

# Robust Sample Weighting to Facilitate Individualized Treatment Rule Learning for a Target Population

Rui Chen

Department of Statistics, University of Wisconsin

Jared D. Huling

Department of Biostatistics, University of Minnesota

Guanhua Chen\*

Department of Biostatistics and Medical Informatics, University of Wisconsin

Menggang Yu†

Department of Biostatistics and Medical Informatics, University of Wisconsin

May 4, 2021

## Abstract

Learning individualized treatment rules (ITRs) is an important topic in precision medicine. Current literature mainly focuses on deriving ITRs from a single source population. We consider the observational data setting when the source population differs from a target population of interest. We assume subject covariates are available from both populations, but treatment and outcome data are only available from the source population. Although adjusting for differences between source and target populations can potentially lead to an improved ITR for the target population, it can substantially increase the variability in ITR estimation. To address this dilemma, we develop a weighting framework that aims to tailor an ITR for a given target population and protect against high variability due to superfluous covariate shift adjustments. Our method seeks covariate balance over a nonparametric function class characterized by a reproducing kernel Hilbert space and can improve many ITR learning methods that rely on weights. We show that the proposed method encompasses importance weights and the so-called overlap weights as two extreme cases, allowing for a better bias-variance trade-off in between. Numerical examples demonstrate that the use of our weighting method can greatly improve ITR estimation for the target population compared with other weighting methods.

*Keywords:* covariate balance, covariate shift, precision medicine, weighting adjustments

---

\*Corresponding authors: gchen25@wisc.edu

†Corresponding authors: meyu@biostat.wisc.edu

# 1 Introduction

Individualized decision making based on a subject’s characteristics has received increasing attention in the past decades. It has broad application in many fields, such as establishing personalized treatment regimes based on electronic health record data (Wang et al., 2016), personalizing ad placement based on user profiles (Bottou et al., 2013), and optimally allocating public resources based on individual characteristics (Kube et al., 2019). The common goal of these problems is to find an *individualized treatment rule* (ITR), a mapping from individual characteristics to a treatment assignment such that the expected outcome is optimized under the rule. In order for the estimated ITR to be practically useful, it is usually desirable to limit the search of the optimal ITR within a prespecified class of restricted rules. Such restriction may arise from logistic, legal, ethical or political considerations (Kitagawa and Tetenov, 2018; Athey and Wager, 2021), or from the need for an interpretable ITR to inform better clinical practice; see, for example, Zhang et al. (2018); Murdoch et al. (2019).

A wide array of statistical methods have been developed to estimate the optimal ITR using experimental or observational data. One type of these approaches relies on modeling the outcomes as functions of the covariates and then obtains the optimal ITR by inverting the regression estimates (Qian and Murphy, 2011; Foster et al., 2011). However, the success of these methods highly depends on accuracy of the outcome models. In contrast, weighting-based ITR learning approaches obviate or reduce the need for fitting outcome models by directly optimizing the expected ITR outcome or value function (Zhao et al., 2012; Zhou et al., 2017; Chen et al., 2017), thus making estimated ITRs more robust to modeling choices. A critical component of this class of methods is a weighting function that reweights the source data based on the covariates and treatment information such that the treated and control groups are comparable. Nearly all such methods use inverse propensity score weights (IPW) for this task. Reweighting by the IPW makes the treated and control groups look as though they followed the same co-

variate distribution as the whole source sample. As a result, the estimated ITR is tailored for the source population, which might be suboptimal for a target population that has a different covariate distribution (Zhao et al., 2019; Mo et al., 2020).

The distributional difference in covariates between the two populations is termed as *covariate shift* in the literature (Sugiyama et al., 2007). Such a scenario is not uncommon, for instance, when we try to generalize the ITR learned from one health care system to another (Institute of Medicine, 2013). Despite the vast literature in estimating the optimal ITR, much less attention has been paid to its generalizability to a target population. The aim of this paper is to develop a weighting framework to facilitate generalizability of optimal ITR from a source population to a target population. We assume subject covariates are available from both populations but treatment and outcome data are only available from the source population, where the treatment assignments are not randomized and thus confounding is also a key concern. In this work, we address issues related to adjusting for both confounding and covariate shift and propose a flexible design-based weighting strategy that balances on a sufficiently large class of covariate functions. Compared with causal generalization for the average treatment effect (ATE), ITR generalization poses new challenges due to the need to model and generalize the rules based on a prespecified class of functions. This puts more stringent requirements on covariate balance. In addition, the prespecified class of functions may not contain the unrestricted true optimal ITR and, as we explain below, our proposed weighting method is designed to mitigate the impact of such misspecification.

Weighting adjustment by the *importance weights* has been a commonly used approach for dealing with covariate shift (Sugiyama et al., 2007). In the context of ITR learning, the source data are reweighted by the density ratio between the target and source populations on top of the IPW, as suggested by Kitagawa and Tetenov (2018, Remark 2.2). Although the importance weights can ensure unbiased ITR estimation by correcting for covariate shift and confounding simultaneously, they can contain extreme values especially when there is insufficient overlap

between the treated and control groups or between the source and target populations, leading to unstable estimation. Kallus (2020) proposed to alleviate the instability issue in ITR learning in this context by retargeting to a population whose density ratio against the source population is proportional to  $\pi(x)(1 - \pi(x))$ , where  $\pi(x)$  denotes the propensity score. This retargeted “hypothetical” population allocates more emphasis on the covariate region where the treated and control groups have good overlap. When combined with the IPW, the resulting weights are essentially the *overlap weights* of Li et al. (2018). Kallus (2020) showed that when the prespecified rule class can well approximate the unrestricted true optimal ITR, their retargeting approach incurs no bias to the learning process and can lead to better performing ITRs, and thus can work well if one expects certain amount of covariate shift in the target population. However, when the unrestricted true optimal ITR is *not* contained in the prespecified rule class, this claim no longer holds because the retargeted population can be substantially different from the target population of interest, and thus their restricted optimal ITRs within the prespecified rule class also differ. Therefore, practitioners interested in generalizing an ITR to a new population are presented with two extreme weighting methods: the importance weights that strive for eliminating bias from confounding and covariate shift but may lead to large variance, and the overlap weights that emphasize robust and stable estimation but are prone to bias as they only mitigate confounding. In this paper, we aim to develop a framework that not only encompasses the importance and the overlap weights, but also allows one to search a better bias-variance trade-off between them in a data-driven manner.

Another increasingly recognized issue of these existing weighting methods is that they are constructed in an indirect way based on the propensity score and density ratio. In practice these functions need to be estimated and can be extremely sensitive to model misspecification (Kang et al., 2007). Our proposed method addresses this issue by constructing the weights directly, bypassing the need for direct modeling of the propensity score or density ratio. Our approach to doing so is inspired by the recent growing literature of covariate balancing weights

for estimation of the ATE or similar causal estimands (Hainmueller, 2012; Imai and Ratkovic, 2014; Wong and Chan, 2018; Hirshberg et al., 2019; Huling and Mak, 2020; Chattopadhyay et al., 2020). Instead of explicitly specifying a functional form for the underlying propensity score model, covariate balancing approaches directly construct weights so that they improve the balance between treatment groups over a given set of covariate functions. The variation of the weights is typically controlled by minimizing the dispersion of the weights subject to the specified balance constraints for these covariate functions.

As we will show, proper weights for ITR learning should be able to achieve balance on a possibly very complex set of covariate functions to cover candidate assignment rule classes. We start by establishing a covariate balancing weight strategy that minimizes the imbalance between the treated group, the control group, and the target population over a nonparametric function class characterized by a reproducing kernel Hilbert space (RKHS, see Wahba (1990)). By carefully inspecting the target population value function, we observe that different from adjusting for confounding, adjusting for covariate shift is not essential when the prespecified ITR class contains the unrestricted true optimal ITR. As we cannot know such containment in practice, we propose a three-way balancing strategy based on a convex combination of objectives that seek to induce covariate shift balance and confounding balance. As our weighting approach emphasizes full distributional balance of covariates, it is robust to the functional form of confounding and works well empirically. Despite the fact that our weights are nonparametrically constructed via balance-seeking objectives, we show that the resulting weights converge to either the importance weights or the overlap weights under different hyperparameters when sample size tends to infinity. To guide the selection of hyperparameters that control the tradeoff in between the importance weights and overlap weights, we devise a tuning procedure based on treatment-control balance and predicted outcomes on the target sample and show the procedure works well in the numerical examples. The proposed weights have potential for broad application, because they can be incorporated into any weighting-based ITR learning methods

as substitutes for the IPW and facilitate a better performing ITR for the target population of interest.

## 2 Preliminaries

Suppose we have collected data on  $n$  subjects:  $(X_i, S_i, S_i A_i, S_i Y_i)$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, n$ .  $X_i \in \mathcal{X} \subset \mathbb{R}^p$  denotes a vector of pre-treatment covariates which contain confounding factors and treatment effect modifiers.  $S_i$  is a population indicator such that  $S_i = 1$  indicates subject  $i$  is from the source population  $\mathcal{S}$  and  $S_i = 0$  indicates  $i$  is from the target population  $\mathcal{T}$ .  $A_i \in \{0, 1\}$  is a binary treatment indicator and  $Y_i$  is the outcome of interest for which we assume larger outcomes are preferred without loss of generality. In our setting,  $A_i$  and  $Y_i$  are only observed for observations from the source population ( $S_i = 1$ ). We will refer to the observations from  $\mathcal{S}$  as the source sample and the rest as the target sample. Let  $n_s$ ,  $n_t$  be the sample sizes of the source and target samples, respectively, and  $n = n_s + n_t$  be the total sample size.

