [AR49] Theodore W. Anderson and Herman Rubin. Estimation of the parameters of a single equation in a complete system of stochastic equations. *The Annals of mathematical statistics*, 20(1):46–63, 1949.
- [ASS19] Isaiah Andrews, James H. Stock, and Liyang Sun. Weak instruments in instrumental variables regression: Theory and practice. *Annual Review of Economics*, 11:727–753, 2019.
- [BGSTM23] Yuehao Bai, Hongchang Guo, Azeem M Shaikh, and Max Tabord-Meehan. Inference in experiments with matched pairs and imperfect compliance. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.13094*, 2023.
- [BJB95] John Bound, David A. Jaeger, and Regina M. Baker. Problems with instrumental variables estimation when the correlation between the instruments and the endogenous explanatory variable is weak. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 90(430):443–450, 1995.
- [Blo84] Howard S. Bloom. Accounting for no-shows in experimental evaluation designs. *Evaluation Review*, 8(2):225–246, 1984.

- [CF22] Peter L. Cohen and Colin B. Fogarty. Gaussian pre pivoting for finite population causal inference. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B: Statistical Methodology*, 84(2):295–320, 2022.
- [CR13] EunYi Chung and Joseph P. Romano. Exact and asymptotically robust permutation tests. *The Annals of Statistics*, 41(2):484–507, 2013.
- [IA94] Guido W. Imbens and Joshua D. Angrist. Identification and estimation of local average treatment effects. *Econometrica*, 62(2):467–475, 1994.
- [IR05] Guido Imbens and Paul R. Rosenbaum. Robust, accurate confidence intervals with a weak instrument: quarter of birth and education. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series A: Statistics in Society*, 168(1):109–126, 2005.
- [IR15] Guido W. Imbens and Donald B. Rubin. *Causal Inference for Statistics, Social, and Biomedical Sciences*. Cambridge University Press, 2015.
- [KPK18] Hyunseung Kang, Laura Peck, and Luke Keele. Inference for instrumental variables: a randomization inference approach. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series A: Statistics in Society*, 181(4):1231–1254, 2018.
- [LD17] Xinran Li and Peng Ding. General forms of finite population central limit theorems with applications to causal inference. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 112(520):1759–1769, 2017.
- [Mik10] Anna Mikusheva. Robust confidence sets in the presence of weak instruments. *Journal of Econometrics*, 157(2):236–247, 2010.
- [Mor09] Marcelo J. Moreira. Tests with correct size when instruments can be arbitrarily weak. *Journal of Econometrics*, 152(2):131–140, 2009.
- [NS90] Charles R. Nelson and Richard Startz. Some further results on the exact small sample properties of the instrumental variable estimator. *Econometrica*, 58(4):967–976, 1990.
- [SS97] Douglas Staiger and James H. Stock. Instrumental variables regression with weak instruments. *Econometrica*, 65(3):557–586, 1997.
- [VdV00] Aad Van der Vaart. *Asymptotic Statistics*, volume 3. Cambridge University Press, 2000.
- [WD21] Jason Wu and Peng Ding. Randomization tests for weak null hypotheses in randomized experiments. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 116(536):1898–1913, 2021.
- [ZD21] Anqi Zhao and Peng Ding. Covariate-adjusted Fisher randomization tests for the average treatment effect. *Journal of Econometrics*, 225(2):278–294, 2021.
- [ZJZ23] Zhen Zhong, Per Johansson, and Junni L. Zhang. Inference of sample complier average causal effects in completely randomized experiments. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.17476*, 2023.