

Model-Assisted Inference for Covariate-Specific Treatment Effects with High-dimensional Data

Peng Wu^a, Zhiqiang Tan^{*b}, Wenjie Hu^c, and Xiao-Hua Zhou^{†d}

^a*Beijing International Center for Mathematical Research,
Peking University, Beijing 100871, China*

^b*Department of Statistics, Rutgers University, 110 Frelinghuysen Road,
Piscataway New Jersey 08854, U.S.A.*

^c*Department of Probability and Statistics, Peking University, Beijing 100871, China*

^d*Department of Biostatistics, Beijing International Center for Mathematical Research
and National Engineering Laboratory of Big Data Analysis and Applied Technology,
Peking University, Beijing 100871, China*

Abstract

Covariate-specific treatment effects (CSTEs) represent heterogeneous treatment effects across subpopulations defined by certain selected covariates. In this article, we consider marginal structural models where CSTEs are linearly represented using a set of basis functions of the selected covariates. We develop a new approach in high-dimensional settings to obtain not only doubly robust point estimators of CSTEs, but also model-assisted confidence intervals, which are valid when a propensity score model is correctly specified but an outcome regression model may be misspecified. With a linear outcome model and subpopulations defined by discrete covariates, both point estimators and confidence intervals are doubly robust for CSTEs. In contrast, confidence intervals from existing high-dimensional methods are valid only when both the propensity score and outcome models are correctly specified. We establish asymptotic properties of the proposed point estimators and the associated confidence intervals. We present simulation studies and empirical applications which demonstrate the advantages of the proposed method compared with competing ones.

*joint-first-author

†Corresponding author: azhou@math.pku.edu.cn

1 Introduction

When analyzing the causal effect of an intervention, the average treatment effect (ATE) is often taken to be the estimand of interest for simplicity and interpretation. However, researchers and policy makers can also be interested in the effects of treatments (or policies) at various subpopulations levels (Abrevaya et al., 2015; Lee et al., 2017; Chernozhukov et al., 2018; Zimmert & Lechner, 2019). Specifically, let Y be an outcome variable, T be a treatment variable taking values in $\{0, 1\}$, and Z be the covariates used to define subpopulations. Define (Y^0, Y^1) as the potential outcomes which would be observed under the treatment arms 0 and 1 respectively. Of interest in this paper is the covariate-specific treatment effect (CSTE) $\tau(z)$, defined by $E(Y^1 - Y^0 | Z = z)$ for possible values z of Z . For example, in our empirical application, we study the effects of maternal smoking on infant birth weights in different subpopulations defined by mother’s age. In clinical settings, CSTEs are useful in precision medicine for the discovery of optimal treatment regimes that can be tailored to individual’s characteristics (Chakraborty & Moodie, 2013).

For observational studies, a large set of covariates are often included, possibly with nonlinear and interaction terms, in statistical analysis to reduce confounding bias and enhance the credibility of causal inference. Thus, we introduce auxiliary covariates V , allowing V to be high-dimensional, and posit that the unconfoundedness holds conditionally on all covariates $X \equiv (Z, V)$ to obtain the identification of CSTEs.

The CSTE $\tau(z)$ is in general different from $\tau(x) \equiv E(Y^1 - Y^0 | X = x)$, the conditional treatment effect given the full covariates. Being conditional on a low-dimensional covariate, $\tau(z)$ is easier to interpret and communicate in practice. Moreover, estimation of $\tau(z)$ can be more manageable and less affected by modeling assumptions in statistical analysis. It is known to be difficult to obtain asymptotic normality and valid confidence intervals for $\tau(x)$ due to the high dimensionality of X , unless some restrictive assumptions are imposed (Tian et al., 2014; Zhao et al., 2018; Dukes & Vansteelandt, 2020; Guo et al., 2021).

There has been increasing interest in estimating CSTEs in recent years. Abrevaya et al. (2015) derived an inverse probability weighting (IPW) estimator of $\tau(z)$ using kernel smoothing with continuous Z , Lee et al. (2017) proposed an AIPW (augmented IPW) estimator based on kernel smoothing, and Lechner (2019) proposed algorithms to construct causal random forests. These three approaches estimate $\tau(z)$ in low-dimensional settings. Fan et al. (2019) and Zimmert & Lechner (2019) extended the method of Lee et al. (2017) to high-dimensional settings. The authors adopted machine learning algorithms to mitigate model specification for nuisance parameters (PS and OR models), and used sample splitting (or cross-fitting) technique to reduce

the impact of nuisance parameters estimation on the resulting estimator of $\tau(z)$. A limitation of these existing high-dimensional methods is that the confidence intervals are shown to be valid when both PS and OR models are correctly specified. Further discussion is provided in Section 2.2.

Our proposed method is motivated by Tan (2020a), where a novel method is developed to obtain not only doubly robust point estimators for ATEs in high-dimensional settings, but also model-assisted confidence intervals, which are valid when a propensity score (PS) model is correctly specified but an outcome regression (OR) model may be misspecified. With a linear OR model, the confidence intervals are also doubly robust. The method of Tan (2020a) is first proposed to estimate ATEs and average treatment effects on treated (ATTs), and recently extended to estimate local average treatment effects (LATEs) in high-dimensional settings (Sun & Tan, 2020). In this article, we further extend the method to tackle estimation of CSTE, which differ from the former quantities in that $\tau(z)$ is a function of the covariate value z .

To handle CSTE defined by continuous or discrete covariates Z or a combination of them, we consider marginal structural models, where CSTE are linearly represented using a set of basis functions in z (Robins, 1999; Tan, 2010b). For discrete covariates Z , these models are unrestrictive when saturated basis functions are used. For continuous covariates Z , these models can be used to provide sufficiently accurate approximations with flexible basis functions. We propose both doubly robust point estimators and model-assisted confidence intervals for CSTE in high-dimensional settings. Remarkably, the model-assisted confidence intervals can be derived by a careful specification of regressors in fitting the OR model. In addition, with a linear OR model and discrete Z , we obtain doubly robust confidence intervals by adding a full set of interactions between Z and V into the regressors when fitting the PS model. To the best of our knowledge, there is no method for estimating CSTE that possesses these desired properties including model-assisted and doubly robust confidence intervals.

The rest of the article is structured as follows. In Section 2, we state the setup of problem interested and discuss some existing methods. Section 3 presents our estimation procedures in details. Section 4 shows the asymptotic results and elucidates why the proposed methods work. In Section 5, extensive simulations are conducted to evaluate the finite sample performance of the proposed methods. Section 6 illustrates our methods with an empirical example. A brief discussion is presented in Section 7.

2 Background

2.1 Setup

Suppose that $\{(Y_i, T_i, X_i) : i = 1, \dots, n\}$ is an independent and identically distributed sample of n observations, where Y is an outcome variable, T is a treatment variable taking values in $\{0, 1\}$, and $X = (V^T, Z^T)^T$ is a vector of measured covariates, where Z is the covariates used to define subpopulations, V is auxiliary covariates. In the potential outcomes framework (Rubin, 1974; Neyman, 1990), let (Y^0, Y^1) be the potential outcomes under the treatment arms 0 and 1 respectively. By the consistency assumption, the observed outcome is $Y = (1 - T)Y^0 + TY^1$. The causal parameter of interest is the CSTE defined by $\tau(z) = E(Y^1 - Y^0|Z = z) = \mu^1(z) - \mu^0(z)$ with $\mu^t(z) = E(Y^t|Z = z)$ for $t = 0, 1$. For identification of $(\mu^0(z), \mu^1(z))$, two common assumptions are imposed throughout:

- (i) Unconfoundedness: $T \perp Y^0|X$ and $T \perp Y^1|X$ (Rubin, 1976).
- (ii) Overlap: $0 < \pi^*(x) < 1$ for all x , where $\pi^*(x) = P(T = 1|X = x)$ is called propensity score (Rosenbaum & Rubin, 1983).

Under these assumptions, letting $m_t^*(X) = E(Y|T = t, X)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mu^1(z) &= E[m_1^*(X)|Z = z] = E\left[\frac{TY}{\pi^*(X)}|Z = z\right] \\ &= E\left[\frac{TY}{\pi^*(X)} - \left(\frac{T}{\pi^*(X)} - 1\right)m_1^*(X)|Z = z\right]. \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

These identification results follow from direct applications of the law of iterated expectations. Similar equations can be derived for $\mu^0(z)$ and $\tau(z)$. Then, $(\mu^0(z), \mu^1(z))$ and $\tau(z)$ can be estimated by imposing additional modeling assumptions on the outcome regression (OR) function $m_t^*(X)$ or the propensity score (PS) $\pi^*(X)$. We mainly discuss estimation of $\mu^1(z)$ and defer the discussion about $\mu^0(z)$ and $\tau(z)$ to Section 3.4.

2.2 Existing estimators

Consider a conditional mean model for OR in the treated group,

$$E(Y|T = 1, X) = m_1(X; \alpha_1) = \psi\{\alpha_1^T g(X)\}, \quad (2)$$

where $\psi(\cdot)$ is an inverse link function, $g(X) = \{1, g_1(X), \dots, g_q(X)\}^T$ is a vector of known functions such as $g(X) = (1, X^T)^T$. Throughout, the superscript T denotes a

transpose, not the treatment variable T . Alternatively, consider a PS model

$$P(T = 1|X) = \pi(X; \gamma) = \Pi\{\gamma^T f(X)\}, \quad (3)$$

where $\Pi(\cdot)$ is an inverse link function, $f(X) = \{1, f_1(X), \dots, f_p(X)\}^T$ is a vector of known functions. For concreteness, assume that model (3) is logistic regression with $\pi(X; \gamma) = [1 + \exp\{-\gamma^T f(X)\}]^{-1}$.

For OR model (2), the average negative log-(quasi-)likelihood function can be written as

$$L_{ML}(\alpha_1) = \tilde{E}(T[-Y\alpha_1^T g(X) + \Psi\{\alpha_1^T g(X)\}]) \quad (4)$$

where $\Psi(u) = \int_0^u \psi(u')du'$ and $\tilde{E}(\cdot)$ denotes the sample average throughout. In high-dimensional settings, a lasso penalized maximum likelihood estimator $\hat{\alpha}_{1,RML}$ can be defined as a minimizer of $L_{RML}(\alpha_1) = L_{ML}(\alpha_1) + \lambda\|(\alpha_1)_{1:q}\|_1$, where $\|\cdot\|_1$ denotes the L_1 norm, $(\alpha_1)_{1:q}$ is α_1 excluding the intercept, $\lambda \geq 0$ is a tuning parameter. Let $\hat{m}_{1,RML}(X) = m_1(X; \hat{\alpha}_{1,RML})$. Then an outcome-regression based estimator of $\mu^1(z)$ can be derived by regressing $\hat{m}_{1,RML}(X)$ on Z . To be specific, for a continuous covariate Z , the local constant regression (Li & Racine, 2007) leads to

$$\hat{\mu}_{OR}^1(z; \hat{m}_{1,RML}) = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n K(\frac{Z_i-z}{h})\hat{m}_{1,RML}(X_i)}{\sum_{i=1}^n K(\frac{Z_i-z}{h})},$$

where $K(u)$ is a kernel function and h is a bandwidth.

