

# Sharp Sensitivity Analysis for Inverse Propensity Weighting via Quantile Balancing\*

Jacob Dorn  
Princeton University

Kevin Guo  
Stanford University

February 20, 2022

## Abstract

Inverse propensity weighting (IPW) is a popular method for estimating treatment effects from observational data. However, its correctness relies on the untestable (and frequently implausible) assumption that all confounders have been measured. This paper introduces a robust sensitivity analysis for IPW that estimates the range of treatment effects compatible with a given amount of unobserved confounding. The estimated range converges to the narrowest possible interval (under the given assumptions) that must contain the true treatment effect. Our proposal is a refinement of the influential sensitivity analysis by Zhao, Small, and Bhattacharya (2019), which we show gives bounds that are too wide even asymptotically. This analysis is based on new partial identification results for Tan (2006)’s marginal sensitivity model.

## 1 Introduction

Estimating treatment effects from observational data is difficult because “treated” and “control” samples typically differ on many characteristics besides treatment status. For example, consumers of nutritional supplements may be wealthier or more health-conscious than those not taking supplements. One popular tool for adjusting for such baseline imbalances is Inverse Propensity Weighting (IPW) [4, 20, 21]. This technique re-weights treated and untreated samples to be similar along all observed characteristics and then compares outcomes in the weighted samples. The crucial assumption underlying this approach is that the weighted samples do not systematically differ along important *unobserved* characteristics. This “unconfoundedness” assumption is untestable, and often implausible.

This paper studies how much can be learned when unconfoundedness does not hold, but one can bound the plausible degree of unobserved confounding. In particular, given a “sensitivity assumption” controlling the degree of selection, we aim to answer two questions:

- (1) *Sensitivity analysis.* Can we bound how much the IPW point estimate from our “primary analysis” might change if unobserved confounding were properly accounted for?
- (2) *Partial identification.* Can we characterize the most informative bounds that could possibly be obtained from the sensitivity assumption with even an infinite amount of observational data?

The specific sensitivity assumption used in this paper is the “marginal sensitivity model” of Tan [57], which extends the famous Rosenbaum model [46, 47, 48] from matched-pairs studies to IPW. This sensitivity assumption is quite popular in causal inference; see [28, 29, 30, 31, 36, 49, 50, 54, 57, 63] for an incomplete list of references. As we will see, it lends itself to computationally-efficient sensitivity analyses which are simple enough to explain to any practitioner comfortable with IPW.

---

\*We are grateful for comments from Guillaume Basse, Bo Honoré, Nathan Kallus, Michal Kolesár, David Lee, Ulrich Müller, Karl Schulze, Dylan Small, Angela Zhou, Qingyuan Zhao, and seminar participants at Berkeley, Cambridge, and Princeton. This material is based upon work supported by the National Science Foundation Graduate Research Fellowship Program under Grant No. DGE-2039656. Any opinions, findings, and conclusions or recommendations expressed in this material are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the National Science Foundation.

Recently, Zhao, Small, and Bhattacharya [63] (hereafter ZSB) introduced an interpretable IPW sensitivity analysis for the marginal sensitivity model. Their approach, based on linear fractional programming, has been largely responsible for the recent resurgence of interest in this sensitivity assumption. However, they did not answer question (2), leaving open the possibility that more informative bounds could be obtained from the same data and assumptions. Indeed, there are no existing partial identification results for the marginal sensitivity model which can be used to benchmark a sensitivity analysis.

The first main contribution of this paper is to provide a complete answer to the partial identification question (2). We derive closed-form expressions for the largest and smallest values of the “usual” estimands (e.g. average treatment effect) compatible with the marginal sensitivity assumption. These expressions show that the ZSB bounds are essentially always too conservative because they ignore an infinite collection of constraints implied by the distribution of observed characteristics. Tan [57] also identified these constraints, but deemed it intractable to incorporate them all in a sensitivity analysis. In contrast, our partial identification results show that this collection can actually be reduced to a *single* constraint which is easy to incorporate.

Our second main contribution is to introduce a new IPW sensitivity analysis, which we call the *quantile balancing* method. The method has several desirable features:

- (i) The quantile balancing sensitivity interval is always a subset of the ZSB interval. Outside of knife-edge cases, it is a strict subset.
- (ii) When the outcome’s conditional quantiles can be estimated consistently, the bounds converge to the best possible bounds that can be obtained under the marginal sensitivity model. In the language of partial identification, quantile balancing is “sharp.”
- (iii) Under standard assumptions for IPW inference, the bounds can be converted into confidence intervals using the same bootstrap scheme proposed in [63].
- (iv) When the estimated quantiles are inconsistent, the sensitivity interval is too wide rather than too narrow and the confidence intervals over-cover rather than under-cover. In other words, our intervals are guaranteed to be valid, regardless of the quality of the additional input we demand.

We apply the quantile balancing method in several simulated examples and one real-data application, and find that it can substantially tighten the ZSB bounds when the covariates are good predictors of the outcome. One shortcoming we will mention is that our statistical guarantees assume the outcome is continuously-distributed. This seems to be inevitable as our sensitivity analysis relies on quantile regression. Since our partial identification results also apply to discrete outcomes, we conjecture that the quantile balancing procedure could be modified to give sharp bounds in that setting too.

## 1.1 Setting and background

We consider the Neyman-Rubin potential outcomes model with a binary treatment [44, 51]. We observe i.i.d. samples  $(X_i, Y_i, Z_i)$  from a distribution  $P$ , where  $X_i \in \mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$  is a vector of covariates,  $Z_i \in \{0, 1\}$  is a binary treatment assignment indicator, and  $Y_i \in \mathbb{R}$  is a real-valued outcome. We assume that  $Y_i = Z_i Y_i(1) + (1 - Z_i) Y_i(0)$  for some unobserved potential outcomes  $(Y_i(0), Y_i(1))$ .

The goal is to use the observed data to draw inferences about a causal estimand  $\psi_0$ . For the purposes of exposition, we initially focus on the counterfactual means  $\psi_T = \mathbb{E}[Y(1)]$  and  $\psi_C = \mathbb{E}[Y(0)]$ , although the examples of most practical interest are the average treatment effect (ATE) and the average treatment effect on the treated (ATT).

$$\begin{aligned}\psi_{\text{ATE}} &= \mathbb{E}[Y(1) - Y(0)] \\ \psi_{\text{ATT}} &= \mathbb{E}[Y(1) - Y(0) | Z = 1].\end{aligned}$$

With minor modification, our identification results can also be applied to more complex estimands, including weighted average treatment effects and policy values of the type considered in [3, 30]. However, we do not present those extensions in this paper.

Under the unconfoundedness assumption  $(Y(0), Y(1)) \perp\!\!\!\perp Z \mid X$ , all of the above quantities can be consistently estimated using inverse propensity weighting. IPW estimators work by reweighting the observed

sample by (some function of) the propensity score  $e(x) := P(Z = 1|X = x)$ . For example, if the estimand of interest is  $\psi_T$ , the (stabilized) IPW estimate is given by (1).

$$\hat{\psi}_T = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n Y_i Z_i / \hat{e}(X_i)}{\sum_{i=1}^n Z_i / \hat{e}(X_i)}. \quad (1)$$

Here,  $\hat{e}(X_i)$  is an estimate of the propensity score  $e(X_i)$ . An unstabilized version of  $\hat{\psi}_T$  which replaces the denominator in (1) by  $n$  is also common. Related estimators for the other estimands considered will be denoted by  $\hat{\psi}_C$ ,  $\hat{\psi}_{ATE}$ , and  $\hat{\psi}_{ATT}$ . See the articles by Austin and Stuart [4] or Hirano and Imbens [20] for their exact formulas.

We will assume some conditions which are required for identification and estimation under unconfoundedness:  $0 < e(X) < 1$  almost surely and  $\mathbb{E}[|Y|] < \infty$ . However, we will not assume unconfoundedness.

## 2 The marginal sensitivity model

The marginal sensitivity model introduced by Tan [57] is a relaxation of unconfoundedness which has been applied in many causal inference problems. This one-parameter sensitivity assumption allows for the existence of unobserved confounders  $U$ , but limits the degree of selection bias that can be attributed to these confounders.

### Assumption $\Lambda$ . (Marginal sensitivity model)

There exists a vector of unmeasured confounders<sup>1</sup>  $U$  that, if measured, would lead to unconfoundedness:  $(Y(0), Y(1)) \perp\!\!\!\perp Z \mid (X, U)$ . However, within each stratum of the observed covariates, measuring  $U$  can only change the odds of treatment by at most a factor of  $\Lambda$ , i.e. if we set  $e_0(x, u) := P(Z = 1|X = x, U = u)$ , then (2) holds with probability one.

$$\Lambda^{-1} \leq \frac{e_0(X, U) / [1 - e_0(X, U)]}{e(X) / [1 - e(X)]} \leq \Lambda \quad (2)$$

To avoid confusion between  $e_0$  and  $e$ , we will follow [31] and refer to  $e_0$  as the “true propensity score” and  $e$  as the “nominal propensity score.”

Like the famous Rosenbaum model [46, 47, 48] for matched-pairs studies, Assumption  $\Lambda$  controls the degree of unobserved confounding with a single parameter. When  $\Lambda = 1$ , measuring additional confounders cannot change the odds of treatment at all, i.e. treatment assignment is unconfounded. As  $\Lambda$  increases, stronger forms of confounding are allowed. For advice on how to choose this parameter, see Hsu and Small [23]. We remark that the marginal sensitivity assumption is “nonparametric” in the following sense: no assumptions are needed about how  $e_0(x, u)$  depends on  $u$ . The dimension of the vector  $U$  does not even need to be specified.

To see how Assumption  $\Lambda$  can be used for sensitivity analysis, begin by considering how an oracle statistician who observes the confounders  $U_i$  might estimate  $\psi_T$ . One strategy would be to use the IPW estimator (3), which is consistent under weak assumptions.

$$\hat{\psi}_T^* = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n Y_i Z_i / e_0(X_i, U_i)}{\sum_{i=1}^n Z_i / e_0(X_i, U_i)}. \quad (3)$$

In reality,  $\{U_i\}_{i \leq n}$  are not observed, but under Assumption  $\Lambda$ , it is possible to *bound* the true propensity scores  $e_0(X_i, U_i)$ . In particular, the vector  $(e_0(X_1, U_1), \dots, e_0(X_n, U_n))$  must belong to the set  $\mathcal{E}_n(\Lambda)$  defined in (4).

$$\mathcal{E}_n(\Lambda) = \left\{ \bar{e} \in \mathbb{R}^n : \Lambda^{-1} \leq \frac{\bar{e}_i / (1 - \bar{e}_i)}{e(X_i) / [1 - e(X_i)]} \leq \Lambda \right\} \quad (4)$$

<sup>1</sup>We have presented a slightly different version of the marginal sensitivity model from the one given in [57] and [63], which requires the unobserved confounder  $U$  to be one or both of the potential outcomes. All of the identification results in this paper can be shown to hold under such an assumption.

ZSB proposed bounding the oracle statistician’s IPW estimator (3) with the largest and smallest IPW estimates that can be obtained using putative propensity weights in  $\mathcal{E}_n(\Lambda)$ .

$$[\hat{\psi}_{\text{T,ZSB}}^-, \hat{\psi}_{\text{T,ZSB}}^+] = \left[ \min_{\bar{e} \in \mathcal{E}_n(\Lambda)} \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n Y_i Z_i / \bar{e}_i}{\sum_{i=1}^n Z_i / \bar{e}_i}, \max_{\bar{e} \in \mathcal{E}_n(\Lambda)} \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n Y_i Z_i / \bar{e}_i}{\sum_{i=1}^n Z_i / \bar{e}_i} \right]. \quad (5)$$

Since the interval (5) contains the consistent estimator  $\hat{\psi}_{\text{T}}^*$ , the distance between the true estimand  $\psi_{\text{T}}$  and the sensitivity interval must tend to zero. ZSB show that this conclusion holds even if the nominal propensity score  $e(x)$  is replaced by a suitably consistent estimate  $\hat{e}(x)$  in the definition of  $\mathcal{E}_n(\Lambda)$ , which is important for practical applications as  $e(x)$  is typically not known in observational studies.

This simple idea is intuitive enough to explain to any practitioner who is comfortable with IPW and has been extended to estimands other than  $\psi_{\text{T}}$ . ZSB also consider  $\psi_{\text{ATE}}$  and  $\psi_{\text{ATT}}$ , and related work by [28, 29, 30, 36] takes the idea substantially further. Tan [57] applied a similar idea to a different propensity-score-based estimator, and [1, 41, 58] used this approach in survey sampling problems.

## 2.1 Sharpness and data-compatibility

The aforementioned works do not address the asymptotic optimality of the interval  $[\hat{\psi}_{\text{T,ZSB}}^-, \hat{\psi}_{\text{T,ZSB}}^+]$ . Does it converge to a limiting set containing all values of  $\psi_{\text{T}}$  compatible with Assumption  $\Lambda$  and no others? Sensitivity analyses with this asymptotic optimality property are called “sharp” in the partial identification literature.<sup>2</sup>

Sharpness is important for interpreting the results of a sensitivity analysis. If the primary analysis finds a positive treatment effect but the bounds associated with a very small value of  $\Lambda$  include zero, one might be tempted to conclude that the primary analysis is sensitive to unobserved confounding. However, unless the bounds are known to be sharp, this inference is not warranted even in large samples. It could be the case that the bounds were just too conservative.

Despite its attractive features, the ZSB sensitivity analysis is not sharp. It can even be arbitrarily conservative. To illustrate this, we only need to consider a very simple joint distribution of observables:

$$\begin{aligned} X &\sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2) \\ Z \mid X &\sim \text{Bernoulli}(\tfrac{1}{2}) \\ Y \mid X, Z &\sim \mathcal{N}(X, 1). \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

Suppose that a data analyst receives i.i.d. samples  $(X_i, Y_i, Z_i)$  from this distribution and is willing to posit that Assumption  $\Lambda$  is satisfied with  $\Lambda = 2$ . Let  $\phi(\cdot)$  and  $z_\tau$  denote the density and  $\tau$ -th quantile of the standard normal distribution, respectively. The following proposition<sup>3</sup> writes the set of values of  $\psi_{\text{T}}$  compatible with Assumption  $\Lambda$  explicitly in terms of these quantities and shows that this “partially identified” set does not coincide with the ZSB interval.

**Proposition 1.** *Let  $(X_i, Y_i, Z_i)$  be i.i.d. samples from the joint distribution (6).*

- (i) *The set of values of  $\psi_{\text{T}}$  compatible with the bound  $\Lambda = 2$  and the distribution (6) is the interval  $[\pm \frac{3}{4} \phi(z_{2/3})] \approx [\pm 0.27]$ .*
- (ii) *However, with probability one,  $[\pm 0.27 \sqrt{\sigma^2 + 1}] \subseteq [\hat{\psi}_{\text{T,ZSB}}^-, \hat{\psi}_{\text{T,ZSB}}^+]$  for all large  $n$ .*

The precise meaning of (i) is the following: for any  $\psi \in [\pm \frac{3}{4} \phi(z_{2/3})]$ , it is possible to construct a distribution  $Q$  for the full data  $(X, Y(0), Y(1), Z, U)$  which marginalizes to (6), satisfies Assumption  $\Lambda$  with  $\Lambda = 2$ , and has  $\mathbb{E}_Q[Y(1)] = \psi$ . On the other hand, for any  $\psi$  not in this interval, it is impossible to construct such a distribution.

Proposition 1 implies that the ZSB interval typically includes many values of  $\psi$  which cannot possibly be reconciled with the data. The explanation for this conservatism is that the odds-ratio bound (2) does not capture all of the restrictions on the true propensity score  $e_0$ . Additional information can be found in

<sup>2</sup>The partial identification literature more typically uses “sharp” to refer to the limiting set itself and uses “estimators of sharp bounds” [16], “asymptotically sharp” [53], or similar to refer to the corresponding finite-sample estimates. We have found it clearer and more concise to use “sharp” to refer to a consistent estimate of a sharp limiting set.

<sup>3</sup>The proof of Proposition 1 and all other results in this paper can be found in Appendix B.

the marginal distribution of the *observed* characteristics. For example, we consider the putative propensity score (7).

$$\bar{e}(x, u) = \begin{cases} 1/3 & \text{if } x < 0 \\ 2/3 & \text{if } x \geq 0 \end{cases} \quad (7)$$

This certainly satisfies the odds-ratio bound (2) — and is therefore a possible value of  $\bar{e}$  in the problem (5) — but it could not possibly be the true propensity score  $e_0$ . If it were, we would observe  $\mathbb{P}(Z = 1|X \geq 0) = \frac{2}{3}$ , while (6) demands that  $\mathbb{P}(Z = 1|X \geq 0) = \frac{1}{2}$ . In short, this choice of  $\bar{e}$  is allowed in the domain of the ZSB optimization problem but is incompatible with the distribution of observed data.

This example suggests that it should be possible to improve upon the ZSB bounds by only optimizing over the subset of  $\mathcal{E}_n(\Lambda)$  which is “data compatible.” However, this is easier said than done, because the observed data distribution actually imposes an infinite number of constraints on putative propensity scores  $\bar{e}$ . For example, the true  $e_0$  “balances” all integrable functions  $h : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[h(X)Z/e_0(X, U)] &= \mathbb{E}[h(X)\mathbb{E}[Z|X, U]/e_0(X, U)] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[h(X)e_0(X, U)/e_0(X, U)] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[h(X)]. \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

Every such  $h$  gives rise to a testable “balancing constraint” (9) which can be used to rule out incompatible values of  $\bar{e}$ .

$$\frac{\sum_{i=1}^n h(X_i)Z_i/\bar{e}_i}{\sum_{i=1}^n Z_i/\bar{e}_i} \approx \mathbb{E}[h(X)] \quad (9)$$

In other words, any sharp sensitivity analysis must contend with an infinite number of constraints, which is typically computationally intractable [6, 15]. Previous works have considered relaxing these constraints by balancing only a finite set of functions [57, 58], but the resulting bounds are generally not sharp.

### 3 Partial identification results

In this section, we show that at the *population* level, it is possible to characterize the sharp bounds for  $\psi_0 \in \{\psi_T, \psi_C, \psi_{ATT}, \psi_{ATE}\}$  without ignoring or relaxing any of the (infinitely many) balancing constraints on the true propensity score. We apply these partial identification results to finite-sample sensitivity analysis in Section 4.

To state these results formally, we need a few pieces of additional notation. Recall that Assumption  $\Lambda$  requires the true propensity score  $e_0(X, U)$  to satisfy the following odds-ratio bound:

$$\Lambda^{-1} \leq \frac{e_0(X, U)/[1 - e_0(X, U)]}{e(X)/[1 - e(X)]} \leq \Lambda.$$

Therefore, it is natural to define  $\mathcal{E}_\infty(\Lambda)$  to be the set of all random variables  $\bar{E}$  which satisfy the same condition:

$$\mathcal{E}_\infty(\Lambda) := \left\{ \bar{E} : \Lambda^{-1} \leq \frac{\bar{E}/(1 - \bar{E})}{e(X)/(1 - e(X))} \leq \Lambda \text{ with probability one} \right\} \quad (10)$$

This can be viewed as the “population” version of the ZSB constraint set  $\mathcal{E}_n(\Lambda)$ . Additionally, we define the conditional distribution function  $F(y|x, z)$  and quantile function  $Q_t(x, z)$  by:

$$\begin{aligned} F(y|x, z) &= P(Y \leq y|X = x, Z = z) \\ Q_t(x, z) &= \inf\{q \in \mathbb{R} : F(q|x, z) \geq t\}. \end{aligned}$$

Since these functions only refer to observed quantities, they are identified from the observed-data distribution.

### 3.1 Balancing bounds

Our first partial identification result shows that the partially identified set for  $\psi_T$  can be computed by simply minimizing and maximizing  $\mathbb{E}[YZ/\bar{E}]$  over the set of  $\bar{E}$  in  $\mathcal{E}_\infty(\Lambda)$  which “balance” a particular conditional quantile of  $Y$ .

**Theorem 1. (Optimal bounds for  $\psi_T$ )**

For any  $\Lambda \geq 1$ , the set of values of  $\psi_T$  compatible with the observed data distribution and Assumption  $\Lambda$  is a closed interval  $[\psi_T^-, \psi_T^+]$ . Moreover, if we define  $\tau = \frac{\Lambda}{\Lambda+1}$ , then the interval endpoints solve (11) and (12).

$$\psi_T^- = \min_{\bar{E} \in \mathcal{E}_\infty(\Lambda)} \mathbb{E}[YZ/\bar{E}] \quad \text{subject to} \quad \mathbb{E}[Q_{1-\tau}(X, 1)Z/\bar{E}] = \mathbb{E}[Q_{1-\tau}(X, 1)] \quad (11)$$

$$\psi_T^+ = \max_{\bar{E} \in \mathcal{E}_\infty(\Lambda)} \mathbb{E}[YZ/\bar{E}] \quad \text{subject to} \quad \mathbb{E}[Q_\tau(X, 1)Z/\bar{E}] = \mathbb{E}[Q_\tau(X, 1)]. \quad (12)$$

We will highlight a few important takeaways from this theorem. First, even if one adds additional balancing constraints of the form  $\mathbb{E}[h(X)Z/\bar{E}] = \mathbb{E}[h(X)]$  in (11) and (12), the value of these problems will not change. Thus, for the purposes of computing bounds, the quantile balancing constraints in Theorem 1 capture all the information in the observed data. Second, the fact that only a single conditional quantile appears in each of the sharp bounds for  $\psi_T$  reflects a special advantage of the marginal sensitivity model. For alternative sensitivity assumptions, sharp bounds often involve distinct quantiles  $Q_{\tau(x)}$  for each covariate level [35, 37], complicating estimation by potentially requiring estimates of the entire conditional quantile process [38, 53]. Third, this result shows that the ZSB sensitivity analysis can only be sharp when the conditional quantiles of  $Y$  do not depend on  $X$  at all. Since this is quite pathological, this suggests there is room for improvement over the ZSB method in almost all applications.

