Integrating Reward Maximization and Population Estimation: Sequential Decision-Making for Internal Revenue Service Audit Selection

Peter Henderson 1  Ben Chugg 1  Brandon Anderson 2  Kristen Altenburger 1  Alex Turk 2  John L. Guyton 2  Jacob Goldin 1  Daniel E. Ho 1

Abstract

We introduce a new setting, optimize-and-estimate structured bandits. Here, a policy must select a batch of arms, each characterized by its own context, that would allow it to both maximize reward and maintain an accurate (ideally unbiased) population estimate of the reward. This setting is inherent to many public and private sector applications and often requires handling delayed feedback, small data, and distribution shifts. We demonstrate its importance on real data from the United States Internal Revenue Service (IRS). The IRS performs yearly audits of the tax base. Two of its most important objectives are to identify suspected misreporting and to estimate the “tax gap” — the global difference between the amount paid and true amount owed. We cast these two processes as a unified optimize-and-estimate structured bandit. We provide a novel mechanism for unbiased population estimation that achieves rewards comparable to baseline approaches. This approach has the potential to improve audit efficacy, while maintaining policy-relevant estimates of the tax gap. This has important social consequences given that the current tax gap is estimated at nearly half a trillion dollars. We suggest that this problem setting is fertile ground for further research and we highlight its interesting challenges.

1. Introduction

Sequential decision-making algorithms, like bandit algorithms and active learning, have been used across a number of domains: from ad targeting to clinical trial optimization (Bouneffouf & Rish, 2019). Across the public sector, these methods are not yet widely adopted, but could improve the efficiency and quality of government services if deployed with care. Henderson et al. (2021) provide a review of this potential. Many administrative enforcement agencies in the U.S. face the challenge of allocating scarce resources for auditing regulatory non-compliance. But these agencies must also balance additional constraints and objectives simultaneously, in particular maintaining an accurate estimate of population non-compliance to inform policy.

In this paper, we focus on the potential of unifying audit processes with these multiple objectives under a bandit-like framework. We call our setting optimize-and-estimate structured bandits. This framework is useful in practical settings, challenging, and has the potential to unify methods from survey sampling, bandits, and active learning. This new setting poses an interesting and novel challenge for the machine learning community and can benefit many public and private sector applications. We illustrate this framework with a case study of the Internal Revenue Service (IRS).

The IRS selects taxpayers to audit every year to detect under-reported tax liability. Improving audit selection could yield 10:1 returns in revenue and help fund socially beneficial programs (Sarin & Summers, 2019). But the agency must also provide an accurate assessment of the tax gap (the projected amount of tax under-reporting if all taxpayers were audited). Currently, the IRS accomplishes this via two separate mechanisms: (1) a stratified random sample to estimate the tax gap; (2) a focused risk-selected sample of taxpayers to collect under-reported taxes. 1

Based on a two year collaboration with the IRS, we were provided with full micro data access to masked audit data. We investigate whether these separate mechanisms and objectives can be combined into one batched structured bandit algorithm, which must both maximize reward and maintain accurate population estimates. Ideally, if information is reused, the system can make strategic selections to balance the two objectives.

1The IRS balances a number of other objectives that we don’t explicitly consider here, such as the deterrence effects of audit selection on tax evasion.
We benchmark several sampling approaches and examine the trade-offs between them. We identify several interesting results and challenges using historical taxpayer audit data in collaboration with the IRS.

First, we introduce a novel sampling mechanism called Adaptive Bin Sampling (ABS) which guarantees an unbiased population estimate by employing a Horvitz-Thompson approach (Horvitz & Thompson, 1952), but is comparable to other methods for cumulative reward. Its unbiasedness and comparable reward comes at the cost of additional variance, though the method provides fine-grained control of this variance-reward trade-off.

Second, we compare this approach to $\epsilon$-greedy and optimism-based approaches, where a model-based population estimate is used. We find that model-based approaches are biased absent substantial reliance on $\epsilon$, but low in variance. Surprisingly, we find that greedy approaches perform well in terms of reward, reinforcing findings by Bietti et al. (2018) and Bastani et al. (2021). But we find the bias from population estimates in the greedy regime to be substantial. These biases are greatly reduced even with small amounts of random exploration.

Third, we show that more reward-optimal approaches tend to sample high-income earners versus low-income earners. And more reward-optimal approaches tend to audit fewer tax returns that yield no change (a reward close to 0). This reinforces the importance of reducing the amount of unnecessary exploration, which would place audit burdens on compliant taxpayers. Appendix C details other ethical and societal considerations taken into account with this work.

Fourth, we show that model errors are heteroskedastic, resulting in more audits of high-income earners by optimism-based methods, but not yielding greater rewards.2

We demonstrate combining random and focused audits into a single framework can more efficiently maximize revenue while retaining accuracy for estimating the tax gap. While additional research is needed in this new and challenging domain, this work demonstrates the promise of applying a bandit-like approach to the IRS setting, and optimize-and-estimate settings more broadly.

2. Related Work

There is growing interest in the application of ML to detecting fraudulent financial statements (Dickey et al., 2019; Bertomeu et al., 2021). Previous methods have included unsupervised outlier detection (de Roux et al., 2018), decision trees (Kotsiantis et al., 2006), and analyzing statements with NLP (Sifa et al., 2019). Closer to our methodology is a bandit approach is used by Soemers et al. (2018) to detect fraudulent credit card transactions. Meanwhile, Zheng et al. (2020) propose reinforcement learning to learn optimal tax policies, but do not focus on enforcement. Finally, some work has investigated the use of machine learning for improved audit selection in various settings (Howard et al., 2020; Ash et al., 2021; Mittal et al., 2018). But none of these approaches takes into account population estimation and some do not use sequential decision-making.

Some prior work has investigated general multi-objective optimization in the context of bandits (Drugan & Nowé, 2014; Tekin & Turğay, 2018; Turgay et al., 2018). A large body of work seeks to improve hypothesis testing efficiency via an active learning or structured bandit process (Kato et al., 2020; Mukherjee et al., 2020). The closest work to our own is that of Liu et al. (2014), Erraqabi et al. (2017), Rafferty et al. (2018), and Chugg & Ho (2021). In those works, the authors trade off maximizing some reward objective with estimation of a metric. However, like other adaptive experimentation literature, these works are in the multi-armed bandit (MAB) setting (Lai & Robbins, 1985). Our work on the other hand deals with the unique challenges of the IRS setting, requiring the use of optimize-and-estimate structured bandits – where arms must be selected in batches, each with their own context, and rewards are delayed.

Several works are close to the structured bandit approach we examine here (without population estimation). In those, the problem is framed as a contextual bandit where rewards are delivered in piles at some point later in time (Huang & Lin, 2016; Lansdell et al., 2019; Chatterji et al., 2021).

To our knowledge the optimize-and-estimate structured bandit setting has not been proposed as we describe it here.

3. Background

Institutional Background. The IRS maintains two distinct categories of audit processes. National Research Program (NRP) audits are aimed at population estimation of non-compliance while Operational (Op) audits are aimed at collecting taxes from non-compliant returns. The NRP is a core measurement program for the Internal Revenue Service (IRS) to regularly evaluate tax non-compliance (Government Accountability Office, 2002; 2003). The NRP randomly selects, via a stratified random sample, around 15k tax returns each year for research audits (Andreoni et al., 1998; Johns & Slemrod, 2010; Internal Revenue Service, 2016; 2019), although this has been decreasing in recent years and there is pressure to reduce it further (Marr & Murray, 2016; Congressional Budget Office, 2020). These audits are used to identify new areas of noncompliance, estimate the overall tax gap (Internal Revenue Service, 2016; 2019), and estimate improper payments of certain tax credits.

2We note that it is possible that these stem from measurement limitations in the high income space (Guyton et al., 2021).
Given the most recent gross tax gap estimate of $441 billion (Internal Revenue Service, 2019), even minor increases in efficiency can yield large returns.

In addition to its use for tax gap estimation, NRP serves as a training set for certain Op audit programs like the Discriminant Inventory Function (DIF) System, which is based on a modified Linear Discriminant Analysis (LDA) model (Lowe, 1976). DIF also incorporates other measures and policy objectives that we do not consider here, focusing instead on the stylized setting of only population estimation and reward maximization. Some Op audits are then selected from the DIF model by selecting tax returns to audit that have a high likelihood of a significant adjustment. It is important to highlight that Op data is not used for estimating the DIF risk model and is not used for estimating the tax gap (specifically, the individual income misreporting component of the tax gap). We illustrate this current process in Appendix E. Though NRP audits are jointly used for population estimates of non-compliance and risk model training, the original sampling design was not optimized for both revenue maximization and estimator accuracy for tax non-compliance. Random NRP audits have also been criticized for burdening compliant taxpayers and for failing to target known areas of known non-compliance (Lawsky, 2008). In this work we show that some randomness in auditing yields important benefits, but demonstrate how a unified process can efficiently maximize revenue while maintaining accurate estimates of the tax gap.