Alternatively, for PS model (3), the negative log-likelihood function is

$$L_{ML}(\gamma) = \tilde{E}[-T\gamma^T f(X) + \log\{1 + e^{\gamma^T f(X)}\}]. \quad (5)$$

Define $\hat{\gamma}_{RML}$ as a lasso penalized maximum likelihood estimator of γ which is a minimizer of $L_{ML}(\gamma) + \lambda\|\gamma_{1:p}\|_1$ to handle high-dimensional data, where $\gamma_{1:p}$ is γ excluding the intercept. Denote $\hat{\pi}_{RML}(X) = \pi(X; \hat{\gamma}_{RML})$. Then in the spirit of Abrevaya et al. (2015), for a continuous covariate Z , an inverse probability weighted (IPW) estimator of $\mu^1(z)$ can be obtained by conducting local constant regression $TY/\hat{\pi}_{RML}(X)$ on Z :

$$\hat{\mu}_{IPW}^1(z; \hat{\pi}_{RML}) = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n K(\frac{Z_i-z}{h})T_i Y_i / \hat{\pi}_{RML}(X_i)}{\sum_{i=1}^n K(\frac{Z_i-z}{h})}.$$

Consistency of the estimator $\hat{\mu}_{OR}^1(z; \hat{m}_{1,RML})$ or $\hat{\mu}_{IPW}^1(z; \hat{\pi}_{RML})$ relies on the correct specification of OR model (2) or PS model (3), respectively. Doubly robust estimators can be constructed in the augmented IPW (AIPW) form by combining OR and PS

models (Robins et al., 1994; Kang & Schafer, 2007; Tan 2007, 2010a). Let

$$\varphi(Y_i, T_i, X_i; \hat{m}_{1,RML}, \hat{\pi}_{RML}) = \frac{T_i Y_i}{\hat{\pi}_{RML}(X_i)} - \left(\frac{T_i}{\hat{\pi}_{RML}(X_i)} - 1 \right) \hat{m}_{1,RML}(X_i). \quad (6)$$

Equation (1) implies that the doubly robust AIPW estimator of $\mu^1(z)$ can be obtained via regressing $\varphi(Y_i, T_i, X_i; \hat{m}_{1,RML}, \hat{\pi}_{RML})$ on Z . See Lee et al. (2017) in low-dimensional settings, and Fan et al. (2019) and Zimmert & Lechner (2019) in high-dimensional settings. For instance, a local constant estimator of $\mu^1(z)$ is

$$\hat{\mu}^1(z; \hat{m}_{1,RML}, \hat{\pi}_{RML}) = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n K\left(\frac{Z_i - z}{h}\right) \varphi(Y_i, T_i, X_i; \hat{m}_{1,RML}, \hat{\pi}_{RML})}{\sum_{i=1}^n K\left(\frac{Z_i - z}{h}\right)}.$$

These authors also adopted machine learning algorithms to fit flexible PS and OR models, and used sample splitting technique to reduce the impact of parameter estimation in PS and OR models on the resulting estimator of $\mu^1(z)$.

Compared with $\hat{\mu}_{OR}^1(z; \hat{m}_{1,RML})$ and $\hat{\mu}_{IPW}^1(z; \hat{\pi}_{RML})$, in addition to being doubly robust point estimator, there is potentially a further advantage of $\hat{\mu}^1(z; \hat{m}_{1,RML}, \hat{\pi}_{RML})$ in high-dimensional settings. Since both $\hat{m}_{1,RML}$ and $\hat{\pi}_{RML}$ usually converge at a slower rate than $O_p(1/\sqrt{nh})$ for high-dimensional X , the resulting convergence rates for $\hat{\mu}_{OR}^1(z; \hat{m}_{1,RML})$ and $\hat{\mu}_{IPW}^1(z; \hat{\pi}_{RML})$ will be slower than $O_p(1/\sqrt{nh})$. According to Zimmert & Lechner (2019), if both models (2) and (3) are correctly specified or with negligible biases, then under suitable conditions, $\hat{\mu}^1(z; \hat{m}_{1,RML}, \hat{\pi}_{RML})$ converges to $\mu^1(z)$ at rate $O_p(1/\sqrt{nh})$ and admits an asymptotic expansion

$$\hat{\mu}^1(z; \hat{m}_{1,RML}, \hat{\pi}_{RML}) = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n K\left(\frac{Z_i - z}{h}\right) \varphi(Y_i, T_i, X_i; m_1^*, \pi^*)}{\sum_{i=1}^n K\left(\frac{Z_i - z}{h}\right)} + R_n(z), \quad (7)$$

where $R_n(z) = o_p(1/\sqrt{nh})$. However, when only one of the model (2) or (3) is correctly specified, the asymptotic expansion (7) or the associated confidence interval for $\mu^1(z)$ does not in general hold.

3 Methods

We develop new methods to obtain both doubly robust point estimators and model-assisted confidence intervals for $(\mu^1(z), \mu^0(z))$ and $\tau(z)$, based on marginal structural models (Robins, 1999; Tan, 2010b).

We first discuss estimation of $\mu^1(z)$. Let $\Phi(z) = (\phi_1(z), \dots, \phi_K(z))^T$ be a vector of basis functions excluding the constant. Consider a marginal structural model where

$\mu^1(z)$ is linearly represented as

$$\mu^1(z) = \beta_0^* + \beta_1^{*T} \Phi(z) \quad (8)$$

where $\beta^* = (\beta_0^*, \beta_1^{*T})^T$ is a vector of parameters. Different choices of $\Phi(z)$ can be used, to accommodate different data types of the covariates Z as follows.

- (a) Z is a binary variable. Let $\Phi(z) = z$. Then model (8) is saturated.
- (b) Z is a categorical variable taking multiple values. For example, suppose that Z is a trichotomous variable encoded as two dummy variables (Z_1, Z_2) . Let $\Phi(z) = (z_1, z_2)^T$. Then model (8) saturated.
- (c) Z consists of multiple binary variables. Suppose that $Z = (Z_1, Z_2)$, where Z_1 and Z_2 are two binary variables. Let $\Phi(z) = (z_1, z_2, z_1 z_2)^T$. Then model (8) saturated. Importantly, when Z consists of multiple discrete variables, it also can be encoded as multiple binary variables.
- (d) Z is a continuous variable. Then $\Phi(z)$ can be specified using spline basis (Schumaker, 2007) and Fourier basis (Ramsay & Silverman, 2005) similarly as in non-parametric estimation of a regression curve.
- (e) Z is a combination of discrete and continuous variables, for example, $Z = (Z_1, Z_2)$, where Z_1 is a binary variable and Z_2 is a continuous variable. Then we can set $\Phi(z) = (z_1, B^T(z_2), z_1 B^T(z_2))^T$, where $B(z_2)$ consists of basis functions of Z_2 .

Model (8) can be made to be saturated by a proper choice of $\Phi(z)$ for a discrete Z . But for a continuous Z , model (8) with a fixed set of basis functions may not hold exactly, i.e., $\mu^1(z)$ may not fall in the class $\{\beta_0 + \beta_1^T \Phi(z) : (\beta_0, \beta_1) \in \mathbb{R}^{K+1}\}$. In this case, model (8) can be interpreted such that $\beta_0^* + \beta_1^{*T} \Phi(z)$ gives the best linear approximation of $\mu^1(z)$ using basis functions $(1, \Phi(z))$, where

$$(\beta_0^*, \beta_1^*) = \arg \min_{\beta_0, \beta_1} E(\mu^1(Z) - \beta_0 - \beta_1^T \Phi(Z))^2. \quad (9)$$

As shown in our simulation study (Section 5), the proposed method is expected to perform well when model (8) provides a sufficiently accurate approximation with a flexible choice of basis functions in $\Phi(z)$.

3.1 Regularized calibrated estimation

To focus on main ideas, consider the generalized linear model (2) and the logistic propensity score model

$$P(T = 1|X) = \pi(X; \gamma) = [1 + \exp\{-\gamma^T f(X)\}]^{-1}. \quad (10)$$

Instead of using regularized likelihood estimation in Section 2.2, we adopt the regularized calibrated estimator of γ and regularized weighted likelihood estimator of α_1 (Tan, 2020a, 2020b). For PS model (10), the regularized calibrated estimator $\hat{\gamma}_{RCAL}$ is defined as a minimizer of the lasso penalized objective function,

$$L_{RCAL}(\gamma) = L_{CAL}(\gamma) + \lambda \|\gamma_{1:p}\|_1, \quad (11)$$

where $L_{CAL}(\gamma)$ is the calibration loss

$$L_{CAL}(\gamma) = \tilde{E}\{Te^{-\gamma^T f(X)} + (1 - T)\gamma^T f(X)\}. \quad (12)$$

For OR model (2), the regularized weighted likelihood estimator $\hat{\alpha}_{1,RWL}$ is defined as a minimizer of the lasso penalized objective function

$$L_{RWL}(\alpha_1; \hat{\gamma}_{RCAL}) = L_{WL}(\alpha_1; \hat{\gamma}_{RCAL}) + \lambda \|(\alpha_1)_{1:q}\|_1, \quad (13)$$

with the weighted likelihood loss

$$L_{WL}(\alpha_1; \hat{\gamma}_{RCAL}) = \tilde{E}(Tw(X; \hat{\gamma}_{RCAL})[-Y\alpha_1^T f(X) + \Psi\{\alpha_1^T f(X)\}]), \quad (14)$$

where $\Psi(u) = \int_0^u \psi(u') du'$, $w(X; \gamma) = \{1 - \pi(X; \gamma)\} / \pi(X; \gamma) = e^{-\gamma^T f(X)}$. Let $\hat{\pi}_{RCAL}(X) = \pi(X; \hat{\gamma}_{RCAL})$ be the fitted PS function and $\hat{m}_{1,RWL}(X) = m_1(X; \hat{\alpha}_{1,RWL})$ be the fitted OR function. As indicated by (14), $\hat{m}_{1,RWL}(X)$ depends on $\hat{\pi}_{RCAL}(X)$, in contrast with the recent papers of Fan et al. (2019) and Zimmert & Lechner (2019), where the propensity score and outcome regression functions are estimated separately.

Before proceeding to the main ideas, we present several interesting properties algebraically associated with $\hat{\pi}_{RCAL}(X)$ and $\hat{m}_{1,RWL}(X)$, part of which are also used in proving our results later. First, by the Karush-Kuhn-Tucker (KKT) condition for

minimizing (11), the fitted propensity score $\hat{\pi}_{RCAL}(X)$ satisfies

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{T_i}{\hat{\pi}_{RCAL}(X_i)} = 1, \quad (15)$$

$$\frac{1}{n} \left| \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{T_i f_j(X_i)}{\hat{\pi}_{RCAL}(X_i)} - \sum_{i=1}^n f_j(X_i) \right| \leq \lambda, \quad j = 1, \dots, p. \quad (16)$$

where equality holds in (16) for any j such that the j -th element of $\hat{\gamma}_{RCAL}$ is nonzero. Equation (15) shows that the sum of inverse probability weights $T/\hat{\pi}_{RCAL}(X)$ equals to sample size n , whereas equation (16) implies that the weighted average of each covariate $f_j(X_i)$ over the treated group may differ from the overall average of $f_j(X_i)$ by no more than λ . In addition, Tan (2020b) showed that, with possible model misspecification, calibrated estimation is better than maximum likelihood estimation in terms of controlling mean squared errors of inverse probability weighted estimators.

