

Synthetic Combinations: A Causal Inference Framework for Combinatorial Interventions

Abhineet Agarwal

University of California, Berkeley

AA3797@BERKELEY.EDU

Anish Agarwal

Amazon Core AI

ANISH.AGARWAL@GMAIL.COM

Suhas Vijaykumar

MIT

SUHASV@MIT.EDU

Abstract

We consider a setting where there are N heterogeneous units and p interventions. Our goal is to learn unit-specific potential outcomes for any combination of these p interventions, i.e., $N \times 2^p$ causal parameters. Choosing a combination of interventions is a problem that naturally arises in a variety of applications such as factorial design experiments, recommendation engines (e.g., showing a set of movies that maximizes engagement for a given user), combination therapies in medicine, selecting important features for machine learning models, etc. Running $N \times 2^p$ experiments to estimate the various parameters is likely expensive and/or infeasible as N and p grow. Further, with observational data there is likely confounding, i.e., whether or not a unit is seen under a combination is correlated with its potential outcome under that combination. To address these challenges, we propose a novel model that imposes latent structure across *both* units and combinations of interventions. Specifically, we assume latent similarity in potential outcomes across units (i.e., the matrix of potential outcomes is approximately rank r) and regularity in how combinations of interventions interact (i.e., the coefficients in the Fourier expansion of the potential outcomes is approximately s sparse). In this setting we establish identification for all $N \times 2^p$ parameters despite unobserved confounding. We propose an estimation procedure, Synthetic Combinations, and establish finite-sample consistency under precise conditions on the observation pattern. Our results imply that Synthetic Combinations is able to consistently estimate unit-specific potential outcomes given a total of $\text{poly}(r) \times (N + s^2p)$ observations. In comparison, previous methods that do not exploit structure across both units and combinations have sample complexity scaling as $\min(N \times s^2p, r \times (N + 2^p))$. We then use Synthetic Combinations to propose a data-efficient experimental design mechanism for combinatorial causal inference. We corroborate our theoretical findings with numerical simulations ¹.

1. Introduction

Modern-day decision makers—in settings from e-commerce to public policy to medicine—often encounter settings where they have to pick a combination of actions, and ideally would like to do so in a highly personalized manner. For example, recommending a curated basket of items to customers on a commerce platform, deciding on a combination of therapies for a health patient, enacting a collection of socio-economic policies for a specific geographic location, computing feature importances for machine learning models, etc. Despite the ubiquity of such a setting, it also comes with

1. Code for Synthetic Combinations and replicating experiments can be found at https://github.com/aagarwal1996/synth_combo

significant empirical challenges: with p actions and N units, a decision maker must estimate $N \times 2^p$ potential combinations in order to confirm the optimal personalized policy. With large N and even with relatively small p (due to its exponential dependence), it likely becomes infeasible to run that many experiments; of course, in observational data there is the additional challenge of potential unobserved confounding. Current methods tackle this problem by following one of two approaches: (i) they impose structure on how combinations of interventions interact, or (ii) they assume latent similarity in potential outcomes across units. However, as we discuss in detail below, these approaches require a large number of observations to estimate all $N \times 2^p$ potential outcomes because they do not exploit structure across both units and combinations. Hence the question naturally arises: *how to effectively share information across both units and combinations of interventions?*

Contributions. In this work, we formalize this combinatorial causal inference problem using the language of potential outcomes. For a given unit $n \in [N]$, we represent its potential outcomes over the 2^p combinations as a Boolean function from $\{-1, 1\}^p$ to \mathbb{R} , expressed in the Fourier basis. To impose structure across combinations, we assume that for a unit n , the linear coefficients $\alpha_n \in \mathbb{R}^{2^p}$ induced by this Fourier basis representation is sparse, i.e., has at most s non-zero entries. To impose structure across units, we assume that this matrix of Fourier coefficients across units $\mathcal{A} = [\alpha_n]_{n \in [N]} \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times 2^p}$ has rank r . This simultaneous sparsity and low-rank assumption is indeed what allows one to share information across both units and combinations. We discuss how various classic models studied in the literature fall relates with our proposed model.

We first establish an identification theorem for the $N \times 2^p$ potential outcomes of interest, which requires that any confounding is mediated through the matrix of Fourier coefficients \mathcal{A} . We then design a two-step algorithm “Synthetic Combinations” and prove it consistently estimates the various causal parameters, despite potential unobserved confounding. The first step of Synthetic Combinations, termed “horizontal regression”, learns the structure across combinations of interventions—assuming sparsity in the Fourier coefficients—via the Lasso. The second step of Synthetic Combinations, termed “vertical regression”, learns the structure across units—assuming low-rankness of the matrix Fourier coefficients—and we theoretically analyze the principal component regression (PCR) estimator for this subsequent step. Our results imply that Synthetic Combinations is able to consistently estimate unit-specific potential outcomes given a total of $\text{poly}(r) \times (N + s^2p)$ observations (ignoring logarithmic factors). This improves over previous methods that do not exploit structure across both units and combinations, which have sample complexity scaling as $\min(N \times s^2p, r \times (N + 2^p))$. A summary of the sample complexities required for different methods can be found in Table 1. A key technical challenge in our analysis is analyzing how the error induced in the first step of Synthetic Combinations percolates through to the second step. To tackle it, we reduce this problem to that of high-dimensional error-in-variables regression with linear model misspecification, and do a novel analysis of this statistical setting. While we focus on the Lasso for the horizontal regression step, Synthetic Combinations allows for any ML algorithm to be used in the first step. This flexibility allows the analyst to tailor the horizontal regression procedure to take advantage of any additional structure in the potential outcomes. We provide an example of this by showing how replacing Lasso with “classification and regression trees” (CART) leads to a sample complexity (ignoring logarithmic factors) of $\text{poly}(r) \times (N + s^2)$ under additional regularity assumptions on the potential outcome function.

Next, we show how Synthetic Combinations can be used to inform experiment design for combinatorial inference. In particular, we propose and analyze an experimental design mechanism that ensures the key assumptions required for consistency of Synthetic Combinations are satisfied.

Learning algorithm	Exploits structure across combinations ($\ \alpha_n\ _0 = s$)	Exploits structure across units ($\text{rank}(\mathcal{A}) = r$)	Sample complexity
Lasso	✓	✗	$O(N \times s^2 p)$
Matrix Completion	✗	✓	$O(\text{poly}(r) \times (N + 2^p))$
Synthetic Combinations	✓	✓	$O(\text{poly}(r) \times (N + s^2 p))$

Table 1: Comparison of sample complexity of different methods to estimate all $N \times 2^p$ causal parameters. Synthetic Combinations exploits structure across both combinations and units to estimate all potential outcomes with significantly fewer observations.

2. Related Work

Learning over Combinations. To place structure on the space of combinations, we use tools from the theory of learning (sparse) Boolean functions, in particular the Fourier transform. Sparsity of the Fourier transform as a complexity measure was proposed by [Karpovsky \(1976\)](#), and was used by [Brandman et al. \(1990\)](#) and others to characterize and design learning algorithms for low-depth trees, low-degree polynomials, and small circuits. Learning Boolean functions is now a central topic in learning theory, and is closely related to many important questions in ML more broadly; see e.g. [Mossel et al. \(2003\)](#) for discussion of the k -Junta problem and its relation to relevant feature selection. We refer to [O’Donnell \(2008, Chapter 3\)](#) for further background on this area. In this paper, we focus on general-purpose statistical procedures for learning sparse Boolean functions with noise. We build on the work of [Negahban and Shah \(2012\)](#) on variants of the Lasso procedure, and the works of [Breiman et al. \(2017\)](#); [Syrkkanis and Zampetakis \(2020\)](#); [Klusowski \(2020, 2021\)](#) and others on CART. In particular, we highlight the works of [Negahban and Shah \(2012\)](#) and [Syrkkanis and Zampetakis \(2020\)](#) which showed that Lasso and CART can be used to efficiently learn sparse Boolean functions, an essential property in our setting since the dimension of the function class grows exponentially.

Matrix Completion. We build on the observation that imputing counterfactual outcomes in the presence of a latent factor structure can be equivalently expressed as low-rank matrix completion ([Bai and Ng, 2019](#); [Athey et al., 2021](#); [Agarwal et al., 2020b](#)). The observation that low-rank matrices may typically be recovered from a small fraction of the entries by nuclear-norm minimization has had a major impact on modern statistics [Candès and Tao \(2010\)](#); [Recht \(2011\)](#); [Candes and Recht \(2012\)](#). In the noisy setting, proposed estimators have generally proceeded by minimizing risk subject to a nuclear-norm penalty, such as in the SoftImpute algorithm of ([Mazumder et al., 2010](#)), or minimizing risk subject to a rank constraint as in the hard singular-value thresholding (HSVT) algorithms analyzed by [Keshavan et al. \(2009, 2010\)](#); [Gavish and Donoho \(2014\)](#); [Chatterjee \(2015\)](#). We refer the reader to [Davenport and Romberg \(2016\)](#); [Nguyen et al. \(2019\)](#) for a comprehensive overview of this vast literature.

Econometrics/causal inference. There is a rich literature on how to simultaneously learn the effects of multiple treatments, and, separately, how to learn personalized treatment effects for heterogeneous units. The latter problem is often formulated in terms of the “conditional average treatment effect,” see [Abrevaya et al. \(2015\)](#). From this perspective, one learns a function $f(X_i)$ which predicts the causal effect (difference between counterfactual outcome) conditional upon individual features X_i . There is also a rich literature dating back to [Rubin \(1976\)](#) that studies when and how a researcher can perform valid causal inference from observational data, building on the potential

outcomes framework introduced by [Neyman and Iwaszkiewicz \(1935\)](#). This problem is of particular importance in the social sciences and in medicine, where experimental data is limited, and has led to several promising approaches including instrumental variables (see [Angrist et al. \(1996\)](#)), difference-in-differences, regression discontinuity, and others; see [Imbens and Rubin \(2015\)](#) for an overview. Of particular interest to us here is the “synthetic control” method of [Abadie et al. \(2010\)](#), which exploits an underlying factor structure to effectively “share” counterfactual information between treatment and control units. Building on [Abadie et al. \(2010\)](#), recent work has shown that the same underlying structure can be used to estimate treatment effects with multiple treatments *and* heterogeneous units, with or without unmeasured confounding. The resulting framework, called “synthetic interventions” (SI), uses the factor representation to efficiently share information across similar (yet distinct) units and treatments ([Agarwal et al., 2020b](#)). We generalize the SI framework to settings where the number of treatments is very large and most treatments have no units that receive it, but there is structure across combinations of interventions. In doing so, we enable its use in several highly practical cases where multiple treatments are delivered simultaneously, such as recommender systems, medical treatment regimens, and inference from factorial designs.

3. Setup and Model

3.1. Notation

Representation of Combinations as Binary Vectors. Let $[p] = \{1, \dots, p\}$ denote the set of p interventions. Denote by Π the power set of $[p]$, i.e., the set of all possible combinations of p interventions, where we note $|\Pi| = 2^p$. Then, any given combination $\pi \in \Pi$ induces the following binary representation $\mathbf{v}(\pi) \in \{-1, 1\}^p$ defined as follows: $\mathbf{v}(\pi)_i = 2 \mathbf{1}\{i \in \pi\} - 1$.

Fourier Expansion of Boolean Functions. Let $\mathcal{F}_{\text{bool}} = \{f : \{-1, 1\}^p \rightarrow \mathbb{R}\}$ be the set of all real-valued functions defined on the hypercube $\{-1, 1\}^p$. Then $\mathcal{F}_{\text{bool}}$ forms a Hilbert space defined by the following inner product: for any $f, g \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{bool}}$, $\langle f, g \rangle_B = \frac{1}{2^p} \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \{-1, 1\}^p} f(\mathbf{x})g(\mathbf{x})$. This inner product induces the norm $\langle f, f \rangle_B := \|f\|_B^2 = \frac{1}{2^p} \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \{-1, 1\}^p} f^2(\mathbf{x})$. We construct an orthonormal basis for $\mathcal{F}_{\text{bool}}$ as follows: for each subset $S \subset [p]$, define a basis function $\chi_S(\mathbf{x}) = \prod_{i \in S} x_i$ where x_i is the i^{th} coefficient of $\mathbf{x} \in \{-1, 1\}^p$. One can verify that for any $S \subset [p]$ that $\|\chi_S\|_B = 1$, and that $\langle \chi_S, \chi_{S'} \rangle_B = 0$ for any $S' \neq S$. Since $|\{\chi_S : S \subset [p]\}| = 2^p$, the functions χ_S are an orthonormal basis of $\mathcal{F}_{\text{bool}}$. Hence, any $f \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{bool}}$ can be expressed via the following “Fourier” decomposition: $f(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{S \subset [p]} \alpha_S \chi_S(\mathbf{x})$, where the Fourier coefficient α_S is given by computing $\alpha_S = \langle f, \chi_S \rangle_B$. We will refer to χ_S as the Fourier character. Define $\boldsymbol{\alpha} \in \mathbb{R}^{2^p}$ and $\boldsymbol{\chi}(x) \in \{-1, 1\}^{2^p}$ as the vector of Fourier coefficients and characters respectively. Hence any function $f : \{-1, 1\}^p \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ can be re-expressed as follows: $f(\mathbf{x}) = \langle \boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\chi}(x) \rangle$. For $\pi \in \Pi$, abbreviate $\chi_S(\mathbf{v}(\pi))$ and $\boldsymbol{\chi}(\mathbf{v}(\pi))$ as χ_S^π and $\boldsymbol{\chi}^\pi$ respectively.

Observed and potential outcomes. We refer to $Y_n^{(\pi)} \in \mathbb{R}$ as the *potential outcome* for unit n under combination π and $Y_{n\pi} \in \{\mathbb{R} \cup \star\}$ as the *observed outcome*, where \star indicates a missing value, i.e., the outcome associated with the unit-combination pair (n, π) was not observed. Let $\mathbf{Y} = [Y_{n\pi}] \in \{\mathbb{R} \cup \star\}^{N \times 2^p}$. Let $\mathcal{D} \subset [N] \times [2^p]$, refer to the subset of unit-combination pairs we do observe. That is,

$$Y_{n\pi} = \begin{cases} Y_n^{(\pi)}, & \text{if } (n, \pi) \in \mathcal{D} \\ \star, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

Note that (1) implies stable unit treatment value assignment (SUTVA) holds. Let $\Pi_S \subseteq \Pi$ denote a subset of combinations. For a given unit n , let $\mathbf{Y}_{\Pi_S, n} = [Y_{n\pi_i} : \pi_i \in \Pi_S] \in \{\mathbb{R} \cup \star\}^{|\Pi_S|}$ represent the vector of observed outcomes for all $\pi \in \Pi_S$. Similarly, let $\mathbf{Y}_n^{(\Pi_S)} = [Y_n^{(\pi_i)} : \pi_i \in \Pi_S] \in \mathbb{R}^{|\Pi_S|}$ represent the vector of potential outcomes. Additionally, denote $\chi(\Pi_S) = [\chi^{\pi_i} : \pi_i \in \Pi_S] \in \{-1, 1\}^{|\Pi_S| \times 2^p}$.

3.2. Model & Target Causal Parameter

Assumption 1 (Potential Outcome Model) For any unit-combination pair (n, π) , we assume it has the following representation,

$$Y_n^{(\pi)} = \langle \boldsymbol{\alpha}_n, \boldsymbol{\chi}^\pi \rangle + \epsilon_n^\pi, \quad (2)$$

where recall $\boldsymbol{\alpha}_n \in \mathbb{R}^{2^p}$, $\boldsymbol{\chi}^\pi \in \{-1, 1\}^{2^p}$ are the Fourier coefficients and characters, respectively. We assume the following properties: (a) low-rank property: $\mathcal{A} = [\boldsymbol{\alpha}_n]_{n \in [N]}$ has rank $r \in [\min\{N, 2^p\}]$; (b) sparsity: $\boldsymbol{\alpha}_n$ is s -sparse (i.e. $\|\boldsymbol{\alpha}_n\|_0 \leq s$, where $s \in [2^p]$) for every unit $n \in [N]$; (c) ϵ_n^π is a residual term specific to (n, π) , and we assume $\mathbb{E}[\epsilon_n^\pi | \mathcal{A}] = 0$.

Note that $Y_n^{(\cdot)}$ can be viewed as a function from $\{-1, 1\}^p \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. Given our discussion on Fourier representations of Boolean functions in Section 3.1, $Y_n^{(\pi)}$ can be represented as $\langle \boldsymbol{\alpha}_n, \boldsymbol{\chi}^\pi \rangle$ without loss of generality. Hence the assumption really is that $\boldsymbol{\alpha}_n$ is s -sparse and \mathcal{A} is rank- r . ϵ_n^π is the residual from this sparse and low-rank approximation, and it serves as the source of uncertainty in our model. Note that conditional on $\mathbb{E}[\epsilon_n^\pi | \mathcal{A}] = 0$, the matrix $\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Y}_N^{(\Pi)}] = [\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Y}_n^{(\Pi)}] : n \in [N]] \in \mathbb{R}^{2^p \times N}$ also is rank r , where the expectation is defined with respect to ϵ_n^π .

The low-rank property places *structure across units*; that is, we assume there is sufficient similarity across units so that $\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Y}_n^{(\Pi)}]$ for any unit n can be written as a linear combination of r other rows of $\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Y}_N^{(\Pi)}]$. A special case of this property is to assume there are exactly r different kinds of units, i.e., $\boldsymbol{\alpha}_n$ is one of exactly r different possibilities, an example we discuss in detail below. The low-rank assumption is commonly made to place structure across units, and has found much use in matrix completion and its related applications (e.g., recommendation engines).

The sparsity assumption establishes *unit-specific* structure; that is, we assume that the potential outcomes for a given user only depend on a small subset of the functions $\{\chi_S : S \subset [p]\}$. We emphasize that this subset of functions can be different across units. As discussed in Section 2, sparsity is commonly assumed when studying the learnability of Boolean functions. In say the context of recommendation engines, sparsity implies that the ratings for a combination of goods may only depend on a small number of items within that set. Sparsity is also commonly assumed, at least implicitly, in factorial design experiments, where analysts typically only include pairwise interaction effects between interventions and ignore higher-order interactions (George et al., 2005). We discuss applications of combinatorial inference in greater detail in Section 4.

Target causal parameter. For any given unit $n \in [N]$ and combination $\pi \in \Pi$, we aim to estimate $\mathbb{E}[Y_n^{(\pi)} | \mathcal{A}]$, where the expectation is with respect to ϵ_n^π , and we condition on the set of Fourier coefficients \mathcal{A} .

4. Combinatorial Inference Applications

In this section, we discuss how classical models and applications could relate to our proposed potential outcome model. In particular, we discuss two well-studied models for functions over combinations: low-degree Boolean polynomials and k -Juntas. We also discuss applications such as factorial design experiments and recommendation systems.

Low-degree Boolean Polynomials. A special instance of sparse Boolean functions is a low-degree polynomial which we define as follows. For a positive integer $d \leq p$, $f : \{-1, 1\}^p \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a d -degree polynomial if its Fourier transform satisfies the following for any input $\mathbf{x} \in \{-1, 1\}^p$

$$f(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{S \subset [p], |S| \leq d} \alpha_S \chi_S(\mathbf{x}). \quad (3)$$

In this setting, we see that $s \leq \sum_{i=0}^d \binom{p}{i} \approx p^d$. That is, degree d -polynomials impose sparsity on the potential outcome by limiting the degree of interaction between interventions.

Applications of low-degree Boolean polynomials. We discuss two applications when the potential outcomes can be modeled as a low-degree Boolean polynomial.

Factorial Design Experiments. Factorial design experiments consist of p treatments where each treatment arm can take on a discrete set of values, and units are assigned different combinations of these treatments. In the special case that each treatment arm only takes on two possible values, this experimental design mechanism is referred to as a 2^p factorial experiment. Factorial design experiments are widely employed in the social sciences, agricultural and industrial applications (Duflo et al., 2007; Dasgupta et al., 2015; Wu and Hamada, 2011). A common strategy to determine treatment effects in this setting is to assume that the potential outcome only depends on main effects and pairwise interactions with higher-order interactions being negligible (Bertrand and Mullainathan, 2004; Eriksson and Rooth, 2014; George et al., 2005). That is, analysts implicitly enforce sparsity of α_n by setting $d = 2$. We refer the reader to Zhao and Ding (2022) for a detailed discussion of various estimation strategies and their validity in different settings. The model we propose (see Assumption 1) captures these various modeling choices commonly used in factorial design experiments by imposing sparsity on α_n . Further, as we show later, Synthetic Combinations can adapt to low-degree polynomials without pre-specifying the degree, d , i.e., it automatically adapts to the inherent level of interactions in the data. The additional assumption we make however is that there is structure across units, i.e., the matrix $\mathcal{A} = [\alpha_n]_{n \in [N]}$ is low-rank.