We can extend the theorem to other estimands. To bound  $\psi_C$ , exchange the labels “treated” and “control” and apply Theorem 1. Sharp bounds on  $\psi_C$  can be translated into sharp bounds on  $\psi_{\text{ATT}}$  using the relation  $\psi_{\text{ATT}} = \frac{\mathbb{E}[Y|Z=1] - \psi_C}{P(Z=1)}$ .

**Corollary 1. (Optimal bounds for  $\psi_C$  and  $\psi_{\text{ATT}}$ )**

In the setting of Theorem 1, the partially identified set for  $\psi_C$  is the interval  $[\psi_C^-, \psi_C^+]$ , where the interval endpoints solve (13) and (14).

$$\psi_C^- = \min_{\bar{E} \in \mathcal{E}_\infty(\Lambda)} \mathbb{E}[Y \frac{1-Z}{1-\bar{E}}] \quad \text{subject to} \quad \mathbb{E}[Q_{1-\tau}(X, 0) \frac{1-Z}{1-\bar{E}}] = \mathbb{E}[Q_{1-\tau}(X, 0)] \quad (13)$$

$$\psi_C^+ = \max_{\bar{E} \in \mathcal{E}_\infty(\Lambda)} \mathbb{E}[Y \frac{1-Z}{1-\bar{E}}] \quad \text{subject to} \quad \mathbb{E}[Q_\tau(X, 0) \frac{1-Z}{1-\bar{E}}] = \mathbb{E}[Q_\tau(X, 0)] \quad (14)$$

The partially identified set for  $\psi_{\text{ATT}}$  is the interval  $[\psi_{\text{ATT}}^-, \psi_{\text{ATT}}^+]$ , where  $\psi_{\text{ATT}}^\mp = \frac{\mathbb{E}[Y|Z=1] - \psi_C^\pm}{P(Z=1)}$ .

Finally, sharp bounds for  $\psi_{\text{ATE}}$  can be obtained by subtracting sharp bounds for  $\psi_T$  and  $\psi_C$ . Equivalently, these bounds can be obtained by solving optimization problems with two quantile balancing constraints. Although this result is superficially similar to Theorem 1 and Corollary 1, its proof requires a novel construction.

**Theorem 2. (Optimal bounds for  $\psi_{\text{ATE}}$ )**

For any  $\Lambda \geq 1$ , the set of values of  $\psi_{\text{ATE}}$  compatible with the observed data distribution and Assumption  $\Lambda$  is a closed interval  $[\psi_{\text{ATE}}^-, \psi_{\text{ATE}}^+]$  where  $\psi_{\text{ATE}}^- = \psi_T^- - \psi_C^+$  and  $\psi_{\text{ATE}}^+ = \psi_T^+ - \psi_C^-$ .

These partial identification results apply to any observed-data distribution  $P$  satisfying overlap and  $\mathbb{E}_P[|Y|] < \infty$ , but in certain special cases, the optimal bounds can be computed more explicitly. Specifically, consider the Gaussian outcome model (17):

$$X \sim P_X \quad (15)$$

$$Z | X \sim \text{Bernoulli}(e(X)) \quad (16)$$

$$Y | X, Z \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu(X, Z), \sigma^2(X)). \quad (17)$$

The following proposition derives the ATE identified set in this model, which offers some intuition about the main factors that make a causal estimate more or less robust to unobserved confounding.

**Proposition 2.** *Suppose the observed-data distribution has the factorization (17). Let  $\psi_{\text{ATE}} = \mathbb{E}_P[\mu(X, 1) - \mu(X, 0)]$  be the nominal ATE. Then the partially identified set for the ATE under Assumption  $\Lambda$  is:*

$$[\psi_{\text{ATE}}^-, \psi_{\text{ATE}}^+] = [\psi_{\text{ATE}} \pm \frac{\Lambda^2 - 1}{\Lambda} \phi(\Phi^{-1}(\frac{\Lambda}{\Lambda + 1})) \mathbb{E}[\sigma(X)]]. \quad (18)$$

Here,  $\phi$  and  $\Phi$  are the standard normal density and distribution function, respectively.

For a fixed bound  $\Lambda$  on the degree of unobserved confounding, the formula (18) shows that two key features map the observed data distribution to robustness. The first is the magnitude of the nominal ATE; all else equal, larger nominal effects are more robust. The second is the average noise level  $\mathbb{E}[\sigma(X)]$ ; the better the measured variables predict the outcome, the less unobserved confounding can affect our estimates. In the extreme case where  $X$  and  $Z$  perfectly predict  $Y$ , then the ATE remains point-identified no matter how large  $\Lambda$  is.

### 3.2 Data-compatible propensity scores

Although the qualitative implications of Proposition 2 are quite plausible, we nevertheless find the quantile balancing formulas of Section 3.1 to be quite counterintuitive. After all, it is certainly not true that every random variable  $\bar{E} \in \mathcal{E}_\infty(\Lambda)$  satisfying  $\mathbb{E}[Q_\tau(X, 1)Z/\bar{E}] = \mathbb{E}[Q_\tau(X, 1)]$  could plausibly be the true propensity score  $e_0(X, U)$ . Indeed, the constraints of the quantile-balancing optimization problems do not even enforce that  $\mathbb{E}[Z/\bar{E}] = 1$ . Our intuition for why the ZSB procedure is conservative suggest the quantile balancing formulas should be conservative as well.

To explain how these results are possible, we begin by characterizing which random variables  $\bar{E}$  could plausibly be the true propensity score  $e_0(X, U)$ . The calculation (8) indicates that  $\bar{E}$  should at least satisfy  $\mathbb{E}[h(X)Z/\bar{E}] = \mathbb{E}[h(X)]$  for all integrable  $h$ , or equivalently,  $\mathbb{E}[Z/\bar{E}|X] = 1$ . Proposition 3 shows that for the purposes of bounding  $\psi_T$ , this is actually the “only” constraint on  $\bar{E}$ . Similar results appear in [8, 45, 57, 19, 22, 17, 63].

**Proposition 3.** *For any random variable  $\bar{E} \in \mathcal{E}_\infty(\Lambda)$  satisfying  $\mathbb{E}[Z/\bar{E}|X] = 1$ , there is a distribution  $Q$  for  $(X, Y(0), Y(1), Z, U)$  with the following properties:*

- (i) *The distribution of the observables  $(X, Y, Z)$  is the same under  $P$  and  $Q$ .*
- (ii)  *$Q$  satisfies Assumption  $\Lambda$ .*
- (iii)  *$\mathbb{E}_Q[Y(1)] = \mathbb{E}_P[YZ/\bar{E}]$ .*

In short, this result says that  $\mathbb{E}[YZ/\bar{E}]$  is a plausible value of  $\psi_T$  as long as  $\mathbb{E}[Z/\bar{E}|X] = 1$ . It is not hard to show that the converse also holds: if  $\psi$  is a plausible value of  $\psi_T$ , then  $\psi = \mathbb{E}[YZ/\bar{E}]$  for some random variable  $\bar{E}$  satisfying  $\mathbb{E}[Z/\bar{E}|X] = 1$ . As a result, the optimal bounds for  $\psi_T$  can be obtained by solving the variational problems in Corollary 2.

**Corollary 2.** *The endpoints of the partially identified interval for  $\psi_T$  solve:*

$$\psi_T^- = \min_{\bar{E} \in \mathcal{E}_\infty(\Lambda)} \mathbb{E}[YZ/\bar{E}] \quad \text{subject to} \quad \mathbb{E}[Z/\bar{E}|X] = 1 \quad (19)$$

$$\psi_T^+ = \max_{\bar{E} \in \mathcal{E}_\infty(\Lambda)} \mathbb{E}[YZ/\bar{E}] \quad \text{subject to} \quad \mathbb{E}[Z/\bar{E}|X] = 1 \quad (20)$$

Even though the variational problems (19) and (20) can be infinite-dimensional optimization problems with infinitely-many constraints, they have several nice features that enable them to be solved explicitly. Some straightforward algebraic manipulation shows that the problem (20) can be written as:

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{maximize} \quad \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[YZ/\bar{E}|X]] \\ & \text{subject to} \quad \mathbb{E}[Z/\bar{E}|X] = 1 \\ & \text{and} \quad 1 + \frac{1-e(X)}{e(X)}\Lambda^{-1} \leq 1/\bar{E} \leq 1 + \frac{1-e(X)}{e(X)}\Lambda. \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

Not only is this problem *linear* in the decision “variable”  $1/\bar{E}$ , it also separates across levels of  $X$ . Therefore, it suffices to separately solve (22) for each  $x \in \mathcal{X}$ .

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{maximize} \quad \mathbb{E}[YZ/\bar{E}|X = x] \\ & \text{subject to} \quad \mathbb{E}[Z/\bar{E}|X = x] = 1 \\ & \text{and} \quad 1 + \frac{1-e(x)}{e(x)}\Lambda^{-1} \leq 1/\bar{E} \leq 1 + \frac{1-e(x)}{e(x)}\Lambda \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

The problem (22) requires us to maximize one expectation subject to an equality constraint on another expectation. This resembles the problem solved by the Neyman-Pearson lemma, and in fact is a special case of the generalization due to [13]. The optimization problems posed in Theorem 1 also fall in this class. It turns out that both of these problems have a common solution, given in Proposition 4.

**Proposition 4.** *Let  $\bar{E}_-, \bar{E}_+ \in \mathcal{E}_\infty(\Lambda)$  satisfy  $\mathbb{E}[Z/\bar{E}_-|X] = \mathbb{E}[Z/\bar{E}_+|X] = 1$  and also (23) and (24).*

$$1/\bar{E}_- = \begin{cases} 1 + \frac{1-e(X)}{e(X)}\Lambda^{+1} & \text{if } Y < Q_{1-\tau}(X, 1) \\ 1 + \frac{1-e(X)}{e(X)}\Lambda^{-1} & \text{if } Y > Q_{1-\tau}(X, 1) \end{cases} \quad (23)$$

$$1/\bar{E}_+ = \begin{cases} 1 + \frac{1-e(X)}{e(X)}\Lambda^{+1} & \text{if } Y > Q_\tau(X, 1) \\ 1 + \frac{1-e(X)}{e(X)}\Lambda^{-1} & \text{if } Y < Q_\tau(X, 1) \end{cases} \quad (24)$$

Then  $\bar{E}_-$  solves both (11) and (19), and  $\bar{E}_+$  solves both (12) and (20).

The form of the propensity score  $\bar{E}_+$  gives us insight into the confounding structure which maximizes  $\psi_T$ : in the worst case, all observations with “high” values of  $Y$  are unlikely to be treated and thus receive large propensity weight, while all observations with “low” values of  $Y$  are likely to be treated and thus receive small propensity weight. The cutoff between high and low is chosen to satisfy the data-compatibility condition  $\mathbb{E}[Z/\bar{E}_+|X] = 1$ .

This argument presented in this section extends immediately to  $\psi_C$  by swapping treatment and control labels, extends to  $\psi_{ATT}$  by the argument given in Section 3.1, and can extend to other sensitivity models of the form  $e_{\min}(X) \leq e_0(X, U) \leq e_{\max}(X)$  by modifying the constraints of (22).

### 3.3 Data compatibility for the ATE

To extend the argument from Section 3.2 to the ATE requires additional care. Although  $\psi_{ATE}^+ = \psi_T^+ - \psi_C^-$  is certainly a *valid* upper bound for the partially identified set for  $\psi_{ATE}$ , it is not obviously a sharp one. Proposition 3 only implies that there exists a distribution  $Q$  matching the observed-data distribution which has  $\mathbb{E}_Q[Y(1)] = \psi_T^+$  and another distribution  $Q'$  which has  $\mathbb{E}_{Q'}[Y(0)] = \psi_C^-$ , but these distributions need not be the same. In other words, the two bounds may not be simultaneously achievable.

Theorem 2 indicates that the worst-case bounds on the counterfactual means are simultaneously achievable in the marginal sensitivity model. This is a surprising result, given that simultaneous achievability is *not* expected to hold in the closely-related Rosenbaum sensitivity model. In that model, Yadlowsky et al. [61] derived sharp bounds on  $\psi_T$  and  $\psi_C$  but required an extra symmetry assumption on the distribution of potential outcomes to establish sharpness of the resulting ATE bounds.

The key to our bounds on  $\psi_{ATE}$  is the following proposition, which strengthens Proposition 3.

**Proposition 5.** *For any random variable  $\bar{E} \in \mathcal{E}_\infty(\Lambda)$  satisfying  $\mathbb{E}[Z/\bar{E}|X] = \mathbb{E}[(1-Z)/(1-\bar{E})|X] = 1$ , there is a distribution  $Q$  for the full data  $(X, Y(0), Y(1), Z, U)$  with the following properties:*

- (i) *The distribution of the observables  $(X, Y, Z)$  is the same under  $P$  and  $Q$ .*
- (ii)  *$Q$  satisfies Assumption  $\Lambda$ .*
- (iii)  *$\mathbb{E}_Q[Y(1)] = \mathbb{E}_P[YZ/\bar{E}]$  and  $\mathbb{E}_Q[Y(0)] = \mathbb{E}_P[Y(1-Z)/(1-\bar{E})]$ .*

Unlike Proposition 3, this result does not follow from the existing data-compatibility characterizations of [8, 45, 57, 63] and instead requires an original construction. Given this result, one can derive Theorem 2 as a consequence of Theorem 1 and Corollary 1.

## 4 Sensitivity analysis

In this section, we give our proposal for translating the population-level partial identification results of Section 3 into a practical sensitivity analysis for IPW, which we call the *quantile balancing* method. Our proposal follows naturally from our partial identification results: on a high level, we modify the ZSB proposal described in Section 2 to incorporate the quantile-balancing constraints we derived in Theorem 1 and Corollary 1. Throughout this section, we take  $\Lambda \geq 1$  to be fixed and write  $\tau = \Lambda/(\Lambda + 1)$ .

## 4.1 Quantile balancing bounds

We begin by describing the quantile balancing bounds for the average treated outcome. Theorem 1 implies that the largest value of  $\psi_T$  compatible with Assumption A solves the optimization problem (25):

$$\psi_T^+ = \max_{\bar{E} \in \mathcal{E}_\infty(\Lambda)} \frac{\mathbb{E}[YZ/\bar{E}]}{\mathbb{E}[Z/\bar{E}]} \quad \text{s.t.} \quad \begin{pmatrix} \mathbb{E}[Q_\tau(X, 1)Z/\bar{E}] \\ \mathbb{E}[Z/\bar{E}] \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbb{E}[Q_\tau(X, 1)Z/e(X)] \\ \mathbb{E}[Z/e(X)] \end{pmatrix}. \quad (25)$$

We have included an additional constraint  $\mathbb{E}[Z/\bar{E}] = \mathbb{E}[Z/e(X)]$  which does not appear in Theorem 1, but this does not affect the value of the optimization problem.

Our proposal is to estimate  $\psi_T^+$  by replacing all of the unknown quantities in (25) with empirical counterparts. We estimate  $\psi_T^-$  by following the same principle. To translate these estimates into confidence intervals, we employ the same simple percentile bootstrap scheme as ZSB.

We will be concrete about what optimization problem we are proposing to solve. Let  $\hat{Q}_\tau(x, z)$  be an estimate of the conditional quantile function of  $Y$  obtained by some kind of quantile regression (e.g. [2, 33, 39, 55]). Let  $\hat{e}$  be the data analyst’s estimate of the nominal propensity score  $e$  from their primary analysis. We define  $\hat{\psi}_T^+$  as the solution to the empirical maximization problem (26).

$$\hat{\psi}_T^+ = \max_{\bar{e} \in \mathcal{E}_n(\Lambda)} \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n Y_i Z_i / \bar{e}_i}{\sum_{i=1}^n Z_i / \bar{e}_i} \quad \text{s.t.} \quad \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \hat{Q}_\tau(X_i, 1) Z_i / \bar{e}_i \\ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n Z_i / \bar{e}_i \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \hat{Q}_\tau(X_i, 1) Z_i / \hat{e}(X_i) \\ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n Z_i / \hat{e}(X_i) \end{pmatrix} \quad (26)$$

The lower bound  $\hat{\psi}_T^-$  is defined similarly, but with maximization replaced by minimization and  $\hat{Q}_\tau(x, z)$  replaced by another quantile estimate  $\hat{Q}_{1-\tau}(x, z)$ .

Several immediate properties of the quantile balancing bounds (26) are collected below:

- (i) When  $\Lambda = 1$  (i.e. no confounding is allowed), the quantile balancing bounds collapse to the usual IPW estimate of  $\psi_T$  under unconfoundedness.
- (ii) The quantile balancing bounds are sample bounded, i.e.  $\min_i Y_i \leq \hat{\psi}_T^- \leq \hat{\psi}_T^+ \leq \max_i Y_i$ .
- (iii) The quantile balancing bounds are always a subset of the ZSB bounds and, outside of knife-edge cases, are a strict subset.
- (iv) The optimization problem (26) is convex and can be solved efficiently. In fact, it reduces to a standard quantile regression problem. See Appendix A for implementation details.

One can also apply quantile balancing to unstabilized IPW estimators at the cost of properties (ii) and (iii).

The quantile balancing idea extends easily to other causal estimands. To compute bounds for  $\psi_C$ , one only needs to exchange the definitions of “treated” and “control” and solve the same optimization problem. Subtracting the bounds for  $\psi_T$  and  $\psi_C$  gives bounds for  $\psi_{ATE}$ , and bounds for  $\psi_{ATT}$  follow from a similar principle (see Appendix A for the exact formula).

To form confidence intervals based on quantile balancing, we follow ZSB [63] and propose using the percentile bootstrap. If  $[\hat{\psi}_b^-, \hat{\psi}_b^+]$  are quantile balancing bounds estimated in the  $b^{\text{th}}$  of  $B$  bootstrap samples, we report the quantile balancing  $1 - \alpha$  confidence interval as:

$$CI(\alpha) = [Q_{\alpha/2}(\{\hat{\psi}_b^-\}_{b \in [B]}), Q_{1-\alpha/2}(\{\hat{\psi}_b^+\}_{b \in [B]})]. \quad (27)$$

As is standard for bootstrap-based IPW inference, we require re-estimating the nominal propensity score separately in each bootstrap replication. That requirement does not extend to the conditional quantiles. While the conditional quantiles can be re-estimated within bootstraps, our inference results will also apply if they are taken from the main dataset. This is important to keep inference computationally tractable.

When the conditional quantiles are estimated using linear quantile regression (i.e.  $\hat{Q}_t(x, z) = \hat{\beta}_t(z)^\top h(x)$  for some “features”  $h : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^k$ ), one could consider directly “balancing” the features  $h$  rather than the fitted quantile  $\hat{Q}_t$  as in [10, 24, 57, 58]. Although this approach has some nice features and theoretical support, our simulations find the resulting inference is less reliable in small samples.

## 4.2 Theoretical properties

We now state some theoretical properties of the quantile balancing bounds  $[\hat{\psi}^-, \hat{\psi}^+]$  which apply when the outcome  $Y$  has a continuous distribution. In short, the bounds are sharp when quantiles are estimated consistently and are valid even when quantiles are estimated inconsistently. Moreover, the percentile bootstrap yields valid confidence intervals if standard IPW inference conditions are satisfied and quantiles are estimated parametrically.

To obtain these results, we need a few conditions. The first condition collects some standard IPW consistency requirements which we expect the data analyst to have already assumed in his or her primary analysis [59].

### Condition 1. (IPW assumptions)

The nominal propensity score  $e$  satisfies  $\varepsilon \leq e(X) \leq 1 - \varepsilon$  with probability one for some  $\varepsilon > 0$ . The estimated propensity score  $\hat{e}(\cdot) \equiv \hat{e}(\cdot, \{X_i, Z_i\}_{i \leq n})$  is uniformly consistent, and the variance of  $Y$  is finite.

The second condition requires that the outcome  $Y$  has a bounded conditional density which is positive near the relevant conditional quantiles. This is a common identification condition for quantile regression [2, 5].

### Condition 2. (Density)

The conditional distribution of  $Y \mid X, Z$  has a uniformly bounded density  $f(y|x, z)$ . For each  $(x, z) \in \mathcal{X} \times \{0, 1\}$ , the map  $y \mapsto f(y|x, z)$  is continuous and positive near  $Q_{1-\tau}(x, z)$  and  $Q_\tau(x, z)$ .

Finally, we make some assumptions about how the quantiles are estimated. For the standard linear quantile regression method of Koenker and Bassett [33], one only needs to check that the regressors in the quantile regression have finite variance. We cover generic (possibly nonlinear) methods by requiring sample splitting to avoid overfitting. The specific form of sample splitting analyzed in our proofs is “cross-fitting” [52, 43, 11], but leave-one-out or out-of-bag quantile estimates perform similarly in simulations.

### Condition 3. (Quantile estimates)

For each  $t \in \{1 - \tau, \tau\}$ , one of the following holds:

- (i)  $\hat{Q}_t(x, z) = \hat{\beta}_t(z)^\top h(x)$  for some fixed “features”  $h_j(X)$  with finite variance.
- (ii)  $\hat{Q}_t(x, z)$  is estimated using cross-fitting and satisfies Condition N in Appendix B.11.

Condition 3 is essentially “algorithmic,” and neither (i) nor (ii) impose any accuracy requirements on the estimated conditional quantiles. The appendix conditions in (ii) are technical to state but very mild. For example, they are satisfied by quantile estimates based on nearest-neighbors [55, 56], kernels [7], and random forests [2, 39] under conditions 1 and 2.

Under these conditions, we have the following result on the asymptotic sharpness of the quantile balancing bounds.

### Theorem 3. (Sharpness and robustness)

For any  $\psi_0 \in \{\psi_T, \psi_C, \psi_{ATT}, \psi_{ATE}\}$ , let  $[\psi^-, \psi^+]$  be its partially identified interval under Assumption A and let  $[\hat{\psi}^-, \hat{\psi}^+]$  be the corresponding quantile balancing interval. Assume Conditions 1, 2, and 3.

- (i) If the quantile regression estimates are consistent, then  $\hat{\psi}^- \xrightarrow{P} \psi^-$  and  $\hat{\psi}^+ \xrightarrow{P} \psi^+$ .
- (ii) Even if the quantile models are misspecified, we still have  $\hat{\psi}^- \leq \psi^- + o_P(1)$  and  $\psi^+ - o_P(1) \leq \hat{\psi}^+$ .