Second, by the KKT condition for minimizing (13), the fitted treatment regression function $\hat{m}_{1,RWL}(X)$ satisfies

$$n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n T_i w(X; \hat{\gamma}_{RCAL}) \{Y_i - \hat{m}_{1,RWL}(X_i)\} = 0. \quad (17)$$

As a consequence of equation (17), the augmented IPW estimator for $E(Y^1)$, defined as $\hat{E}_{RCAL}(Y^1) = \tilde{E}\{\varphi(Y, T, X; \hat{m}_{1,RWL}, \hat{\pi}_{RCAL})\}$, can be reformulated as

$$\tilde{E} \left[\hat{m}_{1,RWL}(X) + \frac{T}{\hat{\pi}_{RCAL}(X)} \{Y - \hat{m}_{1,RWL}(X)\} \right] = \tilde{E}\{TY + (1 - T)\hat{m}_{1,RWL}(X)\},$$

which implies that $\hat{E}_{RCAL}(Y^1)$ always fall within the range of the observed outcomes $\{Y_i : T_i = 1, i = 1, \dots, n\}$ and the predicted values $\{\hat{m}_{1,RWL}(X_i) : T_i = 0, i = 1, \dots, n\}$.

3.2 Model-assisted confidence intervals of $\mu^1(z)$

For ease of exposition hereafter, we let $\hat{\gamma} = \hat{\gamma}_{RCAL}$, $\hat{\alpha}_1 = \hat{\alpha}_{1,RWL}$, $\hat{\pi} = \hat{\pi}_{RCAL}(X)$, $\hat{m}_1 = \hat{m}_{1,RWL}(X)$, $\hat{\varphi} = \varphi(Y, T, X; \hat{m}_{1,RWL}, \hat{\pi}_{RCAL})$, $\varphi^* = \varphi(Y, T, X; m_1^*, \pi^*)$, and $\Phi^\dagger(z) = (1, \Phi(z)^T)^T$.

By the identity (1) for $\mu^1(z)$ and the expression (9) for (β_0^*, β_1^*) , it seems natural to define an estimator of β^* directly as

$$\hat{\beta} = (\hat{\beta}_0, \hat{\beta}_1^T)^T = \tilde{E}^{-1}\{\Phi^\dagger(Z)\Phi^\dagger(Z)^T\} \tilde{E}\{\Phi^\dagger(Z)\hat{\varphi}\}.$$

The corresponding estimator of $\mu^1(z)$ is

$$\hat{\mu}^1(z; \hat{m}_1, \hat{\pi}) = \hat{\beta}^T \Phi^\dagger(z), \quad (18)$$

The estimator $\hat{\mu}^1(z; \hat{m}_1, \hat{\pi})$ is easily shown to be a doubly robust point estimator of $\mu^1(z)$. Remarkably, model-assisted confidence intervals for $\mu^1(z)$ can be derived by a careful specification of $g(X)$ in fitting OR model (2).

Define $f(X) \otimes \Phi(Z)$ as the vector of all the interactions between $f(X)$ and $\Phi(Z)$. To obtain model-assisted confidence intervals, we set

$$g(X) = (f(X)^T, (f(X) \otimes \Phi(Z))^T)^T. \quad (19)$$

There may be same functions repeated in $g(X)$. In that case, we let $g(X)$ be the vector $(f(X)^T, (f(X) \otimes \Phi(Z))^T)^T$ after excluding the duplicated elements. To put it more clearly, we let $f(X) = (1, V^T, \Phi(Z)^T)^T$ and present the specific form of $g(X)$ for the first four data types of Z after equation (8):

- Z is a binary variable, $f(X) = (1, V^T, Z)^T$, $g(X) = (1, V^T, Z, V^T Z)^T$.
- Z is a trichotomous variable encoded as two dummy variables (Z_1, Z_2) , $f(X) = (1, V^T, Z_1, Z_2)^T$, $g(X) = (1, V^T, Z_1, Z_2, V^T Z_1, V^T Z_2)^T$.
- Z consists of two binary variables Z_1 and Z_2 . $f(X) = (1, V^T, Z_1, Z_2, Z_1 Z_2)^T$, $g(X) = (1, V^T, Z_1, Z_2, Z_1 Z_2, V^T Z_1, V^T Z_2, V^T Z_1 Z_2)^T$.
- Z is a continuous variable, $f(X) = (1, V^T, \Phi(Z)^T)^T$, $g(X) = (1, V^T, \Phi(Z)^T, (V \otimes \Phi(Z))^T, (\Phi(Z) \otimes \Phi(Z))^T)^T$.

In general, the choice of $f(X)$ can be flexible. For instance, it is possible to include full interactions between V and $\Phi(Z)$ in $f(X)$, namely, $f(X) = (1, V^T, \Phi(Z)^T, (V \otimes \Phi(Z))^T)^T$. Interestingly, this choice of $f(X)$ can be applied to construct doubly robust confidence intervals for $\mu^1(z)$ with discrete Z , as shown in Section 3.3. In addition, it is possible to include more covariates, such as nonlinear terms of V , in $f(X)$. These additional terms are easily accommodated under sparsity conditions.

We provide a high-dimensional analysis of the estimator $\hat{\mu}^1(z; \hat{m}_1, \hat{\pi})$ in (18), allowing for possible model misspecification. Define $\bar{\gamma}$ as a minimizer of the expected calibration loss $E\{L_{CAL}(\gamma)\} = E\{T e^{-\gamma^T f(X)} + (1 - T)\gamma^T f(X)\}$ and $\bar{\alpha}_1$ as a minimizer of

$$E\{L_{WL}(\alpha_1; \bar{\gamma})\} = E[T w(X; \bar{\gamma}) [-Y \alpha_1^T f(X) + \Psi\{\alpha_1^T f(X)\}]].$$

Let $\bar{\pi} = \pi(X; \bar{\gamma})$, $\bar{m}_1 = m(X; \bar{\alpha}_1)$ and $\bar{\varphi} = \varphi(Y, T, X; \bar{m}_1, \bar{\pi})$. If model (10) is correctly specified, then $\bar{\pi} = \pi^*$; otherwise, $\bar{\pi}$ may differ from π^* . Likewise, if model (2) is correctly specified, then $\bar{m}_1 = m_1^*$; $\bar{m}_1 \neq m_1^*$ otherwise. Let

$$\bar{\beta} \equiv (\bar{\beta}_0, \bar{\beta}_1^T)^T = \tilde{E}^{-1}\{\Phi^\dagger(Z)\Phi^\dagger(Z)^T\}\tilde{E}\{\Phi^\dagger(Z)\bar{\varphi}\},$$

and $\hat{\mu}^1(z; \bar{m}_1, \bar{\pi}) = \bar{\beta}^T \Phi^\dagger(z)$. Our main result shows that under suitable conditions,

$$\hat{\mu}^1(z; \hat{m}_1, \hat{\pi}) = \hat{\mu}^1(z; \bar{m}_1, \bar{\pi}) + R_n(z), \quad (20)$$

with $|R_n(z)| = o_p(n^{-1/2})$ for both discrete Z and continuous Z .

Suppose that the lasso tuning parameters are specified as $\lambda = A_0 \lambda_0$ for $\hat{\gamma}$ and $\lambda = A_1 \lambda_1$ for $\hat{\alpha}_1$, where A_0 and A_1 are two sufficiently large positive constants, the tuning parameters (λ_0, λ_1) are set as $\lambda_0 = \sqrt{\log\{(1+p)/\epsilon\}/n}$, $\lambda_1 = \sqrt{\log\{(1+q)/\epsilon\}/n}$ ($\geq \lambda_0$), where $0 < \epsilon < 1$ is a tail probability for the error bound. For example, $\lambda_0 = \sqrt{2 \log(1+p)/n}$ by taking $\epsilon = 1/(1+p)$. For a vector $b = (b_0, b_1, \dots, b_p)^T$, denote $S_b = \{0\} \cup \{j : b_j \neq 0, j = 1, \dots, p\}$ and the size of the set S_b as $|S_b|$. The following Propositions 1 can be deduced from Theorem 3 directly.

Proposition 1 (Model-assisted confidence intervals) *Suppose that Assumptions 1–2 hold as in Section 4.2, $g(X)$ is chosen as in (19), and $(|S_{\bar{\gamma}}| + |S_{\bar{\alpha}_1}|) \log(q) = o(n^{1/2})$. If PS model (10) is correctly specified, then asymptotic expansion (20) is valid. Furthermore, for any given z_0 , the following results hold for both discrete Z and continuous Z :*

(i) $n^{1/2}\{\hat{\mu}^1(z_0; \hat{m}_1, \hat{\pi}) - \mu^1(z_0)\} \xrightarrow{D} N(0, V(z_0))$, where

$$V(z_0) = \text{var}\left\{\Phi^\dagger(z_0)^T E^{-1}[\Phi^\dagger(Z)\Phi^\dagger(Z)^T]\Phi^\dagger(Z)\varphi(Y, T, X; \bar{m}_1, \bar{\pi})\right\}.$$

(ii) a consistent estimator of $V(z_0)$ is

$$\hat{V}(z_0) = \Phi^\dagger(z_0)^T M^{-1} \hat{G} M^{-1} \Phi^\dagger(z_0)/n,$$

where $M = \tilde{E}\{\Phi^\dagger(Z)\Phi^\dagger(Z)^T\}$ and

$$\hat{G} = n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \left\{ \Phi^\dagger(Z_i)\Phi^\dagger(Z_i)^T [\varphi(Y_i, T_i, X_i; \hat{m}_1, \hat{\pi}) - \hat{\beta}^T \Phi^\dagger(Z_i)]^2 \right\}.$$

(iii) an asymptotic $(1-c)$ confidence interval for $\mu^1(z_0)$ is $\hat{\mu}(z_0; \hat{m}_1, \hat{\pi}) \pm z_{c/2} \sqrt{\hat{V}(z_0)/n}$, where $z_{c/2}$ is the $(1-c/2)$ quantile of $N(0, 1)$. That is, a model-assisted confidence in-

terval for $\mu^1(z_0)$ is obtained.

For simplicity, the preceding result is stated while assuming that model (8) is correct. If model (8) does not hold exactly, then the confidence interval $\hat{\mu}(z_0; \hat{m}_1, \hat{\pi}_1) \pm z_{c/2} \sqrt{\hat{V}(z_0)/n}$ remains valid when evaluated against the approximate value $\tilde{\mu}^1(z) = \beta_0^* + \beta_1^{*T} \Phi(z)$ for (β_0^*, β_1^*) defined in (9). In Section 5, our simulation study shows that the approximate confidence intervals perform very well.

Why can the model-assisted confidence intervals be obtained by a careful specification of $g(X)$? We provide a theoretical analysis of the estimator $\hat{\mu}^1(z; \hat{m}_1, \hat{\pi})$ in Section 4, where Section 4.1 gives a heuristic discussion.