To some extent, the current process already exists as an informal sequential decision-making system. NRP strata are informed by the Op distribution, and are adjusted year-to-year. We posit that by formalizing the current IRS system in the form of a sequential decision-making problem, we can incorporate more methods that can improve the efficiency, accuracy, and fairness of the system.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th># Audits</th>
<th>( \mu - uw )</th>
<th>( \mu - w )</th>
<th>Cov. Drift</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>13403</td>
<td>$2258.07</td>
<td>$963.93</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>14220</td>
<td>$2213.64</td>
<td>$920.35</td>
<td>0.0143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>14656</td>
<td>$2442.33</td>
<td>$938.11</td>
<td>0.0141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>12756</td>
<td>$2159.62</td>
<td>$989.06</td>
<td>0.0197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>13481</td>
<td>$2177.26</td>
<td>$1034.47</td>
<td>0.0143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>13902</td>
<td>$3047.39</td>
<td>$1038.69</td>
<td>0.0315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>15635</td>
<td>$3921.93</td>
<td>$1041.12</td>
<td>0.0306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>14505</td>
<td>$3617.64</td>
<td>$1173.87</td>
<td>0.0211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>14357</td>
<td>$5024.25</td>
<td>$1218.01</td>
<td>0.0144</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Summary statistics by year of the average misreporting per audited taxpayer across the NRP sample. \( \mu - uw \) is unweighted mean, \( \mu - w \) is the mean weighted by NRP sample weights. Cov. drift is the year-over-year covariate drift (see Appendix D). We also include the average population no change rate and the number of taxpayers by audit class in Appendix E.

### Data
The data used throughout this work is from the NRP’s random sample (Andreoni et al., 1998; Johns & Slemrod, 2010; Internal Revenue Service, 2016; 2019), which we will treat as the full population of audited returns, since they are collected via a stratified random sample and represent the full population of taxpayers. The NRP sample is formed by dividing the taxpayer base into activity classes based on income and claimed tax credits, and various strata within each class. Each stratum is weighted to be representative of the national population of tax filers. Then a stratified random sample is taken across the classes. NRP audits seek to estimate the correctness of the whole return via a close to line-by-line examination (Belnap et al., 2020). This differs from Op audits, which are narrower in scope and focus on specific issues. Given the added expensive nature of NRP audits, NRP sample sizes are relatively small at around 15,000 audits per year (Guyton et al., 2018). The IRS uses these audits to estimate the tax gap and average non-compliance, with some statistical adjustments to compensate for some limitations to the NRP sampling approach, as well as for naturally occurring variation in the depth of audit (Guyton et al., 2020; Internal Revenue Service, 2012; 2016; 2019). These statistical adjustments will compensate for identifying taxpayer misreporting that is difficult to find via auditing, upweighting certain types of misreporting via a multiplier (Erard & Feinstein, 2011). For the goals of this work we ignore those adjustments.

Legal requirements for the accuracy of these estimates exist (Taxpayer Advocate Service, 2018). The 2018 Office of Management and Budget (OMB) guidelines, for instance, recommended that the estimates for these values be “statistically valid” (unbiased estimates of the mean) and have “±3% or better margin of error at the 95% confidence level for the improper payment percentage estimate” (Office of Management and Budget, 2018). Later OMB guidelines have provided more discretion to programs for developing feasible point estimates and confidence intervals (CIs) (Office of Management and Budget, 2021).

Our NRP stratified random audit sample covers from 2006 to 2014. We use 500 covariates as inputs to the model which are a superset of those currently used for fitting the DIF model. The covariates we use include every value reported by a taxpayer on a tax return. Table 1 provides summary statistics of the NRP research audits conducted on a yearly basis. Since NRP audits are stratified, the unweighted means represent the average adjustment made by the IRS to that year’s return for all audited taxpayers in the sample. The weighted mean takes into account stratification weights for each sample. One can think of the weighted mean as the average taxpayer misreporting across all taxpayers in the

---

3 We omit several hand-crafted and proprietary features used by DIF that are transformations of the base set of features we retain; the omitted features do not add additional external information.
United States, while the unweighted mean is the average taxpayer misreporting in the NRP sample.\footnote{Because we do not perform detection controlled estimation here, our estimates may be lower than reported by IRS.}

**Notation.** We formulate our models in a modified version of the structured bandit framework (Mersereau et al., 2009). In the MAB, an agent is given a finite set of arms \( \mathcal{A} \) to choose from. The agent pulls an arm at each timestep \( t \) and then observes a reward for that arm \( r^a(t) \). The agent then seeks to maximize the total reward, trading off exploration to find the optimal arm with exploitation in choosing the optimal reward as much as possible. The structured bandit setting assumes that arms can be parameterized by \( \theta \) such that pulling one arm may provide information about another arm. We modify this setting as follows.

At timestep \( t \), there is a set \( \mathcal{A}_t \) of \( N_t \) arms to choose from and a budget of \( K_t \) arms that can be chosen. After all \( K_t \) arms are chosen, their rewards are revealed. The goal is to maximize the average reward of the chosen batch of arms at a given timestep. However, the agent has an additional requirement that it be able to yield an accurate estimate of the average reward across all arms – even those that have not been chosen (the population reward). As in the structured bandit setting, we assume that the reward can be modeled by a function \( r^a_t = f_\theta(X^a_t) \) where \( X^a_t \) are some set of features associated with arm \( a \) at timestep \( t \), and \( \theta \) are the parameters of the true reward function. Thus, the agent must trade off exploration, exploitation, and accurate modeling.

In our IRS setting each arm \( (a_t) \) represents a taxpayer which the model could select for a given year \( t \). The associated features \( (X^a_t) \) are the 500 covariates in our data for the tax return. The reward \( (r^a_t) \) is the adjustment recorded after the audit. The population average reward that the agent seeks to accurately model is the average adjustment (summing together would instead provide the tax gap).

**4. Methods**

We focus on a suite of three key sampling methods: (1) \( \epsilon \)-greedy; (2) optimism-based approaches (3) ABS sampling.

**\( \epsilon \)-greedy.** Here we choose to sample randomly with probability \( \epsilon \). Otherwise, we select the observation with the highest predicted reward according to a fitted model \( f_\theta(X^a_t) \), where \( \theta \) indicates fitted model parameters. To batch sample, we repeat this process \( K \) times. The underlying model is then trained on the observed observation-reward pairs, and we repeat. For population estimation, we use a model-based approach (see, e.g., Esteban et al. 2019). After the model receives the true rewards from the sampled arms, the population estimate is predicted as: \( \hat{\mu}(t) = \frac{1}{\sum a \in \mathcal{A}_t} \sum a \in \mathcal{A}_t w_a f_\theta(X^a_t) \), where \( w_a \) is the NRP sample weight\footnote{The returns in each NRP strata can be weighted by the NRP sample weights to make the sample representative of the overall population, acting as inverse propensity weights. We choose to resample by NRP weights to get a close to true population estimate. See Appendix F for more discussion.} from the population distribution.

**Optimism.** We refer readers to Lattimore & Szepesvári (2020) for a general introduction to Upper Confidence Bound and optimism-based methods. We import an optimism-based approach into this setting as follows. Consider a random forest with \( B \) trees \( T_1, T_2, \ldots, T_B \). We form an optimistic estimate of the reward for each arm according to: \( \hat{\mu}(t) = \frac{1}{B} \sum_b T_b(X^a_t) + Z \text{Var}_b(T_b(X^a_t)) \), where \( Z \) is an exploration parameter based on the variance of the tree-based predictions, similar to Hutter et al. (2011). We select the \( K \) returns with the largest optimistic reward estimates. We shorthand this approach as UCB and use the same model-based population estimation method as \( \epsilon \)-greedy.

**ABS Sampling.** Adaptive Bin Sampling guarantees statistically unbiased population estimates, while enabling an explicit trade-off between reward and the variance of the...
estimate. If $K$ is the set of arms sampled during a period and each arm $a$ has non-zero probability of being selected, then 
\[
\hat{\mu}(t) = \frac{1}{\sum_{a} w_a} \sum_{a \in K} w_a \hat{\mu}_a
\]
is an unbiased estimate of the true population mean, where $w_a$ is the arm’s NRP weight and $p_a$ is an arm’s selection probability.