The result (i) is expected, so we offer some intuition for (ii). The true worst-case propensity score  $\bar{E}_+$  defined in Proposition 4 “balances” all (integrable) functions of  $X$ , so it is “almost” feasible in the optimization problem (26). Thus, even if the quantile regression model is misspecified, the IPW estimator based on  $\bar{E}_+$  will “almost” be in the domain of (26). We should therefore expect  $\hat{\psi}_+$  to be too large rather than too small. The robustness result (ii) shows that it eventually is.

The validity of the confidence interval (27) follows under stronger parametric assumptions. We prove an inference result assuming the nominal propensity score is estimated by a correctly-specified parametric model and the conditional quantiles are estimated by a (potentially misspecified) parametric model. These assumptions are not much stronger than what we expect the primary analysis to assume for inference under unconfoundedness [20, 63].

**Theorem 4. (Inference)**

Let  $[\psi^-, \psi^+]$  be as in Theorem 3, and let  $\text{CI}(\alpha)$  be as in (27). Suppose Conditions 1, 2, and 3.(i) are satisfied, and also that the nominal propensity score is estimated by a regular parametric model (e.g. logistic regression). Then we have

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}([\psi^-, \psi^+] \subseteq \text{CI}(\alpha)) \geq 1 - \alpha \tag{28}$$

for any  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ .

The inferential guarantee (28) is stronger than some analysts may require. The confidence interval  $\text{CI}(\alpha)$  covers the entire partially identified set  $[\psi^-, \psi^+]$  with probability asymptotically at least  $1 - \alpha$ . However, if one believes that the sensitivity assumption is actually correct, then the coverage of the true causal estimand will typically exceed  $1 - \alpha$ . Refined bounds intended only to capture  $\psi_0$  could be constructed using an approach similar to the one from Imbens and Manski [25].

Although we do not have theoretical support for the confidence interval  $\text{CI}(\alpha)$  when quantiles are estimated by a nonlinear model, we find that approach performs reasonably well in the simulations of Section 5.

## 5 Numerical examples

In this section, we illustrate the finite-sample performance of the quantile balancing method on several simulated datasets and one real-data example. We also compare several variants of the method against the ZSB method described in Section 2 on the simulated datasets.

### 5.1 Simulated data

We consider two data-generating processes (DGPs) in our simulated examples. The two DGPs differ in the distribution of the regression function  $\mathbb{E}[Y|X, Z]$ , but otherwise can be described as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} X &\sim \text{Uniform}([-1, 1]^5) \\ Z | X &\sim \text{Bernoulli} \left( \frac{1}{1 + \exp(-\sum_{j=1}^5 X_j / \sqrt{5})} \right) \\ Y | X, Z &\sim \mathcal{N}(\mu(X), 1). \end{aligned} \tag{29}$$

In the first DGP, we use  $\mu(x) = x_1 + \dots + x_5$ , and in the second DGP we use  $\mu(x) = \frac{3}{2}\text{sign}(x_1) + \text{sign}(x_2)$ . The estimand of interest is the ATE and we fix  $\Lambda = 2$ , i.e. unobserved confounders can double or halve the odds of treatment.

We compare four methods for obtaining bounds on  $\psi_{\text{ATE}}$ . **Linear** applies the quantile balancing method of Section 4 with quantiles estimated following [33]. **Forest** is similar, but  $\hat{Q}_t(x, z)$  is fitted using out-of-bag estimates from the random forest method of Athey et al. [2]. **Covariates** directly balances the features  $X$  without first estimating quantiles. **ZSB** implements the unconstrained method described in Section 2. All four methods estimate the nominal propensity score by logistic regression.

Figure 1 shows the distribution of upper and lower bound point estimates from each of these four methods, estimated using 1,000 simulations with 500 observations each. Dashed lines indicate the true partially identified region. The results conform to the asymptotic predictions of Proposition 1 and Theorem 3: (i) when the quantile models are “correctly specified,” the quantile balancing point estimates are nearly unbiased; (ii) under misspecification, the range of point estimates is too wide rather than too narrow; and (iii) the ZSB range of point estimates is too wide in both cases.




Figure 1: *Boxplots of the ATE upper and lower bound point estimates for both DGPs and all considered methods. The dashed line indicates the boundary of the true partially identified set. In DGP1, the **Linear** and **Covariates** methods are correctly specified and give the most accurate bounds. In DGP2, the **Forest** method is well-suited to the piecewise-constant outcome model and gives the most accurate bounds.*

Confidence intervals based on the **Linear** and **Covariates** approaches exhibited some under-coverage at this sample size, at least in the “well-specified” setting of DGP1. The 90% bootstrap confidence intervals based on the **Linear** method had approximately 85.4% coverage of the identified set, whereas those based on the **Covariates** method had 81.3% coverage. This undercoverage is partially caused by a small bias in the original range of point estimates, which is not readily apparent from Figure 1. Meanwhile, **Forest** had 95.5% coverage, and **ZSB** had 100% coverage. In DGP2, the **Forest** method had 91.6% coverage and all other methods had at least 99% coverage.

## 5.2 Real data

In this section, we apply our proposed sensitivity analysis to a subsample of data from the 1966-1981 National Longitudinal Survey (NLS) of Older and Young Men. We wish to estimate the impact of union membership on wages. Specifically, we consider the ATE of union membership on log wages. For illustrative reasons, we focus on the 1978 cross-section of Young Men and restrict our attention to craftsmen and laborers not enrolled in school. Our estimates are thus based on a sample of 668 respondents with measurements on wages, union membership, and eight other covariates.

For our primary analysis, we use IPW to adjust for baseline imbalances in covariates between union and nonunion samples. Table 1 reports the covariate balance between union and nonunion samples before and after weighting by the (estimated) inverse propensity score. On several important characteristics, inverse propensity weighting dramatically improves balance across the two samples.

The IPW point estimate of the ATE is 0.23 with an associated 90% confidence interval of [0.18, 0.27]. Thus, our primary analysis concludes that union membership has a positive effect on wages, at least on average among craftsmen and laborers. Both the point estimate and the confidence interval are in agreement with prior literature studying the same problem using cross-sectional data. See [26, 27] for overviews. Alternative analysis methods (e.g. regression, matching) give essentially the same point estimates when applied to this data.

Freeman [18], Mellow [40] and many other economists have argued that cross-sectional estimates of the union premium overestimate the true causal effect because higher-skill workers are simultaneously more likely

Covariate	Unweighted		Weighted	
	Union	Nonunion	Union	Nonunion
Age	30.1	30.0	30.0	30.0
Black	24%	24%	23%	24%
Metropolitan	74%	57%	66%	65%
Southern	32%	53%	42%	42%
Married	78%	75%	76%	76%
Manufacturing	42%	32%	37%	38%
Laborer	23%	15%	18%	18%
Education	12.2	11.7	12.1	12.0

Table 1: *Covariate means among the nonunion and union subsamples, along with the means in the weighted samples. In red, we highlight particularly large imbalances. In the weighted samples, propensity weights are estimated using logistic regression.*

to be selected for union jobs and earn high wages. Here, “skill” refers to an unobserved confounder which is only partially captured by the measured covariates. Is it plausible that the positive effect we find in the IPW analysis could be entirely due to the selection on skill? A sensitivity analysis may help address this problem.

Figure 2 reports point estimate ranges and 90% bootstrap confidence intervals from both quantile balancing and the ZSB sensitivity analysis for several values of the sensitivity parameter  $\Lambda$ . We estimate  $\hat{Q}_t(x, z)$  for quantile balancing using the standard linear quantile model of Koenker and Bassett [33].




Figure 2: *Point estimate ranges and 90% bootstrap confidence intervals for the ATE in the NLS dataset. For the quantile balancing method, conditional quantiles are estimated using the linear quantile regression method of Koenker and Bassett [33].*

Both sensitivity analyses show that the positive effect found in the primary analysis is fairly robust to unobserved confounding, but quantile balancing refines the ZSB interval. Even if the odds of union membership for “skilled” workers were double the odds for “typical” workers with the same observed covariates, the quantile balancing analysis would still find a statistically significant positive treatment effect. Meanwhile, when  $\Lambda = 2$ , the ZSB confidence intervals already include the null, although the range of point estimates (barely) excludes it. In this application, quantile balancing only slightly refined the ZSB range. Generally speaking, we expect to see larger relative improvements in problems where the covariates have more explanatory power.

To put these figures in context, we follow Kallus and Zhou [31] and compute the degree to which the (estimated) odds of union membership could change if *measured* confounders were omitted from the dataset. Caveats to this approach and more sophisticated empirical calibration strategies are discussed in Hsu and

Small [23], Zhang and Small [62], and Cinelli and Hazlett [12]. Omitting `Black` only changes the odds of treatment by a factor of 1.4, and omitting `Laborer` only changes the odds of treatment by a factor of 1.9. In fact, no measured confounders except `South` were able to double or halve the odds of union membership for any respondent. We interpret these results as showing that the qualitative conclusions of the primary analysis are fairly robust to unobserved confounding by skill.

Incidentally, longitudinal estimates of union wage effects — which control for individual-specific effects like “skill” — come to similar conclusions as the one suggested by our sensitivity analysis. Although treatment effect estimates from longitudinal studies are generally smaller than those from cross-sectional studies, they still find evidence in favor of the “union premium” [9, 26, 18].

## 6 Conclusion

We have shown that quantile balancing — a simple modification of the popular ZSB [63] sensitivity analysis — is feasible, robust, and sharp. This new sensitivity analysis for IPW is based on novel partial identification results for Tan [57]’s marginal sensitivity model.

We will point to several interesting directions for future work. While our partial identification results focus on counterfactual means and a few treatment effects, it should be possible to extend our partial identification results to more complex estimands of the type considered in [28, 29, 30, 31, 36]. Perhaps a similarly compact sensitivity analysis could even apply to dynamic treatment regimes. In addition, while our identification arguments generalize to any sensitivity assumption that only restricts the propensity score in a pointwise fashion (i.e.  $e_{\min}(x) \leq e_0(x, u) \leq e_{\max}(x)$ ), the practicality of our sensitivity analysis and its theoretical properties rely on the marginal sensitivity model quite heavily. It would be interesting to see if a practical and sharp sensitivity analysis could be developed for other sensitivity assumptions in this class.

## References

- [1] Peter M Aronow and Donald K K Lee. “Interval estimation of population means under unknown but bounded probabilities of sample selection”. In: *Biometrika* 100.1 (2013), pp. 235–240.
- [2] Susan Athey, Julie Tibshirani, and Stefan Wager. “Generalized random forests”. In: *Annals of Statistics* 47.2 (Apr. 2019), pp. 1148–1178.
- [3] Susan Athey and Stefan Wager. “Policy Learning with Observational Data”. In: *Econometrica* 89.1 (2021), pp. 133–161.
- [4] Peter C. Austin and Elizabeth A. Stuart. “Moving towards best practice when using inverse probability of treatment weighting (IPTW) using the propensity score to estimate causal treatment effects in observational studies”. In: *Statistics in Medicine* 34.28 (2015), pp. 3661–3679.
- [5] Alexandre Belloni et al. “Conditional quantile processes based on series or many regressors”. In: *Journal of Econometrics* 213.1 (2019). Annals: In Honor of Roger Koenker, pp. 4–29. ISSN: 0304-4076.
- [6] Arie Beresteanu, Ilya Molchanov, and Francesca Molinari. “Sharp Identification Regions in Models with Convex Moment Predictions”. In: *Econometrica* 79.6 (2011), pp. 1785–1821. ISSN: 00129682, 14680262.
- [7] P. K. Bhattacharya and Ashis K. Gangopadhyay. “Kernel and Nearest-Neighbor Estimation of a Conditional Quantile”. In: *Annals of Statistics* 18.3 (1990), pp. 1400–1415.
- [8] Jolene Birmingham, Andrea Rotnitzky, and Garrett M Fitzmaurice. “Pattern-mixture and selection models for analysing longitudinal data with monotone missing patterns”. In: *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B* 65.1 (2003), pp. 275–297.
- [9] Gary Chamberlain. “Multivariate regression models for panel data”. In: *Journal of Econometrics* 18.1 (1982), pp. 5–46. ISSN: 0304-4076.
- [10] Kwun Chuen Gary Chan, Sheung Chi Phillip Yam, and Zheng Zhang. “Globally efficient non-parametric inference of average treatment effects by empirical balancing calibration weighting”. In: *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B* 78.3 (2016), pp. 673–700.
- [11] Victor Chernozhukov et al. “Double/debiased machine learning for treatment and structural parameters”. In: *Econometrics Journal* 21.1 (2018), pp. C1–C68.
- [12] Carlos Cinelli and Chad Hazlett. “Making Sense of Sensitivity: Extending Omitted Variables Bias”. In: *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B* 82 (2020), pp. 39–67.
- [13] George B. Dantzig and Abraham Wald. “On the Fundamental Lemma of Neyman and Pearson”. In: *Annals of Mathematical Statistics* 22.1 (1951), pp. 87–93. ISSN: 00034851.
- [14] D. A. Darling. “On a Class of Problems Related to the Random Division of an Interval”. In: *Annals of Mathematical Statistics* 24.2 (June 1953), pp. 239–253.
- [15] Laurent Davezies and Xavier D’Haultfoeuille. *A New Characterization of Identified sets in Partially Identified Models*. 2016.
- [16] Yanqin Fan and Sang Soo Park. “Sharp bounds on the distribution of treatment effects and their statistical inference”. In: *Econometric Theory* 26.3 (2010), pp. 931–951. ISSN: 02664666, 14694360.
- [17] Alexander M Franks, Alexander D Amour, and Avi Feller. “Flexible Sensitivity Analysis for Observational Studies Without Observable Implications”. In: *Journal of the American Statistical Association* (2019).
- [18] Richard B. Freeman. “Longitudinal Analyses of the Effects of Trade Unions”. In: *Journal of Labor Economics* 2.1 (1984), pp. 1–26. ISSN: 0734306X, 15375307.
- [19] Bryan S. Graham. “Efficiency Bounds for Missing Data Models With Semiparametric Restrictions”. In: *Econometrica* 79.2 (2011), pp. 437–452.
- [20] Keisuke Hirano and Guido W Imbens. “Estimation of Causal Effects using Propensity Score Weighting: An Application to Data on Right Heart Catheterization”. In: *Health Services & Outcomes Research Methodology* 2 (2002), pp. 259–278.

- [21] Keisuke Hirano, Guido W Imbens, and Geert Ridder. “Efficient Estimation of Average Treatment Effects Using the Estimated Propensity Score”. In: *Econometrica* 71.4 (2003), pp. 1161–1189. ISSN: 00129682, 14680262.
- [22] M. Hristache and V. Patilea. “Conditional moment models with data missing at random”. In: *Biometrika* 104.3 (May 2017), pp. 735–742. ISSN: 0006-3444.
- [23] Jesse Y. Hsu and Dylan S. Small. “Calibrating Sensitivity Analyses to Observed Covariates in Observational Studies”. In: *Biometrics* 69.4 (2013), pp. 803–811. ISSN: 0006341X, 15410420.
- [24] Kosuke Imai and Marc Ratkovic. “Covariate balancing propensity score”. In: *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B* 76.1 (2014), pp. 243–263.
- [25] Guido W. Imbens and Charles F. Manski. “Confidence Intervals for Partially Identified Parameters”. In: *Econometrica* 72.6 (2004), pp. 1845–1857.
- [26] George Jakubson. “Estimation and Testing of the Union Wage Effect Using Panel Data”. In: *Review of Economic Studies* 58.5 (1991), pp. 971–991. ISSN: 00346527, 1467937X.
- [27] George Johnson. “Economic Analysis of Trade Unionism”. In: *American Economic Review* 65.2 (1975), pp. 23–28.
- [28] Nathan Kallus, Xiaojie Mao, and Angela Zhou. “Interval Estimation of Individual-Level Causal Effects Under Unobserved Confounding”. In: *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*. Ed. by Kamalika Chaudhuri and Masashi Sugiyama. Vol. 89. Proceedings of Machine Learning Research. PMLR, 2019, pp. 2281–2290.
- [29] Nathan Kallus and Angela Zhou. “Confounding-Robust Policy Evaluation in Infinite-Horizon Reinforcement Learning”. In: *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*. Ed. by H. Larochelle et al. Vol. 33. Curran Associates, Inc., 2020, pp. 22293–22304.
- [30] Nathan Kallus and Angela Zhou. “Confounding-Robust Policy Improvement”. In: *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 31. Ed. by S. Bengio et al. Curran Associates, Inc., 2018, pp. 9269–9279.
- [31] Nathan Kallus and Angela Zhou. “Minimax-Optimal Policy Learning Under Unobserved Confounding”. In: *Management Science* (2020).
- [32] Roger Koenker. *Quantile Regression*. Econometric Society Monographs. Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- [33] Roger W Koenker and Gilbert Bassett. “Regression Quantiles”. In: *Econometrica* 46.1 (1978), pp. 33–50.
- [34] M.R. Kosorok. *Introduction to empirical processes and semiparametric inference*. Springer series in statistics. Springer, 2008. ISBN: 9780387749778.
- [35] David Lee. “Training, Wages, and Sample Selection: Estimating Sharp Bounds on Treatment Effects”. In: *Review of Economic Studies* 76 (2009), pp. 1071–1102.
- [36] Kwonsang Lee, Falco J. Bargagli-Stoffi, and Francesca Dominici. *Causal Rule Ensemble: Interpretable Inference of Heterogeneous Treatment Effects*. 2020. arXiv: [2009.09036](https://arxiv.org/abs/2009.09036) [stat.ME].
- [37] Matthew A Masten and Alexandre Poirier. “Identification of Treatment Effects Under Conditional Partial Independence”. In: *Econometrica* 86.1 (2018), pp. 317–351.
- [38] Matthew A. Masten, Alexandre Poirier, and Linqi Zhang. *Assessing Sensitivity to Unconfoundedness: Estimation and Inference*. 2020. arXiv: [2012.15716](https://arxiv.org/abs/2012.15716) [econ.EM].
- [39] Nicolai Meinshausen. “Quantile Regression Forests”. In: *Journal of Machine Learning Research* 7 (Dec. 2006), pp. 983–999. ISSN: 1532-4435.
- [40] Wesley Mellow. “Unionism and Wages: A Longitudinal Analysis”. In: *Review of Economics and Statistics* 63.1 (1981), pp. 43–52. ISSN: 00346535, 15309142.
- [41] L W Miratrix, S Wager, and J R Zubizarreta. “Shape-constrained partial identification of a population mean under unknown probabilities of sample selection”. In: *Biometrika* 105.1 (2018), pp. 103–114.

- [42] Whitney K. Newey and Daniel McFadden. “Large sample estimation and hypothesis testing”. In: vol. 4. *Handbook of Econometrics*. Elsevier, 1994, pp. 2111–2245.
- [43] Whitney K. Newey and James M. Robins. *Cross-fitting and fast remainder rates for semiparametric estimation*. CeMMAP working papers CWP41/17. Centre for Microdata Methods and Practice, Institute for Fiscal Studies, 2017.
- [44] Jerzy Neyman. “On the Application of Probability Theory to Agricultural Experiments. Essay on Principles. Section 9”. In: *Statistical Science* 5.4 (Nov. 1923), pp. 465–472.
- [45] James M. Robins, Andrea Rotnitzky, and Daniel O. Scharfstein. “Sensitivity Analysis for Selection bias and unmeasured Confounding in missing Data and Causal inference models”. In: *Statistical Models in Epidemiology, the Environment, and Clinical Trials*. Ed. by M. Elizabeth Halloran and Donald Berry. New York, NY: Springer New York, 2000, pp. 1–94. ISBN: 978-1-4612-1284-3.
- [46] Paul R Rosenbaum. *Design of Observational Studies*. New York: Springer, 2010.
- [47] Paul R Rosenbaum. “Sensitivity analysis for certain permutation inferences in matched observational studies”. In: *Biometrika* 74.1 (1987), pp. 13–26.
- [48] Paul R. Rosenbaum. “Covariance Adjustment in Randomized Experiments and Observational Studies”. In: *Statistical Science* 17.3 (Aug. 2002), pp. 286–327.
- [49] Evan Rosenman and Art B. Owen. *Designing Experiments Informed by Observational Studies*. 2021. arXiv: [2102.10237 \[stat.ME\]](#).
- [50] Evan Rosenman et al. *Combining Observational and Experimental Datasets Using Shrinkage Estimators*. 2020. arXiv: [2002.06708 \[stat.ME\]](#).
- [51] D.B. Rubin. “Estimating causal effects of treatments in randomized and nonrandomized studies”. In: *Journal of Educational Psychology* 66.5 (1974), pp. 688–701.
- [52] Anton Schick. “On Asymptotically Efficient Estimation in Semiparametric Models”. In: *Annals of Statistics* 14.3 (Sept. 1986), pp. 1139–1151.
- [53] Vira Semenova. *Better Lee Bounds*. 2020. arXiv: [2008.12720 \[econ.EM\]](#).
- [54] Dan Soriano et al. *Interpretable Sensitivity Analysis for Balancing Weights*. 2021. arXiv: [2102.13218 \[stat.ME\]](#).
- [55] Charles J. Stone. “Consistent Nonparametric Regression”. In: *Annals of Statistics* 5.4 (July 1977), pp. 595–620.
- [56] Winfried Stute. “Conditional Empirical Processes”. In: *Annals of Statistics* 14.2 (1986), pp. 638–647.
- [57] Zhiqiang Tan. “A Distributional Approach for Causal Inference Using Propensity Scores”. In: *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 101.476 (2006), pp. 1619–1637.
- [58] Matthew Tudball et al. *An Interval Estimation Approach to Sample Selection Bias*. 2019. arXiv: [1906.10159 \[stat.ME\]](#).
- [59] Mark J van der Laan and Sherri Rose. *Targeted Learning: Causal Inference for Observational and Experimental Data*. Springer Series in Statistics. New York: Springer-Verlag, 2011.
- [60] Jon Wellner and Yihui Zhan. *Bootstrapping Z-estimators*. Tech. rep. University of Washington, Dept. of Statistics, 1996.
- [61] Steve Yadlowsky et al. *Bounds on the conditional and average treatment effect with unobserved confounding factors*. 2018. arXiv: [1808.09521 \[stat.ME\]](#).
- [62] Bo Zhang and Dylan S Small. “A calibrated sensitivity analysis for matched observational studies with application to the effect of second-hand smoke exposure on blood lead levels in children”. In: *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series C* 69.5 (2020), pp. 1285–1305.
- [63] Qingyuan Zhao, Dylan S Small, and Bhaswar B Bhattacharya. “Sensitivity analysis for inverse probability weighting estimators via the percentile bootstrap”. In: *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B* 81.4 (2019), pp. 735–761.