Optimal Team Selection. Another use for combinatorial inference is to find the optimal configuration for a team. For example, a soccer team can be interested in finding the configuration of positions (i.e., defensive, midfield, offensive players) that leads to the highest winning percentage. Here, units n are different teams, and combinations π represent possible configurations of the team. The potential outcomes $\mathbb{E}[Y_n^{(\pi)}]$ represent the winning percentage for a given team n under a particular configuration π , with the coefficients of α_n representing the effect of different configurations on the win rate. In this setting, enforcing sparsity of α_n via low-degree polynomials may be appropriate because the number of wins may depend on all the players, however only interactions between players of the same type matter while higher-order interactions between players of different types can be negligible. Returning to the example of a soccer team, the win rate can depend strongly on the synergy of the offensive players, whereas interactions between offensive and defensive players

have a smaller effect. Further, since different teams might play in similar ways and can have the same optimal configuration, one potential way to capture this structure across teams is by placing a low-rank structure on \mathcal{A} .

k -Juntas. Another special case of sparse Boolean functions are k -Juntas which only depend on $k < p$ input variables. More formally, a function $f : \{-1, 1\}^p \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a k -junta if there exists a set $K \subset [p]$ with $|K| = k$ such that the fourier expansion of f can be represented as follows

$$f(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{S \subset K} \alpha_S \chi_S(\mathbf{x}) \tag{4}$$

Therefore, in the setting of the k -Junta, the sparsity index $s \leq 2^k$. In contrast to low-degree polynomials where the function depends on all p variables but limits the degree of interaction between variables, k -Juntas only depend on k variables but allow for arbitrary interactions amongst them.

Applications of k -Juntas. We discuss two applications when the potential outcomes can be modeled as a k -Junta.

Recommendation Systems. Recommendation platforms such as *Netflix* are often interested in recommending a combination of movies that maximizes a user’s engagement with a platform. Here, units n can be individual users, and π represents combinations of different movies. The potential outcomes $\mathbb{E}[Y_n^{(\pi)}]$ are the engagement levels for a unit n when presented with a combination of movies π , with α_n representing the preferences for that user. In this setting, a user’s engagement with the platform may only depend on a small subset of movies. For example, a user who is only interested in fantasy will only remain on the platform if they are recommended movies such as *Harry Potter*. Under this behavioral model, the potential outcomes (i.e., engagement levels) can be modeled as a k -Junta with the non-zero coefficients of α_n representing the combinations of the k movies that affect engagement level for a user n . Our potential outcome observational model (Assumption 1) captures this form of sparsity while also reflecting the low-rank structure commonly assumed when studying recommendation systems. Once again, our results show Synthetic Combinations can adapt to k -Juntas without pre-specifying the subset of features K , i.e., it automatically learns the important features for a given user. This additional structure in k -Juntas is well-captured by the CART estimator, which leads to tighter finite-sample bounds, as detailed in Appendix G.

Knock-down Experiments in Genomics. A key task in genomics is to identify which set of genes are responsible for a phenotype (i.e., physical trait of interest such as blood pressure) in a given individual. To do so, geneticists use knock-down experiments which measure the difference in the phenotype after eliminating the effect of a set of genes in an individual. To encode this process in the language of combinatorial causal inference, we can think of units n as different individuals, an action as knocking a particular gene out, and π as a combination of genes that are knocked out. The potential outcomes $\mathbb{E}[Y_n^{(\pi)}]$ is the expression of the phenotype for a unit n when the combination of genes π are eliminated via knock-down experiments, and the coefficients of α_n represent the effect of different combination of genes on the phenotype. A typical assumption in genomics is that phenotypes only depend on a small set of genes and their interactions. In this setting, we can model this form of sparsity by thinking of the potential outcome function as a k -junta, as well as capturing the similarity between the effect of genes on different individuals via our low-rank assumption.

5. Identification of Potential Outcomes

In this section, we show that $\mathbb{E}[Y_n^{(\pi)} \mid \mathcal{A}]$ can be written as a function of observed outcomes, i.e., we establish identification of our target causal parameter. Our identification argument allows for *unobserved confounding*. That is, whether or not a unit is seen under a combination is correlated with its potential outcome under that combination due to unobserved factors. Below we list the required assumptions for identification.

Assumption 2 (Selection on Fourier coefficients) For all $n \in [N]$ and $\pi \in \Pi$, $Y_n^{(\pi)} \perp\!\!\!\perp \mathcal{D} \mid \mathcal{A}$.

Assumption 2 states that conditional on the Fourier coefficients \mathcal{A} , the potential outcomes are conditionally independent of the treatment assignments \mathcal{D} . However, the treatment assignment can be an arbitrary function of the Fourier coefficients. This conditional independence condition can be thought of as “selection on Fourier coefficients”, which is analogous to “selection on observables”, where it is assumed that potential outcomes are independent of treatment assignments conditional on *observed* covariates.

To define the next assumption, we introduce necessary notation. For each unit $n \in [N]$, denote the subset of combinations we observe them under as $\Pi_n \subseteq \Pi$. Additionally, for $\pi \in \Pi$, let $\tilde{\chi}_n^\pi \in \mathbb{R}^{2^p}$ denote the vector where we zero out all coordinates of $\chi^\pi \in \mathbb{R}^{2^p}$ that correspond to the coefficients of α_n which are zero. For example, if $\alpha_n = (1, 1, 0, 0, \dots, 0)$ and $\chi^\pi = (1, 1, \dots, 1)$, then $\tilde{\chi}_n^\pi = (1, 1, 0, \dots, 0)$.

Assumption 3 (Donor Units) We assume there exists a set of “donor units” $\mathcal{I} \subset [N]$, such that the following two conditions hold:

- (a) *Horizontal span inclusion:* For any donor unit $u \in \mathcal{I}$ and combination $\pi \in \Pi$, suppose $\tilde{\chi}_u^\pi \in \text{span}(\tilde{\chi}_u^{\pi_i} : \pi_i \in \Pi_u)$. That is, there exists $\beta_{\Pi_u}^\pi \in \mathbb{R}^{|\Pi_u|}$ such that $\tilde{\chi}_u^\pi = \sum_{\pi_i \in \Pi_u} \beta_{\pi_i}^\pi \tilde{\chi}_u^{\pi_i}$.
- (b) *Linear span inclusion:* For any unit $n \in [N] \setminus \mathcal{I}$, suppose $\alpha_n \in \text{span}(\alpha_u : u \in \mathcal{I})$. That is, there exists w^n such that $\alpha_n = \sum_{u \in \mathcal{I}} w_u^n \alpha_u$.

We interpret this assumption below. *Horizontal span inclusion:* This requires that the set of observed combinations for any donor unit is “diverse” enough that the projection of the Fourier characteristic for a target intervention is in the span of characteristics of observed interventions. *Linear span inclusion:* This requires that the donor set is diverse enough such that the Fourier coefficient of any unit is in the span of the Fourier coefficients of the donor set.

Motivating example. We provide the following running example as a motivation for the existence of a donor set \mathcal{I} that satisfies Assumption 3. Suppose Assumption 1 holds and that each unit belongs to one of r types. That is, for every unit $n \in [N]$ that $\alpha_n \in \{\alpha(1), \alpha(2), \dots, \alpha(r)\} \subset \mathbb{R}^{2^p}$, where each $\alpha(i)$ is s -sparse. Note that having r distinct sets of Fourier coefficients implies the low-rank property in Assumption 1 (a). Suppose we choose the donor set $\mathcal{I} \subset [N]$ by sampling a subset of units independently and uniformly at random with size satisfying $\Omega(r \log(r/\gamma))$. Sample $\Pi_{\mathcal{I}} \subset \Pi$ combinations independently and uniformly at random with size satisfying $\Omega(s \log(r|\mathcal{I}|/\gamma))$, and assign all donor units this set of combinations. Proposition 4 below (proved in Appendix F) establishes that under this sampling scheme horizontal and linear span inclusion (i.e., Assumption 3) is satisfied with high probability as long as each type is well-represented (i.e., there are $\Omega(N)$ units of each type).

Proposition 4 *Let Assumptions 1 and Assumptions 2 hold. Moreover, suppose that for some $c > 0$, there are at least cN/r units of each type. Then, under the proposed sampling scheme described above, Assumption 3 is satisfied with probability at least $1 - \gamma$.*

Proposition 4 shows that (ignoring logarithmic factors) sampling r units and assign these units s combinations at random is sufficient to induce a valid donor set. Further, we show in Section 8 that our assumption of exactly r unit types can be relaxed. Specifically, we show that a randomly selected donor set of size $\omega(r \log(rs))$ will satisfy linear span inclusion as long as the r non-zero singular values of the matrix \mathcal{A} are of similar size (see Assumption 9 below).

5.1. Identification Result

Given these assumptions, we now present our identification theorem.

Theorem 5 *Let Assumptions 1 and 3 hold. Then, given $\beta_{\Pi_u}^\pi$ and \mathbf{w}_u^n defined in Assumption 3, we have*

$$[(a)] \text{ Donor units: For } u \in \mathcal{I}, \text{ and } \pi \in \Pi, \mathbb{E}[Y_u^{(\pi)} \mid \mathcal{A}] = \sum_{\pi_u \in \Pi_u} \beta_{\pi_u}^\pi \mathbb{E}[Y_{u, \pi_u} \mid \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{D}].$$

$$[(b)] \text{ Non-donor units: For } n \in [N] \setminus \mathcal{I}, \text{ and } \pi \notin \Pi_n, \mathbb{E}[Y_n^{(\pi)} \mid \mathcal{A}] = \sum_{u \in \mathcal{I}, \pi_u \in \Pi_u} w_u^n \beta_{\pi_u}^\pi \mathbb{E}[Y_{u, \pi_u} \mid \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{D}].$$

Theorem 5 allows for identification despite *unobserved confounding* (i.e, the combinations assigned to units are allowed to depend on the Fourier coefficients \mathcal{A}). Part (a) establishes that for every donor unit $u \in \mathcal{I}$, the causal estimand can be written as a function of its *own* observed outcomes $\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Y}_{\Pi_u}]$, given knowledge of $\beta_{\Pi_u}^\pi$. Part (b) states that the target causal estimand $\mathbb{E}[Y_n^{(\pi)}]$ for a non-donor unit and combination π can be written as a linear combination of the outcomes of the donor set \mathcal{I} , given knowledge of \mathbf{w}_u^n . Thus, Theorem 5 suggests that the key quantities in estimating $\mathbb{E}[Y_n^{(\pi)}]$ for any unit-combination pair (n, π) are $\beta_{\Pi_u}^\pi$ and \mathbf{w}_u^n . In the following section, we provide an algorithm to estimate both $\beta_{\Pi_u}^\pi$ and \mathbf{w}_u^n , as well as concrete ways of determining the donor set \mathcal{I} .

6. The Synthetic Combinations Estimator

We now describe the Synthetic Combinations estimator, a simple and flexible two-step procedure for estimating our target causal parameter. In Figure 1, we provide a pictorial representation of the estimator.

Step 1: Horizontal Regression. For notational simplicity, we denote the vector of observed responses $\mathbf{Y}_{n, \Pi_n} = [Y_{n\pi} : \pi \in \Pi_n] \in \mathbf{R}^{|\Pi_n|}$ for any unit n as \mathbf{Y}_{Π_n} . Then, for every unit u in the donor set \mathcal{I} , we estimate $\mathbb{E}[Y_u^{(\pi)}]$ via the Lasso, i.e., by solving the following convex program with penalty parameter λ_u :

$$\hat{\alpha}_u = \arg \min_{\alpha} \frac{1}{|\Pi_u|} \|\mathbf{Y}_{\Pi_u} - \chi(\Pi_u)\alpha\|_2^2 + \lambda_u \|\alpha\|_1 \quad (5)$$

where recall that $\chi(\Pi_u) = [\chi^\pi : \pi \in \Pi_u] \in \mathbb{R}^{|\Pi_u| \times 2^p}$. Then, for any donor unit-combination pair (u, π) , let $\hat{\mathbb{E}}[Y_u^{(\pi)}] = \langle \hat{\alpha}_u, \chi^\pi \rangle$ denote the estimate of the potential outcome $\mathbb{E}[Y_u^{(\pi)}]$.

Step 2: Vertical Regression. Next, we estimate potential outcomes for all units $n \in [N] \setminus \mathcal{I}$. To do so, we define some additional required notation. For $\Pi_S \subset \Pi$, define the vector of estimated

potential outcomes $\hat{\mathbb{E}}[\mathbf{Y}_u^{(\Pi_S)}] = [\hat{\mathbb{E}}[Y_u^{(\pi)}] : \pi \in \Pi_S] \in \mathbb{R}^{|\Pi_S|}$. Additionally, let $\hat{\mathbb{E}}[\mathbf{Y}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_S)}] = [\hat{\mathbb{E}}[\mathbf{Y}_u^{(\Pi_S)}] : u \in \mathcal{I}] \in \mathbb{R}^{|\Pi_S| \times |\mathcal{I}|}$.

Step 2(a): Principal Component Regression. Perform a singular value decomposition (SVD) of $\hat{\mathbb{E}}[\mathbf{Y}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_n)}]$ to get $\hat{\mathbb{E}}[\mathbf{Y}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_n)}] = \sum_{l=1}^{\min(|\Pi_n|, |\mathcal{I}|)} \hat{s}_l \hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_l \hat{\boldsymbol{\nu}}_l^T$. Using a hyper-parameter $\kappa \leq \min(|\Pi_n|, |\mathcal{I}|)^2$, compute $\hat{\mathbf{w}}^n \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{I}|}$ as follows:

$$\hat{\mathbf{w}}^n = \left(\sum_{l=1}^{\kappa} \hat{s}_l^{-1} \hat{\boldsymbol{\nu}}_l \hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_l^T \right) \mathbf{Y}_{\Pi_n} \quad (6)$$

Step 2(b): Estimation. Using $\hat{\mathbf{w}}^n = [\hat{w}_u^n : u \in \mathcal{I}]$, we have the following estimate for any intervention $\pi \in \Pi$

$$\hat{\mathbb{E}}[Y_n^{(\pi)}] = \sum_{u \in \mathcal{I}} \hat{w}_u^n \hat{\mathbb{E}}[Y_u^{(\pi)}] \quad (7)$$




Figure 1: A visual description of Synthetic Combinations. Figure 1(a) depicts an example of a particular observation pattern with outcome for unit-combination pair (n, π) missing. Figure 1(b) demonstrates horizontal regression for donor unit u where we estimate potential outcome $\mathbb{E}[Y_u^{(\pi)}]$. Figure 1(c) visualizes vertical regression where we transfer estimated outcomes from the donor set \mathcal{I} to the unit-combination pair (n, π) .

Suitability of Lasso and PCR. Lasso is appropriate for the horizontal regression step because it adapts to the sparsity of α_u . However, it can be replaced with other algorithms that adapt to sparsity (see below for a larger discussion). For vertical regression, PCR is appropriate because \mathcal{A} is low rank. As Agarwal et al. (2019, 2020a) show, PCR implicitly regularizes the regression by adapting to the rank of the covariates (\mathbf{Y}_{Π_n}) , i.e., the out-of-sample error of PCR scales with r rather than the ambient covariate dimension.

Determining Donor Set \mathcal{I} . Synthetic Combinations requires the existence of a subset of units $\mathcal{I} \subset [N]$ such that we are able to (i) accurately estimate their potential outcomes under all possible combinations, and (ii) transfer these estimated outcomes to a unit $n \in [N] \setminus \mathcal{I}$. Theoretically, we detail sufficient conditions on the observation pattern such that we are able to perform (i) and (ii) accurately via the Lasso and PCR respectively. In practice, we recommend the following practical guidance to determining the donor set \mathcal{I} . For every unit $n \in [N]$, learn a separate Lasso model α_n and assess its performance through k -fold cross-validation (CV). Assign units with low CV error

2. Both λ and κ can be chosen in a data-driven manner (e.g., via cross-validation) as discussed in Chetverikov et al. (2021) and Agarwal et al. (2020a) respectively.

(with a pre-determined threshold) as the donor set \mathcal{I} , and estimate outcomes $\hat{\mathbb{E}}[Y_u^{(\pi)}]$ for every unit $u \in \mathcal{I}$ and $\pi \in \Pi$. For any non-donor unit $n \in [N] \setminus \mathcal{I}$, we learn a model via PCR as discussed in step 2 of Synthetic Combinations and assess the performance of PCR through CV. For units with low PCR error, linear span inclusion (Assumption 3(b)) and the assumptions required for the generalization for PCR likely hold, and hence we estimate their potential outcomes as in (7). For units with large PCR error, it is either unlikely that these set of assumptions holds or that $|\Pi_n|$ is not large enough (i.e., additional experiments need to be run for this unit), and hence we do not recommend estimating their counterfactuals.

Horizontal Regression Model Selection. Synthetic Combinations allows for any ML algorithm (e.g., random forests, neural networks, ensemble methods) to be used in the first step. We provide an example of this flexibility by showing how the horizontal regression can also be done via CART in Appendix G. Our theoretical analysis of CART shows that it leads to better finite-sample rates under stronger regularity conditions on the potential outcomes $\mathbb{E}[Y_n^{(\pi)}]$ (see Corollary 13). This model-agnostic approach allows the analyst to tailor the horizontal learning procedure to the data at hand and include additional structural information for better performance. However, for simplicity, we focus on the Lasso for the remainder of this paper.

7. Synthetic Combinations Theoretical Analysis

Below, we establish the statistical properties of Synthetic Combinations. In section 7.1, we state the additional assumptions alongside their interpretation required for our theoretical results. In Section 7.2, we establish finite-sample consistency of Synthetic Combinations. In Section 7.3, we discuss our theoretical results and the required sample-complexity of Synthetic Combinations to estimate our causal parameter.

7.1. Additional Assumptions

Assumption 6 (Boundedness of Potential Outcomes) *We assume that $\mathbb{E}[Y_n^{(\pi)}] \in [-1, 1]$ for any unit-combination pair (n, π) .*

Assumption 7 (Sub-Gaussian Noise) *Conditioned on \mathcal{A} , for any unit-combination pair (n, π) , ϵ_n^π are independent zero-mean sub-Gaussian random variables with $\text{Var}[\epsilon_n^\pi | \mathcal{A}] \leq \sigma^2$ and $\|\epsilon_n^\pi | \mathcal{A}\|_{\psi_2} \leq C\sigma$ for some constant $C > 0$.*

Assumption 8 (Incoherence of Donor Fourier characteristics) *For every unit $u \in \mathcal{I}$, we assume $\chi(\Pi_u)$ satisfies the incoherence condition: $\left\| \frac{\chi(\Pi_u)^T \chi(\Pi_u)}{|\Pi_u|} - \mathbf{I}_{2^p} \right\|_\infty \leq \frac{C'}{s}$, for a universal constant $C' > 0$.*

To define our next set of assumptions, we introduce necessary notation. For any subset of combinations $\Pi_S \subset \Pi$, let $\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Y}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_S)}] = [\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Y}_u^{(\Pi_S)}] : u \in \mathcal{I}] \in \mathbb{R}^{|\Pi_S| \times |\mathcal{I}|}$.

Assumption 9 (Donor Unit Balanced Spectrum) *For a given unit $n \in [N] \setminus \mathcal{I}$, let r_n and $s_1 \dots s_{r_n}$ denote the rank and non-zero singular values of $E[\mathbf{Y}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_n)} | \mathcal{A}]$ respectively. Then, we assume that the singular values are well-balanced, i.e., for universal constant $c, c' > 0$, we have that $s_{r_n}/s_1 \geq c$, and $\|E[\mathbf{Y}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_n)} | \mathcal{A}]\|_F^2 \geq c' |\Pi_n| |\mathcal{I}|$*

Assumption 10 (Subspace Inclusion) For a given unit $n \in [N] \setminus \mathcal{I}$ and intervention $\pi \in \Pi \setminus \Pi_n$, assume that $\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Y}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\pi)}]$ lies within the row-span of $\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Y}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_n)}]$

Assumption 6 and 7 are self-explanatory. Assumption 8 is necessary for finite-sample consistency when estimating α_n via the Lasso estimator (5), and is commonly made when studying the Lasso (Rigollet and Hütter, 2015). Incoherence can also be seen as an inclusion criteria for a unit n to be included in the donor set \mathcal{I} . Lemma 2 in Negahban and Shah (2012) shows that the Assumption 8 is satisfied with high probability if Π_u is chosen uniformly at random and grows as $\omega(s^2 p)$. Assumption 9 requires that the non-zero singular values of $\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Y}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_n)} \mid \mathcal{A}]$ are well-balanced. Such an assumption is commonly made while studying PCR Agarwal et al. (2019, 2020b), and is also standard within the econometrics literature Bai and Ng (2021); Fan et al. (2018). It can also be empirically validated by plotting the spectrum of $\hat{\mathbb{E}}[\mathbf{Y}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_n)}]$; if the spectrum of $\hat{\mathbb{E}}[\mathbf{Y}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_n)}]$ displays a natural elbow point in its singular spectrum, then Assumption 9 is likely to hold. Assumption 10 is also commonly made when analyzing PCR Agarwal et al. (2020a,b); Agarwal and Singh (2021). It can be thought of as a “causal transportability” condition from the model learnt using Π_n to the interventions $\pi \in \Pi \setminus \Pi_n$. That is, subspace inclusion allows us to generalize well, and accurately estimate $\mathbb{E}[Y_n^{(\pi)}]$ using $\langle \hat{\mathbb{E}}[\mathbf{Y}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_n)}], \hat{\mathbf{w}}^n \rangle$. As we show in Section 8, subspace inclusion holds with high probability if $|\Pi_n|$ is chosen uniformly and independently at random from Π and has size $\omega(r \log(|\mathcal{I}|))$

7.2. Finite Sample Consistency

The following result establishes finite-sample consistency of Synthetic Combinations. Without loss of generality, we will focus on estimating the pair of quantities $(\mathbb{E}[Y_u^{(\pi)}], \mathbb{E}[Y_n^{(\pi)}])$ for a given donor unit $u \in \mathcal{I}$, and non-donor unit $n \in [N] \setminus \mathcal{I}$ under treatment assignment $\pi \in \Pi$. To simplify notation, we will use O_p notation which is a probabilistic version of big- O notation. Formally, for any sequence of random vectors X_n , $X_n = O_p(\gamma_n)$ if, for any $\epsilon > 0$, there exists constants c_ϵ and n_ϵ such that $\mathbb{P}(\|X_n\|_2 \geq c_\epsilon \gamma_n) \leq \epsilon$ for every $n \geq n_\epsilon$. Equivalently, we say that X_n/γ_n is “uniformly tight” or “bounded in probability”. Similarly, we define $\tilde{O}_p(\gamma_n)$ which suppresses dependence on logarithmic terms. Additionally, we will absorb dependencies on σ and logarithmic factors into the constant within $\tilde{O}_p(\cdot)$.