3.3 Doubly robust confidence intervals of $\mu^1(z)$ for discrete Z

We derive doubly robust confidence intervals for $\mu^1(z)$ with discrete Z when a linear OR model is used. Consider the linear OR model

$$E(Y|T = 1, X) = m_1(X; \alpha_1) = \alpha_1^T g(X) \quad (21)$$

and the PS model (10). Remarkably, doubly robust confidence intervals for $\mu^1(z)$ can be obtained merely by including full interactions between V and $\Phi(Z)$ in $f(X)$, that is, setting

$$f(X) = (1, V^T, \Phi(Z)^T, (V \otimes \Phi(Z))^T)^T, \quad g(X) = (f(X)^T, (f(X) \otimes \Phi(Z))^T)^T. \quad (22)$$

We also show some specific forms of $f(X)$ and $g(X)$ for different types of discrete Z :

- Z is a binary variable, $f(X) = g(X) = (1, V^T, Z, V^T Z)^T$.
- Z is trichotomous variable encoded as two dummy variables (Z_1, Z_2) , $f(X) = g(X) = (1, V^T, Z_1, Z_2, V^T Z_1, V^T Z_2)^T$.
- Z consists of two binary variables Z_1 and Z_2 , $f(X) = g(X) = (1, V^T, Z_1, Z_2, Z_1 Z_2, V^T Z_1, V^T Z_2, V^T Z_1 Z_2)^T$.

It can be seen that the configuration of (22) will make the dimension of $f(X)$ the same as $g(X)$. In addition, the proposed setup of $f(X)$ is intuitively sensible, in the sense that the OR and PS models should include interaction terms between V and Z . Proposition 2 presents the large sample properties of $\hat{\mu}^1(z_0; \hat{m}_1, \hat{\pi})$ for discrete Z , which can be deduced from Theorem 2 directly.

Proposition 2 (Doubly robust confidence intervals) *Suppose that Assumptions 1-2 hold as in Section 4.2, $f(X)$ and $g(X)$ are chosen as in (22), and $(|S_{\bar{\gamma}}|+|S_{\bar{\alpha}_1}|) \log(q) = o(n^{1/2})$. Then asymptotic expansion (20) is valid. Moreover, if either PS model (10) or linear OR model (21) is correctly specified, then for any given z_0 , the following results hold for discrete Z :*

(i) $n^{1/2}\{\hat{\mu}^1(z_0; \hat{m}_1, \hat{\pi}) - \mu^1(z_0)\} \xrightarrow{D} N(0, V(z_0))$, where $V(z_0)$ is the same as that in Proposition 1.

(ii) a consistent estimator of $V(z_0)$ is $\hat{V}(z_0)$, where $\hat{V}(z_0)$ is the same as that in Proposition 1.

(iii) an asymptotic $(1-c)$ confidence interval for $\mu^1(z_0)$ is $\hat{\mu}(z_0; \hat{m}_1, \hat{\pi}_1) \pm z_{c/2} \sqrt{\hat{V}(z_0)/n}$, where $z_{c/2}$ is the $(1 - c/2)$ quantile of $N(0, 1)$. That is, a doubly robust confidence interval for $\mu^1(z_0)$ is obtained.

It is noteworthy that asymptotic expansion (20) holds in Proposition 2 without the need for correctly specified PS model (10), while such a result does not hold in Proposition 1. The reasons for this phenomenon involve essential ideas about why the proposed methods work. A heuristic interpretation is given in Section 4.1.

For discrete Z , stratified analysis is a routinely used method to estimate $\mu^1(z)$ (Abrevaya et al., 2015). It first splits the sample by Z , and then for each subclass, obtains the estimations of \hat{m}_1 and $\hat{\pi}$, and uses the sample average of $\hat{\varphi}$ as the estimator of $\mu^1(z)$. Next we show the connections between the proposed method and stratified analysis for discrete Z and elucidate the advantages of the proposed approach.

Without of generality, consider the case of binary Z , and take $f(X) = g(X) = (1, V^T, Z, V^T Z)^T$ according to (22). In order to establish a relationship with stratified analysis, we rewrite $f(X)$ as its equivalent expression

$$f(X) = g(X) = (I\{Z = 0\}, I\{Z = 0\}V^T, I\{Z = 1\}, I\{Z = 1\}V^T)^T. \quad (23)$$

Then by setting the gradient of $L_{CAL}(\gamma)$ and $L_{WL}(\alpha_1)$ to zero gives that

$$\tilde{E} \left\{ \left(\frac{T}{\pi(X; \gamma)} - 1 \right) f(X) \right\} = 0, \quad (24)$$

$$\tilde{E} \left\{ T \frac{1 - \pi(X; \hat{\gamma})}{\pi(X; \hat{\gamma})} (Y - \alpha_1^T f(X)) f(X) \right\} = 0. \quad (25)$$

which are the sample estimating equations for γ and α_1 (up to the lasso penalties in high-dimensional settings). We focus on analyzing equation (24), and equation (25)

can be discussed similarly. Equation (24) can be divided into two equations

$$\tilde{E} \left\{ \left(\frac{T}{[1 + \exp\{-\gamma_0^T f_0(X)\}]^{-1}} - 1 \right) f_0(X) \right\} = 0, \quad (26)$$

$$\tilde{E} \left\{ \left(\frac{T}{[1 + \exp\{-\gamma_1^T f_1(X)\}]^{-1}} - 1 \right) f_1(X) \right\} = 0, \quad (27)$$

where $f_0(X) = I\{Z = 0\}(1, V^T)^T$, $f_1(X) = I\{Z = 1\}(1, V^T)^T$, $\gamma = (\gamma_0^T, \gamma_1^T)^T$ that satisfies $\gamma^T f(X) = \gamma_0^T f_0(X) + \gamma_1^T f_1(X)$. Equations (26) and (27) are equivalent to the sample estimating equations in stratified analysis. However, if there are multiple categories, then stratified analysis is troublesome, especially in high-dimensional settings, where stratified analysis may select different tuning parameters for lasso penalties and different covariates in different strata. The proposed method is numerically more tractable with only two lasso tuning parameters for the PS and OR models.

3.4 Estimations of $\mu^0(z)$ and $\tau(z)$.

The results presented in Propositions 1 and 2 mainly focus on estimation of $\mu^1(z)$, but they can be directly extended for estimating $\mu^0(z)$ and $\tau(z)$. Similar to (8), we posit a marginal structural model for $\mu^0(z)$ based on basis functions $(1, \Phi(z))$.

In addition to the propensity score model (10) and generalized linear outcome model (2), consider the following outcome regression model in the untreated population,

$$E(Y|T = 0, X) = m_0(X; \alpha_0) = \psi\{\alpha_0^T g(X)\}, \quad (28)$$

where $g(X)$ is the same as in model (2) and α_0 is a vector of unknown parameters. Then for a given z_0 , our point estimator of $\tau(z_0)$ is $\hat{\mu}^1(z_0; \hat{m}_1, \hat{\pi}) - \hat{\mu}^0(z_0; \hat{m}_0, \hat{\pi}_0)$, with

$$\hat{\mu}^0(z_0; \hat{m}_0, \hat{\pi}_0) = \Phi^\dagger(z_0)^T \tilde{E}^{-1} [\Phi^\dagger(Z) \Phi^\dagger(Z)^T] \tilde{E} [\Phi^\dagger(Z) \varphi(Y, 1 - T, X; \hat{m}_0, 1 - \hat{\pi}_0)],$$

where $\varphi(\cdot)$ is defined in (6), $\hat{\pi}_0 = \pi(X; \hat{\gamma}_{0,RCAL})$, $\hat{m}_0 = m_0(X; \hat{\alpha}_{0,RWL})$, and $\hat{\gamma}_{0,RCAL}$ is defined as a minimizer of (11), but with the calibration loss function $L_{CAL}(\gamma)$ replaced by $L_{0,CAL}(\gamma) = \tilde{E}\{(1 - T)e^{\gamma^T f(X)} - T\gamma^T f(X)\}$. The estimator $\hat{\alpha}_{0,RWL}$ is defined as a minimizer of $L_{0,RWL}(\alpha_0; \hat{\gamma}_{0,RCAL}) = L_{0,WL}(\alpha_0; \hat{\gamma}_{0,RCAL}) + \lambda \|(\alpha_0)_{1:q}\|_1$, with

$$L_{0,WL}(\alpha_0; \hat{\gamma}_{0,RCAL}) = \tilde{E} \left[\frac{1 - T}{w(X; \hat{\gamma}_{0,RCAL})} \{-Y \alpha_0^T g(X) + \Psi(\alpha_0^T g(X))\} \right].$$

Under similar conditions in Proposition 1 or 2, the estimator $\hat{\mu}^0(z_0; \hat{m}_0, \hat{\pi}_0)$ admits an

asymptotic expansion

$$\hat{\mu}^0(z_0; \hat{m}_0, \hat{\pi}_0) = \hat{\mu}^0(z_0; \bar{m}_0, \bar{\pi}_0) + o_p(n^{-1/2}), \quad (29)$$

where $\bar{\pi}_0 = \pi(X; \bar{\gamma}_0)$, $\bar{m}_0 = m_0(X; \bar{\alpha}_0)$, $\bar{\gamma}_0$ and $\bar{\alpha}_0$ are defined as the minimizers of $E\{L_{0,CAL}(\gamma)\}$ and $E\{L_{0,WL}(\alpha_0; \hat{\gamma}_0, RCAL)\}$, respectively. In particular, an asymptotic $(1 - c)$ confidence interval for $\tau(z_0)$ can be given as

$$\hat{\mu}^1(z_0; \hat{m}_1, \hat{\pi}) - \hat{\mu}^0(z_0; \hat{m}_0, \hat{\pi}_0) \pm z_{c/2} \sqrt{\hat{V}(z_0)/n}, \quad (30)$$

where $\hat{V}(z_0) = \Phi^\dagger(z_0)^T M^{-1} \hat{G} M^{-1} \Phi^\dagger(z_0)/n$, $\hat{G} = \tilde{E}\{\Phi^\dagger(Z)\Phi^\dagger(Z)[\hat{\varphi}_\tau - (\tilde{\beta}_0, \tilde{\beta}_1^T)\Phi^\dagger(Z)]^2\}$, $M = \tilde{E}\{\Phi^\dagger(Z)\Phi^\dagger(Z)^T\}$, $\hat{\varphi}_\tau = \varphi(Y, T, X; \hat{m}_1, \hat{\pi}) - \varphi(Y, 1 - T, X; \hat{m}_0, 1 - \hat{\pi}_0)$, and $(\tilde{\beta}_0, \tilde{\beta}_1^T)^T = \tilde{E}^{-1}\{\Phi^\dagger(Z)\Phi^\dagger(Z)^T\}\tilde{E}[\Phi^\dagger(Z)\hat{\varphi}_\tau]$.