## A Appendix: Computation

This appendix describes how the quantile balancing sensitivity analysis can be implemented using standard solvers for linear quantile regression (A.1), e.g. the `quantreg` package in R or the `qreg` function in Stata. It also gives the formulas for the ATT bounds (A.2), which were omitted from the main text.

Throughout this appendix,  $\Lambda \geq 1$  is fixed and we set  $\tau = \Lambda/(\Lambda + 1)$ . We also use the notation  $\mathbb{P}_n[\cdot]$  as shorthand for the average  $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n [\cdot]_i$ .

### A.1 Computing bounds with weighted quantile regression

We begin by considering computation of  $\psi_T^+$ . We consider the more general optimization problem (30) for some function  $g : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^k$  containing an “intercept.” In the main text, we assumed  $g(x) = (1, \hat{Q}_\tau(x, 1))$ .

$$\max_{\bar{e} \in \mathcal{E}_n(\Lambda)} \frac{\mathbb{P}_n Y Z / \bar{e}}{\mathbb{P}_n Z / \hat{e}(X)} \quad \text{subject to} \quad \mathbb{P}_n g(X) Z / \bar{e} = \mathbb{P}_n g(X) Z / \hat{e}(X). \quad (30)$$

Let  $\rho_\tau(u) = u(\tau - \mathbb{I}\{u < 0\})$  be the quantile regression “check” function [32, 33] and define the weighted quantile regression objective as:

$$\mathcal{L}_n(\gamma) := \mathbb{P}_n \rho_\tau(Y - \gamma^\top g(X)) Z \frac{1 - \hat{e}(X)}{\bar{e}(X)}. \quad (31)$$

The following proposition shows that any minimizer of  $\mathcal{L}_n$  can be used to compute the solution of (30).

**Proposition 6.** *Suppose  $\hat{e}(X_i) \in (0, 1)$  for all  $i$ , let  $\hat{\gamma}$  minimize  $\mathcal{L}_n$  and let  $\hat{V}_i = \text{sign}(Y_i - \hat{\gamma}^\top g(X))$ . Then the optimal objective value in (30) is:*

$$\frac{\mathbb{P}_n(Y - \hat{\gamma}^\top g(X)) Z (1 + \Lambda \hat{V}_i (1 - \hat{e}(X)) / \hat{e}(X)) + \mathbb{P}_n \hat{\gamma}^\top g(X) Z / \hat{e}(X)}{\mathbb{P}_n Z / \hat{e}(X)}.$$

*Proof.* See Appendix B. □

This same approach can be used to compute a lower bound for  $\psi_T$ , by replacing  $Y$  with  $-Y$ , applying Proposition 6, and then negating the answer. Upper and lower bounds for  $\psi_C$  can then be obtained by replacing  $Z$  by  $1 - Z$  and  $\hat{e}(X)$  by  $1 - \hat{e}(X)$  and then applying the same procedure. Subtracting the upper and lower bounds for  $\psi_T$  and  $\psi_C$  (as in Theorem 2) gives bounds on  $\psi_{\text{ATE}}$ .

### A.2 Bounds for the ATT

Next, we describe the standard quantile balancing bounds for  $\psi_{\text{ATT}}$ . Let  $\bar{Y}(1)$  be the average value of  $Y_i$  among treated observations. We define the quantile balancing upper bound for the ATT as the solution to the optimization problem (32), where  $g_+(x) = (1, \hat{Q}_{1-\tau}(x, 0))$ .

$$\hat{\psi}_{\text{ATT}}^+ = \max_{\bar{e} \in \mathcal{E}_n(\Lambda)} \bar{Y}(1) - \frac{\sum_{Z_i=0} Y_i \frac{\bar{e}_i}{1 - \bar{e}_i}}{\sum_{Z_i=0} \frac{\bar{e}_i}{1 - \bar{e}_i}} \quad \text{s.t.} \quad \sum_{Z_i=0} g_+(X_i) \frac{\bar{e}_i}{1 - \bar{e}_i} = \sum_{Z_i=0} g_+(X_i) \frac{\hat{e}_i}{1 - \hat{e}_i} \quad (32)$$

The lower bound  $\hat{\psi}_{\text{ATT}}^-$  is defined similarly, but with maximization replaced by minimization and  $g_+(x)$  replaced by  $g_-(x) := (1, \hat{Q}_\tau(x, 0))$ . When  $\Lambda = 1$ , the two bounds collapse to the ordinary (stabilized) IPW estimate of the ATT under unconfoundedness [4, 24]. These bounds can also be computed using a variant of Proposition 6, but we omit the details.

## B Appendix: Proofs

This appendix collects proofs of the results in the main text, along with supporting results. Throughout, we will use the following notation. For an integer  $n \geq 1$ ,  $[n]$  denotes the set  $\{1, \dots, n\}$ . For symmetric matrices  $\mathbf{A}$  and  $\mathbf{B}$ ,  $\mathbf{A} \succeq \mathbf{B}$  and  $\mathbf{A} \succ \mathbf{B}$  mean  $\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{B}$  is positive semidefinite and positive definite, respectively. If  $\{a_n\}$  and  $\{b_n\}$  are sequences of real numbers, then  $a_n \lesssim b_n$  means  $a_n = \mathcal{O}(b_n)$  and  $a_n \sim b_n$  means  $a_n/b_n \rightarrow 1$ . Similarly, if  $\{A_n\}$  and  $\{B_n\}$  are sequences of random variables, then  $A_n \lesssim_P B_n$  means  $A_n = \mathcal{O}_P(B_n)$  and  $A_n \sim_P B_n$  means  $A_n/B_n \xrightarrow{P} 1$ . We adopt the convention that  $a/b = 0$  when  $a$  and  $b$  are both zero.

We also make use of some standard empirical process notation. For a (possibly random) function  $f : \mathcal{X} \times \mathbb{R} \times \{0, 1\} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , we will write  $Pf := \int f dP$  and  $\mathbb{P}_n f := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n f(X_i, Y_i, Z_i)$ . For any vector  $v = (v_1, \dots, v_n)$ , we take  $\mathbb{P}_n v = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n v_i$ . For any  $p \in [1, \infty)$ , we define  $\|f\|_{L^p(P)} = (P|f|^p)^{1/p}$  and  $\|f\|_{L^p(\mathbb{P}_n)} = (\mathbb{P}_n|f|^p)^{1/p}$ . When  $p = \infty$ , we set  $\|f\|_{L^\infty(P)} = \inf\{t : P(|f| \leq t) = 1\}$  and  $\|f\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{P}_n)} = \max_{i \leq n} |f(X_i, Y_i, Z_i)|$ .

### B.1 Proof of Proposition 1

*Proof.* The partially identified set for  $\psi_T$  follows from the proof of Proposition 2, so we only need to show that the ZSB interval is asymptotically too wide. Let  $\hat{\psi}_{T, \text{ZSB}}^+$  be as in (5). Let  $\bar{E}^* = \frac{1}{3} + \frac{1}{3}\mathbb{I}\{Y \leq 0.27\sqrt{\sigma^2 + 1}\}$ , and notice that  $Y | Z = 1 \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2 + 1)$ . Then a straightforward calculation using the Inverse Mills ratio formula gives:

$$\frac{\mathbb{E}[YZ/\bar{E}^*]}{\mathbb{E}[Z/\bar{E}^*]} = \frac{\phi(0.27)\sqrt{\sigma^2 + 1}}{2 - \Phi(0.27)} > 0.27\sqrt{\sigma^2 + 1}$$

The strong law of large numbers implies  $\liminf \hat{\psi}_{T, \text{ZSB}}^+ \geq \liminf (\mathbb{P}_n YZ/\bar{E}^*)/(\mathbb{P}_n Z/\bar{E}^*) > 0.27\sqrt{\sigma^2 + 1}$  almost surely. The lower bound follows by symmetry.  $\square$

### B.2 Proof of Proposition 2

*Proof.* First, we will compute the partially identified set for  $\psi_T$ . Let  $z_\tau$  denote the  $\tau$ -th quantile of the standard normal distribution. Since the conditional distribution of  $Y | X = x, Z = 1$  is continuous for every  $x$ , Proposition 4 implies  $\psi_T^+ = \mathbb{E}[YZ/\bar{E}_+]$  where  $\bar{E}_+$  satisfies the following:

$$1/\bar{E}_+ = \begin{cases} 1 + \frac{1-e(X)}{e(X)}\Lambda^{+1} & \text{if } Y \geq \mu(X, 1) + \sigma(X)z_\tau \\ 1 + \frac{1-e(X)}{e(X)}\Lambda^{-1} & \text{if } Y < \mu(X, 1) + \sigma(X)z_\tau \end{cases}$$

Let  $C(x) = \mu(x, 1) + \sigma(x)z_\tau$ . Write  $\mathbb{E}[YZ/\bar{E}_+] = \mathbb{E}[e(X)\mathbb{E}[Y/\bar{E}_+ | X, Z = 1]]$  and evaluate the inner expectation as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[Y/\bar{E}_+ | X, Z = 1] &= \tau\mathbb{E}[Y/\bar{E}_+ | X, Z = 1, Y < C(X)] + (1 - \tau)\mathbb{E}[Y/\bar{E}_+ | X, Z = 1, Y \geq C(X)] \\ &= \tau\mathbb{E}[Y | X, Z = 1, Y < C(X)] + \tau\frac{1-e(X)}{e(X)}\Lambda^{-1}\mathbb{E}[Y | X, Z = 1, Y < C(X)] \\ &= \frac{\mu(X, 1)}{e(X)} + \frac{\Lambda-1}{\Lambda}\frac{1-e(X)}{e(X)}\sigma(X)\frac{\phi(z_\tau)}{1-\tau} \end{aligned}$$

In the last step, we used the inverse Mill's ratio formula for the expectation of a truncated Gaussian distribution. Simplifying gives  $\psi_T^+ = \mathbb{E}[\mu(X, 1)] + \frac{\Lambda^2-1}{\Lambda}\phi(z_\tau)\mathbb{E}[(1-e(X))\sigma(X)]$ .

At this point, we can immediately generalize the above calculation to all other potential outcome bounds. By applying the preceding calculation to  $-Y$  and negating the answer, we may conclude:

$$\psi_T^- = \mathbb{E}[\mu(X, 1)] - \frac{\Lambda^2-1}{\Lambda}\phi(z_\tau)\mathbb{E}[(1-e(X))\sigma(X)].$$

By exchanging the roles of  $Z$  and  $1-Z$  (and correspondingly the roles of  $e(X)$  and  $1-e(X)$ ), we then obtain the bounds:

$$\begin{aligned} \psi_C^+ &= \mathbb{E}[\mu(X, 0)] + \frac{\Lambda^2-1}{\Lambda}\phi(z_\tau)\mathbb{E}[e(X)\sigma(X)] \\ \psi_C^- &= \mathbb{E}[\mu(X, 0)] - \frac{\Lambda^2-1}{\Lambda}\phi(z_\tau)\mathbb{E}[e(X)\sigma(X)] \end{aligned}$$

Finally, subtracting the sharp bounds on  $\psi_T$  and  $\psi_C$  as justified by Theorem 2 gives the conclusion of Proposition 2.  $\square$

### B.3 Proof of Proposition 3

We instead show the more general result:

**Proposition 3B.** *Let  $(X, Y, Z) \sim P$ , and let  $e_{\min}, e_{\max} : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow (0, 1]$  be any two functions. For any random variable  $\bar{E} \in (0, 1]$  satisfying  $\mathbb{E}[Z/\bar{E}|X] = 1$  and  $Z/e_{\max}(X) \leq Z/\bar{E} \leq Z/e_{\min}(X)$ , we can construct random variables  $(Y(0), Y(1), U)$  on the same probability space as  $(X, Y, Z, \bar{E})$  and an associated putative propensity score  $\bar{e}(X, U) := \mathbb{E}[Z|X, U]$  satisfying the following properties:*

- (i)  $Y = ZY(1) + (1 - Z)Y(0)$ .
- (ii)  $(Y(0), Y(1)) \perp\!\!\!\perp Z \mid (X, U)$  and  $e_{\min}(X) \leq \bar{e}(X, U) \leq e_{\max}(X)$ .
- (iii)  $Z/\bar{e}(X, U) = Z/\bar{E}$ .

To recover the result of Proposition 3 from Proposition 3B, define  $e_{\min}(x) = e(x)/(e(x) + [1 - e(x)]\Lambda)$  and  $e_{\max}(x) = e(x)/(e(x) + [1 - e(x)]/\Lambda)$ . Then let  $Q$  be the joint distribution of  $(X, Y(0), Y(1), Z, U)$ . Item (i) implies  $Q$  is data compatible, item (ii) and  $\bar{E} \in \mathcal{E}_{\infty}(\Lambda)$  imply  $Q$  satisfies Assumption  $\Lambda$ , and item (iii) implies  $\mathbb{E}_Q[Y(1)] = \mathbb{E}_Q[YZ/\bar{e}(X, U)] = \mathbb{E}_P[YZ/\bar{E}]$ .

*Proof.* We begin by constructing  $Y(0), Y(1)$  and  $U$ . Let  $(X, Y, Z, \bar{E})$  be as in the proposition, and suppose we have access to independent random variables  $V_1, V_2 \sim \text{Uniform}[0, 1]$  which are also jointly independent of  $(X, Y, Z, \bar{E})$ . Define the following collection of distribution functions:

$$\begin{aligned} F(y|x, z) &= P(Y \leq y | X = x, Z = z) \\ G(y|x, z, \bar{e}) &= P(Y \leq y | X = x, Z = z, \bar{E} = \bar{e}) \\ H(\bar{e}|x, z) &= P(\bar{E} \leq \bar{e} | X = x, Z = z) \\ K(u|x) &= \int_{-\infty}^u \frac{e(x)}{1 - e(x)} \frac{1 - \bar{e}}{\bar{e}} dH(\bar{e}|x, 1) \end{aligned}$$

One can verify that the conditions  $\mathbb{E}[Z/\bar{E}|X] = 1$  and  $\bar{E} > 0$  imply  $K(u|x)$  is a proper CDF for each  $x$ . Using these functions, we define  $Y(1), Y(0)$ , and  $U$  by:

$$\begin{aligned} Y(1) &= ZY + (1 - Z)G^{-1}(V_1|X, 1, \bar{E}) \\ Y(0) &= ZF^{-1}(V_1|X, 0) + (1 - Z)Y \\ U &= Z\bar{E} + (1 - Z)K^{-1}(V_2|X). \end{aligned}$$

We adopt the convention that  $J^{-1}(s) := \inf\{t : J(t) \geq s\}$  whenever  $J$  is a distribution function, so that these quantities are well-defined even when some of these conditional distribution functions are not invertible.

With the construction done, we now verify the properties stated in the Proposition.

- (i) This is immediate from the definition of  $Y(0)$  and  $Y(1)$ .
- (ii) We compute the distribution of  $(Y(0), Y(1))$  given  $X, U, Z = 1$  and the distribution of  $(Y(0), Y(1))$  given  $X, U, Z = 0$ .

$$\begin{aligned} P(Y(0) \leq y_0, Y(1) \leq y_1 | X, U, Z = 1) &= P(F^{-1}(V_1|X, 0) \leq y_0, Y \leq y_1 | X, \bar{E}, Z = 1) \\ &= P(F^{-1}(V_1|X, 0) \leq y_0 | X, \bar{E}, Z = 1) G(y_1 | X, 1, \bar{E}) \\ &= P(F^{-1}(V_1|X, 0) \leq y_0 | X) G(y_1 | X, 1, \bar{E}) \\ &= F(y_0 | X, 0) G(y_1 | X, 1, \bar{E}) \\ P(Y(0) \leq y_0, Y(1) \leq y_1 | X, U, Z = 0) &= P(Y \leq y_0, G^{-1}(V_1|X, 1, \bar{E}) \leq y_1 | X, U, Z = 0) \\ &= P(Y \leq y_0 | X, U, Z = 0) P(G^{-1}(V_1|X, 1, \bar{E}) \leq y_1 | X, U, Z = 0) \\ &= P(Y \leq y_0 | X, Z = 0) P(G^{-1}(V_1|X, 1, \bar{E}) \leq y_1 | X) \\ &= F(y_0 | X, 0) G(y_1 | X, 1, \bar{E}). \end{aligned}$$

Since these are the same,  $(Y(0), Y(1)) \perp\!\!\!\perp Z \mid (X, U)$ .

A short calculation using Bayes' theorem shows that  $\bar{e}(X, U) = U$ .

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{e}(x, u) &= e(x) \frac{dP(u|X = x, Z = 1)}{dP(u|X = x)} \\ &= e(x) \frac{dP(u|x, 1)/dH(u|x, 1)}{dP(u|x)/dH(u|x, 1)} \\ &= \frac{e(x)}{e(x) + (1 - e(x)) \frac{e(x)}{1 - e(x)} \frac{1 - u}{u}} \\ &= u\end{aligned}$$

Since the support of  $K(\cdot|x)$  is a subset of the support of  $H(\cdot|x, 1)$ , the assumption  $Z/e_{\max}(X) \leq \bar{E} \leq Z/e_{\min}(X)$  implies  $e_{\min}(X) \leq U \leq e_{\max}(X)$  almost surely, so  $e_{\min}(X) \leq e(X, U) \leq e_{\max}(X)$ .

(iii) The event  $Z = 1$  implies  $U = \bar{E}$ , so  $Z/e(X, U) = Z/U = Z/\bar{E}$ . □

## B.4 Proof of Proposition 4

*Proof.* By symmetry, it suffices to show that  $\bar{E}_+$  solves both (12) and (20).

First, we show that there exists  $\bar{E}_+ \in \mathcal{E}_\infty(\Lambda)$  with the properties stated in Proposition 4. Define  $e_{\min}(x) = e(x)/(e(x) + [1 - e(x)]/\Lambda)$  and  $e_{\max}(x) = e(x)/(e(x) + [1 - e(x)]\Lambda)$ . For any  $\gamma \in [e_{\min}(x), e_{\max}(x)]$ , define  $e_\gamma(x, y)$  by:

$$\bar{e}_\gamma(x, y) = \begin{cases} e_{\min}(x) & \text{if } y > Q_\tau(x, 1) \\ e_{\max}(x) & \text{if } y < Q_\tau(x, 1) \\ \gamma & \text{if } y = Q_\tau(x, 1) \end{cases}$$

We claim that for all  $x$ , there exists  $\gamma(x) \in [e_{\min}(x), e_{\max}(x)]$  solving  $\mathbb{E}[Z/\bar{e}_\gamma(X, Y)|X = x] = 1$ . We will prove this by applying the intermediate value theorem to the continuous function  $w_x(\gamma) := \mathbb{E}[Z/e_\gamma(X, Y)|X = x]$ . If we took  $\gamma = e_{\max}(x)$ , then we would have:

$$\begin{aligned}w_x(e_{\max}(x)) &= F(Q_\tau(x, 1)|x, 1)(e(x) + [1 - e(x)]/\Lambda) + (1 - F(Q_\tau(x, 1)|x, 1))(e(x) + [1 - e(x)]\Lambda) \\ &\leq e(x) + (1 - e(x))(\tau/\Lambda + (1 - \tau)\Lambda) \\ &= 1\end{aligned}$$

and a similar calculation shows  $w_x(e_{\min}(x)) \geq 1$ . Thus, there is some  $\gamma(x) \in [e_{\min}(x), e_{\max}(x)]$  which solves  $\mathbb{E}[Z/\bar{e}_\gamma(X, Y)|X = x] = 1$ . For that choice of  $\gamma(x)$ ,  $\bar{E}_+ := \bar{e}_{\gamma(x)}(X, Y)$  belongs to  $\mathcal{E}_\infty(\Lambda)$  and satisfies  $\mathbb{E}[Z/\bar{E}_+|X] = 1$ .

Now we show that any random variable  $\bar{E}_+$  satisfying the requirements of the proposition solves the quantile balancing problem (12). It is easy to see that  $\bar{E}_+$  is feasible in (12), since  $\mathbb{E}[Q_\tau(X)Z/\bar{E}_+] = \mathbb{E}[Q_\tau(X)\mathbb{E}[Z/\bar{E}_+|X]] = \mathbb{E}[Q_\tau(X)]$ . Moreover, for any other  $\bar{E} \in \mathcal{E}_\infty(\Lambda)$  which balances  $Q_\tau$ , we may write:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}[YZ/\bar{E}] &= \mathbb{E}[Q_\tau(X, 1)Z/\bar{E} + (Y - Q_\tau(X, 1))Z/\bar{E}] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}[Q_\tau(X, 1)] + \mathbb{E}[(Y - Q_\tau(X, 1))Z/\bar{E}_+] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[Q_\tau(X, 1)Z/\bar{E}_+] + \mathbb{E}[(Y - Q_\tau(X, 1))Z/\bar{E}_+] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[YZ/\bar{E}_+].\end{aligned}$$

The inequality step follows because  $1/\bar{E}_+$  takes on the maximum allowable value whenever  $(Y - Q_\tau(X, 1))Z$  is positive and the minimal allowable value whenever  $(Y - Q_\tau(X, 1))Z$  is negative, so  $(Y - Q_\tau(X, 1))Z/\bar{E}_+$  is always larger than  $(Y - Q_\tau(X, 1))Z/\bar{E}$ . Since  $\bar{E}$  is arbitrary, this proves  $\bar{E}_+$  solves (12).