Theorem 11 (Finite Sample Consistency of Synthetic Combinations) Conditioned on \mathcal{A} , let Assumptions 1–3, and 6–10 hold. Then, the following statements hold.

- (a) For the given donor unit-combination pair (u, π) , let the Lasso regularization parameter satisfy $\lambda_u = \Omega(\sqrt{\frac{p}{|\Pi_u|}})$. Then, we have

$$|\hat{\mathbb{E}}[Y_u^{(\pi)}] - \mathbb{E}[Y_u^{(\pi)}]| = \tilde{O}_p \left(\sqrt{\frac{s^2 p}{|\Pi_u|}} \right)$$

- (b) For the given unit-combination pair (n, π) where $n \in [N] \setminus \mathcal{I}$, let $\kappa = \text{rank}(\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Y}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_n)}]) := r_n$. Then, provided that $\min_{u \in \mathcal{I}} |\Pi_u| := M = \omega(r_n^2 s^2 p)$, we have

$$\left| \hat{\mathbb{E}}[Y_n^{(\pi)}] - \mathbb{E}[Y_n^{(\pi)}] \right| = \tilde{O}_p \left(\frac{r_n^2 \sqrt{s^2 p}}{\sqrt{M} \times \min\{|\Pi_n|, |\mathcal{I}|\}} + \frac{r_n^2 s^2 p \sqrt{|\mathcal{I}|}}{M} + \frac{r_n}{|\Pi_n|^{1/4}} \right)$$

We discuss the necessary conditions on the number of observations required for Π_n and $\min_{u \in \mathcal{I}} |\Pi_u| = M$ to achieve consistency in estimating the potential outcome for the given pair of quantities $(\mathbb{E}[Y_u^{(\pi)}], \mathbb{E}[Y_n^{(\pi)}])$. To simplify the discussion, we assume that $\min\{|\Pi_n|, |\mathcal{I}|\} = |\mathcal{I}|$. This condition can be easily be enforced in practice by picking a subset of donor units such that $|\mathcal{I}| \leq |\Pi_n|$ when performing PCR (i.e., step 2 of Synthetic Combinations) Given this assumption, it can be easily verified $|\Pi_n|$ and M need to scale as $\omega(r_n^4)$ and $\omega(r_n^4 s^2 p)$ respectively to achieve $\max\left(|\hat{\mathbb{E}}[Y_u^{(\pi)}] - \mathbb{E}[Y_u^{(\pi)}]|, |\hat{\mathbb{E}}[Y_n^{(\pi)}] - \mathbb{E}[Y_n^{(\pi)}]|\right) = \tilde{o}_p(1)$ Next, we present a corollary that discusses how quickly the parameters r_n, s, p can grow with the number of observations $|\Pi_n|, M$.

Corollary 12 *Let the set-up of Theorem 11 hold. If the following hold,*

- (a) $r_n = o(|\Pi_n|^{1/4})$
- (b) $s = o\left(\sqrt{M/(p \max\{|\Pi_n|, |\mathcal{I}|\})}\right)$

then, we have $\max\left(|\hat{\mathbb{E}}[Y_u^{(\pi)}] - \mathbb{E}[Y_u^{(\pi)}]|, |\hat{\mathbb{E}}[Y_n^{(\pi)}] - \mathbb{E}[Y_n^{(\pi)}]|\right) = \tilde{o}_p(1)$ as $M, |\Pi_n|, |\mathcal{I}| \rightarrow \infty$.

Corollary 12 provides conditions on how the parameters s, r_n can scale with the number of observations to achieve consistency. That is, Corollary 12 reflects the maximum ‘‘complexity’’ allowed for a given sample size.

Next, we present an analogous corollary that assumes the horizontal regression is done via CART instead of the Lasso. We defer the discussion on the CART estimator and required assumptions to Appendix G.2.

Corollary 13 *Let the set-up of Theorems 11, 37, and condition (a) of Corollary 12 hold. Then, if $s = o\left(\sqrt{M/(\max\{|\Pi_n|, |\mathcal{I}|\})}\right)$, we have*

$$\max\left(|\hat{\mathbb{E}}[Y_u^{(\pi)}] - \mathbb{E}[Y_u^{(\pi)}]|, |\hat{\mathbb{E}}[Y_n^{(\pi)}] - \mathbb{E}[Y_n^{(\pi)}]|\right) = \tilde{o}_p(1)$$

Corollary 13 shows CART exploits the regularity conditions placed on the potential outcomes allows the sparsity s to scale more quickly (i.e., by a factor of p) while achieving consistency. That is, CART allows Synthetic Combinations to achieve consistency with $M = \omega(r_n^4 s^2)$ samples. The superior sample complexity of CART (under the additional structural assumptions on $\mathbb{E}[Y_n^{(\pi)}]$) reflect the flexibility of Synthetic Combinations.

7.3. Sample Complexity

We discuss the sample complexity of Synthetic Combinations to estimate all $N \times 2^p$ causal parameters, and compare it to that of other methods. To ease our discussion, we will ignore dependence on logarithmic factors and σ . Again, we assume that the horizontal regression is done via the Lasso.

Note that even if all potential outcomes $Y_n^{(\pi)}$ were observed for all unit-combination pairs, consistently estimating $\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Y}_N^{(\Pi)}]$ is not trivial. This is because, we only get to observe a single and noisy version $Y_{n\pi} = \langle \boldsymbol{\alpha}_n, \mathcal{X}^\pi \rangle + \epsilon_n^\pi$. Hypothetically, if we observe K independent samples of $Y_{n\pi}$ for a given (n, π) , denoted by $Y_{n\pi}^1, \dots, Y_{n\pi}^K$, the maximum likelihood estimator would be

the empirical average $\frac{1}{K} \sum_{i=1}^K Y_{n\pi}^i$. In this case, the empirical average would concentrate around $\mathbb{E}[Y_n^{(\pi)}]$ at a rate $O(1/\sqrt{K})$ and hence would require $K = \Omega(\delta^{-2})$ samples to estimate $\mathbb{E}[Y_n^{(\pi)}]$ within error $O(\delta)$. Therefore, for all $N \times 2^p$ causal parameters, this naive (unimplementable) solution would require $N \times 2^p \times \delta^{-2}$ observations.

On the other hand, Synthetic Combinations produces consistent estimates of the potential outcome despite being given *at most only a single noisy sample* of each potential outcome. As the discussion after Theorem 11 shows, if $|\mathcal{I}| \leq |\Pi_n|$, Synthetic Combinations requires $|\mathcal{I}| \times r^4 s^2 p / \delta^2$ observations for the donor set, and $(N - |\mathcal{I}|) \times r^4 / \delta^4$ observations for the non-donor units to achieve an estimation error of $O(\delta)$ for all $N \times 2^p$ causal parameters. That is, Synthetic Combinations requires at most $N \times r^4 / \delta^4 + |\mathcal{I}| \times r^4 s^2 p / \delta^2$ observations to estimate $\mathbb{E}[Y_n^{(\pi)}]$ with error $O(\delta)$ for all unit-combination pairs (n, π) . Of course, this is assuming that the key assumptions (see Section 7.1) are satisfied. Hence, we have that the number of observations required to achieve an estimation error of $O(\delta)$ scales as $O(\text{poly}(r) / \delta^4 \times (N + s^2 p))$.

Comparison to Other Methods. We compare the sample complexity of our method to other algorithms.

Horizontal regression: An alternative algorithm would be to learn an individual model for each unit $n \in [N]$. That is, run a separate horizontal regression via the Lasso for every unit. As implied by the analysis of [Negahban and Shah \(2012\)](#), this alternative algorithm has sample complexity that scales at least as $O(N \times s^2 p / \delta^2)$ rather than $O(\text{poly}(r) / \delta^4 \times (N + s^2 p))$ required by Synthetic Combinations. This alternative algorithm suffers because it does not utilize any structure across units (i.e., the low-rank property of \mathcal{A}), whereas Synthetic Combinations captures the similarity between units via PCR.

Matrix completion: Synthetic Combinations can be thought of as a matrix completion method; estimating $\mathbb{E}[Y_n^{(\pi)}]$ is equivalent to imputing (n, π) -th entry of the observation matrix $\mathbf{Y} \in \{\mathbb{R} \cup \star\}^{N \times 2^p}$. Under the low-rank property (Assumption 1(b)) and various models of missingness (i.e., observation patterns), recent works on matrix completion [Candes and Plan \(2010\)](#); [Ma and Chen \(2019\)](#); [Agarwal et al. \(2021\)](#) (see Section 2 for an overview) have established that estimating $\mathbb{E}[Y_n^{(\pi)}]$ to an accuracy $O(\delta)$ requires at least $O(\text{poly}(r/\delta) \times (N + 2^p))$ samples. This is because matrix completion techniques do not leverage additional structural information such as the Fourier expansion of Boolean functions and the resulting sparsity in α_n . Moreover, matrix completion results typically report error in the Frobenius norm, whereas we give entry-wise guarantees. This leads to an extra factor of s in our analysis as it requires proving convergence for $\|\hat{\alpha}_n - \alpha_n\|_1$ rather than $\|\hat{\alpha}_n - \alpha_n\|_2$.

Hence, Synthetic Combinations combines the best of both approaches by leveraging both the structure of the potential outcomes *and* the similarity across units to estimate potential outcomes $\mathbb{E}[Y_n^{(\pi)}]$.

Natural Lower Bound on Sample Complexity. We provide an informal discussion on the lower bound on the number of samples required to estimate all $N \times 2^p$ potential outcomes. To do so, consider the matrix of Fourier coefficients \mathcal{A} which is of rank r , and where every row (i.e., α_n) is s -sparse. As established in Lemma 32, this means that \mathcal{A} has at most rs non-zero columns. Counting the parameters in the singular value decomposition of \mathcal{A} , we observe that in fact only $r \times (N + rs)$ free parameters are required to be estimated. Hence, a natural lower bound on the sample complexity for any estimation algorithm scales as $O(Nr + r^2 s)$. This implies Synthetic

Combinations is only sub-optimal in terms of sample-complexity by a factor (ignoring logarithmic factors) of sp and $\text{poly}(r)$. As discussed earlier, an additional factor of s can be removed if we instead focus on deriving bounds for Frobenius norm errors. It remains an interesting future to work on deriving estimation procedures that are able to achieve this lower bound.

8. Experiment Design for Combinatorial Causal Inference

In this section, we show how Synthetic Combinations can be used to design experiments that allow for combinatorial inference (i.e., learning all $N \times 2^p$ causal parameters).

Key Assumptions Behind Finite Sample Consistency of Synthetic Combinations. Synthetic Combinations requires the existence of a donor set \mathcal{I} such that we are able to perform accurate horizontal regression for all donor units, and then transfer these estimated outcomes to non-donor units via PCR. The enabling conditions for accurate horizontal regression are (i) horizontal span inclusion (Assumption 3 (a)), and (ii) incoherence of the Fourier characteristics (Assumption 8). Similarly, the critical assumptions required for consistency of PCR are (i) linear span inclusion (Assumption 3 (b)), and (ii) subspace inclusion (Assumption 10). In terms of experiment design, these key assumptions suggest that the donor set and treatment assignments must be carefully chosen. To that end, we introduce the following experimental design mechanism.

Experimental Design Mechanism. Fix a probability threshold $\gamma \in (0, 1)$ and estimation error threshold $\delta \in (0, 1)$. Our design mechanism (see Figure 2 for a visual description) then proceeds as follows.

Step 1: Donor set selection. Choose the donor set $\mathcal{I} \subset [N]$ by sampling a subset of units independently and uniformly at random with size satisfying $|\mathcal{I}| = \Omega(r \log(rs/\gamma))$.

Step 2: Donor set treatment assignment. Sample $\Pi_{\mathcal{I}} \subset \Pi$ combinations independently and uniformly at random with size satisfying $|\Pi_{\mathcal{I}}| = \Omega\left(\frac{r^4 s^2 \log(|\mathcal{I}| 2^p / \gamma)}{\delta^2}\right)$. Assign all donor units $u \in \mathcal{I}$ this set of combinations.

Step 3: Non-donor unit treatment assignment. Randomly sample $\Pi_N \subset \Pi$ combinations independently and uniformly at random of size $|\Pi_N| = \Omega(r \log(|\mathcal{I}|/\gamma) \vee r^4/\delta^4 \vee |\mathcal{I}|)$. Assign all non-donor units $n \in [N] \setminus \mathcal{I}$ combinations Π_N .

Potential outcome estimation. Given the observation pattern described above, estimate outcomes for each unit-combination pair via Synthetic Combinations as described in Section 6.

We show that our design mechanism satisfies the key assumptions presented above with high probability. In fact, we show our proposed mechanism ensures these key conditions hold under very limited assumptions. In particular, we only require that: (i) our potential outcome model is satisfied (Assumption 1), (ii) there is selection on Fourier coefficients (Assumption 2), (iii) $\mathbb{E}[Y_n^{(\pi)}]$ is bounded (Assumption 6). Additionally, we only need a weakened version of balanced spectrum condition (Assumption 9):

Assumption 14 (Restricted Balanced Spectrum) Let $s_1 \dots s_r$ denote the non-zero singular values of $\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Y}_N^{(\Pi)}]$. Assume that its singular values are well-balanced, i.e., for universal constants $c, c' > 0$, we have that $s_r/s_1 \geq c$, and $\|E[\mathbf{Y}_N^{(\Pi)} | \mathcal{A}]\|_F^2 \geq c' N 2^p$

As compared to the original balanced spectrum condition, Assumption 14 only requires that the singular values are balanced for the entire potential outcome matrix as opposed to a collection of

submatrices. Additionally, the condition $\|E[\mathbf{Y}_N^{(\Pi)} \mid \mathcal{A}]\|_F^2 \geq c'N2^p$ is mild and is equivalent to requiring that $\min_{n \in [N]} \|\alpha_n\|_2 \geq c'$. Given the discussion on the assumptions required, we now present our results.

Theorem 15 *Let Assumptions 1, 2, 6, and 14 hold. Then, the proposed experimental design mechanism satisfies the following conditions simultaneously with probability at least $1 - \gamma$: (i) horizontal and linear span inclusion (Assumption 3), (ii) incoherence of donor unit Fourier characteristics (Assumption 8), and subspace inclusion (Assumption 10).*

Corollary 16 *Let the set-up of Theorem 15 hold. Then, for every unit-combination pair (n, π) , we have $|\mathbb{E}[Y_n^{(\pi)}] - \hat{\mathbb{E}}[Y_n^{(\pi)}]| = \tilde{O}_p(\delta)$.*

Theorem 15 implies that the key enabling conditions for Synthetic Combinations are satisfied for every unit-combination pair (n, π) . That is, the required assumptions on the observation pattern for meaningful estimation of the entire potential outcome matrix $\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Y}_N^{(\Pi)}]$ are met. As a result, Corollary 16 shows that we can achieve $O(\delta)$ error for all $N \times 2^p$ causal parameters. In contrast, our results in the observational setting do not guarantee we can accurately estimate *all* $N \times 2^p$ parameters; instead, they show we can learn $\mathbb{E}[Y_n^{(\pi)}]$ for any specific unit-combination pair (n, π) that satisfy the required assumptions on the observation pattern. Additionally, given the discussion in Section 7.3, one can verify that the number of experiments required by our design mechanism scales as $\tilde{O}(\text{poly}(r/\delta) \times (N + s^2p))$.




Figure 2: Observation pattern induced by experiment design mechanism.

9. Numerical Experiments

In this section, we corroborate our theoretical findings with numerical simulations in both the observational setting and under our experimental design mechanism described in Section 8. We compare Synthetic Combinations to the Lasso (i.e., running a separate horizontal regression for every

unit) and benchmark matrix completion algorithms. Specifically, we compare Synthetic Combinations to the following matrix completion algorithms: (i) `SoftImpute` (Mazumder et al., 2010), (ii) `IterativeSVD` (Troyanskaya et al., 2001). We note that we also tried running our simulation experiments for nuclear-norm minimization method introduced in (Candes and Recht, 2012), but the method was unable to be run within a reasonable time frame (6 hours) for any of our simulation settings. Code for implementing Synthetic Combinations and reproducing our experiments can be found at https://github.com/aagarwall1996/synth_combo.

9.1. Observational Setting

For this numerical experiment, we simulate an observation pattern commonly found in applications such as recommendation engines, where most users tend to provide ratings for combinations of goods they either particularly liked or disliked, i.e., there is confounding. The precise experimental set-up for this setting is as follows.

Experimental Set-up. We consider $N = 100$ units, and vary the number of interventions $p \in \{10, 11, \dots, 15\}$. We choose $r = 3$, and $s = rp^{3/2}$. To proceed, we first describe how we generate the potential outcomes, followed by how we generate the observation pattern.

Generating Potential Outcomes. For every $i \in [r]$, we generate α_i by first sampling $p^{3/2}$ non-zero coefficients at random. Then, we sample every non-zero coefficient of α_i from a standard normal distribution. Denote $\mathcal{A}_r = [\alpha_i : i \in [r]] \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times 2^p}$. Next, we construct $\mathcal{A}_{N-r} = \mathbf{B}\mathcal{A}_r \in \mathbb{R}^{(N-r) \times 2^p}$, where the entries in $\mathbf{B} \in \mathbb{R}^{(N-r) \times r}$ are sampled i.i.d from a standard Dirichlet distribution. This ensures that the Fourier coefficients of \mathcal{A}_{N-r} lie in the span of the Fourier coefficients in \mathcal{A}_r . We then define $\mathcal{A} = [\mathcal{A}_r, \mathcal{A}_{N-r}]$. By construction, $\text{rank}(\mathcal{A}) = r$, and $\|\alpha_n\|_0 \leq rp^{3/2} = s$ for every unit. The expected potential outcomes are simply constructed by computing $\chi(\Pi)\mathcal{A}^T$. Finally, we generate noisy potential outcomes by adding normally distributed noise $\epsilon \sim N(0, \sigma^2)$ to the potential outcome $\mathbb{E}[Y_n^{(\pi)}]$ for every unit n and combination π . We choose σ^2 such that the percentage of variance explained (PVE), defined by the formula $\text{PVE} = \text{Var}(\mathbb{E}[Y_N^{(\Pi)}]) / (\sigma^2 + \text{Var}(\mathbb{E}[Y_N^{(\Pi)}]))$ is equal to 0.9, and where $\text{Var}(\cdot)$ denotes the variance. PVE is proportional to signal to noise ratio, and can be thought of as the fraction of variance that is explained by the underlying potential outcome matrix.

Observation Pattern. Next, we discuss how we generate the observation pattern. Let $p_{n,\pi}$ denote the probability that the expected potential outcome for unit n and combination π is revealed. In this simulation, we define $p_{n,\pi} = |\mathbb{E}[Y_n^{(\pi)}]| / \sum_{\pi \in \Pi} |\mathbb{E}[Y_n^{(\pi)}]|$. Our definition of $p_{n,\pi}$ induces the missingness pattern where we are more likely to see outcomes with larger absolute values. In the context of recommendation engines, this can be interpreted as saying that we are only likely to observe the ratings for combinations that users either strongly like or dislike. Next, we choose $|\mathcal{I}| = 2r$ donor units. For a donor unit u , we generate $2p^{5/2}$ observations where a combination π is picked with probability $p_{u,\pi}$. We do the same for non-donor units but generate only $2r^4$ observations.

Hyper-parameter Choices for Estimation Methods. For the Lasso, we tune the regularization parameter λ via 5-fold cross-validation (CV). For PCR (i.e., step 2 of Synthetic Combinations), we tune κ , the number of singular values retained, via 5-fold CV as well. The matrix completion techniques that we compare to require that the rank r of the underlying matrix to be recovered is provided as a

hyper-parameter. In this simulation, we provide the true rank $r = 3$ as the hyper-parameter to these matrix completion algorithms.


Results. We measure the mean squared error (MSE) averaged over 5 repetitions between the estimated potential outcome matrix and the true potential outcome matrix for each method. The MSE for each method as we vary the number of interventions is visualized in Figure 3 (a). The results show that Synthetic Combinations outperforms all other methods as the number of interventions grow. Further, the gap in performance between Synthetic Combinations and the Lasso enforce the utility of using PCR for non-donor units that do not have sufficient measurements. We also note that the sample sizes chosen here for the donor set are less than that required by our theoretical results. Nonetheless, Synthetic Combinations performs well, suggesting that our theoretical results may not be entirely tight.

9.2. Experimental Design Simulations

We begin by describing the simulation set-up for the observation pattern induced by our experimental design mechanism.

Experimental Set-up. We generate potential outcomes, and noisy potential outcomes as we do in the observational setting. We generate the observation pattern as described by the experimental design mechanism in Section 8. Finally, hyper-parameters of all estimation methods are chosen as described in the experimental set-up for the simulations in the observational setting.

Results. We plot the MSE (averaged over 5 repetitions) for the different methods as we increase the number of interventions $p \in \{10, 11, \dots, 15\}$ in Figure 3 (b). We see that Synthetic Combinations significantly outperforms all methods for the observation pattern induced by our design mechanism. The performance of Synthetic Combinations corroborates our theoretical findings that this experimental design mechanism is able to utilize the strengths of Synthetic Combinations effectively.



(a) Observational setting simulations.

(b) Experimental design simulations.