Roughly speaking, ABS chooses the selection probabilities $p_a$ to tradeoff between variance of $\hat{\mu}(t)$ and reward. We parameterize the predicted risk distribution $\{\hat{\mu}_a^t\}$ with a parameter $\alpha$ to obtain a smoothed distribution $\{\hat{\rho}_a^t\}$, from which we form the selection probabilities $\{p_a\}$. As $\alpha$ decreases, $\{\hat{\rho}_a^t\}$ approaches a uniform distribution which results in lower variance for $\hat{\mu}(t)$ but lower reward. As $\alpha$ increases, the variance of $\hat{\mu}(t)$ increases but so too does the reward.

More specifically, ABS has two main parameters, $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\zeta \in \{0, 1, \ldots, K\}$. First, we sample the top $\zeta$ returns with the highest predicted adjustments. Second, $\alpha$, mixes a logistic or exponential curve with the remaining predicted risk distribution. For example, for mixing with a logistic curve, predictions $\hat{\rho}_a^t$ are mapped as $\hat{\rho}_a^t = 1/(1 + e^{-\alpha(\hat{\mu}_a^t - \kappa)})$. $\kappa$ is the value of the $K$-th largest value amongst reward predictions $\{\hat{\mu}_a^t\}$, where we recall that $K$ is our batch size. Figure 1 provides a visualization of this mixing function for a logistic curve. Third, the transformed predictions $\hat{\rho}_a^t$ are stratified into $H$ bins (stratification is done by minimizing intra-strata variance according to a k-means fit). A probability distribution $\{\hat{\pi}_h\}$ is placed over the strata $\{S_h\}$ using the mean predicted reward of each, and the selection probabilities are then $p_a = (K - \zeta) \hat{\pi}_h / |S_h|$. The selection of the $K - \zeta$ arms is done by first sampling with replacement from $\pi$ and then, if stratum $h$ was sampled $\ell$ times, sampling $\ell$ returns from $h$ uniformly at random. Like with other HT-based methods (Potter, 1990; Alexander et al., 1997), to reduce variance we also add an option for a minimum probability of sampling a bin, which we call the trim %.

Reward Structure Models. As the data is highly nonlinear and high-dimensional, we use Random Forest Regression (RFR) for our reward model. We exclude linear models from our suite of algorithms after verifying that they consistently underperform RFR (Appendix I). We do not include neural networks in this analysis as the data regime is too small. Future approaches might build on this work using pretraining methods suited for a few-shot context (Bommasani et al., 2021).

We do compare to an LDA baseline. In the LDA baseline rather than regressing a predicted reward value for selection, we predict whether the true reward is greater than $200$ (our no-change cutoff). Arms are selected based on increasing likelihood that they are part of the $200+$ reward class. This is included both as context to our broad modeling decisions, and as an imperfect stylized proxy for one component of the current risk-based selection approach used by the IRS.

5. Evaluation Protocol

Metrics. We use four metrics to evaluate our models: cumulative reward, percent difference of the population estimate, the no-change rate, and rank adjusted reward efficiency.

Cumulative reward is simply the total reward of all arms selected by the agent across the entire time series. It represents the total amount of under-reported tax revenue returned to the government after auditing. This is averaged across seeds and denoted as $R$.

The percent difference is the difference between the estimated population average and the true population average: $100\% * (\hat{\mu} - \mu^*) / \mu^*$. We denote $\sigma_{PE}$ to be the standard deviation of the percent difference across random seeds (see more explanation in Appendix H.2). $\mu_{PE}$ is absolute mean percent difference across seeds. $\sqrt{\sigma_{PE}^2}$ is the root mean squared percent difference across every prediction (years and seeds).

The no-change rate is the percent of arms that yield no reward (we round down such that any reward <$200 is considered no change). We note that the no-change rate is of some importance. An audit that results in no adjustment can be perceived as unfair, because the taxpayer did not commit any wrongdoing (Lawsky, 2008). It can have adverse effects on future compliance (Beer et al., 2015; Lederman, 2018).

$\mu_{NR}$ is the average no change rate across seeds.

We also use rank adjusted reward efficiency (RARE) to evaluate how well the learned model ranks taxpayer audits based on risk and, for regression models, level of misreporting. This applies to model-based methods and is used to assist hyperparameter selection. See Appendix H.3.

Experimental Protocol. Our evaluation protocol for all experiments follows the same pattern. For a given year we offer 80% of the NRP sample as arms for the agent to select from. We repeat this process across 20 distinct random seeds such that there are 20 unique subsampled datasets that are shared across all methods, creating a sub-sampled bootstrap for CIs (more in Appendix O). Comparing methods seed-to-seed will be the same as comparing two methods on the same dataset. Each year, the agent has a budget of 600 arms to select from the population of 10k+ arms (description of budget selection in Appendix N). We delay the delivery of rewards for one year. This is because the majority of audits are completed and returned only after such a delay (DeBacker et al., 2018). Thus, the algorithm in year 2008 will only make decisions with the information from 2006. Because of this delay the first two years are randomly sampled for the entire budget (i.e., there is a warm start).

After receiving rewards for a given year, the agent must then provide a population estimate of the overall population average for the reward (i.e., the average tax adjustment after audit). This process repeats until 2014, the final year...
Table 2. We rank all methods and hyperparameters based on reward bands. We show the top reward band and best hyperparameter settings for each method in that reward band (where CIs across random seeds overlap indicated by “*”). See Section 5 for metric notation. ABS-1 is a hyperparameter configuration that focuses slightly more on reward at the cost of population estimation variance. ϵ-Greedy uses an ϵ of 0.1, UCB-1 has Z = 1, UCB-2 has a larger exploration factor of Z = 10. ABS-1 uses an exponential mixing function with 80% greedy sample, α = 5, and a 2.5% trim factor. ABS-2 uses a logistic mixing function, α = 0.5, a 5% trim, and 80% greedy sample. Both ABS methods use an unweighted fit while all other approaches saw improved results with a weighted fit. Extended table in Appendix P. Better reward hyperparameter settings are available for ABS at the cost of significantly higher population estimation variance, as can be seen in Figure 2.

6. Results

We highlight several key findings (more in Appendix P).

6.1. Unbiased population estimates are possible with little impact to reward

As seen in Table 2, ABS sampling can achieve similar returns to the best performing methods in terms of audit selection, while yielding an unbiased population estimate. Conversely, greedy, ϵ-greedy, and UCB approaches – which use a model-based population estimation method – do not achieve unbiased population estimates. Others have noted that adaptively collected data often have negative bias (Nie et al., 2018; Neel & Roth, 2018), leading to biased models. Future work might attempt debiasing model estimates. For ϵ-greedy, using the ϵ-sample only would achieve an unbiased estimate, yet due to its small sample size the variance is prohibitively high. Finally, ABS population estimates tend to be higher variance across runs, as is typical of HT estimators. This also results in higher root mean square percent difference for the ABS method as variance is reflected in this metric. It is possible to reduce this variance at the cost of reward (see Figure 2). Conversely, model-based estimates are significantly lower variance, but biased. This may be because models re-use information across years, whereas ABS does not. Future research could re-use information in ABS to reduce variance, perhaps with a model’s assistance.

6.2. ABS allows fine-grained control over the population estimation variance v. reward trade-off

We sample a grid of hyperparameters for ABS (selecting from different trim, α, and mixing function settings). Figure 2 shows that as we select more greedy samples in ABS, and reward consequently increases, the variance of the population estimate increases. We can control this variance with the trimming mechanism. This ensures that each bin of the risk distribution will be sampled some minimum amount. Figure 2 also demonstrates that when we add trimming, we can retain large rewards and unbiased population estimates. We can also keep variance down to 1.7x that of a random sample, though it is still larger than model-based methods.

6.3. Greedy is not all you need

As seen in Table 2, greedy surprisingly achieves optimal reward compared to all other methods. This is in line with prior work that has suggested that a purely greedy approach in contextual bandits might be enough to induce sufficient exploration under highly varied contexts (Bietti et al., 2018; Bastani et al., 2021). In our case, there are several intrinsic sources of exploration that may cause this result: intrinsic model error, covariate drift (see Table 1), highly varied contexts due to differences in tax filing compositions, and the fact that our population of arms already come from a stratified random sample (whose changing in composition year-to-year).