Finally,  $\bar{E}_+^*$  solves the less constrained problem (12) and is feasible in the more constrained problem (20), so it solves (20) as well. This proves Proposition 4. □

## B.5 Proof of Proposition 5

*Proof.* We will divide the proof of Proposition 5 into several steps. Rather than explicitly constructing a distribution  $Q$  with  $\mathbb{E}_Q[Y(1)] = \mathbb{E}_P[YZ/\bar{E}]$  and  $\mathbb{E}_Q[Y(0)] = \mathbb{E}_P[Y(1-Z)/(1-\bar{E})]$  for each  $\bar{E}$  satisfying the conditions of the Proposition, we will instead construct the extremal distributions  $Q_{+,+}$ ,  $Q_{+,-}$ ,  $Q_{-,+}$  and  $Q_{-,-}$  that attain the endpoints of the partially identified set for  $\psi_T$  and  $\psi_C$ . Then, we will show that we can achieve any mixture. This will establish Proposition 5.

### B.5.1 Notation

We begin by recording some notation that will be used throughout the proof. By Theorem 1 and Proposition 4 (and their generalizations to the estimand  $\psi_C$ ), the extremal potential outcomes have the following formulas:

$$\begin{aligned}\psi_T^+ &= \mathbb{E}[YZ/\bar{E}_T^+] \\ \psi_T^- &= \mathbb{E}[YZ/\bar{E}_T^-] \\ \psi_C^+ &= \mathbb{E}[Y(1-Z)/(1-\bar{E}_C^+)] \\ \psi_C^- &= \mathbb{E}[Y(1-Z)/(1-\bar{E}_C^-)]\end{aligned}$$

where the worst-case propensity scores  $\bar{E}_T^-, \bar{E}_T^+, \bar{E}_C^-, \bar{E}_C^+$  are random variables which satisfy the following:

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{E}_T^+ &= \begin{cases} \frac{e(X)}{e(X)+[1-e(X)]\Lambda} & \text{if } Y > Q_\tau(X, 1) \\ \frac{e(X)}{e(X)+[1-e(X)]/\Lambda} & \text{if } Y < Q_\tau(X, 1) \end{cases} \\ \bar{E}_T^- &= \begin{cases} \frac{e(X)}{e(X)+[1-e(X)]/\Lambda} & \text{if } Y > Q_{1-\tau}(X, 1) \\ \frac{e(X)}{e(X)+[1-e(X)]\Lambda} & \text{if } Y < Q_{1-\tau}(X, 1) \end{cases} \\ \bar{E}_C^+ &= \begin{cases} \frac{e(X)}{e(X)+[1-e(X)]/\Lambda} & \text{if } Y > Q_\tau(X, 0) \\ \frac{e(X)}{e(X)+[1-e(X)]\Lambda} & \text{if } Y < Q_\tau(X, 0) \end{cases} \\ \bar{E}_C^- &= \begin{cases} \frac{e(X)}{e(X)+[1-e(X)]\Lambda} & \text{if } Y > Q_{1-\tau}(X, 0) \\ \frac{e(X)}{e(X)+[1-e(X)]/\Lambda} & \text{if } Y < Q_{1-\tau}(X, 0) \end{cases}.\end{aligned}$$

The formulas for  $\bar{E}_C^-$  and  $\bar{E}_C^+$  can be derived by exchanging the roles of  $Z$  and  $1-Z$  (and correspondingly the roles of  $e(X)$  and  $1-e(X)$ ) and then applying Proposition 4.

### B.5.2 Constructing $Q_{+,-}$

We now construct the distribution  $Q_{+,-}$  which attains the upper bound on  $\psi_T$  and the lower bound on  $\psi_C$ . We will actually construct random variables  $Y(0), Y(1), U$  on the same probability space as  $(X, Y, Z)$ , with associated plausible propensity score  $\bar{e}(X, U) := \mathbb{E}[Z|X, U]$ , that satisfy the following requirements:

- (i)  $Y = Y(1)Z + Y(0)(1-Z)$ .
- (ii)  $(Y(0), Y(1)) \perp\!\!\!\perp Z \mid (X, U)$ .
- (iii)  $\bar{e}(X, U) \in \mathcal{E}_\infty(\Lambda)$ .
- (iv)  $\mathbb{E}[Y(1)] = \psi_T^+$  and  $\mathbb{E}[Y(0)] = \psi_C^-$ .

We then take  $Q_{+,-}$  to be the joint distribution of  $(X, Y(0), Y(1), Z, U)$ .

We start with the construction. Let  $(X, Y, Z) \sim P$  and  $(V_1, V_2) \sim \text{Uniform}[0, 1]^2$  independently of  $(X, Y, Z)$ . Let  $F(y|x, z) = P(Y \leq y|X = x, Z = z)$  and  $\bar{H}(y|x, z) = P(Y = y|X = x, Z = z)$ . Let  $T = \tau Z + (1-\tau)(1-Z)$ , and define the binary ‘‘confounder’’  $U$  by:

$$U = \mathbb{I}\{Y > Q_T(X, Z)\} + \mathbb{I}\{Y = Q_T(X, Z), V_1 \bar{H}(Y|X, Z) < F(Y|X, Z) - T\}.$$

Define the conditional CDF of  $Y$  to sample from by  $G(y|x, z, u) = P(Y \leq y|X = x, U = u, Z = z)$ , and construct  $Y(0), Y(1)$  by:

$$Y(1) = ZY + (1-Z)G^{-1}(V_2|X, Z = 1, U)$$

$$Y(0) = ZG^{-1}(V_2|X, Z = 0, U) + (1 - Z)Y.$$

This concludes the construction. We now verify that  $Y(0), Y(1), U$  satisfy the required properties (i) – (iv).

- (i) This is immediate from the definition of  $Y(0)$  and  $Y(1)$ .
- (ii) We prove (ii) by computing the joint distribution of  $(Y(0), Y(1))$  given  $X, U, Z = 1$  and also the joint distribution of  $(Y(0), Y(1))$  given  $X, U, Z = 0$ .

$$\begin{aligned} P(Y(0) \leq y_0, Y(1) \leq y_1 | X, U, Z = 1) &= P(G^{-1}(V_2|X, 0, U) \leq y_0, Y \leq y_1 | X, U, Z = 1) \\ &= G(y_0|X, 0, U)P(Y \leq y_1 | X, U, Z = 1) \\ &= G(y_0|X, 0, U)G(y_1|X, 1, U) \\ P(Y(0) \leq y_0, Y(1) \leq y_1 | X, U, Z = 0) &= P(Y \leq y_0, G^{-1}(V_2|X, 1, U) \leq y_1 | X, U, Z = 0) \\ &= P(Y \leq y_0 | X, U, Z = 0)G(y_1|X, 1, U) \\ &= G(y_0|X, 0, U)G(y_1|X, 1, U) \end{aligned}$$

Since these are the same,  $(Y(0), Y(1)) \perp\!\!\!\perp Z \mid (X, U)$ .

- (iii) We establish (iii) by directly computing  $\bar{e}(X, U)$ . First, observe that  $\mathbb{E}[U|X, Z = 1] = 1 - \tau$ .

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[U|X, Z = 1] &= P(Y > Q_\tau(X, Z)|X, Z = 1) + P(Y = Q_\tau(X, Z), V_1 < \frac{F(Q_\tau(X, 1)|X, 1) - \tau}{\bar{H}(Q_\tau(X, 1)|X, 1)} \mid X, 1) \\ &= 1 - F(Q_\tau(X, 1)|X, 1) + \bar{H}(Q_\tau(X, 1)|X, 1) \frac{F(Q_\tau(X, 1)|X, 1) - \tau}{\bar{H}(Q_\tau(X, 1)|X, 1)} \\ &= 1 - \tau \end{aligned}$$

A similar calculation shows  $\mathbb{E}[U|X, Z = 0] = \tau$ . Therefore, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{e}(x, 0) &= P(Z = 1 \mid X = x, U = 0) \\ &= \frac{e(x)P(U = 0|X = x, Z = 1)}{e(x)P(U = 0|X = x, Z = 1) + [1 - e(x)]P(U = 0|X = x, Z = 0)} \\ &= \frac{e(x)\tau}{e(x)\tau + [1 - e(x)](1 - \tau)} \\ &= \frac{e(x)}{e(x) + [1 - e(x)]/\Lambda} \\ \bar{e}(x, 1) &= P(Z = 1 \mid X = x, U = 1) \\ &= \frac{e(x)P(U = 1|X = x, Z = 1)}{e(x)P(U = 1|X = x, Z = 1) + [1 - e(x)]P(U = 1|X = x, Z = 0)} \\ &= \frac{e(x)(1 - \tau)}{e(x)(1 - \tau) + [1 - e(x)]\tau} \\ &= \frac{e(x)}{e(x) + [1 - e(x)]\Lambda} \end{aligned}$$

Both  $\bar{e}(x, 1)$  and  $\bar{e}(x, 0)$  satisfy the bounded odds ratio condition, so  $\bar{e}(X, U) \in \mathcal{E}_\infty(\Lambda)$ .

- (iv) The explicit formulas for  $\bar{e}(X, U)$  obtained in the proof of (iii) shows that  $\bar{e}(X, U)$  satisfies:

$$\bar{e}(X, U) = \begin{cases} \frac{e(X)}{e(X) + [1 - e(X)]\Lambda} & \text{if } U = 1 \\ \frac{e(X)}{e(X) + [1 - e(X)]\Lambda} & \text{if } U = 0 \end{cases} \quad (33)$$

If  $Z = 1$ , then  $Y > Q_\tau(X, 1)$  implies  $U = 1$  while  $Y < Q_\tau(X, 1)$  implies  $U = 0$ . Therefore, by comparing (33) with the formula for  $\bar{E}_T^+$ , we may conclude that  $Z/\bar{e}(X, U) = Z/\bar{E}_T^+$ , except possibly on the event  $Y = Q_\tau(X, 1)$ . Moreover, we can check that  $\mathbb{E}[Z/\bar{e}(X, U)|X] = 1$ .

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[Z/\bar{e}(X, U)|X] &= e(X)\mathbb{E}[1/\bar{e}(X, U)|X, Z = 1] \\ &= e(X)(P(U = 0|X, Z = 1)/\bar{e}(X, 0) + P(U = 1|X, Z = 1)/\bar{e}(X, 1)) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= e(X)(\tau(1 + \frac{1-e(X)}{e(X)}\Lambda^{-1}) + (1-\tau)(1 + \frac{1-e(X)}{e(X)}\Lambda)) \\
&= 1
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore,  $\mathbb{E}[YZ/\bar{e}(X, U)] = \psi_T^+$  by Proposition 4.

Similarly, when  $Z = 0$ , then  $Y > Q_{1-\tau}(X, 0)$  implies  $U = 1$  and  $Y < Q_{1-\tau}(X, 0)$  implies  $U = 0$ . Therefore, by comparing (33) with the formula for  $\bar{E}_C^-$ , we can conclude  $(1-Z)/(1-\bar{e}(X, U)) = (1-Z)/(1-\bar{E}_C^-)$ , except possibly on the event  $Y = Q_{1-\tau}(X, 0)$ . Moreover, we can check that  $\mathbb{E}[(1-Z)/(1-\bar{e}(X, U))|X] = 1$ .

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[(1-Z)/(1-\bar{e}(X, U))|X] &= (1-e(X))\mathbb{E}[1/(1-\bar{e}(X, U))|X, Z=0] \\
&= (1-e(X))\left(\frac{P(U=0|X, Z=0)}{1-\bar{e}(X, 0)} + \frac{P(U=1|X, Z=1)}{1-\bar{e}(X, 1)}\right) \\
&= (1-e(X))\left((1-\tau)\frac{1-e(X)+e(X)\Lambda}{1-e(X)} + \tau\frac{1-e(X)+e(X)/\Lambda}{1-e(X)}\right) \\
&= 1
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, by an argument similar to the proof of Proposition 4, we have  $\mathbb{E}[YZ/\bar{e}(X, U)] = \psi_C^-$ .

### B.5.3 Constructing the other extremal distributions

Next, we construct the other extremal distributions. We start with the distribution  $Q_{+,+}$  that attains  $\psi_T^+$  and  $\psi_C^+$ .

Define  $Y' = ZY + (1-Z)(-Y)$ . Applying the construction from Section B.5.2 to the data  $(X, Y', Z)$  yields potential outcomes  $(Y(0)', Y(1)')$  and a binary confounder  $U'$  satisfying the consistency relation  $Y' = Y(1)'Z + Y(0)'(1-Z)$  and the unconfoundedness condition  $(Y(0)', Y(1)') \perp\!\!\!\perp Z \mid (X, U')$ . Moreover, if we define  $Q'_t(x, z)$  to be the  $t$ -th conditional quantile of  $Y'$  given  $X = x, Z = z$ , then  $e'(X, U') := \mathbb{E}[Z|X, U']$  will satisfy:

$$\begin{aligned}
Z/e'(X, U') &= \begin{cases} Z \left(1 + \frac{1-e(X)}{e(X)}\Lambda^{+1}\right) & \text{if } Y' > Q'_\tau(X, 1) \\ Z \left(1 + \frac{1-e(X)}{e(X)}\Lambda^{-1}\right) & \text{if } Y' < Q'_\tau(X, 1) \end{cases} \\
(1-Z)/(1-e'(X, U')) &= \begin{cases} (1-Z) \left(1 + \frac{e(X)}{1-e(X)}\Lambda^{-1}\right) & \text{if } Y' > Q'_{1-\tau}(X, 0) \\ (1-Z) \left(1 + \frac{e(X)}{1-e(X)}\Lambda^{+1}\right) & \text{if } Y' < Q'_{1-\tau}(X, 0) \end{cases}
\end{aligned}$$

and also  $\mathbb{E}[Z/e'(X, U')|X] = \mathbb{E}[(1-Z)/(1-e'(X, U'))|X] = 1$ .

Observe that when  $Z = 1$ ,  $Y' = Y$  and  $Q'_\tau(X, 1) = Q_\tau(X, 1)$ . Therefore,  $Z/e'(X, U') = Z/\bar{E}_T^+$ , except possibly on the event  $Y = Q_\tau(X, 1)$ . As a result, the argument from the proof of Proposition 4 implies:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[Y(1)'] &= \mathbb{E}[Y'Z/e'(X, U')] \\
&= \mathbb{E}[Y'Z/\bar{E}_T^+] \\
&= \psi_T^+
\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, when  $Z = 0$ , we have  $Y' = -Y$  and  $Q'_{1-\tau}(X, 0) = -Q_\tau(X, 0)$ . On this event,  $Y' > Q'_{1-\tau}(X, 0)$  is equivalent to  $Y < Q_\tau(X, 0)$ , so  $(1-Z)/(1-e'(X, U')) = (1-Z)/(1-\bar{E}_C^+)$ , except possibly on the event  $Y = Q_\tau(X, 0)$ . Again, the proof of Proposition 3 implies:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[Y(0)'] &= \mathbb{E}[Y'(1-Z)/(1-e'(X, U'))] \\
&= -\mathbb{E}[Y(1-Z)/(1-\bar{E}_C^+)] \\
&= -\psi_C^+
\end{aligned}$$

Finally, we define  $Y(0) = -Y(0)', Y(1) = Y(1)'$  and  $U = U'$ . Then the data  $(Y(0), Y(1), Z, X, U)$  will satisfy Assumption A and also  $\mathbb{E}[Y(1)] = \psi_T^+, \mathbb{E}[Y(0)] = \psi_C^-$ .

To construct  $Q_{-,-}$ , apply the preceding construction to  $Y'' = -Y'$ . To construct  $Q_{-,+}$ , apply the construction in Section B.5.2 to  $Y''' = -Y$ .

### B.5.4 Creating all convex combinations

Finally, we show that for any  $\psi_T$  satisfying  $\psi_T^- \leq \psi_T \leq \psi_T^+$  and any  $\psi_C$  satisfying  $\psi_C^- \leq \psi_C \leq \psi_C^+$ , there is a data-compatible distribution  $Q$  satisfying Assumption  $\Lambda$  with  $\mathbb{E}_Q[Y(1)] = \psi_T$  and  $\mathbb{E}_Q[Y(0)] = \psi_C$ .

Since the vector  $(\psi_T, \psi_C)$  lies in the convex hull of the points  $(\psi_T^-, \psi_C^-), (\psi_T^-, \psi_C^+), (\psi_T^+, \psi_C^-), (\psi_T^+, \psi_C^+)$ , there exists nonnegative weights  $w_1, w_2, w_3, w_4$  summing to one and satisfying:

$$\begin{pmatrix} \psi_T \\ \psi_C \end{pmatrix} = w_1 \begin{pmatrix} \psi_T^- \\ \psi_C^- \end{pmatrix} + w_2 \begin{pmatrix} \psi_T^- \\ \psi_C^+ \end{pmatrix} + w_3 \begin{pmatrix} \psi_T^+ \\ \psi_C^- \end{pmatrix} + w_4 \begin{pmatrix} \psi_T^+ \\ \psi_C^+ \end{pmatrix}$$

Let  $M \sim \text{Multinomial}(\{1, \dots, 4\}, (w_1, \dots, w_4))$ , and sample  $(X, Y(0), Y(1), Z, U) \sim Q_{-, -}$  when  $M = 1$ ,  $Q_{-, +}$  when  $M = 2$ ,  $Q_{+, -}$  when  $M = 3$  and  $Q_{+, +}$  when  $M = 4$ . Finally, let  $Q$  be the distribution of  $(X, Y(0), Y(1), Z, U')$  where  $U' = (U, M)$ .

It is clear that the distribution  $Q$  is data-compatible and satisfies Assumption  $\Lambda$ , since it is the mixture of distributions satisfying these conditions. Moreover, it is easy to check that  $\mathbb{E}_Q[Y(1)] = \mathbb{E}_Q[\mathbb{E}[Y(1)|M]] = w_1\psi_T^- + w_2\psi_T^- + w_3\psi_T^+ + w_4\psi_T^+ = \psi_T$ . By the same reasoning,  $\mathbb{E}_Q[Y(0)] = \psi_C$ .  $\square$

## B.6 Proof of Proposition 6

*Proof.* If  $\Lambda = 1$ , the claim holds trivially, so we proceed assuming  $\Lambda > 1$ .

Let  $\hat{W}_i = Z_i(1 - \hat{e}(X_i))/\hat{e}(X_i)$ . Since  $\mathcal{L}_n$  is convex, computing the subdifferential optimality criterion for  $\hat{\gamma}$  shows that there exists a vector  $\Delta \in [\Lambda^{-1}, \Lambda]^n$  such that  $\mathbb{P}_n \hat{W} g(X)(\Delta - 1) = 0$  and  $\Delta_i = \Lambda^{\text{sign}(Y_i - \hat{\gamma}^\top h(X_i))}$  whenever  $Y_i \neq \hat{\gamma}^\top h(X_i)$ .

We will first show that  $\bar{e}_i^* := (1 + \Delta_i(1 - \hat{e}_i)/\hat{e}_i)^{-1}$  solves (30). It is clear that  $\bar{e}_i^*$  belongs to  $\mathcal{E}_n(\Lambda)$ . Moreover, we have  $0 = \mathbb{P}_n \hat{W} g(X)(\Delta - 1) = \mathbb{P}_n g(X)Z/\bar{e}^* - \mathbb{P}_n g(X)Z/\hat{e}(X)$ . Therefore  $\bar{e}^*$  is a feasible solution to (30).

Optimality of  $\bar{e}_i^*$  follows from Theorem 3.1 in [13]. The main technical requirement to apply that result is that  $\mathbb{P}_n g(X)Z/\hat{e}(X)$  is in the relative interior of  $\{\mathbb{P}_n g(X)Z/\tilde{e} : \tilde{e} \in \mathcal{E}_n(\Lambda)\}$ . If  $0 < \hat{e}_i < 1$  for all  $i$ , then this condition is satisfied by the open mapping theorem and the fact that  $1/\hat{e}$  is an interior point of  $1/\mathcal{E}_n(\Lambda)$ .

Finally, we show the desired equivalence:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\mathbb{P}_n Y Z / \bar{e}^*}{\mathbb{P}_n Z / \hat{e}(X)} & \stackrel{i}{=} \frac{\mathbb{P}_n (Y - \hat{\gamma}^\top g(X))Z / \bar{e}^* + \mathbb{P}_n \hat{\gamma}^\top g(X)Z / \bar{e}^*}{\mathbb{P}_n Z / \hat{e}(X)} \\ & \stackrel{ii}{=} \frac{\mathbb{P}_n (Y - \hat{\gamma}^\top g(X))Z / \bar{e}^* + \mathbb{P}_n \hat{\gamma}^\top g(X)Z / \hat{e}(X)}{\mathbb{P}_n Z / \hat{e}(X)} \\ & \stackrel{iii}{=} \frac{\mathbb{P}_n (Y - \hat{\gamma}^\top g(X))Z(1 + \Lambda^{\hat{V}}(1 - \hat{e}(X))/\hat{e}(X)) + \mathbb{P}_n \hat{\gamma}^\top g(X)Z / \hat{e}(X)}{\mathbb{P}_n Z / \hat{e}(X)} \end{aligned}$$

There, step  $i$  adds and subtracts the term  $\mathbb{P}_n \hat{\gamma}^\top g(X)Z / \bar{e}^*$  in the numerator, step  $ii$  uses the fact that  $\bar{e}^*$  “balances”  $g(X)$ , and step  $iii$  restates  $\bar{e}^*$  in terms of  $\hat{V}$ . Since  $\frac{\mathbb{P}_n Y Z / \bar{e}^*}{\mathbb{P}_n Z / \bar{e}^*}$  is the objective value from (30), this proves Proposition 6.  $\square$

## B.7 Proof of Corollary 2

*Proof.* For this proof, we need a mathematically precise definition of the partially identified set. Let  $\mathcal{P}(\Lambda)$  be the set of all probability distributions  $Q$  on  $\mathcal{X} \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} \times \{0, 1\} \times \mathbb{R}^k$  (for some  $k \geq 1$ ) satisfying the following properties:

- (i) If  $(X, Y(0), Y(1), Z, U) \sim Q$ , then  $(Y(0), Y(1)) \perp\!\!\!\perp Z \mid (X, U)$ .
- (ii) If we define  $Y = ZY(1) + (1 - Z)Y(0)$ , then the law of  $(X, Y, Z)$  under  $Q$  is the observed-data distribution  $P$ .
- (iii) The odds ratio between  $Q(Z = 1 \mid X, U)$  and  $Q(Z = 1 \mid X)$  is bounded between  $\Lambda^{-1}$  and  $\Lambda$  almost surely.

