

Extrapolating Treatment Effects in Multi-Cutoff Regression Discontinuity Designs*

Matias D. Cattaneo[†] Luke Keele[‡] Rocío Titiunik[§]
Gonzalo Vazquez-Bare[¶]

July 29, 2022

Abstract

Regression discontinuity (RD) designs are viewed as one of the most credible identification strategies for program evaluation and causal inference. However, RD treatment effect estimands are necessarily local, making statistical methods for the extrapolation of these effects a key area for development. We introduce a new method for extrapolation of RD effects that relies on the presence of multiple cutoffs, and is therefore design-based. Our approach relies on an easy-to-interpret identifying assumption that mimics the idea of “common trends” in differences-in-differences designs. We use our methods to study the effect of a subsidized loan program on post-education attendance in Colombia, and offer new empirical evidence on the program effects for students with test scores away from the cutoff that determined program eligibility.

Keywords: causal inference, regression discontinuity, extrapolation.

*We are very grateful to Fabio Sanchez and Tatiana Velasco for sharing the proprietary dataset used in the empirical work reported in this paper. We also thank Josh Angrist, Sebastian Calonico, Sebastian Galiani, Nicolas Idrobo, Xinwei Ma, Max Farrell, and seminar participants at various institutions for their comments. Cattaneo and Titiunik gratefully acknowledges financial support from the National Science Foundation (SES 1357561).

[†]Department of Economics and Department of Statistics, University of Michigan.

[‡]Department of Surgery and Biostatistics, University of Pennsylvania.

[§]Department of Political Science, University of Michigan.

[¶]Department of Economics, University of California at Santa Barbara.

1 Introduction

The regression discontinuity (RD) design is increasingly viewed as one of the more credible strategies for estimating causal treatment effects in non-experimental studies. An RD design occurs when units receive a score, and a treatment is assigned based on whether the score exceeds a known cutoff value: units with scores above the cutoff are assigned to the treatment condition, and units with scores below the cutoff are assigned to the control condition. This treatment assignment rule creates a discontinuity in the probability of receiving treatment which, under the assumption that units' average characteristics do not change abruptly at the cutoff, offers a way to learn about the causal treatment effect by comparing units barely above and barely below the cutoff. Despite the popularity and widespread use of RD designs, the evidence they provide has an important limitation: the RD causal effect is only identified for the very specific subset of the population whose scores are “just” above and below the cutoff, and is not necessarily informative or representative of what the treatment effect would be for units whose scores are far from the RD cutoff. Thus, by its very nature, the RD parameter is local and has limited external validity.

A recent study of the ACCES (*Acceso con Calidad a la Educación Superior*) program illustrates both the advantages and limitations of RD designs ([Melguizo et al., 2016](#)). ACCES is a subsidized loan program in Colombia, administered by the Colombian Institute for Educational Loans and Studies Abroad (ICETEX), that provides tuition credits to underprivileged populations for various post-secondary education programs such as technical, technical-professional, and university degrees. In order to be eligible to receive an ACCES credit, students must be admitted to a qualifying higher education program, have good credit standing and, if soliciting the credit in the first or second semester of the higher education program, achieve a minimum score on a high school exit exam known as *SABER 11*. In other words, to obtain ACCES funding students must have an exam score above a known cutoff on the SABER 11 test. Students who are just below the exam cutoff are deemed ineligible, and therefore are not offered the financial assistance provided by the ACCES policy

intervention. This discontinuity in program eligibility based on the exam score leads to a RD design: [Melguizo et al. \(2016\)](#) found that students just above the threshold in SABER 11 test scores were significantly more likely to enroll in a wide variety of post-secondary education programs. The evidence from the original study, however, is limited to the population of students around the cutoff. This standard causal RD treatment effect is interesting in its own right, but it cannot be used to understand the effects of the policy for students whose SABER 11 test scores are farther from the cutoff that determines treatment eligibility. The effect of the treatment away from the cutoff is useful for a variety of purposes, ranging from answering purely substantive questions to addressing practically important policy making decisions such as whether to roll-out the program or not.

In this article, we propose a novel approach for estimating RD causal treatment effects away from the cutoff that determines treatment assignment—that is, for students other than those whose SABER 11 scores are in the immediate neighborhood of the cutoff point. Our extrapolation approach is design-based as it exploits the presence of multiple RD cutoffs across different subpopulations to construct valid counterfactual extrapolations of the expected outcome of interest, given different scores levels, in the absence of treatment assignment. In sum, we impute the average outcome in the absence of treatment of a treated subpopulation exposed to a given cutoff, using the average outcome of another subpopulation exposed to a higher cutoff. Assuming that the difference between these two average outcomes is constant as a function of the score, this imputation identifies causal treatment effects at score values higher than the lower cutoff.

The rest of the article is organized as follows. The next section presents further details on the operation of the ACCES program, discusses the particular program design features that we use for the extrapolation of RD effects, and presents the intuitive idea behind our approach as well as the related literature. [Section 3](#) presents the main methodological framework and extrapolation results, and [Section 4](#) applies these results to extrapolate the effect of the ACCES program on educational outcomes. [Section 5](#) presents extensions to

our framework, including imperfect compliance with treatment assignment, and alternative versions of our main identification assumption. Section 6 briefly concludes.

2 The RD Design in the ACCES Program

The SABER 11 exam that serves as the basis for eligibility to the ACCESS program is a national exam administered by the Colombian Institute for the Promotion of Postsecondary Education (ICFES), an institute within Colombia’s National Ministry of Education. This exam may be taken in the fall or spring semester each year, and has a common core of mandatory questions in seven subjects—chemistry, physics, biology, social sciences, philosophy, mathematics, and language. To sort students according to their performance in the exam, ICFES creates an index based on the difference between (i) a weighted average of the standardized grades obtained by the student in each common core subject, and (ii) the within-student standard deviation across the standardized grades in the common core subjects. This index is commonly referred to as the SABER 11 score.

Each semester of every year, ICFES calculates the 1,000-quantiles of the SABER 11 score among all students who took the exam that semester, and assigns a score between 1 and 1,000 to each student according to their position in the distribution—we refer to these scores as the SABER 11 position scores. Thus, the students in that year and semester whose scores are in the top 0.1% are assigned a value of 1 (first position), the students whose scores are between the top 0.1% and 0.2% are assigned a value of 2 (second position), etc., and the students whose scores are in the bottom 0.1% are assigned a value of 1,000 (the last position). Every year, the position scores are created separately for each semester, and then pooled. [Melguizo et al. \(2016\)](#) provide further details on the Colombian education system and the ACCESS program.

In this RD design, the running variable is the SABER 11 position score, denoted by X_i for each unit i in the sample, and the treatment of interest is receiving approval of the

ACCESS credit. Between 2000 and 2008, the cutoff to qualify for an ACCESS credit was 850, which was the same for all Colombian departments (the largest subnational administrative unit in Colombia, equivalent to U.S. states) and all years between 2002 and 2008. To be eligible for the program, a student must have a SABER 11 position score at or below the 850 cutoff.