Figure 3: MSE for different methods as we vary the number of interventions in (a) the observational setting and (b) under our proposed experimental design mechanism. Synthetic Combinations outperforms all other methods in both settings.

10. Discussion

In this work, we formulate a causal inference framework for combinatorial interventions, a setting that is ubiquitous in practice. We propose a model that imposes both unit-specific structure, and latent similarity across units. Next, we propose an estimation procedure, Synthetic Combinations, that is able to leverage the strengths of these models, and establish finite-sample consistency in an observational setting. Further, we provide an experimental design mechanism for inferring all $N \times 2^p$ potential outcomes using Synthetic Combinations. Our work naturally suggests directions for future work such as extending Synthetic Combinations to permutations (i.e., rankings).

Acknowledgments

We thank Alberto Abadie, Isaiah Andrews, Giles Hooker, Devavrat Shah, and Vasilis Syrgkanis for useful discussions and feedback.

References

- Alberto Abadie, Alexis Diamond, and Jens Hainmueller. Synthetic control methods for comparative case studies: Estimating the effect of california’s tobacco control program. *Journal of the American statistical Association*, 105(490):493–505, 2010.
- Jason Abrevaya, Yu-Chin Hsu, and Robert P Lieli. Estimating conditional average treatment effects. *Journal of Business & Economic Statistics*, 33(4):485–505, 2015.
- Anish Agarwal and Rahul Singh. Causal inference with corrupted data: Measurement error, missing values, discretization, and differential privacy. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2107.02780*, 2021.
- Anish Agarwal, Devavrat Shah, Dennis Shen, and Dogyoon Song. On robustness of principal component regression. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 32, 2019.
- Anish Agarwal, Devavrat Shah, and Dennis Shen. On principal component regression in a high-dimensional error-in-variables setting. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.14449*, 2020a.
- Anish Agarwal, Devavrat Shah, and Dennis Shen. Synthetic interventions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2006.07691*, 2020b.
- Anish Agarwal, Munther Dahleh, Devavrat Shah, and Dennis Shen. Causal matrix completion. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2109.15154*, 2021.
- Joshua D Angrist, Guido W Imbens, and Donald B Rubin. Identification of causal effects using instrumental variables. *Journal of the American statistical Association*, 91(434):444–455, 1996.
- Susan Athey, Mohsen Bayati, Nikolay Doudchenko, Guido Imbens, and Khashayar Khosravi. Matrix completion methods for causal panel data models. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, pages 1–41, 2021.
- Jushan Bai and Serena Ng. Matrix completion, counterfactuals, and factor analysis of missing data. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1910.06677*, 2019.
- Jushan Bai and Serena Ng. Matrix completion, counterfactuals, and factor analysis of missing data. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 116(536):1746–1763, 2021.
- Marianne Bertrand and Sendhil Mullainathan. Are emily and greg more employable than lakisha and jamal? a field experiment on labor market discrimination. *American economic review*, 94(4):991–1013, 2004.
- Yigal Brandman, Alon Orlitsky, and John Hennessy. A spectral lower bound technique for the size of decision trees and two-level and/or circuits. *IEEE Transactions on Computers*, 39(2):282–287, 1990.

- Leo Breiman, Jerome H Friedman, Richard A Olshen, and Charles J Stone. *Classification and regression trees*. Routledge, 2017.
- Emmanuel Candes and Benjamin Recht. Exact matrix completion via convex optimization. *Communications of the ACM*, 55(6):111–119, 2012.
- Emmanuel J Candes and Yaniv Plan. Matrix completion with noise. *Proceedings of the IEEE*, 98(6):925–936, 2010.
- Emmanuel J Candès and Terence Tao. The power of convex relaxation: Near-optimal matrix completion. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 56(5):2053–2080, 2010.
- Sourav Chatterjee. Matrix estimation by universal singular value thresholding. 2015.
- Denis Chetverikov, Zhipeng Liao, and Victor Chernozhukov. On cross-validated lasso in high dimensions. *The Annals of Statistics*, 49(3):1300–1317, 2021.
- Tirthankar Dasgupta, Natesh S Pillai, and Donald B Rubin. Causal inference from 2 k factorial designs by using potential outcomes. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B: Statistical Methodology*, pages 727–753, 2015.
- Mark A. Davenport and Justin Romberg. An overview of low-rank matrix recovery from incomplete observations. *IEEE Journal of Selected Topics in Signal Processing*, 10(4):608–622, 2016. doi: 10.1109/JSTSP.2016.2539100.
- Esther Duflo, Rachel Glennerster, and Michael Kremer. Using randomization in development economics research: A toolkit. *Handbook of development economics*, 4:3895–3962, 2007.
- Stefan Eriksson and Dan-Olof Rooth. Do employers use unemployment as a sorting criterion when hiring? evidence from a field experiment. *American economic review*, 104(3):1014–1039, 2014.
- Jianqing Fan, Weichen Wang, and Yiqiao Zhong. An l_∞ eigenvector perturbation bound and its application to robust covariance estimation. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 18(207): 1–42, 2018.
- Matan Gavish and David L Donoho. The optimal hard threshold for singular values is $4/\sqrt{3}$. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 60(8):5040–5053, 2014.
- EP George, William Gordon Hunter, and J Stuart Hunter. *Statistics for experimenters: design, innovation, and discovery*. Wiley, 2005.
- Guido W Imbens and Donald B Rubin. *Causal inference in statistics, social, and biomedical sciences*. Cambridge University Press, 2015.
- Mark Karpovsky. *Finite Orthogonal Series in Design of Digital Devices*. John Wiley & Sons, Inc., Hoboken, NJ, USA, 1976. ISBN 0471731889.
- Raghunandan Keshavan, Andrea Montanari, and Sewoong Oh. Matrix completion from noisy entries. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 22, 2009.

- Raghunandan H Keshavan, Andrea Montanari, and Sewoong Oh. Matrix completion from a few entries. *IEEE transactions on information theory*, 56(6):2980–2998, 2010.
- Jason Klusowski. Sparse learning with cart. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33:11612–11622, 2020.
- Jason M Klusowski. Universal consistency of decision trees in high dimensions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2104.13881*, 2021.
- Wei Ma and George H Chen. Missing not at random in matrix completion: The effectiveness of estimating missingness probabilities under a low nuclear norm assumption. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 32, 2019.
- Rahul Mazumder, Trevor Hastie, and Robert Tibshirani. Spectral regularization algorithms for learning large incomplete matrices. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 11:2287–2322, 2010.
- Elchanan Mossel, Ryan O’Donnell, and Rocco P Servedio. Learning juntas. In *Proceedings of the thirty-fifth annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing*, pages 206–212, 2003.
- Sahand Negahban and Devavrat Shah. Learning sparse boolean polynomials. In *2012 50th Annual Allerton Conference on Communication, Control, and Computing (Allerton)*, pages 2032–2036. IEEE, 2012.
- Jerzy Neyman and Karolina Iwaszkiewicz. Statistical problems in agricultural experimentation. *Supplement to the Journal of the Royal Statistical Society*, 2(2):107–180, 1935.
- Luong Trung Nguyen, Junhan Kim, and Byonghyo Shim. Low-rank matrix completion: A contemporary survey. *IEEE Access*, 7:94215–94237, 2019.
- Ryan O’Donnell. Some topics in analysis of boolean functions. In *Proceedings of the fortieth annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing*, pages 569–578, 2008.
- Benjamin Recht. A simpler approach to matrix completion. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 12(12), 2011.
- Phillippe Rigollet and Jan-Christian Hütter. High dimensional statistics. *Lecture notes for course 18S997*, 813(814):46, 2015.
- Donald B Rubin. Inference and missing data. *Biometrika*, 63(3):581–592, 1976.
- Vasilis Syrgkanis and Manolis Zampetakis. Estimation and inference with trees and forests in high dimensions. In *Conference on learning theory*, pages 3453–3454. PMLR, 2020.
- Joel A Tropp. User-friendly tail bounds for sums of random matrices. *Foundations of computational mathematics*, 12(4):389–434, 2012.
- Olga Troyanskaya, Michael Cantor, Gavin Sherlock, Pat Brown, Trevor Hastie, Robert Tibshirani, David Botstein, and Russ B Altman. Missing value estimation methods for dna microarrays. *Bioinformatics*, 17(6):520–525, 2001.

Roman Vershynin. Introduction to the non-asymptotic analysis of random matrices. In Yonina C. Eldar and Gitta Editors Kutyniok, editors, *Compressed Sensing: Theory and Applications*, pages 210–268. Cambridge University Press, 2012. doi: 10.1017/CBO9780511794308.006.

Per-Åke Wedin. Perturbation bounds in connection with singular value decomposition. *BIT Numerical Mathematics*, 12(1):99–111, 1972.

CF Jeff Wu and Michael S Hamada. *Experiments: planning, analysis, and optimization*. John Wiley & Sons, 2011.

Anqi Zhao and Peng Ding. Regression-based causal inference with factorial experiments: estimands, model specifications and design-based properties. *Biometrika*, 109(3):799–815, 2022.

Appendix A. Proof of Theorem 5

Proof Below, the symbol $\stackrel{AX}{=}$ and $\stackrel{DX}{=}$ imply that the equality follows from Assumption X and Definition X , respectively. We begin with the proof of Theorem 5 (a). *Proof of Theorem 5 (a):* For a donor unit $u \in \mathcal{I}$ and $\pi \in \Pi \setminus \Pi_u$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathbb{E}[Y_u^{(\pi)} \mid \mathcal{A}] &\stackrel{A1}{=} \mathbb{E}[\langle \alpha_u, \chi^\pi \rangle + \epsilon_u^\pi \mid \mathcal{A}] \\
 &\stackrel{A1(c)}{=} \langle \alpha_u, \chi^\pi \rangle \mid \mathcal{A} \\
 &= \langle \alpha_u, \chi^\pi \rangle \mid \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{D} \\
 &\stackrel{A1(b)}{=} \langle \alpha_u, \tilde{\chi}_u^\pi \rangle \mid \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{D} \\
 &\stackrel{A3(a)}{=} \langle \alpha_u, \sum_{\pi_u \in \Pi_u} \beta_{\pi_u}^\pi \tilde{\chi}_u^{\pi_u} \rangle \mid \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{D} \\
 &= \sum_{\pi_u \in \Pi_u} \beta_{\pi_u}^\pi \langle \alpha_u, \tilde{\chi}_u^{\pi_u} \rangle \mid \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{D} \\
 &\stackrel{A1(c), A2}{=} \sum_{\pi_u \in \Pi_u} \beta_{\pi_u}^\pi \mathbb{E}[\langle \alpha_u, \tilde{\chi}_u^{\pi_u} \rangle + \epsilon_u^{\pi_u} \mid \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{D}] \\
 &\stackrel{A1}{=} \sum_{\pi_u \in \Pi_u} \beta_{\pi_u}^\pi \mathbb{E}[Y_{u, \pi_u} \mid \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{D}]
 \end{aligned}$$

Proof of Theorem 5 (b): For a donor unit $n \in [N] \setminus I^D$ and $\pi \in \Pi \setminus \Pi_n$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathbb{E}[Y_n^{(\pi)} \mid \mathcal{A}] &\stackrel{A1}{=} \mathbb{E}[\langle \alpha_n, \chi^\pi \rangle + \epsilon_n^\pi \mid \mathcal{A}] \\
 &\stackrel{A1(c)}{=} \langle \alpha_n, \chi^\pi \rangle \mid \mathcal{A} \\
 &= \langle \alpha_n, \chi^\pi \rangle \mid \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{D} \\
 &\stackrel{A3(b)}{=} \langle \sum_{u \in \mathcal{I}} w_u^n \alpha_u, \chi^\pi \rangle \mid \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{D} \\
 &= \sum_{u \in \mathcal{I}} w_u^n \langle \alpha_u, \chi^\pi \rangle \mid \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{D} \\
 &\stackrel{A1(c), A2}{=} \sum_{u \in \mathcal{I}} w_u^n \mathbb{E}[\langle \alpha_u, \chi^\pi \rangle + \epsilon_u^\pi \mid \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{D}] \\
 &\stackrel{A1}{=} \sum_{u \in \mathcal{I}} w_u^n \mathbb{E}[Y_u^{(\pi)} \mid \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{D}] \\
 &= \sum_{u \in \mathcal{I}} \sum_{\pi_u \in \Pi_u} w_u^n \beta_{\pi_u}^\pi \mathbb{E}[Y_{u, \pi_u} \mid \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{D}]
 \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality follows from Theorem 5 (a). ■

Appendix B. Proof of Theorem 11

B.1. Proof of Theorem 11 (a)

We have that

$$\begin{aligned}
 \hat{\mathbb{E}}[Y_u^{(\pi)}] - \mathbb{E}[Y_u^{(\pi)}] &= \langle \hat{\alpha}^u, \chi^\pi \rangle - \langle \alpha_u, \chi^\pi \rangle \\
 &= \langle \hat{\alpha}_u - \alpha_u, \chi^\pi \rangle \\
 &\leq \|\hat{\alpha}_u - \alpha_u\|_1 \|\chi^\pi\|_\infty \\
 &= \|\hat{\alpha}_u - \alpha_u\|_1
 \end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

To finish the proof, we quote the following Theorem which we adapt to our notation.

Theorem 17 (Theorem 2.18 in Rigollet and Hütter (2015)) *Fix the number of samples $n \geq 2$. Assume that the linear model $Y = \mathbf{X}\theta^* + \epsilon$, where $\mathbf{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$ and ϵ is a sub-gaussian random variable with noise variance σ^2 . Moreover, assume that $\|\theta^*\|_0 \leq k$, and that \mathbf{X} satisfies the incoherence condition (Assumption 8) with parameter k . Then, the lasso estimator $\hat{\theta}^L$ with regularization parameter defined by*

$$2\tau = 8\sigma\sqrt{\log(2d)/n} + 8\sigma\sqrt{\log(1/\delta)/n}$$

satisfies

$$\|\theta^* - \hat{\theta}^L\|_2^2 \leq k\sigma^2 \frac{\log(2d/\delta)}{n} \tag{9}$$

with probability at least $1 - \delta$.

Further, as in established in the proof of Theorem 2.18 in Rigollet and Hütter (2015), $\|\theta^* - \hat{\theta}^L\|_1 \leq \sqrt{k}\|\theta^* - \hat{\theta}^L\|_2$. Note that the set-up of Theorem 17 holds in our setting with the following notational changes: $Y = \mathbf{Y}_{\Pi_u}$, $\mathbf{X} = \chi(\Pi_u)$, $\theta^* = \alpha_u$, $\hat{\theta}^L = \hat{\alpha}_u$, $k = s$ as well as our assumptions on the regularization parameter λ_u and that ϵ_u^π is sub-gaussian (Assumption 7). Applying Theorem 17 gives us

$$\|\hat{\alpha}_u - \alpha_u\|_1 = O_p\left(\sqrt{\frac{s^2 p}{|\Pi_u|}}\right)$$

Substituting this bound into (8) yields the claimed result.

B.2. Proof of Theorem 11 (b)

For any matrix \mathbf{A} with orthonormal columns, let $\mathcal{P}_A = \mathbf{A}\mathbf{A}^T$ denote the projection matrix on the subspace spanned by the columns of \mathbf{A} . Define $\tilde{\mathbf{w}}^n = \mathcal{P}_{V_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_n)}} \mathbf{w}^n$, where $V_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_n)}$ are the right singular vectors of $\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Y}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_n)}]$. Let $\Delta_w^n = \hat{\mathbf{w}}^n - \tilde{\mathbf{w}}^n \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{I}|}$, and $\Delta_{\mathcal{I}}^\pi = \hat{\mathbb{E}}[\mathbf{Y}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\pi)}] - \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Y}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\pi)}] \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{I}|}$. Denote $\Delta_E = \max_{u \in \mathcal{I}, \pi \in \Pi} \left| \hat{\mathbb{E}}[Y_u^{(\pi)}] - \mathbb{E}[Y_u^{(\pi)}] \right|$. In order to proceed, we first state the following result,

Lemma 18 *Let the set-up of Theorem 11 hold. Then, we have*

$$\mathbb{E}[Y_n^{(\pi)}] = \langle \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Y}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\pi)}], \tilde{\mathbf{w}}^n \rangle$$

Using Lemma 18, and the notation established above, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \widehat{\mathbb{E}}[Y_n^{(\pi)}] - \mathbb{E}[Y_n^{(\pi)}] \right| &= \left| \langle \widehat{\mathbb{E}}[\mathbf{Y}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\pi)}], \tilde{\mathbf{w}}^n \rangle - \langle \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Y}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\pi)}], \tilde{\mathbf{w}}^n \rangle \right| \\ &\leq |\langle \Delta_{\mathcal{I}}^{\pi}, \tilde{\mathbf{w}}^n \rangle| + \left| \langle \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Y}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\pi)}], \Delta_w^n \rangle \right| + |\langle \Delta_w^n, \Delta_{\mathcal{I}}^{\pi} \rangle| \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

From Assumption 10, it follows that $\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Y}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\pi)}] = \mathcal{P}_{V_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_n)}} \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Y}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\pi)}]$, where $V_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_n)}$ are the right singular vectors of $\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Y}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_n)}]$. Using this in (10) gives us

$$\left| \widehat{\mathbb{E}}[Y_n^{(\pi)}] - \mathbb{E}[Y_n^{(\pi)}] \right| \leq |\langle \Delta_{\mathcal{I}}^{\pi}, \tilde{\mathbf{w}}^n \rangle| + \left| \langle \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Y}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\pi)}], \mathcal{P}_{V_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_n)}} \Delta_w^n \rangle \right| + |\langle \Delta_w^n, \Delta_{\mathcal{I}}^{\pi} \rangle| \quad (11)$$

Below, we bound the three terms on the right-hand-side of (11) separately. Before we bound each term, we state a Lemma that will be useful to help us establish the results.

Lemma 19 *Let Assumptions 1, 3, 6, and 9 hold. Then, $\|\tilde{\mathbf{w}}^n\|_2 \lesssim \sqrt{\frac{r_n}{|\mathcal{I}|}}$*

Bounding Term 1. By Holder's inequality and Lemma 19, we have that

$$|\langle \Delta_{\mathcal{I}}^{\pi}, \tilde{\mathbf{w}}^n \rangle| \leq \|\tilde{\mathbf{w}}^n\|_1 \|\Delta_{\mathcal{I}}^{\pi}\|_{\infty} \leq \|\tilde{\mathbf{w}}^n\|_1 \Delta_E \leq \sqrt{|\mathcal{I}|} \|\tilde{\mathbf{w}}^n\|_2 \Delta_E \lesssim \sqrt{r_n} \Delta_E \quad (12)$$

This concludes the analysis for the first term.

Bounding Term 2. By Cauchy-Schwarz and Assumption 6 we have,

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \langle \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Y}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\pi)}], \mathcal{P}_{V_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_n)}} \Delta_w^n \rangle \right| &\leq \|\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Y}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\pi)}]\|_2 \|\mathcal{P}_{V_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_n)}} \Delta_w^n\|_2 \\ &\leq \sqrt{|\mathcal{I}|} \|\mathcal{P}_{V_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_n)}} \Delta_w^n\|_2 \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

We now state a lemma that will help us conclude our bound of Term 2. The proof is given in Appendix C.3.

Lemma 20 *Let the set-up of Theorem 11 hold. Then,*

$$\begin{aligned} &\|\mathcal{P}_{V_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_n)}} \Delta_w^n\|_2 \\ &= \tilde{O}_p \left(r_n^2 \left[\frac{\Delta_E}{\sqrt{|\mathcal{I}|} \min\{\sqrt{|\Pi_n|}, \sqrt{|\mathcal{I}|}\}} + \Delta_E^2 \right] + \frac{r_n^{3/2} \Delta_E}{\sqrt{|\mathcal{I}|}} + \frac{r_n (1 + \sqrt{\Delta_E} r_n^{1/4})}{\sqrt{|\mathcal{I}|} |\Pi_n|^{1/4}} \right) \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

Incorporating the result of the lemma above into (13) gives us

$$\begin{aligned} &\left| \langle \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Y}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\pi)}], \mathcal{P}_{V_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_n)}} \Delta_w^n \rangle \right| \\ &= \tilde{O}_p \left(r_n^2 \left[\frac{\Delta_E}{\min\{\sqrt{|\Pi_n|}, \sqrt{|\mathcal{I}|}\}} + \sqrt{|\mathcal{I}|} \Delta_E^2 \right] + r_n^{3/2} \Delta_E + \frac{r_n (1 + \sqrt{\Delta_E} r_n^{1/4})}{|\Pi_n|^{1/4}} \right) \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

Bounding Term 3. By Holder's inequality, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle \Delta_w^n, \Delta_{\mathcal{I}}^\pi \rangle| &\leq \|\Delta_w^n\|_2 \|\Delta_{\mathcal{I}}^\pi\|_2 \\ &\leq \sqrt{|\mathcal{I}|} \|\Delta_w^n\|_2 \|\Delta_{\mathcal{I}}^\pi\|_\infty \\ &\leq \sqrt{|\mathcal{I}|} \Delta_E \|\Delta_w^n\|_2 \end{aligned} \tag{16}$$

$$\tag{17}$$

We now state a proposition that will help us conclude our proof of Term 3. The proof is given in Appendix C.4.