Figure 3 demonstrates greedy sampling’s implicit exploration for one random seed. As the years progress, greedy
Integrating Reward Maximization and Population Estimation

Figure 3. A kernel density plot of the distribution of sampled arms by reward from 2007, 2010, and 2014 (left to right, more in Appendix P). “True” refers to the density of all returns for the given year. X-axis is true reward. Y-axis is sampling distribution density.

is (correctly) more biased toward sampling arms with high rewards. Nonetheless, it yields a large number of arms that are the same as a random sample would yield. This inherent exploration backs the hypothesis that the test sample is highly stochastic, leading to implicit exploration. It is worth emphasizing that in a larger population and with a larger budget, greedy’s exploration may not be sufficient and more explicit exploration may be needed.

The key difference from our result and that of Bietti et al. (2018) and Bastani et al. (2021) is our additional population estimation objective. The greedy policy has a significant bias when it comes to model-based population estimation. This bias is similar – but not identical – to the bias reported in other adaptive data settings (Thrun & Schwartz, 1993; Nie et al., 2018; Shin et al., 2021; Farquhar et al., 2021). Even a 10% random sample – significantly underpowered for typical sampling-based estimation – can reduce this bias by more than 2.5× (see Table 2). Even if greedy can be optimal for a high-variance contextual bandit, it is not optimal for the optimize-and-estimate setting. We do note, however, that ε-greedy achieves a compromise between variance that may be more acceptable when some bias is permitted.

6.4. Using RFR significantly outperforms LDA

Figure 4 shows the cumulative return of ε-greedy sampling strategies using an LDA-based approach versus RFR-based approaches. FRO indicates that the RFR was fit to the random sample only. The key difference from our result and that of Bietti et al. (2018) and Bastani et al. (2021) is our additional population estimation objective. The greedy policy has a significant bias when it comes to model-based population estimation. This bias is similar – but not identical – to the bias reported in other adaptive data settings (Thrun & Schwartz, 1993; Nie et al., 2018; Shin et al., 2021; Farquhar et al., 2021). Even a 10% random sample – significantly underpowered for typical sampling-based estimation – can reduce this bias by more than 2.5× (see Table 2). Even if greedy can be optimal for a high-variance contextual bandit, it is not optimal for the optimize-and-estimate setting. We do note, however, that ε-greedy achieves a compromise between variance that may be more acceptable when some bias is permitted.

6.5. A more focused approach audits higher-income taxpayers

A key motivator for our work is that unnecessary randomness in audit selection will not only be suboptimal for the government, but could impose unnecessary burdens on taxpayers (Lawsky, 2008; Davis-Nozemack, 2012). In particular, an issue that has received increasing attention by policymakers and commentators in recent years concerns the fair allocation of audits by income (Kiel, 2019; Internal Revenue Service, 2021; Treasury, 2021). Although we do not take a normative position on the precise contours of a fair distribution of audits, we examine how alternative models shape the income distribution of audited taxpayers. As shown in Figure 5a, we find that as methods become more optimal we see an increase in the total positive income (TPI) of the individuals selected for audit (RF Greedy selects between $1.8M and $9.4M more cumulative TPI than LDA Greedy, effect size 95% CI matched by seed). In Figure 5b we show the distribution of ABS hyperparameter settings we sampled. As the settings are more likely to increase reward and decrease no change rates, the cumulative TPI increases. This indicates that low-income individuals are less likely to be audited as models are more likely to sample in the higher range of the risk distribution. We confirm this in Figure 5c.
which shows the distribution of activity classes sampled by different approaches. These classes are used as strata in the NRP sample. The UCB and RF Greedy approaches are more likely to audit taxpayers with more than $1M in TPI (with UCB sampling this class significantly more, likely due to heteroskedasticity). More optimal approaches also significantly sample those with <$200K in TPI, but more than $200K reported on their Schedule C or F tax return forms (used to report business and farm income, respectively).

6.6. Errors are heteroskedastic, leading to difficulties in using model-based optimism methods

We also find that, surprisingly, our optimism-based approach audits higher-income taxpayers more ($1.2M to $5.8M million cumulative TPI more than RF Greedy) despite yielding similar returns as the greedy approach. We believe this is because adjustments and model errors are heteroskedastic. Though total positive income is correlated with the adjustment amount (Pearson $r = 0.49$, $p < 10^{-5}$), all errors across model fits were heteroskedastic according to a Breusch–Pagan test ($p < 10^{-5}$). A potential source of large uncertainty estimates in the high income range could be because: (1) there are fewer datapoints in that part of the feature space; (2) NRP audits may not give an accurate picture of misreporting at the higher part of the income space, resulting in larger variance and uncertainty (Guyton et al., 2021); or (3) additional features are needed to improve precision in part of the state space. This leads to difficulties in using some optimism-based approaches since there is a confound between aleatoric and epistemic uncertainty. As a result, optimism-based approaches audit higher income individuals more often, but do not necessarily achieve higher returns. This poses another interesting challenge for future research.

7. Discussion

We have introduced the optimize-and-estimate structured bandit setting. The setting is motivated by common features of public sector applications (e.g., multiple objectives, batched selection, delayed feedback), where there is wide applicability of sequential decision making, but, to date, limited understanding of the unique methodological challenges. Our proposed ABS approach enables parties to explicitly trade off population estimation and reward maximization. We have shown how this framework addresses longstanding concerns in the real-world setting of IRS detection of tax evasion. It could shift audits toward higher income individuals and recover more revenue than the status quo, while maintaining an unbiased population estimate. Though there are other real-world objectives to consider, such as the effect of audit policies on tax evasion, our results suggest that unifying audit selection with estimation may help ensure that processes are as fair, optimal, and robust as possible.

We hope that the methods we describe here are a starting point for both additional research into sequential decision-making in public policy and new research into optimize-and-estimate structured bandits.
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Appendix

A. Software and Data

We are unable to publish even anonymized data due to statutory constraints. 26 U.S. Code § 6103. All code, however, is available at https://github.com/reglab/irs-optimize-and-estimate. We also provide datasets that can act as rough proxies to the IRS data for running the code, including the Public Use Microdata Sample (PUMS) (United States Census Bureau, 2018) and Annual Social and Economic Supplement (ASEC) of the Current Population Survey (CPS) (United States Census Bureau, 2019). These two datasets are provided by the U.S. Census Bureau. In this case, we use the proxy goal of identifying high-income earners with non-income-based features while maintaining an estimate of total population average income.

B. Carbon Impact Statement

As suggested by Henderson et al. (2020), we report the energy and carbon impacts of our experiments. While we are unable to calculate precise carbon emissions from hardware counters, we give an estimate of our carbon emissions. We estimate roughly 12 weeks of CPU usage total, including hyperparameter optimization and iteration on experiments, on two Intel Xeon Platinum CPUs with a TDP of 165 W each. This is equal to roughly 665 kWh of energy used and 471 kg CO$_2$ eq at the U.S. National Average carbon intensity.

C. Society/Ethics Statement

As part of the initial planning of this collaboration, the project proposal was presented to an Ethics Review Board and was reviewed by the IRS. While the risks of this retrospective study – which uses historical data – are minimal,
we are cognizant of distributive effects that targeted auditing may have. In this work we examine the distribution of audits across income, noting that more optimal models audit higher income taxpayers – in line with current policy proposals for fair tax auditing (Treasury, 2021). Our collaboration will also be investigating other notions of fairness in separate follow-on works as they require a more in-depth examination than can be done in this work alone.

There are multiple important (and potentially conflicting) goals in selecting who to audit, including maximizing the detection of under-reported tax liability, maintaining a population estimate, avoiding the administrative and compliance costs associated with false positive audits, and ensuring a fair distribution of audits across taxpayers of different incomes and other groups. It is important to note that the IRS and Treasury Department will ultimately be responsible for the policy decision about how to balance these various objectives. We see an important contribution of our project as understanding these trade-offs and making them explicit to the relevant policy-makers. We demonstrate how to quantify and incorporate these considerations into a multi-objective model. We also formalize an existing de facto sequential decision-making (SDM) problem to help identify relevant fairness frameworks and trade-offs for policymakers (Henderson et al., 2021). We note, however, that we do not consider a number of other objectives important to the IRS, including deterring tax evasion.

Finally, as is also well-known, there is no single solution for remediying fairness – different fairness definitions are contested and mutually incompatible. For this reason, our plan is not to adopt a single, fixed performance measure. Rather, we seek to show how the optimal algorithm varies based on the relative importance one attaches to the alternative goals.

We note that all models used by the IRS go through extensive internal review processes with robustness and generalizability checks beyond the scope of our work here. No model in this work will be directly used in any auditing mechanism.

