

David Choi

June 9, 2022

**Abstract**

In experiments that study social phenomena, such as peer influence or herd immunity, the treatment of one unit may influence the outcomes of others. Such “interference between units” violates traditional approaches for causal inference, so that additional assumptions are often imposed to model or limit the underlying social mechanism. For binary outcomes, we propose an approach that does not require such assumptions, allowing for interference that is both unmodeled and strong, with confidence intervals derived using only the randomization of treatment. However, the estimates will have wider confidence intervals and weaker causal implications than those attainable under stronger assumptions. The approach allows for the usage of regression, matching, or weighting, as may best fit the application at hand. Inference is done by bounding the distribution of the estimation error over all possible values of the unknown counterfactual, using an integer program. Examples are shown using a vaccination trial and two experiments investigating social influence.

## 1 Introduction

In experiments where the assumption of “no interference between units” does not apply, the effects of the treatment may extend to units receiving the control. Examples include vaccination studies where units receiving the placebo may be protected by the vaccine through herd immunity; economic effects such as those occurring in a marketplace; or social networks in which units may be influenced by information received from others. In such settings, generally an assumption is made to limit the effects of interference; for example, one might divide the units into groups that are assumed not to interfere with each other. In settings where such restrictions are implausible or have questionable validity, analyses relying on those assumptions may yield misleading conclusions.

For such settings, we propose to estimate contrasts in attributable treatment effects. The attributable effect is the difference between a unit’s observed outcome and that which would have resulted under a uniformity trial, such as the counterfactual in which all units had received the control (Rosenbaum, 2001). In this paper, we show that such effects can be partially characterized as a function of each unit’s direct treatment and indirect exposure to the treatment of others, potentially with no assumptions on interference.

For example, to give a simple characterization we might regress effects against treatment,

$$Effect_i \sim \beta_0 + \beta_1 \cdot Treatment_i \quad (1)$$

where  $Effect_i$  is the attributable effect for unit  $i$ , and  $Treatment_i$  is the binary indicator of that unit’s treatment assignment. This is equivalent to the least squares problem,

$$\min_{\beta_0, \beta_1} \sum_{i=1}^N (Effect_i - \beta_0 - \beta_1 \cdot Treatment_i)^2 \quad (2)$$

As a more complex example, given an observed social network we might regress effects against each unit’s treatment, their number of treated friends, and an interaction term,

$$Effect_i \sim \beta_0 + \beta_1 \cdot Treatment_i + \beta_2 \cdot \# Treated Friends_i + \beta_3 \cdot (Treatment_i \cdot \# Treated Friends_i) \quad (3)$$

In both (1) and (3), the variable  $Effect$  is not observed, and hence statistical inference is required to estimate the regression parameters.

The main result of this paper is that in regression specifications such as (1) and (3) with binary outcomes, contrasts such as  $\beta_1$ ,  $\beta_2$ , and  $\beta_3$  can be interval estimated with no assumptions beyond those regarding randomization of treatment. Thus, these parameters can be reliably inferred even when interference between individuals is difficult to accurately model, including settings in which an observed network only crudely reflects the true underlying social mechanisms. The regression may include transformations of the treatment variable, or adjustments (i.e., “controls”) if the indirect exposure to treatment is non-identically distributed. The approach also generalizes beyond regression, to estimands corresponding to weighted or matching-based comparisons of units. Inference requires novel computations to bound the interval widths.

In the regression (1), the coefficient  $\beta_1$  measures the relative benefits of being treated versus not treated. For example, consider a vaccination trial where those receiving the placebo might be indirectly affected by the vaccines. In this setting, an appropriately signed  $\beta_1$  would indicate that the vaccinated units were relatively more protected than those who received the placebo, by an additional  $\beta_1$  cases prevented per capita. Similarly, in (3), the coefficients  $\beta_1$ ,  $\beta_2$ , and  $\beta_3$  characterize the relative effects as a function of direct and indirect exposure to treatment. In vaccination settings, this might imply that units were relatively more protected when vaccinated, and additionally that placebo units were relatively more protected when their friends were vaccinated.

Relative effects are a partial characterization, and carry the caveat that “more protected” may actually mean “less harmed”, if making the treatment available causes everyone to become worse off. For example, a vaccine trial might prevent an even more effective intervention from being deployed. Such scenarios, when legitimately plausible, will have implications for all methods of analysis.

How might such estimates be used? Decision-makers must often operate with incomplete information, and a rigorous estimate of relative effects might be more convincing than one that measures total effects, but hides uncertainty by making overly strong assumptions. When communicating with policy makers, [Manski \(2013\)](#) and [Nagin and Sampson \(2019\)](#) emphasize the importance of properly conveying uncertainties that might otherwise be hidden by strong assumptions, with [Nagin and Sampson \(2019\)](#) specifically focusing on the challenges of interference. Along these lines, doing an analysis both with and without questionable assumptions may communicate the range of possible answers to a question. Thus our approach might complement others.

In some settings, the research question may be of the form “is X contagious?”, for behaviors and conditions such as product adoption, criminal behavior, and obesity. In such studies, the treatment might serve primarily to trigger a social influence mechanism so that it can be observed under randomization. Then estimation of relative effects might advance knowledge by showing that a social effect exists, and that it can be partially identified in a rigorous way. This could fill an important role. For example, [Christakis and Fowler \(2007\)](#) studied contagion of obesity and received widespread attention, but also strong criticism for lack of rigor ([Lyons, 2011](#)).

## 1.1 Related Work

Our work is part of a growing literature on statistical inference in the presence of interference between units. Approaches vary in their target estimand and severity of modeling assumptions, with stronger inferences generally requiring stronger assumptions.

Under the assumption of a known exposure model ([Aronow and Samii, 2017](#); [Eckles et al., 2017](#)), the outcome of each unit depends on the treatments through a set of statistics, termed the unit exposure; for example, a unit’s exposure might equal the treatment of its neighbors in an elicited social network. For this setting, [Aronow and Samii \(2017\)](#) gives propensity-weighted estimates and confidence intervals for the average treatment effect, which they define to be the difference in average outcome between two treatment allocations (such as full treatment and full control).

The papers [Hudgens and Halloran \(2008\)](#); [Sävje et al. \(2021\)](#); [Leung \(2019\)](#); [Liu and Hudgens \(2014\)](#); [Hu et al. \(2021\)](#); [Li and Wager \(2020\)](#) consider the expected effects of intervening on the treatment of a single unit, assuming the treatment of all other units to be randomized according to the experiment design. Estimands of this type (sometimes termed the EATE) have been defined for direct and indirect effects ([Hu et al., 2021](#)), and also generalized to misspecified exposure models ([Leung, 2019](#)). For this class of estimands, unbiased point estimation requires no assumptions beyond randomization; however, variance estimates and valid confidence intervals require assumptions on interference, although not on its exact structure. For example, [Leung \(2019\)](#) requires a bandwidth parameter to be chosen according to the strength of the assumed interference; [Sävje et al. \(2021\)](#) proposes variance inflation factors based on the degrees of the

underlying dependency graph; and [Li and Wager \(2020\)](#) consider random networks with distributional interactions between units.

With the exception of [Section 4.3](#), we will assume only that treatments are randomized, so that interference may be unknown and unbounded in strength. Previous work in this setting includes testing for null hypotheses related to peer effects, such as the hypothesis of direct effects but no spillovers ([Athey et al., 2018](#); [Aronow, 2012](#); [Basse et al., 2019](#)); and estimation of effects on the ranks of the treated and control units when ordering by outcome ([Rosenbaum, 2007](#)).

**Other related works** Estimation under parametric modeling assumptions is studied in [Rigdon and Hudgens \(2015\)](#), and under an assumption that the effect is nonnegative in [Choi \(2017\)](#). The definition and estimation of vaccine-specific effects is an active field, whose breadth is beyond our scope; we refer to [Cai et al. \(2021\)](#) for a recent discussion. Inference in observational studies with interference is also an active area of research, and we refer to [Forastiere et al. \(2021\)](#) and [Ogburn et al. \(2017\)](#). A technical report ([Choi, 2018](#)) considers the estimand  $\tau_1$  given by [\(6\)](#), but without generalization to other regressions, weighting, or matching.

## 2 Basic Approach

To introduce the main concepts, and to draw parallels with existing approaches, we first describe our method for the simple regression [\(1\)](#) that measures differences in attributable effects for the treated and control.

### 2.1 Defining the Attributable Effect

We assume a randomized experiment on  $N$  units, and let  $X \in \{0, 1\}^N$  denote the treatment assignment (whose distribution is known),  $Y \in \{0, 1\}^N$  the observed outcomes<sup>1</sup>, and  $\theta \in \{0, 1\}^N$  the counterfactual outcomes that would result under a “uniformity trial” ([Rosenbaum, 2007](#)). Under the uniformity trial, the random treatment assignment  $X$  is generated but not actually administered, so that the outcomes are unaffected by it. A common choice of uniformity trial is to let  $\theta$  denote the outcomes if all units were to receive the control regardless of  $X$ . We do not assume or require  $\theta$  to be observed (even indirectly) for any unit.

We define the *individual-level attributable treatment effect* to be the vector

$$Y - \theta.$$

For example, in a vaccination trial the treatment  $X_i$  might denote whether unit  $i$  received the vaccine or a placebo,  $Y_i$  whether the unit had the disease, and  $\theta_i$  the counterfactual outcome that would have resulted if all units were given the placebo. Letting an outcome of 1 denote the disease and 0 otherwise, an effect of  $Y_i - \theta_i = -1$  would mean that unit  $i$  did not have the disease, but would have if the placebo had been administered to all participants. In such a case, it can be said that administering the

---

<sup>1</sup>For some estimands, we will allow  $Y$  and  $\theta$  to be  $[0, 1]$ -valued instead of binary.

vaccine prevented this unit from having the disease. This can occur even if the unit received the placebo in the trial, due to social effects such as herd immunity.

The vector  $Y - \theta$  clearly has a causal interpretation, and is the effect of the treatment under the observed treatment assignment. It can be seen that averaging  $Y - \theta$  equals the attributable effect

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N (Y_i - \theta_i), \quad (4)$$

which is studied in [Rosenbaum \(2001\)](#). Our focus will be to partially characterize  $Y - \theta$  by estimating a partial regression coefficient, or a weighted or matching-based comparison of the unit outcomes. We will typically make no assumptions on  $\theta$  except on its range of allowable values. In particular, we do not assume that  $\theta$  is observed for any unit, and even allow  $Y$  to be uninformative for the values of  $\theta$ .

## 2.2 A Simple Example

Let  $N_1$  and  $N_0$  denote the number of treated and control units, and let  $\bar{X} = N_1/N$  denote the average treatment. We consider a slight modification of the regression (1),

$$Y_i - \theta_i \sim \tau_0 + \tau_1(X_i - \bar{X}),$$

which is equivalent to the least squares problem

$$\min_{\tau_0, \tau_1} \sum_{i=1}^N (Y_i - \theta_i - \tau_0 - \tau_1(X_i - \bar{X}))^2.$$

It can be seen that the intercept  $\tau_0$  and slope  $\tau_1$  are given by

$$\tau_0 = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N (Y_i - \theta_i) \quad (5)$$

$$\tau_1 = \underbrace{\frac{1}{N_1} \sum_{i: X_i=1} (Y_i - \theta_i)}_{\text{attributable effect on treated}} - \underbrace{\frac{1}{N_0} \sum_{i: X_i=0} (Y_i - \theta_i)}_{\text{attributable effect on control}}, \quad (6)$$

so that  $\tau_0$  is the average attributable effect, and  $\tau_1$  is the difference in attributable effects for the treated and control. The estimand  $\tau_1$  answers whether the units receiving the treatment were affected differently than those receiving the control (and by how much), while knowledge of both parameters  $(\tau_0, \tau_1)$  specifies the attributable effects for each group.

To give a possible usage for  $\tau_1$ , suppose that an intervention is believed to have positive effects, perhaps due to previous experiments in which units were effectively isolated, preventing interference. Then given a more operational deployment in which the treatments are not isolated, one might ask if the assignment was sufficiently dense to saturate the population. For example, one might wish to know whether placebo units were nearly as well-protected as those receiving a vaccination, or whether an

assignment of service providers provided evenly distributed spatial coverage. Estimating  $\tau_1$ , the difference in effects that were experienced by treated and untreated units, could be part of an analysis to answer such questions.