2.1 The Multi-Cutoff RD Design

In the canonical RD design, a single cutoff is used to decide which units are treated. As we noted above, eligibility for the ACCESS program between 2000 and 2008 followed this template, since the cutoff was 850 for all students. However, in many RD designs, the same treatment is given to all units based on whether the RD score exceeds a cutoff, but different units are exposed to different cutoffs. This contrasts with the assignment rule in the standard RD design, in which all units face the same cutoff value. RD designs with multiple cutoffs, which we call Multi-Cutoff RD designs, are fairly common and have specific properties ([Cattaneo et al., 2016](#)).

In 2009, ICFES changed the program eligibility rule, and started employing different cutoffs in different Colombian departments and different years. Consequently, after 2009, ACCESS eligibility follows a Multi-Cutoff RD design: the treatment is the same throughout Colombia—all students above the cutoff receive the same financial credits for educational spending—but the cutoff that determines treatment assignment varies widely by department and changes each year, so that different sets of students face different cutoffs. This design feature is at the core of our approach for extrapolation of RD treatment effects.

2.2 The Pooled RD Effect of the ACCES Program

Multi-Cutoff RD designs are often analyzed as if there is a single RD cutoff. For example, in the original analysis, [Melguizo et al. \(2016\)](#) redefined the RD running variable as distance to the cutoff, and analyzed all observations together using a common cutoff equal to zero. In

fact, this normalizing-and-pooling approach, which essentially ignores or “averages over” the multi-cutoff features of the design, is widespread in empirical work employing RD designs. See the supplemental appendix for a sample of recent papers that analyze RD designs with multiple cutoffs across various disciplines.

We first present some initial empirical results using the standard normalized-and-pooling RD approach commonly employed in applied work as a benchmark for later analyses. The outcome we analyze is an indicator for whether the student enrolls in a higher education program, one of several outcomes considered in the original study by [Melguizo et al. \(2016\)](#). In order to maintain the standard definition of RD assignment as having a score above the cutoff, we multiply the SABER 11 position score by -1 . We focus on the intention-to-treat effect of program eligibility on higher education enrollment, which gives a Sharp RD design. We discuss an extension to Fuzzy RD designs in Section 5. We focus our analysis on the population of students exposed to two different cutoffs, 850 and 571.

Throughout our paper, we employ statistical methods for RD designs based on recent methodological developments in [Calonico et al. \(2014, 2015\)](#), [Calonico et al. \(2018a,b\)](#), [Calonico et al. \(2019b\)](#), and references therein. In particular, point estimators are constructed using mean squared error (MSE) optimal bandwidth selection, and confidence intervals are formed using robust bias correction (RBC). We provide details on estimation and inference in Section 3.2. Furthermore, all empirical results are obtained via general-purpose software ([Calonico et al., 2017, 2019a](#); [Cattaneo et al., 2018](#)), and complete replication files are provided.

The pooled RD estimate of the ACCESS program treatment effect on expected higher education enrollment is 0.125, with corresponding 95% RBC confidence interval $[0.012, 0.22]$ —Figure 1 reports a graphical summary of this estimate. These results indicate that, in our sample, students who barely qualify for the ACCESS program based on their SABER 11 exam score are 12.5 percentage points more likely to enroll in a higher education program than students who are barely ineligible for the program. These results are consistent with the




Figure 1: Normalized and Pooled Effect RD Effect of ACCES Loan Eligibility on Higher Education Enrollment

original positive effects of ACCESS eligibility on higher education enrollment rates reported in [Melguizo et al. \(2016\)](#). However, the pooled RD estimate only pertains to a limited set of ACCES applicants: those whose scores are barely above or below any of the cutoffs.

More precisely, [Cattaneo et al. \(2016\)](#) show that the pooled RD estimand is a weighted average of cutoff-specific RD treatment effects for subpopulations facing different cutoffs. The results for the pooled and cutoff-specific estimates can be seen in the upper panel of [Table 2](#). In our sample, the pooled estimate of 0.125 is a combination of two cutoff-specific RD estimates, one for units facing the low cutoff -850 and one for units facing the high cutoff -571 . In this case, the pooled estimate gives a weight of 0.57 to the cutoff -850 , and 0.43 to the cutoff -571 . Importantly, the cutoff-specific estimates are not directly comparable, as these magnitudes correspond not only to different values of the running variable but also to different subpopulations. Next, we discuss how the availability of multiple cutoffs can be exploited to learn about treatment effects far from the cutoff in the context of the SABER 11 policy intervention.

2.3 Using the Multi-Cutoff RD Design for Extrapolation

The key innovation in our paper is to exploit the presence of multiple RD cutoffs to extrapolate the standard RD average treatment effects (at each cutoff) to students whose SABER 11 scores are away from the cutoff actually used to determine program eligibility. Our method relies on a simple idea: when different units are exposed to different cutoffs, units with the same value of the score may be assigned to different treatment conditions, relaxing the strict lack of overlap between treated and control scores that is characteristic of the single-cutoff RD design.

For example, consider the simplest Multi-Cutoff RD design with two cutoffs, ℓ and h , with $\ell < h$, where we wish to estimate the average treatment effect at a point $\bar{x} \in (\ell, h)$. Units exposed to ℓ receive the treatment according to $\mathbb{1}(X_i \geq \ell)$, where X_i is unit's i score and $\mathbb{1}(\cdot)$ is the indicator function, so they are all treated at $X_i = \bar{x}$. However, the same design contains units who receive the treatment according to $\mathbb{1}(X_i \geq h)$, so they are controls at both $X = \bar{x}$ and $X = \ell$. Our idea is to compare the observable difference in the control groups at the low cutoff ℓ , and assume that the same difference in control groups occurs at the interior point \bar{x} . This allows us to identify the average treatment effect for all score values between the cutoffs ℓ and h .

Our identifying idea is analogous to the “parallel trends” assumption in difference-in-difference designs (see, e.g., [Abadie, 2005](#), and references therein), but over a continuous dimension—that is, over the values of the continuous score variable X_i (the SABER 11 score in our example). This basic idea can be further extended to allow for non-parallel control regression functions or to hold conditionally on pre-intervention covariates, as we discuss in [Section 5](#). The availability of multiple cutoffs is common in practice, which makes our extrapolation method widely applicable. In fact, as is the case in our own example, many of the canonical single-cutoff RD applications are in fact Multi-Cutoff RD designs where the score has been normalized and hence ignored for the analysis. Most (if not all) of the RD empirical papers that we list in the supplemental appendix employ data with multiple

cutoffs but do not explicitly use this design feature in the analysis.

2.4 Related Literature

We contribute to the causal inference and program evaluation literature (see [Imbens and Rubin, 2015](#); [Abadie and Cattaneo, 2018](#), for recent overviews and further references) and, more specifically, to the methodological literature on RD designs (see [Imbens and Lemieux, 2008](#); [Lee and Lemieux, 2010](#); [Cattaneo and Escanciano, 2017](#); [Cattaneo et al., 2017, 2019a,b](#), for literature reviews, background references, and practical introductions).