The partially identified set for  $\psi_T$  is the set  $\Psi_T = \{\mathbb{E}_Q[Y(1)] : Q \in \mathcal{P}(\Lambda)\}$ .

For any random variable  $\bar{E}$  on the same probability space as  $(X, Y, Z)$  satisfying  $\mathbb{E}_P[Z/\bar{E}|X] = 1$ , Proposition 3 implies that we may construct a distribution  $Q \in \mathcal{P}(\Lambda)$  for which  $\mathbb{E}_Q[Y(1)] = \mathbb{E}_P[YZ/\bar{E}]$ . Therefore,  $\psi_T^+ = \sup \Psi_T \geq \mathbb{E}_P[YZ/\bar{E}]$ . Since this inequality holds for every  $\bar{E}$  satisfying  $\mathbb{E}_P[Z/\bar{E}|X] = 1$ , it holds for the supremum over  $\bar{E}$ . This proves one side of the equality (20).

For the other side, for any distribution  $Q \in \mathcal{P}(\Lambda)$ , we may write:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}_Q[Y(1)] &= \mathbb{E}_Q[YZ/Q(Z=1 | X, U)] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_Q[YZ \times \mathbb{E}[1/Q(Z=1 | X, U) | X, Y, Z]]\end{aligned}$$

Since  $\mathbb{E}[1/Q(Z=1 | X, U) | X, Y, Z]$  is  $\sigma(X, Y, Z)$ -measurable, there exists a measurable function  $\bar{e}_Q(x, y, z)$  such that  $e_Q(X, Y, Z) = 1/\mathbb{E}[1/Q(Z=1 | X, U) | X, Y, Z]$ . Hence, if we define the random variable  $\bar{E}$  on the same probability space on which  $P$  is defined by  $\bar{E} = \bar{e}_Q(X, Y, Z)$ , then we have:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}_Q[Y(1)] &= \mathbb{E}_Q[YZ/\bar{e}_Q(X, Y, Z)] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_P[YZ/\bar{e}_Q(X, Y, Z)] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_P[YZ/\bar{E}].\end{aligned}$$

Finally, we check that  $\bar{E}$  has the required properties. For any integrable function  $h : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , we have:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}_P[h(X)Z/\bar{E}] &= \mathbb{E}_P[h(X)Z/\bar{e}_Q(X, Y, Z)] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_Q[h(X)Z/\bar{e}_Q(X, Y, Z)] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_Q[h(X)Z\mathbb{E}[1/Q(Z=1 | X, U) | X, Y, Z]] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_Q[h(X)] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_P[h(X)]\end{aligned}$$

Since this holds for every  $h$ , we may conclude  $\mathbb{E}_P[Z/\bar{E} | X] = 1$ . Finally, since, conditional on  $X$ , the support of  $\bar{e}_Q(X, Y, Z)$  (under  $P$  or  $Q$ ) is the same as that of  $Q(Z=1 | X, U)$ , we may conclude:

$$1 + \frac{1-e(X)}{e(X)}\Lambda^{-1} \leq 1/\bar{E} \leq 1 + \frac{1-e(X)}{e(X)}\Lambda$$

holds with probability one. Hence,  $\bar{E} \in \mathcal{E}_\infty(\Lambda)$ , implying  $\mathbb{E}_Q[Y(1)] = \mathbb{E}_P[YZ/\bar{E}] \leq \sup_{\bar{E} \in \mathcal{E}_\infty(\Lambda)} \mathbb{E}[YZ/\bar{E}]$  s.t.  $\mathbb{E}[Z/\bar{E}|X] = 1$ . Since  $Q$  is arbitrary, the inequality continues to hold after taking the supremum over  $Q \in \mathcal{P}(\Lambda)$  on both sides. This proves the other side of (20).

The equality (19) follows from an identical argument.  $\square$

## B.8 Proof of Theorem 1

*Proof.* To prove that the partially identified set is an interval, observe that the set

$$\mathcal{W} = \{1/\bar{E} : \bar{E} \in \mathcal{E}_\infty(\Lambda), \mathbb{E}_P[Z/\bar{E}|X] = 1\}$$

is convex. By the proof of Corollary 2, the partially identified set is the image of  $\mathcal{W}$  under the linear function  $W \mapsto \mathbb{E}[YZW]$ . Therefore, the partially identified set is a convex set in  $\mathbb{R}$ , i.e. an interval.

The formulas for the interval endpoints follow immediately from Corollary 2 and Proposition 4. These results also show that the endpoints are attained, so that the partially identified interval is closed.  $\square$

## B.9 Proof of Theorem 2

*Proof.* As in the proof of Corollary 2, let  $\mathcal{P}(\Lambda)$  be the set of full-data distributions  $Q$  compatible with Assumption A and the observed-data distribution  $P$ . Then we may write:

$$\psi_{ATE}^+ = \sup_{Q \in \mathcal{P}(\Lambda)} \mathbb{E}_Q[Y(1) - Y(0)]$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq \sup_{Q \in \mathcal{P}(\Lambda)} \mathbb{E}_Q[Y(1)] - \inf_{Q \in \mathcal{P}(\Lambda)} \mathbb{E}_Q[Y(0)] \\
&= \psi_T^+ - \psi_C^-.
\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, Proposition 4 implies that there exists worst-case propensity scores  $\bar{E}_T^+$  and  $\bar{E}_C^-$  in  $\mathcal{E}(\Lambda)$  satisfying  $\psi_T^+ = \mathbb{E}_P[YZ/\bar{E}_T^+]$  and  $\psi_C^- = \mathbb{E}_P[Y(1-Z)/(1-\bar{E}_C^-)]$  such that if we define  $\bar{E} = Z\bar{E}_T^+ + (1-Z)\bar{E}_C^-$ , then  $\bar{E}$  satisfies the hypotheses of Proposition 5. Therefore, Proposition 5 implies that there exists a distribution  $Q \in \mathcal{P}(\Lambda)$  for which  $\mathbb{E}_Q[Y(1)-Y(0)] = \psi_T^+ - \psi_C^-$ . Therefore  $\sup_{Q \in \mathcal{P}(\Lambda)} \mathbb{E}_Q[Y(1)-Y(0)] \geq \psi_T^+ - \psi_C^-$ .

The arguments so far imply  $\psi_T^+ - \psi_C^- \geq \psi_{\text{ATE}}^+ = \sup_{Q \in \mathcal{P}(\Lambda)} \mathbb{E}_Q[Y(1) - Y(0)] \geq \psi_T^+ - \psi_C^-$ . Thus,  $\psi_{\text{ATE}}^+ = \psi_T^+ - \psi_C^-$ . By exactly the same reasoning,  $\psi_{\text{ATE}}^- = \psi_T^- - \psi_C^+$ .

Finally, it remains to show that the partially identified set for  $\psi_{\text{ATE}}$  is a closed interval. By Proposition 5, Theorem 1 and Corollary 1, the partially identified set for the ATE contains the set  $\{\psi_T - \psi_C : (\psi_T, \psi_C) \in [\psi_T^-, \psi_T^+] \times [\psi_C^-, \psi_C^+]\}$ , which is a closed interval. Moreover, the preceding calculation shows it does not contain any other points. Thus, the partially identified set is a closed interval.  $\square$

## B.10 Proof of Theorem 3 for linear quantiles

In this section, we give the proof of Theorem 3 under the assumption that  $\hat{Q}_\tau(x, z) = \hat{\beta}(z)^\top h(x)$  for some “features”  $h : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^k$  with finite variance. We assume throughout that  $h$  contains an “intercept”, i.e.  $h_1(x) \equiv 1$ . For simplicity, we only give the arguments for the estimator  $\hat{\psi}_T^+$ . Results for other quantile balancing bounds follow by essentially the same arguments. Since this estimator only involves a single estimated quantile function, we will lighten the notation by writing  $Q(x)$  and  $\hat{Q}(x)$  in place of  $Q_\tau(x, 1)$  and  $\hat{Q}_\tau(x, 1)$ .

### B.10.1 Supporting lemmas

The proofs will make use of several easy lemmas.

**Lemma 1.** *Assume that Conditions 1 and 2 hold, and also that  $Q(x) = \beta_0^\top h(x)$  for some  $\beta_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ . Further suppose that  $\mathbb{E}[h(X)h(X)^\top]$  is finite and nonsingular. Let  $\hat{\gamma}$  minimize the loss function  $\mathcal{L}_n(\gamma) = \mathbb{P}_n \rho_\tau(Y - \gamma^\top h(X)) Z \frac{1-e(X)}{e(X)}$ . Then  $\hat{\gamma} \xrightarrow{P} \beta_0$ .*

*Proof.* Define the population loss function  $\mathcal{L}$  by:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{L}(\gamma) &= \mathbb{E}_P[\rho_\tau(Y - \gamma^\top h(X)) Z \frac{1-e(X)}{e(X)}] \\
&= \mathbb{E}_P[(1 - e(X)) \mathbb{E}[\rho_\tau(Y - \gamma^\top h(X)) | X, Z = 1]]
\end{aligned}$$

By Condition 2,  $\beta_0$  is the unique minimizer of  $\mathbb{E}[\rho_\tau(Y - \gamma^\top h(X)) | X = x, Z = 1]$  for each  $x \in \mathcal{X}$ , and hence the unique minimizer of  $\mathcal{L}$ .

We will show that  $\mathcal{L}_n$  converges to  $\mathcal{L}$  pointwise in probability. For each  $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}^d$ , we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{L}_n(\gamma) &= \mathbb{P}_n \rho_\tau(Y - \gamma^\top h(X)) Z \frac{1-e(X)}{e(X)} \\
&= \mathbb{P}_n \rho_\tau(Y - \gamma^\top h(X)) Z \frac{1-e(X)}{e(X)} + \mathbb{P}_n \rho_\tau(Y - \gamma^\top h(X)) Z (1/\hat{e}(X) - 1/e(X)) \\
&= \mathbb{P}_n \rho_\tau(Y - \gamma^\top h(X)) Z \frac{1-e(X)}{e(X)} + \mathcal{O}(\|\rho_\tau(y - \gamma^\top h(x))\|_{L^2(\mathbb{P}_n)} \|1/\hat{e} - 1/e\|_{L^2(\mathbb{P}_n)}) \\
&= \mathcal{L}(\gamma) + o_P(1)
\end{aligned}$$

where the last step is by the law of large numbers and Condition 1. The conclusion  $\hat{\gamma} \xrightarrow{P} \beta_0$  now follow from general consistency results for convex M-estimators, e.g. Theorem 2.7 in [42].  $\square$

**Lemma 2.** *Let  $\hat{U}_i = \text{sign}(Y_i - \hat{Q}(X_i))$ . Then we have the inequality:*

$$\hat{\psi}_T^+ \leq \frac{\mathbb{P}_n(Y - \hat{Q}(X))Z(1 + \Lambda^{\hat{U}}(1 - \hat{e}(X))/\hat{e}(X)) + \mathbb{P}_n \hat{Q}(X)Z/\hat{e}(X)}{\mathbb{P}_n Z/\hat{e}(X)} \quad (34)$$

*Proof.* By Proposition 6,  $\hat{\psi}_T^+$  would be exactly equal to the right-hand side of (34) if  $\hat{U}_i$  were replaced by  $\hat{V}_i = \text{sign}(Y_i - \hat{\gamma}_0 - \hat{\gamma}_1 \hat{Q}(X_i))$  where  $\hat{\gamma} = (\hat{\gamma}_0, \hat{\gamma}_1)$  comes from  $\mathcal{L}_n$  in Lemma 2. However,  $(Y_i - \hat{Q}(X_i))\Lambda^{\hat{U}_i}$  is (weakly) larger than  $(Y_i - \hat{Q}(X_i))\Lambda^{\hat{V}_i}$  for every  $i$ , since  $\hat{U}_i$  exactly matches the sign of  $Y_i - \hat{Q}(X_i)$  while  $\hat{V}_i$  might not. Making this replacement index-by-index gives (34).  $\square$

**Lemma 3.** *Let  $U_i = \text{sign}(Y_i - Q(X_i))$ . Then we have the inequality:*

$$\hat{\psi}_T^+ \geq \frac{\mathbb{P}_n(Y - \hat{\gamma}^\top h(X))Z(1 + \Lambda^U(1 - \hat{e}(X))/\hat{e}(X)) + \mathbb{P}_n \hat{\gamma}^\top h(X)Z/\hat{e}(X)}{\mathbb{P}_n Z/\hat{e}(X)} \quad (35)$$

where  $\hat{\gamma}$  is as in Lemma 1.

*Proof.* For the purposes of this proof, let  $\bar{\psi}_T^+$  be the solution to the ‘‘feature-balancing’’ problem:

$$\bar{\psi}_T^+ = \max_{\bar{e} \in \mathcal{E}_n(\Lambda)} \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n Y_i Z_i / \bar{e}_i}{\sum_{i=1}^n Z_i / \bar{e}_i} \quad \text{s.t.} \quad \mathbb{P}_n h(X)Z/\bar{e} = \mathbb{P}_n h(X)Z/\hat{e}(X).$$

It is clear that  $\hat{\psi}_T^+ \geq \bar{\psi}_T^+$ , since the feature balancing problem has the same objective as the quantile balancing problem but faces more constraints. Proposition 6 implies the  $\bar{\psi}_T^+$  would be exactly equal to the right-hand side of (35) if we replaced  $U_i$  by  $\hat{U}_i = \text{sign}(Y_i - \hat{\gamma}^\top h(X_i))$ . However,  $(Y_i - \hat{\gamma}^\top h(X_i))\Lambda^{\hat{U}_i}$  is (weakly) smaller than  $(Y_i - \hat{\gamma}^\top h(X_i))\Lambda^{\hat{U}_i}$  for every  $i$ , since  $\hat{U}_i$  exactly matches the sign of  $Y_i - \hat{\gamma}^\top h(X_i)$  while  $U_i$  might not. Making this replacement index-by-index gives (35).  $\square$

### B.10.2 Proof of main result

Now we prove Theorem 3(i), which we restate to make the regularity conditions more precise.

**Theorem 3(i).** (Sharpness for  $\psi_T^+$ )

*Assume Conditions 1, 2, and 3.(i). If  $Q(x) = \beta_0^\top h(x)$  for some  $\beta_0 \in \mathbb{R}^k$  and  $\hat{\beta} \xrightarrow{P} \beta_0$ , then  $\hat{\psi}_T^+ = \psi_T^+ - o_P(1)$ . However, even if  $Q(x) \neq \beta^\top h(x)$  for any  $\beta$ , we still have  $\hat{\psi}_T^+ \geq \psi_T^+ - o_P(1)$ .*

*Proof.* We start by proving the upper bound  $\hat{\psi}_T^+ \leq \psi_T^+ + o_P(1)$  in the well-specified case. Lemma 2 gives the following upper bound on the quantile balancing estimator:

$$\hat{\psi}_T^+ \leq \frac{\mathbb{P}_n(Y - \hat{Q}(X))Z(1 + \Lambda^{\hat{U}}(1 - \hat{e}(X))/\hat{e}(X)) + \mathbb{P}_n \hat{Q}(X)Z/\hat{e}(X)}{\mathbb{P}_n Z/\hat{e}(X)}.$$

Condition 1 implies  $\mathbb{P}_n Z/\hat{e}(X) \xrightarrow{P} 1$ , and the consistency of  $\hat{\beta}$  implies  $\mathbb{P}_n \hat{Q}(X)Z/\hat{e}(X) \xrightarrow{P} \mathbb{E}[Q(X)]$ . To establish the upper bound, it remains to show  $\mathbb{P}_n(Y - \hat{Q}(X))Z(1 + \Lambda^{\hat{U}}(1 - \hat{e}(X))/\hat{e}(X))$  converges to  $\psi_T^+ - \mathbb{E}[Q(X)]$ .

The first step is to replace the estimated propensity score  $\hat{e}$  appearing in this quantity by the true nominal propensity score  $e$ . The Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and Condition 1 imply:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}_n(Y - \hat{Q}(X))Z\Lambda^{\hat{U}}\left(\frac{1-\hat{e}(X)}{\hat{e}(X)} - \frac{1-e(X)}{e(X)}\right) &= \mathcal{O}(\|Y - \hat{\beta}^\top h(X)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{P}_n)} \times \|1/\hat{e}(X) - 1/e(X)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{P}_n)}) \\ &= \mathcal{O}_P((\|Y\|_{L^2(\mathbb{P}_n)} + \|\hat{\beta}^\top h(X)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{P}_n)}) \times \varepsilon^{-2} \|\hat{e}(X) - e(X)\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{P}_n)}) \\ &= \mathcal{O}_P(\|Y\|_{L^2(\mathbb{P}_n)} + \|Q(X)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{P}_n)}) \times o_P(1) \\ &= o_P(1) \end{aligned}$$

Thus,  $\mathbb{P}_n(Y - \hat{Q}(X))Z(1 + \Lambda^{\hat{U}}\frac{1-\hat{e}(X)}{\hat{e}(X)}) = \mathbb{P}_n(Y - Q(X))Z(1 + \Lambda^{\hat{U}}\frac{1-e(X)}{e(X)}) + o_P(1)$ .

The next step is to replace  $\hat{U}$  and  $\hat{Q}(X)$  by  $U = \text{sign}(Y - Q(X))$  and  $Q(X)$ , respectively. For this, we employ a uniform convergence argument. For each  $\beta \in \mathbb{R}^k$ , define the function  $f_\beta(x, y, z)$  by:

$$f_\beta(x, y, z) = (y - \beta^\top h(x))z(1 + \Lambda^{\text{sign}(y - \beta^\top h(x))}\frac{1-e(x)}{e(x)}).$$

Standard Glivenko-Cantelli (GC) preservation arguments (c.f. [34]) show that the class  $\mathcal{F} = \{f_\beta : \|\beta - \beta_0\| \leq 1\}$  is GC, so we have the uniform convergence  $\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} |\mathbb{P}_n f - Pf| = o_P(1)$ . Moreover, the map  $\beta \mapsto Pf_\beta$  is continuous at  $\beta_0$ , which can be seen by noticing that as  $\beta \rightarrow \beta_0$ ,  $f_\beta(x, y, z) \rightarrow f_{\beta_0}(x, y, z)$  for almost every  $(x, y, z)$  (exceptions occur when  $y = \beta_0^\top x$ , but Condition 2 implies this happens with probability zero) and then applying the dominated convergence theorem. Thus, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}_n(Y - \hat{Q}(Z))Z(1 + \Lambda^{\hat{U}} \frac{1 - e(X)}{e(X)}) &= \mathbb{P}_n f_{\hat{\beta}}(X, Y, Z) \\ &= Pf_{\hat{\beta}}(X, Y, Z) + o_P(1) \\ &= Pf_{\beta_0}(X, Y, Z) + o_P(1) \\ &= \mathbb{E}[(Y - Q(X))Z/\bar{E}_+] + o_P(1) \\ &= \psi_{\text{T}}^+ - \mathbb{E}[Q(X)] + o_P(1) \end{aligned}$$

Combining these various results gives  $\hat{\psi}_{\text{T}}^+ \leq \psi_{\text{T}}^+ + o_P(1)$ . This establishes the upper bound in the well-specified case.

Now we turn to the lower bound,  $\hat{\psi}_{\text{T}}^+ \geq \psi_{\text{T}}^+ - o_P(1)$ , beginning in the correctly-specified case. Lemma 3 lower bounds the quantile balancing estimator by a variant of the “feature balancing” estimator:

$$\hat{\psi}_{\text{T}}^+ \geq \frac{\mathbb{P}_n(Y - \hat{\gamma}^\top h(X))Z(1 + \Lambda^U(1 - \hat{e}(X))/\hat{e}(X)) + \mathbb{P}_n \hat{\gamma}^\top h(X)Z/\hat{e}(X)}{\mathbb{P}_n Z/\hat{e}(X)}.$$

We will show that this lower bound is at least  $\psi_{\text{T}}^+ - o_P(1)$ . We may assume without loss of generality that  $\mathbb{E}[h(X)h(X)^\top]$  is full rank, since excising features that are linear combinations of other ones has no effect on the feature balancing estimator. In the preceding display, the denominator  $\mathbb{P}_n Z/\hat{e}(X)$  converges to one, so we can focus on the two terms in the numerator.

Since Lemma 1 implies that  $\hat{\gamma}$  is consistent, exactly the same arguments from the upper bound show  $\mathbb{P}_n \hat{\gamma}^\top h(X)Z/\hat{e}(X) \xrightarrow{P} \mathbb{E}[Q(X)]$ . Moreover, the argument from the upper bound shows that  $\hat{e}$  can be replaced by  $e$  in the expression  $\mathbb{P}_n(Y - \hat{\gamma}^\top h(X))Z(1 + \Lambda^U(1 - \hat{e}(X))/\hat{e}(X))$ . Some manipulation shows that  $1 + \Lambda^U(1 - e(X))/e(X) = 1/\bar{E}_+$  almost surely, where  $\bar{E}_+$  is the worst-case propensity score defined in Proposition 4. Therefore, we may write:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}_n(Y - \hat{\gamma}^\top h(X))Z(1 + \Lambda^U \frac{1 - \hat{e}(X)}{\hat{e}(X)}) &= \mathbb{P}_n(Y - \hat{\gamma}^\top h(X))Z/\bar{E}_+ + o_P(1) \\ &= \mathbb{P}_n(Y - Q(X))Z/\bar{E}_+ + \mathcal{O}_P(\|\hat{\gamma} - \beta_0\|) + o_P(1) \\ &= \psi_{\text{T}}^+ - \mathbb{E}[Q(X)] + o_P(1) \end{aligned}$$

Combining these various results gives  $\hat{\psi}_{\text{T}}^+ \geq \psi_{\text{T}}^+ - o_P(1)$ . This establishes the lower bound in the well-specified case.

Finally, we extend the lower bound to the misspecified case. If  $Q(x) \neq \beta^\top h(x)$  for any  $\beta$ , then we can lower bound  $\hat{\psi}_{\text{T}}^+$  by the feature-balancing estimator that balances  $h(x)$  and the true quantile  $Q(x)$ . This brings us back to the well-specified case, so the preceding arguments show  $\hat{\psi}_{\text{T}}^+ \geq \psi_{\text{T}}^+ - o_P(1)$ .  $\square$

## B.11 Proof of Theorem 3 for nonlinear quantiles

In this section, we prove Theorem 3 when quantiles are estimated by a nonlinear model. As in the case of linear quantiles, we will give the argument for the estimator  $\hat{\psi}_{\text{T}}^+$ . As such, we will continue to use  $\hat{Q}(x)$  and  $Q(x)$  as shorthand for  $\hat{Q}_\tau(x, 1)$  and  $Q_\tau(x, 1)$ .