**Estimation of  $\tau_1$**  The quantity  $\tau_1$  is not a parameter, but rather an unobserved random variable. Conservative prediction intervals (PIs) can be found for  $\tau_1$  when  $X$  is assigned by sampling without replacement. Letting  $\hat{\tau}_1$  denote a point estimate equal to the difference in observed outcomes

$$\hat{\tau}_1 = \frac{1}{N_1} \sum_{i: X_i=1} Y_i - \frac{1}{N_0} \sum_{i: X_i=0} Y_i, \quad (7)$$

it can be seen that the estimation error  $\tau_1 - \hat{\tau}_1$  is given by

$$\tau_1 - \hat{\tau}_1 = \sum_{i: X_i=1} \frac{\theta_i}{N_1} - \sum_{i: X_i=0} \frac{\theta_i}{N_0}, \quad (8)$$

which is the difference between a random sample and its complement from the unknown  $\theta$ . As a result, we can apply a finite population central limit theorem to find a prediction interval for  $(\tau_1 - \hat{\tau}_1)$ , and hence for the estimand  $\tau_1$ . The width of this interval will depend on the unknown variance  $\sigma_\theta^2$ , given by

$$\bar{\theta} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \theta_i, \quad \sigma_\theta^2 = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^n (\theta_i - \bar{\theta})^2. \quad (9)$$

Proposition 1 gives the prediction interval, using the bound  $\sigma_\theta^2 \leq 1/4$  which holds for binary outcomes. It is proven in Section B.1 of the supplement.

**Proposition 1.** *Given  $\rho \in (0, 1)$ , assume a sequence of experiments in which  $N \rightarrow \infty$ , where treatment is assigned by sampling  $N_1$  units without replacement;  $N_1/N$  converges to  $\rho$ ; and  $\theta \in \{0, 1\}^N$ . Then  $\tau_1$  is contained the interval*

$$\hat{\tau}_1 \pm z_{1-\alpha} \sqrt{\frac{N}{N-1} \frac{N}{N_1 N_0} \frac{1}{4}}$$

*with probability asymptotically lower bounded by  $1 - 2\alpha$ .*

**Comparison with SATT** The point estimate  $\hat{\tau}_1$  given by (7) is the difference in mean outcomes, and also appears in estimation for the average treatment effect (ATE), the average treatment effect on the treated (ATT), and the expected average treatment effect (EATE).

The prediction interval for  $\tau_1$  is most closely related to that of the sample ATT discussed in [Sekhon and Shem-Tov \(2021\)](#). To see this, assume an experiment where treatment is assigned by sampling without replacement, and let  $\bar{Y}_1$  and  $\bar{Y}_0$  respectively denote the average observed outcomes for the treated and control groups, and let  $\theta$  denote the counterfactual outcomes that would occur if all units received the control, with  $\theta_1$  and  $\theta_0$  defined analogously.

In the absence of interference, it holds for the control units that  $Y_i = \theta_i$ . The sample ATT is defined as the difference between the observed and counterfactual outcomes for the treated units,

$$\tau^{\text{SATT}} = \frac{1}{N_1} \sum_{i: X_i=1} (Y_i - \theta_i) = \bar{Y}_1 - \bar{\theta}_1.$$

The estimator  $\hat{\tau}_1$  equals  $\bar{Y}_1 - \bar{Y}_0$ , and has error  $\hat{\tau}_1 - \tau^{\text{SATT}} = \bar{\theta}_0 - \bar{\theta}_1$ , where we have used  $\bar{Y}_0 = \bar{\theta}_0$ . This error is zero mean and has variance

$$\text{Var}(\hat{\tau}_1 - \tau^{\text{SATT}}) = \frac{N}{N-1} \frac{N}{N_1 N_0} \sigma_{\bar{\theta}}^2, \quad (10)$$

with  $\sigma_{\bar{\theta}}^2$  given by (9). Since  $Y_i = \theta_i$  for the control units, the empirical variance of the control outcomes  $\{Y_i : X_i = 0\}$  is consistent for  $\sigma_{\bar{\theta}}^2$  and can be plugged into (10) to estimate  $\text{Var}(\hat{\tau}_1 - \tau^{\text{SATT}})$ .

In the presence of interference,  $\theta_i$  need not equal  $Y_i$  for the control units. For example, the effects of the treatment may be redistributive, helping the treated by hurting the control. Then  $\bar{\theta}$  might approximately satisfy  $\bar{Y}_0 \leq \bar{\theta} \leq \bar{Y}_1$ . More generally,  $\bar{\theta} \in [0, 1]$  if no assumptions are made.

In such settings, we cannot estimate  $\tau^{\text{SATT}}$ , but we can estimate  $\tau_1$ , the difference in effects for the treated and control. As shown by (8), the estimation error  $\hat{\tau}_1 - \tau_1$  again equals  $\bar{\theta}_1 - \bar{\theta}_0$ , and hence its variance is the same as (10). However,  $\sigma_{\bar{\theta}}^2$  can no longer be estimated from the control outcomes, and must be bounded by 1/4 if no further assumptions are made, resulting in a prediction interval that is wider than that of  $\tau^{\text{SATT}}$  by a factor of  $(2\sigma_{Y_0})^{-1}$ .

In some cases, it may be reasonable to reduce this factor by bounding  $\sigma_{\bar{\theta}}^2 = \bar{\theta}(1 - \bar{\theta})$  more tightly. For example, in Section 4.3 we consider a vaccination trial in which the disease rate ranged from 0.002 to 0.005 in the preceding years. In such a case, it might be reasonable to bound  $\bar{\theta}$  by a safety factor of the historical values, as opposed to allowing  $\bar{\theta}$  to equal 0.5, which would be implausibly high for this setting.

**Comparison with EATE** The point estimate  $\hat{\tau}_1$  is also unbiased for the expected average treatment effect (Sävje et al., 2021), which can be written as

$$\text{EATE} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N (\mathbb{E}[Y_i | X_i = 1] - \mathbb{E}[Y_i | X_i = 0]). \quad (11)$$

If the units are independently assigned to treatment or control, the EATE is the expected effect of intervening on a unit on that unit's outcome, where the expectation is taken over the randomly assigned treatment of the others.

While  $\tau_1$  and the EATE have the same point estimate, they have quite different sources of estimation error, which are not “nested” in any sense. Unlike  $\tau_1$ , the estimation error for the EATE is the difference between  $\hat{\tau}_1$  and its expectation  $\mathbb{E}[\hat{\tau}_1]$ , and hence depends on the observed outcome vector  $Y$ , whose values may have unknown dependencies that must be controlled by additional assumptions. As a result, the confidence interval

width for the EATE will depend on the strength of the assumption that is made. Under strong assumptions, the interval width for the EATE may approach those attainable under an assumption of no interference; under very weak assumptions, consistent estimation of the EATE may not be possible.

To give a simple example of the latter case, suppose that the outcomes are given by

$$Y_i = X_1 f_i(X_i) + (1 - X_1) g_i(X_i),$$

so that depending on the treatment of unit 1, the outcome of unit  $i$  is given either by  $f_i(X_i)$  or by  $g_i(X_i)$ . In this case the point estimate will be inconsistent for the EATE (while remaining  $\sqrt{N}$ -consistent for  $\tau_1$ ), as the EATE depends on both  $f$  and  $g$ , but only one of the two will be observed.

### 3 General Case

We generalize  $\tau_1$  to allow the estimand to be a linear function of  $Y - \theta$ ,

$$\text{estimand} = \sum_{i=1}^N w_i(X) (Y_i - \theta_i), \quad (12)$$

where the weight  $w$  should depend only on  $X$  and be approximately zero-mean in order for our interval estimates to be small. To implement this requirement when the treatment (or the indirect exposure to treatment) is non-identically distributed, we can use matching, weighting, or regression adjustment to draw approximately unbiased comparisons between units.

**Preliminaries** To measure each unit's indirect exposure to the treatment of others, let  $A \in \{0, 1\}^{N \times N}$  denote the adjacency matrix of an observed network. Given a treatment assignment  $X$ , let  $Z = (Z_1, \dots, Z_N)$  denote the number of treated neighbors for each unit,

$$Z_i = \sum_{j:A_{ij}=1} X_j, \quad (13)$$

and let  $W = (W_1, \dots, W_N)$  the thresholding at a fixed level  $z_{\min}$ :

$$W_i = 1\{Z_i \geq z_{\min}\}. \quad (14)$$

We will assume that the units can be partitioned into  $K$  propensity classes  $\Pi_1, \dots, \Pi_K$ , where  $n_k = |\Pi_k|$  denotes the size of class  $k$ , and  $k(i)$  equals the propensity class of unit  $i$ . Nominally,  $Z_i$  and  $Z_j$  should be identically distributed if  $k(i) = k(j)$ . For example, if  $X$  is assigned by sampling without replacement, then the distribution of  $Z_i$  varies only with  $i$ 's number of neighbors in the network  $A$ . In some cases, the propensity classes may be misspecified, so that units belonging to the same class may have non-identical exposure distributions. Then our approach will produce wider intervals, so as to not be invalidated.

### 3.1 Examples

**Regression** Let  $\beta \in \mathbb{R}^d$  denote a general regression specification, solving the least squares problem

$$\min_{\beta} \sum_{i=1}^N \left( Y_i - \theta_i - \xi_i(X)^T \beta \right)^2,$$

for some choice of regressors  $\xi_i(X) \in \mathbb{R}^d$  for  $i \in [N]$ . Then  $\beta$  is given by

$$\beta = \left( \sum_{i=1}^N \xi_i(X) \xi_i(X)^T \right)^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \xi_i(X) (Y_i - \theta_i) \quad (15)$$

and it can be seen that the  $\ell$ th entry of  $\beta$  can be written in the form  $w(X)^T(Y - \theta)$  for  $w$  given by

$$w_i(X) = e_{\ell}^T \left( \sum_{i=1}^N \xi_i(X) \xi_i(X)^T \right)^{-1} \xi_i(X), \quad (16)$$

where  $e_{\ell} \in \mathbb{R}^d$  is the  $\ell$ th column of the  $d \times d$  identity matrix.

We give two examples. Let  $\beta^{\text{adj}}$  denote the partial regression coefficient that arises when regressing the treatment effects  $Y - \theta$  on the exposures  $Z$  and the set of  $K$  indicator variables representing the membership of each unit in the propensity classes  $\Pi_1, \dots, \Pi_K$ :

$$\beta^{\text{adj}} = \left( \sum_{i=1}^N (Z_i - \zeta_{k(i)})^2 \right)^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N (Z_i - \zeta_{k(i)}) (Y_i - \theta_i), \quad (17)$$

where  $\zeta_k$  is the average exposure for the  $k$ th propensity class

$$\zeta_k = \frac{1}{n_k} \sum_{i \in \Pi_k} Z_i$$

To interpret  $\beta^{\text{adj}}$ , we may say that for two individuals in the same propensity class, a unit difference in the level of exposure is associated with a  $\beta^{\text{adj}}$  difference in their individual-level attributable effects.

As a second example, regress  $Y - \theta$  on a set of indicator variables for the possible values of  $Z$  and also on the  $K$  propensity classes. This results in the least squares problem

$$\min_{\gamma \in \mathbb{R}^{D+1}, \nu \in \mathbb{R}^K} \sum_{i=1}^N \left( \gamma_{Z_i} + \nu_{k(i)} - (Y_i - \theta_i) \right)^2, \quad (18)$$

where  $D$  denotes the maximum value of  $Z$ . Here the regression coefficients  $\gamma_0, \dots, \gamma_D$  correspond to the levels of  $Z$ , and  $\nu$  corresponds to the propensity classes. We may then choose the contrasts  $\gamma_d - \gamma_0$ , for  $d = 1, \dots, D$ , as the estimand of interest. To interpret these contrasts, we may say that  $\gamma_d - \gamma_0$  predicts the difference in attributable effects for a unit with exposure level  $d$  compared to one in the same propensity class who had zero exposure.