4 Asymptotic properties

4.1 Heuristic discussion

We delineate basic ideas underlying the construction of the estimators $\hat{\gamma}$ and $\hat{\alpha}_1$, and point out why we need careful specification of $f(X)$ and $g(X)$ in (19) or (22), such that the estimator $\hat{\mu}^1(z_0; \hat{\pi}_1, \hat{\pi})$ satisfies asymptotic expansion (20), under possible model misspecification. The discussion here is heuristic, and formal theory is presented in Section 4.2. For a given z_0 ,

$$\hat{\mu}^1(z_0; \hat{m}_1, \hat{\pi}) = \hat{\mu}^1(z_0; \bar{m}_1, \bar{\pi}) + \Phi^\dagger(z_0)^T \tilde{E}^{-1}\{\Phi^\dagger(Z)\Phi^\dagger(Z)^T\} \tilde{E}\{\Phi^\dagger(Z)(\hat{\varphi} - \bar{\varphi})\}.$$

Under mild assumptions, for (20) to hold, it suffices to show that

$$\tilde{E}\{\Phi^\dagger(Z)(\hat{\varphi} - \bar{\varphi})\} = o_p(n^{-1/2}). \quad (31)$$

By a Taylor expansion of $\tilde{E}\{\Phi^\dagger(Z)\hat{\varphi}\}$,

$$\tilde{E}\{\Phi^\dagger(Z)\hat{\varphi}\} = \tilde{E}\{\Phi^\dagger(Z)\bar{\varphi}\} + (\hat{\alpha}_1 - \bar{\alpha}_1)^T \Delta_1 + (\hat{\gamma} - \bar{\gamma})^T \Delta_2 + o_p(n^{-1/2}), \quad (32)$$

where the remainder is taken to be $o_p(n^{-1/2})$ under suitable conditions, and

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta_1 &= \frac{\partial}{\partial \alpha_1} \tilde{E}(\Phi^\dagger(Z)\varphi(Y, T, X; \alpha_1, \gamma)) \Big|_{(\alpha_1, \gamma) = (\bar{\alpha}_1, \bar{\gamma})}, \\ \Delta_2 &= \frac{\partial}{\partial \gamma} \tilde{E}(\Phi^\dagger(Z)\varphi(Y, T, X; \alpha_1, \gamma)) \Big|_{(\alpha_1, \gamma) = (\bar{\alpha}_1, \bar{\gamma})}.\end{aligned}$$

To show (31), it is sufficient to show that $(\hat{\alpha}_1 - \bar{\alpha}_1)^T \Delta_1 = o_p(n^{-1/2})$ and $(\hat{\gamma} - \bar{\gamma})^T \Delta_2 = o_p(n^{-1/2})$ with possible model specification. In general, $\hat{\alpha}_1 - \bar{\alpha}_1$ and $\hat{\gamma} - \bar{\gamma}$ are no smaller than $O_p(n^{-1/2})$ in low- or high-dimensional settings. In order to get the desired convergence rates, the crucial point is that Δ_1 and Δ_2 should be $o_p(1)$, and their corresponding population version should satisfy

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \alpha_1} E(\Phi^\dagger(Z)\varphi(Y, T, X; \alpha_1, \gamma)) \Big|_{(\alpha_1, \gamma) = (\bar{\alpha}_1, \bar{\gamma})} = 0, \quad (33)$$

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \gamma} E(\Phi^\dagger(Z)\varphi(Y, T, X; \alpha_1, \gamma)) \Big|_{(\alpha_1, \gamma) = (\bar{\alpha}_1, \bar{\gamma})} = 0. \quad (34)$$

Hence a natural approach is to solve (33) and (34) being in low-dimensional settings and add lasso penalties in high-dimensional settings. Nevertheless, this method will encounter with a basic problem: there are more equations than parameters. It is easy to see that (33) includes $(K + 1)(q + 1)$ equations and (34) contains $(K + 1)(p + 1)$ equations, while the dimensions of γ and α_1 are $p + 1$ and $q + 1$, respectively. Therefore, the coefficients γ and α_1 cannot be identified by solving (33) and (34) without further consideration. Fortunately, this difficulty can be overcome by simply a careful specification of $f(X)$ and $g(X)$.

Specifically, with PS model (10) and linear OR model (21), Δ_1 and Δ_2 reduces to

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta_1 &= \tilde{E} \left\{ \left(\frac{T}{\bar{\pi}(X)} - 1 \right) g(X) \otimes \Phi^\dagger(Z) \right\}, \\ \Delta_2 &= \tilde{E} \left\{ T \frac{1 - \bar{\pi}(X)}{\bar{\pi}(X)} (Y - \bar{\alpha}_1^T g(X)) f(X) \otimes \Phi^\dagger(Z) \right\}.\end{aligned}$$

If $g(X)$ satisfies the form of (19), then according to the definition of $\bar{\alpha}_1$, (34) holds regardless of whether the OR model is specified correctly. In addition, (33) holds provided that PS model (10) is correctly specified but OR model (21) may be misspecified, which elucidates why Proposition 1 can be derived. Furthermore, if $f(X)$ and $g(X)$ are

specified as in (22), then Δ_1 and Δ_2 have a simpler form with discrete Z :

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta_1 &= \tilde{E} \left\{ \left(\frac{T}{\bar{\pi}(X)} - 1 \right) f(X) \right\}, \\ \Delta_2 &= \tilde{E} \left\{ T \frac{1 - \bar{\pi}(X)}{\bar{\pi}(X)} (Y - \bar{\alpha}_1^T g(X)) g(X) \right\},\end{aligned}$$

which exactly are the gradients of $L_{CAL}(\bar{\gamma})$ and $L_{WL}(\alpha_1; \bar{\gamma})$, respectively. In this case, (33) and (34) hold just by the definition of $\bar{\gamma}$ and $\bar{\alpha}_1$, irrespective of the model specifications for PS and OR, which explains why Proposition 2 can be obtained.

4.2 Theoretical analysis

First, we summarize the results which can be deduced directly from Tan (2020a) about $(\hat{\gamma}, \hat{\alpha}_1)$. For a matrix Σ with row indices $\{0, 1, \dots, k\}$, a compatibility condition (Buhlmann & van de Geer, 2011) is said to hold with a subset $S \in \{0, 1, \dots, k\}$ and constants $\nu > 0$ and $\xi > 1$ if $\nu^2 (\sum_{j \in S} |b_j|^2 \leq b^T \Sigma b)$ for any vector $b = (b_0, b_1, \dots, b_k) \in \mathbb{R}^{k+1}$ satisfying $\sum_{j \notin S} |b_j| \leq \xi \sum_{j \in S} |b_j|$.

Assumption 1. Suppose that the following conditions are satisfied:

- (i) $\max_{j=0,1,\dots,p} |f_j(X)| \leq C_0$ almost surely for a constant $C_0 \geq 1$;
- (ii) $\bar{\gamma}^T f(X) \geq B_0$ almost surely for a constant B_0 , that is, $\pi(X; \bar{\gamma}) \geq (1 + e^{-B_0})^{-1}$.
- (iii) a compatibility condition holds for Σ_f with the subset $S_{\bar{\gamma}} = \{0\} \cup \{j : \bar{\gamma}_j \neq 0, j = 1, \dots, p\}$ and some constants $\nu_0 > 0$ and $\xi_0 > 1$, where $\Sigma_f = E[Tw(X; \bar{\gamma})f(X)f(X)^T]$ is the Hessian of $E\{L_{CAL}(\gamma)\}$ at $\gamma = \bar{\gamma}$ and $w(X; \bar{\gamma}) = e^{-\bar{\gamma}^T f(X)}$.
- (iv) $|S_{\bar{\gamma}}| \lambda_0$ is sufficiently small.

Assumption 2. Suppose that the following conditions are satisfied:

- (i) $\max_{j=0,1,\dots,q} |g_j(X)| \leq C_1$ almost surely for a constant $C_1 \geq 1$;
- (ii) $\bar{\alpha}_1^T g(X)$ is bounded in absolute values by $B_1 > 0$ almost surely;
- (iii) $\psi'(u) \leq \psi'(\tilde{u}) e^{C_2|u-\tilde{u}|}$ for any (u, \tilde{u}) , where C_2 is a constant.
- (iv) $Y^1 - m_1(X; \bar{\alpha}_1)$ is uniformly sub-Gaussian given X :

$$D_0^2 E \left[\exp \left\{ (Y^1 - m_1(X; \bar{\alpha}_1))^2 / D_0^2 \right\} - 1 \mid X \right] \leq D_1^2$$

for some positive constants (D_0, D_1) .

- (v) a compatibility condition holds for Σ_g with the subset $S_{\bar{\alpha}_1} = \{0\} \cup \{j : \bar{\alpha}_{1,j} \neq 0, j = 1, \dots, p\}$ and some constants $\nu_1 > 0$ and $\xi_1 > 0$, where $\Sigma_g = E[Tw(X; \bar{\gamma})g(X)g(X)^T]$.
- (vi) $|S_{\bar{\gamma}}|\lambda_0 + |S_{\bar{\alpha}_1}|\lambda_1$ is sufficiently small.

Theorem 1 summarizes the results of Tan (2020a) related to $(\hat{\gamma}, \hat{\alpha}_1)$.

Theorem 1 (Tan, 2020a) *Suppose Assumptions 1 and 2 hold and $\lambda_0 \leq 1$. Then for sufficiently large constants A_0 and A_1 .*

(a) *If OR model (2) is used, $g(X)$ is specified as in (19), then we have with probability at least $1 - c_0\epsilon$,*

$$\|\hat{\gamma} - \bar{\gamma}\|_1 \leq M_0 |S_{\bar{\gamma}}| \lambda_0, \quad (\hat{\gamma} - \bar{\gamma})^T \tilde{\Sigma}_f (\hat{\gamma} - \bar{\gamma}) \leq M_0 |S_{\bar{\gamma}}| \lambda_0^2 \quad (35)$$

$$\|\hat{\alpha}_1 - \bar{\alpha}_1\|_1 \leq M_1 (|S_{\bar{\gamma}}| \lambda_0 + |S_{\bar{\alpha}_1}| \lambda_1), \quad (\hat{\alpha}_1 - \bar{\alpha}_1)^T \tilde{\Sigma}_g (\hat{\alpha}_1 - \bar{\alpha}_1) \leq M_1 (|S_{\bar{\gamma}}| \lambda_0^2 + |S_{\bar{\alpha}_1}| \lambda_1^2), \quad (36)$$

where c_0 , M_0 and M_1 are positive constants, $\tilde{\Sigma}_f$ and $\tilde{\Sigma}_g$ are the sample versions of Σ_f and Σ_g , i.e., $\tilde{\Sigma}_f = \tilde{E}[Tw(X; \bar{\gamma})f(X)f(X)^T]$ and $\tilde{\Sigma}_g = \tilde{E}[Tw(X; \bar{\gamma})g(X)g(X)^T]$. Furthermore, if PS model (10) is correctly specified, we also have with probability at least $1 - c_0\epsilon$,

$$|\tilde{E}(\hat{\varphi} - \bar{\varphi})| \leq M_2 (|S_{\bar{\gamma}}| \lambda_0 + |S_{\bar{\alpha}_1}| \lambda_1) \lambda_1, \quad (37)$$

where M_2 is a positive constant.

(b) *If linear OR model (21) is used, $f(X)$ and $g(X)$ are specified as in (22), then the results (35), (36) and (37) also hold.*

Inequalities (35) and (36) lead directly to the convergence rates for $(\hat{\gamma}, \hat{\alpha}_1)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\hat{\gamma} - \bar{\gamma}\|_1 &= O_p(1) \cdot |S_{\bar{\gamma}}| \{\log(p)/n\}^{1/2}, \\ \|\hat{\alpha}_1 - \bar{\alpha}_1\|_1 &= O_p(1) \cdot (|S_{\bar{\gamma}}| + |S_{\bar{\alpha}_1}|) \{\log(q)/n\}^{1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

Inequality (37) will be used to establish the inequalities (38) in Theorem 2(a) and (40) in Theorem 3(a), two crucial results in this article. The following Theorem 2 presents the large sample properties of the proposed estimator $\hat{\mu}^1(z; \hat{m}_1, \hat{\pi})$ for discrete Z .