For causal interpretation, we use the potential outcome framework (Rosenbaum and Rubin, 1983; Imbens and Rubin, 2015), wherein each subject  $i$  is assumed to have two potential outcomes  $Y_i(1)$ , the outcome if subject  $i$  were to receive the treatment, and  $Y_i(0)$ , the outcome if  $i$  were not to receive the treatment. Under the Stable Unit Treatment Value Assumption (SUTVA), the observed outcome in the source sample can be expressed as  $Y_i = Y(A_i)$ . Throughout this paper, we assume SUTVA holds. Under SUTVA we can associate each observation with a “full” random variate  $(X_i, S_i, A_i, Y_i(0), Y_i(1))$ , which across  $i$  are assumed to be i.i.d. draws from a super-population.

Consider a prespecified ITR class  $\mathcal{D} \subset \{0, 1\}^{\mathcal{X}}$ . For an ITR  $d \in \mathcal{D}$ , the potential outcome following the treatment assignment prescribed by  $d$  is  $Y(d(X))$ . The utility of the ITR  $d$  can be measured by the *value function*, which is defined as the population mean outcome were all subjects to receive treatment according to  $d$ . Specifically, the value function under the source

distribution and the target distribution are

$$\mathcal{V}_S(d) = \mathbb{E}[Y(d(X)) \mid S = 1] \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{V}_T(d) = \mathbb{E}[Y(d(X)) \mid S = 0],$$

respectively. The objective is then to find the optimal ITR in  $\mathcal{D}$  for the target population, i.e. the one that maximizes  $\mathcal{V}_T(d)$  among all rules in the prespecified rule class:

$$\arg \max_{d \in \mathcal{D}} \mathcal{V}_T(d). \tag{1}$$

We assume that the treatment assignment mechanism in the source sample is determined by a *propensity score*  $\pi(x) = \mathbb{P}(A = 1 \mid X = x, S = 1)$  (Rosenbaum and Rubin, 1983). If the source sample is from a randomized trial, then  $\pi(x)$  is known. We further denote  $\rho(x) = \mathbb{P}(S = 1 \mid X = x)$  and refer to this as *participation probability* (Dahabreh et al., 2020). To identify  $\mathcal{V}_T(d)$  from the observed data, we impose the following assumptions throughout the paper.

**Assumption 1.** (*Unconfoundedness of treatment assignment*) *In the source population,  $(Y(0), Y(1))$  are conditionally independent of  $A$  given  $X$ :  $(Y(0), Y(1)) \perp\!\!\!\perp A \mid X, S = 1$ .*

**Assumption 2.** (*Positivity of propensity score*) *The propensity score of the source population is bounded away from 0 and 1: for some  $c > 0$ ,  $c \leq \pi(X) \leq 1 - c$  almost surely.*

**Assumption 3.** (*Mean exchangability across populations*) *The conditional mean of the potential outcomes given the covariates are equal between the two populations:  $\mathbb{E}[Y(a) \mid X, S = 1] = \mathbb{E}[Y(a) \mid X, S = 0]$  almost surely for  $a \in \{0, 1\}$ .*

**Assumption 4.** (*Positivity of participation probability*) *The participation probability is bounded away from 0:  $\rho(X) > c$  almost surely for some  $c > 0$ .*

The first two are common assumptions in causal inference; and together with the SUTVA enable identification of causal quantities with respect to the source population, such as  $\mathcal{V}_S(d)$ , from the observed sample. The last two assumptions are adopted from Dahabreh et al. (2020)

and Rudolph and van der Laan (2017) and allow us to generalize causal estimates to the target population (Colnet et al., 2020). Under these assumptions, the value function on the target population can be identified with the observed source sample quantities through

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{T}}(d) &= \mathbb{E}[w^*(A, X)\mathbb{1}(d(X) = A)Y \mid S = 1] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[Aw^*(1, X)d(X)Y \mid S = 1] + \mathbb{E}[(1 - A)w^*(0, X)(1 - d(X))Y \mid S = 1] \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

where  $\mathbb{1}(\cdot)$  is the indicator function and

$$w^*(a, x) = \left\{ \frac{a}{\pi(x)} + \frac{1 - a}{1 - \pi(x)} \right\} \frac{\mathbb{E}(S)(1 - \rho(x))}{(1 - \mathbb{E}(S))\rho(x)}. \quad (3)$$

For  $a = 1$  (or 0),  $w^*(1, x)$  (or  $w^*(0, x)$ ) is proportional to the density ratio between the target population and the treated group (or control group). In other words,  $w^*(a, x)$  acts as the importance weight that reweights the underlying distribution of the source data to the target distribution. It can be estimated from data because  $\mathbb{E}(S)$  can be estimated as the empirical average of  $S_i$  and  $\pi(x), \rho(x)$  can be estimated by probability models for binary outcomes such as logistic regression. However, since the probability estimates appear in the denominator of  $w^*(a, x)$ , estimation error and model misspecification of the probability models can lead to significant error in estimating  $\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{T}}(d)$  and thus jeopardize the ITR learning process. In the next section, we propose approaches to directly estimate weights that are suitable for ITR learning.

### 3 Method

Let  $w : \{0, 1\} \times \mathcal{X} \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  denote a general weighting function. Let  $\mathcal{S}_a = \{i : S_i = 1, A_i = a\}$  be the index set of treatment group  $a$  among the source sample,  $a \in \{0, 1\}$ . By abuse of notation we let  $\mathcal{S}$  also denote  $\{i : S_i = 1\}$  and similarly  $\mathcal{T} = \{i : S_i = 0\}$ . Following (2) we

consider estimators for  $\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{T}}(d)$  of the form:

$$\widehat{\mathcal{V}}_n(d; w) = \frac{1}{n_s} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{S}_1} w_i d(X_i) Y_i + \frac{1}{n_s} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{S}_0} w_i (1 - d(X_i)) Y_i, \quad (4)$$

where the weights  $w_i$  are autonormalized as

$$w_i = \begin{cases} \frac{w(1, X_i)}{\frac{1}{n_s} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{S}_1} w(1, X_i)}, & \text{if } i \in \mathcal{S}_1, \\ \frac{w(0, X_i)}{\frac{1}{n_s} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{S}_0} w(0, X_i)}, & \text{if } i \in \mathcal{S}_0. \end{cases}$$

The weights are normalized by treatment group, i.e.,  $\sum_{i \in \mathcal{S}_1} w_i = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{S}_0} w_i = n_s$ . Such weighted estimators are also known as the Hájek estimator (Chattopadhyay et al., 2020). Given the weights, the optimal ITR can be estimated as

$$\hat{d} = \arg \max_{d \in \mathcal{D}} \widehat{\mathcal{V}}_n(d; w). \quad (5)$$

When  $w(1, x) = 1/\pi(x)$  and  $w(0, x) = 1/(1 - \pi(x))$ , (4) becomes the objective function of outcome weighted learning approach (Zhao et al., 2012).

In this section, we will study the requirements on  $w(\cdot)$  or  $w_i$  such that maximizing  $\widehat{\mathcal{V}}_n(d; w)$  produces a well-performing ITR for the target population and will then develop a balancing weight framework to meet these conditions. We first derive two different balancing weight methods, one that makes a covariate shift adjustment in addition to adjusting for confounding and the other that only adjusts for confounding. We will demonstrate that each of these two approaches is suitable under different situations, depending on whether or not the prespecified rule class contains the unrestricted optimal ITR. However, it is not clear *a priori* which of the weighting approaches is best suited for a given data-generating mechanism. To address this, our final approach will be formulated as a hybrid of these two balancing weighting methods that combines them in a data-driven manner.

### 3.1 General case: balancing to the target population

In this section we focus on the general case where the true optimal ITR is potentially not contained in the prespecified class  $\mathcal{D}$ . In this case we investigate what properties a set of weights should have in order to reduce error in estimation of the optimal ITR. From the perspective of ITR evaluation (Kallus, 2018), a natural idea is to choose  $w$  for the source population so that make  $\widehat{\mathcal{V}}_n(d; w)$  is as close to  $\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{T}}(d)$  as possible for all  $d \in \mathcal{D}$ . Given such weights, an ITR  $d$  that is the maximizer of  $\widehat{\mathcal{V}}_n(d; w)$  will also achieve a high value of  $\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{T}}(d)$ .