**Weighting and Matching** Given thresholded exposures  $W$  and propensity classes  $\Pi_1, \dots, \Pi_K$ , let  $n_{k1}$  and  $n_{k0}$  denote the number of units in  $\Pi_k$  for which  $W_i = 1$  and  $W_i = 0$ , respectively. Let  $\tau^{\text{weighted}}$  denote the weighted difference

$$\tau^{\text{weighted}} = \sum_{k=1}^K \frac{n_k}{N} \sum_{i \in \Pi_k} \left( \frac{W_i(Y_i - \theta_i)}{n_{k1}} - \frac{(1 - W_i)(Y_i - \theta_i)}{n_{k0}} \right), \quad (19)$$

which can be interpreted as the difference in attributable effects within each propensity class, averaged together after weighting by class size. It can be seen that  $\tau^{\text{weighted}}$  can be written in the form  $w(X)^T(Y - \theta)$  for  $w(X)$  given by

$$w_i(X) = \frac{n_k}{N} \left( \frac{W_i}{n_{k(i)1}} - \frac{1 - W_i}{n_{k(i)0}} \right) \quad (20)$$

Alternatively, we can construct a matched subset of units by randomly pairing units within the same propensity class (where one unit in each pair has  $W_i = 1$  and the other has  $W_i = 0$ ), without replacement until no more pairs can be formed. Let  $\mathcal{M}$  denote the set of all units included in the matching, and let  $m = |\mathcal{M}|/2$  denote the number of matched pairs. Let  $\tau^{\text{matched}}$  denote the difference in attributable treatment effects between the matched units,

$$\tau^{\text{matched}} = \frac{1}{m} \left( \sum_{i \in \mathcal{M}: W_i=1} (Y_i - \theta_i) - \sum_{i \in \mathcal{M}: W_i=0} (Y_i - \theta_i) \right). \quad (21)$$

The value  $\tau^{\text{matched}}$  is analogous to  $\tau$ , measuring the difference in attributable effects for the units in the matching. It can be seen that  $\tau^{\text{matched}}$  equals  $w(X)^T(Y - \theta)$  for  $w(X)$  given by

$$w_i(X) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{m} & \text{if } i \in \mathcal{M}, W_i = 1 \\ -\frac{1}{m} & \text{if } i \in \mathcal{M}, W_i = 0 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (22)$$

As units are randomly paired within the same propensity class, the quantity  $\tau^{\text{matched}}$  is random given  $X$ . If this is undesirable, the expectation of  $\tau^{\text{matched}}$  may be used instead. This quantity closely resembles  $\tau^{\text{weighted}}$ , and is given by

$$E[\tau^{\text{matched}} | X] = \sum_{k=1}^K \frac{m_k}{m} \sum_{i \in \Pi_k} \left( \frac{W_i(Y_i - \theta_i)}{n_{k1}} - \frac{(1 - W_i)(Y_i - \theta_i)}{n_{k0}} \right), \quad (23)$$

where  $m_k = \min(n_{k1}, n_{k0})$  equals the number of matched pairs formed in the  $k$ th strata, with  $m = \sum_k m_k$ .

### 3.2 Estimation

In principle, estimation for the general estimand  $w(X)^T(Y - \theta)$  proceeds similarly to that of  $\tau_1$ , by defining the point estimate to equal  $w(X)^T Y$ .

This point estimate will usually take intuitive form. For example, if the estimand  $w(X)^T(Y - \theta)$  is a regression on the attributable effects, then  $w(X)^TY$  is simply the regression applied to the observed outcomes. Likewise, if the estimand is weighted or matching-based comparison, then  $w(X)^TY$  is simply that comparison applied to the observed outcomes. This point estimate need not be unbiased, in the sense that the estimation error  $w(X)^T\theta$  may not be zero-mean; however, the expectation of the error can be bounded by

$$\min_{\vartheta \in \{0,1\}^N} \mathbb{E}w(X)^T\vartheta \leq \mathbb{E}w(X)^T\theta \leq \max_{\vartheta \in \{0,1\}^N} \mathbb{E}w(X)^T\vartheta, \quad (24)$$

which can be easily evaluated when  $\mathbb{E}w(X)$  is known, as is the case for a randomized experiment.

To find a prediction interval, we will first show that a central limit theorem holds for  $w(X)^T\theta$ ,

$$\frac{w(X)^T\theta - \bar{w}^T\theta}{\sqrt{\text{Var}(w(X)^T\theta)}} \rightarrow N(0, 1),$$

where  $\bar{w}^T\theta$  is a location parameter for the asymptotic distribution. This implies a normal-based interval for  $w(X)^T\theta$  given by

$$\bar{w}^T\theta \pm z_{1-\alpha} \sqrt{\text{Var}[w(X)^T\theta]},$$

As  $\theta$  is unobserved, the boundaries of this interval are unknown, but we can find an outer bound by maximizing and minimizing over the unknown values of  $\theta$ , resulting in the upper and lower bounds  $U$  and  $L$  given by

$$U = \max_{\vartheta \in \{0,1\}^N} \bar{w}^T\vartheta + z_{1-\alpha} \sqrt{\text{Var}[w(X)^T\vartheta]} \quad (25)$$

$$L = \min_{\vartheta \in \{0,1\}^N} \bar{w}^T\vartheta - z_{1-\alpha} \sqrt{\text{Var}[w(X)^T\vartheta]}, \quad (26)$$

and a  $(1 - 2\alpha)$  level prediction interval for the estimand is given by  $w(X)^TY - [U, L]$ .<sup>2</sup>

Proposition 2 gives conditions under which prediction intervals for a variety of estimands will asymptotically have correct coverage. It assumes a sequence of experiments in which the number of units  $N$  goes to infinity, where the estimation error  $w(X)^T\theta$  is a smooth function  $h$  of an averaged random vector  $T(X)$  of sufficient statistics. The theorem applies the delta method and uses a central limit theorem for sums of variables whose dependency graph has bounded degree (Rinott, 1994, Thm 2.2), whose application requires Bernoulli randomization of the treatment vector  $X$ .

**Proposition 2.** *Given constants  $d_{\max}, \rho, B, q, \bar{\Sigma} \in \mathbb{R}^{q \times q}, \bar{T} \in \mathbb{R}^q$ , and mapping  $h : \mathbb{R}^q \rightarrow \infty$  that is continuously differentiable in a neighborhood of  $\bar{T}$ , assume a sequence of experiments with estimands  $w(X)^T(Y - \theta)$ , in which  $N \rightarrow \infty$  and the following hold*

- A.1 *Each unit is assigned to treatment independently with probability  $\rho \in (0, 1)$*

<sup>2</sup>To see this, observe that if  $a \leq f(X) \leq b$  with probability  $1 - \alpha$ , then for any  $g(X)$  it holds that  $a + g(X) \leq f(X) + g(X) \leq b + g(X)$  with the same probability.

A.2 The adjacency matrix  $A \in \{0, 1\}^{N \times N}$  has in-degree and out-degree bounded by  $d_{\max}$

A.3 The quantity  $w(X)^T \theta$  equals  $h(T(X))$ , where  $T(X)$  equals

$$T(X) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \phi_i(X),$$

for mappings  $\phi_1, \dots, \phi_N : \{0, 1\}^N \mapsto \mathbb{R}^q$  satisfying

$$\|\phi_i(X)\|_{\infty} \leq B, \quad \forall X$$

and

$$\phi_i(X) = \phi_i(X') \quad \text{if } X_i = X'_i \text{ and } X_j = X'_j \text{ for all } j : A_{ij} = 1$$

so that each  $\phi_i$  depends only on the treatment of unit  $i$  and  $i$ 's neighbors in  $A$ .

A.4  $\mathbb{E}T(X; \theta)$  converges to  $\bar{T}$ , and  $\sqrt{N} \cdot T(X; \theta)$  has covariance matrix converging to  $\bar{\Sigma}$ , which is non-zero but may be non-invertible

A.5 The variance of  $\sqrt{N} \cdot w(X)^T \theta$  is asymptotically non-zero.

Under these conditions, let  $\bar{w}$  satisfy  $\bar{w}^T \theta = h(\mathbb{E}T)$ , and let  $U$  and  $L$  equal (25) and (26) respectively. Then the quantity  $w^T(Y - \theta)$  is contained by the interval  $w^T Y - [U, L]$  with probability asymptotically lower bounded by  $(1 - 2\alpha)$ .

Corollary 1 gives conditions under which Proposition 2 can be applied to the regression weights  $\beta$  given by (15).

**Corollary 1.** Assume a sequence of experiments with  $N \rightarrow \infty$  which satisfy conditions A.1 and A.2 of Theorem 2, where  $w(X)$  as given by (16) for any  $\ell$  satisfies condition A.5, with  $\xi_i$  satisfying  $\|\xi_i(X)\|_{\infty} \leq B$  for all  $X$ , and

$$\xi_i(X) = \xi_i(X') \quad \text{if } X_i = X'_i \text{ and } X_j = X'_j \text{ for all } j : A_{ij} = 1$$

so that  $\xi_i(X)$  depends only on the treatment of unit  $i$  and  $i$ 's neighbors in  $A$ . Let  $\phi_i(X)$  be given by

$$\phi_i(X) = \begin{bmatrix} \xi_i(X) \otimes \xi_i(X) \\ \theta_i \xi_i(X) \end{bmatrix},$$

where  $\otimes$  denotes kronecker product, and let  $T(X) = N^{-1} \sum_i \phi_i(X)$  satisfy condition A.4. Then for the estimand  $\beta$  given by (15), the conclusions of Proposition 2 apply to the interval estimation of  $\beta_{\ell}$  with  $\bar{w}$  given by

$$\bar{w}_i = e_i^T \left( \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{E}[\xi_i(X) \xi_i(X)^T] \right)^{-1} \mathbb{E} \xi_i(X). \quad (27)$$

Corollary 2 gives conditions under which Proposition 2 can be applied to the weighted contrast  $\tau^{\text{weighted}}$ , as given by (19).

**Corollary 2.** Assume a sequence of experiments with  $N \rightarrow \infty$  which satisfy conditions A.1 and A.2 of Theorem 2, with  $w(X)$  given by (20) for fixed  $K$  satisfying condition A.5. Let  $\phi_i(X) \in \mathbb{R}^{4K}$  be given by

$$\phi_i(X) = \left( \left[ 1, \frac{NW_i}{n_{k(i)}}, \frac{N\theta_i}{n_{k(i)}}, \frac{NW_i\theta_i}{n_{k(i)}} \right]^T \right) \otimes e_{k(i)}$$

where  $\otimes$  denotes kronecker product and  $e_k$  denotes the  $k$ th column of the  $K \times K$  identity matrix, with  $n_k/N \geq 1/B$  for all  $k \in [K]$ , and  $T(X) = N^{-1} \sum_i \phi_i(X)$  satisfying condition A.4. Then the conclusions of Proposition 2 apply to the interval estimation of  $\tau^{\text{weighted}}$ , with  $\bar{w}$  given by

$$\bar{w}_i = \frac{n_{ki}}{N} \left( \frac{\mathbb{E}W_i}{\mathbb{E}n_{k(i)1}} - \frac{1 - \mathbb{E}W_i}{\mathbb{E}n_{k(i)0}} \right) \quad (28)$$

### Remarks

1. Conditions A.1 and A.2 of Proposition 2 are required to apply the central limit theorem of (Rinott, 1994, Thm 2.2), which applies to sums of dependent variables, such as the entries of  $W$ . Condition A.4 of the proposition implies  $\sqrt{N}$ -asymptotics, under which A.5 is required for the delta method to yield intervals with the desired coverage. Conditions A.1 and A.5 can potentially be removed when delta method and central limit theorem of Rinott (1994) are not used, as shown for  $\tau_1$  in Proposition 1 and for  $\beta^{\text{adj}}$  in Proposition 3 contained in the appendix.
2. To enforce the degree constraint given by A.2, we might sparsify the observed network  $A$ , for example by considering only same-neighborhood connections. This changes the regression specification or estimand that is being considered. However, it does not assume interference to be limited to the sparsity pattern of  $A$ .
3. While Corollary 1 implies that prediction intervals can be found for all entries of  $\beta$  and will have correct coverage, the intervals may be vacuously wide for entries corresponding to non-contrasts (such as the intercept term), or if the regression does not include adjustment for non-identically distributed  $X$  or  $Z$ . In such cases the entries of  $\bar{w}$  may be large, resulting in large bounds for  $U$  and  $L$ .

### 3.3 Computation

As  $\text{Var}(w^T \theta)$  equals  $\theta^T Q \theta$  for  $Q = \mathbb{E}w w^T - \mathbb{E}w \mathbb{E}w^T$ , solving for  $U$  given by (25) requires solving the optimization problem

$$\max_{\vartheta \in \{0,1\}^N} \bar{w}^T \vartheta + z_{1-\alpha} \sqrt{\vartheta^T Q \vartheta}, \quad (29)$$

To ensure coverage of the prediction intervals, a local optimum to (29) is not sufficient – either the global solution or an upper bound must be found. As  $Q$  is positive semi-definite, this requires maximization of a convex objective, which is computationally difficult even if the integer constraint on  $\vartheta$  is relaxed to the convex set  $[0, 1]^N$ .