Proposition 21 *Let the set-up of Theorem 11 hold. Then, conditioned on \mathcal{A} , we have*

$$\hat{\mathbf{w}}^n - \tilde{\mathbf{w}}^n = \tilde{O}_p \left(r_n \left[\frac{\|\tilde{\mathbf{w}}^n\|_2}{\min\{\sqrt{|\Pi_n|}, \sqrt{|\mathcal{I}|}\}} + \Delta_E \right] \right) \tag{18}$$

As a result of Proposition 21 and Lemma 19, we have the following bound for Term 3,

$$|\langle \Delta_w^n, \Delta_{\mathcal{I}}^\pi \rangle| = \tilde{O}_p \left(r_n^{3/2} \left[\frac{\Delta_E}{\min\{\sqrt{|\Pi_n|}, \sqrt{|\mathcal{I}|}\}} + \sqrt{|\mathcal{I}|} \Delta_E^2 \right] \right) \tag{19}$$

Collecting Terms. Combining equations (12), (15), (19) gives us

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \hat{\mathbb{E}}[Y_n^{(\pi)}] - \mathbb{E}[Y_n^{(\pi)}] \right| \\ &= \tilde{O}_p \left(r_n^2 \left[\frac{\Delta_E}{\min\{\sqrt{|\Pi_n|}, \sqrt{|\mathcal{I}|}\}} + \sqrt{|\mathcal{I}|} \Delta_E^2 \right] + r_n^{3/2} \Delta_E + \frac{r_n (1 + \sqrt{\Delta_E} r_n^{1/4})}{|\Pi_n|^{1/4}} \right) \end{aligned} \tag{20}$$

By Theorem 11 (a), we have that

$$\Delta_E = \max_{u \in \mathcal{I}} O_p \left(\sqrt{\frac{s^2 p}{|\Pi_u|}} \right) = O_p \left(\sqrt{\frac{s^2 p}{M}} \right) \tag{21}$$

where we remind the reader that $M = \min_{u \in \mathcal{I}} |\Pi_u|$. Substituting (21), and our assumption that $M = \omega(r_n^2 s^2 p)$ into (20), we get

$$\left| \hat{\mathbb{E}}[Y_n^{(\pi)}] - \mathbb{E}[Y_n^{(\pi)}] \right| = \tilde{O}_p \left(\frac{r_n^2 \sqrt{s^2 p}}{\sqrt{M} \times \min\{|\Pi_n|, |\mathcal{I}|\}} + \frac{r_n^2 s^2 p \sqrt{|\mathcal{I}|}}{M} + \frac{r_n}{|\Pi_n|^{1/4}} \right) \tag{22}$$

Appendix C. Proofs of Helper Lemmas for Theorem 11.

In this section we provide proofs of Lemmas 18, 19, 20, and Proposition 21 which were required for the Proof of Theorem 11.

C.1. Proof of Lemma 18

By Assumption 1 and 3 (b), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathbb{E}[Y_n^{(\pi)}] &= \mathbb{E}[\langle \boldsymbol{\alpha}_n, \boldsymbol{\chi}^\pi \rangle + \epsilon_n^\pi] \\
 &= \mathbb{E}[\langle \boldsymbol{\alpha}_n, \boldsymbol{\chi}^\pi \rangle] \\
 &= \sum_{u \in \mathcal{I}} w_u^n \mathbb{E}[\langle \boldsymbol{\alpha}_u, \boldsymbol{\chi}^\pi \rangle] \\
 &= \sum_{u \in \mathcal{I}} w_u^n \mathbb{E}[Y_u^{(\pi)}] \\
 &= \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Y}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\pi)}]^T \mathbf{w}^n
 \end{aligned}$$

From Assumption 10, we have that $\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Y}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\pi)}] = \mathcal{P}_{V_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_n)}} \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Y}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\pi)}]$. Substituting this into the equation above completes the proof.

C.2. Proof of Lemma 19

For simplicity, denote $\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Y}_n^{(\Pi_n)}] = \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Y}^{(\Pi_n)}]$. By definition, $\tilde{\mathbf{w}}^n$ is the solution to the following optimization program

$$\begin{aligned}
 \min_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{I}|}} \quad & \|\mathbf{w}\|_2 \\
 \text{s.t.} \quad & \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Y}^{(\Pi_n)}] = \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Y}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_n)}] \mathbf{w}
 \end{aligned} \tag{23}$$

Let $\mathbf{U}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_n)}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_n)}, \mathbf{V}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_n)}$ denote the SVD of $\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Y}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_n)}]$. Further, let $\mathbf{U}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_n), r_n}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_n), r_n}, \mathbf{V}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_n), r_n}$ denote the rank r_n truncation of the SVD. Then, define $\mathbf{w}_{r_n} = \mathbf{V}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_n), r_n} (\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_n), r_n})^\dagger (\mathbf{U}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_n), r_n})^T \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Y}^{(\Pi_n)}]$, where \dagger is pseudo-inverse. We first show that \mathbf{w}_{r_n} is a solution to (23).

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Y}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_n)}] \mathbf{w}_{r_n} &= \left(\mathbf{U}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_n)} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_n)} (\mathbf{V}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_n)})^T \right) \mathbf{V}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_n), r_n} (\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_n), r_n})^\dagger (\mathbf{U}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_n), r_n})^T \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Y}^{(\Pi_n)}] \\
 &= \left(\sum_{i=1}^{r_n} s_i u_i v_i^T \right) \left(\sum_{j=1}^{r_n} \frac{1}{s_j} v_j u_j^T \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Y}^{(\Pi_n)}] \right) \\
 &= \sum_{i,j=1}^{r_n} \frac{s_i}{s_j} u_i v_i^T v_j u_j^T \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Y}^{(\Pi_n)}] \\
 &= \sum_{i=1}^{r_n} u_i u_i^T \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Y}^{(\Pi_n)}] \\
 &= \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Y}^{(\Pi_n)}]
 \end{aligned}$$

Next, we bound $\|\mathbf{w}_{r_n}\|_2$ using Assumptions 6 and 9 as follows

$$\begin{aligned}
 \|\mathbf{w}_{r_n}\|_2 &\leq \|(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_n), r_n})^\dagger\|_2 \|\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Y}^{(\Pi_n)}]\|_2 \\
 &\leq \frac{\sqrt{|\Pi_n|}}{s_{r_n}(\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Y}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_n)}])} \\
 &\leq \sqrt{\frac{c r_n}{|\mathcal{I}|}}
 \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we have

$$\|\tilde{\mathbf{w}}^n\|_1 \leq \sqrt{|\mathcal{I}|} \|\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_{r_n}\|_2 \leq \sqrt{cr_n}$$

C.3. Proof of Lemma 20

First, we introduce some necessary notation required for the proof. Let $\hat{\mathbb{E}}[\mathbf{Y}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_n)}] = \hat{\mathbf{U}}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_n)} \hat{\mathbf{S}}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_n)} \hat{\mathbf{V}}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_n)}$ denote the rank r_n SVD of $\hat{\mathbb{E}}[\mathbf{Y}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_n)}]$. Then, to establish Lemma 20, consider the following decomposition:

$$\mathcal{P}_{V_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_n)}} \Delta_w^n = \left(\mathcal{P}_{V_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_n)}} - \mathcal{P}_{\hat{V}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_n)}} \right) \Delta_w^n + \mathcal{P}_{\hat{V}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_n)}} \Delta_w^n$$

We bound each of these terms separately again.

Bounding Term 1. We have

$$\left\| \left(\mathcal{P}_{V_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_n)}} - \mathcal{P}_{\hat{V}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_n)}} \right) \Delta_w^n \right\|_2 \leq \left\| \mathcal{P}_{V_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_n)}} - \mathcal{P}_{\hat{V}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_n)}} \right\|_{\text{op}} \|\Delta_w^n\|_2 \quad (24)$$

Theorem 22 (Wedin's Theorem Wedin (1972)) *Given $\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$, let $(\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{V}), (\hat{\mathbf{U}}, \hat{\mathbf{V}})$ denote their respective left and right singular vectors. Further, let $(\mathbf{U}_k, \mathbf{V}_k) \in (\text{respectively, } (\hat{\mathbf{U}}_k, \hat{\mathbf{V}}_k))$ correspond to the truncation of (\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{V}) (respectively, $(\hat{\mathbf{U}}, \hat{\mathbf{V}})$), respectively, that retains the columns corresponding to the top k singular values of \mathbf{A} (respectively, \mathbf{B}). Let s_i represent the i -th singular values of \mathbf{A} . Then, $\max(\|\mathcal{P}_{U_k} - \mathcal{P}_{\hat{U}_k}\|_{\text{op}}, \|\mathcal{P}_{V_k} - \mathcal{P}_{\hat{V}_k}\|_{\text{op}}) \leq \frac{2\|\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{B}\|_{\text{op}}}{s_k - s_{k+1}}$*

Applying Theorem 22 gives us

$$\begin{aligned} \max \left(\left\| \mathcal{P}_{U_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_n)}} - \mathcal{P}_{\hat{U}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_n)}} \right\|_{\text{op}}, \left\| \mathcal{P}_{V_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_n)}} - \mathcal{P}_{\hat{V}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_n)}} \right\|_{\text{op}} \right) &\leq \frac{2\|\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Y}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_n)}] - \hat{\mathbb{E}}[\mathbf{Y}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_n)}]\|_{\text{op}}}{s_{r_n} - s_{r_n+1}} \\ &\leq \frac{2\sqrt{|\mathcal{I}|} |\Pi_n| \|\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Y}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_n)}] - \hat{\mathbb{E}}[\mathbf{Y}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_n)}]\|_{\max}}{s_{r_n} - s_{r_n+1}} \\ &= \frac{2\sqrt{|\mathcal{I}|} |\Pi_n| \Delta_E}{s_{r_n} - s_{r_n+1}} \\ &= \frac{2\sqrt{|\mathcal{I}|} |\Pi_n| \Delta_E}{s_{r_n}} \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

where the last equality follows from the fact that $\text{rank}(\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Y}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_n)}]) = r_n$, hence $s_{r_n+1} = 0$. Now, plugging Assumption 9, (25) into (24) gives us

$$\max \left(\left\| \mathcal{P}_{V_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_n)}} - \mathcal{P}_{\hat{V}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_n)}} \right\|_{\text{op}}, \left\| \mathcal{P}_{V_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_n)}} - \mathcal{P}_{\hat{V}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_n)}} \right\|_{\text{op}} \right) \leq C\sqrt{r_n} \Delta_E \quad (26)$$

Substituting the result of Proposition 21 and (26) into (24) gives us

$$\left\| \left(\mathcal{P}_{V_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_n)}} - \mathcal{P}_{\hat{V}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_n)}} \right) \Delta_w^n \right\|_2 = O_p \left(\log^3(|\Pi_n| |\mathcal{I}|) r_n^{3/2} \left[\frac{\|\tilde{\mathbf{w}}^n\|_2 \Delta_E}{\min\{\sqrt{|\Pi_n|}, \sqrt{|\mathcal{I}|}\}} + \Delta_E^2 \right] \right) \quad (27)$$

To further simplify (27), we substitute the result of Lemma 19
 Substituting the Lemma 19 into (27) gives us

$$\left\| \left(\mathcal{P}_{V_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_n)}} - \mathcal{P}_{\hat{V}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_n)}} \right) \Delta_w^n \right\|_2 = \tilde{O}_p \left(r_n^2 \left[\frac{\Delta_E}{\sqrt{|\mathcal{I}|} \min\{\sqrt{|\Pi_n|}, \sqrt{|\mathcal{I}|}\}} + \Delta_E^2 \right] \right) \quad (28)$$

Bounding Term 2. We introduce some necessary notation required to bound the second term. Let $\hat{\mathbb{E}}[\mathbf{Y}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_n), r_n}] = \sum_{l=1}^{r_n} \hat{s}_l \hat{\mu}_l \hat{v}_l'$ denote the r_n decomposition of $\hat{\mathbb{E}}[\mathbf{Y}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_n)}]$. Equivalently, $\hat{\mathbb{E}}[\mathbf{Y}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_n), r_n}] = \hat{\mathbf{U}}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_n)} \hat{\mathbf{S}}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_n)} (\hat{\mathbf{V}}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_n)})^T$. Let $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}^{\Pi_n} = [\epsilon_n^\pi : \pi \in \Pi_n] \in \mathbb{R}^{|\Pi_n|}$.

Then to begin, note that since $\hat{\mathbf{V}}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_n)}$ is a isometry, we have that

$$\|\mathcal{P}_{\hat{V}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_n)}} \Delta_w^n\|_2^2 = \|(\hat{\mathbf{V}}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_n)})^T \Delta_w^n\|_2^2$$

To upper bound $\|(\hat{\mathbf{V}}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_n)})^T \Delta_w^n\|_2^2$ as follows, consider

$$\|\hat{\mathbb{E}}[\mathbf{Y}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_n)}] \Delta_w^n\|_2^2 = \left((\hat{\mathbf{V}}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_n)})^T \Delta_w^n \right)^T \left(\hat{\mathbf{S}}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_n)} \right)^2 \left((\hat{\mathbf{V}}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_n)})^T \Delta_w^n \right) \geq \hat{s}_{r_n}^2 \|(\hat{\mathbf{V}}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_n)})^T \Delta_w^n\|_2^2$$

Using the two equations above gives us

$$\|\mathcal{P}_{\hat{V}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_n)}} \Delta_w^n\|_2^2 \leq \frac{\|\hat{\mathbb{E}}[\mathbf{Y}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_n), r_n}] \Delta_w^n\|_2^2}{\hat{s}_{r_n}^2} \quad (29)$$

To bound the numerator in (29), note that by definition $\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Y}^{(\Pi_n)}] = \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Y}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_n)}] \tilde{\mathbf{w}}^n$. Using this observation, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\hat{\mathbb{E}}[\mathbf{Y}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_n), r_n}] \Delta_w^n\|_2^2 &\leq 2\|\hat{\mathbb{E}}[\mathbf{Y}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_n), r_n}] \tilde{\mathbf{w}}^n - \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Y}^{(\Pi_n)}]\|_2^2 + 2\|\hat{\mathbb{E}}[\mathbf{Y}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_n), r_n}] \tilde{\mathbf{w}}^n - \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Y}^{(\Pi_n)}]\|_2^2 \\ &= 2\|\hat{\mathbb{E}}[\mathbf{Y}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_n), r_n}] \tilde{\mathbf{w}}^n - \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Y}^{(\Pi_n)}]\|_2^2 + 2\|(\hat{\mathbb{E}}[\mathbf{Y}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_n), r_n}] - \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Y}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_n)}]) \tilde{\mathbf{w}}^n\|_2^2 \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

To proceed, we then use the following inequality: for any $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{a \times b}$, $v \in \mathbb{R}^b$, we have

$$\|\mathbf{A}v\|_2 = \left\| \sum_{j=1}^b \mathbf{A}_{.j} v_j \right\|_2 \leq \left(\max_{j \leq b} \|\mathbf{A}_{.j}\|_2 \right) \left(\sum_{j=1}^b v_j \right) = \|\mathbf{A}\|_{2, \infty} \|v\|_1 \quad (31)$$

Substituting (30) into (29) and then applying inequality (31) gives us

$$\|\mathcal{P}_{\hat{V}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_n)}} \Delta_w^n\|_2^2 \leq \frac{2}{\hat{s}_{r_n}^2} \left(\|\hat{\mathbb{E}}[\mathbf{Y}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_n), r_n}] \tilde{\mathbf{w}}^n - \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Y}^{(\Pi_n)}]\|_2^2 + \|\hat{\mathbb{E}}[\mathbf{Y}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_n), r_n}] - \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Y}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_n)}]\|_{2, \infty}^2 \|\tilde{\mathbf{w}}^n\|_1^2 \right) \quad (32)$$

Next, we bound $\|\hat{\mathbb{E}}[\mathbf{Y}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_n), r_n}] \tilde{\mathbf{w}}^n - \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Y}^{(\Pi_n)}]\|_2^2$. To this end, note that Assumption 1 implies that

$$\begin{aligned} &\|\hat{\mathbb{E}}[\mathbf{Y}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_n), r_n}] \tilde{\mathbf{w}}^n - \mathbf{Y}^{(\Pi_n)}\|_2^2 \\ &= \|\hat{\mathbb{E}}[\mathbf{Y}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_n), r_n}] \tilde{\mathbf{w}}^n - \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Y}^{(\Pi_n)}] - \boldsymbol{\epsilon}^{\Pi_n}\|_2^2 \\ &= \|\hat{\mathbb{E}}[\mathbf{Y}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_n), r_n}] \tilde{\mathbf{w}}^n - \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Y}^{(\Pi_n)}]\|_2^2 + \|\boldsymbol{\epsilon}^{\Pi_n}\|_2^2 - 2\langle \hat{\mathbb{E}}[\mathbf{Y}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_n), r_n}] \tilde{\mathbf{w}}^n - \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Y}^{(\Pi_n)}], \boldsymbol{\epsilon}^{\Pi_n} \rangle \end{aligned} \quad (33)$$

Next, we proceed by calling upon Property 4.1 of [Agarwal et al. \(2020a\)](#) which states that $\hat{\mathbf{w}}^n$ as given by (6) is the unique solution to the following convex program:

$$\begin{aligned} & \min_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{I}|}} \|\mathbf{w}\|_2 \\ & \text{s.t. } \mathbf{w} \in \arg \min_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{I}|}} \|\mathbf{Y}^{(\Pi_n)} - \hat{\mathbb{E}}[\mathbf{Y}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_n), r_n}] \mathbf{w}\|_2^2 \end{aligned} \quad (34)$$

Using this property, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\hat{\mathbb{E}}[\mathbf{Y}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_n), r_n}] \hat{\mathbf{w}}^n - \mathbf{Y}^{(\Pi_n)}\|_2^2 \\ & \leq \|\hat{\mathbb{E}}[\mathbf{Y}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_n), r_n}] \tilde{\mathbf{w}}^n - \mathbf{Y}^{(\Pi_n)}\|_2^2 \\ & = \|\hat{\mathbb{E}}[\mathbf{Y}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_n), r_n}] \tilde{\mathbf{w}}^n - \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Y}^{(\Pi_n)}] - \boldsymbol{\epsilon}^{\Pi_n}\|_2^2 \\ & = \|\hat{\mathbb{E}}[\mathbf{Y}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_n), r_n}] \tilde{\mathbf{w}}^n - \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Y}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_n)}] \tilde{\mathbf{w}}^n - \boldsymbol{\epsilon}^{\Pi_n}\|_2^2 \\ & = \|(\hat{\mathbb{E}}[\mathbf{Y}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_n), r_n}] - \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Y}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_n)}]) \tilde{\mathbf{w}}^n\|_2^2 + \|\boldsymbol{\epsilon}^{\Pi_n}\|_2^2 - 2\langle (\hat{\mathbb{E}}[\mathbf{Y}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_n), r_n}] - \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Y}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_n)}]) \tilde{\mathbf{w}}^n, \boldsymbol{\epsilon}^{\Pi_n} \rangle \end{aligned} \quad (35)$$

Substituting (33) and (35) into (32) and using (31), we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\hat{\mathbb{E}}[\mathbf{Y}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_n), r_n}] \hat{\mathbf{w}}^n - \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Y}^{(\Pi_n)}]\|_2^2 \\ & \leq \|(\hat{\mathbb{E}}[\mathbf{Y}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_n), r_n}] - \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Y}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_n)}]) \tilde{\mathbf{w}}^n\|_2^2 + 2\langle (\hat{\mathbb{E}}[\mathbf{Y}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_n), r_n}]) \Delta_w^n, \boldsymbol{\epsilon}^{\Pi_n} \rangle \\ & \leq \|(\hat{\mathbb{E}}[\mathbf{Y}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_n), r_n}] - \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Y}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_n)}])\|_{2, \infty}^2 \|\tilde{\mathbf{w}}^n\|_1^2 + 2\langle (\hat{\mathbb{E}}[\mathbf{Y}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_n), r_n}]) \Delta_w^n, \boldsymbol{\epsilon}^{\Pi_n} \rangle \end{aligned}$$

Then substituting this equation into (32) gives us

$$\|\mathcal{P}_{\hat{\mathcal{V}}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_n)}} \Delta_w^n\|_2^2 \leq \frac{4}{\hat{s}_{r_n}^2} \left(\|(\hat{\mathbb{E}}[\mathbf{Y}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_n), r_n}] - \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Y}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_n)}])\|_{2, \infty}^2 \|\tilde{\mathbf{w}}^n\|_1^2 + \langle \hat{\mathbb{E}}[\mathbf{Y}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_n), r_n}] \Delta_w^n, \boldsymbol{\epsilon}^{\Pi_n} \rangle \right) \quad (36)$$

We state three lemmas that help us bound the equation above with their proofs given in Appendices C.3.1, C.3.2 and C.3.3 respectively.