Define  $\mu_a(x) = \mathbb{E}[Y(a) \mid X = x]$  and  $\varepsilon_i \equiv Y_i - \mu_{A_i}(X_i)$ . We assume that  $\varepsilon_i$  are mutually independent and have uniformly bounded variance, i.e.,  $\mathbb{E}[\varepsilon_i^2 \mid X_i, A_i] \leq \sigma^2 < \infty$ . Let  $\mathcal{V}_{n, \mathcal{T}}(d) = \frac{1}{n_t} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{T}} \{d(X_i)\mu_1(X_i) + (1 - d(X_i))\mu_0(X_i)\}$  be the sample version of  $\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{T}}(d)$ , where  $n_t = \sum_i (1 - S_i)$ . Then the estimation error  $\widehat{\mathcal{V}}_n(d; w) - \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{T}}(d)$  admits the following decomposition:

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\mathcal{V}}_n(d; w) - \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{T}}(d) &= \frac{1}{n_s} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{S}_1} w_i d(X_i) (\mu_1(X_i) + \varepsilon_i) + \frac{1}{n_s} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{S}_0} w_i (1 - d(X_i)) (\mu_0(X_i) + \varepsilon_i) \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{n_t} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{T}} d(X_i) \mu_1(X_i) - \frac{1}{n_t} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{T}} (1 - d(X_i)) \mu_0(X_i) + \{\mathcal{V}_{n, \mathcal{T}}(d) - \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{T}}(d)\} \\ &= \int_{\mathcal{X}} d(x) \mu_1(x) d[\mathbb{P}_{n, \mathcal{S}_1}^{(w)} - \mathbb{P}_{n, \mathcal{T}}](x) + \int_{\mathcal{X}} (1 - d(x)) \mu_0(x) d[\mathbb{P}_{n, \mathcal{S}_0}^{(w)} - \mathbb{P}_{n, \mathcal{T}}](x) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{n_s} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{S}} \mathbb{1}(d(X_i) = A_i) w_i \varepsilon_i + \{\mathcal{V}_{n, \mathcal{T}}(d) - \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{T}}(d)\}. \end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

Here  $\mathbb{P}_{n, \mathcal{S}_a}^{(w)} = \frac{1}{n_s} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{S}_a} w_i \delta_{X_i}$  are the weighted empirical distributions of the covariates of the treated ( $a = 1$ ) and control ( $a = 0$ ) units in the source sample, and  $\mathbb{P}_{n, \mathcal{T}}$  is the empirical distribution of the covariates of the target sample.

The decomposition (6) allows a transparent understanding about what properties  $w_i$ 's should possess to ensure the estimation error of the value function in the target population to be small. The first term in the decomposition is the source of estimation bias arising from the imbalance between  $\mathbb{P}_{n, \mathcal{S}_1}^{(w)}$  and  $\mathbb{P}_{n, \mathcal{T}}$  on the function  $d(x)\mu_1(x)$ . In other words, depending on the behavior of

the unknown quantity  $d(x)\mu_1(x)$ , this term can contribute to the bias if the weighted distribution of covariates of treated group in the source sample differs from the empirical distribution of covariates in the target sample. Similarly, the second term is due to the imbalance between  $\mathbb{P}_{n, \mathcal{S}_0}^{(w)}$  and  $\mathbb{P}_{n, \mathcal{T}}$  on  $(1 - d(x))\mu_0(x)$ . The third term demonstrates how variance is inflated by the weighting function  $w(a, x)$ . These three terms can be controlled by properly selecting the weighting function  $w(a, x)$ . The last term on the right-hand side of (6) is completely due to sampling error and is not related to  $w(a, x)$  in any manner. It converges to 0 at the rate of  $\mathcal{O}(n^{-\frac{1}{2}})$  as long as the target sample is representative of the target population.

We first consider the first term on the right-hand side of (6). Ideally we want to eliminate or mitigate the bias by balancing  $\mathbb{P}_{n, \mathcal{S}_1}^{(w)}$  and  $\mathbb{P}_{n, \mathcal{T}}$  on  $d(x)\mu_1(x)$ . However,  $\mu_1(x)$  is typically unknown. Even if  $\mu_1(x)$  can be well approximated by a single function, multiplication by  $d(x)$  with  $d(x)$  varying over the ITR class  $\mathcal{D}$  can induce a highly complex set of functions. Therefore, we consider the maximum imbalance between  $\mathbb{P}_{n, \mathcal{S}_1}^{(w)}$  and  $\mathbb{P}_{n, \mathcal{T}}$  over a class of flexible functions. Specifically, we choose this function class to be the unit ball of an RKHS  $\mathcal{H}$  associated with a positive definite kernel function  $K(x, x')$ . We will restrict our attention to universal and bounded kernel functions. This includes many commonly used kernel functions, such as the Gaussian kernel and the Matérn kernel. This maximum or worst-case imbalance is also commonly referred to as the *maximum mean discrepancy* (MMD) (Gretton et al., 2012):

$$\text{MMD}_{\mathcal{H}}(\mathbb{P}_{n, \mathcal{S}_1}^{(w)}, \mathbb{P}_{n, \mathcal{T}}) = \sup_{h \in \mathcal{H}, \|h\|_{\mathcal{H}} \leq 1} \int_{\mathcal{X}} h(x) d[\mathbb{P}_{n, \mathcal{S}_1}^{(w)} - \mathbb{P}_{n, \mathcal{T}}](x). \quad (7)$$

Although  $d(x)\mu_1(x)$  is typically not itself a member of the RKHS  $\mathcal{H}$  due to the discrete nature of  $d(x)$ , (7) still provides a *probabilistic* bound for the imbalance between  $\mathbb{P}_{n, \mathcal{S}_1}^{(w)}$  and  $\mathbb{P}_{n, \mathcal{T}}$  on  $d(x)\mu_1(x)$ . Specifically, if  $\mu_1 \in \mathcal{H}$  and the kernel function takes the form of  $K(x, x') = \theta^{-p} K_0(\|x - x'\|/\theta)$  then under suitable regularity conditions provided in the supplementary

materials, we can show that the following

$$\int_{\mathcal{X}} d(x)\mu_1(x)d[\mathbb{P}_{n,S_1}^{(w)} - \mathbb{P}_{n,\mathcal{T}}](x) \leq \|\mu_1\|_{\mathcal{H}}\text{MMD}_{\mathcal{H}}(\mathbb{P}_{n,S_1}^{(w)}, \mathbb{P}_{n,\mathcal{T}}) + C_1 \left( \frac{1}{n\theta^p} + \theta^{\gamma/2} \right) \quad (8)$$

holds with probability at least  $1 - \exp\{-C_2n\theta^{p+\gamma}\}$ , where  $\gamma, C_1, C_2$  are constants not related to  $d(x)$ . The derivation of this result is based on Gretton et al. (2012) and is deferred to the supplementary materials. This observation motivates us to find a set of appropriate weights by minimizing  $\text{MMD}_{\mathcal{H}}(\mathbb{P}_{n,S_1}^{(w)}, \mathbb{P}_{n,\mathcal{T}})$ . Gretton et al. (2012) showed that when  $\mathcal{X}$  is a compact space,  $\text{MMD}_{\mathcal{H}}$  is indeed a metric of the probability distributions on  $\mathcal{X}$ . Therefore, by minimizing  $\text{MMD}_{\mathcal{H}}(\mathbb{P}_{n,S_1}^{(w)}, \mathbb{P}_{n,\mathcal{T}})$  with respect to the weights, we are in essence searching for a set of weights that make the treated group in the source sample close to the target sample and further due to (8), this minimization can help mitigate one of the key sources of systematic bias, i.e. the first term in the decomposition (6). By a similar argument we propose to control the other key source of systematic bias, the second term of (6), by optimizing  $\text{MMD}_{\mathcal{H}}(\mathbb{P}_{n,S_0}^{(w)}, \mathbb{P}_{n,\mathcal{T}})$ .

Reducing the impact from the third term of (6) requires some element of control over the magnitude of  $w_i$ . In the literature of covariate balancing weights (Hainmueller, 2012; Chan et al., 2016; Wang and Zubizarreta, 2020), this is usually achieved by minimizing a dispersion measure of  $w_i$ . We choose to penalize a large  $\frac{1}{n_s^2} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{S}} w_i^2$  for several reasons. First, the conditional mean square of the third term of (6) given  $\{X_i, S_i, A_i\}$ ,  $\frac{1}{n_s^2} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{S}} w_i^2 \mathbb{1}(d(X_i) = A_i) \text{Var}(\varepsilon_i | X_i, S_i, A_i)$ , is bounded by  $\frac{\sigma^2}{n_s^2} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{S}} w_i^2$ . So  $\frac{1}{n_s^2} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{S}} w_i^2$  directly relates to the magnitude of this term. Second, for weighted data the effective sample size is usually approximated as  $(\sum_i w_i)^2 / \sum_i w_i^2$  (Kish, 1965), which is equal to  $4n_s^2 / \sum_{i \in \mathcal{S}} w_i^2$  in our case due to the normalizing constraints. Thus,  $\frac{1}{n_s^2} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{S}} w_i^2$  has a clear interpretation as the inverse sample size and has been advocated for diagnosing the stability of weighting approaches (Chattopadhyay et al., 2020).

Putting all the pieces discussed above together, we propose to estimate weights via the

constrained optimization

$$\begin{aligned}
& \min_w \quad \text{MMD}_{\mathcal{H}}(\mathbb{P}_{n, \mathcal{S}_1}^{(w)}, \mathbb{P}_{n, \mathcal{T}})^2 + \text{MMD}_{\mathcal{H}}(\mathbb{P}_{n, \mathcal{S}_0}^{(w)}, \mathbb{P}_{n, \mathcal{T}})^2 + \frac{\lambda}{n_s^2} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{S}} w_i^2, \\
& \text{subject to} \quad \sum_{i \in \mathcal{S}_1} w_i = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{S}_0} w_i = n_s,
\end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

where  $\lambda > 0$  is a hyperparameter controlling the level of penalty. Here we take square of the  $\text{MMD}_{\mathcal{H}}$  terms for computational convenience, which will be explained in Section 4.1.