Specifically, our paper adds to the recent literature on RD extrapolation methods. This literature can be classified into two groups: strategies assuming the availability of external information, and strategies based only on information from within the research design. Approaches based on external information include [Wing and Cook \(2013\)](#), [Rokkanen \(2015\)](#), and [Angrist and Rokkanen \(2015\)](#). [Rokkanen \(2015\)](#) assumes that multiple measures of the running variable are available, and all measures capture the same latent factor; identification relies on the assumption that the potential outcomes are conditionally independent of the available measurements given the latent factor. [Angrist and Rokkanen \(2015\)](#) rely on pre-intervention covariates, assuming that the running variable is ignorable conditional on the covariates over the whole range of extrapolation. [Wing and Cook \(2013\)](#) rely on a pre-intervention measure of the outcome variable, which they use to impute the treated-control differences of the post-intervention outcome above the cutoff. All these approaches assume the availability of external information that is not part of the original RD design.

In contrast, the extrapolation approaches in [Dong and Lewbel \(2015\)](#) and [Bertanha and Imbens \(2019\)](#) require only the score and outcome in the standard (single-cutoff) RD design. [Dong and Lewbel \(2015\)](#) assume mild smoothness conditions to identify the derivatives of the average treatment effect with respect to the score, which allows for a local extrapolation of the standard RD treatment effect to score values marginally above the cutoff. [Bertanha and Imbens \(2019\)](#) exploit variation in treatment assignment generated by imperfect treatment

compliance imposing independence between potential outcomes and compliance types to extrapolate a single-cutoff fuzzy RD treatment effect (i.e., a Local Average Treatment Effect at the cutoff) away from the cutoff. Our paper also belongs to this second type, as it relies on within-design information, using only the score and outcome in the Multi-Cutoff RD design, but our extrapolation approach is conceptually and methodologically different from prior methods, none of which rely on multiple cutoffs.

Finally, [Cattaneo et al. \(2016\)](#) introduced the causal Multi-Cutoff RD framework, and studied the properties of normalizing-and-pooling estimation and inference in that setting. Building on that paper, [Bertanha \(2018\)](#) discusses estimation and inference of an average treatment effect across multi-cutoffs, assuming away cutoff-specific treatment effect heterogeneity. Neither of these papers addresses the topic of RD treatment effect extrapolation across different levels of the score variable, exploiting the features of the Multi-Cutoff RD design, which is the goal and main innovation of the present paper.

3 Extrapolation in Multi-Cutoff RD Designs

We now introduce our notation and framework. Recall that X_i is the running variable (score) for unit i , which is assumed to be continuous with a continuous density $f_X(x)$ and support \mathcal{X} . Unlike the canonical RD design where the cutoff is a fixed scalar, in a Multi-Cutoff RD design the cutoff faced by unit i is a random variable C_i taking values in a set $\mathcal{C} \subset \mathcal{X}$. For simplicity, we focus on a setup with only two cutoffs: $\mathcal{C} = \{\ell, h\}$, with $\ell < h$ and $\ell, h \in \mathcal{X}$. Extensions to more than two cutoffs and to geographic and multi-score RD designs are discussed in the supplemental appendix.

The conditional density of the running variable at each cutoff is $f_{X|C}(x|c)$ for each $c \in \mathcal{C}$. We focus on sharp RD designs, where treatment assignment and status are identical and are denoted by $D_i = \mathbb{1}(X_i \geq C_i)$. Finally, we let $Y_i(1)$ and $Y_i(0)$ denote the potential outcomes of unit i under treatment and control, respectively, and $Y_i = D_i Y_i(1) + (1 - D_i) Y_i(0)$ the

observed outcome. The treatment effect for unit i is defined as $\tau_i = Y_i(1) - Y_i(0)$.

The potential and observed outcome regression functions are given, respectively, by $\mu_{d,c}(x) = \mathbb{E}[Y_i(d)|X_i = x, C_i = c]$ and $\mu_c(x) = \mathbb{E}[Y_i|X_i = x, C_i = c]$, for $d = 0, 1$. We express all parameters of interest in terms of the “response” function

$$\tau_c(x) = \mathbb{E}[\tau_i | X_i = x, C_i = c]. \quad (1)$$

The response function measures the treatment effect for the subpopulation exposed to cutoff c when the running variable takes the value x . For a fixed cutoff c , it records how the treatment effect for the subpopulation exposed to this cutoff varies with the running variable. As such, it captures the key quantity of interest when extrapolating the RD treatment effect. The usual parameter of interest in the standard (single-cutoff) RD design is a particular case of $\tau_c(x)$ when cutoff and score coincide:

$$\tau_c(c) = \mathbb{E}[\tau_i | X_i = c, C_i = c] = \mu_{1,c}(c) - \mu_{0,c}(c).$$

It is well known that, via continuity assumptions, the function $\tau_c(x)$ is nonparametrically identifiable at the single point $x = c$, which limits the external validity of the parameter. Our approach exploits the presence of multiple cutoffs to identify this function at other points on a portion of the support of the score variable.

Figure 2 contains a graphical representation of our extrapolation approach for Multi-Cutoff RD designs. In the plot, there are two populations, one exposed to a low cutoff ℓ , and another exposed to high cutoff h . The RD effects for each subpopulation are, respectively, $\tau_\ell(\ell)$ and $\tau_h(h)$. We seek to learn about the effects of the treatment at points other than the particular cutoff to which units were exposed, such as the point \bar{x} in Figure 2. Below, we develop a framework for the identification of $\tau_\ell(x)$ for $\ell < x < h$ so that we can assess what would have been the average treatment effect for the subpopulation exposed to the cutoff ℓ at score values above ℓ (illustrated by the effect $\tau_\ell(\bar{x})$ in Figure 2).




Figure 2: Estimands of interest with two cutoffs.

In our framework, the multiple cutoffs define different subpopulations. In some cases, the cutoff depends only on characteristics of the units, such as when the cutoffs are cumulative and increase as the score falls in increasingly higher ranges. In other cases, the cutoff to which a unit is exposed depends on external features, such as when different cutoffs are used in different geographic regions or time periods. This means that, in our framework, the cutoff C_i acts as an index for different subpopulation “types”, capturing both observed and unobserved characteristics of the units.

Given the subpopulations defined by the cutoff values actually used in the Multi-Cutoff RD design, we consider the effect that the treatment would have had for those subpopulations had the units had a higher score value than observed. This is why, in our notation, the index for the cutoff value is fixed, and the index for the score is allowed to vary and is the main argument of the regression functions. This conveys the idea that the subpopulations are defined by the multiple cutoffs actually employed, and our exercise focuses on studying the treatment effect at different score values for those pre-defined subpopulations. For example, this settings covers RD designs with a common running variable but with cutoffs varying by regions, schools, firms, or some other cluster-based variable. Thus, our method is not appropriate to extrapolate to populations outside those defined by the Multi-Cutoff RD design.