To solve or upper bound (29), we proceed in two steps. First, we find a diagonal matrix  $D$  such that  $Q - D$  is negative semidefinite. This can be done by solving the semidefinite program

$$\min_{D \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}} \sum_{i=1}^n D_{ii} \quad \text{subject to } D \text{ diagonal, } D \geq 0, \text{ and } Q - D \preceq 0$$

where  $\geq 0$  denotes nonnegativity and  $\preceq 0$  denotes negative semidefinite. Then, we can rewrite (29) as

$$\max_{\vartheta \in \{0,1\}^N} \bar{w}^T \vartheta + z_{1-\alpha} \sqrt{\vartheta^T (Q - D) \vartheta + \sum_i D_{ii} \vartheta_i} \quad (30)$$

It can be seen that the objective of (30) is concave, but equals that of (29) for  $\vartheta \in \{0,1\}^N$ , since  $x = x^2$  if  $x$  is binary valued. (30) can be solved or bounded by Gurobi using branch-and-bound methods. For faster computation, an upper bound can be found by relaxing the integrality constraint of (30) to  $\vartheta \in [0,1]^N$ , resulting in a concave maximization problem whose global optimum can be efficiently found. Solving for  $L$  given by (26) proceeds analogously.

In principle, assumptions on  $\theta$  may be incorporated in the optimization of (25) and (26), in the form of additional constraints. Doing so may result in smaller confidence intervals. Such assumptions may be easier to consider than those that directly bound interference; for example, in Section 4.3 we consider a bound on  $\theta$  based on historical rates of the outcome in the years prior to treatment.

## 4 Examples

### 4.1 Social Networks and the Decision to Insure

In the experiment described in Cai et al. (2015), rural farmers in China were randomly assigned to information sessions where they would be given the opportunity to purchase weather insurance<sup>3</sup>. First round sessions were held three days before second round sessions, so that first round attendees could have informal conversations with their second round friends, in which they might share their opinions about the insurance product. A major goal of the experiment was to demonstrate the effects of information sharing through this channel.

The farmers were instructed to list 5 close friends with whom they specifically discussed rice production or financial issues. One of the conclusions of Cai et al. (2015) was that the decision to purchase insurance was affected not only by a farmer's own treatment assignment, but also by that of their friends; specifically, farmers assigned to a second round session were more likely to purchase insurance if more of their listed friends in the first round were assigned to a high-information session.

---

<sup>3</sup>data available at <https://www.aeaweb.org/articles?id=10.1257/app.20130442>

**Setup** We let  $M$  and  $N$  denote the number of units in the first and second rounds, and define  $X$ ,  $Y$ ,  $Z$ , and  $\theta$  as follows. For the first round units, let  $X \in \{0, 1\}^M$  indicate whether each unit was assigned to a high or low information session. For the second round units, let  $Y \in \{0, 1\}^N$  indicate whether or not they purchased insurance;  $Z$  their number of same-village first round friends assigned to a high information session; and  $\theta \in \{0, 1\}^N$  their outcomes that would have occurred under a counterfactual in which the first round sessions were not held. For example, if  $Y_i = 1$  and  $\theta_i = 0$ , then unit  $i$  purchased insurance, but would not have done so if the first round sessions were not held. Thus  $Y - \theta$  equals the effect of the first round sessions on the purchasing decisions of the second round.

We will assume that  $X$  is randomized by simple random sampling within each village, inducing propensity classes that were the interaction of village and number of first round friends. In fact, [Cai et al. \(2015\)](#) reports that treatments were stratified by family size and amount of land used for rice farming; however, further details are not included, and additionally these variables are missing for a significant fraction of the first round units. For this reason, our results for this example should be viewed primarily as a illustration of the proposed method.

**Results** Table 1 gives estimates for various parameters described in Section 3.1. The point estimate for  $\beta^{\text{adj}}$  suggests that for two farmers in the same propensity class, a unit difference in their number of high information first round friends was associated with a 0.08 difference in the effects of the first round sessions. However, the interval is weakly non-significant (95% PI: [0.0, 0.16]).

The contrasts  $\gamma_d - \gamma_0$  suggest an effect threshold at 2 high information friends. Units with 1 high information friend experienced effects that were indistinguishable from those with zero such friends. In comparison, units with 2 such friends were more strongly encouraged to purchase insurance, with effects that were 22% larger (95% PI: [2%, 41%]) than the effects on those with zero high info friends. Contrasts  $\gamma_d - \gamma_0$  for  $d \geq 3$  were non-significant due to small numbers of units with  $Z \geq 3$ . Similar differences in effect were estimated by the weighted and matching-based estimands  $\tau^{\text{weighted}}$ ,  $\tau^{\text{matched}}$ , and  $E[\tau^{\text{matched}}|X]$ , using the thresholded exposures  $W_i = 1\{Z_i \geq 2\}$ .

The interpretation of our estimates is that the second round units were affected by the first round sessions, with effects that correlated with the information content given to their first round friends, and in particular with whether at least two such friends received high information content.

## 4.2 Simulated Vaccine Trial

We analyze the `vaccinesim` dataset, which simulates a vaccine trial using models that were partially fit to an actual cholera vaccine trial, as described in [Perez-Heydrich et al. \(2014\)](#)<sup>4</sup>.

---

<sup>4</sup>available in the R package `inference` described in [Saul and Hudgens \(2017\)](#)

	Point Est.	Bias	95% PI
$\beta^{\text{adj}}$	8%	$\pm 0.4\%$	[0%, 17%]
$\gamma_1 - \gamma_0$	2%	$\pm 1\%$	[-11%, 14%]
$\gamma_2 - \gamma_0$	<b>21%</b>	$\pm 1\%$	[2%, 40%]
$\gamma_3 - \gamma_0$	16%	$\pm 2\%$	[-17%, 49%]
$\gamma_4 - \gamma_0$	69%	$\pm 2\%$	[-60%, 195%]
$\tau^{\text{weighted}}$	<b>19%</b>	$\pm 2\%$	[2%, 36%]
$\tau^{\text{matched}}$	<b>20%</b>	$\pm 1\%$	[3%, 37%]
$E[\tau^{\text{matched}} X]$	<b>19%</b>	$\pm 1\%$	[3%, 35%]

Table 1: Estimation Results for Insurance Experiment

**Setup** We let  $X_i$  denote whether unit  $i$  received the vaccine or placebo;  $Y_i = 1$  that the unit had cholera;  $\theta_i$  their outcome under the counterfactual in which all units had received the placebo; and  $V_i$  their neighborhood vaccination rate which equals the fraction of individuals in  $i$ 's neighborhood (including non-participants) who were assigned to vaccination. Participants were assigned independently with probability 2/3 to receive the vaccine, otherwise receiving the placebo. Supplement C contains additional simulation details.

**Results** We estimate  $\tau_1$  given by (6) and  $\beta_1$ ,  $\beta_2$ , and  $\beta_3$  in the regression of effects on direct treatment, neighborhood vaccination rates, and their interaction,

$$(Y_i - \theta_i) \sim \beta_0 + \beta_1 X_i + \beta_2 V_i + \beta_3 (X_i \cdot V_i) + \text{controls},$$

where the control terms are the expectations  $\mathbb{E}[V_i]$  and  $\mathbb{E}[X_i V_i]$ , which depend on (and control for) the number of participants and non-participants in each neighborhood.

Table 2 shows the resulting estimates. They suggest that vaccinated units were relatively more protected than placebo units, and that placebo units were relatively more protected when their neighbors were vaccinated. Estimates for  $\beta_1$ ,  $\beta_2$  and  $\beta_3$  had high uncertainty, and 90% prediction intervals are shown.  $\tau_1$  indicates that vaccinated units were relatively more protected than placebo, with 0.12 additional cases prevented per capita. However, this may underrepresent the effects of the vaccine, as placebo units may have been protected by the vaccines. To see this, observe that the point estimates for  $\beta_1$  and  $\beta_3$  suggest that the relative effects varied with neighborhood vaccination rates, with

$$0.22 - 0.29 \cdot \text{vaccination rate}$$

additional cases prevented per capita for vaccinated units versus placebo. Thus in neighborhoods with low vaccination rates, the difference in effects for vaccinated and placebo units may have been significantly larger than the overall difference given by  $\tau_1$ . The point estimate for  $\beta_2$  indicates that placebo units were relatively more protected in neighborhoods with high

	Point Est.	Bias	PI	Coverage
$\tau_1$	<b>-0.12</b>	0	[-0.17, -0.07]	95%
$\beta_1$	<b>-0.21</b>	$\pm 0.005$	[-0.38, -0.05]	90%
$\beta_2$	<b>-0.59</b>	$\pm 0.02$	[-1.16, -0.02]	90%
$\beta_3$	0.29	$\pm 0.01$	[-0.03, 0.61]	90%

Table 2: Estimates for `vaccinesim` data

vaccination rates, with a 0.01 difference in rates associated with 0.006 additional cases per capita prevented by the trial.

**Comparison with Other Approaches** For this application, the EATE can be interval estimated using the approach of [Leung \(2019\)](#). This method requires a choice of bandwidth, beyond which interference is assumed to be negligible; we chose this bandwidth to imply negligible interference between neighborhoods. Comparing the EATE estimate to that of  $\tau_1$ , we find that the boundaries of their 95% intervals differed by less than 0.01.

Similarly, the estimand  $\beta$  may be compared to  $DE(\alpha)$  and  $IE_0(\alpha, \alpha')$ , which are discussed in [Perez-Heydrich et al. \(2014\)](#); [Tchetgen and VanderWeele \(2012\)](#), and are given by

$$DE(\alpha) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \left( \mathbb{E}[Y_i | X_i = 1; \alpha] - \mathbb{E}[Y_i | X_i = 0; \alpha] \right)$$

$$IE_0(\alpha, \alpha') = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \left( \mathbb{E}[Y_i | X_i = 0; \alpha] - \mathbb{E}[Y_i | X_i = 0; \alpha'] \right)$$

where  $\mathbb{E}[\cdot | \cdot; \alpha]$  denotes expectation under i.i.d. Bernoulli( $\alpha$ ) randomization of treatment for all individuals, including non-participants. It can be seen that  $DE(\alpha)$  is the expected effect of intervening on a single random unit, if all individuals (including non-participants) were randomized to receive the vaccine with probability  $\alpha$ . Similarly,  $IE_0(\alpha, \alpha')$  is the expected effect on a placebo unit of changing the probability of vaccination for all individuals from  $\alpha'$  to  $\alpha$ .

Figure 1 shows estimates and true values for  $IE_0(\alpha, 0.4)$  and  $DE(\alpha)$  for a range of  $\alpha$  values. In comparison to  $\beta$ , have similar values, but show less uncertainty and describe the overall effects of possible interventions, rather than relative effects of the observed treatment. However, they assume no interference between neighborhoods, and also assume that the decision to participate followed a known functional form dependent only on observed covariates.

**Coverage of Confidence Intervals** Using the simulation parameters given in [Perez-Heydrich et al. \(2014\)](#), we may generate the unknown counterfactual outcomes  $\theta$  and simulate  $X$  to measure the coverage rates of our confidence intervals. In 10K simulations, the intervals for  $\beta_1$ ,  $\beta_2$ ,




Figure 1: Estimates of effect heterogeneity/herd immunity. Shown are point estimates, 90% PI, and true values (dashed red line). Fig. (c) and (d) show effects relative to that of 40% vaccination.

and  $\beta_3$  achieved coverage but were as much as 2.2 times wider than necessary. However, for other values of  $\theta$ , found by solving (25), the coverage of the 90% interval was as low as 91%. This suggests that the interval widths were necessary in order to have coverage for all possible values of  $\theta$ , as required without further assumptions.

### 4.3 Real Vaccine Trial (Aggregate Outcomes)

The paper [Ali et al. \(2005\)](#) analyzes the actual results of the cholera vaccine trial, in order to investigate the possibility of indirect (herd) protection under high levels of vaccination. A table of aggregate outcomes for the actual cholera vaccine trial is given, which we aggregate further in Table 3 into two groups of roughly equal size, by dividing the units according to whether their neighborhood vaccination rate was  $\leq 40\%$  or  $> 40\%$ . We consider the regression

$$(Y_i - \theta_i) \sim \beta_1 X_i + \beta_2 (X_i \cdot i \in \text{group 1}) + \text{controls},$$

where the control terms are the membership indicators for groups 1 and 2.