Lemma 23 *Let the set-up of Theorem 11 hold. Then,*

$$\hat{s}_{r_n} - s_{r_n} = O_p(1)$$

Lemma 24 *Let the set-up of Theorem 11 hold. Then for a universal constant $C > 0$, we have*

$$\|\hat{\mathbb{E}}[\mathbf{Y}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_n), r_n}] - \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Y}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_n)}]\|_{2, \infty} \leq C \sqrt{r_n |\Pi_n|} \Delta_E \quad (37)$$

Lemma 25 *Let the set-up of Theorem 11 hold. Then,*

$$\langle \hat{\mathbb{E}}[\mathbf{Y}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_n), r_n}] \Delta_w^n, \boldsymbol{\epsilon}^{\Pi_n} \rangle = O_p \left(\sqrt{|\Pi_n|} + r_n + \|\hat{\mathbb{E}}[\mathbf{Y}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_n), r_n}] - \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Y}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_n)}]\|_{2, \infty} \|\tilde{\mathbf{w}}^n\|_1 \right) \quad (38)$$

Using the results of three lemmas above, applying Assumption 9 in (36), and then simplifying gives us

$$\|\mathcal{P}_{\hat{\mathcal{V}}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_n)}} \Delta_w^n\|_2 = O_p \left(\frac{r_n \Delta_E \|\tilde{\mathbf{w}}^n\|_1}{\sqrt{|\mathcal{I}|}} + \frac{r_n \left(1 + \sqrt{\Delta_E \|\tilde{\mathbf{w}}^n\|_1} \right)}{\sqrt{|\mathcal{I}|} |\Pi_n|^{1/4}} \right) \quad (39)$$

This concludes the proof for term 2. Using the result of Lemma 19, we have that $\|\tilde{\mathbf{w}}^n\|_1 \leq \sqrt{r_n}$. Substituting this into (39) gives us

$$\|\mathcal{P}_{\hat{V}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_n)}} \Delta_w^n\|_2 = O_p \left(\frac{r_n^{3/2} \Delta_E}{\sqrt{|\mathcal{I}|}} + \frac{r_n \left(1 + \sqrt{\Delta_E} r_n^{1/4}\right)}{\sqrt{|\mathcal{I}|} |\Pi_n|^{1/4}} \right) \quad (40)$$

Collecting Terms. Combining the results of (28) and (40), gives us

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\mathcal{P}_{V_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_n)}} \Delta_w^n\|_2 \\ &= \tilde{O}_p \left(r_n^2 \left[\frac{\Delta_E}{\sqrt{|\mathcal{I}|} \min\{\sqrt{|\Pi_n|}, \sqrt{|\mathcal{I}|}\}} + \Delta_E^2 \right] + \frac{r_n^{3/2} \Delta_E}{\sqrt{|\mathcal{I}|}} + \frac{r_n \left(1 + \sqrt{\Delta_E} r_n^{1/4}\right)}{\sqrt{|\mathcal{I}|} |\Pi_n|^{1/4}} \right) \end{aligned}$$

C.3.1. PROOF OF LEMMA 23

We first state Weyl's inequality which will be useful for us to establish the results.

Theorem 26 (Weyl's Inequality) *Given two matrices $\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$, let s_i and \hat{s}_i denote the i -th singular values of \mathbf{A} and \mathbf{B} respectively. Then, for all, $i \leq \min\{n, m\}$, we have $|s_i - \hat{s}_i| \leq \|\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{B}\|_{op}$*

Using Weyl's inequality gives us

$$\begin{aligned} |\hat{s}_{r_n} - s_{r_n}| &\leq \|\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Y}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_n)}] - \hat{E}[\mathbf{Y}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_n)}]\|_{op} \\ &\leq \sqrt{|\mathcal{I}| |\Pi_n|} \Delta_E \end{aligned}$$

Using the inequality above and Assumption 9, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{s}_{r_n} &\geq s_{r_n} - \sqrt{|\mathcal{I}| |\Pi_n|} \Delta_E \\ &= s_{r_n} \left(1 - \frac{\sqrt{|\mathcal{I}| |\Pi_n|} \Delta_E}{s_{r_n}} \right) \\ &\geq s_{r_n} (1 - \sqrt{r_n} \Delta_E) \end{aligned}$$

Then, substituting (21) into the equation above gives us that

$$\frac{\hat{s}_{r_n}}{s_{r_n}} \geq \left(1 - C \sqrt{\frac{r_n s^2 p}{M}} \right)$$

holds with high probability for some universal constant $C \geq 0$. Finally, using the assumption that $M = \omega(r_n s^2 p)$ yields the claimed result.

C.3.2. PROOF OF LEMMA 24

For notational simplicity, let $\hat{\mathbf{U}}_{r_n}, \hat{\mathbf{S}}_{r_n}, \hat{\mathbf{V}}_{r_n}$ denote $\hat{\mathbf{U}}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_n)}, \hat{\mathbf{S}}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_n)}, \hat{\mathbf{V}}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_n)}$ respectively. For a matrix \mathbf{A} , let $A_{\cdot,j}$ denote its j -th column. Additionally, denote $\Delta_j = \hat{\mathbb{E}}[\mathbf{Y}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_n),r_n}]_{\cdot,j} - \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Y}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_n)}]_{\cdot,j}$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} & \hat{\mathbb{E}}[\mathbf{Y}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_n),r_n}]_{\cdot,j} - \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Y}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_n)}]_{\cdot,j} \\ &= \left(\hat{\mathbb{E}}[\mathbf{Y}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_n),r_n}]_{\cdot,j} - \hat{\mathbf{U}}_{r_n} \hat{\mathbf{U}}_{r_n}^T \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Y}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_n)}]_{\cdot,j} \right) + \left(\hat{\mathbf{U}}_{r_n} \hat{\mathbf{U}}_{r_n}^T \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Y}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_n)}]_{\cdot,j} - \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Y}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_n)}]_{\cdot,j} \right) \end{aligned}$$

We have that $\left(\hat{\mathbb{E}}[\mathbf{Y}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_n),r_n}]_{\cdot,j} - \hat{\mathbf{U}}_{r_n} \hat{\mathbf{U}}_{r_n}^T \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Y}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_n)}]_{\cdot,j} \right)$ belongs to the subspace spanned by the column vectors of $\hat{\mathbf{U}}_{r_n}$, while $\left(\hat{\mathbf{U}}_{r_n} \hat{\mathbf{U}}_{r_n}^T \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Y}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_n)}]_{\cdot,j} - \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Y}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_n)}]_{\cdot,j} \right)$ belongs to its orthogonal complement. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \hat{\mathbb{E}}[\mathbf{Y}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_n),r_n}]_{\cdot,j} - \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Y}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_n)}]_{\cdot,j} \right\|_2^2 \\ &= \left\| \hat{\mathbb{E}}[\mathbf{Y}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_n),r_n}]_{\cdot,j} - \hat{\mathbf{U}}_{r_n} \hat{\mathbf{U}}_{r_n}^T \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Y}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_n)}]_{\cdot,j} \right\|_2^2 + \left\| \hat{\mathbf{U}}_{r_n} \hat{\mathbf{U}}_{r_n}^T \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Y}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_n)}]_{\cdot,j} - \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Y}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_n)}]_{\cdot,j} \right\|_2^2 \end{aligned}$$

Bounding $\left\| \hat{\mathbb{E}}[\mathbf{Y}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_n),r_n}]_{\cdot,j} - \hat{\mathbf{U}}_{r_n} \hat{\mathbf{U}}_{r_n}^T \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Y}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_n)}]_{\cdot,j} \right\|_2^2$. Observe that, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\mathbf{U}}_{r_n} \hat{\mathbf{U}}_{r_n}^T \hat{\mathbb{E}}[\mathbf{Y}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_n)}]_{\cdot,j} &= \hat{\mathbf{U}}_{r_n} \hat{\mathbf{U}}_{r_n}^T \hat{\mathbb{E}}[\mathbf{Y}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_n)}] \mathbf{e}_j = \hat{\mathbf{U}}_{r_n} \hat{\mathbf{U}}_{r_n}^T \hat{\mathbf{U}}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_n)} \hat{\mathbf{S}}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_n)} \hat{\mathbf{V}}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_n)} \mathbf{e}_j \\ &= \hat{\mathbf{U}}_{r_n} \hat{\mathbf{S}}_{r_n} \hat{\mathbf{V}}_{r_n}^T \mathbf{e}_j = \hat{\mathbb{E}}[\mathbf{Y}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_n),r_n}]_{\cdot,j} \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \hat{\mathbb{E}}[\mathbf{Y}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_n),r_n}]_{\cdot,j} - \hat{\mathbf{U}}_{r_n} \hat{\mathbf{U}}_{r_n}^T \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Y}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_n)}]_{\cdot,j} \right\|_2^2 &= \left\| \hat{\mathbf{U}}_{r_n} \hat{\mathbf{U}}_{r_n}^T \hat{\mathbb{E}}[\mathbf{Y}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_n)}]_{\cdot,j} - \hat{\mathbf{U}}_{r_n} \hat{\mathbf{U}}_{r_n}^T \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Y}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_n)}]_{\cdot,j} \right\|_2^2 \\ &\leq \left\| \hat{\mathbf{U}}_{r_n} \hat{\mathbf{U}}_{r_n}^T \right\|_2^2 \left\| \hat{\mathbb{E}}[\mathbf{Y}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_n)}]_{\cdot,j} - \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Y}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_n)}]_{\cdot,j} \right\|_2^2 \\ &\leq |\Pi_n| \Delta_E^2 \end{aligned}$$

Bounding $\left\| \hat{\mathbf{U}}_{r_n} \hat{\mathbf{U}}_{r_n}^T \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Y}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_n)}]_{\cdot,j} - \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Y}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_n)}]_{\cdot,j} \right\|_2^2$. Note that $\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Y}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_n)}]_{\cdot,j} = \mathbf{U}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_n)} \left(\mathbf{U}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_n)} \right)^T \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Y}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_n)}]_{\cdot,j}$. Using Assumption 6 and (26), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \hat{\mathbf{U}}_{r_n} \hat{\mathbf{U}}_{r_n}^T \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Y}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_n)}]_{\cdot,j} - \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Y}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_n)}]_{\cdot,j} \right\|_2^2 &\leq \left\| \hat{\mathbf{U}}_{r_n} \hat{\mathbf{U}}_{r_n}^T - \mathbf{U}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_n)} \left(\mathbf{U}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_n)} \right)^T \right\|_2^2 \left\| \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Y}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_n)}]_{\cdot,j} \right\|_2^2 \\ &\leq \left\| \hat{\mathbf{U}}_{r_n} \hat{\mathbf{U}}_{r_n}^T - \mathbf{U}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_n)} \left(\mathbf{U}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_n)} \right)^T \right\|_2^2 |\Pi_n| \\ &\leq Cr_n |\Pi_n| \Delta_E^2 \end{aligned}$$

for a universal constant $C > 0$. Combining the two bounds gives us,

$$\max_j \Delta_j \leq C \sqrt{r_n |\Pi_n|} \Delta_E$$

for a universal constant $C > 0$.

C.3.3. PROOF OF LEMMA 25

The proof of Lemma 25 follows from adapting the notation of Lemma H.5 in Agarwal et al. (2020b) to that used in this paper. Specifically, we have the notational changes established in Table 2, as well as the following changes: $r_{pre} = r_n$, $\mathbf{Y}_{pre, \mathcal{I}^{(d)}}^{r_{pre}} = \hat{\mathbb{E}}[\mathbf{Y}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_n), r_n}]$, $\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Y}_{pre, \mathcal{I}^{(d)}}]$, $\epsilon_{pre, n} = \epsilon^{\Pi_n}$, $T_0 = \Pi_n$ where the l.h.s of each equality is the notation used in Agarwal et al. (2020b), and the r.h.s is the notation used in this work. Using the notation established, we can use the result of Lemma H.5 in Agarwal et al. (2020b) to give us

$$\langle \hat{\mathbb{E}}[\mathbf{Y}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_n), r_n}] \Delta_w^n, \epsilon^{\Pi_n} \rangle = O_p \left(\sqrt{|\Pi_n|} + r_n + \|\hat{\mathbb{E}}[\mathbf{Y}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_n), r_n}] - \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Y}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_n)}]\|_{2, \infty} \|\tilde{\mathbf{w}}^n\|_1 \right)$$

which completes the proof.

C.4. Proof of Proposition 21

We prove Proposition 21, which also serves as the finite-sample analysis of the vertical regression procedure (step 2 of Synthetic Combinations) done via principal component regression. The proof follows from adapting the notation of Proposition E.3 in Agarwal and Singh (2021) to that used in this paper. Specifically, we present table 2 that matches their notation to ours.

Notation of Agarwal and Singh (2021)	Our Notation
\mathbf{Y}	\mathbf{Y}_{Π_n}
\mathbf{X}	$\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Y}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_n)}]$
\mathbf{Z}	$\hat{\mathbb{E}}[\mathbf{Y}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_n)}]$
n	$ \Pi_n $
p	$ \mathcal{I} $
β^*	$\tilde{\mathbf{w}}$
$\hat{\beta}$	$\hat{\mathbf{w}}$
Δ_E	Δ_E
r	r
ϕ^{lr}	0
\bar{A}	1
K	0
$K_a, \kappa, \bar{\sigma}$	$C\sigma$
ρ_{min}	1

Table 2: A summary of the main notational differences between our setting and that of Agarwal and Singh (2021).

Using the table above, we have that the following holds with probability $1 - O\left((|\mathcal{I}||\Pi_n|)^{-10}\right)$

$$\|\hat{\mathbf{w}}^n - \tilde{\mathbf{w}}^n\|_2 \leq C\sigma^3 \log^3(|\mathcal{I}||\Pi_n|) \left[\frac{\|\tilde{\mathbf{w}}^n\|_2}{\min\{\sqrt{|\Pi_n|}, \sqrt{|\mathcal{I}|}\}} + \Delta_E \right]$$

This completes the proof.

Appendix D. Proof of Theorem 15

Let $\mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_2, \mathcal{E}_3, \mathcal{E}_4$ denote the event that horizontal span inclusion (Assumptions 3 (a)), incoherence of donor units (Assumption 8), linear span inclusion (3) (b) and subspace inclusion (Assumption 10) hold, respectively. Let $\mathcal{E}_H = \mathcal{E}_1 \cap \mathcal{E}_2$ and $\mathcal{E}_V = \mathcal{E}_3 \cap \mathcal{E}_4$ denote the events that the conditions required for horizontal and vertical regression are satisfied respectively. We proceed by showing that both events \mathcal{E}_H and \mathcal{E}_V hold with high probability.

Step 1: \mathcal{E}_H high probability bound. To show \mathcal{E}_H holds with high probability, we state the following two lemmas proved in Appendix E.1.

Lemma 27 (Horizontal Span Inclusion) *Let the set-up of Theorem 15 hold. Then, horizontal span inclusion (Assumption 3(a)) holds for every unit $u \in \mathcal{I}$ with probability at least $1 - \gamma/4$.*

Lemma 28 (Incoherence of Donor Units) *Let the set-up of Theorem 15 hold. Then, $\chi(\Pi_{\mathcal{I}})$ satisfies the incoherence condition:*

$$\left\| \frac{\chi(\Pi_{\mathcal{I}})^T \chi(\Pi_{\mathcal{I}})}{|\Pi_{\mathcal{I}}|} - \mathbf{I}_{2^p} \right\|_{\infty} \leq \frac{C}{s}$$

for a universal constant $C > 0$ with probability at least $1 - \gamma/4$.

Applying Lemmas 27 and 28 alongside Demorgan's law and the union bound gives us

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_H^c) = \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_1^c \cup \mathcal{E}_2^c) \leq \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_1^c) + \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_2^c) \leq \gamma/2 \quad (41)$$

Step 2: \mathcal{E}_V high probability bound. Next, we show that \mathcal{E}_V holds with high probability. To that end, we state the following two lemmas proved in Appendix E.2. We define some necessary notation for the following lemma, let $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{I}} = [\alpha_u : u \in \mathcal{I}] \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{I}| \times 2^p}$.

Lemma 29 (Linear Span Inclusion) *Let the set-up of Theorem 15 hold. Then, we have that*

$$s_r(\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{I}}^T \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{I}}) \geq \frac{C' |\mathcal{I}|}{r} \quad (42)$$

for a universal constant $C' > 0$ with probability at least $1 - \gamma/4$.

Since $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{I}}$ has rank r , we have that $\text{rank}(\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{I}}) = \text{rank}(\mathcal{A})$. Further, since $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{I}}$ is a sub-matrix of \mathcal{A} , linear span inclusion (i.e., \mathcal{E}_3) holds with probability at least $1 - \gamma/4$. Next, we show that subspace inclusion holds.

Lemma 30 (Subspace Inclusion) *Let the set-up of Theorem 15 and (42) hold. Then, $\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Y}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\pi)}]$ lies in the row-space of $\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Y}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_N)}]$ holds with probability at least $1 - \gamma/4$. That is, subspace inclusion (Assumption 10) holds with high probability.*

Let \mathcal{E}_5 denote the event that (42) holds. As a result of Lemma 30, we have that $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_4 | \mathcal{E}_5) \geq 1 - \gamma/4$. Additionally, note that $\mathcal{E}_3 \subset \mathcal{E}_5$. Hence, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_V) &= \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_3 \cap \mathcal{E}_4) \geq \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_4 \cap \mathcal{E}_5) \\ &= \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_4 | \mathcal{E}_5) \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_5) \\ &\geq (1 - \gamma/4)^2 \geq 1 - \gamma/2 \end{aligned} \quad (43)$$

Step 3: Collecting Terms. Let $\mathcal{E} = \mathcal{E}_H \cap \mathcal{E}_V$. To complete the proof, it suffices to show that $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}) \geq 1 - \gamma$. Applying (41) and (43) gives us

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}^c) = \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_H^c \cup \mathcal{E}_V^c) \leq \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_H^c) + \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_V^c) \leq 1 - \gamma$$

This completes the proof.

Appendix E. Proofs of Helper Lemmas for Theorem 15

Throughout these proofs, we use c, c', c'', c''', C, C' to refer to positive universal constants that can change from line to line.

E.1. Proof of Lemmas for Horizontal Regression

In this section, we provide proofs that horizontal span inclusion and incoherence of the donor unit Fourier characteristics hold with high probability under our experimental design mechanism. That is, we prove Lemmas 27 and 28 used in Theorem 15.

E.1.1. PROOF OF LEMMA 27

We begin by defining some necessary notation. For a given unit $u \in \mathcal{I}$, and let $\mathcal{S}_u = \{S \subset [p] \mid \alpha_{u,S} \neq 0\}$. That is, \mathcal{S}_u denotes the subset of coordinates where $\alpha_u \in \mathbb{R}^{2^p}$ is non-zero. Note that by Assumption 1, $|\mathcal{S}_u| \leq s$. For any combination π , let $\chi_{\mathcal{S}_u}^\pi = [\chi_S^\pi : S \in \mathcal{S}_u] \in \{-1, 1\}^{|\mathcal{S}_u|}$ denote the projection of χ^π to the non-zero coordinates of α_u . For example, if $\alpha_u = (1, 1, \dots, 0)$ and $\chi^\pi = (1, 1, \dots, 1)$, then $\chi_{\mathcal{S}_u}^\pi = (1, 1)$. Finally, let $\chi_{\mathcal{S}_u}(\Pi_{\mathcal{I}}) = [\chi_{\mathcal{S}_u}^\pi : \pi \in \Pi_{\mathcal{I}}] \in \{-1, 1\}^{|\Pi_{\mathcal{I}}| \times |\mathcal{S}_u|}$.

To proceed, we first show horizontal span inclusion holds for a given unit $u \in \mathcal{I}$, and then show that it extends to the entire donor set \mathcal{I} via the union bound. To that end, fix a donor unit $u \in \mathcal{I}$ and then we proceed by quoting the following result required for our proof, which is based on the matrix Bernstein's inequality (Tropp, 2012, Theorem 1.4).

Theorem 31 ((Vershynin, 2012, Theorem 5.41)) *Let A be an $N \times s$ matrix whose rows A_i are independent isotropic random vectors in \mathbb{R}^s . Let m be such that $\|A_i\|_2 \leq \sqrt{m}$ almost surely for all $i \in [N]$. Then, for every $t \geq 0$, one has*

$$\sqrt{N} - t\sqrt{m} \leq s_{\min}(A) \leq s_{\max}(A) \leq \sqrt{N} + t\sqrt{m}$$

with probability at least $1 - 2s \cdot \exp(-ct^2)$.

To apply the theorem, we first show that $\chi_{\mathcal{S}_u}^\pi$ is isotropic for any combination $\pi \in \Pi_{\mathcal{I}}$. That is, we show $\mathbb{E}[\chi_{\mathcal{S}_u}^\pi (\chi_{\mathcal{S}_u}^\pi)^T] = \mathbf{I}_{|\mathcal{S}_u|}$ where the expectation is taken over the randomness in choosing π uniformly and independently at random from Π . The isotropy of $\chi_{\mathcal{S}_u}^\pi$ follows since for any two subsets $S, S' \subset [p]$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\chi_S^\pi \chi_{S'}^\pi] &= \frac{1}{2^p} \sum_{\pi \in \Pi} \chi_S^\pi \chi_{S'}^\pi \\ &= \langle \chi_S, \chi_{S'} \rangle_B = \mathbb{1}\{S = S'\}. \end{aligned}$$

Next, we verify that $\|\chi_{\mathcal{S}_u}^\pi\|_2 \leq \sqrt{s}$ almost surely. This follows since $\chi_{\mathcal{S}_u}^\pi \in \{1, -1\}^{|\mathcal{S}_u|}$, so

$$\|\chi_{\mathcal{S}_u}^\pi\|_2 \leq \sqrt{|\mathcal{S}_u|} \|\chi_{\mathcal{S}_u}^\pi\|_\infty \leq \sqrt{|\mathcal{S}_u|}.$$

Thus, applying the theorem with $N = |\Pi_{\mathcal{I}}|$ gives

$$\sqrt{|\Pi_{\mathcal{I}}|} - t\sqrt{|\mathcal{S}_u|} \leq s_{\min}(\chi_{\mathcal{S}_u}(\Pi_{\mathcal{I}}))$$

with probability at least $1 - 2|\mathcal{S}_u| \cdot \exp(-ct^2)$. Choosing $t = \sqrt{|\Pi_{\mathcal{I}}|/4|\mathcal{S}_u|}$ gives

$$\sqrt{|\Pi_{\mathcal{I}}|/4} \leq s_{\min}(\chi_{\mathcal{S}_u}(\Pi_{\mathcal{I}})) \quad (44)$$

with probability at least $1 - 2|\mathcal{S}_u| \cdot \exp(-c|\Pi_{\mathcal{I}}|/4|\mathcal{S}_u|)$. Using our assumption that $|\Pi_{\mathcal{I}}| \geq \frac{Cr^2s^2 \log(|\mathcal{I}|2^p/\gamma)}{\delta^2} \geq C|\mathcal{S}_u| \log(|\mathcal{S}_u||\mathcal{I}|/\gamma)$ establishes that $\chi_{\mathcal{S}_u}(\Pi_{\mathcal{I}})$ has full-rank with probability at least $1 - \gamma/|\mathcal{I}|$. Since, $\chi_{\mathcal{S}_u}(\Pi_{\mathcal{I}})$ has full-rank, we have that horizontal span inclusion holds for unit u . Taking a union bound over all donor units $u \in \mathcal{I}$ completes the proof.