Figure 3: RD Extrapolation with Constant Bias ($B(\ell) = B(\bar{x})$).

3.1 Identification Result

The main challenge to the identification of extrapolated treatment effects in the single-cutoff (sharp) RD design is the lack of observed control outcomes for score values above the cutoff. In the Multi-Cutoff RD design, we still face this challenge for a given subpopulation, but we have other subpopulations exposed to higher cutoff values that, under some assumptions, can aid in solving the missing data problem and identify average treatment effects. Before turning to the formal derivations, we illustrate the idea graphically.

Figure 3 illustrates the regression functions for the populations exposed to cutoffs ℓ and h , with the function $\mu_{1,h}(x)$ omitted for simplicity. We seek an estimate of $\tau_\ell(\bar{x})$, the average effect of the treatment at the point $\bar{x} \in (\ell, h)$ for the subpopulation exposed to the lower cutoff ℓ . In the figure, this parameter is represented by the segment \overline{ab} . The main identification challenge is that we only observe the point a , which corresponds to $\mu_{1,\ell}(\bar{x})$, the treated regression function for the population exposed to ℓ , but we fail to observe its control counterpart $\mu_{0,\ell}(\bar{x})$ (point b), because all units exposed to cutoff ℓ are treated at any $x > \ell$. We use the control group of the population exposed to the higher cutoff, h , to infer what would have been the control response at the point $\bar{x} \in (\ell, h)$ of units exposed to the lower cutoff ℓ . At the point $X_i = \bar{x}$, the control response of the population exposed to h is $\mu_{0,h}(\bar{x})$, which is represented by the point c in Figure 3. Since all units in this subpopulation

are untreated at \bar{x} , the point c is identified by the average observed outcomes of the control units in the subpopulation h at $X_i = \bar{x}$.

Of course, units facing different cutoffs may differ in both observed and unobserved ways. Thus, there is generally no reason to expect that the average control outcome of the population facing cutoff h will be a good approximation to the average control outcome of the population facing cutoff ℓ . This is captured in Figure 3 by the fact that $\mu_{0,\ell}(\bar{x}) \equiv b \neq c \equiv \mu_{0,h}(\bar{x})$. This difference in untreated potential outcomes for units facing different cutoffs can be interpreted as a bias driven by differences in observed and unobserved characteristics of the different subpopulations, analogous to “site selection” bias in multiple randomized experiments. We formalize this idea with the following definition:

Definition 1 (Cutoff Bias) $B(x, c, c') = \mu_{0,c}(x) - \mu_{0,c'}(x)$, for $c, c' \in \mathcal{C}$. There is bias from exposure to different cutoffs if $B(x, c, c') \neq 0$ for some $c, c' \in \mathcal{C}$, $c \neq c'$ and for some $x \in \mathcal{X}$.

Table 1 defines the parameters associated with the corresponding segments in Figure 3. The parameter of interest, $\tau_\ell(\bar{x})$, is unobservable because we fail to observe $\mu_{0,\ell}(\bar{x})$. If we replaced $\mu_{0,\ell}(\bar{x})$ with $\mu_{0,h}(\bar{x})$, we would be able to estimate the distance \overline{ac} . This distance, which is observable, is the sum of the parameter of interest, $\tau_\ell(\bar{x})$, plus the bias $B(\bar{x}, c, c')$ that arises from using the control group in the h subpopulation instead of the control group in the ℓ subpopulation. Graphically, $\overline{ac} = \overline{ab} + \overline{bc}$. Since we focus on the two-cutoff case, we denote the bias by $B(\bar{x})$ to simplify the notation.

We use the distance between the control groups facing the two different cutoffs at a point where both are observable, to approximate the unobservable distance between them at \bar{x} —that is, to approximate the bias $B(\bar{x})$. As shown in the figure, at ℓ , all units facing cutoff h are controls and all units facing cutoff ℓ are treated. But under standard RD assumptions, we can identify $\mu_{0,\ell}(\ell)$ using the observations in the ℓ subpopulation whose score is just below ℓ . Thus, the bias term $B(\ell)$, captured in the distance between \overline{ed} , is estimable from the data.

Table 1: Segments and Corresponding Parameters in Figure 2

Segment	Parameter	Description
\overline{ab}	$\tau_\ell(\bar{x}) = \underbrace{\mu_{1,\ell}(\bar{x})}_{\text{Observable}} - \underbrace{\mu_{0,\ell}(\bar{x})}_{\text{Unobservable}}$	Extrapolation parameter of interest
\overline{bc}	$B(\bar{x}) = \underbrace{\mu_{0,\ell}(\bar{x})}_{\text{Unobservable}} - \underbrace{\mu_{0,h}(\bar{x})}_{\text{Observable}}$	Control facing ℓ vs. control facing h , at $X_i = \bar{x}$
\overline{ac}	$\tau_\ell(\bar{x}) + B(\bar{x}) = \underbrace{\mu_{1,\ell}(\bar{x})}_{\text{Observable}} - \underbrace{\mu_{0,h}(\bar{x})}_{\text{Observable}}$	Treated facing ℓ vs. control facing h , at $X_i = \bar{x}$
\overline{ed}	$B(\ell) = \underbrace{\mu_{0,\ell}(\ell)}_{\text{Observable}} - \underbrace{\mu_{0,h}(\ell)}_{\text{Observable}}$	Control facing ℓ vs. control facing h , at $X_i = \ell$

Graphically, we can identify the extrapolation parameter $\tau_\ell(\bar{x})$ assuming that the observed difference between the control functions $\mu_{0,\ell}(\cdot)$ and $\mu_{0,h}(\cdot)$ at ℓ is constant for all values of the score:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \overline{ac} - \overline{ed} &= \{\mu_{1,\ell}(\bar{x}) - \mu_{0,h}(\bar{x})\} - \{\mu_{0,\ell}(\ell) - \mu_{0,h}(\ell)\} \\
 &= \{\tau_\ell(\bar{x}) + B(\bar{x})\} - \{B(\ell)\} \\
 &= \tau_\ell(\bar{x}).
 \end{aligned}$$

We now formalize this intuitive result employing standard continuity assumptions on the relevant regression functions. Assume the following:

Assumption 1 (Continuity) $\mu_{d,c}(x)$ is continuous in $x \in [\ell, h]$ for $d = 0, 1$ and for all c .

Next, define

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mu_{0,c}(c) &= \lim_{\varepsilon \uparrow 0} \mu_c(c + \varepsilon) \quad \text{for } c \in \mathcal{C} = \{\ell, h\} \\
 \mu_{1,c}(c) &= \lim_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \mu_c(c + \varepsilon) \quad \text{for } c \in \mathcal{C} = \{\ell, h\} \\
 \mu_{0,h}(x) &= \mu_h(x) \quad \text{for all } x \in (\ell, h) \\
 \mu_{1,\ell}(x) &= \mu_\ell(x) \quad \text{for all } x \in (\ell, h).
 \end{aligned}$$

Our main extrapolation assumption is that the bias is not a function of the score, which is analogous to the parallel trends assumption in the difference-in-differences design.