### B.11.1 Regularity conditions

As alluded to in Condition 3, we require nonlinear models to be estimated using a form of sample splitting called “cross-fitting” [11, 52, 43]. We briefly describe the procedure, mostly to fix notation.

The sample  $\{(X_i, Y_i, Z_i)\}$  is divided into  $K$  disjoint “folds”  $\mathcal{F}_1, \dots, \mathcal{F}_K$  of approximately equal size. For each  $k \in [K]$ , a quantile estimate  $\hat{Q}_{-k}$  is obtained using observations not in  $\mathcal{F}_k$ . Finally, we set

$\hat{Q}_i = \sum_{k=1}^K \hat{Q}_{-k}(X_i) \mathbb{I}\{i \in \mathcal{F}_k\}$ . In this way, no observation is used to obtain its own quantile estimate. In the extreme case where  $K$  is equal to the sample size, this is simply “leave-one-out” estimation. However, in cross-fitting,  $K$  is taken to be a fixed constant.

We also require the fitted quantiles  $\hat{Q}_i$  to satisfy an additional regularity condition.

**Condition N.** For some  $\alpha, \beta > 0$ , we have  $\max_{i \leq n} |\hat{Q}_i| = o_P(n^\alpha)$  and  $\mathbb{P}(0 < |\hat{Q}_i - \hat{Q}_j| < n^{-\beta} \text{ for some } (i, j)) \rightarrow 0$ .

This condition rules out gross “outliers” in  $\hat{Q}_i$  which are difficult to balance. The condition  $\max_i |\hat{Q}_i| = o_P(n^\alpha)$  alone is not sufficient for this, because it is not an affine-invariant assumption. One can take an arbitrarily poorly-behaved estimate  $\hat{Q}$  and scale it to be bounded by one without changing the estimator  $\hat{\psi}_T^+$ . The separation requirement rules out this trick.

It is not hard to find examples of estimators which satisfy this condition. For example, under Conditions 1 and 2, Condition N is satisfied by any estimator whose fitted values  $\{\hat{Q}_i\}$  only take values in the observed outcomes  $\{Y_i\}$  (e.g. [39, 55, 2]) will satisfy it with  $\alpha = \frac{1}{2}$  and any  $\beta > 2$ .<sup>4</sup>

### B.11.2 Supporting lemmas

To simplify the proof, we separate out a preliminary convergence result as a lemma. Throughout this proof and the next, we will use the following notation: for a function  $f$ ,  $\mathbb{P}_n^k f$  denotes the fold- $k$  average  $\frac{1}{|\mathcal{F}_k|} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{F}_k} f(X_i, Y_i, Z_i)$ .

**Lemma 4.** Assume Condition 1. Suppose  $\|\hat{Q}_{-k} - Q\|_{L^2(P)} \xrightarrow{P} 0$  for each  $k \in [K]$ . Then  $\|\hat{Q} - Q\|_{L^2(\mathbb{P}_n)} = o_P(1)$  and  $\mathbb{P}_n \hat{Q}Z/\hat{e}(X) = \mathbb{E}[Q(X)] + o_P(1)$ .

*Proof.* Start with the first claim. For any  $k \in [K]$ , applying Markov’s inequality conditionally on  $\{(X_i, Y_i, Z_i)\}_{i \notin \mathcal{F}_k}$  gives  $\mathbb{P}_n^k (\hat{Q}_{-k}(X) - Q(X))^2 = \mathcal{O}_P(\|\hat{Q}_{-k} - Q\|_{L^2(P)}^2) = o_P(1)$ . Averaging over  $k \in [K]$  gives the desired result.

For the second claim, write:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}_n \hat{Q}Z/\hat{e}(X) &= \mathbb{P}_n QZ/e(X) + \mathbb{P}_n (\hat{Q} - Q)Z/e(X) + \mathcal{O}(\|\hat{Q}\|_{L^2(\mathbb{P}_n)} \|1/\hat{e} - 1/e\|_{L^2(\mathbb{P}_n)}) \\ &= \mathbb{E}[Q(X)] + \mathcal{O}(\|\hat{Q} - Q\|_{L^2(\mathbb{P}_n)}/\varepsilon) + o_P(1) \\ &= \mathbb{E}[Q(X)] + o_P(1). \end{aligned}$$

□

### B.11.3 Proof of main result

Now we are ready to prove Theorem 3 for nonlinear quantile models in the case of the estimand  $\psi_T^+$ . We restate the result to make the quantile consistency assumption precise.

**Theorem 3(ii).** Assume Conditions 1, 2, 3.(ii), and N. If  $\|\hat{Q}_{-k} - Q\|_{L^2(P)} = o_P(1)$  for each  $k \in [K]$ , then  $\hat{\psi}_T^+ = \psi_T^+ - o_P(1)$ . However, even if  $\|\hat{Q}_{-k} - Q\|_{L^2(P)} \not\rightarrow 0$ , we still have  $\hat{\psi}_T^+ \geq \psi_T^+ - o_P(1)$ .

*Proof.* We start by proving  $\hat{\psi}_T^+ \leq \psi_T^+ + o_P(1)$  when the quantile model is consistent. This part of the proof follows roughly the same template as the corresponding proof in the linear case. Lemma 2 implies:

$$\hat{\psi}_T^+ \leq \frac{\mathbb{P}_n(Y - \hat{Q})Z(1 + \Lambda^{\hat{U}}(1 - \hat{e}(X))/\hat{e}(X)) + \mathbb{P}_n \hat{Q}Z/\hat{e}(X)}{\mathbb{P}_n Z/\hat{e}(X)}$$

where  $\hat{U}_i = \text{sign}(Y_i - \hat{Q}_i)$ . Since  $\mathbb{P}_n Z/\hat{e}(X) \xrightarrow{P} 1$  by Condition 1 and  $\mathbb{P}_n \hat{Q}Z/\hat{e}(X) \xrightarrow{P} \mathbb{E}[Q(X)]$  by Lemma 4, it remains to show that  $\mathbb{P}_n(Y - \hat{Q})Z(1 + \Lambda^{\hat{U}}(1 - \hat{e}(X))/\hat{e}(X))$  converges to  $\psi_T^+ + o_P(1)$ . By the same reasoning

<sup>4</sup>The upper bound follows from the well-known fact that the maximum of  $n$  i.i.d. observations from a distribution with finite variance has magnitude  $o_P(n^{-1/2})$ . Therefore,  $\max_i |\hat{Q}_i| \leq \max_j |Y_j| = o_P(n^{-1/2})$ . For the lower bound, it suffices to show that  $\mathbb{P}(\min_{i \neq j} |Y_i - Y_j| < n^{-\beta}) \rightarrow 0$  whenever  $\beta > 2$ . Let  $F_Y(y) = P(Y \leq y)$ , and let  $B < \infty$  be a uniform bound on  $F_Y'(\cdot)$ ; this exists since  $f(y|x, z)$  is uniformly bounded by Condition 2. Then  $\mathbb{P}(\min_{i \neq j} |Y_i - Y_j| < n^{-\beta}) \leq \mathbb{P}(\Delta \leq Bn^{-\beta})$  where  $\Delta = \min_{i \neq j} |F_Y(Y_i) - F_Y(Y_j)|$ . Theorem 8.2 in [14] shows that  $n^2 \Delta \rightsquigarrow \text{Exponential}(1)$ , so  $\mathbb{P}(n^2 \Delta \leq Bn^{-(\beta-2)}) \rightarrow 0$ .

as in the linear case, we may replace  $\hat{e}(X)$  by  $e(X)$  in this quantity without changing its value much. Thus, we may write:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}_n(Y - \hat{Q})Z(1 + \Lambda^{\hat{U} \frac{1-\hat{e}(X)}{\hat{e}(X)}}) &= \mathbb{P}_n(Y - \hat{Q})Z(1 + \Lambda^{\hat{U} \frac{1-e(X)}{e(X)}}) + o_P(1) \\
&=_{i} \mathbb{P}_n(Y - Q(X))Z(1 + \Lambda^{\hat{U} \frac{1-e(X)}{e(X)}}) + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^{-1} \|\hat{Q}(X) - Q(X)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{P}_n)}) + o_P(1) \\
&=_{ii} \mathbb{P}_n(Y - Q(X))Z(1 + \Lambda^{\hat{U} \frac{1-e(X)}{e(X)}}) + o_P(1) \\
&=_{iii} \mathbb{P}_n(Y - Q(X))Z/\bar{E}_+ + \mathcal{O}(\|Y - Q(X)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{P}_n)} \|Z\Lambda^{\hat{U}} - Z\Lambda^U\|_{L^2(\mathbb{P}_n)}) + o_P(1) \\
&=_{iv} \psi_T^+ - \mathbb{E}[Q(X)] + \mathcal{O}_P(\|Z\Lambda^{\hat{U}} - Z\Lambda^U\|_{L^2(\mathbb{P}_n)}) + o_P(1)
\end{aligned}$$

Here, *i* adds and subtracts a term then applies Cauchy-Schwarz, *ii* applies Lemma 4 to conclude  $\|\hat{Q} - Q\|_{L^2(\mathbb{P}_n)} = o_P(1)$ , *iii* adds and subtracts  $\mathbb{P}_n(Y - Q(X))Z/\bar{E}_+$  and applies Cauchy-Schwarz, and *iv* holds by Proposition 4 and the law of large numbers.

It remains to prove that  $\|Z\Lambda^{\hat{U}} - Z\Lambda^U\|_{L^2(\mathbb{P}_n)} = o_P(1)$ , or equivalently (up to constants) that  $\mathbb{P}_n Z \mathbb{I}\{\hat{U} \neq U\} = o_P(1)$ . For each  $k \in [K]$ , we may apply Chebyshev's inequality conditional on  $\{(X_i, Y_i, Z_i)\}_{i \notin \mathcal{F}_k}$  to conclude:

$$\left| \mathbb{P}_n^k Z \mathbb{I}\{\hat{U} \neq U\} - \int z \mathbb{I}\{\text{sign}(y - \hat{Q}_{-k}(x)) \neq \text{sign}(y - Q(x))\} dP(x, y, z) \right| = o_P(1)$$

The integral in the preceding display tends to zero in probability. To see this, recall that Condition 2 requires the conditional density  $f(y|x, z)$  to be uniformly bounded by some  $B < \infty$ , so we may write:

$$\begin{aligned}
\int z \mathbb{I}\{\text{sign}(y - \hat{Q}_{-k}(x)) \neq \text{sign}(y - Q(x))\} dP(x, y, z) &= \int_{\mathcal{X}} e(x) \int_{\hat{Q}_{-k}(x) \wedge Q(x)}^{\hat{Q}_{-k}(x) \vee Q(x)} f(y|x, 1) dy dP_X(x) \\
&\leq \int_{\mathcal{X}} (1 - \varepsilon) B |\hat{Q}_{-k}(x) - Q(x)| dP_X(x) \\
&\lesssim \|\hat{Q}_{-k} - Q\|_{L^1(P)} \\
&\leq \|\hat{Q}_{-k} - Q\|_{L^2(P)} \\
&= o_P(1).
\end{aligned}$$

Thus,  $\mathbb{P}_n^k Z \mathbb{I}\{\hat{U} \neq U\} = o_P(1)$ . Averaging over  $k$  gives  $\mathbb{P}_n Z \mathbb{I}\{\hat{U} \neq U\} = o_P(1)$ , and so  $\hat{\psi}_T^+ \leq \psi_T^+ + o_P(1)$ .

Now, we turn to the lower bound, which is substantially more difficult. We wish to show  $\hat{\psi}_T^+ \geq \psi_T^+ - o_P(1)$  whether or not  $\hat{Q}_{-k}$  converges to  $Q$ . For each  $k \in [K]$ , define  $\hat{\psi}^+(k)$  by:

$$\hat{\psi}^+(k) = \max_{\bar{e}_k \in \mathcal{E}_{n,k}(\Lambda)} \mathbb{P}_n^k Y Z / \bar{e}_k \quad \text{subject to} \quad \begin{pmatrix} \mathbb{P}_n^k \hat{Q}_{-k} Z / \bar{e}_k \\ \mathbb{P}_n^k Z / \bar{e}_k \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbb{P}_n^k \hat{Q}_{-k} Z / \hat{e} \\ \mathbb{P}_n^k Z / \hat{e}(X) \end{pmatrix} \quad (36)$$

where  $\mathcal{E}_{n,k}(\Lambda)$  is the projection of  $\mathcal{E}_n(\Lambda)$  onto the coordinates in  $\mathcal{F}_k$ . Clearly,  $\hat{\psi}_T^+ \times \mathbb{P}_n Z / \hat{e}(X) \geq \sum_k \hat{\psi}^+(k) |\mathcal{F}_k| / n$ , so it suffices to prove  $\hat{\psi}^+(k) \geq \psi_T^+ - o_P(1)$  for each  $k$ .

We will make some notational simplifications. The remainder of the proof will focus on showing  $\hat{\psi}^+(1) \geq \psi_T^+ - o_P(1)$ . For convenience, we will assume  $\mathcal{F}_1 = [n_1]$  where  $n_1 \sim n/K$ . As an additional simplification, we will assume that  $\varepsilon/2 \leq \hat{e}_i \leq 1 - \varepsilon/2$  for all  $i$ . Mechanically, this can always be done by ‘‘trimming’’ the estimated propensity score. Condition 1 implies the trimming has no effect in large samples, so it is only used as a theoretical device to simplify calculations. Finally, recall that we have defined  $\tilde{W}_i = Z_i(1 - \hat{e}_i)/\hat{e}_i$ .

We will construct an propensity vector  $\bar{e}^*$  satisfying the constraints of (36) with the property that  $\bar{\psi}^1 := \mathbb{P}_n^1 Y Z / \bar{e}^*$  converges to  $\psi_T^+$ . Since  $\hat{\psi}^+(1) \geq \bar{\psi}^1$ , this will show  $\hat{\psi}^+(1) \geq \psi_T^+ - o_P(1)$ . A natural first idea is to take the idealized propensity score  $\bar{e}_i^* = (1 + \theta_i(1 - \hat{e}(X_i))/\hat{e}(X_i))^{-1}$ , where  $\theta_i = \Lambda^{U_i}$ . This mimics the true worst-case propensity score, but uses  $\hat{e}(X_i)$  in place of  $e(X_i)$  to satisfy the odds-ratio constraint. It is not hard to see that this would result in a sharp estimate of  $\psi_T^+$  by classic IPW logic.

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}_n^1 Y Z (1 + \theta \frac{1-\hat{e}(X)}{\hat{e}(X)}) &= \mathbb{P}_n^1 Y Z (1 + \theta \frac{1-e(X)}{e(X)}) + \mathcal{O}(\|Y Z\|_{L^1(\mathbb{P}_n)} \times \|1/e - 1/\hat{e}\|_{\infty}) \\
&= \mathbb{P}_n^1 Y Z / \bar{E}_+ + o_P(1) \\
&= \psi_T^+ + o_P(1)
\end{aligned} \quad (37)$$

However, this choice of  $\bar{e}^*$  is not guaranteed to satisfy the ‘‘balancing’’ constraints of (36). Our construction perturbs this ‘‘ideal’’ choice to gain feasibility.

Our construction will be convoluted, so it is worth taking a moment to explain the high-level idea. First, we discard a small number of gross ‘‘outliers’’ to produce a set of ‘‘inliers’’  $\mathcal{I}_{j^*}$  whose fitted quantiles are relatively easy to balance. We then produce a feasible propensity  $\bar{e}^*$  by assigning the outliers the nominal propensity score  $\hat{e}(X_i)$  and perturbing the inliers’ idealized propensity score by a small amount. We show the resulting lower bound  $\bar{\psi}^1 = \mathbb{P}_n^1 Y Z / \bar{e}^*$  is a consistent (albeit impractical) estimator of  $\psi_T^+$ .

We start by extracting a set of inliers  $\mathcal{I}_{j^*} \subseteq [n_1]$  in the following fashion: set  $\mathcal{I}_1 = [n_1]$ , and for  $2 \leq j \leq 4\beta + 3$ , recursively define  $\mathcal{I}_j$  by:

$$\mathcal{I}_j = \{i \in \mathcal{I}_{j-1} : |\hat{Q}_i - \bar{Q}_{j-1}| \leq 2^{(j-1)} n^{-(j-1)/4}\} \quad (38)$$

where  $\bar{Q}_{j-1} = (\sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{j-1}} \hat{W}_i \hat{Q}_i) / (\sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{j-1}} \hat{W}_i)$  is the weighted average value of  $\hat{Q}_i$  within  $\mathcal{I}_{j-1}$ . We set  $\mathcal{I}_{4\beta+4} = \emptyset$ . Let  $j^*$  be the first stage in the above procedure at which an  $n_1^{-1/8}$  fraction of the ‘‘weight’’ in  $\mathcal{I}_j$  comes from outliers.

$$j^* = \min \left\{ j : \frac{\sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_j \setminus \mathcal{I}_{j+1}} \hat{W}_i}{\sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_j} \hat{W}_i} \geq n_1^{-1/8} \right\} \quad (39)$$

It is easy to verify that  $j^*$  is well-defined (the set is not empty) whenever  $Z_i = 1$  for some index  $i \leq n_1$ . For completeness, we arbitrarily set  $j^* = 4\beta + 3$  when that does not happen.

With this definition of  $j^*$ , we ensure the total ‘‘weight’’ on discarded outliers is asymptotically negligible. Since  $\sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_j \setminus \mathcal{I}_{j+1}} \hat{W}_i \leq n_1^{-1/8} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_j} \hat{W}_i$  for all  $j < j^*$ , we have:

$$\sum_{i \notin \mathcal{I}_{j^*}} \hat{W}_i = \sum_{j < j^*} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_j \setminus \mathcal{I}_{j+1}} \hat{W}_i \leq (4\beta + 2) n_1^{-1/8} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_1} Z_i (1 - \hat{e}_i) / \hat{e}_i = o_P(n_1).$$

Therefore the inliers  $\mathcal{I}_{j^*}$  will constitute most of the ‘‘weight’’ in the sample, i.e.

$$\frac{1}{n_1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{j^*}} \hat{W}_i = \frac{1}{n_1} \sum_{i=1}^{n_1} \hat{W}_i - o_P(1) \geq (2/\varepsilon) \frac{1}{n_1} \sum_{i=1}^{n_1} Z_i - o_P(1) \quad (40)$$

We now perturb the idealized propensity for inliers in  $\mathcal{I}_{j^*}$ . Set  $R_i = (\hat{Q}_i - \bar{Q}_{j^*}) \mathbb{I}\{j^* \neq 4\beta + 3\} + \mathbb{I}\{j^* = 4\beta + 3\}$ , and define  $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \alpha$  by:

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_1 &= \frac{\sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{j^*}} \hat{W}_i R_i (1 - \theta_i)}{\sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{j^*}} \hat{W}_i |R_i|} \times (1 + \mathbb{I}\{j^* \neq 4\beta + 3\}) \\ \lambda_2 &= \frac{\sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{j^*}} \hat{W}_i (1 - \theta_i - \lambda_1 \mathbb{I}\{R_i \geq 0\})}{\sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{j^*}} \hat{W}_i} \\ \alpha &= \min\{1, (|\lambda_1| + |\lambda_2|) / (\Lambda^{-1} - 1)\}. \end{aligned}$$

Finally, construct  $\bar{e}^*$  by:

$$1/\bar{e}^* = \begin{cases} 1/\hat{e}_i & \text{if } i \notin \mathcal{I}_{j^*} \\ 1 + \frac{1 - \hat{e}_i}{\hat{e}_i} (\alpha + (1 - \alpha)(\theta_i + \lambda_1 \mathbb{I}\{R_i \geq 0\} + \lambda_2)) & \text{if } i \in \mathcal{I}_{j^*}. \end{cases}$$

We may verify that, with probability tending to one, we were successful in satisfying the constraints of (36). The odds-ratio condition is satisfied deterministically, so we omit the calculation. If  $\sum_{i=1}^{n_1} \hat{W}_i = 0$ , we balance everything vacuously, so we proceed assuming otherwise. Our first substantive calculation verifies that  $\bar{e}^*$  balances ones, i.e.  $\mathbb{P}_n^1 Z / \bar{e}^* = \mathbb{P}_n^1 Z / \hat{e}(X)$ :

$$\mathbb{P}_n^1 (Z / \bar{e}^* - Z / \hat{e}(X)) = \frac{1}{n_1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{j^*}} \hat{W}_i (\alpha + (1 - \alpha)(\theta_i + \lambda_1 \mathbb{I}\{R_i \geq 0\} + \lambda_2) - 1)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= (1 - \alpha) \frac{1}{n_1} \left( \lambda_2 \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{j^*}} \hat{W}_i - \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{j^*}} \hat{W}_i (1 - \theta_i - \lambda_1 \mathbb{I}\{R_i \geq 0\}) \right) \\
&= 0
\end{aligned}$$

The final equality holds by the definition of  $\lambda_2$ .

To verify that  $\bar{e}^*$  also balances  $\hat{Q}_{-k}$  with probability tending to one, we use the following decomposition:

$$\mathbb{P}_n^1 \hat{Q} Z(1/\bar{e}^* - 1/\hat{e}(X)) = \mathbb{I}\{j^* \neq 4\beta + 3\} \times \bar{Q}_{j^*} \mathbb{P}_n^1 Z(1/\bar{e}^* - 1/\hat{e}(X)) \quad (41)$$

$$+ \mathbb{I}\{j^* \neq 4\beta + 3\} \times \mathbb{P}_n^1 (\hat{Q} - \bar{Q}_{j^*}) Z(1/\bar{e}^* - 1/\hat{e}(X)) \quad (42)$$

$$+ \mathbb{I}\{j^* = 4\beta + 3\} \times \mathbb{P}_n^1 \hat{Q} Z(1/\bar{e}^* - 1/\hat{e}(X)) \quad (43)$$

Since  $\bar{e}^*$  balances constants, (41) is also zero with high probability.