### 3.2 Special case with correctly specified rule class: balancing between the treated and control in the source population

In the previous section, we discussed a strategy to find an appropriate weighting function by making  $\widehat{\mathcal{V}}_n(d; w)$  a good estimator for the value function  $\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{T}}(d)$  without any consideration for whether the prespecified ITR class  $\mathcal{D}$  provided a reasonable approximation to the true optimal ITR. The resulting optimization problem minimizes the distance between  $\mathbb{P}_{n, \mathcal{S}_a}^{(w)}$  and  $\mathbb{P}_{n, \mathcal{T}}$  subject to a smoothing penalty. However, since the objective is to find a good ITR rather than to estimate  $\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{T}}(d)$ , such an intermediate objective might not always be necessary. In this section, we consider the situation where the unrestricted true optimal ITR  $d^*(x) = \mathbb{1}(\mu_1(x) \geq \mu_0(x))$  is contained in  $\mathcal{D}$ . In this case, the optimal ITR does not depend on the distribution of the covariates, obviating the need for covariate shift adjustments that make  $\mathbb{P}_{n, \mathcal{S}_a}^{(w)}$  similar to  $\mathbb{P}_{n, \mathcal{T}}$ . As a consequence, we will see that the balancing requirements can be relaxed, thus allowing for use of a balancing criterion that yields less variable weights compared with the general case in Section 3.1.

To illustrate the key source of error in estimating the optimal ITR when  $\mathcal{D}$  is well-specified, we investigate conditions under which the maximizer of  $\widehat{\mathcal{V}}_n(d; w)$  will be close to  $d^*$ . A sufficient condition of such is to ensure that  $\widehat{\mathcal{V}}_n(d, w)$  is only be greater than  $\widehat{\mathcal{V}}_n(d^*, w)$  when  $d$  is close to  $d^*$ . In other words,  $\widehat{\mathcal{V}}_n(d^*; w) - \widehat{\mathcal{V}}_n(d; w)$  must be positive whenever  $d$  differs substantially from

$d^*$ . Let  $m(x) = \{\mu_0(x) + \mu_1(x)\}/2$  denote the main effect function and  $\tau(x) = \mu_1(x) - \mu_0(x)$  denote the conditional average treatment effect (CATE) function. Let us consider the following decomposition

$$\begin{aligned}
\widehat{\mathcal{V}}_n(d^*; w) - \widehat{\mathcal{V}}_n(d; w) &= \frac{1}{n_s} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{S}_1} w_i \{d^*(X_i) - d(X_i)\} \left\{ m(X_i) + \frac{\tau(X_i)}{2} + \varepsilon_i \right\} \\
&\quad - \frac{1}{n_s} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{S}_0} w_i \{d^*(X_i) - d(X_i)\} \left\{ m(X_i) - \frac{\tau(X_i)}{2} + \varepsilon_i \right\} \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathcal{X}} \{d^*(x) - d(x)\} \tau(x) d[\mathbb{P}_{n, \mathcal{S}_1}^{(w)} + \mathbb{P}_{n, \mathcal{S}_0}^{(w)}](x) \\
&\quad + \int_{\mathcal{X}} \{d^*(x) - d(x)\} m(x) d[\mathbb{P}_{n, \mathcal{S}_1}^{(w)} - \mathbb{P}_{n, \mathcal{S}_0}^{(w)}](x) \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{n_s} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{S}} (2A_i - 1) \{d^*(X_i) - d(X_i)\} w_i \varepsilon_i.
\end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

Since  $d(x)$  and  $d^*(x)$  only take value in  $\{0, 1\}$ ,  $d^*(x) - d(x) \in \{0, \pm 1\}$ . When  $\mathcal{D}$  contains the unrestricted optimal ITR,  $d^*(x)$  can be expressed as  $\mathbb{1}(\tau(x) \geq 0)$ , so  $\tau(x)$  is non-negative when  $d^*(x) - d(x) = 1$  and negative when  $d^*(x) - d(x) = -1$ . Consequently, the first term on the right-hand side of (10) is always non-negative, and it will take a large positive value if  $d(x)$  is substantially different from  $d^*(x)$ , especially when they disagree on the region in the covariate space where  $\tau(x)$  is of large magnitude. On the contrary, the signs of the second and the last terms in (10) are uncertain. If the magnitude of these two terms can be controlled, then  $\widehat{\mathcal{V}}_n(d^*; w) - \widehat{\mathcal{V}}_n(d; w)$  can only be positive when  $d$  is sufficiently close to  $d^*$ .

The second term arises from the imbalance between  $\mathbb{P}_{n, \mathcal{S}_1}^{(w)}$  and  $\mathbb{P}_{n, \mathcal{S}_0}^{(w)}$  on  $\{d^*(x) - d(x)\}m(x)$ . Using similar arguments as in the previous section, we propose to control this quantity by optimizing  $\text{MMD}_{\mathcal{H}}(\mathbb{P}_{n, \mathcal{S}_1}^{(w)}, \mathbb{P}_{n, \mathcal{S}_0}^{(w)})$ . The last term in the decomposition always has mean zero and involves the variability of the weights; so to mitigate this noise term, we again use a penalty

term  $\frac{\lambda}{n_s^2} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{S}} w_i^2$ . Hence, we obtain the following optimization problem

$$\begin{aligned} \min_w \quad & \text{MMD}_{\mathcal{H}}(\mathbb{P}_{n, \mathcal{S}_1}^{(w)}, \mathbb{P}_{n, \mathcal{S}_0}^{(w)})^2 + \frac{\lambda}{n_s^2} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{S}} w_i^2, \\ \text{subject to} \quad & \sum_{i \in \mathcal{S}_1} w_i = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{S}_0} w_i = n_s. \end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

The balancing objective in (11) is to make  $\mathbb{P}_{n, \mathcal{S}_1}^{(w)}$  and  $\mathbb{P}_{n, \mathcal{S}_0}^{(w)}$  close, but does not explicitly enforce them towards any specific distribution. In Section 3.4 we formally establish that the resulting reweighted distribution is one that focuses on the region in the covariate space where the two treatment groups have good overlap, similar to the notion of overlap weights (Li et al., 2018).

Since  $\text{MMD}_{\mathcal{H}}$  is a metric of probability distributions, it follows from the triangle inequality that  $\text{MMD}_{\mathcal{H}}(\mathbb{P}_{n, \mathcal{S}_1}^{(w)}, \mathbb{P}_{n, \mathcal{S}_0}^{(w)}) \leq \text{MMD}_{\mathcal{H}}(\mathbb{P}_{n, \mathcal{S}_1}^{(w)}, \mathbb{P}_{n, \mathcal{T}}) + \text{MMD}_{\mathcal{H}}(\mathbb{P}_{n, \mathcal{S}_0}^{(w)}, \mathbb{P}_{n, \mathcal{T}})$ . This implies

$$\text{MMD}_{\mathcal{H}}(\mathbb{P}_{n, \mathcal{S}_1}^{(w)}, \mathbb{P}_{n, \mathcal{S}_0}^{(w)})^2 \leq 2\text{MMD}_{\mathcal{H}}(\mathbb{P}_{n, \mathcal{S}_1}^{(w)}, \mathbb{P}_{n, \mathcal{T}})^2 + 2\text{MMD}_{\mathcal{H}}(\mathbb{P}_{n, \mathcal{S}_0}^{(w)}, \mathbb{P}_{n, \mathcal{T}})^2.$$

Thus, the balancing objective in (9) is inherently more stringent than that in (11). As a result, (11) will generally produce weights with less variability thus translating to a larger effective sample size. Balancing the weighted distribution of all confounders between the treated and control groups is indeed the minimal requirement in ITR estimation and cannot be further relaxed unless data were generated from a randomized controlled trial or no confounding is present. Without such a balance, the ITR obtained from optimizing  $\mathcal{V}_{n, \mathcal{T}}(d)$  might recommend a subject to take a treatment not because it corresponds to a better potential outcome but because more people with similar characteristics received the treatment in the observed data.

### 3.3 Back to the general case: a three-way balancing approach

The objective (9) works for general situations but imposes stronger balancing requirements, which may result in more extreme weights, causing the ITR learning process to focus too heavily on a few observations with large weights. On the other hand, the objective (11) only

requires minimal balancing requirements, but the resulting weights are only likely to yield an optimal ITR when  $\mathcal{D}$  contains the unrestricted true optimal ITR. Yet, in practice, it is unclear how well  $\mathcal{D}$  is specified and one may be unwilling to wager that  $\mathcal{D}$  contains the unrestricted true optimal ITR and thus only balance the treated and control groups to each other. To achieve some of the benefits of each approach, we propose to combine these two balancing strategies by optimizing the following convex combination of them

$$\begin{aligned} \min_w \quad & \alpha \text{MMD}_{\mathcal{H}}(\mathbb{P}_{n, \mathcal{S}_1}^{(w)}, \mathbb{P}_{n, \mathcal{T}})^2 + \alpha \text{MMD}_{\mathcal{H}}(\mathbb{P}_{n, \mathcal{S}_0}^{(w)}, \mathbb{P}_{n, \mathcal{T}})^2 \\ & + (1 - \alpha) \text{MMD}_{\mathcal{H}}(\mathbb{P}_{n, \mathcal{S}_1}^{(w)}, \mathbb{P}_{n, \mathcal{S}_0}^{(w)})^2 + \frac{\lambda}{n_s^2} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{S}} w_i^2, \\ \text{subject to} \quad & \sum_{i \in \mathcal{S}_1} w_i = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{S}_0} w_i = n_s. \end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

Here  $\alpha \in [0, 1]$  is a hyperparameter controlling the extent to which the weighted treated/control group should resemble the target sample. We present a strategy for choosing both  $\alpha$  and  $\lambda$  in Section 4.2.

### 3.4 Asymptotic properties

The following theorem characterizes the convergence limit of the proposed weights. Here we impose two conditions on the RKHS: universality and that the unit ball is  $\mathbb{P}$ -Donsker. These conditions hold for most commonly used kernels, such as the Gaussian kernel and Matérn kernel (Sriperumbudur et al., 2016).