Assumption 2 (Constant Bias) $B(\ell) = B(x)$ for all $x \in (\ell, h)$.

While technically our identification result only needs this condition to hold at $x = \ell$, in practice it may be hard to argue that the equality between biases holds at a single point. Combining the constant bias assumption with the continuity-based identification of the conditional expectation functions allows us to express the unobservable bias for an interior point, $\bar{x} \in (\ell, h)$, as a function of estimable quantities. The bias at the low cutoff ℓ can be written as

$$B(\ell) = \lim_{\varepsilon \uparrow 0} \mu_\ell(\ell + \varepsilon) - \mu_h(\ell).$$

Under Assumption 2, we have

$$\mu_{0,\ell}(\bar{x}) = \mu_h(\bar{x}) + B(\ell),$$

that is, the average control response for the ℓ subpopulation at the interior point \bar{x} is equal to the average observed response for the h subpopulation at the same point, plus the difference in the average control responses between both subpopulations at the low cutoff ℓ . This leads to our main identification result.

Theorem 1 (Extrapolation) *Under Assumptions 1 and 2, for any point $\bar{x} \in (\ell, h)$,*

$$\tau_\ell(\bar{x}) = \mu_\ell(\bar{x}) - [\mu_h(\bar{x}) + B(\ell)].$$

In Section 3.3, we discuss two approaches to provide empirical support for the constant bias assumption, i.e. a below-cutoff parallel conditional expectation condition. Note also that this result can be extended to hold for $\bar{x} \in (\ell, h]$ by using side limits appropriately. We

provide a generalization of Assumption 2 that allows the bias to be a p -th order polynomial in Section 5.

3.2 Estimation and Inference

We estimate all conditional expectations $\mu_c(x) = \mathbb{E}[Y_i|X_i = x, C_i = c]$ using nonparametric local-linear methods, employing robust bias correction methods for inference. See [Calonico et al. \(2014\)](#) and [Calonico et al. \(2018a\)](#) for more methodological details, and [Calonico et al. \(2017\)](#) and [Calonico et al. \(2019a\)](#) for software implementation.

To be more precise, $\mu_c(x)$ is estimated using $\hat{\mu}_c(x) = \mathbf{e}'_0 \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_c(x)$, where

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_c(x) = \underset{\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{R}^{p+1}}{\operatorname{argmin}} \sum_{i=1}^n (Y_i - \mathbf{r}_p(X_i - x)' \mathbf{b})^2 K\left(\frac{X_i - x}{h}\right) \mathbb{1}(C_i = c)$$

for $p = 1$ (local-linear), $K(\cdot)$ set to be triangular, h set to be MSE-optimal, and where \mathbf{e}_0 is a vector with a one in the first position and zeros in the rest. Then, given two cutoffs ℓ and \bar{h} and an interior point \bar{x} , the extrapolated treatment effect at \bar{x} for the subpopulation facing cutoff ℓ is estimated as $\hat{\tau}_\ell(\bar{x}) = \hat{\mu}_\ell(\bar{x}) - \hat{\mu}_{\bar{h}}(\bar{x}) - \hat{\mu}_\ell(\ell) + \hat{\mu}_{\bar{h}}(\ell)$, which is a linear combination of the nonparametric estimators described above. Hence, optimal bandwidth selection and robust bias-corrected inference can be implemented using the methods and software described in [Calonico et al. \(2018a\)](#). By construction, $\hat{\mu}_\ell(x)$ and $\hat{\mu}_{\bar{h}}(x')$ are independent for any x, x' since the observations used in estimation come from different subpopulations. Similarly, $\hat{\mu}_\ell(\ell)$ and $\hat{\mu}_{\bar{h}}(\bar{x})$ are independent since the first term is estimated using control units whereas the second term uses treated units. On the other hand, in finite samples, $\hat{\mu}_{\bar{h}}(x)$ and $\hat{\mu}_\ell(\bar{x})$ can be correlated if the bandwidths used for estimation overlap (or, alternatively, if x and x' are close enough), in which case we account for such correlation in our inference results. More precisely, $\mathbb{V}[\hat{\tau}_\ell(\bar{x})|\mathbf{X}] = \mathbb{V}[\hat{\mu}_\ell(\bar{x})|\mathbf{X}] + \mathbb{V}[\hat{\mu}_\ell(\ell)|\mathbf{X}] + \mathbb{V}[\hat{\mu}_{\bar{h}}(\bar{x})|\mathbf{X}] + \mathbb{V}[\hat{\mu}_{\bar{h}}(\ell)|\mathbf{X}] - 2\operatorname{Cov}(\hat{\mu}_{\bar{h}}(\ell), \hat{\mu}_{\bar{h}}(\bar{x})|\mathbf{X})$, where $\mathbf{X} = (X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n)'$. We provide replication files for all our empirical analysis.

3.3 Assessing the Validity of the Parallel Trends Assumption

Assessing the validity of our extrapolation strategy should be a key component of empirical work using these methods. In general, while the assumption of constant bias is not testable, this assumption can be tested indirectly via falsification. While a falsification test cannot demonstrate that an assumption holds, it can provide persuasive evidence that an assumption is likely invalid. We now discuss two strategies for falsification tests to reinforce the credibility of the constant bias assumption that is at the center of our extrapolation approach.

The first falsification approach relies on a global polynomial regression: we test globally whether the conditional expectation functions of the two control groups are parallel below the lowest cutoff, that is, for values of the score that are smaller to the values that are used for extrapolation of the RD treatment effect. One way to implement this idea, given the two cutoff points $\ell < \hbar$, is to test $\boldsymbol{\delta} = \mathbf{0}$ based on the regression model

$$Y_i = \alpha + \beta \mathbb{1}(C_i = \hbar) + \mathbf{r}_p(X_i)' \boldsymbol{\gamma} + \mathbb{1}(C_i = \hbar) \mathbf{r}_p(X_i)' \boldsymbol{\delta} + u_i,$$

only for units with $X_i < \ell$, and where $\mathbf{r}_p(\cdot)$ is a polynomial basis of order p . In words, we employ a p -th order global polynomial model to estimate the two regression functions $\mathbb{E}[Y_i | X_i = x, X_i < \ell, C_i = \ell]$ and $\mathbb{E}[Y_i | X_i = x, X_i < \ell, C_i = \hbar]$, separately, and test that they are equal up to a vertical shift.

The second falsification approach employs nonparametric local polynomial methods: we test for equality of the derivatives of the conditional expectation functions for values $x < \ell$. Specifically, we test for $\mu_\ell^{(1)}(x) = \mu_\hbar^{(1)}(x)$ for all $x < \ell$, where $\mu_\ell^{(1)}(x)$ and $\mu_\hbar^{(1)}(x)$ denote the derivatives of $\mathbb{E}[Y_i | X_i = x, X_i < \ell, C_i = \ell]$ and $\mathbb{E}[Y_i | X_i = x, X_i < \ell, C_i = \hbar]$, respectively. This test can be implemented using several evaluation points, or using a summary statistic such as the supremum. See [Calonico et al. \(2018a\)](#) for details on software implementation, and further references.