There are strict statutory rules that limit the use and disclosure of taxpayer data. All work in this manuscript was completed under IRS credentials and federal government security and privacy standards. All authors that accessed data have undergone a background check and been onboarded into the IRS personnel system under the Intergovernmental Personnel Act or the student analogue. That means all data-accessing authors took all trainings on security and privacy related to IRS data. This manuscript and associated data was cleared under privacy review. All work using taxpayer data was done on a secure system with separate hardware. No taxpayer names were associated with the features used in this work.

D. Covariate Drift

We also characterize the covariate drift year to year. We calculate the average per-covariate drift via the non-intersection distance, as is done by the drifter R package (Biecek, 2018), using 20 bins to calculate distributions. This provides the difference between any two given years on a per-covariate basis, which we then average and report in Table 1.

For example, we may expect some shift in total positive income year to year based on inflation. The non-intersection distance bins any continuous covariates and then provides a distance metric:

$$d(P, Q) = 1 - \sum_i \min(P_i, Q_i). \quad (1)$$

Other distance metrics have been used for such purposes, like the Hellinger Distance or Total Variation Distance (Webb et al., 2016), but for our purposes NID is adequate to characterize drift. The year over year drift, as seen in Table 1, is mostly constant except for 2011-2013, which has a much higher year-over-year average per-covariate drift.

E. More Data Details

Figure 6 is a figure representing the current audit process at the IRS.

Table 3 is a table of notation correspondence to the IRS equivalent in our structured bandit.

Table 4 is an extended table of summary statistics, including the no change rate in the population NRP sample and the sum of sample weights (equal to the population from which NRP was sampled).

Table 5 shows the number of taxpayers in each NRP audit class, as well as provides a description of those audit classes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bandit Framework</th>
<th>IRS Equivalent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>arm ($a_t$)</td>
<td>tax return or taxpayer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>context ($X^a_t$)</td>
<td>reported information to IRS, in our data 500 covariates constituting mostly of information reported in a tax return</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reward ($r^a_t$)</td>
<td>adjustment amount ($) after audit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>timestep ($t$)</td>
<td>the selection year</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Correspondence between structured bandit framework and our setting.
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**Current Audit Selection Process**

1) Identify returns for NRP audits

2a) Estimate the overall tax gap

2b) Training set for the DIF System

3) Op audits selected with high likelihood of significant adjustment

*Figure 6.* We illustrate the current tax audit process. As described in Section 3, the NRP audits are jointly used for population estimation of non-compliance and risk model training. The Op audits are then selected from the DIF model but are never used for estimating the tax gap or for re-training the DIF risk model.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th># Audits</th>
<th>$μ\text{-u}w$</th>
<th>$μ\text{-}w$</th>
<th>Cov. Drift</th>
<th>No Change</th>
<th>$\sum w$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>13403</td>
<td>$2258.07$</td>
<td>$963.93$</td>
<td></td>
<td>54.8%</td>
<td>133M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>14220</td>
<td>$2213.64$</td>
<td>$920.35$</td>
<td>0.0143</td>
<td>55.1%</td>
<td>137M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>14656</td>
<td>$2442.33$</td>
<td>$938.11$</td>
<td>0.0141</td>
<td>55.7%</td>
<td>137M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>12756</td>
<td>$2159.62$</td>
<td>$989.06$</td>
<td>0.0197</td>
<td>55.5%</td>
<td>135M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>13481</td>
<td>$2177.26$</td>
<td>$1034.47$</td>
<td>0.0143</td>
<td>53.8%</td>
<td>138M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>13902</td>
<td>$3047.39$</td>
<td>$1038.69$</td>
<td>0.0315</td>
<td>53.7%</td>
<td>140M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>15635</td>
<td>$3921.93$</td>
<td>$1041.12$</td>
<td>0.0306</td>
<td>49.9%</td>
<td>140M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>14505</td>
<td>$3617.64$</td>
<td>$1173.87$</td>
<td>0.0211</td>
<td>49.4%</td>
<td>141M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>14357</td>
<td>$5024.25$</td>
<td>$1218.01$</td>
<td>0.0144</td>
<td>47.3%</td>
<td>143M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 4.* Summary statistics by year of the average misreporting per audited taxpayer across the NRP sample. $μ\text{-u}w$ is unweighted mean, $μ\text{-}w$ is the mean weighted by NRP sample weights. Cov. drift is the year-over-year covariate drift. No change is the no change rate. $\sum w$ is the sum of the NRP sample weights for a given year, equal to the total sampling population.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NRP Class</th>
<th>270</th>
<th>271</th>
<th>272</th>
<th>273</th>
<th>274</th>
<th>275</th>
<th>276</th>
<th>277</th>
<th>278</th>
<th>279</th>
<th>280</th>
<th>281</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>1972</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>2311</td>
<td>2060</td>
<td>1861</td>
<td>641</td>
<td>427</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>870</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>605</td>
<td>667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>2445</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>2440</td>
<td>1792</td>
<td>1762</td>
<td>683</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>944</td>
<td>1680</td>
<td>543</td>
<td>943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>2631</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>2505</td>
<td>1797</td>
<td>1809</td>
<td>658</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>943</td>
<td>1816</td>
<td>603</td>
<td>907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>2688</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>2143</td>
<td>1878</td>
<td>1617</td>
<td>605</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>899</td>
<td>1239</td>
<td>464</td>
<td>467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2380</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>2093</td>
<td>1830</td>
<td>1722</td>
<td>625</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>1005</td>
<td>1623</td>
<td>523</td>
<td>754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>2364</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>2090</td>
<td>965</td>
<td>1001</td>
<td>761</td>
<td>591</td>
<td>618</td>
<td>1289</td>
<td>1589</td>
<td>982</td>
<td>1488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>2416</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>2189</td>
<td>1067</td>
<td>971</td>
<td>1051</td>
<td>966</td>
<td>962</td>
<td>906</td>
<td>1726</td>
<td>1190</td>
<td>1977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>2540</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>2211</td>
<td>1072</td>
<td>1136</td>
<td>1002</td>
<td>950</td>
<td>823</td>
<td>914</td>
<td>1446</td>
<td>1033</td>
<td>1191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>2361</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>2144</td>
<td>1086</td>
<td>1067</td>
<td>947</td>
<td>870</td>
<td>832</td>
<td>918</td>
<td>1449</td>
<td>949</td>
<td>1519</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 5.* Counts for each NRP class by year in the full NRP sample.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NRP Activity Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>270</td>
<td>Form 1040 EITC present &amp; TPI &lt; $200k and Sch. C/F Total Gross Receipts (TGR) &lt; $25k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>271</td>
<td>Form 1040 EITC present &amp; TPI &lt; $200,000 and Sch. C/F TGR &gt; $25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>272</td>
<td>Form 1040 TPI &lt; $200,000 and No Sch. C, E, F or 2106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>273</td>
<td>Form 1040 TPI &lt; $200,000 and No Sch. C or F, but Sch. E or 2106 OKAY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>274</td>
<td>Form 1040 Non-farm Business with Sch. C/F TGR &lt; $25,000 and TPI &lt; $200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>275</td>
<td>Form 1040 Non-farm Business with Sch. C/F TGR $25,000 - $100,000 and TPI &lt; $200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>276</td>
<td>Form 1040 Non-farm Business with Sch. C/F TGR $100,000 - $200,000 and TPI &lt; $200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>277</td>
<td>Form 1040 Non-farm Business with Sch. C/F TGR $200,000 or More and TPI &lt; $200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>278</td>
<td>Form 1040 Farm Business Not Classified Elsewhere and TPI &lt; $200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>279</td>
<td>Form 1040 No Sch. C or F present and TPI ≥ $200,000 and &lt; $1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>280</td>
<td>Form 1040 Sch. C or F present and TPI ≥ $200,000 and &lt; $1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>281</td>
<td>Form 1040 TPI ≥ $1,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6. A correspondence of audit classes to their descriptions. Replicated from https://www.irs.gov/pub/irs-pia/2018_doc_6209_section_13.pdf. TGR is Sch. C/F Total Gross Receipts (TGR). TPI is total positive income. Schedule F is a form filed with tax returns used to report Profit or Loss From Farming. Schedule C is used to report income or loss from a business operated or a profession practiced as a sole proprietor. Schedule E is used to “report income or loss from rental real estate, royalties, partnerships, S corporations, estates, trusts, and residual interests in real estate mortgage investment conduits (REMICs).” See https://www.irs.gov/forms-pubs/about-schedule-e-form-1040. Form 2106 is used to report business expenses. See https://www.irs.gov/forms-pubs/about-form-2106. EITC is the Earned Income Tax Credit for low-to-moderate-income families and workers. See https://www.irs.gov/credits-deductions/individuals/earned-income-tax-credit-eitc.