**Theorem 1.** *Suppose  $\{\hat{w}_i, i \in \mathcal{S}\}$  are the weights that solve (12). Assume the RKHS is universal, and the unit ball in it  $\mathcal{H}$  is  $\mathbb{P}$ -Donsker. Assume  $\pi(x), \rho(x)$  are continuous functions on  $\mathcal{X}$ . If  $0 < \alpha \leq 1$ , then*

$$\frac{1}{n_s} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{S}} (\hat{w}_i - w^*(A_i, X_i))^2 \xrightarrow{p} 0,$$

where  $w^*(a, x)$  is defined in (3). If  $\alpha = 0$ ,

$$\frac{1}{n_s} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{S}} (\hat{w}_i - w^\dagger(A_i, X_i))^2 \xrightarrow{p} 0.$$

Here

$$w^\dagger(a, x) = \frac{\pi(X)(1 - \pi(X))}{C_\pi} \left\{ \frac{a}{\pi(x)} + \frac{1 - a}{1 - \pi(x)} \right\},$$

where  $C_\pi = \mathbb{E}[\pi(X)(1 - \pi(X)) \mid S = 1]$  is a normalizing constant.

The proofs of this theorem and the other theoretical results below are deferred to the supplementary materials. The convergence results of the weights straightforwardly imply the convergence limit of  $\widehat{\mathcal{V}}_n(d; \hat{w})$ , the objective function for learning the optimal ITR:

**Corollary 1.1.** *Suppose the conditions in Theorem 1 hold and the potential outcomes are square integrable. Then, for any treatment rule  $d$ , when  $\alpha > 0$ ,  $\widehat{\mathcal{V}}_n(d; \hat{w}) \xrightarrow{p} \mathcal{V}_T(d)$ ; when  $\alpha = 0$ ,  $\widehat{\mathcal{V}}_n(d; \hat{w}) \xrightarrow{p} C_\pi^{-1} \mathbb{E}[Y(d)\pi(X)(1 - \pi(X)) \mid S = 1]$ .*

The limiting weights under both cases have the form of  $\{\pi(x)^{-1}a + (1 - \pi(x))^{-1}(1 - a)\}h(x)$ . They balance the weighted distributions of the covariates between the treated and control groups, and retarget the distribution to a population whose density ratio to the source population is  $h(x)$ . When  $\alpha > 0$ ,  $h(x) \propto (1 - \rho(x))/\rho(x)$  is exactly the density ratio between the target population and the source population, so the corresponding weights are the classical importance weights. For  $\alpha = 0$ ,  $h(x) \propto \pi(x)(1 - \pi(x))$ . With this choice we put more focus on the covariate region where the treated and control groups have good overlap, i.e. the region where  $\pi(x)$  is close to 0.5. Li et al. (2018) also derived weights of this form from the perspective of minimizing the asymptotic efficient estimation variance of the weighted average treatment effect, and they referred to  $w^\dagger$  as the ‘‘overlap weights’’. Kallus (2020) advocated using the overlap weights for estimating the optimal ITR with observational data, especially when there is limited overlap between the treated and control groups, because the overlap weights avoid

putting too much attention to a few observations and thus reduce estimation variability. In our setting of learning optimal ITR for a target population, the overlap weights are well-justified when  $\mathcal{D}$  is well specified and our nonparametric balancing weights converge to the overlap weights purely by means of optimizing within-population imbalance.

Although the weights converge to the same limit for all  $\alpha > 0$ , under finite samples, varying  $\alpha$  from 1 to 0 provides a smooth transition from the importance weights to the overlap weights. The importance weights aim for minimizing the distributional difference between the source sample and the target population, while the overlap weights put more emphasis on improving stability and reducing any imbalance between treated and control units. Therefore, the proposed method enables us to search for a better trade-off in the middle ground, calibrating the estimation towards the target population while retaining small variance and mitigating imbalance due to selection bias into the treatment.

Another advantage of our method compared to the importance weights or overlap weights is that by targeting distributional imbalance directly, it avoids explicit modeling of either the propensity score  $\pi(x)$  and participation probability  $\rho(x)$ . As discussed before, modeling may result in the failure of weighting methods due to model misspecification or estimation error. While the proposed weights are free of model specification issues and have more stable values, Theorem 1 guarantees that they converge to interpretable limits. Further, since the proposed method is entirely formulated upon covariate balancing, it enjoys better finite sample balance properties, and this generally leads to more precise treatment comparison in practice (Chattopadhyay et al., 2020). As far as we know, our work is the first to show that overlap weights can be estimated by constructing weights that purely target imbalance of covariate distributions.

## 4 Computation

### 4.1 Finite sample representation

Since  $\mathcal{H}$  is an infinite-dimensional function space, direct evaluation and optimization of (12) may appear intractable. The following lemma is based on Lemma 6 of Gretton et al. (2012) and provides a finite sample representation for the  $\text{MMD}_{\mathcal{H}}$  between two (weighted) empirical distributions.

**Lemma 1.** *Let  $P = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_P} p_i \delta_{x_i}$  and  $Q = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{I}_Q} q_j \delta_{x_j}$  be two discrete probability distributions on  $\mathcal{X}$ . Here  $\mathcal{I}_P$  and  $\mathcal{I}_Q$  are two finite index sets, and  $\{p_i, i \in \mathcal{I}_P\}$  and  $\{q_j, j \in \mathcal{I}_Q\}$  are point mass that satisfy  $\sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_P} p_i = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_Q} q_i = 1$ . Then*

$$\text{MMD}_{\mathcal{H}}(P, Q)^2 = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_P} \sum_{i' \in \mathcal{I}_P} p_i p_{i'} K(x_i, x_{i'}) + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{I}_Q} \sum_{j' \in \mathcal{I}_Q} q_j q_{j'} K(x_j, x_{j'}) - 2 \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_P} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{I}_Q} p_i q_j K(x_i, x_j).$$

We can apply Lemma 1 to evaluate the  $\text{MMD}_{\mathcal{H}}$  terms in (12). Specifically, denote  $K_{\mathcal{S}_a, \mathcal{S}_{a'}} = (K(x_i, x_j))_{i \in \mathcal{S}_a, j \in \mathcal{S}_{a'}}$  for  $a, a' \in \{0, 1\}$ , and  $K_{\mathcal{S}_a, \mathcal{T}} = (K(x_i, x_j))_{i \in \mathcal{S}_a, j \in \mathcal{T}}$ . Let  $w$  be a vector of length  $n_s$  by stacking  $(w_i)_{i \in \mathcal{S}_1}$  and  $(w_i)_{i \in \mathcal{S}_0}$ . By Lemma 1, we can write each of the  $\text{MMD}_{\mathcal{H}}$  terms in (12) as a quadratic function of  $w$ . Then the optimization objective of (12) can be rearranged as

$$w^{\top} \Sigma w - 2b^{\top} w + c$$

with

$$\Sigma = \frac{1}{n_s^2} \begin{bmatrix} K_{\mathcal{S}_1, \mathcal{S}_1} + \lambda I & (\alpha - 1) K_{\mathcal{S}_1, \mathcal{S}_0} \\ (\alpha - 1) K_{\mathcal{S}_0, \mathcal{S}_1} & K_{\mathcal{S}_0, \mathcal{S}_0} + \lambda I \end{bmatrix}, \quad b = \frac{\alpha}{n_s n_t} \begin{bmatrix} K_{\mathcal{S}_1, \mathcal{T}} \mathbf{1} \\ K_{\mathcal{S}_0, \mathcal{T}} \mathbf{1} \end{bmatrix}, \quad c = \frac{2\alpha}{n_t^2} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{T}} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{T}} K(x_i, x_j).$$

Here  $\mathbf{1}$  is a vector of 1's. The matrix  $\Sigma$  is positive definite, and the constraints in (12) are linear. So the optimization problem is convex and its global optima exists. We can solve this problem using standard quadratic programming tools.

## 4.2 Hyperparameter selection

There are two hyperparameters controlling the result of (12). The hyperparameter  $\alpha$  controls the extent to which the weighted source sample should resemble the target sample, and  $\lambda$  regularizes the smoothness of the weights. In this section we propose a heuristic procedure to select the hyperparameters by grid search. Before discussing the details and motivation of the procedure, we first outline the procedure:

---

**Algorithm 1:** Tuning parameter selection procedure

---

**Input:** A grid of values for  $\alpha$ :  $\{\alpha_j\}_{j=1}^J$  where  $0 = \alpha_1 < \alpha_2 < \dots < \alpha_J = 1$  and a grid

for  $\lambda$ :  $\{\lambda_l\}_{l=1}^L$  where  $0 < \lambda_1 < \lambda_2 < \dots < \lambda_L$

**for each**  $\alpha_j \in \{\alpha_j\}_{j=1}^J$

**for each**  $\lambda_l \in \{\lambda_l\}_{l=1}^L$

Optimize (12) to obtain weights  $\hat{w}$  ;

Record the resulting treatment-control imbalance using the MMD criterion

**end**

Given  $\alpha_j$ , choose the  $\lambda_l$  (denoted by  $\lambda_{\alpha_j}$ ) that results in the minimum

treatment-control imbalance and evaluate the resulting ITR's value function on the target sample;

**end**

Output the pair  $(\alpha_j, \lambda_{\alpha_j})$  that results in an ITR with the largest value

---

For each  $\alpha$  in a grid over  $[0, 1]$ , we first select  $\lambda$  based on treatment-control balance. As discussed in Section 3.2, if the distribution of confounders in the treated and control groups is not well balanced, then the ITR may be biased towards the treatment assignment in the observed data. For each  $\lambda$ , we calculate the weights under  $(\alpha, \lambda)$ , and evaluate the  $\text{MMD}_{\mathcal{H}}$  between the weighted treated group and the weighted control group. To obtain an “honest” evaluation, we compute this quantity on subsamples of the source sample instead of the entire source sample, and use the average result computed from many subsamples as the selection criterion. With a right penalization level, the weights are robust to sampling variation and

lead to small imbalance on the subsamples. In this way, the degree of weight penalization  $\lambda$  and treatment-control balance are not necessarily competing directly. In our implementation, the size of subsample is set as 80% of the source sample, and the computation is done on 50 subsamples. Then the  $\lambda$  that yields the smallest treatment-control  $\text{MMD}_{\mathcal{H}}$  will be selected for the given  $\alpha$ . We denote this selected value as  $\lambda_\alpha$ .