4 Extrapolating the Effect of Loan Access on College Enrollment

We use our proposed extrapolation methods to investigate the external validity of the ACCES program RD effects. As mentioned above, our sample has observations exposed to two cutoffs, $l = -850$ and $h = -571$. We begin by extrapolating the effect to the point $\bar{x} = -650$; our focus is thus the effect of eligibility for ACCESS on whether the student enrolls in a higher education program for the subpopulation exposed to cutoff 850 when their SABER 11 score is 650.

Table 2 shows the results. The single-cutoff effect at -850 is 0.137 with 95% RBC confidence interval of $[0.036, 0.231]$; the effect at -571 is somewhat higher at 0.17 , with 95% RBC confidence interval of $[-0.038, 0.429]$. These single-cutoff effects are illustrated in Figures 4(a) and 4(b), respectively. The extrapolation results are illustrated in Figure 4(c) and reported in the last two panels of Table 2. At the -650 cutoff, the treated population exposed to cutoff -850 has an enrollment rate of 0.755 , while the control population exposed to cutoff -571 has a rate of 0.706 . This naive comparison, however, is likely biased due to unobservable differences between both subpopulations. The bias, which is estimated at the low cutoff -850 , is -0.141 , showing that the control population exposed to the -850 cutoff has lower enrollment rates at that point than the population exposed to the high cutoff -571 (0.525 versus 0.666). The extrapolated effect in the last row corrects the naive comparison according to Theorem 1. The resulting extrapolated effect is $0.755 - (0.706 - 0.141) = 0.190$ with RBC confidence interval of $[0.079, 0.334]$.

The choice of the point -650 is simply for illustration purposes. In practice, choosing a set of evaluation points at which to extrapolate the effect may give a much more complete picture of the impact of the program. In Figures 5a and 5b, we conduct this analysis by estimating the extrapolated effect at 14 equidistant points between -840 and -580 . The effects are statistically significant, ranging from around 0.14 to 0.25 .

4.1 Parallel Trends Assumption

Table 3 reports results employing global polynomial regression, which does not reject the null hypothesis of parallel trends. Figure 6a offers a graphical illustration. Table 4 shows the results for the local approach, which again does not reject the null hypothesis. Additionally, Figure 6b plots the difference in derivatives (solid line) between groups estimated nonparametrically at 10 evaluation points below ℓ , along with pointwise robust bias-corrected confidence intervals (dashed lines). The figure reveals that the difference in derivatives is not significantly different from zero.

5 Extensions

The main idea underlying our extrapolation methods can be extended in several directions that may be useful in other applications. In this section, we briefly outline three such extensions: Fuzzy RD designs, Ignorable Cutoff Bias, and Polynomial-in-Score Cutoff Bias.

5.1 Fuzzy RD Designs

Our extrapolation methods can be generalized to fuzzy RD designs. For simplicity, we focus on the case of one-sided (treatment) non-compliance, that is, units assigned to the control group comply with their assignment but units assigned to treatment status may not. This setting is relevant for a wide array of empirical applications in which program administrators are able to successfully exclude units from the treatment, but cannot force units to actually comply with it.

We employ the Fuzzy Multi-Cutoff framework of Cattaneo et al. (2016), which builds on the canonical framework of Angrist et al. (1996). Let $D_i(x, c)$ be the binary treatment indicator and $\underline{x} \leq \bar{x}$. We define compliers as units with $D_i(\underline{x}, c) < D_i(\bar{x}, c)$, always-takers as units with $D_i(\underline{x}, c) = D_i(\bar{x}, c) = 1$, never-takers as units with $D_i(\underline{x}, c) = D_i(\bar{x}, c) = 0$ and defiers as units with $D_i(\underline{x}, c) > D_i(\bar{x}, c)$. We assume the following conditions:

Assumption 3 (Fuzzy RD Design)

1. *Continuity:* $\mathbb{E}[Y_i(0)|X_i = x, C_i = c]$ and $\mathbb{E}[(Y_i(1) - Y_i(0))D(x, c)|X_i = x, C_i = c]$ are continuous in x for all c .
2. *Constant bias:* $B(\ell) = B(x)$ for all $x \in (\ell, h)$.
3. *Monotonicity:* $D_i(x, c) \leq D_i(\bar{x}, c)$ for all i and for all $x \leq \bar{x}$.
4. *One-sided noncompliance:* $D_i(x, c) = 0$ for all $x < c$.

The conditions are standard in the fuzzy RD literature and used to identify local average treatment effect (LATE)—the effect among those units that comply with treatment assignment under an RD design. The following result shows how to recover a LATE-type extrapolation parameter in this fuzzy RD setting.

Theorem 2 *Under Assumption 3,*

$$\frac{\mu_\ell(\bar{x}) - [\mu_h(\bar{x}) + B(\ell)]}{\mathbb{E}[D_i|X_i = x, C_i = \ell]} = \mathbb{E}[Y_i(1) - Y_i(0)|X_i = x, C_i = \ell, D_i(x, \ell) = 1].$$

The left-hand side can be interpreted as an “adjusted” Wald estimand, where the adjustment allows for extrapolation away from the cutoff point ℓ . More precisely, this theorem shows that under one-sided (treatment) noncompliance we can recover the average extrapolated effect on compliers by dividing the adjusted intention-to-treat parameter by the proportion of compliers.

5.2 Conditional-on-covariates Constant Bias

Following [Abadie \(2005\)](#), we can relax the constant bias Assumption 2 to hold conditionally on observable characteristics. Let the bias term conditional on a vector of observable covariates $Z_i = z \in \mathcal{Z}$ be denoted by $B(x, z) = \mathbb{E}[Y_i(0)|X_i = x, Z_i = z, C_i = \ell] - \mathbb{E}[Y_i(0)|X_i =$

$x, Z_i = z, C_i = h$], and let $p_c(x, z) = \mathbb{P}(C_i = c | X_i = x, Z_i = z)$ denote the cutoff propensity score.

We impose the following conditions:

Assumption 4 (Ignorable Constant Bias)

1. *Conditional bias:* $B(\ell, z) = B(x, z)$ for all $x \in (\ell, h)$ and for all $z \in \mathcal{Z}$.
2. *Common support:* $\delta < p_\ell(x, z) < 1 - \delta$ for some $\delta > 0$, $x \in \mathcal{X}$ and for all $z \in \mathcal{Z}$.
3. *Continuity:* $p_\ell(x, z)$ is continuous in x for all $z \in \mathcal{Z}$.

Part 1 states that the selection bias is equal across cutoffs after conditioning on a covariates, part 2 is the usual assumption rulling out empty cells defined by the covariates Z_i , and part 3 assumes that the propensity score is continuous in the running variable. Then, letting $S_i = \mathbb{1}(C_i = \ell)$, we have the following result, which is proven in the supplemental appendix.