F. NRP Weights

A key complication in our investigation is that the NRP sample used by IRS is a stratified random sample and NRP weights must be used to estimate the population. This makes evaluation on the NRP sample more difficult. As such, we only use NRP weights for the population estimate. However, taking a random sample (as in the ε exploration sample) means that the sample is not evenly distributed across the population, but rather it matches the distribution of the NRP sample. We weighed alternative designs, such as synthetically replicating features in proportion to NRP weights and then discarding the NRP weights. However, we felt this was not realistic enough. As such, our evaluation might be thought to scale to a larger system in the following way. First a very large NRP sample would be selected. Then, within that larger sample our methods would select sub-samples that are in line with the true budget.

For all methods we run both a weighted and an unweighted fit using NRP weights for the model fit. We found that ABS was the only method to have reduced variance from an unweighted fit, whereas other methods improved from a weighted fit. This is likely because for non-ABS methods the population estimation mechanism is model-based and the model benefits from having more fine-grained splitting criteria in areas that are up-weighted later on.

The composition of the NRP sample may also add sources of drift and stochasticity to our sample. Each year the NRP sample weights are re-calculated according to changing priorities and improvements to the program. As such, later years have a different composition of samples across NRP activity codes (Table 6) than earlier years.

We note that the NRP sample weights are base weights, reflecting the sampling probability, not adjusted for final outcome.

G. Extended Related Work and Connections to the Optimize-and-Estimate Framework

The tax gap estimation requirement could be formulated as an active learning problem – the better the underlying model the more effective it will be in estimating the tax gap. This also coincides somewhat with the bandit exploration component since a better model will allow the agent to select the optimal arm more frequently. However, the revenue maximization objective we introduce corresponds with the exploit component of the bandit problem and is not found in the active learning framework.

An alternative view of this problem is as a contextual bandit problem with no shared context, but rather a per arm context. This is similar to the setup to the contextual bandit formulation of Li et al. (2010) used for news recommendation systems. However, unlike in Li et al. (2010), rewards here would have to be delivered after $K$ rounds of selection (where $K$ is the budget of audits that can be selected in a given year). Since the IRS does not conduct audits on a rolling basis, the rewards are delayed and updated all at once. This is similar to the “piled-reward” variant of the contextual bandit framework discussed by Huang &
Lin (2016) or possibly a variant of contextual bandits with knapsacks (Agrawal & Devanur, 2015).

The overall mechanism can be thought of in three parts: the function approximator ($f_\theta$), which is used to estimate the structure of the reward function; the population estimation mechanism utilizing the function approximator ($f_\theta$); and the sampling mechanism.

H. Extended Metrics Descriptions

H.1. Choice of cumulative versus average reward and TPI

Note, we report cumulative reward as is standard for bandit settings. Average reward can be recovered by dividing by the number of timesteps. We also note that in early years, where no selection has been made, the selection probability is the same across all algorithms, therefore cumulative reward reflects late-stage differences more clearly. We report cumulative average TPI for similar reasons. Cumulative average TPI is calculated as the average TPI for a selected batch in a given year, then summed over years.

H.2. Extended Percent Difference Explanation

The percent difference is the difference between the estimated population average and the true population average: 100% * (\(\hat{\mu} - \mu^*\))/\(\mu^*\). We denote \(\sigma_{PE}\) to be the standard deviation of the population estimate percent difference across random seeds. That is, we measure the variation across random seeds on a per year basis, resulting in a standard deviation per year, then we present the average of these standard deviation values. This is in line with current recommendations in the ML community which recommend showing variation across seeds (Henderson et al., 2018; Agarwal et al., 2021). This provides insight into the variation of the method across slightly different populations drawn from the same distribution.

\(\mu_{PE}\) is absolute mean percent difference across seeds. \(\sqrt{\frac{\mu_{PE}^2}{n}}\) is the root mean squared percent difference across every prediction (year and seeds). That is, the percent difference for every prediction is squared, averaged, and the square root is taken. This is a scalar point metric and gives some indication as the a combined error rate due to both bias and variance. Note, this takes into account variance inherent to subsampling of NRP (the 80% sample used to simulate different populations) as well as variance in sampling across seeds. As such, non-model-based methods are at an inherent disadvantage since they do not re-use data from prior years. Though, this may be an interesting direction for future work.

H.3. RARE Score

It can be thought of as a modification of discounted cumulative gain (DCG) (Järvelin & Kekäläinen, 2002) or RankDCG (Katerenchuk & Rosenberg, 2018). In those methods, the distance between the predicted rank and true rank of a data point is discounted based on the rank position (and in the case of RankDCG, normalized and accounts for ties). Similar to other related metrics (Järvelin & Kekäläinen, 2002; Katerenchuk & Rosenberg, 2018), the RARE metric takes into account the magnitude of the error in estimate revenue potential as well as the rank. It is effectively the distance from the maximum revenue under the correct ranking, or the percentage of the maximum area under the ranked cumulative reward potential. We consider the true area under the cumulative reward curve where rewards are ordered by magnitude of the true reward of the arm: \(\xi_{w,\text{max}} = \sum_{i=0}^{N} \sum_{j=0}^{n_i} \sum_{k=0}^{w_k} r_k\), where \(N\) is the size of the total population.

The ranking algorithm’s area under the predicted reward curve is denoted by \(\xi\) and the minimum area under the reward curve is the area under the reverse ordering of the reward \(\xi_{\text{min}}\). \(w_k\) is the sampling weight in case the training sample is not uniformly drawn (as is the case in NRP). The RARE metric thus gives an approximation of a magnitude-adjusted distance to optimal ranking: \(RARE = \frac{\xi - \xi_{\text{min}}}{\xi_{\text{max}} - \xi_{\text{min}}}\). After a working group discussion with IRS stakeholders, we found that RARE seemed to capture many key dimensions of interest more than other conventional measures.

I. Function Approximator Selection

We examine which function approximator might be best suited overall if the sample is purely an unbiased random sample. We fit random forests, OLS, and Ridge regression on a purely random sample. We evaluate the ability of the function approximator to rank correctly as well as estimate the population mean. For example, for year 2008, we train on a random sample of 2006 and evaluate the model population estimate and ranking accuracy. For year 2009, we train on a random sample of 2006 and 2007, and so on.

We find that non-linear estimators consistently achieve significantly higher RARE scores and more accurate population estimates than linear equivalents. As seen in Figure 7. As such, for the remaining experiments, we do not use any linear function approximation methods.

J. ABS Sampling

In this section we provide further details on ABS, verify that the population estimate is unbiased, and make some general remarks on the effects of various parameters on the variance of the estimate. Algorithm 1 gives an overview of ABS with
We place a distribution without replacement at the level of returns (we cannot audit within that bin to choose the return. We do not recalculate \( \lambda \) where \( \lambda = \frac{1}{1 + \exp(-\alpha(\hat{r}_a - \kappa))} \), or an exponential function

\[
\hat{\rho}_a = \exp(\alpha \hat{r}_a).
\]

\( \kappa \) is the value of the \( K \)-th largest value amongst reward predictions \( \{\hat{r}_t\} \). For the logistic we normalize such that \( \hat{r}_a \in [-5, 5] \), and \( \hat{r}_a \in [0, 1] \) for the exponential. The distribution of transformed predictions \( \{\hat{\rho}_a\} \) is then stratified into \( H \) non-intersecting strata \( S_1, \ldots, S_H \). We choose the strata in order to minimize intra-cluster variance, subject to the constraint of having at least \( K - \zeta \) points per bin:

\[
\min_{S_1, \ldots, S_H} \sum_{h} \sum_{\rho \in S_h} \|\hat{\rho} - \lambda_h\|^2, \quad \text{s.t.} \quad |S_h| \geq K - \zeta,
\]

where \( \lambda_h = |S_h|^{-1} \sum_{\rho \in S_h} \hat{\rho} \) is the average value of the points in bin \( b \). Note that \( \sum_{h} \sum_{\rho \in S_h} \|\hat{\rho} - \lambda_h\|^2 = \sum_{h} \sum_{\rho \in S_h} |S_h| \text{Var} \rho_h \), so the quadratic program (2) is indeed minimizing intra-cluster variance.