The selection of  $\alpha$  is primarily based on an assessment of the performance of the corresponding ITR as measured by the value function. Let  $\hat{w}_\alpha$  be the optimal weights under  $(\alpha, \lambda_\alpha)$ . We first solve for  $\hat{d}_\alpha$  by maximizing  $\hat{\mathcal{V}}_n(d; \hat{w}_\alpha)$ , and then evaluate the value function of  $\hat{d}_\alpha$ . When  $\alpha$  is small, the weighted treated and control groups do not resemble the target population, so  $\hat{\mathcal{V}}_n(d; \hat{w}_\alpha)$  is not necessarily a good estimator for  $\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{T}}(d)$ . Hence, we use a regression-based approach to evaluate the value function: the source sample is used to fit the potential outcome models and impute the potential outcomes for the target, then a plug-in estimate of  $\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{T}}(\hat{d}_\alpha)$  based on these imputations is computed. Then we select the  $\alpha$  that yields the largest  $\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{T}}(\hat{d}_\alpha)$ .

This hyperparameter tuning procedure involves solving the quadratic programming (12) under various choices of  $(\alpha, \lambda)$ . To speed up computation, when solving (12) under a new pair of hyperparameters, we use the solution under the previous hyperparameters as a warm start. This is possible when using the OSQP package (Stellato et al., 2020). The empirical results in the following sections suggest that this tuning procedure works quite well in practice and is able to select suitable hyperparameters.

## 5 Simulation studies

### 5.1 Setup

In this section, we conduct simulation studies to evaluate the performance of the proposed method in finite sample settings. In our simulation setup, we generate covariates  $X_i$  inde-

pendently from a uniform distribution on  $[-2, 2]^4$ . Given the covariates  $X_i$ , the population indicator  $S_i$  is then generated from a Bernoulli distribution with success probability  $\rho(X_i)$ , where  $\rho(x) = G(x_2 - 1.2x_1)$ ,  $G(z) = 0.8\Phi(z) + 0.1$  and  $\Phi(z)$  is the standard normal cumulative probability function. Data with  $S_i = 1$  and  $S_i = 0$  constitute the source sample and target sample respectively. For the source sample, we further simulate the treatment assignment and outcome as follows. To test the performance of the proposed method under a wide range of settings, we consider three propensity score models for treatment assignment:

- (1)  $\pi(x) = G(0.5x_1 + 0.3x_2 - 0.3)$ ; (linear assignment)
- (2)  $\pi(x) = G(1.6x_1 + 1.3x_2 - 0.8)$ ; (linear assignment, bad overlap)
- (3)  $\pi(x) = G(0.4x_1^2 + 0.4x_2^2 + 0.5x_1x_2 - 0.4x_1 + 0.4x_2 - 0.9)$ . (nonlinear assignment)

In the first setting the propensity score, after a monotone transformation, linearly depends on the covariates, and thus the logistic regression can provide a decent fit even though the link function is not perfectly specified. The second setting is similar, but the large coefficients induce a substantial difference between the covariate distributions of the treated and control groups. The third setting includes quadratic terms and an interaction term, and thus any model that only considers main effects may be insufficient for controlling for confounding.

The observed outcome is generated as  $Y_i = m(X_i) + (A_i - 0.5)\tau(X_i) + \varepsilon_i$ , where  $m(x) = \Phi(-0.6x_1 - 0.6x_2 + 0.2x_3 + 0.5) + 0.5$  and  $\varepsilon_i \stackrel{i.i.d.}{\sim} N(0, 0.5^2)$ . The CATE function is set as  $\tau(x) = \kappa\tau_{\text{NL}}(x) + (1 - \kappa)\tau_{\text{L}}(x)$ , where

$$\begin{aligned}\tau_{\text{NL}}(x) &= \Phi(1.5x_2 + 0.8x_1 - 0.4(x_1 - x_2)^2 - 0.3) - 0.07(x_1 - x_2)^2, \\ \tau_{\text{L}}(x) &= \Phi(0.4x_2 + 0.6x_1) - 0.5.\end{aligned}$$

Here,  $\tau(x)$  is linear combination of two parts: a nonlinear part  $\tau_{\text{NL}}(x)$  and a linear part  $\tau_{\text{L}}(x)$ . The parameter  $\kappa$  controls the degree of nonlinearity of  $\tau(x)$ . We consider two choices of  $\kappa$ : 0 and 0.4, the former indicating a linear setting and the latter a nonlinear setting. Figure 1

visualizes  $\tau(x)$  under these two choices. We choose  $\mathcal{D}$  to be the linear rule class, i.e. ITRs of the form  $d(x) = \mathbb{1}(x^\top \beta \geq 0)$ . So when  $\kappa = 0$ ,  $\mathcal{D}$  contains the unrestricted true optimal ITR, and thus the optimal ITRs for the source population and the target population are the same; otherwise, the optimal linear ITR for the target population is different from that for the source population, which necessitates adjustment for covariate shift from source to target.




Figure 1: Contour plot of the CATE function  $\tau(x)$  and the lines are the optimal linear decision boundaries, with the solid line indicating the boundary for the optimal linear ITR for the target population and the dashed line indicating the boundary for the optimal linear ITR on the source population.

We implement the proposed method using the Gaussian kernel with bandwidth chosen via the median heuristic (Gretton et al., 2012). To find the linear rule that maximizes  $\widehat{\mathcal{V}}_n(d, w)$ , we re-cast the optimization problem as a weighted classification problem. Note that  $\widehat{\mathcal{V}}_n(d, w)$  can be expressed as

$$\frac{1}{n_s} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{S}} \max\{w_i Y_i, 0\} - \frac{1}{n_s} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{S}} |w_i Y_i| \mathbb{1}\{d(X_i) \neq A_i \text{sign}(w_i Y_i)\},$$

so maximizing  $\widehat{\mathcal{V}}_n(d, w)$  is equivalent to minimizing  $\frac{1}{n_s} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{S}} |w_i Y_i| \mathbb{1}\{d(X_i) \neq A_i \text{sign}(w_i Y_i)\}$ , which is a weighted binary classification problem that uses  $A_i \text{sign}(w_i Y_i)$  as the labels and  $|w_i Y_i|$  as the weights. We substitute the 0-1 loss with the logistic loss and solve the optimization

approximately with weighted logistic regression (Xu et al., 2015). The predictive modeling tasks used for value function estimation in the tuning procedure are implemented with `xgboost` (Chen and Guestrin, 2016).

For comparison, we consider other weighting methods, including the overlap weights, the importance weights and the IPW (labeled as `Overlap`, `Importance` and `IPW`, respectively). To compute these weights, we use logistic regression to fit the propensity score and participation probability. So the propensity score model is nearly correctly specified in the first two treatment assignment scenarios but is misspecified in the last treatment assignment scenario. The oracle counterparts that use the underlying true probabilities to construct weights are also included. We further include entropy balancing (Hainmueller, 2012) analogues of the importance weights and IPW in the comparison, labeled as `ebal_t` and `ebal_s` respectively: `ebal_t` finds the weights of minimum entropy such that covariate moments of the reweighted treated/control group are equal to those of the target sample, and `ebal_s` is defined similarly but with covariate moments given by the whole source sample. We note that among the comparator methods only the importance weights and `ebal_t` use the covariate information from the target sample. After obtaining the weights from these methods, we apply the same weighted classification procedure described above to maximize  $\widehat{\mathcal{V}}_n(d, w)$  and get the corresponding optimal ITRs, which are then compared to the one estimated with our weights. In the simulation, the total sample size is set to be  $n = 1600$ .

## 5.2 Results

The performance of all methods is measured in terms of two criteria: the regret of the learned ITR compared to the optimal linear ITR, and the classification accuracy using the treatment prescription from the optimal linear ITR as the true “label”. An independent test sample of size  $10^5$  is generated from the target population to evaluate these quantities. We also use this

test sample to search for the optimal linear ITR. Since in our settings only  $X_1$  and  $X_2$  are effect modifiers, the optimal linear ITR has the form of  $d(x) = \mathbb{1}(\cos(\theta)x_1 + \sin(\theta)x_2 + b \geq 0)$ , then we find the optimal  $\theta$  and  $b$  using the grid search procedure described in Kallus (2020). The boxplots in Figure 2 summarize the results under different scenarios based on 500 independent simulation runs.




Figure 2: Simulation results. Top: regret compared to the optimal linear ITR. Bottom: classification accuracy with true label given by the optimal linear ITR. Methods labeled with (true) compute the weights using the true values of  $\pi(x)$  and  $\rho(x)$  instead of the estimated ones.