E.1.2. PROOF OF LEMMA 28

We begin the proof by defining some notation. For a subset $S \subset [p]$, let $\chi_S^{\Pi_{\mathcal{I}}} = [\chi_S^\pi : \pi \in \Pi_{\mathcal{I}}] \in \{-1, 1\}^{|\Pi_{\mathcal{I}}|}$. For any two distinct subsets $S, S' \in [p]$, define $z_i = \chi_S^{\pi_i} \chi_{S'}^{\pi_i} / |\Pi_{\mathcal{I}}| \in \{-\frac{1}{|\Pi_{\mathcal{I}}|}, \frac{1}{|\Pi_{\mathcal{I}}|}\}$ for $1 \leq i \leq |\Pi_{\mathcal{I}}|$. Let $S \Delta S'$ denote the symmetric difference of two subsets S, S' . Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[z_i] &= \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{|\Pi_{\mathcal{I}}|} \chi_S^{\pi_i} \chi_{S'}^{\pi_i} \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{|\Pi_{\mathcal{I}}|} \left(\prod_{j \in S} v(\pi_i)_j \right) \left(\prod_{j' \in S'} v(\pi_i)_{j'} \right) \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{|\Pi_{\mathcal{I}}|} \left(\prod_{j \in S \Delta S'} v(\pi_i)_j \right) \right] \end{aligned}$$

where the expectation is taken over choosing π_i uniformly and independently at random. Since each $\pi \in \Pi_{\mathcal{I}}$ is chosen in this fashion, we have that the random variables $v(\pi)_j$ are independent and identically distributed being over $\{-1, 1\}$. Plugging this into the equation above, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[z_i] &= \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{|\Pi_{\mathcal{I}}|} \left(\prod_{j \in S \Delta S'} v(\pi_i)_j \right) \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{|\Pi_{\mathcal{I}}|} \prod_{j \in S \Delta S'} \mathbb{E}[v(\pi_i)_j] = 0 \end{aligned}$$

Next, observe that since each $\pi \in \Pi_{\mathcal{I}}$ is chosen independently and uniformly and random, we have that $z_1 \dots z_{|\Pi_{\mathcal{I}}|}$ are independent and identically distributed bounded random variables. Hence, we can apply Hoeffding's inequality for any $t > 0$ to give us,

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{|\Pi_{\mathcal{I}}|} z_i \geq t \right) \leq 2 \exp\left(-\frac{|\Pi_{\mathcal{I}}|t^2}{2}\right) \quad (45)$$

Then, for any distinct subsets $S, S' \subset [p]$, we have

$$\frac{1}{|\Pi_{\mathcal{I}}|} \langle \boldsymbol{\chi}_{S'}^{\Pi_{\mathcal{I}}}, \boldsymbol{\chi}_S^{\Pi_{\mathcal{I}}} \rangle = \sum_{\pi_i \in \Pi_{\mathcal{I}}} \chi_{S'}^{\pi_i} \chi_S^{\pi_i} = \sum_{i=1}^{|\Pi_{\mathcal{I}}|} z_i$$

Therefore, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P} \left(\max_{S \neq S'} \frac{1}{|\Pi_{\mathcal{I}}|} |\langle \boldsymbol{\chi}_{S'}^{\Pi_{\mathcal{I}}}, \boldsymbol{\chi}_S^{\Pi_{\mathcal{I}}} \rangle| \geq t \right) &\leq \sum_{S \neq S'} \mathbb{P} \left(\frac{1}{|\Pi_{\mathcal{I}}|} |\langle \boldsymbol{\chi}_{S'}^{\Pi_{\mathcal{I}}}, \boldsymbol{\chi}_S^{\Pi_{\mathcal{I}}} \rangle| \geq t \right) \\ &\leq 2^{2p+1} \exp\left(-\frac{|\Pi_{\mathcal{I}}|t^2}{2}\right) \end{aligned}$$

where we use (45) for the last inequality. Choosing $t = C'/s$, and using our assumption that $|\Pi_{\mathcal{I}}| \geq \frac{Cr^2s^2 \log(|\mathcal{I}|2^p/\gamma)}{\delta^2} \geq Cs^2 \log(2^p/\gamma)$ gives us

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\max_{S \neq S'} \frac{1}{|\Pi_{\mathcal{I}}|} |\langle \boldsymbol{\chi}_{S'}^{\Pi_{\mathcal{I}}}, \boldsymbol{\chi}_S^{\Pi_{\mathcal{I}}} \rangle| \geq \frac{C'}{s} \right) \leq \gamma \quad (46)$$

for an appropriately chosen constant $C > 0$. To proceed, observe that $\langle \boldsymbol{\chi}_S^{\Pi_{\mathcal{I}}}, \boldsymbol{\chi}_S^{\Pi_{\mathcal{I}}} \rangle / |\Pi_{\mathcal{I}}| = 1$. Hence, we have that

$$\left\| \frac{\boldsymbol{\chi}(\Pi_{\mathcal{I}})\boldsymbol{\chi}(\Pi_{\mathcal{I}})^T}{|\Pi_{\mathcal{I}}|} - \mathbf{I}_{2^p} \right\|_{\infty} = \max_{S \neq S'} \frac{1}{|\Pi_{\mathcal{I}}|} |\langle \boldsymbol{\chi}_{S'}^{\Pi_{\mathcal{I}}}, \boldsymbol{\chi}_S^{\Pi_{\mathcal{I}}} \rangle|$$

Substituting this into (46) completes the proof.

E.2. Proofs of Lemmas for Vertical Regression

In this section, we provide proofs that vertical span inclusion and subspace inclusion holds with high probability under our experimental design mechanism. That is, we prove Lemmas 29 and 30 used in Theorem 15.

E.2.1. PROOF OF LEMMA 29

Let $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{I}} = [\boldsymbol{\alpha}_u : u \in \mathcal{I}] \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{I}| \times 2^p}$ denote the matrix of Fourier coefficients of the uniformly sampled donor set. By Assumption 1 (a), it suffices to show that $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{I}}$ has rank r with high probability. To proceed, note that $\boldsymbol{\chi}(\Pi)/2^{p/2}$ is an orthogonal matrix since $(\boldsymbol{\chi}(\Pi)/2^{p/2})^T \boldsymbol{\chi}(\Pi)/2^{p/2} = \mathbf{I}_{2^p}$. Further, observe that $\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Y}_N^{(\Pi)}] = \boldsymbol{\chi}(\Pi)\mathcal{A}^T$. Then, since multiplication by an orthogonal matrix preserves singular values, we have

$$2^p s_i(\mathcal{A}^T \mathcal{A}) = 2^p s_i \left(\left(\frac{\boldsymbol{\chi}(\Pi)}{2^{p/2}} \right) \mathcal{A}^T \mathcal{A} \left(\frac{\boldsymbol{\chi}(\Pi)}{2^{p/2}} \right)^T \right) = s_i(\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Y}_N^{(\Pi)}] \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Y}_N^{(\Pi)}]^T) \quad (47)$$

Then, by Assumption 14 and the equality above, we have

$$\frac{CN}{r} \geq s_1(\mathcal{A}^T \mathcal{A}) \geq s_r(\mathcal{A}^T \mathcal{A}) \geq \frac{cN}{r}. \quad (48)$$

Now, let $\tilde{\mathcal{A}} = [\tilde{\alpha}_n : n \in [N]] \in \mathbb{R}^{|N| \times p'}$ be formed by removing all the zero columns of \mathcal{A} . Analogously, define $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{\mathcal{I}} = [\tilde{\alpha}_u : u \in \mathcal{I}] \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{I}| \times p'}$ by removing all the zero columns of $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{I}}$. Then clearly, for every $i \in [r]$, we have that $s_i(\tilde{\mathcal{A}}^T \tilde{\mathcal{A}}) = s_i(\mathcal{A}^T \mathcal{A})$. Moreover, note that

$$\mathbb{E}[\tilde{\alpha}_u \tilde{\alpha}_u^T] = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N \tilde{\alpha}_n \tilde{\alpha}_n^T = \tilde{\mathcal{A}}^T \tilde{\mathcal{A}}/N.$$

where the expectation is taken over the randomness in uniformly and independently sampling donor units u from $[N]$. That is, the expectation is taken over the randomness in choosing α_u uniformly and random from \mathcal{A} . To bound the number of non-zero columns p' , we state the following Lemma proved in Appendix E.2.3.

Lemma 32 *The number of nonzero columns of \mathcal{A} , which we have denoted p' , satisfies $p' \leq rs$.*

Further, since multiplication by an orthogonal matrix preserves the 2-norm of a vector, for every unit $n \in [N]$, we have

$$\|\alpha_n\|_2 = 2^{-p/2} \|\chi(\Pi)\alpha_n\|_2 = 2^{-p/2} \|\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Y}_n^{(\Pi)}]\|_2 \leq 1 \quad (49)$$

where we used the assumption $\mathbb{E}[Y_n^{(\pi)}] \in [-1, 1]$ for every unit-combination pair. To proceed, we state the following result.

Theorem 33 (Theorem 5.44 in Vershynin (2012)) *Let X be an $q \times p'$ matrix whose rows X_i are independent random vectors in $\mathbb{R}^{p'}$ with the common second moment matrix $\Sigma = \mathbb{E}[X_i X_i^T]$. Let m be a number such that $\|X_i\|_2 \leq \sqrt{m}$ almost surely for all i . Then for every $t \geq 0$, the following inequality holds with probability at least $1 - p' \cdot \exp(-ct^2)$:*

$$\left\| \frac{1}{q} X^T X - \Sigma \right\| \leq t \sqrt{\frac{m \|\Sigma\|}{q}} \vee \frac{t^2 m}{q}$$

Here $c > 0$ is an absolute constant.

Then, we can apply Theorem 33 with $X = \tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{\mathcal{I}}$, $q = |\mathcal{I}|$, $m = 1$ (obtained from (49)), $\Sigma = \mathbb{E}[\tilde{\alpha}_u \tilde{\alpha}_u^T]$, $\|\Sigma\| = C/r$ (obtained from (48)), and $t = \sqrt{\log(rs/\gamma)/c'}$ to give us that

$$\left\| \frac{1}{|\mathcal{I}|} \tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{\mathcal{I}}^T \tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{\mathcal{I}} - \Sigma \right\| \leq \sqrt{\frac{\log(8rs/\gamma)}{c' r |\mathcal{I}|}} \vee \frac{\log(8rs/\gamma)}{c'' |\mathcal{I}|} \quad (50)$$

holds with probability at least $1 - \gamma/8$. Then using Weyl's inequality (Theorem 26), (48), and (50), we have

$$\begin{aligned} s_r(\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{\mathcal{I}}^T \tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{\mathcal{I}}/|\mathcal{I}|) &\geq s_r(\tilde{\mathcal{A}}^T \tilde{\mathcal{A}}/N) - \left\| \frac{1}{|\mathcal{I}|} \tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{\mathcal{I}}^T \tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{\mathcal{I}} - \Sigma \right\| \\ &\geq \frac{c}{r} - \sqrt{\frac{\log(8rs/\gamma)}{c' r |\mathcal{I}|}} \vee \frac{\log(8rs/\gamma)}{c'' |\mathcal{I}|}. \end{aligned}$$

Choosing $|\mathcal{I}| \geq Cr \log(rs/\gamma)$ for an appropriate constant $C > 0$ gives us that

$$s_r(\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{\mathcal{I}}^T \tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{\mathcal{I}}/|\mathcal{I}|) \geq \frac{c'''}{r} \quad (51)$$

for some universal constant $c''' > 0$ with probability at least $1 - \gamma/8$. To establish the result, observe that $s_r(\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{\mathcal{I}}^T \tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{\mathcal{I}}/|\mathcal{I}|) = s_r(\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{I}}^T \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{I}}/|\mathcal{I}|)$. This completes the proof.

E.2.2. PROOF OF LEMMA 30

It suffices to show that $\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Y}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_N)}] = [\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Y}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\pi)}] : \pi \in \Pi_N] \in \mathbb{R}^{|\Pi_N| \times |\mathcal{I}|}$ has rank r with high probability. We begin by establishing that $\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Y}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi)}]$ has a balanced spectrum. To proceed, note that since $\chi(\Pi)/2^{p/2}$ is an orthogonal matrix, $\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Y}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi)}] = \chi(\Pi)\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{I}}^T$, and that multiplication by an orthogonal matrix preserves singular values, we have that

$$2^p s_i(\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{I}}^T \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{I}}) = s_i \left(\left(\frac{\chi(\Pi)}{2^{p/2}} \right) \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{I}}^T \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{I}} \left(\frac{\chi(\Pi)}{2^{p/2}} \right)^T \right) = s_i(\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Y}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi)}] \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Y}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi)}]^T)$$

Using the equation above and by assuming (42) in the set-up of the Lemma, we have

$$s_r(\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Y}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi)}]^T \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Y}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi)}]) = 2^p s_r(\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{I}}^T \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{I}}) \geq \frac{c|\mathcal{I}|2^p}{r} \quad (52)$$

for a universal constant $C > 0$. Next, we have that

$$s_1(\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Y}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi)}]^T \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Y}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi)}]) \leq \|\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Y}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi)}]\|_F^2 \leq \frac{C|\mathcal{I}|2^p}{r} \quad (53)$$

Putting both (52) and (53) together, we get

$$\frac{C'|\mathcal{I}|2^p}{r} \geq s_1(\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Y}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi)}]^T \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Y}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi)}]) \geq s_r(\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Y}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi)}]^T \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Y}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi)}]) \geq \frac{c|\mathcal{I}|2^p}{r} \quad (54)$$

which establishes that $\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Y}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi)}]$ has a balanced spectrum. Further, observe that for $\pi \in \Pi$ chosen uniformly at random, we have

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Y}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\pi)}]^T \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Y}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\pi)}] \right] = \frac{1}{2^p} \sum_{\pi \in \Pi} \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Y}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\pi)}]^T \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Y}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\pi)}] = \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Y}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi)}]^T \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Y}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi)}] / 2^p$$

where the outer expectation is taken with respect to the randomness in choosing π uniformly and independently at random from Π . Then, we can apply Theorem 33 with $X = \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Y}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_N)}]$, $m = \|\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Y}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\pi)}]\| \leq \sqrt{|\mathcal{I}|}$ for any $\pi \in \Pi$, $\Sigma = \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Y}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi)}]^T \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Y}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi)}] / 2^p$, $\|\Sigma\| = C|\mathcal{I}|/r$ (obtained from (53)), $t = \sqrt{\log(8|\mathcal{I}|/\gamma)}/c'$ to give us that

$$\left\| \frac{1}{|\Pi_N|} \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Y}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_N)}]^T \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Y}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_N)}] - \Sigma \right\| \leq \sqrt{\frac{|\mathcal{I}|^2 \log(8|\mathcal{I}|/\gamma)}{c'r|\Pi_N|}} \vee \frac{|\mathcal{I}| \log(8|\mathcal{I}|/\gamma)}{c''|\Pi_N|} \quad (55)$$

holds with probability at least $1 - \gamma/8$. Next, using Theorem 26, (54), and (55), we have

$$\begin{aligned} s_r(\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Y}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_N)}]^T \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Y}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_N)}] / |\Pi_N|) &\geq s_r(\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Y}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi)}]^T \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Y}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi)}] / 2^p) - \left\| \frac{1}{|\Pi_N|} \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Y}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_N)}]^T \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Y}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_N)}] - \Sigma \right\| \\ &\geq \frac{c|\mathcal{I}|}{r} - \sqrt{\frac{|\mathcal{I}|^2 \log(8|\mathcal{I}|/\gamma)}{c'r|\Pi_N|}} \vee \frac{|\mathcal{I}| \log(8|\mathcal{I}|/\gamma)}{c''|\Pi_N|} \end{aligned}$$

Choosing $|\Pi_N| \geq Cr \log(|\mathcal{I}|/\gamma)$ for appropriate constant $C > 0$ implies $s_r(\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Y}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_N)}]^T \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Y}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(\Pi_N)}] / |\Pi_N|) > 0$ with probability at least $1 - \gamma/8$. This completes the proof.

E.2.3. PROOF OF LEMMA 32

Let \mathcal{A}_t denote the sub-matrix of \mathcal{A} formed by taking the first t rows. Further, let p'_t denote the number of nonzero columns of \mathcal{A}_t . We proceed by induction, that is we show for all t ,

$$p'_t - s \cdot \text{rank}(\mathcal{A}_t) \leq 0$$

In the case of $t = 1$, either the first row is the zero vector, in which case $p'_1 = \text{rank}(\mathcal{A}_1) = 0$, or else $\text{rank}(\mathcal{A}_1) = 1$ and $p'_1 \leq s$ since the first row is at most s -sparse. Then, for general t , note that

$$\text{rank}(\mathcal{A}_{t-1}) \leq \text{rank}(\mathcal{A}_t) \leq \text{rank}(\mathcal{A}_{t-1}) + 1.$$

If $\text{rank}(\mathcal{A}_t) = \text{rank}(\mathcal{A}_{t-1})$ then we must also have $p'_{t-1} = p'_t$ and the inductive hypothesis holds. Otherwise, $\text{rank}(\mathcal{A}_t) = \text{rank}(\mathcal{A}_{t-1}) + 1$. Note that the t^{th} row of \mathcal{A} has only s nonzero entries, so $p'_t \leq p'_{t-1} + s$. In this case, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} p'_t - s \cdot \text{rank}(\mathcal{A}_t) &= p'_t - s \cdot (\text{rank}(\mathcal{A}_{t-1}) + 1) \\ &\leq (p'_{t-1} + s) - s \cdot (\text{rank}(\mathcal{A}_{t-1}) + 1) \leq 0 \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality holds due to the inductive hypothesis. Since $\text{rank}(\mathcal{A}) = r$, we have that $p' \leq rs$. This completes the proof.

Appendix F. Proof of Proposition 4

In this section, we show that the set-up of our motivating example ensures that Assumption 3 holds with probability at least $1 - \gamma$. Let $\mathcal{E}_H, \mathcal{E}_L$ denote the events that horizontal span and linear inclusion holds. We proceed by showing that both $\mathcal{E}_H, \mathcal{E}_L$ hold with high probability.

Step 1: \mathcal{E}_H high probability bound. Recall the following notation defined in Section E.1. For a given unit $u \in \mathcal{I}$, and let $\mathcal{S}_u = \{S \subset [p] \mid \alpha_{u,S} \neq 0\}$. That is, \mathcal{S}_u denotes the subset of coordinates where $\alpha_u \in \mathbb{R}^{2^p}$ is non-zero. Note that by Assumption 1, $|\mathcal{S}_u| \leq s$. For any combination π , let $\chi_{\mathcal{S}_u}^\pi = [\chi_S^\pi : S \in \mathcal{S}_u] \in \{-1, 1\}^{|\mathcal{S}_u|}$ denote the projection of χ^π to the non-zero coordinates of α_u . Let $\chi_{\mathcal{S}_u}(\Pi_{\mathcal{I}}) = [\chi_{\mathcal{S}_u}^\pi : \pi \in \Pi_{\mathcal{I}}] \in \{-1, 1\}^{|\Pi_{\mathcal{I}}| \times |\mathcal{S}_u|}$. Additionally, define $\tilde{\chi}_u(\Pi_{\mathcal{I}}) = [\tilde{\chi}_u^\pi : \pi \in \Pi_{\mathcal{I}}] \in \{-1, 1\}^{2^p}$ where $\tilde{\chi}_u$ is defined in Section 5.

Notice that our sampling scheme for assigning combinations to donor units is precisely the same as that described in our experimental design mechanism in Section 8. Using this observation and Equation (44) from the proof of Lemma 27 gives us that $s_{\min}(\chi_{\mathcal{S}_u}(\Pi_{\mathcal{I}})) > 0$ with probability at least $1 - 2|\mathcal{S}_u| \cdot \exp(-c|\Pi_{\mathcal{I}}|/4|\mathcal{S}_u|)$ for a given unit u . Plugging in our assumption that $|\Pi_{\mathcal{I}}| \geq Cs \log(s|\Pi_{\mathcal{I}}|/\gamma)$ for an appropriate universal constant ensures that

$$\mathbb{P}(s_{\min}(\chi_{\mathcal{S}_u}(\Pi_{\mathcal{I}})) > 0) \geq 1 - \gamma/2|\mathcal{I}|$$

Next, observe that $s_{\min}(\chi_{\mathcal{S}_u}(\Pi_{\mathcal{I}})) = s_{\min}(\tilde{\chi}_u(\Pi_{\mathcal{I}}))$. Using this fact shows that horizontal linear span inclusion holds for unit u with probability at least $1 - \gamma/2|\mathcal{I}|$. Taking a union bound over all donor units shows that $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_H) \geq 1 - \gamma/2$.

