
IMPROVING UPLIFT MODEL EVALUATION ON RCT DATA

A PREPRINT

 **Björn Bokelmann**

Chair of information systems
Humboldt University Berlin
Unter den Linden 6
10099 Berlin
bokelmab@hu-berlin.de

 **Stefan Lessmann**

Chair of information systems
Humboldt University Berlin
Unter den Linden 6
10099 Berlin

October 6, 2022

ABSTRACT

Estimating treatment effects is one of the most challenging and important tasks of data analysts. Traditional statistical methods aim to estimate average treatment effects over a population. While being highly useful, such average treatment effects do not help to decide which individuals profit most by the treatment. This is where uplift modeling becomes important. Uplift models help to select the right individuals for treatment, to maximize the overall treatment effect (uplift). A challenging problem in uplift modeling is to evaluate the models. Previous literature suggests methods like the Qini curve and the transformed outcome mean squared error. However, these metrics suffer from variance: Their evaluations are strongly affected by random noise in the data, which makes these evaluations to a certain degree arbitrary. In this paper, we analyze the variance of the uplift evaluation metrics, on randomized controlled trial data, in a sound statistical manner. We propose certain outcome adjustment methods, for which we prove theoretically and empirically, that they reduce the variance of the uplift evaluation metrics. Our statistical analysis and the proposed outcome adjustment methods are a step towards a better evaluation practice in uplift modeling.

Keywords Uplift modeling · evaluation · metrics · conditional average treatment effects · Qini

1 Introduction

Estimating treatment effects is one of the most challenging and important tasks of data analysts. In health care, researchers infer the effect of new drugs on the patients through data from clinical trials [van Klaveren et al., 2018]. In business, companies collect and analyse customer data to estimate the effect of marketing campaigns [Haupt and Lessmann, 2022] or churn prevention methods [Lemmens and Gupta, 2020]. Also governments use their data to infer the effects of policies, they decided on [Athey and Wager, 2021]. The Application fields are numerous and the meaning of such estimates is of highest significance as health care organizations, companies and governments base important decisions on them. Traditionally, the *average treatment effect* (ATE) for a population of interest, was estimated. In the mentioned applications, such ATE's could be an increase in the average survival time due to a new cancer therapy, the percentage reduction of churns from the customers of a company or the increase in demand due to a tax reduction. Although being very useful, ATE estimates only offer limited information as they do not allow for differentiated effect estimates depending on characteristics of an individual. E.g. the ATE's do not help us to decide which patients benefit most of a treatment (elderly women with diabetes or young men without pre-existing diseases) or which customers react positively towards a marketing campaign and which are annoyed. To adress these problems, it is necessary to estimate *conditional average treatment effects* (CATE), that is treatment effects which depend on the characteristics of an individual.

Building statistical models to support decisions which individuals to treat is the objective of uplift modeling [Gutierrez and Gérardy, 2017]. There are different ways to define this prediction problem: Making treatment decisions can be seen as a "causal classification problem", where the goal is to identify individuals whose outcome positively changes

by the treatment [Li et al., 2021]. To make this classification problem more realistic, the cost of treatment can be included [Verbeke et al., 2022]. An alternative to treating the task as a classification problem is to treat it as a ranking problem. Then the prediction problem becomes to rank individuals according to the effect a treatment would have on them [Devriendt et al., 2020]. An uplift model being able to rank individuals well helps to select the individuals which profit most from the treatment. Irrespective of how the prediction problem is defined, there are various methods for building uplift models [Gutierrez and Gérardy, 2017]. For our research it is not important to list all the different modeling approaches. It is only necessary to note that uplift models can yield estimates for the CATE [Radcliffe, 2007, Jaroszewicz and Rzepakowski, 2014, Athey and Imbens, 2016] but they do not have to. It is also sufficient if the model just yields a score for each individual (which does not need to correspond to the CATE), such that the score can be used for ranking or deciding whether to treat or not. There are applications where such "non-CATE models" outperform models for the CATE [Gubela et al., 2020, Fernández-Loría and Provost, 2022].