Theorem 2 (doubly robust confidence intervals) *Under the conditions of Theorem 1(b), then for any given z_0 of discrete Z , we have*

(a) *with probability at least $1 - c_0\epsilon$,*

$$|\hat{\mu}^1(z_0; \hat{m}_1, \hat{\pi}) - \hat{\mu}^1(z_0; \bar{m}_1, \bar{\pi})| \leq M_3 (|S_{\bar{\gamma}}| \lambda_0 + |S_{\bar{\alpha}_1}| \lambda_1) \lambda_1, \quad (38)$$

where M_3 is a positive constant.

(b) with probability $1 - (c_0 + 4)\epsilon$,

$$\hat{V}(z_0) - V(z_0) = o_p(1), \quad (39)$$

provided that $(|S_{\bar{\gamma}}| + |S_{\bar{\alpha}_1}|)\sqrt{\log(q)} = o(n^{1/2})$, where $V(z_0)$ and $\hat{V}(z_0)$ are defined in Proposition 2(i)–(ii).

It should be noted that $\hat{\mu}^1(z; \bar{m}_1, \bar{\pi})$ is a doubly robust point estimator of $\mu^1(z)$. Therefore, (38) implies that $\hat{\mu}^1(z; \hat{m}_1, \hat{\pi})$ is also a doubly robust point estimator of $\mu^1(z)$, provided that $(|S_{\bar{\gamma}}|\lambda_0 + |S_{\bar{\alpha}_1}|\lambda_1)\lambda_1 = o(1)$, that is, $(|S_{\bar{\gamma}}| + |S_{\bar{\alpha}_1}|)\log(q) = o(n)$. In addition, to obtain a valid confidence intervals, it requires the asymptotic expansion (20) to hold, which implies that $(|S_{\bar{\gamma}}|\lambda_0 + |S_{\bar{\alpha}_1}|\lambda_1)\lambda_1 = o(n^{-1/2})$, namely, $(|S_{\bar{\gamma}}| + |S_{\bar{\alpha}_1}|)\log(q) = o(n^{1/2})$. In summary, Theorem 2 shows that, for discrete Z with linear OR model (21) and specification of $f(X)$ and $g(X)$ as in (22), the proposed method obtains both doubly point estimators and doubly confidence intervals for $\mu^1(z)$, provided that $(|S_{\bar{\gamma}}| + |S_{\bar{\alpha}_1}|)\log(q) = o(n^{1/2})$, which leads to Proposition 2. Similar to Theorem 2, the following Theorem 3 implies the results presented in Proposition 1.

Theorem 3 (Model-assisted confidence intervals) *Under the conditions of Theorem 1(a), if PS model (10) is correctly specified, then for a given value z_0 of discrete Z or continuous Z , we have*

(a) with probability at least $1 - (c_0 + 8)\epsilon$,

$$|\hat{\mu}^1(z_0; \hat{m}_1, \hat{\pi}) - \hat{\mu}^1(z_0; \bar{m}_1, \bar{\pi})| \leq M_4(|S_{\bar{\gamma}}|\lambda_0 + |S_{\bar{\alpha}_1}|\lambda_1)\lambda_1, \quad (40)$$

where M_4 is a positive constant.

(b) with probability at least $1 - (c_0 + 12)\epsilon$,

$$\hat{V}(z_0) - V(z_0) = o_p(1), \quad (41)$$

provided that $(|S_{\bar{\gamma}}| + |S_{\bar{\alpha}_1}|)\sqrt{\log(q)} = o(n^{1/2})$, where $V(z_0)$ and $\hat{V}(z_0)$ are defined in Proposition 1(i)–(ii).

The preceding theoretical analysis focuses on the large sample properties of $\hat{\mu}^1(z; \hat{m}_1, \hat{\pi})$. Similar results can be derived for $\hat{\mu}^0(z; \hat{m}_0, \hat{\pi}_0)$ and $\hat{\mu}^1(z; \hat{m}_1, \hat{\pi}) - \hat{\mu}^0(z; \hat{m}_0, \hat{\pi}_0)$ by analogous arguments.

5 Simulation studies

Extensive simulation studies are carried out to evaluate the finite sample performance of the proposed methods. We consider three scenarios of Z : binary variable Z , continuous variable Z , and Z consists of two binary variables Z_1 and Z_2 . The regularized calibrated estimation for PS model and regularized weighted likelihood estimation for OR model can be implemented by using R package **RCAL** (Tan, 2019), and the corresponding tuning parameters are determined via using 5-fold cross validation.

Throughout this simulation, the data generating processes of covariates are as follows: $V = (V_1, \dots, V_d) \sim Normal(0, \Sigma)$ with $\Sigma_{j,k} = 2^{-|j-k|}$ for $1 \leq j, k \leq d$, and independently, $Z \sim Binomial(1, 0.5)$ or $Z \sim Uniform(-0.5, 0.5)$ for discrete or continuous Z . For Z consisting of two binary variables (Z_1, Z_2) , Z_1 and Z_2 are independent and identically distributed from $Binomial(1, 0.5)$. The error term is $\epsilon \sim Normal(0, 1)$. Let $\gamma = 0.5(1, -1, -1, 1, -1)^T$, $X = (Z^T, V^T)^T$ and V_i be i -th element of V .

Discrete Z . We first consider the following three different data generating scenarios (C1)-(C3) with binary Z . The three cases can help to assess the doubly robust properties for both point estimators and confidence intervals.

$$(C1) \quad Z \text{ is binary variable, } P(T = 1|X) = \{1 + \exp(-(Z, V_1, V_2, V_3, V_4)^T \gamma)\}^{-1}, Y^1 = 1 + Z + \sum_{i=1}^4 \{V_i Z + 2V_i(1 - Z)\} + \epsilon.$$

$$(C2) \quad \text{Generate } Z, V \text{ and } T \text{ as in case (C1), } Y^1 = 1 + Z + \sum_{i=1}^4 \{V_i Z + 2V_i(1 - Z) + V_i^3/2^i\} + \epsilon.$$

$$(C3) \quad \text{Generate } Z, V \text{ and } Y^1 \text{ as in case (C1), } P(T = 1|X) = \{1 + \exp(-(Z, V_1^2, V_2^2, V_3^2, V_4^2)^T \gamma)\}^{-1}.$$

The three scenarios can be classified as follows:

(C1) PS and OR models both correctly specified.

(C2) PS model correctly specified, but OR model misspecified.

(C3) PS model misspecified, but OR model correctly specified.

The true curve of $\mu^1(z)$ is $1 + z$ for all cases of (C1)-(C3). We set $f(X) = g(X) = (1, V^T, Z, V^T Z)^T$ as discussed in Section 3.3. Each simulation study is based on 1000 replicates with sample size $n = 500$. Bias and Var are the Monte Carlo bias and variance over the 1000 simulations of the points estimates. EVar is the mean of the variance estimates. Cov90 and Cov95 are the coverage proportions of the 90% and 95% confidence intervals by using the asymptotic variance formula, respectively. Table 1 summarizes the results of $\hat{\mu}^1(z)$ for scenarios (C1)-(C3).

Table 1: Estimations of $\mu^1(z)$ for binary variable Z

$\hat{\mu}^1(z)$	Bias	$n = 500, p = 200$				$n = 500, p = 400$				
		$\sqrt{\text{Var}}$	$\sqrt{\text{EVar}}$	Cov90	Cov95	Bias	$\sqrt{\text{Var}}$	$\sqrt{\text{EVar}}$	Cov90	Cov95
(C1) cor PS, cor OR										
$\hat{\mu}^1(0)$	-0.032	0.370	0.371	0.905	0.954	-0.034	0.366	0.368	0.897	0.950
$\hat{\mu}^1(1)$	-0.040	0.201	0.200	0.879	0.952	-0.038	0.202	0.200	0.889	0.943
(C2) cor PS, mis OR										
$\hat{\mu}^1(0)$	-0.054	0.516	0.501	0.896	0.944	-0.063	0.515	0.498	0.884	0.941
$\hat{\mu}^1(1)$	-0.081	0.348	0.337	0.887	0.935	-0.072	0.336	0.336	0.898	0.951
(C3) mis PS, cor OR										
$\hat{\mu}^1(0)$	0.019	0.377	0.361	0.888	0.938	0.033	0.375	0.357	0.874	0.935
$\hat{\mu}^1(1)$	-0.003	0.195	0.202	0.905	0.955	-0.016	0.203	0.200	0.888	0.947

Note: Both the dimensions of $f(X)$ and $g(X)$ are $p + 1$.

As shown in Table 1, for all the cases (C1)-(C3), the Bias is small, $\sqrt{\text{EVar}}$ is close to $\sqrt{\text{Var}}$ and the coverage proportions Cov90 and Cov95 are around the nominal levels 0.90 and 0.95, respectively. Because case (C2) involves a misspecified OR model and case (C3) involves a misspecified PS model, the results of cases (C2) and (C3) justify that both the point estimators and confidence intervals are doubly robust.

Continuous Z . We consider two data generation mechanisms with continuous Z :

(C4) Z is a continuous variable, $P(T = 1|X) = \{1 + \exp(-(Z, V_1, V_2, V_3, V_4)^T \gamma)\}^{-1}$,
 $Y^1 = Z + \sum_{i=1}^4 V_i + \epsilon$.

(C5) Generate Z, V and T as in case (C4), $Y^1 = Z(1 + 2Z)^2(Z - 1)^2 + \sum_{i=1}^4 (V_i^2 + V_i)/2^{i+1} + \epsilon$.

Scenario (C4) implies $\mu^1(z)$ is a linear function of z , while scenario (C5) indicates $\mu^1(z)$ is a polynomial function of z . The vectors $f(X)$ and $g(X)$ are specified as follows: $f(X) = (1, V^T, Z)^T$, $g(X) = (1, V^T, Z, \Phi(Z)^T, V^T \phi_1(Z), \dots, V^T \phi_K(Z), \Phi(Z)^T Z)^T$. In this simulation, we let $\Phi(Z)$ be cubic spline basis functions with three knots selected by the 25%, 50% and 75% sample quantiles of Z , which is a six-dimensional random vector excluding a constant and can be implemented using R package **gam** (Hastie, 2018). Since Z is continuous for cases (C4) and (C5), we report the simulation results at five representative points of Z : $-0.4, -0.2, 0, 0.2, 0.4$. Table 2 shows the numerical results of $\hat{\mu}^1(z)$ for cases (C4) and (C5). Both of them have a similar performance with those of discrete Z .