In the first column of Figure 2, the underlying assignment mechanisms and the participation probabilities are linear in the covariates after a monotonic transformation, and the treated and control groups have sufficient overlap, so these settings constitute the easiest design across our simulation settings. As we can see, even for this simple setting, whether calibrating to the target sample can yield improvement in learning the ITR for the target population does depend on the underlying outcome model. When the rule class contains the unrestricted true optimal ITR, weighting the data to the target population helps only little (if any) in achieving a larger value function. However, it will make the estimated rule more vulnerable to random noise. In this case, the overlap weights attain the best performance and our proposed method achieves a very similar result to the overlap weights, as the tuning parameter selection procedure allows it to yield weights that mimic the overlap weights. On the other hand, when the difference in covariate distributions from source to target leads to a different optimal ITR, it is necessary to tailor the weights to the target population. As a result, the overlap weights yield a suboptimal ITR, while our method adaptively chooses the calibration level  $\alpha$  to incorporate covariate shift adjustments and achieves the best performance among methods both in terms of regret and accuracy. We also notice that the importance weights based on modeling  $\pi(x)$  and  $\rho(x)$  can occasionally achieve great performance, but the result is highly unstable with some replications yielding poor performance likely as a result of large weights.

The second and third columns of Figure 2 compare the performance under more challenging scenarios. When there is a substantial difference between the covariate distributions of the treated and control groups, the performance of the overlap weights is similar to the previous cases in that it yields excellent performance but only for correctly specified rule classes; however, this benefit is attenuated in the nonlinear confounding setting when the model for the propensity score is more severely misspecified. The other modeling-based weights appear to be vulnerable to insufficient treatment-control overlap, the misspecification of the propensity score model, or the wrong choice of moments to balance. The proposed method achieves the best results

among all the competing methods, especially when covariate shift needs to be adjusted for. Lastly, when the assignment mechanism is nonlinear, our method is able to retain satisfactory performance due to its nonparametric nature and ability to balance full covariate distributions not just prespecified covariate moments. The relative benefit of the proposed method is the greatest under the nonlinear assignment mechanism settings.

## **6 Application: transthoracic echocardiography and mortality in sepsis**

In this section, we illustrate the proposed method by studying individualized treatment recommendation of the use of transthoracic echocardiography (TTEC) for intensive care unit (ICU) patients with sepsis. Feng et al. (2018) studied the average treatment effect of TTEC on improving 28-day mortality and suggested the use of TTEC is associated with a significant improvement. However, It has been argued that TTEC use in surgical ICU is not cost-effective due to a high failure rate (Cook et al., 2002). Hence, studying potential heterogeneous treatment effects of TTEC and identifying a subgroup of patients who can benefit from it is clinically relevant.

We use the same dataset in Feng et al. (2018), which is derived from the MIMIC-III database (Johnson et al., 2016). This is an observational dataset consisting of 6361 ICU patients. Among the patients, 51.3% had TTEC performed during or in the period less than 24 hours before their ICU admission. We use 28-day survival as the outcome. We use 17 baseline variables in the analysis: age (range 18 - 91), gender, weight; severity at admission, which is measured by the simplified acute physiology score (SAPS), the sequential organ failure assessment (SOFA) score, and the Elixhauser comorbidity score; comorbidity indicators, including congestive heart failure, atrial fibrillation, respiratory failure, malignant tumor; vital signs, including mean ar-

terial pressure, heart rate and temperature; laboratory results, including platelet count, partial pressure of oxygen, lactate, and blood urea nitrogen. The distributions of lab results are right skewed, so we apply log transformations on these variables. All the continuous variables are then standardized for further analysis. We impute any missing values using MissForest (Stekhoven and Bühlmann, 2012), which is a flexible non-parametric missing value imputation approach.

In order to evaluate ITR learning results and study the influence of covariate shift and confounding, we use the following procedure to construct the training data and test data which induces different levels of covariate shift and confounding. First, we randomly sample 40% of the data without replacement; this part will be used to construct the source sample and the remaining represents the target population. The sampling probability is proportional to a function of the covariates,  $f(X_i)$ . We consider two choices of  $f$ : (a)  $f(x) = 0.5$ , which means each individual is sampled with equal probability and (b)  $f(x) = G(\text{age} - \text{weight} + 0.6 \times I(\text{gender} = \text{female}) - 0.4)$ , so the source and target populations have different covariate distributions. Here  $G(\cdot)$  is the function defined in Section 5. Then among the first part of the data, we randomly select (without replacement) 50% of the TTEC patients and 50% of the non-TTEC patients to form the source sample; however, the treated units are selected with probability proportional to  $g(X_i)$  while the control units are with probability proportional to  $0.5 - g(X_i)$ . This step induces additional confounding to the source data based on  $g$ . Three choices of  $g$  are considered: (a)  $g(x) = 0.5$ , so there is no extra confounding; (b)  $g(x) = G(\text{SAPS} + 0.8 \times \text{SOFA} - 0.9 \times \text{Elixhauser})$ , which introduces extra confounding determined by a linear combination of the severity scores; (c)  $g(x) = G(0.3 \times \text{SAPS}^2 + 0.2 \times \text{SOFA}^2 + 0.2 \times \text{Elixhauser}^2 + 0.4 \times \text{SAPS} \times \text{SOFA} - 0.3 \times \text{SAPS} + 0.4 \times \text{SOFA} + 0.2 \times \text{Elixhauser} - 0.6)$ , which leads a confounding mechanism that involves an interaction term. Among the second part of the data, 1/3 of the patients are randomly sampled with equal probability, and their covariate information is used as the target sample, and the remaining data is used as the test data. So the target sample and the test data have the same covariate distribution.

By the aforementioned procedure, we preserve the covariate-outcome relationship in the real data, but use various sampling designs to induce different levels of covariate shift and confounding. There are 6 scenarios; under each one, we run 400 replications of the sampling procedure. For each replication, we then apply the proposed method to estimate the optimal ITR for the target population. The competing methods in Section 5 are also applied, except the oracle ones using the true probabilities as they are unknown. In addition, we include a trivial treatment rule that assigns all patients to TTEC (labeled as `treat_all`) to help calibrate the performances of the methods relative to the average effect of TTEC. The evaluation metric is a modified version of the value function:  $\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{T},2}(d) = \mathbb{E}[Y(d(X)) - Y(1 - d(X)) \mid S = 0]$ . For comparison purpose,  $\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{T},2}(d)$  is equivalent to  $\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{T}}(d)$  as  $\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{T},2}(d) = 2\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{T}}(d) - \mathbb{E}[Y(1) + Y(0) \mid S = 0]$ . We use  $\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{T},2}(d)$  because it is equal to the ATE when  $d$  is the trivial treat-all ITR. We estimate  $\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{T},2}(d)$  on the test data using the conventional inverse probability estimator. The result is reported in Figure 3.




Figure 3: Modified version of value function in the real data application. `treat_all` is a trivial ITR that assigns all patients to treatment and the result equals the ATE. The other methods are the same as those in Figure 2.

The modified value function of the trivial treat-all ITR is around 6% (i.e. a 6% improvement

in 28-day survival rate over no TTEC), which is close to the ATE estimate in Feng et al. (2018) (5%). The value achieved by the best performing ITRs is around 8%. This suggests the presence of heterogeneity of treatment effect, thus personalizing decisions of whether to use TTEC can potentially lead to an improved overall survival rate. The performance of all the methods are close when there is no covariate shift and extra confounding.

When the source population and the target population have different covariate distributions (second row of Figure 3), the methods that calibrate to the target sample, `ebal_t` and `Importance`, perform worse than the others. This suggests that a linear rule is likely sufficient and that calibrating the covariates to a specific distribution may be unnecessary; in this case, the overlap weights is a desirable option. The advantage of overlap weights becomes more noticeable when the treated and control groups have less overlap (second column of Figure 3). In this case the proposed method also achieves good performance because it can adaptively approximate the overlap weights by selecting a small  $\alpha$  value. From the third column of Figure 3 we can see that the entropy balancing and probability modeling methods are subject to the choice of balancing functions or model specification. In contrast, the proposed method is free of such specification issues. Further, we can see that even with covariate shift and extra confounding with an interaction, our proposed method does nearly as well as when there is no covariate shift and no extra confounding.

## 7 Discussion

In this work, we have proposed a weighting framework for ITR learning for the two-population setting where the target population has different covariate distribution than the source population. The proposed method seeks covariate functional balancing over a rich RKHS. The resulting weights adjust for confounding and covariate shift simultaneously. It is always essential to achieve treatment-control balance; however, correcting for covariate shift does not

always lead to an improved ITR, especially when the prespecified class of ITRs contains the unrestricted optimal ITR. Moreover, covariate shift adjustments may introduce additional variability into the learning process. Therefore, the proposed method allows for different degrees of covariate shift adjustment while maintaining control over the discrepancy between the treated and control groups. Our theoretical results indicate that the proposed framework encompasses both the importance weights and the overlap weights in the limiting sense. Thus, by carefully selecting the hyperparameters, it can achieve a better bias-variance trade-off for finite sample settings than these two extreme cases. We have devised a regression-based procedure for tuning the hyperparameters selection and demonstrated the proposed method’s efficiency and robustness via various numerical examples. A key benefit of our method is that it directly targets covariate balance and does not require probability modeling. As such, our method can achieve better finite sample covariate balance, which generally leads to improved performance for learning ITR in practice.

In the methodological development we have focused on the objective function (2), which is based on the outcome weighted learning approach (Zhao et al., 2012). The proposed weights, however, can be used in any other weighting-based ITR learning approaches that utilize the IPW, such as residual weighted learning of Zhou et al. (2017) and the weighting method of Chen et al. (2017). By leveraging the observed subject level covariates information from the target population, the proposed weights enhance these ITR learning methods for the generalization setting and can lead to a better ITR for the target population.