Irrespective of which uplift modeling strategy is used, applicants get in the situation to evaluate their model. They need to measure how precise its CATE estimates are or how allocating treatment according to the model's predictions affects business/health care. In this paper, we focus on the situation where a randomized controlled trial (RCT) was performed and the data is used to train and evaluate the uplift model. It is common practice to split the data and use one part for training and the other part (test set) for evaluation. In supervised learning, applicants would pick the target Y from the test set and would evaluate how well the predictions for this target are, for example by calculating the mean squared error. A fundamental problem which renders such an evaluation method impossible for uplift modeling is that the target (CATE) can not be observed. What is observed are either outcomes for the treated or the untreated. Accordingly, common predictive model evaluation approaches need to be adapted to uplift modeling. In the literature, there are two main uplift evaluation strategies: The first strategy is to substitute the actual CATE by a transformed outcome (an unbiased estimate of the CATE) and then calculate the mean squared error between the model predictions and this transformed outcome [Gutierrez and Gérardy, 2017]. We refer to this approach as *transformed outcome mean squared error* (MSE_W). The second strategy is to evaluate how well the model can rank individuals according to their CATE. This works by cutting the test set observations into segments according to the model predictions (e.g. the individuals with the 10% highest predictions) and then calculating the mean difference between the treated and the untreated in this segment. If the model ranks well, the observed differences in a high ranked segment will also be high. This approach and some variations of it are found under the name Qini or uplift curve in the literature [Devriendt et al., 2020].

In previous uplift literature, it is often remarked that uplift evaluation metrics are quite "noisy" or "unstable" [Devriendt et al., 2018]. This means that their evaluations of a model depend heavily on the specific test set data. One model can easily be by chance deemed better than another just because of the random noise in the test set. In statistical terms, it is more precise to call this undesirable property of an error metric the *variance*. If model evaluations generally vary a lot with the choice of test data, the metric is said to have a high variance. In fact, like common for statistical analysis, we can discuss evaluation metrics in terms of *bias and variance*. In this context, a metric would be biased, if it favors any kind of uplift model over another, unrelated to their real performance (we will explain this in more detail later). To highlight the importance of these properties: If an evaluation metric is either biased or suffers from high variance, it is essentially meaningless. Although we will see that uplift metrics for RCT data are not biased, their variance is indeed an issue. Previous literature only provides a few studies that deal with the statistical properties of uplift evaluation metrics [Schuler and Shah, 2018, Saito et al., 2019, Saito, 2020]. For the case of observational data, they already provide a thorough analysis of bias and variance and make suggestions about possible improvements to standard metrics. However, for the case of RCT data, an analysis of the statistical properties of evaluation metrics and ideas for improvement are still missing. It is worthwhile to analyze the RCT setting separately from the observational data setting, as many assumptions can be dropped and it is possible to provide clear advice how to best evaluate models.

Our paper contributes to the uplift literature by thoroughly analyzing the statistical properties of the uplift evaluation metrics on RCT data and providing methods for improvement. By statistical analysis, we identify the sources of variance. It turns out, that the variance of the MSE_W and the Qini curve is due to the same source, which could be expressed in simple mathematical terms. Using these theoretical results, we show that certain adjustments to the outcome can lead to a reduction of variance for the uplift evaluation metrics without causing a bias. In addition to the comprehensive theoretical analysis, we use simulation data to demonstrate that the variance in the uplift metrics can pose a severe problem for model evaluation and that our adjustment methods can significantly mitigate this problem in many cases. Although we focus our analysis on the MSE_W and the Qini curve, we also show that the results can be transferred to the other evaluation metrics, applied in the uplift literature. As our suggested adjustment methods are easy to apply and never harm the quality of model evaluations, we see a benefit of our research for the current practice of uplift model evaluation.

2 Related literature

In this section, we will review the branches of literature which deal with the evaluation of uplift models. Thereby we deliberately leave out the vast literature dealing with building uplift models. A summary of all these many methods is, for example, provided by Gutierrez and Gérardy [2017] and Jacob [2021]. Our paper, starts when the model building process is already finished. We only deal with the question, how to best evaluate the model on the test set. There are three branches of literature, providing related ideas to our research: A small branch within the uplift modeling literature, which is concerned with evaluation metrics, a branch of literature about covariate adjustment for RCT's and the branch of econometric CATE estimation literature. We review these branches, highlight ideas related to our research and clarify where our research extends theirs.

In the uplift literature, the basic idea of the Qini curve is mostly attributed to Radcliffe [2007]. Many authors use slight modifications of the Qini curve for evaluation, but the basic idea remains unchanged [Devriendt et al., 2020]. As an alternative evaluation metric, the MSE_W is suggested by Gutierrez and Gérardy [2017] and Hitsch and Misra [2018]. All these studies have in common, that they introduce plausible metrics, and argue why a good model is expected to achieve good evaluations according to their metrics. In our terms, they showed that their metrics are unbiased. What they do not do is to analyze their metrics variances. A theoretical analysis of the uplift evaluation metrics in terms of variance (and bias) is provided by Saito et al. [2019] and Saito [2020]. The first paper focuses on the MSE_W and the second paper focuses on the Qini curve. Our paper differs from these two studies in that we consider the setting of an RCT instead of observational data. In consequence, our theoretical analysis is different and we can provide easier solutions with less assumptions. Another paper being related to ours is provided by Schuler and Shah [2018], who empirically compare uplift evaluation metrics in terms of model selection. However, they do not provide a theoretical analysis of the metric's variances.