Table 2: Estimations of $\mu^1(z)$ for continuous Z , $n = 500$, $p = 60$, $q = 420$

$\hat{\mu}^1(z)$	Bias	$\sqrt{\text{Var}}$	$\sqrt{\text{EVar}}$	Cov90	Cov95	Bias	$\sqrt{\text{Var}}$	$\sqrt{\text{EVar}}$	Cov90	Cov95
	(C4) cor PS, cor OR					(C5) cor PS, mis OR				
$\hat{\mu}^1(-0.4)$	0.011	0.409	0.400	0.886	0.942	-0.027	0.201	0.199	0.882	0.942
$\hat{\mu}^1(-0.2)$	-0.035	0.359	0.341	0.881	0.936	-0.020	0.172	0.170	0.884	0.944
$\hat{\mu}^1(0.0)$	-0.036	0.339	0.331	0.892	0.940	-0.025	0.179	0.166	0.866	0.928
$\hat{\mu}^1(0.2)$	-0.013	0.341	0.342	0.899	0.948	-0.036	0.173	0.177	0.894	0.948
$\hat{\mu}^1(0.4)$	-0.034	0.414	0.403	0.883	0.941	-0.028	0.208	0.207	0.880	0.938

Note: the dimensions of $f(X)$ and $g(X)$ are $p + 1$ and $q + 1$, respectively.

The setups for all preceding numeric results are in exact sparsity settings. A more common scenario in modern applications is approximate sparsity, which means that all covariates are relevant associated with nonzero coefficients but only a few are truly important with large coefficients. We also conduct numeric experiments to assess the finite sample performance of proposed methods under approximate sparsity settings for both binary Z , continuous Z and Z consisting of two binary variables. The corresponding results are similar to those of in exact sparsity settings and are presented in Table S1 of the supplementary material.

Finally, we compare the proposed method with competing AIPW methods of [Fan et al. \(2019\)](#) and [Zimmert & Lechner \(2019\)](#) discussed in Section 2.2 for continuous Z . We adopt the AIPW methods with full sample and four-fold cross-fitting as suggested in [Fan et al. \(2019\)](#). For PS and OR models, we set $f(X) = g(X) = (1, V^T, Z)^T$ and the associated tuning parameters are selected by 5-fold cross validation. As done in [Fan et al. \(2019\)](#), we use the Gaussian kernel throughout and the bandwidth is set as $h = \hat{h}_{opt} \times n^{1/5} \times n^{-2/7}$, where \hat{h}_{opt} is a plug-in estimator of the optimal bandwidth that can be implemented using R package **KernSmooth** ([Ruppert et al., 1995](#); [Wand, 2015](#)).

Table 3 summarizes the results of competing AIPW estimators for cases (C4) and (C5). When both PS and OR models are correctly specified, the two competing AIPW methods perform well in terms of Bias, Cov90 and Cov95. Nevertheless, when OR model is misspecified, their coverage proportions are away from the nominal values. This indicates that the competing approaches do not enjoy the property of doubly robust confidence intervals. As expected, the AIPW estimator with full sample tends to have larger Bias and smaller $\sqrt{\text{Var}}$ than that of four-fold cross-fitting, in that sample-splitting may decrease bias and induce random errors in finite sample. In addition, by comparison of Table 3 with Table 2, the proposed method has similar performance with competing AIPW methods when both PS and OR models are correctly specified.

However, with a misspecified OR model, the proposed approach has smaller Bias and $\sqrt{\text{Var}}$, and better coverage proportions.

Table 3: Comparison of competing approaches for continuous Z

$\hat{\mu}^1(z)$	Bias	$\sqrt{\text{Var}}$	$\sqrt{\text{EVar}}$	Cov90	Cov95	Bias	$\sqrt{\text{Var}}$	$\sqrt{\text{EVar}}$	Cov90	Cov95
Fan et al. (2019)'s AIPW with full sample										
	(C4) cor PS, cor OR					(C5) cor PS, mis OR				
$\hat{\mu}^1(-0.4)$	-0.018	0.406	0.359	0.858	0.930	-0.057	0.210	0.190	0.837	0.899
$\hat{\mu}^1(-0.2)$	-0.036	0.355	0.349	0.912	0.943	-0.037	0.191	0.184	0.861	0.917
$\hat{\mu}^1(0.0)$	-0.025	0.387	0.352	0.888	0.930	-0.038	0.207	0.195	0.856	0.925
$\hat{\mu}^1(0.2)$	-0.016	0.383	0.354	0.882	0.929	-0.050	0.198	0.197	0.862	0.914
$\hat{\mu}^1(0.4)$	-0.030	0.376	0.358	0.872	0.932	-0.050	0.218	0.209	0.828	0.881
Fan et al. (2019) and Zimmert & Lechner (2019)'s AIPW with four-fold cross-fitting										
	(C4) cor PS, cor OR					(C5) cor PS, mis OR				
$\hat{\mu}^1(-0.4)$	-0.034	0.417	0.376	0.873	0.927	-0.047	0.296	0.300	0.826	0.899
$\hat{\mu}^1(-0.2)$	-0.001	0.441	0.399	0.875	0.931	-0.034	0.286	0.264	0.867	0.926
$\hat{\mu}^1(0.0)$	-0.016	0.417	0.397	0.869	0.928	-0.027	0.266	0.255	0.857	0.917
$\hat{\mu}^1(0.2)$	-0.032	0.388	0.377	0.892	0.942	-0.040	0.264	0.252	0.845	0.903
$\hat{\mu}^1(0.4)$	0.027	0.443	0.432	0.882	0.940	-0.009	0.266	0.242	0.848	0.908

6 Application

Low birth weights can be closely related to one's health, education and performances in labor market throughout life (Almond et al., 2005; Almond & Currie, 2011), and maternal smoking is regarded as the most important preventable cause for low birth weights (Kramer, 1987). Many studies assessed the magnitude of maternal smoking on birth weights by estimating its average treatment effect. See da Veiga & Wilder (2008) and Walker et al. (2009). In this empirical analysis, we are interested in exploring the heterogeneity of effects of maternal smoking on infant birth weights across different subpopulations by analyzing a dataset available from the STATA website (<http://www.stata-press.com/data/r13/cattaneo2.dta>). The same question have been investigated in recent works of Abrevaya et al. (2015), Lee et al. (2017), Fan et al. (2019) and Zimmert & Lechner (2019).

The proposed methods improve on these previous investigations by obtaining both doubly robust point estimators and model-assisted confidence intervals, which allows for one of the PS model or OR model misspecified and hence the results are more reliable. In addition, the proposed method handles discrete and continuous Z in a unified manner,

while the competing methods are only focused on the case of continuous Z .

For ease of comparison, as done in Lee et al. (2017), we restrict our sample to white and non-Hispanic mothers. This yields a data subset with size 3,754. The outcome variable Y is the infant birth weights measured in grams, the exposure variable T is the status of maternal smoking: $T = 1$ represents that the mother smokes and $T = 0$ otherwise. The covariates X include the parents' socio-economic information and the mother's medical and health records, which is summarized in Table S2 of the supplementary material. The subpopulations of interest are defined by covariates Z , which are taken to be `alcohol`, `deadkids`, `prenatal1`, `fbaby` or `mage`. We pick these variables because they may have an impact on infant birth weights: `alcohol` is a risk factor known for low birth weights; `deadkids` and `mage` may have influence on mother's health; `presental1` = 1 implies that the mother has a prenatal visit early. The first four variables are binary and the last one is continuous.

As suggested in Section 3.3, we set $f(X) = g(X) = (1, V^T, Z, V^T Z)^T$ for binary Z , where V is all the covariates listed in Table S2 of the supplementary material excluding variable Z ; the dimension of $f(X)$ is $p = 45$, excluding the constant. All variables in $f(X)$ are standardized to have sample mean 0 and sample variance 1. As done in simulation studies, the lasso tuning parameter λ is selected by five-fold cross validation. Table 4 summarizes the estimated causal effects of maternal smoking on infant birth weights conditional on different binary variable Z , where CSTE is the point estimator of $\tau(z)$, SD and 95% CI denote the estimated standard error and 95% point-wise confidence interval by using formula (30). As shown in Table 4, there is a significant difference in causal effect point-estimators between the first infant group (-177.40) and not first infant group (-322.97). And the alcohol consumed group (-290.14) tends to have a lower infant birth weights than the group of not drinking (-259.06). The asymptotic variance of $\hat{\tau}(1)$ in alcohol consumed group is large, this is because only 93 subjects in drinking group. In addition, the causal effects of maternal smoking on birth weights have no large difference among subgroups with different values of `deadkids` and `prenatal1`.

Table 4: Effects of maternal smoking on infant birth weights for discrete Z with proposed method

$\hat{\tau}(z)$	CSTE	SD	95% CI	CSTE	SD	95% CI
	$Z = \text{alcohol}$			$Z = \text{deadkids}$		
$\hat{\tau}(0)$	-259.06	33.36	(-324.45, -193.67)	-270.56	30.27	(-329.89, -211.23)
$\hat{\tau}(1)$	-290.14	97.43	(-481.10, -99.18)	-251.28	54.56	(-358.22, -144.34)
	$Z = \text{prenatal1}$			$Z = \text{fbaby}$		
$\hat{\tau}(0)$	-275.59	47.90	(-369.47, -181.71)	-322.97	41.72	(-404.74, -241.20)
$\hat{\tau}(1)$	-263.88	35.63	(-333.71, -194.05)	-177.40	49.03	(-273.50, -81.30)

Note: CSTE is the point estimator of $\tau(z) = E(Y^1 - Y^0|Z = z)$, SD and 95% CI denote the estimated standard error and 95% point-wise confidence interval of $\hat{\tau}(z)$, respectively.

Given that the existing methods in Section 2.2 do not deal with discrete Z , we compare the proposed method with a naturally alternative approach, which also employs the same basis functions $\Phi(z)$ and regressors $f(X) = g(X) = (1, V^T, Z)^T$, while using regularized maximum likelihood estimators $\hat{\pi}_{RML}$ and $\hat{m}_{t,RML}$ for $t = 0, 1$. The corresponding results are similar to those in Table 4 and are presented in Table S3 of the supplementary material.




Figure 1: Standardized calibration differences $CAL^1(\hat{\pi}_{RCAL}; f_j)$ plotted against index j for $\hat{\pi}_{RCAL}$ with λ selected by 5-fold cross-validation




Figure 2: Standardized calibration differences $CAL^1(\hat{\pi}_{RML}; f_j)$ plotted against index j for $\hat{\pi}_{RML}$ with λ selected by 5-fold cross-validation.

We conduct balance checking by using a propensity score estimate $\hat{\pi}_{RCAL}$ in treated sample to assess the reliability of results in Table 4. Specifically, for a function $h(X)$, we use the standardized calibration difference (Tan, 2020b)

$$CAL^1(\hat{\pi}; h) = \left[\frac{\tilde{E}\{Th(X)\hat{\pi}^{-1}(X)\}}{\tilde{E}\{T\hat{\pi}^{-1}(X)\}} - \tilde{E}\{h(X)\} \right] / \tilde{V}^{1/2}\{h(X)\}$$

to measure the effect of calibration, where $\tilde{E}(\cdot)$ and $\tilde{V}(\cdot)$ denote the sample mean and variance. Figure 1 and 2 display the values of standardized calibration difference of all covariates for the four choices of binary Z , obtained from $\hat{\pi}_{RCAL}$ and $\hat{\pi}_{RML}$. It can be seen that the values of $CAL^1(\hat{\pi}_{RCAL}; f_j)$ tend to be less variable than those of $CAL^1(\hat{\pi}_{RML}; f_j)$ for different Z , which implies that $\hat{\pi}_{RCAL}$ can balance covariates better than $\hat{\pi}_{RML}$ and thus the associated results are more reliable.