With no further assumption on  $\theta$ , we allow for the possibility that in the absence of the vaccinations, the cholera rate could have been hundreds of times larger than the observed rate of 2.8 cases per thousand. As this may be unrealistic, we will consider an additional assumption based on past cholera rates. The trial covered the Matlab region of Bangladesh in 1985, and cholera rates for this region are given in ([Zaman et al., 2020](#), Fig. 1). We will assume that under the counterfactual  $\theta$  in which all units receive the placebo, the cholera rate for the participants would be upper bounded by 7 cases per thousand,

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \theta_i \leq 0.007, \quad (31)$$

which is substantially higher than the highest observed rate of 5 per thousand in the ten years before the trial. As the participants ( $\approx 30\%$  of the population) are not a random sample, some caution is required; however,

Group	Vaccination Rate	Cholera Rate (per 1000)	
		Treated	Control
1	$\leq 40\%$	2.1 (54/25K)	5.6 (72/13K)
2	$> 40\%$	1.7 (42/25K)	3.0 (36/12K)
Total		1.94 (96/49K)	4.4 (108/25K)

Table 3: Cholera cases in treated and control units grouped by neighborhood vaccination rates. (Taken from [Hudgens and Halloran \(2008\)](#); [Ali et al. \(2005\)](#).)

	Point Estimate	Bias	90% PI
$\beta_1$	-1.3	0	[-3.5, 0.9]
$\beta_2$	-2.2	0	[-4.4, 0.0]
$\beta_1 + \beta_2$	-3.5	0	[-5.6, -1.4]

Table 4: Estimates (in cases per thousand) for aggregate-level cholera data

(31) may easier to consider than a bound on interference between neighborhoods.

The coefficients  $\beta_1$  and  $\beta_2$  characterize the relative effects of receiving the vaccine versus placebo, in each group. Table 4 shows the results. The estimates suggest that vaccinated units were relatively more protected than placebo ones, by a difference of

$$1.3 + 2.2 \cdot 1\{\text{unit is in group 1}\}$$

additional cases prevented per thousand. Prediction intervals (weakly) exclude zero for the interaction term  $\beta_2$ , indicating that the relative effects were different for the two groups, and also for  $\beta_1 + \beta_2$ , which gives the relative effects for group 1 which had lower vaccination rates. These results suggest that the overall difference in outcomes between treatment and control, which equaled 2.4 cases per thousand, may under-represent the effects of the vaccine, as larger relative effects occurred when vaccination rates were low.

## 5 Conclusions

We have presented an approach for partial estimation of unit-level attributable effects given a randomized trial on a single network with strong unmodeled interference. The approach goes beyond testing to give a partial characterization, returning interval estimates for the relative effects of treatment.

**Supplemental Materials** The supplement contains analysis of a social experiment ([Paluck et al., 2016](#)); proofs; and data summaries.

## References

- Ali, M., Emch, M., Von Seidlein, L., Yunus, M., Sack, D. A., Rao, M., Holmgren, J., and Clemens, J. D. (2005). Herd immunity conferred by killed oral cholera vaccines in bangladesh: a reanalysis. *The Lancet*, 366(9479):44–49.
- Aronow, P. M. (2012). A general method for detecting interference between units in randomized experiments. *Sociological Methods & Research*, 41(1):3–16.
- Aronow, P. M. and Samii, C. (2017). Estimating average causal effects under general interference, with application to a social network experiment. *The Annals of Applied Statistics*, 11(4):1912–1947.
- Athey, S., Eckles, D., and Imbens, G. W. (2018). Exact p-values for network interference. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 113(521):230–240.
- Basse, G., Feller, A., and Toulis, P. (2019). Randomization tests of causal effects under interference. *Biometrika*, 106(2):487–494.
- Cai, J., De Janvry, A., and Sadoulet, E. (2015). Social networks and the decision to insure. *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics*, 7(2):81–108.
- Cai, X., Kenah, E., and Crawford, F. W. (2021). Causal identification of infectious disease intervention effects in a clustered population. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2105.03493*.
- Choi, D. (2017). Estimation of monotone treatment effects in network experiments. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 112(519):1147–1155.
- Choi, D. (2018). Using exposure mappings as side information in experiments with interference. Technical report. arXiv:1806.11219.
- Christakis, N. A. and Fowler, J. H. (2007). The spread of obesity in a large social network over 32 years. *New England journal of medicine*, 357(4):370–379.
- Eckles, D., Karrer, B., and Ugander, J. (2017). Design and analysis of experiments in networks: Reducing bias from interference. *Journal of Causal Inference*, 5(1):20150021.
- Forastiere, L., Airoidi, E. M., and Mealli, F. (2021). Identification and estimation of treatment and interference effects in observational studies on networks. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 116(534):901–918.
- Hu, Y., Li, S., and Wager, S. (2021). Average direct and indirect causal effects under interference. *Biometrika*.

- Hudgens, M. G. and Halloran, M. E. (2008). Toward causal inference with interference. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 103(482):832–842.
- Leung, M. P. (2019). Causal inference under approximate neighborhood interference. *Available at SSRN 3479902*.
- Li, S. and Wager, S. (2020). Random graph asymptotics for treatment effect estimation under network interference. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2007.13302*.
- Liu, L. and Hudgens, M. G. (2014). Large sample randomization inference of causal effects in the presence of interference. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 109(505):288–301.
- Lyons, R. (2011). The spread of evidence-poor medicine via flawed social-network analysis. *Statistics, Politics, and Policy*, 2(1).
- Manski, C. F. (2013). *Public policy in an uncertain world*. Harvard University Press.
- Nagin, D. S. and Sampson, R. J. (2019). The real gold standard: measuring counterfactual worlds that matter most to social science and policy. *Annual Review of Criminology*, 2:123–145.
- Ogburn, E. L., Sofrygin, O., Diaz, I., and van der Laan, M. J. (2017). Causal inference for social network data. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1705.08527*.
- Paluck, E. L., Shepherd, H., and Aronow, P. M. (2016). Changing climates of conflict: A social network experiment in 56 schools. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 113(3):566–571.
- Perez-Heydrich, C., Hudgens, M. G., Halloran, M. E., Clemens, J. D., Ali, M., and Emch, M. E. (2014). Assessing effects of cholera vaccination in the presence of interference. *Biometrics*, 70(3):731–741.
- Rigdon, J. and Hudgens, M. G. (2015). Exact confidence intervals in the presence of interference. *Statistics & probability letters*, 105:130–135.
- Rinott, Y. (1994). On normal approximation rates for certain sums of dependent random variables. *Journal of Computational and Applied Mathematics*, 55(2):135–143.
- Rosenbaum, P. R. (2001). Effects attributable to treatment: Inference in experiments and observational studies with a discrete pivot. *Biometrika*, 88(1):219–231.
- Rosenbaum, P. R. (2007). Interference between units in randomized experiments. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 102(477):191–200.
- Saul, B. C. and Hudgens, M. G. (2017). A recipe for inference: Start with causal inference. Add interference. Mix well with R. *Journal of Statistical Software, Articles*, 82(2):1–21.

- Sävje, F., Aronow, P. M., and Hudgens, M. G. (2021). Average treatment effects in the presence of unknown interference. *The Annals of Statistics*, 49(2):673 – 701.
- Sekhon, J. S. and Shem-Tov, Y. (2021). Inference on a new class of sample average treatment effects. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 116(534):798–804.
- Tchetgen, E. J. T. and VanderWeele, T. J. (2012). On causal inference in the presence of interference. *Statistical methods in medical research*, 21(1):55–75.
- Zaman, K., Kim, D. R., Ali, M., Ahmmed, F., Im, J., Islam, M. T., Khan, A. I., Yunus, M., Khan, M. A., Marks, F., et al. (2020). Can cholera ‘hotspots’ be converted to cholera ‘coldspots’ in cholera endemic countries? the Matlab, Bangladesh experience. *International Journal of Infectious Diseases*, 95:28–31.




Figure 2: Estimates (point estimate, bias bound, and 95% PI) for experiment described in Section A.

## Supplemental Material for “Randomization-only Inference in Experiments with Interference”

### A Support for Conflict Reduction in Schools

The paper [Paluck et al. \(2016\)](#) describes an experiment<sup>5</sup> in which public middle schools were randomized to receive a treatment designed to encourage anti-conflict norms and behavior in students. Within each treated schools, a small subset of eligible students (between 40-64) were randomized between treatment and control. Treated students were invited to participate in bi-monthly meetings in which they designed and enacted strategies to reduce schoolwide conflict. Outcomes for all students in each school included the self-reported wearing of an orange wristband representing support for anti-conflict norms. Network information (“spent time with”) was recorded for all students. Estimation of effects on the wristband outcome has been used in [Aronow \(2012\)](#) and [Leung \(2019\)](#) to illustrate their proposed methods, as we do here.

**Setup** Let  $X_i$  denote if student  $i$  was invited to participate in the anti-conflict meetings (which can only equal 1 for eligible students), and  $Y_i$  their outcome of whether they self-reported wearing the wristband representing support for anti-conflict norms. Breaking slightly from the previous examples, we define the counterfactual  $\theta_i$  to denote their outcome if all eligible units were invited to participate in the meetings (“full treatment”). With  $\theta$  so defined, the difference  $Y - \theta$  is interpretable as the effect of not inviting the control units to participate.

<sup>5</sup>data available at <https://www.icpsr.umich.edu/web/civicleads/studies/37070>

**Results** Following [Aronow \(2012\)](#) and [Leung \(2019\)](#), we estimate differences in treatment effect on four groups of students, corresponding to whether or not they were invited to participate in the meetings, and also whether or not they had at least one network connection who was invited to participate. [Figure 2a](#) shows estimates of  $\mathbb{E}[\tau^{\text{matched}}]$  for units that were matched based on school and number of eligible friends. Similar results were found using weighting or matching. A significant difference in effects was found between two groups; as a result of not inviting the control units to participate, units in control whose friends were also in control were affected more adversely than those who were treated and had at least one treated friend.

## B Proofs

We prove [Propositions 1 and 2](#), [Corollaries 1 and 2](#), and also state and prove [Proposition 3](#), which gives an alternate interval estimate for  $\beta^{\text{adj}}$ .

### B.1 Proof of [Proposition 1](#)

Our proof of [Propositions 1 and 3](#) will use the following finite population central limit theorem.

**Theorem 1.** ([Li and Ding, 2017, Thm. 1](#)) Let  $\bar{u}_S$  denote the average of  $N_1$  units sampled without replacement from the finite population  $u_1, \dots, u_N$ , with  $\bar{u} = N^{-1} \sum_i u_i$ . As  $N \rightarrow \infty$ , if

$$\frac{1}{\min(N_1, N - N_1)} \cdot \frac{m_N}{v_N} \rightarrow 0, \quad (\text{S.1})$$

where  $m_N$  and  $v_N$  are given by

$$m_N = \max_i (u_i - \bar{u})^2 \quad \text{and} \quad v_N = \frac{1}{N-1} \sum_i (u_i - \bar{u})^2,$$

then  $(\bar{u}_S - \bar{u})/\sqrt{\text{Var}(\bar{u}_S)} \rightarrow N(0, 1)$  in distribution.

[Lemma 1](#) gives a simpler expression for the difference in means of  $\theta$ , from which its variance can be derived.

**Lemma 1.** Let  $X$  be assigned by sampling  $N_1$  units without replacement, and let  $\bar{\theta}$  and  $\sigma_\theta^2$  denote the mean and variance of  $\theta$ . Then it holds that

$$\sum_{X_i=1} \frac{\theta_i}{N_1} - \sum_{X_i=0} \frac{\theta_i}{N_0} = \frac{1}{N_1} \sum_{i=1}^N X_i \frac{(\theta_i - \bar{\theta})N}{N_0},$$

which is the average of  $N_1$  samples without replacement from the finite population  $u_1, \dots, u_N$ , where  $u_i = (\theta_i - \bar{\theta})N/N_0$ , and which has variance

$$\frac{1}{N_1} \frac{N_0}{N-1} \frac{N^2}{N_0^2} \sigma_\theta^2. \quad (\text{S.2})$$

*Proof of Lemma 1.*

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{X_i=1} \frac{\theta_i - \bar{\theta}}{N_1} - \sum_{X_i=0} \frac{\theta_i - \bar{\theta}}{N_0} \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{X_i(\theta_i - \bar{\theta})}{N_1} - \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{(1 - X_i)(\theta_i - \bar{\theta})}{N_0} \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^N X_i(\theta_i - \bar{\theta}) \frac{N}{N_1 N_0} - \frac{1}{N_0} \underbrace{\sum_{i=1}^N (\theta_i - \bar{\theta})}_{=0} \\
&= \frac{1}{N_1} \sum_{i=1}^N X_i \frac{(\theta_i - \bar{\theta})N}{N_0}.
\end{aligned}$$

This equals the average of  $N_1$  samples without replacement from the finite population  $u_1, \dots, u_N$ , where  $u_i = (\theta_i - \bar{\theta})N/N_0$ , which is known to have variance equal to  $\frac{1}{N_1} \frac{N_0}{N-1}$  multiplied by the variance of  $\{u_i\}$ , which equals (S.2).  $\square$

*Proof of Proposition 1.* It can be seen that  $\tau_1 - \hat{\tau}_1$  equals

$$\tau_1 - \hat{\tau}_1 = \sum_{X_i=1} \frac{\theta_i}{N_1} - \sum_{X_i=0} \frac{\theta_i}{N_0}.$$

By Lemma 1, this equals the average of  $N_1$  samples without replacement from the finite population  $u_1, \dots, u_N$ , where  $u_i = (\theta_i - \bar{\theta})N/N_0$ , with variance given by (S.2). Hence the terms  $m_N$  and  $v_N$  as defined in Theorem 1 can be bounded by

$$m_N \leq (N/N_0)^2 \quad \text{and} \quad v_N = \sigma_\theta^2 (N/N_0)^2. \quad (\text{S.3})$$

To prove the proposition, we will divide the sequence of experiments into two subsequences: (i) those for which  $\sigma_\theta^2 \geq (\log N)/N$ , and (ii) those for which  $\sigma_\theta^2 < (\log N)/N$ , and then show coverage of the proposed interval for each subsequence separately.