The term (42) requires a lengthier argument. On the event  $j^* \neq 4\beta + 3$ , we have  $\mathbb{P}_n^1 (\hat{Q} - \bar{Q}_{j^*}) Z(1/\bar{e}^* - 1/\hat{e}(X)) = \mathbb{P}_n^1 R Z(1/\bar{e}^* - 1/\hat{e}(X))$ , which the following calculation shows is identically zero when  $j^* \neq 4\beta + 3$ :

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}_n^1 R Z(1/\bar{e}^* - 1/\hat{e}) &= i (1 - \alpha) \frac{1}{n_1} \left( \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{j^*}} \hat{W}_i R_i (1 - \theta_i) - \lambda_1 \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{j^*}} \hat{W}_i R_i \mathbb{I}\{R_i \geq 0\} \right) \\
&= ii (1 - \alpha) \frac{1}{n_1} \left( \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{j^*}} \hat{W}_i R_i (1 - \theta_i) - \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{j^*}} \hat{W}_i R_i (1 - \theta_i) \times \frac{\sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{j^*}} \hat{W}_i R_i \mathbb{I}\{R_i \geq 0\}}{\frac{1}{2} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{j^*}} \hat{W}_i |R_i|} \right) \\
&= iii 0
\end{aligned}$$

Step *i* follows since  $\sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{j^*}} \hat{W}_i R_i = 0$  on the event  $\{j^* \neq 4\beta + 3\}$ , step *ii* substitutes in the definition of  $\lambda_1$ , and step *iii* exploits the identity  $\sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{j^*}} \hat{W}_i R_i \mathbb{I}\{R_i \geq 0\} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{j^*}} \hat{W}_i |R_i|$ :

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{2} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{j^*}} \hat{W}_i |R_i| &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{j^*}} \hat{W}_i R_i \mathbb{I}\{R_i \geq 0\} + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{j^*}} \hat{W}_i (-R_i) \mathbb{I}\{R_i < 0\} \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{j^*}} \hat{W}_i R_i \mathbb{I}\{R_i \geq 0\} + \frac{1}{2} \left( \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{j^*}} \hat{W}_i R_i - \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{j^*}} \hat{W}_i R_i \mathbb{I}\{R_i < 0\} \right) \\
&= \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{j^*}} \hat{W}_i R_i \mathbb{I}\{R_i \geq 0\}
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, (42) = 0.

The final term (43) is more subtle. For any  $i, j \in \mathcal{I}_{4\beta+3}$ ,  $|\hat{Q}_i - \bar{Q}_{4\beta+2}|, |\hat{Q}_j - \bar{Q}_{4\beta+2}| \leq 2^{(4\beta+2)} n^{-(\beta+1/4)}$ , so  $|\hat{Q}_i - \hat{Q}_j| \lesssim n^{-(\beta+1/4)}$ . However, by Condition N, all distinct values of  $\hat{Q}_i$  are separated by distance  $n^{-\beta}$  with probability approaching one. Thus, with high probability, all values of  $\hat{Q}_i$  in  $\mathcal{I}_{4\beta+3}$  are identical to a constant  $\hat{Q}_0$ . In that case (43) =  $\hat{Q}_0 \times \mathbb{P}_n^1 z(1/\bar{e}^* - 1/\hat{e}(X)) = \hat{Q}_0 \times 0$ .

Combining these various cases yields the conclusion  $\mathbb{P}_n^1 \hat{Q} Z(1/\bar{e}^* - 1/\hat{e}(X)) = 0$  with probability tending to one. Thus,  $\bar{e}^*$  is (with high probability) feasible in (36).

Next, we check that  $\bar{\psi}^1$  converges to  $\psi_T^1$ .

The first step in this consistency calculation is to prove that  $\lambda_1 = o_P(1)$  and  $\lambda_2 = o_P(1)$ . Conditional on  $\{(X_i, Z_i)\}_{i \leq N}$  and  $\hat{Q}_{-k}$ , the only randomness remaining in  $\lambda_1$  comes from the  $\theta_i$  values. For observations  $i$  with  $Z_i = 1$ ,  $\theta_i$  takes on the value  $\Lambda^{-1}$  with probability  $\tau$  and  $\Lambda$  with probability  $1 - \tau$ . Since  $\tau = \Lambda/(\Lambda + 1)$ , simple algebra gives  $\mathbb{E}[(1 - \theta_i) | Z_i = 1, X_i] = 0$ . Hence,  $\mathbb{E}[\lambda_1 | \mathcal{G}] = 0$  where  $\mathcal{G} = \sigma(\{(X_i, Z_i)\}_{i \leq N}, \hat{Q}_{-k})$ . Chebyshev's inequality implies  $\lambda_1 = \mathcal{O}_P(\sqrt{\text{Var}(\lambda_1 | \mathcal{G})})$ , so it suffices to show the conditional variance of  $\lambda_1$  vanishes. Note that  $\text{Var}(\theta_i | \mathcal{G}) \leq c(\Lambda)$  for some constant  $c(\Lambda)$ , and  $1 - \theta_i$  is (conditionally) independent of  $1 - \theta_j$  when  $i \neq j$ . Therefore, we may write:

$$\text{Var}(\lambda_1 | \mathcal{G}) \lesssim \frac{\sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{j^*}} (\hat{W}_i R_i)^2}{(\sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{j^*}} \hat{W}_i |R_i|)^2} \mathbb{I}\{j^* \neq 4\beta + 3\} + \frac{\sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{j^*}} (\hat{W}_i R_i)^2}{(\sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{j^*}} \hat{W}_i |R_i|)^2} \mathbb{I}\{j^* = 4\beta + 3\}. \quad (44)$$

Without loss of generality, assume that the exponent  $\alpha$  in Condition N is zero. This can always be achieved by rescaling  $\hat{Q}_i$  by  $n^{-\alpha}$  and making a corresponding change to the lower bound  $\beta$ . Hence:

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{j^*}} (\hat{W}_i R_i)^2}{(\sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{j^*}} \hat{W}_i |R_i|)^2} \mathbb{I}\{j^* \neq 4\beta + 3\} &\leq_i \frac{\sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{j^*}} (\hat{W}_i R_i)^2}{(\sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{j^*} \setminus \mathcal{I}_{j^*-1}} \hat{W}_i |R_i|)^2} \mathbb{I}\{j^* \neq 4\beta + 3\} \\
&\leq_{ii} \frac{\sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{j^*}} \hat{W}_i^2 R_i^2}{(\sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{j^*} \setminus \mathcal{I}_{j^*+1}} \hat{W}_i 2^{j^*} n^{-j^*/4})^2} \mathbb{I}\{j^* \neq 4\beta + 3\} \\
&\leq_{iii} \frac{\sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{j^*}} \hat{W}_i^2 (2^{j^*} n^{-(j^*-1)/4})^2}{(\sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{j^*} \setminus \mathcal{I}_{j^*+1}} \hat{W}_i 2^{j^*} n^{-j^*/4})^2} \mathbb{I}\{j^* \neq 4\beta + 3\} \\
&\leq_{iv} n^{1/2} \times \frac{\sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{j^*}} \hat{W}_i^2}{(n_1^{-1/8} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{j^*}} \hat{W}_i)^2} \mathbb{I}\{j^* \neq 4\beta + 3\} \\
&\lesssim_v \frac{n^{3/4}}{\sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{j^*}} \hat{W}_i} \mathbb{I}\{j^* \neq 4\beta + 3\} \\
&=_{vi} o_P(n^{-1/4})
\end{aligned}$$

Step *i* makes the denominator smaller by removing positive terms. Step *ii* is justified because, on the event  $j^* \neq 4\beta + 3$ ,  $|R_i| \geq 2^{j^*} n^{-j^*/4}$  for all  $i \in \mathcal{I}_{j^*} \setminus \mathcal{I}_{j^*+1}$  by (38). Step *iii* requires some more justification. If  $j^* = 1$ , then  $R_i = |\hat{Q}_i - \bar{Q}_1| \leq 2 \max_i |\hat{Q}_i| \leq 2$ . If  $1 < j^* \neq 4\beta + 3$ , then  $|R_i| = |\bar{Q}_i - \bar{Q}_{j^*}| \leq |\bar{Q}_i - \bar{Q}_{j^*-1}| + |\bar{Q}_{j^*-1} - \bar{Q}_{j^*}| \leq 2^{j^*} n^{-(j^*-1)/4}$ . In either case,  $|R_i| \leq 2^{j^*} n^{-(j^*-1)/4}$ . Step *iv* rearranges and invokes the definition of  $j^*$ , while step *v* uses the fact that  $n_1 \leq n$  and our trimming assumption on  $\hat{e}_i$  ensures the ratio of  $\hat{W}_i/\hat{W}_i^2$  is bounded above and below when  $Z_i \neq 1$ . Step *vi* holds by (40).

The second term (44) can be controlled by a similar calculation. In fact, it is easier, since  $R_i = 1$  on the event  $j^* = 4\beta + 3$ . That omitted calculation shows that  $\text{Var}(\lambda_1 | \mathcal{G}) = o_P(1)$ , and hence  $\lambda_1 = o_P(1)$ .

To show  $\lambda_2 = o_P(1)$ , start by writing  $\lambda_2$  as the difference of two terms.

$$\lambda_2 = \frac{\sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{j^*}} \hat{W}_i (1 - \theta_i)}{\sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{j^*}} \hat{W}_i} - \lambda_1 \frac{\sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{j^*}} \hat{W}_i \mathbb{I}\{R_i \geq 0\}}{\sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{j^*}} \hat{W}_i}$$

The first term is  $o_P(1)$  by the same argument as the one for  $\lambda_1$  when  $j^* = 4\beta + 3$ . The second term is the product of  $\lambda_1$  and a quantity less than one. Since  $\lambda_1 = o_P(1)$ , this shows the second term is  $o_P(1)$  as well.

Finally, we ready to show that  $\bar{\psi}^1 = \psi_T^+ - o_P(1)$ . By (37), it suffices to show the distance between  $\mathbb{P}_n^1 YZ/\bar{e}^*$  and  $\mathbb{P}_n^1 YZ(1 + \theta_i \frac{1 - \hat{e}(X_i)}{\hat{e}(X_i)})$  is vanishing. We expand this difference as the sum of several terms:

$$\mathbb{P}_n^1 YZ/\bar{e}^* - \mathbb{P}_n^1 YZ(1 + \theta_i \frac{1 - \hat{e}(X)}{\hat{e}(X)}) = \frac{1}{n_1} \sum_{i \notin \mathcal{I}_{j^*}} \hat{W}_i Y_i (1 - \theta_i) \tag{45}$$

$$+ \alpha \frac{1}{n_1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{j^*}} \hat{W}_i Y_i (1 - \theta_i) \tag{46}$$

$$+ (1 - \alpha) \frac{1}{n_1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{j^*}} \hat{W}_i Y_i (\lambda_1 \mathbb{I}\{R_i \geq 0\} + \lambda_2). \tag{47}$$

The term (45) can be handled as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
\left| \frac{1}{n_1} \sum_{i \notin \mathcal{I}_{j^*}} \hat{W}_i Y_i (\theta_i - 1) \right| &\lesssim \left( \frac{1}{n_1} \sum_{i \notin \mathcal{I}_{j^*}} \hat{W}_i^2 \right)^{1/2} \left( \frac{1}{n_1} \sum_{i=1}^{n_1} |Y_i|^2 \right)^{1/2} \\
&\lesssim \left( \frac{1}{n_1} \sum_{i \notin \mathcal{I}_{j^*}} \hat{W}_i \right)^{1/2} (\mathbb{E}[Y^2] + o_P(1))
\end{aligned}$$

$$= o_P(1)$$

where we have used (40) in the final step. To analyze (46), use the fact that  $|\lambda_1| \vee |\lambda_2| = o_P(1)$ , and hence  $\alpha = o_P(1)$ . Since  $\frac{1}{n_1} \sum_{i=1}^{n_1} \hat{W}_i |Y_i| = \mathcal{O}_P(1)$ , the product vanishes. Finally, (47) is smaller than  $\mathcal{O}_P(1) \times \frac{1}{n_1} \sum_{i=1}^{n_1} \hat{W}_i |Y_i| (|\lambda_1| + |\lambda_2|) = o_P(1)$ .

Putting it all together, we have shown  $\mathbb{P}_n^1 YZ/\bar{e}^* - \mathbb{P}_n^1 YZ(1 + \theta_i \frac{1-\hat{e}(X)}{\hat{e}(X)}) = o_P(1)$ , and hence  $\hat{\psi}_+(1) \geq \bar{\psi}^1 = \psi_T^+ - o_P(1)$ .  $\square$

## B.12 Proof of Theorem 4

In this section, we prove Theorem 4. For brevity, we only prove the validity of the bootstrap upper bound for  $\psi_T^+$ , and restrict our attention to the case where the nominal propensity score is estimated by logistic regression. By symmetry, the result extends to  $\psi_T^-$  and the other estimands of interest, and the proof can easily be modified to handle other parametric propensity models like probit regression. As in the proof of Theorem 3(i), we abbreviate  $\hat{Q}_\tau(x, 1)$  and  $Q_\tau(x, 1)$  by  $\hat{Q}(x)$  and  $Q(x)$ , respectively.

For convenience, we restate the theorem in this special case to make the regularity conditions more precise.

### Theorem 4(i). (Inference for $\psi_T^+$ )

Assume Conditions 1, 2, and 3.(i). Suppose that the nominal propensity score  $\hat{e}$  is consistently estimated by logistic regression, and the covariate space  $\mathcal{X}$  is bounded.<sup>5</sup> Suppose the number of bootstrap samples  $B \equiv B_n$  tends to infinity. Then we have:

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}(\psi_T^+ \leq Q_{1-\alpha}(\{\hat{\psi}_b^+\}_{b \in [B]}) \geq 1 - \alpha$$

for all  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ .

*Proof.* We begin by introducing some notation. For  $i \leq n$ , let  $(X_i^*, Y_i^*, Z_i^*) \sim \mathbb{P}_n$  be bootstrap observations, and let  $\mathbb{P}_n^* = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \delta_{(X_i^*, Y_i^*, Z_i^*)}$  denote the bootstrap empirical distribution. Let  $\hat{\theta}^*$  be the logistic regression coefficient vector estimated on the bootstrap dataset, and set  $\hat{e}^*(x) = 1/[1 + \exp(-x^\top \hat{\theta}^*)]$ . Further define the bootstrap ZSB constraint set  $\mathcal{E}_n^*(\Lambda)$  by:

$$\mathcal{E}_n^*(\Lambda) = \left\{ \bar{e} \in \mathbb{R}^n : \Lambda^{-1} \leq \frac{\bar{e}_i/[1 - \bar{e}_i]}{\hat{e}^*(X_i^*)/[1 - \hat{e}^*(X_i^*)]} \leq \Lambda \text{ for all } i \leq n \right\}$$

and the bootstrap quantile balancing estimator  $\hat{\psi}_*^+$  by:

$$\hat{\psi}_*^+ = \max_{\bar{e} \in \mathcal{E}_n^*(\Lambda)} \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n Y_i Z_i / \bar{e}_i}{\sum_{i=1}^n Z_i / \bar{e}_i} \quad \text{s.t.} \quad \begin{pmatrix} \mathbb{P}_n^* \hat{Q}(X) Z / \bar{e} \\ \mathbb{P}_n^* Z / \bar{e} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbb{P}_n^* \hat{Q}(X) Z / \hat{e}^*(X) \\ \mathbb{P}_n^* Z / \hat{e}^*(X) \end{pmatrix}.$$

The estimated quantile  $\hat{Q}$  in the definition of  $\hat{\psi}_*^+$  comes from the original dataset, but the rest of the argument will go through even if it is re-estimated within each bootstrap sample.

The first step of the proof is to reduce our task to that of proving bootstrap consistency for a much simpler estimator under the assumption that  $Q(x) = \beta_0^\top h(x)$ . Define the bootstrap *feature balancing* estimator  $\bar{\psi}_*^+$  by:

$$\bar{\psi}_*^+ = \max_{\bar{e} \in \mathcal{E}_n^*(\Lambda)} \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n Y_i Z_i / \bar{e}_i}{\sum_{i=1}^n Z_i / \bar{e}_i} \quad \text{s.t.} \quad \mathbb{P}_n^* h(X) Z / \bar{e} = \mathbb{P}_n^* h(X) Z / \hat{e}^*(X).$$

Clearly,  $\hat{\psi}_*^+ \geq \bar{\psi}_*^+$  deterministically, so the quantiles of the bootstrap distribution of  $\hat{\psi}_*^+$  are above the quantiles of the bootstrap distribution of  $\bar{\psi}_*^+$ . A further reduction can be obtained by defining the estimator  $\hat{\psi}_*^+$  by:

$$\hat{\psi}_*^+ = \frac{\mathbb{P}_n^*(Y - \hat{\gamma}^{*\top} h(X)) Z (1 + \Lambda \text{sign}(Y - Q(X))(1 - \hat{e}^*(X))/\hat{e}^*(X)) + \mathbb{P}_n^* \hat{\gamma}^{*\top} h(X) Z / \hat{e}^*(X)}{\mathbb{P}_n^* Z / \hat{e}^*(X)}$$

<sup>5</sup>This is needed for logistic regression to be compatible with the strong overlap requirement of Condition 1, although examining the proof shows it could be relaxed to the existence of certain exponential moments as in [63].

$$\hat{\gamma}^* = \operatorname{argmin}_{\gamma \in \mathbb{R}^k} \mathbb{P}_n^* \rho_\tau(Y - \gamma^\top h(X)) Z \frac{1 - \hat{\epsilon}^*(X)}{\hat{\epsilon}^*(X)}.$$

This estimator is not actually implementable as it depends on the true quantile  $Q$  through the term  $\operatorname{sign}(Y - Q(X))$ . Still, the proof of Lemma 3 implies  $\bar{\psi}_*^+ \geq \psi_*^+$ , so it suffices to prove the validity of the percentile bootstrap for the estimator  $\psi_*^+$ .

The rest of this proof will be dedicated to proving the validity of the percentile bootstrap for the estimator  $\psi_*^+$ . Let  $\theta_0$  be the true logistic regression coefficient vector. For any  $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^d, \beta \in \mathbb{R}^k, \psi \in \mathbb{R}$ , define the estimating equation  $m_{\theta, \beta, \psi}(x, y, z)$  by:

$$m_{\theta, \gamma, \psi}(x, y, z) = \begin{bmatrix} x(z - 1/(1 + e^{-\theta^\top x})) \\ h(x)(\tau - \mathbb{I}\{\gamma^\top h(x) < 0\})ze^{\theta^\top x} \\ (y - \gamma^\top h(x))z(1 + \Lambda^{\operatorname{sign}(y - Q(x))}e^{\theta^\top x} + \gamma^\top h(x)z(1 + e^{-\theta^\top x}) - \psi z(1 + e^{-\theta^\top x})) \end{bmatrix}.$$

and define  $M(\theta, \gamma, \psi) = Pm_{\theta, \gamma, \psi}(X, Y, Z)$ . If the linear quantile model is correctly specified (i.e.  $Q(x) = \beta_0^\top h(x)$  for some  $\beta_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ), then  $(\theta_0, \beta_0, \psi_0^+)$  solve the estimating equation  $M(\theta_0, \gamma_0, \psi_0^+) = 0$ . Meanwhile, the estimators  $(\hat{\theta}^*, \hat{\gamma}^*, \hat{\psi}_*^+)$  (approximately) solve the bootstrap estimating equation:

$$M_n^*(\hat{\theta}^*, \hat{\gamma}^*, \hat{\psi}_*^+) = \mathbb{P}_n^* m_{\hat{\theta}^*, \hat{\gamma}^*, \hat{\psi}_*^+}(X, Y, Z) = o_P(n^{-1/2}).$$

Therefore, we are in a position to apply the standard theory of bootstrap  $Z$ -estimators, at least in the correctly-specified case  $Q(x) = \beta_0^\top h(x)$ .

Specifically, we will apply Theorem 10.6 in [34], but prove bootstrap consistency by more direct means. This is essentially equivalent to using Theorem 3.1 in [60] but establishing equicontinuity using Donsker conditions. Since logistic regression and weighted quantile regression are both convex optimization problems, the consistency  $\hat{\theta}^* \xrightarrow{P} \theta_0$  and  $\hat{\gamma}^* \xrightarrow{P} \beta_0$  follow from the bootstrap law of large numbers and Theorem 2.7 in [42]. From this, the result  $\hat{\psi}_*^+ \xrightarrow{P} \psi_0^+$  follows from the same argument used in the proof of Theorem 3.(i), with all applications of the law of large numbers replaced by the bootstrap law of large numbers. It remains to check Assumption (C) in Theorem 10.6 of [34]. Exercise 10.5.5 in [34] verifies this for the logistic regression estimating equation  $x(z - 1/(1 + e^{-\theta^\top x}))$ . The quantile regression estimating equation eventually lives in the product of the VC class  $\mathcal{F}$  and the smooth parametric class  $\mathcal{G}$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F} &= \{(x, y, z) \mapsto (\tau - \mathbb{I}\{\gamma^\top h(x) < 0\}) : \gamma \in \mathbb{R}^d, \} \\ \mathcal{G} &= \{(x, y, z) \mapsto h(x)ze^{\theta^\top x} : \|\theta - \theta_0\| \leq 1\}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, Assumption (C) follows from Theorem 9.15 in [34] and the dominated convergence theorem. The same arguments verify this condition for the final estimating equation.

Thus, we have shown that if  $Q(x) = \beta_0^\top h(x)$  for some  $\beta_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ , then all the requirements for the proof of Theorem 10.16 in [34] are satisfied, and hence the percentile bootstrap based on  $\hat{\psi}_*^+$  will be asymptotically valid.

Finally, it remains to remove the assumption that the linear quantile model is correctly specified. If  $Q(x) \neq \beta^\top h(x)$  for any  $\beta \in \mathbb{R}^d$ , then we may once again lower bound  $\hat{\psi}_*^+$  by the estimator that balances  $h(x)$  and the true quantile  $Q(x)$ . This brings us back to the well-specified case, and the preceding arguments imply the validity of the bootstrap upper confidence bound.  $\square$