Step 2: \mathcal{E}_L high probability bound. We begin by defining some notation. Let N_j denote the number of times a unit of type j appears. More formally, we have

$$N_j = \sum_{u \in \mathcal{I}} \mathbb{1}[\alpha_u = \alpha(j)]$$

Additionally, let $X \sim \text{Bin}(n, p)$ denote a draw from a binomial distribution with parameters n and p , where n is the number of trials and $p \in [0, 1]$ is the success probability of each trial. Note that N_j is distributed as a Binomial random variable with parameters $|\mathcal{I}|, p_j$ where p_j is the probability of choosing a unit of type j . Since each donor unit is drawn independently and uniformly at random, and we assume that there are at least cN/r units of each type, we have that $p_j \geq c/r$.

To show linear span inclusion holds, it suffices to show that $\min_{j \in [r]} N_j > 0$. Note that for a fixed $j \in [r]$, we have

$$\mathbb{P}(N_j = 0) = (1 - p_j)^{|\mathcal{I}|} \leq (1 - c/r)^{|\mathcal{I}|} \leq \exp(-c|\mathcal{I}|/r) \quad (56)$$

where we use the inequality $(1 - x)^a \leq \exp(-ax)$. Next, by Demorgan's law, the union bound and (56), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}((\min_{j \in [r]} N_j > 0)^c) &= \mathbb{P}((\cap_{j=1}^r N_j > 0)^c) \\ &= \mathbb{P}(\cup_{j=1}^r N_j = 0) \\ &\leq \sum_{j=1}^r \mathbb{P}(N_j = 0) \\ &\leq r \exp(-c|\mathcal{I}|/r) \end{aligned}$$

Plugging in our assumption $|\mathcal{I}| \geq cr \log(r/\gamma)$ into the equation above gives us that

$$\mathbb{P}((\min_{j \in [r]} N_j > 0)^c) \leq \gamma/2$$

for an appropriately chosen constant $c > 0$. Hence, we have that $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_L) \geq 1 - \gamma/2$.

Step 3: Collecting Terms. Let $\mathcal{E} = \mathcal{E}_H \cap \mathcal{E}_L$. To complete the proof, it suffices to show that $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}) \geq 1 - \gamma$. From steps 1 and 2, we have that $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_H)$ and $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_L)$ occur with probability at least $1 - \gamma/2$. Hence, we have that

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}^c) = \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_H^c \cup \mathcal{E}_L^c) \leq \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_H^c) + \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_L^c) \leq 1 - \gamma$$

This completes the proof.

Appendix G. CART Horizontal Regression

G.1. CART Background

Assume we have access to a training set $\mathcal{D}_n = \{(\mathbf{x}_1, y_1) \dots (\mathbf{x}_n, y_n)\}$ where \mathbf{x}_i is sampled from a distribution \mathcal{D}_x with support $\{-1, 1\}^p$, and the responses are generated as $y = f(\mathbf{x}_i) + \epsilon$. In the context of combinations, \mathbf{x}_i can correspond to the binary vector $\mathbf{v}(\pi)$.

Let $S \subset [p]$ denote a subset of coordinate indices, and $\mathbf{z} \in \{-1, 1\}^{|S|}$. Then, we define a *node* $\mathfrak{t} \subset \{-1, 1\}^p$ as a subcube of the form $\mathfrak{t}(S, \mathbf{z}) = \{\mathbf{x} \in \{-1, 1\}^p : x_j = z_j \text{ for } j \in S\}$. Let $N(\mathfrak{t}) := |\{i : \mathbf{x}_i \in \mathfrak{t}\}|$ denote the size of this set. Define the sub-cell $\mathfrak{t}_{j,1} = \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathfrak{t}, x_j = 1\}$ with respect to a feature j . Analogously, define the sub-cell $\mathfrak{t}_{j,-1} = \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathfrak{t}, x_j = -1\}$. Furthermore, denote the mean response over the node by

$$\hat{\mathbb{E}}_{\mathfrak{t}}[y] := \hat{\mathbb{E}}[y | \mathbf{x} \in \mathfrak{t}] = \frac{1}{N(\mathfrak{t})} \sum_{\mathbf{x}_i \in \mathfrak{t}} y_i.$$

A *partition* $\mathfrak{p} = \{t_1, \dots, t_m\}$ is a collection of nodes with disjoint interiors, whose union is the Boolean hypercube $\{-1, 1\}^p$. For any $\mathbf{x} \in \{-1, 1\}^p$, we define $\mathfrak{p}(\mathbf{x})$ to be the cell of \mathfrak{p} that contains \mathbf{x} . Given the training set \mathcal{D}_n , every partition yields an estimator $\hat{f}(-; \mathfrak{p}, \mathcal{D}_n)$ for f via *leaf-only averaging*: for every input \mathbf{x} , the estimator outputs the mean response over the node containing \mathbf{x} . In other words, we define

$$\hat{f}(\mathbf{x}; \mathfrak{p}, \mathcal{D}_n) := \sum_{t \in \mathfrak{p}} \hat{\mathbb{E}}_t[y] \mathbf{1}\{\mathbf{x} \in t\}.$$

The CART algorithm constructs a partition $\hat{\mathcal{T}} = \{t_1, \dots, t_m\}$, by choosing a feature j to split on at each intermediate node in a greedy fashion according to the impurity decrease split criterion defined as follows

$$\hat{\Delta}(t, j) := \frac{1}{N(t)} \left(\sum_{\mathbf{x}_i \in t} (y_i - \hat{\mathbb{E}}_t[y])^2 - \sum_{\mathbf{x}_i \in t_{j,1}} (y_i - \hat{\mathbb{E}}_{t_{j,1}}[y])^2 - \sum_{\mathbf{x}_i \in t_{j,-1}} (y_i - \hat{\mathbb{E}}_{t_{j,-1}}[y])^2 \right).$$

The tree is stopped from growing upon reaching a stopping condition. For example, common stopping conditions include minimum number of samples in a node, maximum depth, or when the number of nodes exceeds a pre-specified threshold.

G.2. CART Estimator for Horizontal Regression

In this section, we show how the horizontal regression procedure can be conducted via greedy tree-based methods such as CART (Breiman et al., 2017). We show CART can achieve better sample complexity under additional assumptions on the structure of $\mathbb{E}[Y_n^{(\pi)}]$. A description of how CART works can be found in Appendix G.1. Our CART-based horizontal regression procedure consists of the following two steps.

Step 1: Feature Identification. For each donor unit $u \in \mathcal{I}$, divide the observed interventions Π_u equally into two sets Π_u^a and Π_u^b . Fit a CART model $\hat{\mathcal{T}} = \{t_1, \dots, t_m\}$ on the dataset $\mathcal{D}_u^a = [\{\mathbf{v}(\pi), Y_{u\pi}\} : \pi \in \Pi_u^a]$. Then, let $\hat{K} = \{\mathbf{v}(\pi)_j : \mathbf{v}(\pi)_j \in \hat{\mathcal{T}}\}$ denote every feature that the CART splits on.

Step 2: Estimation. For every subset $S \subset \hat{K}$, compute $\hat{\alpha}_{u,S} = \frac{1}{|\Pi_u^b|} \sum_{\pi \in \Pi_u^b} Y_{u\pi} \chi_S^\pi$. We then estimate our target causal parameter as follows:

$$\hat{\mathbb{E}}[Y_u^{(\pi)}] = \sum_{S \in \hat{K}} \hat{\alpha}_{u,S} \chi_S^\pi \quad (57)$$

G.3. CART Finite-Sample Analysis

We now define the additional assumptions required for finite-sample analysis. Throughout our analysis, we follow the notation used in Syrgkanis and Zampetakis (2020).

Definition 34 For a given partition \mathfrak{p} , and a cell $t \in \mathfrak{p}$, define

$$\bar{V}(t, \mathfrak{p}) = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x} \sim \mathcal{D}_x} \left[\left(\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{z} \sim \mathcal{D}_x} [f(\mathbf{z}) | \mathbf{z} \in \mathfrak{p}(\mathbf{x})] \right)^2 \mid \mathbf{x} \in t \right] \quad (58)$$

In order to introduce the next assumption, we first introduce some additional notation. For a partition \mathfrak{p} , and cell $\mathfrak{t} \in \mathfrak{p}$, define the split operator $\mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{p}, \mathfrak{t}, j)$ that outputs a partition with the cell \mathfrak{t} split on feature j . That is, $\mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{p}, \mathfrak{t}, j) = (\mathfrak{p} \setminus \{\mathfrak{t}\}) \cup \{\mathfrak{t}_{j,-1}, \mathfrak{t}_{j,1}\}$. The split operator for a partition \mathfrak{p} and cell \mathfrak{t} can also be defined for a set of features $T \subset [p]$ by repeatedly splitting the cell \mathfrak{t} with respect to all the features in T . More formally, this can be defined inductively as follows: for all $j \in T$, let $\mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{p}, \mathfrak{t}, T) = \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{p}, \mathfrak{t}, j), \mathfrak{t}_{j,-1}, T \setminus \{j\}), \mathfrak{t}_{j,1}, T \setminus \{j\})$. Moreover, define the short-hand $\bar{V}(\mathfrak{t}, T) = \bar{V}(\mathfrak{t}, \mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{p}, \mathfrak{t}, T))$

Definition 35 (Strong Partition Sparsity, Assumption 4.2 in Syrgkanis and Zampetakis (2020))

A function $f : \{-1, 1\}^p \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is (β, k) -strong partition sparse if f is a k -junta (see (4)) with relevant features K and the function \bar{V} satisfies: $\bar{V}(\mathfrak{t}, T \cup \{j\}) - \bar{V}(\mathfrak{t}, T) + \beta \leq \bar{V}(\mathfrak{t}, T \cup \{i\}) - \bar{V}(\mathfrak{t}, T)$, for all possible cells $\mathfrak{t} \in \mathfrak{p}$, any $T \subset [p]$, all $i \in K$, $j \in [p] \setminus K$.

A function satisfying Definition 35 and using Equation (4.4) in Syrgkanis and Zampetakis (2020) imply that the reduction in expected mean square error (i.e., the impurity decrease) when splitting a cell on a relevant variable is larger than when splitting on an irrelevant variable by at least β . This generative assumption is required for greedy algorithms such as CART to identify the relevant feature subset K .

Assumption 36 (Bounded Noise) Conditioned on the Fourier coefficients \mathcal{A} , for any unit-intervention pair (n, π) , ϵ_n^π are independent zero-mean bounded random variables with $\epsilon_n^\pi \in [-1/2, 1/2]$.

Theorem 37 Suppose $\Pi_u \subset \Pi$ is chosen uniformly and independently at random. Additionally, let Assumptions 1, 6, 36 hold and suppose that $\mathbb{E}[Y_u^{(\pi)}]$ satisfies definition 35 with parameters (β, k) . If \hat{T} is grown with number of nodes³ $m = 2^k$, $s = 2^k$, and $|\Pi_u| = \Omega(2^k \log(p)/\beta^2)$, then we have

$$\hat{\mathbb{E}}[Y_u^{(\pi)}] - \mathbb{E}[Y_u^{(\pi)}] = O_p \left(\sqrt{\frac{s^2 \log(s)}{|\Pi_u|}} \right) \quad (59)$$

for any donor unit $u \in \mathcal{I}$ and any combination $\pi \in \Pi$.

Remark 38 (CART Donor Set Inclusion) Under the set-up of Theorem 37, any unit $n \in [N]$ that has $|\Pi_n| = \Omega(2^k \log(p)/\beta^2)$ randomly sampled observations can be considered a donor unit.

CART (57) consistently estimates the target causal parameter for a donor unit u provided that the structural assumptions on the potential outcomes are satisfied and the number of observations $|\Pi_u|$ grows as $\omega(s^2 \max\{\log(p), \log(s)\})$. On the other hand, the Lasso estimator requires that $|\Pi_u|$ grows as $\omega(s^2 p)$. The difference in sample complexity can be ascribed to the fact that CART performs feature selection (i.e., learns the subset of features that $\mathbb{E}[Y_u^{(\pi)}]$ depends on), thereby only having to learn the fourier coefficient over a 2^k dimensional space, instead of 2^p for the Lasso.

3. In practice, the number of nodes can be tuned by cross-validation.

Appendix H. Proofs for CART Horizontal Regression

H.1. Proof of Theorem 37

Proof Let \mathcal{E}_1 denote the event that $\hat{K} = K$. Further, define the event \mathcal{E}_S for any subset $S \subset K$ as

$$\mathcal{E}_S = \left\{ |\hat{\alpha}_{u,S} - \alpha_{u,S}| \leq \sqrt{\frac{8 \log(2^{k+3}/\delta)}{|\Pi_u^b|}} \right\}$$

Additionally, let $\mathcal{E} = \mathcal{E}_1 \cap (\cap_{S \subset K} \mathcal{E}_S)$. We first show that \mathcal{E} occurs with high probability. To establish this claim, we state the following two results proved in Appendix H.1.1.

Proposition 39 (Theorem D.9 in Syrgkanis and Zampetakis (2020)) *Let the set-up of Theorem 37 hold. Then, $\hat{K} = K$ with probability $1 - \delta/2$.*

Lemma 40 *Let the set-up of Theorem 37 hold. Then for any subset $S \subset K$, we have*

$$\mathbb{P} \left(|\hat{\alpha}_{u,S} - \alpha_{u,S}| \geq \sqrt{\frac{8 \log(2^{k+2}/\delta)}{|\Pi_u^b|}} \right) \leq \frac{\delta}{2^k} \quad (60)$$

where $\hat{\alpha}_{u,S} = \frac{1}{|\Pi_u^b|} \sum_{\pi \in \Pi_u^b} Y_{u\pi} \chi_S^\pi$

Using Proposition 39 and Lemma 40, and applying the union bound alongside Demorgan's law, we get

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_3^c) = \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_1^c \cup (\cup_{S \subset K} \mathcal{E}_S^c)) \leq \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_1^c) + \mathbb{P}(\cup_{S \subset K} \mathcal{E}_S^c) \leq \frac{\delta}{2} + \sum_{S \subset K} \frac{\delta}{2^{k+1}} \leq \delta$$

Then conditioned on \mathcal{E} , we get

$$\begin{aligned} |\hat{\mathbb{E}}[Y_u^{(\pi)}] - \mathbb{E}[Y_u^{(\pi)}]| &= \left| \sum_{S \subset \hat{K}} \hat{\alpha}_{u,S} \chi_S^\pi - \sum_{S \subset K} \alpha_{u,S} \chi_S^\pi \right| \\ &= \left| \sum_{S \subset K} (\hat{\alpha}_{u,S} - \alpha_{u,S}) \chi_S^\pi \right| \\ &\leq \sum_{S \subset K} |\hat{\alpha}_{u,S} - \alpha_{u,S}| \\ &\leq \sqrt{\frac{2^{2k+3} \log(2^{k+3}/\delta)}{|\Pi_u^b|}} \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we have

$$|\hat{\mathbb{E}}[Y_u^{(\pi)}] - \mathbb{E}[Y_u^{(\pi)}]| = O_p \left(\sqrt{\frac{2^{2k} k}{|\Pi_u|}} \right)$$

Substituting $s = 2^k$ concludes the proof. ■

H.1.1. PROOF OF LEMMA 40

Fix any subset $S \subset K$. Then for any $t > 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \mathbb{P}(|\hat{\alpha}_{u,S} - \alpha_{u,S}| \geq t) \tag{61} \\
 &= \mathbb{P}\left(\left|\frac{1}{|\Pi_u^b|} \sum_{\pi \in \Pi_u^b} \left(\mathbb{E}[Y_u^{(\pi)}] \chi_S^\pi + \epsilon_u^\pi \chi_S^\pi\right) - \alpha_{u,S}\right| \geq t\right) \\
 &\leq \mathbb{P}\left(\left|\frac{1}{|\Pi_u^b|} \sum_{\pi \in \Pi_u^b} \mathbb{E}[Y_u^{(\pi)}] \chi_S^\pi - \alpha_{u,S}\right| + \left|\frac{1}{|\Pi_u^b|} \sum_{\pi \in \Pi_u^b} \epsilon_u^\pi \chi_S^\pi\right| \geq t\right) \\
 &\leq \mathbb{P}\left(\left|\frac{1}{|\Pi_u^b|} \sum_{\pi \in \Pi_u^b} \mathbb{E}[Y_u^{(\pi)}] \chi_S^\pi - \alpha_{u,S}\right| \geq \frac{t}{3}\right) + \mathbb{P}\left(\left|\frac{1}{|\Pi_u^b|} \sum_{\pi \in \Pi_u^b} \epsilon_u^\pi \chi_S^\pi\right| \geq \frac{2t}{3}\right) \\
 &\leq \mathbb{P}\left(\left|\frac{1}{|\Pi_u^b|} \sum_{\pi \in \Pi_u^b} \mathbb{E}[Y_u^{(\pi)}] \chi_S^\pi - \alpha_{u,S}\right| \geq \frac{t}{3}\right) + \mathbb{P}\left(\left|\frac{1}{|\Pi_u^b|} \sum_{\pi \in \Pi_u^b} \epsilon_u^\pi \chi_S^\pi \pm \frac{1}{2^p} \sum_{\pi \in \Pi} \epsilon_u^\pi \chi_S^\pi\right| \geq \frac{2t}{3}\right) \\
 &\leq \mathbb{P}\left(\left|\frac{1}{|\Pi_u^b|} \sum_{\pi \in \Pi_u^b} \mathbb{E}[Y_u^{(\pi)}] \chi_S^\pi - \alpha_{u,S}\right| \geq \frac{t}{3}\right) + \mathbb{P}\left(\left|\frac{1}{|\Pi_u^b|} \sum_{\pi \in \Pi_u^b} \epsilon_u^\pi \chi_S^\pi - \frac{1}{2^p} \sum_{\pi \in \Pi} \epsilon_u^\pi \chi_S^\pi\right| \geq \frac{t}{3}\right) \\
 &\quad + \mathbb{P}\left(\left|\frac{1}{2^p} \sum_{\pi \in \Pi} \epsilon_u^\pi \chi_S^\pi\right| \geq \frac{t}{3}\right) \tag{62}
 \end{aligned}$$

We bound each of the three terms above separately.

Bounding Term 1. We begin by showing that $\mathbb{E}\left[\frac{1}{|\Pi_u^b|} \sum_{\pi \in \Pi_u^b} \mathbb{E}[Y_u^{(\pi)}] \chi_S^\pi\right] = \alpha_{u,S}$, where the expectation is taken over the randomness in sampling π . Since each $\pi \in \Pi_u^b$ is chosen uniformly and independently at random from Π , we have that

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\frac{1}{|\Pi_u^b|} \sum_{\pi \in \Pi_u^b} \mathbb{E}[Y_u^{(\pi)}] \chi_S^\pi\right] = \frac{1}{2^p} \sum_{\pi \in \Pi} \mathbb{E}[Y_u^{(\pi)}] \chi_S^\pi = \langle \mathbb{E}[Y_u^{(\pi)}], \chi_S \rangle_B = \alpha_{u,S}$$

Next, since each $\chi_S^\pi \in \{-1, 1\}$, and $\mathbb{E}[Y_u^{(\pi)}] \in [-1, 1]$, we have that $\frac{1}{|\Pi_u^b|} \sum_{\pi \in \Pi_u^b} \mathbb{E}[Y_u^{(\pi)}] \chi_S^\pi$ is a sum of independent bounded random variables. Hence, applying Hoeffding's inequality gives us

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\left|\frac{1}{|\Pi_u^b|} \sum_{\pi \in \Pi_u^b} \mathbb{E}[Y_u^{(\pi)}] \chi_S^\pi - \alpha_{u,S}\right| \geq \frac{t}{3}\right) \leq 2 \exp\left(-\frac{|\Pi_u^b| t^2}{9}\right)$$

Bounding Term 2. By Assumption 36, and the mutual independence of χ_S^π and ϵ_u^π for each π , we have that $\frac{1}{|\Pi_u^b|} \sum_{\pi \in \Pi_u^b} \epsilon_u^\pi \chi_S^\pi$ is a sum of independent bounded random variables. Applying Hoeffding's

ing's inequality once again gives us

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\left| \frac{1}{|\Pi_u^b|} \sum_{\pi \in \Pi_u^b} \epsilon_u^\pi \chi_S^\pi - \frac{1}{2^p} \sum_{\pi \in \Pi} \epsilon_u^\pi \chi_S^\pi \right| \geq \frac{t}{3} \right) \leq 2 \exp \left(-\frac{|\Pi_u| t^2}{9} \right)$$

Bounding Term 3. By Assumption 36, ϵ_u^π are independent mean-zero bounded random variables for each π . Hence, applying Hoeffding's inequality gives us

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\left| \frac{1}{2^p} \sum_{\pi \in \Pi} \epsilon_u^\pi \chi_S^\pi \right| \geq \frac{t}{3} \right) \leq 2 \exp \left(-\frac{2^{p+1} t^2}{9} \right) \leq 2 \exp \left(-\frac{2|\Pi_u| t^2}{9} \right)$$

where the last inequality follows from the fact that $|\Pi_u| \leq 2^p$

Collecting Terms. Choosing $t = \sqrt{\frac{9 \log(2^{k+3}/\delta)}{|\Pi_u|}}$, and plugging the bounds of Term 1,2 and 3 into (62) gives us

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P} \left(|\hat{\alpha}_{u,S} - \alpha_{u,S}| \geq \sqrt{\frac{8 \log(2^{k+2}/\delta)}{|\Pi_u^b|}} \right) &\leq 2 \exp \left(-\frac{|\Pi_u| t^2}{9} \right) + 2 \exp \left(-\frac{2|\Pi_u| t^2}{9} \right) + 2 \exp \left(-\frac{|\Pi_u| t^2}{9} \right) \\ &\leq 6 \exp \left(-\frac{|\Pi_u| t^2}{9} \right) \\ &\leq \frac{\delta}{2^k} \end{aligned}$$

Observing that the result above holds uniformly across uniformly for all subsets $S \subset [K]$ completes the proof.