For subsequence (i), we observe that by (S.3), along with  $N_1 \rightarrow \rho N$  and  $\sigma_\theta^2 \geq (\log N)/N$ , it can be seen that the CLT condition (S.1) holds, i.e.,

$$\frac{1}{\min(N_1, N - N_1)} \cdot \frac{m_N}{v_N} \rightarrow 0.$$

Thus by Theorem 1, it holds that

$$\mathbb{P}\left(|\tau_1 - \hat{\tau}_1| \geq z_{1-\alpha} \sqrt{\text{Var}(\tau_1 - \hat{\tau}_1)}\right) \rightarrow 1 - 2\alpha. \quad (\text{S.4})$$

Since  $\theta \in \{0, 1\}^N$ , it holds that  $\sigma_\theta^2 \leq 1/4$ , and plugging this bound into (S.2) yields an upper bound on the variance,

$$\text{Var}(\tau_1 - \hat{\tau}_1) \leq \frac{1}{4} \frac{N}{N-1} \frac{N}{N_1 N_0}, \quad (\text{S.5})$$

and combining (S.5) and (S.4) implies for subsequence (i) that

$$\mathbb{P} \left( |\tau_1 - \hat{\tau}_1| \geq z_{1-\alpha} \sqrt{\frac{1}{4} \frac{N}{N-1} \frac{N}{N_1 N_0}} \right) \rightarrow 2\alpha, \quad (\text{S.6})$$

and hence that  $\tau_1$  is in the interval  $\hat{\tau}_1 \pm z_{1-\alpha} \sqrt{\frac{1}{4} \frac{N}{N-1} \frac{N}{N_1 N_0}}$  with the same probability.

For subsequence (ii), plugging  $\sigma_\theta^2 < (\log N)/N$  into (S.2) implies that  $\sqrt{\text{Var}(\tau_1 - \hat{\tau}_1)}$  is a vanishing fraction of  $z_{1-\alpha} \sqrt{\frac{1}{4} \frac{N}{N-1} \frac{N}{N_1 N_0}}$ , the width of the proposed confidence interval. As a result, for this subsequence it holds by Chebychev's inequality that

$$\mathbb{P} \left( |\tau_1 - \hat{\tau}_1| \geq z_{1-\alpha} \sqrt{\frac{1}{4} \frac{N}{N-1} \frac{N}{N_1 N_0}} \right) \rightarrow 0, \quad (\text{S.7})$$

and hence that  $\tau_1$  is in the interval  $\hat{\tau}_1 \pm z_{1-\alpha} \sqrt{\frac{1}{4} \frac{N}{N-1} \frac{N}{N_1 N_0}}$  with the same probability.

Combining (S.6) for subsequence (i) and (S.7) for subsequence (ii) implies that for combined sequence of experiments,  $\tau_1$  is in the interval  $\hat{\tau}_1 \pm z_{1-\alpha} \sqrt{\frac{1}{4} \frac{N}{N-1} \frac{N}{N_1 N_0}}$  with probability asymptotically lower bounded by  $1 - 2\alpha$ , proving the proposition.  $\square$

## B.2 Proof of Theorem 2

The proof of Theorem 2 will use several tools.

The Cramer-Wold device (Van der Vaart, 2000, Sec 2.3) states that a sequence of random vectors  $X_n \in \mathbb{R}^d$  converges in distribution to  $X$  if and only if  $\varpi^T X_n$  converges in distribution to  $\varpi^T X$  for all vectors  $t \in \mathbb{R}^d$ .

Theorem 2 describes a uniform delta method (Van der Vaart, 2000, Thm 3.8), which implies that if  $\sqrt{n}X$  converges to a multivariate normal distribution, then  $f(X)$  does so as well after centering and rescaling, if  $f$  is continuously differentiable around the limit point of  $X$ .

**Theorem 2.** (Van der Vaart, 2000, Thm 3.8) *Let  $f : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a continuously differentiable mapping in a neighborhood of  $\bar{T}$ , and let random vectors  $T_n \in \mathbb{R}^d$  and non-random  $(\bar{T}_n, r_n) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}$  satisfy that  $\bar{T}_n \rightarrow \bar{T}$ ,  $r_n \rightarrow \infty$ , and  $r_n(T_n - \bar{T}_n)$  converges in distribution to a random vector  $T$ . Then  $r_n(f(T_n) - f(\bar{T}_n))$  converges in distribution to  $\nabla f(\bar{T})^T T$ , the inner product of  $T$  and the gradient of  $f$  at  $\bar{T}$ . Moreover, the difference between  $r_n(f(T_n) - f(\bar{T}_n))$  and  $\nabla f(\bar{T})^T r_n(T_n - \bar{T}_n)$  converges in probability to 0.*

Theorem 3 is a central limit theorem (Rinott, 1994, Thm 2.2) that requires the notion of a dependency graph: Given a collection of dependent random variables  $X_1, \dots, X_N$ , a graph with  $N$  nodes is said to be its dependency graph if for any two disjoint subsets  $S_1$  and  $S_2$ , if there is no edge in the graph connecting  $S_1$  to  $S_2$  then the sets of random variables  $\{X_i : i \in S_1\}$  and  $\{X_i : i \in S_2\}$  are independent.

**Theorem 3.** (*Rinott, 1994, Thm 2.2*) Let  $X_1, \dots, X_N$  be zero-mean random variables having a dependency graph whose maximal degree is strictly less than  $D$ , satisfying  $|X_i - \mathbb{E}X_i| \leq B$  a.s.,  $i = 1, \dots, N$ , and  $\text{Var} \sum_{i=1}^N X_i = \sigma^2 > 0$ . Let  $\Phi$  denote the CDF of a standard normal. Then for all  $t \in \mathbb{R}$  it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \mathbb{P} \left( \frac{\sum_{i=1}^N X_i}{\sigma} \leq t \right) - \Phi(t) \right| \\ & \leq \frac{1}{\sigma} \left\{ \sqrt{\frac{1}{2\pi}} DB + 16 \left( \frac{n}{\sigma^2} \right)^{1/2} D^{3/2} B^2 + 10 \left( \frac{n}{\sigma^2} \right) D^2 B^3 \right\} \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 2 bounds the degree of the dependency graph for the thresholded exposures.

**Lemma 2.** *Let the assumptions and definitions of Theorem 2 hold. Then the random vectors  $\phi_1(X), \dots, \phi_N(X)$  have dependency graph with maximum degree bounded by  $d_{\max}^2$ .*

*Proof of Lemma 2.* Let  $G$  denote the graph with  $N$  nodes which has an edge between  $i$  and  $j$  if  $A_{i\ell} = A_{j\ell} = 1$  for any node  $\ell$ , so that  $\ell$  is a common neighbor of both  $i$  and  $j$ . Since  $A$  has maximum degree  $d_{\max}$ , it can be seen that  $G$  has maximum degree  $d_{\max}^2$ .

To see that  $G$  is the dependency graph for  $\phi_1(X), \dots, \phi_N(X)$ , we observe that since treatments are assigned independently, if nodes  $i$  and  $j$  are not connected in  $G$ , they have no common neighbors in  $A$ , and hence  $\phi_i(X)$  and  $\phi_j(X)$  depend on disjoint treatments and are independent. Similarly, given disjoint subsets  $S_1$  and  $S_2$  with no edges between them in  $G$ , it follows that the sets  $\{\phi_i(X) : i \in S_1\}$  and  $\{\phi_i(X) : i \in S_2\}$  also depend on disjoint treatments and are independent, making  $G$  the dependency graph of  $\phi_1(X), \dots, \phi_N(X)$ .  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 2.* Let  $\Sigma$  equal the covariance matrix of  $\sqrt{N}T(X)$ , which may be non-invertible. We will show that  $\varpi^T T(X)$  is asymptotically normal for every non-zero vector  $\varpi \in \mathbb{R}^L$ , from which multivariate normality of  $T(X)$  will follow by Cramer-Wold device<sup>6</sup>. In turn, the delta method will imply that  $h(T(X))$  is asymptotically normal after centering and rescaling.

Given  $\varpi \in \mathbb{R}^L$ , it can be seen from condition A.3 that

$$\varpi^T (T(X) - \mathbb{E}T) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \varpi^T (\phi_i(X; \theta_i) - \mathbb{E}\phi_i(X; \theta_i))$$

Dividing by  $\sqrt{\text{Var}(\varpi^T T(X))} = \sqrt{\varpi^T \Sigma \varpi / N}$  yields

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\varpi^T (T - \mathbb{E}T)}{\sqrt{\text{Var}(\varpi^T T)}} &= \frac{\varpi^T (T - \mathbb{E}T)}{\sqrt{\varpi^T \Sigma \varpi}} \cdot \sqrt{N} \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{\varpi^T (\phi_i(X; \theta_i) - \mathbb{E}\phi_i(X; \theta_i))}{N} \cdot \sqrt{\frac{N}{\varpi^T \Sigma \varpi}} \quad (\text{S.8}) \end{aligned}$$

<sup>6</sup>while  $\Sigma$  may be non-invertible,  $T(X)$  is normal in the sense that its characteristic function exists and equals that of a normal distribution in a subspace of  $\mathbb{R}^K$

For any fixed  $\varpi$  not in the nullspace of  $\bar{\Sigma}$ , (S.8) can be seen to equal a sum of  $N$  zero-mean random variables that are bounded by  $O(1/\sqrt{N})$ , where we have used that  $\phi_i$  is bounded, and that  $\varpi^T \Sigma \varpi \rightarrow \varpi^T \bar{\Sigma} \varpi$ , which is bounded away from zero for  $\varpi$  not in the nullspace. As the variables in the sum are scaled and centered functions of  $\{\phi_i(X; \theta_i)\}$ , their dependency graph has maximum degree  $d_{\max}^2$  by Lemma 2. As a result, for  $\varpi \notin \text{nullspace}(\bar{\Sigma})$ , Theorem 3 can be applied to show that

$$\sqrt{N} \frac{\varpi^T (T - \mathbb{E}T)}{\sqrt{\varpi^T \Sigma \varpi}} \rightarrow_d N(0, 1) \quad (\text{S.9})$$

To apply Cramer-Wold, we must show that  $\sqrt{N} \cdot \varpi^T (T - \mathbb{E}T)$  converges in distribution to  $N(0, \varpi^T \bar{\Sigma} \varpi)$  for all vectors  $\varpi$ . To show this result for  $\varpi \notin \text{nullspace}(\bar{\Sigma})$ , (S.9) implies that

$$\sqrt{N} \cdot \varpi^T (T - \mathbb{E}T) \rightarrow_d N(0, \varpi^T \Sigma \varpi) \rightarrow_d N(0, \varpi^T \bar{\Sigma} \varpi),$$

as  $\Sigma \rightarrow \bar{\Sigma}$ . To show it for  $\varpi \in \text{nullspace}(\bar{\Sigma})$ , observe that

$$\begin{aligned} N \text{Var}(\varpi^T T) &= \varpi^T \Sigma \varpi \\ &\rightarrow \varpi^T \bar{\Sigma} \varpi = 0, \end{aligned}$$

and hence that  $\sqrt{N} \varpi^T (T - \mathbb{E}T) \rightarrow_d N(0, \varpi^T \bar{\Sigma} \varpi)$ .