We place a distribution \( (\pi_h) \) over the bins by averaging the risk in each bin, i.e.,

\[
\pi_h = \frac{\lambda_h}{\sum_{h'} \lambda_{h'}}.
\]

To make our selection, we sample \( K - \zeta \) times from \( (\pi_1, \ldots, \pi_H) \) to obtain a bin, and then we sample uniformly within that bin to choose the return. We do not recalculate \( (\pi_1, \ldots, \pi_H) \) after each selection, so while we are sampling without replacement at the level of returns (we cannot audit the same taxpayer twice), we are sampling with replacement at the level of bins. This is (i) because of computational feasibility, and (ii) in order to obtain an unbiased estimate of the mean via Horvitz-Thompson Sampling (Horvitz & Thompson, 1952).

In particular, note that the probability that arm \( a \) in stratum \( S_h \) is sampled is \( p_a = (K - \zeta) \pi_h / N_h \) (see the next subsection for a derivation), where \( N_h = |S_h| \) is the size of \( S_h \). If \( K \) is the set of returns chosen for auditing and \( S_{H+1} \) contains those \( \zeta \) points first sampled, then

\[
\hat{\mu}_{HT}(t) = \frac{1}{\sum_a w_a} \left( \sum_{a \in K \setminus S_{H+1}} w_a r_a + \sum_{a \in S_{H+1}} w_a r_a \right),
\]

is an unbiased estimator of the true mean

\[
\mu(t) = \frac{1}{\sum_a w_a} \sum_a w_a r_a.
\]

To see this, let \( 1_{a \in K} \) be the random variable indicating whether arm \( a \) is sampled. Since \( E[1_{a \in K}] = p_a \), linearity of expectation gives that \( E[\hat{\mu}_{HT}] \) is equal to

\[
\frac{1}{\sum_a w_a} E \left[ \sum_{a \in A \setminus S_{H+1}} \frac{w_a r_a}{p_a} 1_{a \in K} + \sum_{a \in S_{H+1}} w_a r_a \right]
\]

\[
= \frac{1}{\sum_a w_a} \left( \sum_{a \in A \setminus S_{H+1}} \frac{w_a r_a}{p_a} E[1_{a \in K}] + \sum_{a \in S_{H+1}} w_a r_a \right)
\]

\[
= \frac{1}{\sum_a w_a} \sum_{a \in A} w_a r_a.
\]

### J.1. Variance of Population Estimate

Write the Horvitz-Thompson estimator as

\[
\hat{\mu}_{HT} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_a \frac{r_a}{p_a} 1_{a \in K},
\]
We can make this expression more specific to our case by conditioning on $\zeta$.

$K$ = 

**Algorithm 1** Adaptive Bin Sampling - Logistic Smoothing

**Input**: $\alpha$, $H$, $\zeta$, $K$, $(X_0, r_0)$

Train model $f_0$ on initial data $(X_0, r_0)$.

For $t = 1, \ldots, T$

- Receive observations $X_t$
- Predict rewards $\hat{r}_a = f_0(x_a)$
- Sample top $\zeta$ predictions.
- For all $a$ compute $\hat{\mu}_t = 1 + \exp(-\alpha(\hat{r}_a - \kappa))^{-1}$
- Construct strata $S_1, \ldots, S_H$ by solving (2).
- Form distribution $\{\pi_h\}$ over strata via (3).

Repeat

- Sample return at uniformly at random from $S_h$.

Until $K - \zeta$ samples drawn

- Compute $\hat{\mu}_{HT}$ once true rewards are collected.
- Retrain model $f$ on $(\cup_i X_i, \cup_i \hat{r}_i)$.

End for

where $K$ is the set of selected arms and $p_a = \Pr(a \in K)$ is arm $a$’s inclusion probability in $K$. Then

$$
\text{Var}(\hat{\mu}_{HT}) = \frac{1}{N^2} \sum_{a,b} p_a p_b \text{Cov}(1_{a \in K} 1_{b \in K})
$$

$$
= \frac{1}{N^2} \left( \sum_a p_a^2 (1 - p_a) + \sum_a \sum_{b \neq a} p_a p_b (p_a - p_b) \right),
$$

where $p_{a,b} = \Pr(a, b \in K) = p_{a,b}$ is the joint inclusion probability of arms $a$ and $b$. Note that for the $\zeta$ arms in stratum $S_{h+1}$, $p_a = 1$ and $p_{a,b} = p_b$. Therefore, all terms involving such arms are zero and they do not contribute to the variance.

We can make this expression more specific to our case by rewriting the inclusion probabilities as functions of the strata. Fix an arm $a$ and suppose it’s in stratum $S_h$. Let $m = K - \zeta$ be the number of returns we’re randomly sampling (i.e., discarding those $\zeta$ points greedily chosen from the top of the risk distribution). The law of total probability over the $m$ trials gives

$$
p_a = \sum_{\ell=0}^m \Pr(a \in K | S_h \cap K = \ell) \Pr(|S_h \cap K| = \ell).
$$

The first term in the product is the probability that $a$ is chosen as one of $\ell$ elements in a bucket of size $N_h = |S_h|$. The second term is the probability that $S_h$ was selected precisely $\ell$ times and is distributed as a binomial. Therefore,

$$
p_a = \sum_{\ell=0}^m \frac{\ell}{N_h} \frac{K}{\ell} \pi_h^\ell (1 - \pi_h)^{m-\ell} = \frac{m \pi_h}{N_h}.
$$

Now consider $p_{a,b}$ for distinct arms $a, b$. Let $b \in S_g$. Conditioning on $b \in K$ gives $\Pr(a \in K | b \in K) = \frac{(m-1)\pi_h}{N_h}$ if $g \neq h$ since there are now $m - 1$ trials to select $a$. If $g = h$, then $\Pr(a \in K | b \in K) = \frac{(K-1)\pi_h}{N_h - 1}$ since there are $m - 1$ trials to select $a$ from a bin of size $N_h - 1$. Thus

$$
p_{a,b} = \Pr(a \in K | b \in K) \Pr(b \in K)
$$

$$
= \begin{cases} 
\frac{m(m-1)\pi_h^2}{N_h(N_h-1)}, & \text{if } g \neq h, \\
\frac{m(m-1)\pi_h^2}{N_h^2(N_h-1)^2}, & \text{if } g = h.
\end{cases}
$$

Rewriting the variance as a summation over the strata, we see that the variance is the difference of two terms $V_1$ and $V_2$ where $V_1$ as a sum across all strata and $V_2$ includes cross-terms dependent on the relationship between strata.

$$
\text{Var}(\hat{\mu}_{HT}) = \frac{1}{mN^2} (V_1 - V_2),
$$

where

$$
V_1 = \sum_{h=1}^H (N_h\pi_h^{-1} - m) \sum_a r_a^2,
$$

and

$$
V_2 = \sum_{h=1}^H \sum_{a \in S_h} \sum_{b \in S_h} r_a r_b + \sum_{g \neq h} \sum_{b \in S_g} r_b.
$$

We make a few remarks on the variance here, but leave a full analysis to future work. If the budget is small relative to the strata sizes (as is the case here), then $\frac{N_h - m}{N_h - 1} \approx 1$, and $V_2$ reduces to $\sum_a \sum_{b \neq a} r_a r_b$ which is independent of the strata. As $\alpha$ grows and we place more weight on those returns deemed higher risk by the model, $p_a \to 0$ for lower risk arms. This results in many arms clustered in a few strata with high $N_h$ and low $\pi_h$, which increases $V_1$. Also, as $\zeta$ grows and we perform more greedy sampling, $m$ decreases and the variance increases roughly proportionally.

**K. Experimental Setup**

Figure 8 provides a visual aid to help understand the problem setting.
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L. Hyperparameter Tuning

The ideal approach would tune the hyperparameters for function approximators using cross-validation every time the model is fit in the active learning process. However, we found this approach to be extremely computationally expensive, a small grid of experiments requiring over a week to run. In the interest of reducing energy consumption – see, for example, discussion by Henderson et al. (2020) – we instead opt for a less computationally expensive proxy. We take our function approximators on 2006 and then evaluate their RARE score and population estimate for the 2008 year, using 5-fold cross-validation across both years. We then run a grid search for all function approximators used. Finally we find the top point on the smoothed Pareto frontier between RARE and population estimation to find the optimal hyperparameters. To do this we rank the reward and population estimation criteria based on Since there is concept drift from year to year, we expect that these hyperparameters are sub-optimal and results may be even further improved with careful per-year hyperparameter tuning. However, this approach is sufficient for the purposes of our experiments.

For handling hyperparameters of the sampling algorithms, we rely on sensitivity analyses rather than hyperparameter searches. This is in line with recent work that promotes reporting results over ranges of hyperparameters and random seeds, particularly for sequential decision-making systems (Henderson et al., 2018; Bouthillier et al., 2021; Agarwal et al., 2021).