Our proposed method is developed for a two-population setting where the target population differs from the source, but it is directly applicable to learning ITR for the source population. To handle optimal ITR estimation for the source population, we can simply substitute  $\mathbb{P}_{n,\mathcal{T}}$  in (12) with  $\mathbb{P}_{n,\mathcal{S}}$ , the empirical covariate distribution of the source sample. Similar to the two-population setting, while treated and control groups should be weighted to have similar distributions, this weighted distribution does not necessarily need to resemble the source

population, especially when the ITR class is correctly specified (Kallus, 2020). In this case, our method provides a full spectrum from the inverse propensity score weights to the overlap weights and is able to adaptively select hyperparameters to provide a suitable mixture of these two extremes.

Although our framework is formulated upon functional covariate balancing, it can also be extended to incorporate other distribution metrics. In (12) we can replace  $\text{MMD}_{\mathcal{H}}$  with other metrics of probability distributions, such as the energy distance (Székely and Rizzo, 2013) and Wasserstein distance (Villani, 2008). The resulting weights can also balance the overall distribution of the covariates. However, the results in Theorem 1 are derived based on the properties of  $\text{MMD}_{\mathcal{H}}$ , so the theoretical properties under other choices of distribution metrics would require further investigation.

## References

- Athey, S. and Wager, S. (2021). Policy learning with observational data. *Econometrica*, 89(1):133–161.
- Bottou, L., Peters, J., Quiñonero-Candela, J., Charles, D. X., Chickering, D. M., Portugaly, E., Ray, D., Simard, P., and Snelson, E. (2013). Counterfactual reasoning and learning systems: The example of computational advertising. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 14(1):3207–3260.
- Chan, K. C. G., Yam, S. C. P., and Zhang, Z. (2016). Globally efficient non-parametric inference of average treatment effects by empirical balancing calibration weighting. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)*, 78(3):673–700.
- Chattopadhyay, A., Hase, C. H., and Zubizarreta, J. R. (2020). Balancing vs modeling approaches to weighting in practice. *Statistics in Medicine*, 39(24):3227–3254.
- Chen, S., Tian, L., Cai, T., and Yu, M. (2017). A general statistical framework for subgroup identification and comparative treatment scoring. *Biometrics*, 73(4):1199–1209.
- Chen, T. and Guestrin, C. (2016). Xgboost: A scalable tree boosting system. In *Proceedings of the 22nd ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery & Data Mining*,

- pages 785–794.
- Colnet, B., Mayer, I., Chen, G., Dieng, A., Li, R., Varoquaux, G., Vert, J.-P., Josse, J., and Yang, S. (2020). Causal inference methods for combining randomized trials and observational studies: a review. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2011.08047*.
- Cook, C. H., Praba, A. C., Beery, P. R., and Martin, L. C. (2002). Transthoracic echocardiography is not cost-effective in critically ill surgical patients. *Journal of Trauma and Acute Care Surgery*, 52(2):280–284.
- Dahabreh, I. J., Robertson, S. E., Steingrimsson, J. A., Stuart, E. A., and Hernan, M. A. (2020). Extending inferences from a randomized trial to a new target population. *Statistics in Medicine*, 39(14):1999–2014.
- Feng, M., McSparron, J. I., Kien, D. T., Stone, D. J., Roberts, D. H., Schwartzstein, R. M., Vieillard-Baron, A., and Celi, L. A. (2018). Transthoracic echocardiography and mortality in sepsis: analysis of the mimic-iii database. *Intensive Care Medicine*, 44(6):884–892.
- Foster, J. C., Taylor, J. M., and Ruberg, S. J. (2011). Subgroup identification from randomized clinical trial data. *Statistics in Medicine*, 30(24):2867–2880.
- Gretton, A., Borgwardt, K. M., Rasch, M. J., Schölkopf, B., and Smola, A. (2012). A kernel two-sample test. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 13(1):723–773.
- Hainmueller, J. (2012). Entropy balancing for causal effects: A multivariate reweighting method to produce balanced samples in observational studies. *Political Analysis*, 20(1):25–46.
- Hirshberg, D. A., Maleki, A., and Zubizarreta, J. (2019). Minimax linear estimation of the retargeted mean. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1901.10296*.
- Huling, J. D. and Mak, S. (2020). Energy balancing of covariate distributions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2004.13962*.
- Imai, K. and Ratkovic, M. (2014). Covariate balancing propensity score. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)*, 76(1):243–263.
- Imbens, G. W. and Rubin, D. B. (2015). *Causal Inference for Statistics, Social, and Biomedical Sciences: An Introduction*. Cambridge University Press.
- Institute of Medicine (2013). *Observational Studies in a Learning Health System: Workshop Summary*. The National Academies Press, Washington, DC.
- Johnson, A. E., Pollard, T. J., Shen, L., Li-Wei, H. L., Feng, M., Ghassemi, M., Moody, B., Szolovits, P., Celi, L. A., and Mark, R. G. (2016). Mimic-iii, a freely accessible critical care database. *Scientific Data*, 3(1):1–9.

- Kallus, N. (2018). Balanced policy evaluation and learning. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 8895–8906.
- Kallus, N. (2020). More efficient policy learning via optimal retargeting. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, pages 1–13.
- Kang, J. D., Schafer, J. L., et al. (2007). Demystifying double robustness: A comparison of alternative strategies for estimating a population mean from incomplete data. *Statistical Science*, 22(4):523–539.
- Kish, L. (1965). *Survey sampling*. Wiley, New York.
- Kitagawa, T. and Tetenov, A. (2018). Who should be treated? empirical welfare maximization methods for treatment choice. *Econometrica*, 86(2):591–616.
- Kube, A., Das, S., and Fowler, P. J. (2019). Allocating interventions based on predicted outcomes: A case study on homelessness services. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 33, pages 622–629.
- Li, F., Morgan, K. L., and Zaslavsky, A. M. (2018). Balancing covariates via propensity score weighting. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 113(521):390–400.
- Mo, W., Qi, Z., and Liu, Y. (2020). Learning optimal distributionally robust individualized treatment rules. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, pages 1–16.
- Murdoch, W. J., Singh, C., Kumbier, K., Abbasi-Asl, R., and Yu, B. (2019). Definitions, methods, and applications in interpretable machine learning. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 116(44):22071–22080.
- Qian, M. and Murphy, S. A. (2011). Performance guarantees for individualized treatment rules. *The Annals of Statistics*, 39(2):1180.
- Rosenbaum, P. R. and Rubin, D. B. (1983). The central role of the propensity score in observational studies for causal effects. *Biometrika*, 70(1):41–55.
- Rudolph, K. E. and van der Laan, M. J. (2017). Robust estimation of encouragement-design intervention effects transported across sites. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)*, 79(5):1509.
- Sriperumbudur, B. et al. (2016). On the optimal estimation of probability measures in weak and strong topologies. *Bernoulli*, 22(3):1839–1893.
- Stekhoven, D. J. and Bühlmann, P. (2012). Missforest—non-parametric missing value imputation for mixed-type data. *Bioinformatics*, 28(1):112–118.
- Stellato, B., Banjac, G., Goulart, P., Bemporad, A., and Boyd, S. (2020). OSQP: an operator

- splitting solver for quadratic programs. *Mathematical Programming Computation*, 12(4):637–672.
- Sugiyama, M., Krauledat, M., and MÅžller, K.-R. (2007). Covariate shift adaptation by importance weighted cross validation. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 8(May):985–1005.
- Székely, G. J. and Rizzo, M. L. (2013). Energy statistics: A class of statistics based on distances. *Journal of Statistical Planning and Inference*, 143(8):1249–1272.
- Villani, C. (2008). *Optimal transport: old and new*, volume 338. Springer Science & Business Media.
- Wahba, G. (1990). *Spline models for observational data*. SIAM, Philadelphia.
- Wang, Y., Wu, P., Liu, Y., Weng, C., and Zeng, D. (2016). Learning optimal individualized treatment rules from electronic health record data. In *2016 IEEE International Conference on Healthcare Informatics (ICHI)*, pages 65–71. IEEE.
- Wang, Y. and Zubizarreta, J. R. (2020). Minimal dispersion approximately balancing weights: asymptotic properties and practical considerations. *Biometrika*, 107(1):93–105.
- Wong, R. K. and Chan, K. C. G. (2018). Kernel-based covariate functional balancing for observational studies. *Biometrika*, 105(1):199–213.
- Xu, Y., Yu, M., Zhao, Y.-Q., Li, Q., Wang, S., and Shao, J. (2015). Regularized outcome weighted subgroup identification for differential treatment effects. *Biometrics*, 71(3):645–653.
- Zhang, Y., Laber, E. B., Davidian, M., and Tsiatis, A. A. (2018). Interpretable dynamic treatment regimes. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 113(524):1541–1549.
- Zhao, Y., Zeng, D., Rush, A. J., and Kosorok, M. R. (2012). Estimating individualized treatment rules using outcome weighted learning. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 107(499):1106–1118.
- Zhao, Y.-Q., Zeng, D., Tangen, C. M., and LeBlanc, M. L. (2019). Robustifying trial-derived optimal treatment rules for a target population. *Electronic Journal of Statistics*, 13(1):1717.
- Zhou, X., Mayer-Hamblett, N., Khan, U., and Kosorok, M. R. (2017). Residual weighted learning for estimating individualized treatment rules. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 112(517):169–187.