Theorem 3 (Conditional-on-covariates extrapolation) *Under Assumption 4,*

$$\begin{aligned} \tau_\ell(\bar{x}) &= \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{Y_i S_i}{p(\bar{x})} \middle| X_i = h \right] - \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{Y_i(1 - S_i)}{1 - p(\bar{x}, Z_i)} \cdot \frac{p(\bar{x}, Z_i)}{p(\bar{x})} \middle| X_i = x \right] \\ &+ \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{Y_i(1 - S_i)p(\bar{x}, Z_i)}{p(\bar{x})(1 - p(\ell, Z_i))} \cdot \frac{f_{X|Z}(h|Z_i)}{f_{X|Z}(\ell|Z_i)} \cdot \frac{f_X(\ell)}{f_X(h)} \middle| X_i = \ell \right] \\ &- \lim_{x \rightarrow \ell^-} \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{Y_i S_i p(\bar{x}, Z_i)}{p(\bar{x})p(\ell, Z_i)} \cdot \frac{f_{X|Z}(h|Z_i)}{f_{X|Z}(\ell|Z_i)} \cdot \frac{f_X(\ell)}{f_X(h)} \middle| X_i = x \right]. \end{aligned}$$

This result is somewhat notationally convoluted, but it is straightforward to implement. It gives a precise formula for extrapolating RD treatment effects for values of the score above the cutoff ℓ , based on a conditional-on- Z_i constant bias assumption. All the unknown quantities in Theorem 3 can be replaced by consistent estimators thereof, under appropriate regularity conditions.

5.3 Non-Constant Bias

Although the constant bias Assumption 2 is intuitive and allows for a helpful analogy with the difference-in-differences design, the RD setup allows for a natural extension. Since the score is a continuous random variable, under additional smoothness of the bias function $B(x)$, we can replace the constant bias assumption with the assumption that $B(x)$ can be approximated by a polynomial expansion of $B(\ell)$ around $x \in (\ell, h)$.

For example, using a polynomial of order one, we can approximate $B(x)$ at \bar{x} as

$$B(\bar{x}) \approx B(\ell) + \dot{B}(\ell) \cdot [\bar{x} - \ell] \quad (2)$$

where $\dot{B}(x) = \dot{\mu}_{0,\ell}(x) - \dot{\mu}_{0,h}(x)$ and $\dot{\mu}_{d,c}(x) = \partial\mu_{d,c}(x)/\partial x$. This shows that the constant bias assumption $B(x) = B(\ell)$ can be seen as a special case of the above approximation, where the first derivatives of $\mu_{0,\ell}(x)$ and $\mu_{0,h}(x)$ are assumed equal to each other at $x = \bar{x}$. In contrast, the approximation in (2) allows these derivatives to be different, and corrects the extrapolation at \bar{x} using the difference between them at the point ℓ .

This idea allows, for instance, for different slopes of the control regression functions at \bar{x} , leading to $B(\bar{x}) \neq B(\ell)$. The linear adjustment in expression (2) provides a way to correct the bias term to account for the difference in slopes at the low cutoff ℓ . This represents a generalization of the constant assumption, which allows the intercepts of $\mu_{0,\ell}(x)$ and $\mu_{0,h}(x)$ to differ, but does not allow their difference to be a function of x . It is straightforward to extend this reasoning to employ higher order polynomials to approximate $B(\bar{x})$, at the cost of a stronger smoothness assumption.

Assumption 5 (Polynomial-in-Score Bias)

1. *Smoothness:* $\mu_{d,c}(x) = \mathbb{E}[Y_i(d) \mid X_i = x, C_i = c]$ are p -times continuously differentiable at $x = c$ for all $c \in \mathcal{C}$, $d = 0, 1$ and for some $p \in \{0, 1, 2, \dots\}$.

2. *Polynomial Approximation: there exists a $p \in \{0, 1, 2, \dots\}$ such that, for $x \in (\ell, h)$*

$$B(x) = \sum_{s=0}^p \frac{1}{s!} B^{(s)}(\ell) \cdot [x - \ell]^s$$

where $B^{(s)}(x) = \mu_{0,\ell}^{(s)}(x) - \mu_{0,h}^{(s)}(x)$ and $\mu_{d,c}^{(s)}(x) = \partial^s \mu_{d,c}(x) / \partial x^s$.

The main extrapolation result in can be generalized as follows.

Theorem 4 *Under Assumption 5, for $\bar{x} \in (\ell, h)$,*

$$\tau_\ell(\bar{x}) = \mu_\ell(\bar{x}) - \left[\mu_h(\bar{x}) + \sum_{s=0}^p \frac{1}{s!} B^{(s)}(\ell) \cdot [x - \ell]^s \right].$$

This result gives once again a way to extrapolate RD treatment effects away from the low cutoff ℓ . This time the extrapolation is done via adjusting for not only the constant difference between the two control regression functions but also their higher-order derivatives. Heuristically, this result justifies approximating the control regression functions by a higher-order polynomial, local to the cutoff, and then using the additional information about higher-derivatives to extrapolate the treatment effects.

6 Conclusion

We introduced a new framework for the extrapolation of RD treatment effects when the RD design has multiple cutoffs. Our approach relies on the assumption that the average outcome difference between control groups exposed to different cutoffs is constant over the relevant support of the score. Our method does not require any information external to the design, and is potentially applicable whenever two or more cutoffs are used to assign the treatment for different subpopulations, which is an unnoticed common feature of many RD applications. We also discussed extensions and relaxations of our main approach, including Fuzzy RD designs and relaxations of our constant bias assumption to a conditional-on-covariates constant bias condition and a polynomial bias condition. Our main insight can

also be applied to settings with many cutoffs, multi-score, and geographic designs (Papay et al., 2011; Keele and Titiunik, 2015), as we briefly discuss in the supplemental appendix.

References

- Abadie, A. (2005), “Semiparametric Difference-in-Differences Estimators,” *Review of Economic Studies*, 72, 1–19.
- Abadie, A., and Cattaneo, M. D. (2018), “Econometric Methods for Program Evaluation,” *Annual Review of Economics*, 10, 465–503.
- Angrist, J. D., Imbens, G. W., and Rubin, D. B. (1996), “Identification of Causal Effects Using Instrumental Variables,” *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 91, 444–455.
- Angrist, J. D., and Rokkanen, M. (2015), “Wanna get away? Regression discontinuity estimation of exam school effects away from the cutoff,” *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 110, 1331–1344.
- Bertanha, M. (2018), “Regression Discontinuity Design with Many Thresholds,” *Working paper, University of Notre Dame*.
- Bertanha, M., and Imbens, G. W. (2019), “External Validity in Fuzzy Regression Discontinuity Designs,” *Journal of Business & Economic Statistics*, forthcoming.
- Calonico, S., Cattaneo, M. D., and Farrell, M. H. (2018a), “On the Effect of Bias Estimation on Coverage Accuracy in Nonparametric Inference,” *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 113, 767–779.
- Calonico, S., Cattaneo, M. D., and Farrell, M. H. (2018b), “Optimal Bandwidth Choice for Robust Bias Corrected Inference in Regression Discontinuity Designs,” Working paper.
- (2019a), “**nprobust**: Nonparametric Kernel-Based Estimation and Robust Bias-Corrected Inference,” *Journal of Statistical Software*, forthcoming.
- Calonico, S., Cattaneo, M. D., Farrell, M. H., and Titiunik, R. (2017), “**rdrobust**: Software for Regression Discontinuity Designs,” *Stata Journal*, 17, 372–404.
- (2019b), “Regression Discontinuity Designs Using Covariates,” *Review of Economics and Statistics*, forthcoming.