Note, for Table 2, where some selection is made, we select the configuration after random sampling that is within the top meritocratic reward band that has the lowest variance (see Joseph et al. (2018) for discussion on meritocratic fairness given overlapping confidence intervals). This reflects the same methodology as Bietti et al. (2018) and reflects the ability for a method to achieve that level of performance. Note, we sample best configurations across all methods in the same way.

M. Winsorization

We winsorize the rewards returned such that the top 1% of highest values is set to the top 99th percentile’s value. Negative values were truncated to 0. This is in line with recommendations for existing models within the IRS (Matta et al., 2016) and other research on audit data (DeBacker et al., 2015). This helps to stabilize predictions, protecting against unusually large outlier adjustments, but may bias the model.

N. Budget Selection

At each timestep the IRS can select a limited budget of samples – for example the NRP sample in 2014 was 14,357 audits. This is a tiny fraction of audits as compared to the general population of taxpayers – and thus impossible to replicate when using the NRP sample to evaluate selection mechanisms. The goal of the NRP sample is to select a large enough sample to approximate the taxpayer base. The parallel in our experiments would be to ensure we select a sample which is smaller than the coreset needed to model the entire data.

Another way of thinking about the size of the budget allowed per year to approximate the NRP mechanism is by determining what is the minimum random sample to achieve a 3% margin of error with 95% confidence of the NRP sample population, per the 2018 OMB requirements for IPERIA reporting. Using an 80% (from subsampling) sample of the per-year average of 14102 NRP yearly samples, we are left with an average of 11282 arms per year. We should need about a 975 arm budget for a random sampling mechanism (ignoring stratification) to achieve OMB specifications.

We then use the approach of Sener & Savarese (2018) to find a minimal coreset which a model could use to achieve a reasonable fit. We first fit a random forest to the entire dataset for a given year and calculate the residuals (or the mean squared error across the dataset). We then iteratively select batches of 25 samples according to the method presented by Sener & Savarese (2018). We use only the raw features to compute distance (contrasting the embedding space used by the authors). We refit a random forest with the same hyperparameters as the optimal fit on the smaller coreset sampler. Then we calculate the ratio of the mean squared error on the entire year’s data to the optimal mean squared error. We find that the mean squared error is reduced to roughly 2x the overfit model at around 600 coreset samples, reducing very slowly after that point. We find that around...
600 samples is the absolute minimum number required to reduce the mean squared error to a stable level at 2 times the optimal mean squared error. To simulate the small sample sizes of the NRP selection, we select this smaller budget of 600 as our main evaluation budget size, corresponding to roughly 4% of the 2014 NRP sample.

O. Confidence Intervals on the Time Series

Since arms within a year are randomly sampled, this is close to the subsampled bootstrap mechanism used for time-series as described by Politis & Romano (1994); Politis et al. (1999); Politis (2003). We consider the year-by-year NRP sample as a stationary time series with each year of arms as an identically distributed sample, though year-to-year the samples are not necessarily independent. The subsample bootstrap provides a mechanism to estimate confidence intervals for such a time series (approximately). This is also similar to the delete-$d$ where $d = n - b$ jackknife as described in (Politis et al., 1999; Shao & Wu, 1989). Because of the computational complexity of running experiments on the time-series, we keep $b$ low at 20 bootstrap samples with distinct random seeds (and thus the setting is not identical to the delete-$d$ jackknife).

P. Results

Our results are too extensive to include an exhaustive list in here tabular form. We thus include a file of all results in our codebase with an associated data description. Here, we plot the effect of various hyperparameters for each model. Figures 9 illustrate the effect of model parameters on cumulative reward, population estimation (mean), population estimation (variance), no change rate, and RARE score. For each parameter and each metric, we plot the results of all runs with the same parameter as it varies across its range. We use violin plots to demonstrate the density of the values.

P.1. Larger Budget

Results stay similar if we increase the budget to 1000 arms per timestep. This can be seen in Figures 12 and 13.

P.2. $\epsilon$-Greedy, Random Sample-Only for Population Estimation

It may be tempting to use only the random sample of the $\epsilon$-Greedy methods for population estimation, but we note that in the constrained budget setting we investigate here the variance of these estimates becomes much higher than ABS settings with comparable rewards. This demonstrates the utility of re-using information to navigate the bias-variance-reward trade-off problem. For a budget of 600, for example, Table 7 demonstrates this. Though the relationship is somewhat non-linear, ABS always has the potential for pareto improvement, yielding higher reward for the same variance. For example, though ABS-2 has 4 more standard deviations higher it yields over $7M extra in revenue. And though ABS-1 yields similar rewards to $\epsilon = 0.1$, it is 6.4 standard deviations lower in variance.
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| ε   | \(\sigma_{PE}\) | \(\sqrt{|\mu_{PE}|^2}\) | \(R\)       |
|-----|-----------------|-----------------|-----------|
| 0.1 | 37.4            | 40.8            | $41.3M$   |
| 0.2 | 29.9            | 32.2            | $38.7M$   |
| 0.4 | 20.6            | 22.04           | $33.1M$   |

| Policy | \(\mu_{NR}\) | \(\mu_{PE}\) | \(\sqrt{|\mu_{PE}|^2}\) | \(\mu_{RARE}\) | \(R\)       | \(\sigma_R\) |
|--------|---------------|---------------|-----------------|--------------|-----------|------------|
| Greedy | 36.5%         | 16.4          | 21.5            | 0.70         | $43.6M*$  | $760k$     |
| UCB-1  | 38.6%         | 15.3          | 20.9            | 0.70         | $42.4M*$  | $853k$     |
| ABS-1  | 37.6%         | 0.4           | 34.2            | 0.70         | $41.5M*$  | $796k$     |
| \(\epsilon\)-Greedy | 38.3%         | 6.1           | 10.5            | 0.73         | $41.3M*$  | $772k$     |
| UCB-2  | 40.7%         | 15.6          | 22.2            | 0.70         | $40.7M*$  | $1.2M$     |
| ABS-2  | 38.3%         | 0.6           | 26.8            | 0.71         | $40.5M*$  | $672k$     |
| Random | 53.1%         | 1.5           | 13.1            | -            | $12.7M$   | $493k$     |

Table 7. The population estimation variance across random seeds and reward given different amounts of \(\epsilon\)-Greedy exploration samples.

Table 8. We rank all methods and hyperparameters based on reward bands. We show the top reward band and best hyperparameter settings for each method in that reward band (where CIs across random seeds overlap). \(R\) is the average cumulative reward at the final timestep across random seeds. \(\mu_{NR}\) is the average no-change rate, \(\mu_{RARE}\) the average RARE score, \(\mu_{PE}\) the absolute percent difference of the population estimate, and \(\sigma_{PE}\) the standard deviation of the population estimate. ABS-1 is a hyperparameter configuration that focuses slightly more on reward at the cost of population estimation variance. \(\epsilon\)-Greedy uses an \(\epsilon\) of 0.1, UCB-1 has \(Z = 1\), UCB-2 has a larger exploration factor of \(Z = 10\). ABS-1 uses an exponential mixing function with 80% greedy sample, \(\alpha = 5\), and a 2.5% trim factor. ABS-2 uses a logistic mixing function, \(\alpha = 0.5\), a 5% trim, and 80% greedy sample. Both ABS methods use an unweighted fit while all other approaches saw improved results with a weighted fit. \(\sqrt{|\mu_{PE}|^2}\) is root mean squared error.

**Figure 9.** Results for ABS with a budget of 600 arms. The top row explores the effect of \(\zeta\) on five metrics, the middle row explores the effect of \(\alpha\), and the bottom the effect of the trimming factor.
Figure 10. A kernel density plot of the distribution of sampled arms from 2006 (top left) to 2014 (bottom). X-axis is true reward. Y-axis is sampling distribution density.

Figure 11. Top: Comparison of the top ABS hyperparameter settings seen in Table 2 with RF \( \epsilon \)-greedy as a reference. Bottom: A small ablation of \( \zeta \)'s effect on class selection counts for an ABS setting of logistic mixing function, \( \alpha = 0.5 \) and a 5% trim.
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**ABS**

Figure 12. Results for ABS with a budget of 1000 arms. The top row explores the effect of $\zeta (Z)$ on five metrics, the middle row explores the effect of $\alpha$, and the bottom the effect of the trimming factor.

Figure 13. Top Left, Middle, Right: ABS hyperparameters with a budget of 1000 arms. Trends largely reflect results at the budget of 600 arms. Bottom: similarly, cumulative rewards for greedy and UCB methods follow trends as in the 600 budget setting.