As a result, by Cramer-Wold it follows that  $\sqrt{N}(T - \mathbb{E}T)$  is asymptotically  $N(0, \bar{\Sigma})$ . By the delta method (Theorem 2), this implies that  $\sqrt{N}(h(T) - h(\mathbb{E}T))$  is asymptotically normal, with non-vanishing variance by assumption A.5. Letting  $U = \max_{\vartheta} [\bar{w}^T \vartheta + z_{1-\alpha} \sqrt{\text{Var}(w(X)^T \vartheta)}]$ , it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{P}\left(w(X)^T \theta \geq U\right) \\ &= \mathbb{P}\left(w(X)^T \theta \geq \max_{\vartheta} \left[\bar{w}^T \vartheta + z_{1-\alpha} \sqrt{\text{Var}(w(X)^T \vartheta)}\right]\right) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}\left(w(X)^T \theta \geq \bar{w}^T \theta + z_{1-\alpha} \sqrt{\text{Var}(w(X)^T \theta)}\right) \\ &= \mathbb{P}\left(\frac{w(X)^T \theta - \bar{w}^T \theta}{\sqrt{\text{Var}(w(X)^T \theta)}} \geq z_{1-\alpha}\right) \\ &= \mathbb{P}\left(\frac{h(T(X)) - h(\mathbb{E}T)}{\sqrt{\text{Var}[h(T(X))]} } \geq z_{1-\alpha}\right) \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S.10})$$

$$\rightarrow \alpha + o(1), \quad (\text{S.11})$$

where (S.10) holds because  $h(T(X)) = w(X)^T \theta$ ,  $h(\mathbb{E}T) = \bar{w}^T \theta$ , and  $N \text{Var}(w(X)^T \theta) \rightarrow N \text{Var}[h(T(X))] > 0$ , and (S.11) follows from the asymptotic non-degenerate normality of  $\sqrt{N}h(T(X))$ .

As this shows that  $w^T \theta \leq U$  with probability asymptotically at least  $1 - \alpha$ , it follows that

$$w^T Y - w^T \theta \geq w^T Y - U$$

holds with the same probability. This proves the lower bound of the prediction interval for  $w^T (Y - \theta)$ . The proof of the upper bound proceeds analogously.  $\square$

### B.3 Proof of Corollaries 1 and 2

To prove Corollaries 1 and 2, we must show that  $w(X)^T\theta = h(T(X))$  for some smooth function  $h$ , and verify that  $\bar{w}^T\theta = h(\mathbb{E}T)$ , as required to apply Proposition 2.

*Proof of Corollary 1.* Let  $M \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$  and  $v \in \mathbb{R}$  equal

$$M = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \xi(X)\xi(X)^T, \quad v = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \theta_i \xi(X),$$

It can be seen that  $T(X) = N^{-1} \sum_i \phi_i(X)$  equals

$$T(X) = \begin{bmatrix} \text{vec}(M) \\ v \end{bmatrix},$$

where  $\text{vec}(M)$  denotes the vector in which the columns of  $M$  are stacked on top of each other. Since  $w(X)^T\theta$  satisfies

$$w(X)^T\theta = M^{-1}v,$$

it follows that  $w(X)^T\theta$  can be written as  $h(T(X))$  for a smooth function  $h$ . From this and the assumptions of Corollary 1, condition A.3 of Proposition 2 is fulfilled. It can also be seen that  $\bar{w}^T\theta = h(\mathbb{E}T)$ . As the remaining conditions of Proposition 2 are assumed by the corollary, the proposition follows. □

*Proof of Corollary 2.* Let  $v^1, v^2, v^3, v^4 \in \mathbb{R}^K$  be given by

$$\begin{aligned} v_k^{(1)} &= n_k/N, & k &= 1, \dots, K \\ v_k^{(2)} &= \frac{1}{n_k} \sum_{i \in \Pi_k} W_i, & k &= 1, \dots, K \\ v_k^{(3)} &= \frac{1}{n_k} \sum_{i \in \Pi_k} \theta_i, & k &= 1, \dots, K \\ v_k^{(4)} &= \frac{1}{n_k} \sum_{i \in \Pi_k} W_i \theta_i, & k &= 1, \dots, K \end{aligned}$$

It can be seen that  $T(X) = N^{-1} \sum_i \phi_i(X)$  equals

$$T(X) = \begin{bmatrix} v^{(1)} \\ v^{(2)} \\ v^{(3)} \\ v^{(4)} \end{bmatrix}$$

It can be seen that  $w(X)^T\theta$  can be written as  $h(T(X))$  for a smooth

function  $h$ , by the following steps

$$\begin{aligned}
w(X)^T \theta &= \sum_{k=1}^K \frac{n_k}{N} \left[ \sum_{i \in \Pi_k} \frac{W_i \theta_i}{n_{k1}} - \sum_{i \in \Pi_k} \frac{(1 - W_i) \theta_i}{n_{k0}} \right] \\
&= \sum_{k=1}^K \frac{n_k}{N} \left[ \sum_{i \in \Pi_k} W_i \theta_i \left( \frac{1}{n_{k1}} + \frac{1}{n_{k0}} \right) - \sum_{i \in \Pi_k} \frac{\theta_i}{n_{k0}} \right] \\
&= \sum_{k=1}^K v_k^{(1)} \left[ v_k^{(4)} \left( \frac{1}{v_k^{(2)}} + \frac{1}{1 - v_k^{(2)}} \right) - \frac{v_k^{(3)}}{1 - v_k^{(2)}} \right] \\
&= h(T(X))
\end{aligned}$$

From this and the assumptions of Corollary 2, condition A.3 of Proposition 2 is fulfilled. It can also be seen that  $\bar{w}^T \theta = h(\mathbb{E}T)$ . As the remaining conditions of Proposition 2 are assumed by the corollary, the proposition follows.  $\square$

## B.4 An Alternate Prediction Interval for $\beta^{\text{adj}}$

Proposition 3 gives an alternative prediction interval for  $\beta^{\text{adj}}$ , whose validity holds under different conditions than those assumed by Proposition 2. In particular, here we assume that treatments are assigned by sampling without replacement, and we do not require the variance of  $\sqrt{N} \cdot w(X)^T \theta$  to be non-vanishing.

**Proposition 3.** *Given constants  $d_{\max}, b_{\min} > 0$ , and  $\rho \in (0, 1)$ , assume a sequence of experiments in which  $N \rightarrow \infty$ , where treatment is assigned by sampling  $N_1$  units without replacement, with  $N_1/N \rightarrow \rho$ ; the adjacency matrix  $A$  has in-degree and out-degree bounded by  $d_{\max}$ ;  $\mathbb{E}[(Z_i - \zeta_{k(i)})^2] \geq b_{\min}$  for a non-vanishing fraction of units; and  $\theta \in \{0, 1\}^N$ .*

Let  $\hat{\beta}^{\text{adj}}$  denote the estimate

$$\hat{\beta}^{\text{adj}} = \left( \sum_{i=1}^N (Z_i - \zeta_{k(i)})^2 \right)^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N (Z_i - \zeta_{k(i)}) Y_i, \quad (\text{S.12})$$

and let  $a(X) \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $v(X) \in \mathbb{R}^N$  be given by

$$a(X) = \left( \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N (Z_i - \zeta_{k(i)})^2 \right)^{-1} \quad \text{and} \quad v_i(x) = \frac{Z_i - \zeta_{k(i)}}{N}, \quad i = 1, \dots, N,$$

and let  $\bar{a} = (\mathbb{E} [\frac{1}{N} \sum_i (Z_i - \zeta_{k(i)})^2])^{-1}$ . Let  $U$  and  $L$  equal

$$U = \max_{\theta} a(X) \mathbb{E} v(X)^T \theta + \bar{a} z_{1-\frac{\alpha}{2}} \max \left\{ \sqrt{\text{Var}[v(X)^T \theta]}, \frac{\log N}{N} \right\} \quad (\text{S.13})$$

$$L = \min_{\theta} a(X) \mathbb{E} v(X)^T \theta - \bar{a} z_{1-\frac{\alpha}{2}} \max \left\{ \sqrt{\text{Var}[v(X)^T \theta]}, \frac{\log N}{N} \right\}. \quad (\text{S.14})$$

Then  $\beta^{adj}$  is contained by the interval  $\hat{\beta}^{adj} - [U, L]$ , with probability asymptotically lower bounded by  $(1 - \alpha)$ .

Proposition 3 contains two technicalities. First, it requires that  $\mathbb{E}[(Z_i - Z_{k(i)})^2] \geq b_{\min}$  for a non-vanishing fraction of units. This limits degenerate cases, such as when a propensity class contains only one unit. Second, the interval width is lower bounded by  $\frac{\log N}{N}$  (which is much smaller than the usual  $N^{-1/2}$  rate). This ensures coverage in the event that asymptotic normality does not hold for  $v(X)^T \theta$ , such as when  $\sum_i \theta_i = O(1)$ .

The equations (S.13)-(S.14) can be solved by the methods discussed in Section 3.3.

### B.4.1 Proof of Proposition 3

Our proof of Proposition 3 will use the following helper lemmas: Lemma 3, which states that  $a(X) \rightarrow_p \bar{a}$ ; and Lemma 4, which gives a central limit theorem for  $(v(X) - \bar{v})^T \theta$ , and also gives an expression for its variance.

**Lemma 3.** *Let the assumptions and definitions of Proposition 3 hold. Then  $a(X)$  converges in probability to  $\bar{a}$ .*

**Lemma 4.** *Let the assumptions and definitions of Proposition 3 hold. Let  $\bar{\theta}_{\Pi_k(j)}$  denote the average of  $\theta$  over the propensity class of unit  $j$ , and let  $u_1, \dots, u_N$  be given by*

$$u_i = \frac{N_1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N (\theta_j - \bar{\theta}_{\Pi_k(j)}) A_{ji},$$

and let  $\sigma_u^2$  be given by

$$\frac{1}{N-1} \sum_i (u_i - \bar{u})^2,$$

where  $\bar{u} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_i u_i$ . Then the variance of  $v(X)^T \theta$  is given by

$$\text{Var}(v(X)^T \theta) = \frac{1}{N_1} \frac{N_0}{N} \sigma_u^2,$$

and if  $\sigma_u^2 \geq N_1^{-1} \log N$ , it holds that

$$\frac{(v(X) - \bar{v})^T \theta}{\sqrt{\text{Var}(v(X)^T \theta)}}$$

is asymptotically normal distributed.

The proof of Lemma 3 will use the Azuma-Hoeffding (or McDiarmid's) inequality (Boucheron et al., 2013, Thm 6.2), which states that given independent variables  $X = (X_1, \dots, X_N)$ , and a function satisfying the bounded difference property

$$|f(X) - f(X')| \leq c_i \text{ if } X_j = X'_j \text{ for all } j \neq i,$$

it holds that  $\mathbb{P}(|f(X) - \mathbb{E}f| > t) \leq 2 \exp(-2t^2 / \sum_i c_i^2)$ .

We first prove Proposition 3, and then give proofs for Lemmas 3, and 4.

*Proof of Proposition 3.* Let  $\sigma_u^2$  be defined as in the statement of Lemma 4, and divide the sequence of experiments assumed by Proposition 3 into two subsequences: (i) those for which  $\sigma_u^2 > N_1^{-1} \log N$ , and (ii) those for which  $\sigma_u^2 \leq N_1^{-1} \log N$ . Let  $a$  and  $v$  abbreviate  $a(X)$  and  $v(X)$ .

To prove the proposition, we will show that the probability that  $av^T\theta$  exceeds the upper bound of the prediction interval is asymptotically bounded by  $\alpha$  for both subsequences (i) and (ii). For subsequence (i), this probability satisfies

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{P}\left(av^T\theta \geq \max_{\theta} \left[ a\bar{v}^T\theta + z_{1-\alpha}\bar{a}\sqrt{\text{Var}(v^T\theta)} \right]\right) \\
& \leq \mathbb{P}\left(av^T\theta \geq a\bar{v}^T\theta + z_{1-\alpha}\bar{a}\sqrt{\text{Var}(v^T\theta)}\right) \\
& = \mathbb{P}\left(\frac{a(v-\bar{v})^T\theta}{\bar{a}\sqrt{\text{Var}(v^T\theta)}} \geq z_{1-\alpha}\right) \\
& = \alpha + o(1)
\end{aligned} \tag{S.15}$$

where (S.15) follows from Slutsky's theorem as  $a/\bar{a} \rightarrow_p 1$  by Lemma 3, and

$$\frac{(v-\bar{v})^T\theta}{\sqrt{\text{Var}(v^T\theta)}}$$

converges in distribution to a standard normal by Lemma 4, and hence their product is asymptotically normal as well.