- Calonico, S., Cattaneo, M. D., and Titiunik, R. (2014), “Robust Nonparametric Confidence Intervals for Regression-Discontinuity Designs,” *Econometrica*, 82, 2295–2326.
- (2015), “Optimal Data-Driven Regression Discontinuity Plots,” *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 110, 1753–1769.
- Cattaneo, M. D., and Escanciano, J. C. (2017), *Regression Discontinuity Designs: Theory and Applications (Advances in Econometrics, volume 38)*, Emerald Group Publishing.
- Cattaneo, M. D., Idrobo, N., and Titiunik, R. (2019a), *A Practical Introduction to Regression Discontinuity Designs: Volume I*, Cambridge Elements: Quantitative and Computational Methods for Social Science, Cambridge University Press, *forthcoming*.
- (2019b), *A Practical Introduction to Regression Discontinuity Designs: Volume II*, Cambridge Elements: Quantitative and Computational Methods for Social Science, Cambridge University Press, *in preparation*.
- Cattaneo, M. D., Keele, L., Titiunik, R., and Vazquez-Bare, G. (2016), “Interpreting Regression Discontinuity Designs with Multiple Cutoffs,” *Journal of Politics*, 78, 1229–1248.
- Cattaneo, M. D., Titiunik, R., and Vazquez-Bare, G. (2017), “Comparing Inference Approaches for RD Designs: A Reexamination of the Effect of Head Start on Child Mortality,” *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, 36, 643–681.
- (2018), “Analysis of Regression Discontinuity Designs with Multiple Cutoffs or Multiple Scores,” Working Paper, University of Michigan.
- Dong, Y., and Lewbel, A. (2015), “Identifying the Effect of Changing the Policy Threshold in Regression Discontinuity Models,” *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 97, 1081–1092.
- Imbens, G., and Lemieux, T. (2008), “Regression Discontinuity Designs: A Guide to Practice,” *Journal of Econometrics*, 142, 615–635.
- Imbens, G. W., and Rubin, D. B. (2015), *Causal Inference in Statistics, Social, and Biomedical Sciences*, Cambridge University Press.
- Keele, L. J., and Titiunik, R. (2015), “Geographic Boundaries as Regression Discontinuities,” *Political Analysis*, 23, 127–155.
- Lee, D. S., and Lemieux, T. (2010), “Regression Discontinuity Designs in Economics,” *Journal of Economic Literature*, 48, 281–355.

- Melguizo, T., Sanchez, F., and Velasco, T. (2016), “Credit for Low-Income Students and Access to and Academic Performance in Higher Education in Colombia: A Regression Discontinuity Approach,” *World Development*, 80, 61–77.
- Papay, J. P., Willett, J. B., and Murnane, R. J. (2011), “Extending the regression-discontinuity approach to multiple assignment variables,” *Journal of Econometrics*, 161, 203–207.
- Rokkanen, M. (2015), “Exam schools, ability, and the effects of affirmative action: Latent factor extrapolation in the regression discontinuity design,” *Unpublished manuscript*.
- Wing, C., and Cook, T. D. (2013), “Strengthening the Regression Discontinuity Design Using Additional Design Elements: A Within-Study Comparison,” *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, 32, 853–877.

Table 2: RD and Extrapolation Effects of ACESS loan eligibility on Post-Education Enrollment

	Estimate	Bw	Eff. N	Robust BC Inference	
				p-value	95% CI
RD effects					
$C = -850$	0.137	72.9	145	0.007	[0.036 , 0.231]
$C = -571$	0.170	135.4	208	0.101	[-0.038 , 0.429]
Naive difference					
$\mu_\ell(-650)$	0.755	303.4	504		
$\mu_h(-650)$	0.706	137.4	208		
Difference	0.049			0.172	[-0.019 , 0.105]
Bias					
$\mu_\ell(-850)$	0.525	54.9	54		
$\mu_h(-850)$	0.666	149.5	237		
Difference	-0.141			0.004	[-0.273 , -0.053]
Extrapolation					
$\tau_\ell(-650)$	0.190			0.001	[0.079 , 0.334]


Table 3: Parallel trends test: global approach

	Estimate	s.e.	p-value
Constant	5.534	3.933	0.159
<i>Score</i>	0.01	0.008	0.22
<i>Score</i> ²	0	0	0.245
$\mathbb{1}(C = h)$	5.732	20.38	0.779
$\mathbb{1}(C = h) \times \textit{Score}$	0.012	0.044	0.79
$\mathbb{1}(C = h) \times \textit{Score}^2$	0	0	0.795
N	257		
Chi-squared test			0.919

Note: Chi-squared test of the null hypothesis that the coefficients on $\mathbb{1}(C = h) \times \textit{Score}$ and $\mathbb{1}(C = h) \times \textit{Score}^2$ are equal to zero.

Table 4: Parallel trends test: local approach


	Estimate	Bw	Robust BC Inference	
			p-value	95%CI
$\mu_\ell^{(1)}(\ell)$	0.000	58.9	0.986	[-0.018 , 0.018]
$\mu_h^{(1)}(\ell)$	0.000	161.3	0.884	[-0.001 , 0.001]
Difference	-0.001		0.977	[-0.018 , 0.018]



(a) Effect at Cutoff 850 (b) Effect at Cutoff 571 (c) Extrapolated Effect at Cutoff 650

Figure 4: RD and Extrapolation Effects of ACCES loan eligibility on Higher Education Enrollment

Figure 5: Extrapolation treatment effects




Notes: panel (a) shows local-linear estimates of the regression functions using an IMSE-optimal bandwidth for the control and treated groups facing cutoff ℓ (black solid lines) and for the control group facing cutoff $\bar{\ell}$ (solid gray line). The dashed line represents the extrapolated regression function for the control group facing cutoff ℓ . Panel (b) shows local-linear extrapolation treatment effects estimates at 14 equidistant evaluation points between -840 and -580 . The gray area represents the RBC 95% (pointwise) confidence intervals.

Figure 6: Parallel trends test

(a) Global approach

(b) Local approach



Note: regression functions in (a) estimated using a quadratic global polynomial regression. Panel (b) plots the difference in derivatives at several points, estimated using a local quadratic polynomial regression (solid line). The gray area represents the RBC 95% (pointwise) confidence intervals.