To estimate a CSTE curve when Z is mage, we apply the proposed method using cubic spline to approximate $\tau(z)$ and find the optimal number of knots by using grid search with Akaike information criterion (AIC, Akaike, 1974) and Bayesian information criterion (BIC, Schwarz, 2005). Specifically, we first fix the number of knots is 10, that is, $f(X) = (1, V^T, \Phi(Z)^T)^T$, $g(X) = (1, V^T, \Phi(Z)^T, (V \otimes \Phi(Z))^T, (\Phi(Z) \otimes \Phi(Z))^T)^T$ with $\Phi(Z)$ being cubic spline basis functions with 10 knots. Then we use $f(X)$ and $g(X)$ to estimate propensity score and outcome regression functions. Finally, we conduct least

squares by regressing $\varphi(Y, T, X; \hat{m}_1, \hat{\pi}) - \varphi(Y, 1 - T, X; \hat{m}_0, 1 - \hat{\pi}_0)$ on $\tilde{\Phi}(Z)$ to get the values of AIC and BIC, where $\tilde{\Phi}(Z)$ is cubic spline basis functions with number of knots ranging from 1 to 10. As can be seen from Table 5, the optimal choice of number of knots is 4 for both AIC and BIC.

Table 5: Values of AIC and BIC under different number of knots

K	AIC	BIC	K	AIC	BIC
1	67290.35	67327.68	6	67293.03	67361.45
2	67287.36	67330.90	7	67299.65	67374.29
3	67292.36	67342.12	8	67662.25	67743.11
4	66600.08	66656.06	9	66609.08	66696.16
5	67290.88	67353.08	10	67304.51	67397.82

Note: K is the number of knots for cubic spline.




Figure 3: upper left: Estimated CSTE curves; upper right: 95% CI for Full sample; lower left: 95% CI for Cross-Fitting; lower right: 95% CI for RMLE.

Figure 3 displays the resulting estimates of CATE curves, where Figure 3(a) presents the point estimates, Figure 3(b) and 3(c) show the associated 95% point-wise confidence

intervals. As done in the simulation with continuous Z and the application with discrete Z , we include the competing AIPW estimates of Fan et al. (2019) and Zimmert & Lechner (2019) and regularized maximum likelihood estimate (RMLE) for comparison. As shown in Figure 3, all methods produce similar trends in point estimates and confidence intervals, although they differ in finer scales. The AIPW, cross-fitting method appears to yield large variations at the two ends of the age interval. Figure 4 depicts the standardized calibration differences for the four methods, which also shows that $\hat{\pi}_{RCAL}$ can better balance all covariates and hence lead to more reliable results than the other methods. Overall, all three methods demonstrate that maternal smoking has a negative effect on birth weights, and the negative effect becomes stronger as age increases before 35. The estimated CATE curve has a drastic change and large variance with age ranging from 35 to 40, which may be induced by a small sample size in this age range. This is consistent with the findings in previous studies.




Figure 4: Standardized calibration differences of four competing methods (Proposed, AIPW with full sample, AIPW with cross-fitting, RMLE) for continuous Z .

7 Discussion

This article develops new methods to obtain both doubly robust point estimators and model-assisted confidence intervals for conditional average treatment effects in high-dimensional settings. In addition, with a linear OR model and discrete Z , the confidence

intervals are also doubly robust. Theoretical properties are established for the proposed methods with different data types of outcome Y and covariates Z , and the corresponding variances can be estimated by a sandwich method.

Further work is desired to extend our method and theory by relaxing the parametric structural model (8) to be nonparametric subject to smoothness conditions, while allowing the basis functions $\Phi(z)$ to be data-adaptively chosen, instead of pre-specified. Another interesting question is that whether doubly robust confidence intervals can be derived for continuous Z . To deal with this question, a possible approach is to discretize Z . For example, for two knots $t_1 < t_2$, we can discretize Z as $(Z_1, Z_2) = (I\{t_1 < Z \leq t_2\}, I\{Z > t_2\})$ or $(Z_1, Z_2) = (I\{Z > t_1\}, I\{Z > t_2\})$. With either choice of (Z_1, Z_2) , the proposed method using $f(X) = (1, V^T, Z_1, Z_2, V^T Z_1, V^T Z_2)^T$ achieves desired doubly robust confidence intervals in the discretized model

$$\mu^1(Z) = E(Y^1|Z) = \beta_0 + (Z_1, Z_2)\beta_1.$$

The method can be easily extended to multiple knots, corresponding to piecewise constant model for $\mu^1(z)$. Then various theoretical questions need to be investigated. For example, it is interesting to study convergence and whether doubly confidence intervals can be achieved, depending on the number of knots used.

Another extension is to consider the case that Z is composed of multiple continuous variables. A possible strategy is to postulate an additive model (Hastie & Tibshirani, 1990)

$$\mu^1(Z) = \beta_0 + \sum_{k=1}^m g_k(Z_k),$$

where g_k is an unknown function of the j -th covariate. Alternatively, we may consider a single index model (Guo et al., 2021)

$$\mu^1(Z) = g(Z^T \beta).$$

It is interesting to study how to incorporate such strategies in future research.

References

- Abrevaya, J., Hus, Y. C. & Lieli, R. P. (2015), ‘Estimating conditional average treatment effect’, *Journal of Business and Economic Statistics* **33**, 485–505.
- Akaike, H. (1974), ‘A new look at the statistical model identification’, *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control* **19**, 716–723.

- Almond, D., Chay, K. Y. & Lee, D. S. (2005), ‘The costs of low birth weight’, *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* **120**, 1031–1083.
- Almond, D. & Currie, J. (2011), ‘Human capital development before age five’, *Handbook of Labor Economics* **4**, 1315–1486.
- Buhlmann, P. & van de Geer, S. (2011), *Statistics for High-Dimensional Data: Methods, Theory and Applications*, Springer Heidelberg.
- Chakraborty, B. & Moodie, E. E. (2013), *Statistical methods for dynamic treatment regimes*, Springer, New York.
- Chernozhukov, V., Fernández-Val, I. & Luo, Y. (2018), ‘The sorted effects method: discovering heterogeneous effects beyond their averages’, *Econometrica* **86**, 1911–1938.
- da Veiga, P. V. & Wilder, R. P. (2008), ‘Maternal smoking during pregnancy and birth-weight: a propensity score matching approach’, *Maternal and Child Health Journal* **12**, 194–203.
- Dukes, O. & Vansteelandt, S. (2020), ‘Inference for treatment effect parameters in potentially misspecified high-dimensional models’, *Biometrika* **00**, 1–14.
- Fan, Q., Hsu, Y. C., Lieli, R. P. & Zhang, Y. (2019), ‘Estimation of conditional average treatment effects with high-dimensional data’, <https://arxiv.org/abs/1908.02399>.
- Guo, W., Zhou, X. H. & Ma, S. (2021), ‘Estimation of optimal individualized treatment rules using a covariate-specific treatment effect curve with high-dimensional covariates’, *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **116**, 309–321.
- Hastie, T. (2018), *gam: Generalized Additive Models*, <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=gam>.
- Hastie, T. J. & Tibshirani, R. J. (1990), *Generalized Additive Models*, London: Chapman and Hall.
- Kang, J. D. & Schafer, J. L. (2007), ‘Demystifying double robustness: a comparison of alternative strategies for estimating a population mean from incomplete data’, *Statistical Science* **22**, 523–539.
- Kramer, M. S. (1987), ‘Intrauterine growth and gestational duration determinants’, *Pediatrics* **80**, 502–511.

- Lechner, M. (2019), ‘Modified causal forests for estimating heterogeneous causal effects’, <https://arxiv.org/abs/1812.09487>.
- Lee, S., Okui, R. & Whang, Y. J. (2017), ‘Doubly robust uniform confidence band for the conditional average treatment effect function’, *Journal of Applied Econometrics* **32**, 1207–1225.
- Li, Q. & Racine, J. S. (2007), *Nonparametric Econometrics: Theory and Practice*, Princeton University Press.
- Neyman, J. S. (1990), ‘On the application of probability theory to agricultural experiments. essay on principles. section 9’, *Statistical Science* **5**, 465–472.
- Ramsay, J. & Silverman, B. (2005), *Functional Data Analysis*, second edn, Springer.
- Robins, J. M. (1999), *Marginal structural models versus structural nested models as tools for causal inference*, in ”Statistical Models in Epidemiology: The Environment and Clinical Trials”, Springer, New York, pp. 95–134.
- Robins, J., Rotnitzky, A. & Zhao, L. (1994), ‘Estimation of regression coefficients when some regressors are not always observed’, *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **89**, 846–866.
- Rosenbaum, P. R. & Rubin, D. B. (1983), ‘The central role of the propensity score in observational studies for causal effects’, *Biometrika* **70**, 41–55.
- Rubin, D. B. (1974), ‘Estimating causal effects of treatments in randomized and non-randomized studies’, *Journal of educational psychology* **66**, 688–701.
- Rubin, D. B. (1976), ‘Inference and missing data’, *Biometrika* **63**, 581–592.
- Ruppert, D., Sheather, S. J. & Wand, M. P. (1995), ‘An effective bandwidth selector for local least squares regression’, *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **90**, 1257–1270.
- Schumaker, L. L. (2007), *Spline Functions: Basic Theory*, third edn, Cambridge University Press.
- Schwarz, G. (2005), ‘Estimating the dimension of a model’, *Annals of Statistics* **6**, 15–18.
- Sun, B. & Tan, Z. (2020), ‘High-dimensional model-assisted inference for local average treatment effects with instrumental variables’, <https://arxiv.org/abs/2009.09286>.

- Tan, Z. (2007), ‘Comment: understanding or, ps and dr’, *Statistical Science* **22**, 560–568.
- Tan, Z. (2010a), ‘Bounded, efficient and doubly robust estimation with inverse weighting’, *Biometrika* **97**, 661–682.
- Tan, Z. (2010b), ‘Nonparametric likelihood and doubly robust estimating equations for marginal and nested structural models’, *The Canadian Journal of Statistics* **38**, 609–632.
- Tan, Z. (2019), *RCAL: Regularized calibrated estimation*, <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=RCAL>.
- Tan, Z. (2020a), ‘Model-assisted inference for treatment effects using regularized calibrated estimation with high-dimensional data’, *The Annals of Statistics* **48**, 811–837.
- Tan, Z. (2020b), ‘Regularized calibrated estimation of propensity scores with model misspecification and high-dimensional data’, *Biometrika* **107**, 137–158.
- Tian, L., Alizadeh, A. A., Gentles, A. J. & Tibshirani, R. (2014), ‘A simple method for estimating interactions between a treatment and a large number of covariates’, *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **109**, 1517–1532.
- Walker, M., Tekin, E. & Wallace, S. (2009), ‘Teen smoking and birth outcomes’, *Southern Economic Journal* **75**, 892–907.
- Wand, M. (2015), *KernSmooth: Functions for Kernel Smoothing Supporting Wand and Jones (1995)*, <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=KernSmooth>.
- Zhao, Q., Small, D. S. & Ertefaie, A. (2018), ‘Selective inference for effect modification via the lasso’, <https://arxiv.org/abs/1705.08020> .
- Zimmert, M. & Lechner, M. (2019), ‘Nonparametric estimation of causal heterogeneity under high-dimensional confounding’, <https://arxiv.org/abs/1908.08779v1> .