We now show the same for subsequence (ii). Let  $r_n = (\log N)^2/N^2$ . It holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{P}\left(av^T\theta \geq \max_{\theta} \left[ a\bar{v}^T\theta + z_{1-\alpha}\bar{a}\sqrt{r_n} \right]\right) \\
& \leq \mathbb{P}\left(av^T\theta \geq a\bar{v}^T\theta + z_{1-\alpha}\bar{a}\sqrt{r_n}\right) \\
& = \mathbb{P}\left(\frac{a(v-\bar{v})^T\theta}{\bar{a}\sqrt{r_n}} \geq z_{1-\alpha}\right) \\
& = o(1)
\end{aligned} \tag{S.16}$$

where (S.16) follows from Slutsky's theorem as  $a/\bar{a} \rightarrow_p 1$  by Lemma 3, and

$$\frac{(v-\bar{v})^T\theta}{\sqrt{r_n}} \rightarrow_p 0$$

by Chebychev's inequality as  $r_n \gg \text{Var}(v(X)^T\theta)$  for subsequence (ii), implying that their product converges to zero as well.

Combining (S.15) and (S.16) implies that

$$\mathbb{P}\left(av^T\theta \geq \max_{\theta} \left[ a\bar{v}^T\theta + z_{1-\alpha}\bar{a}\sqrt{\max\{r_n, \text{Var}(v^T\theta)\}} \right]\right) \leq \alpha + o(1) \tag{S.17}$$

for both subsequences (i) and (ii). Substituting  $av^T\theta = \hat{\beta}^{\text{adj}} - \beta^{\text{adj}}$ , and  $U = \max_{\theta} \left[ a\bar{v}^T\theta + z_{1-\alpha}\bar{a}\sqrt{\max\{r_n, \text{Var}(v^T\theta)\}} \right]$  into (S.17) implies

$$\mathbb{P}(\hat{\beta}^{\text{adj}} - \beta^{\text{adj}} \leq U) \geq 1 - \alpha + o(1),$$

and hence that  $\beta^{\text{adj}} \geq \hat{\beta}^{\text{adj}} - U$  with probability at least  $1 - \alpha + o(1)$  as well. This is the lower bound of the PI for  $\beta^{\text{adj}}$ . The proof of the upper bound proceeds analogously.  $\square$

*Proof of Lemma 3.* We will couple  $X$  with a vector  $\tilde{X} \in \{0, 1\}^N$  whose entries are i.i.d. Bernoulli( $N_1/N$ ). To do this, let  $\tilde{N}_1$  denote the number of selected units in  $\tilde{X}$ ,

$$\tilde{N}_1 = \sum_i \tilde{X}_i,$$

and let  $X$  be generated from  $\tilde{X}$  in the following manner. If  $\tilde{N}_1 > N_1$ , randomly sample  $\tilde{N}_1 - N_1$  entries without replacement from  $\{i : \tilde{X}_i = 1\}$ , and change their values to 0; if  $\tilde{N}_1 \leq N_1$ , randomly sample and alter  $N_1 - \tilde{N}_1$  entries from  $\{i : \tilde{X}_i = 0\}$  in likewise fashion. The resulting vector has exactly  $N_1$  entries equal to 1, and is uniformly drawn from the set of all such vectors; hence, the resulting vector has the required distribution for  $X$ .

Let  $b(x) = a^{-1}(x)$ , so that  $b(X)$  equals

$$b(X) = \sum_{i=1}^N (Z_i - \zeta_{k(i)})^2.$$

To prove the proposition, we will show 3 steps. First, we show that  $b$  satisfies a bounded difference property, so that if  $x$  and  $x'$  are vectors in  $\{0, 1\}^N$  differing in a single entry, then

$$|b(x) - b(x')| \leq \frac{d_{\max}^2}{N}. \quad (\text{S.18})$$

Second, we will use (S.18) to show that

$$a(\tilde{X}) = \bar{a}(1 + o_P(1)). \quad (\text{S.19})$$

Third, we will show that

$$a(X) = a(\tilde{X})(1 + o_P(1)). \quad (\text{S.20})$$

Together (S.19) and (S.20) imply that  $a(X) = \bar{a}(1 + o_P(1))$ , proving the claim.

We first show (S.18). It can be seen that  $Z = AX$ , and that the vector  $v(X)$  can be written as

$$v(X) = \frac{1}{N}(I - P)AX, \quad (\text{S.21})$$

where  $P$  is a projection matrix given by

$$P_{ij} = \frac{1\{k(i) = k(j)\}}{|\Pi_{k(i)}|}. \quad (\text{S.22})$$

Similarly,  $b(X)$  can be written as

$$b(X) = \frac{1}{N}X^T A^T (I - P)AX,$$

where we have used the identity that  $(I - P)^T(I - P) = I - P$  when  $P$  is a projection matrix. Letting  $X' = X + \delta$ , it thus follows that

$$\begin{aligned} b(X) - b(X') &= \frac{1}{N}(X + \delta)^T A^T (I - P) A (X + \delta) - \frac{1}{N} X^T A^T (I - P) A X \\ &= \frac{1}{N} 2\delta^T A^T (I - P) A X + \frac{1}{N} \delta^T A^T (I - P) A \delta \\ &= 2\delta^T A^T v(X) + \frac{1}{N} \delta^T A^T (I - P) A \delta. \end{aligned}$$

For  $X$  and  $X'$  differing in only one entry,  $\delta$  is equal to the vector of all zeros except one entry equal in  $[-1, 1]$ , and it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} |b(X) - b(X')| &\leq |2\delta^T A^T v(X)| + \left| \frac{1}{N} \delta^T A^T (I - P) A \delta \right| \\ &\leq \frac{d_{\max}^2}{N} + \frac{d_{\max}}{N}, \end{aligned}$$

which proves (S.18). Here we have used that  $A$  has maximum in-degree and out-degree  $d_{\max}$ , and that the entries of  $v(X)$  are bounded by  $d_{\max}/N$ .

We next show (S.19). Using the bounded difference property (S.18), the Azuma-Hoeffding inequality implies that

$$\mathbb{E} \left( |b(\tilde{X}) - \mathbb{E}b| \geq t \right) \leq \exp \left( \frac{-t^2 N}{d_{\max}^2} \right), \quad (\text{S.23})$$

which implies that  $b(\tilde{X}) \rightarrow_p \mathbb{E}b(\tilde{X})$ . Using this with  $\mathbb{E}b(\tilde{X}) = \Omega(1)$  and  $a(\tilde{X}) = 1/b(\tilde{X})$ , it follows that  $a(\tilde{X}) = \bar{a}(1 + o_P(1))$ . This shows (S.19).

We finally show (S.20). We observe that since  $\mathbb{E}\tilde{N}_1 = N_1$ , Hoeffding's inequality implies that

$$\mathbb{P}(|\tilde{N}_1 - N_1| \geq \sqrt{N} \log N) \leq \exp(-\frac{1}{2} \log N),$$

which implies that  $\|\tilde{X} - X\|_1 = o_p(\sqrt{N} \log N)$ . Hence by the bounded difference property (S.18) it holds that

$$|b(\tilde{X}) - b(X)| = o_P(1),$$

and hence by continuity that  $a(\tilde{X}) - a(X) = o_P(1) = o_P(a(X))$  as well, proving (S.20). This completes the proof of the lemma.  $\square$

*Proof of Lemma 4.* We begin with the observation that

$$v(X)^T \theta = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N (Z_i - \zeta_{k(i)}) \theta_i,$$

and hence can be written using projection matrix  $P$  defined by (S.22) as

$$\begin{aligned} v(X)^T \theta &= \frac{1}{N} \theta^T (I - P) A X \\ &= \frac{1}{N_1} \frac{N_1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \left( \sum_{j=1}^N (\theta_j - \bar{\theta}_{\Pi_k(j)}) A_{ji} \right) X_i \\ &= \frac{1}{N_1} \sum_{i=1}^N u_i X_i, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S.24})$$

This can be seen to equal the average of  $N_1$  units sampled without replacement from  $u_1, \dots, u_N$ , and thus has variance

$$\text{Var}[v(X)^T \theta] = \frac{1}{N_1} \frac{N_0}{N} \sigma_u^2.$$

It can be seen that

$$\max_i (u_i - \bar{u})^2 = O(d_{\max}^2),$$

and as  $\sigma_u^2 > N_1^{-1} \log N$ , it holds that

$$\frac{1}{\min(N_1, N - N_1)} \frac{\max_i (u_i - \bar{u})^2}{\sigma_u^2} \rightarrow 0,$$

and hence the lemma follows from the CLT given by Theorem 1 (Li and Ding, 2017, Thm. 1).  $\square$

## C Summary Information for Data Sets

Here we give tables to summarize the simulated cholera trial outcomes released by Perez-Heydrich et al. (2014), insurance takeup by farmers in the experiment of Cai et al. (2015), and wristband-wearing decisions made by students in the school interventions described in Paluck et al. (2016). An aggregate table of the actual outcomes for the cholera trial is given by Table 3.

Vaccination Rate	Cases, placebo	Cases, vaccine
0-25%	50/111 (45%)	37/144 (26%)
25-50%	73/282 (25%)	81/464 (17%)
50-75%	24/183 (13%)	42/480 (9%)
75-100%	2/13 (15%)	4/110 (4%)
Total	149/589 (25%)	164/1198 (14%)

Table S5: Outcomes for simulated cholera trial dataset

A comparison of Tables S5 and 3 shows that the actual population is much larger than the simulated data set ( $N=74K$  vs  $1.7K$ ), and has much lower rates of cholera incidence (0.003 vs 0.17). As the simulated outcomes were fit to the actual data as a function of treatment (including neighborhood vaccination) and observed covariates (age and distance to water), we speculate that the covariate distributions were shifted to a higher-risk subpopulation.

Perez-Heydrich et al. (2014) gives some information regarding the simulation parameters, stating that the outcome for unit  $j$  in neighborhood  $i$  was determined by a logistic regression model

$$\log \text{odds} P(Y_{ij} = 1) = 0.5 - 0.788a - 2.953\alpha_i - 0.098X_{ij1} - 0.145X_{ij2} + 0.35a\alpha_i,$$

where  $a$  is the unit treatment;  $\alpha_i$  was the neighborhood vaccination rate if  $j$ 's treatment equals  $a$ ;  $X_{ij1}$  and  $X_{ij2}$  denote  $j$ 's age (in decades) and distance to the nearest river (in km), which were randomly generated. Treatments were assigned i.i.d. Bernoulli(2/3). Units were generated by simulating the covariate  $X$ , and then selecting units to participate in the trial by a logistic regression model

$$\log \text{odds}P(\text{participate}_{ij}) = 0.2727 - 0.0387X_{ij1} + 0.2179X_{ij2} + b_i,$$

where  $b_i$  is a random neighborhood-level effect.

Table S6 gives summary statistics for the experiment of [Cai et al. \(2015\)](#). In this experiment, units were randomized not only by first or second round and by high or low information, but also whether or not the second round units were shown a list of names corresponding to people who had purchased the insurance product in the first round. When studying the effects of informal communication between rounds, the analysis of [Cai et al. \(2015\)](#) is restricted to the “no info” group which excludes those units who were shown such a list, and we follow their example in our analysis as well.

Exposure (# of high info friends)	Insurance Takeup
0	116/293 (40%)
1	196/454 (43%)
2	96/171 (56%)
3	21/46 (46%)
4	5/8 (63%)
5	1/1 (100%)
Total	435/973 (45%)

Table S6: Outcomes for insurance purchases of farmers, for “no info” group used by [Cai et al. \(2015\)](#)

Table S7 gives summary statistics for the experiment of [Paluck et al. \(2016\)](#). For this experiment, the analysis of the wristband outcomes in [Paluck et al. \(2016\)](#) and [Aronow and Samii \(2017\)](#) restricts to units who had positive probability of being assigned to one of the four treatment outcomes that were considered, meaning that they were eligible units with at least one eligible friend, and we follow their example in our analysis as well.

Treated?	$\geq 1$ Treated Friend?	Outcome
No	No	12/158 (7%)
No	Yes	61/374 (16%)
Yes	No	53/201 (26%)
Yes	Yes	103/333 (31%)
Total		229/1066 (21%)

Table S7: Outcomes for school intervention

## References

- Boucheron, S., Lugosi, G., and Massart, P. (2013). *Concentration inequalities: A nonasymptotic theory of independence*. Oxford university press.
- Li, X. and Ding, P. (2017). General forms of finite population central limit theorems with applications to causal inference. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 112(520):1759–1769.
- Van der Vaart, A. W. (2000). *Asymptotic statistics*, volume 3. Cambridge university press.