Another branch related to our research is the literature about covariate adjustment for RCT's. The idea goes back to Fisher et al. [1925], who argued that by using covariates to build a statistical model for the outcome, some of the outcome's variance could be reduced and therefore the variance of the ATE estimate could also be reduced. In recent years, flexible covariate adjustment methods appeared in the literature including penalized regression [Bloniarz et al., 2016], weighted regression [Rubin and van der Laan, 2008] and machine learning [Wager et al., 2016]. This literature strongly relates to our research, as we also apply covariate adjustment methods to the outcome of RCT data. The difference is that we focus on improving uplift evaluation metrics and not overall ATE estimates (although we will see that segment wise ATE estimation is crucial for calculating the Qini curve).

Finally, the third related branch of literature is the econometric CATE estimation literature. This branch is related to our research because it applies some important methods for our research in another context: Different versions of the MSE_W , which is an evaluation metric in our context, are used for model fitting there [Athey and Imbens, 2016, Chernozhukov et al., 2018]. Thereby doubly-robust outcome transformation, which is strongly related to one of our suggested outcome adjustment methods, turns out to be particularly suited for model fitting. Strongly related to our idea of unbiased outcome adjustment is the idea of cross fitting [Chernozhukov et al., 2018] and honest trees [Wager and Athey, 2018], which refer to treatment effect estimation methods where models are build on one sub-sample and applied on another sub-sample to generate unbiased treatment effect estimates.

3 Evaluation of uplift models

In this paper we consider the following situation: An RCT was performed and data was split into a training and a test set. Uplift models $\hat{\tau}_x^{(1)}, \hat{\tau}_x^{(2)}, \dots$ were build on the training set and are to be evaluated on the test set. The treatment group W was assigned randomly with fixed probability p . The outcome is of the form

$$Y = \mu_x + W \cdot \tau_x + \varepsilon, \quad (1)$$

where μ_x is the conditional expectation of Y given X , τ_x is the CATE and ε is the noise which can not be explained by X .

The question to be answered is "How could we measure the performance of the models $\hat{\tau}_x^{(1)}, \hat{\tau}_x^{(2)}, \dots$?" Previous literature suggests either to evaluate the accuracy of model predictions $\hat{\tau}_x$ for the true τ_x or to evaluate how well a model can rank individuals according to τ_x [Gutierrez and Gérardy, 2017]. The literature also suggests how to calculate this performance on the test set. We refer to these performance calculations on a test set as "empirical evaluation metrics". Before we introduce the suggested empirical evaluation metrics, we will first analyze uplift model performance theoretically. This is important, because we will show that the empirical evaluation metrics always mean to estimate a theoretical performance measure, based on the test set. It will become clear that the bias is a systematical deviation of the empirical evaluation metrics from the theoretical performance measures and the variance is the random variation of the empirical evaluation metric's values due to noise in the test set.

In the next subsection, we will provide the theoretical performance measures, which the empirical evaluation metrics mean to estimate. After that, the next two subsections introduce the empirical evaluation metrics provided by the previous literature. Subsection 3.2 provides the empirical evaluation metric to assess the accuracy of model estimates $\hat{\tau}_x$ for the true τ_x . Subsection 3.3 provides the empirical evaluation metric to assess how well a model can rank individuals according to τ_x .

3.1 Theoretical uplift model performance

In this section we will discuss how to measure accuracy and ranking performance of uplift models theoretically. We start with accuracy: Here, previous literature already defines theoretical performance by the mean squared error

$$MSE(\hat{\tau}_x) = E[(\tau_x - \hat{\tau}_x)^2] \quad (2)$$

[Gutierrez and Gérardy, 2017, Hitsch and Misra, 2018]. Note that this performance measure only applies to uplift models, which yield CATE estimates.

For ranking performance, the situation is a bit more complicated, because previous literature mostly focuses on how to calculate the empirical metric on the test set, instead of reflecting what this measures theoretically. Most suggested empirical evaluation metrics go back to Radcliffe [2007], whose idea of ranking performance can be described by the following thought experiment: The model is provided a data set with individuals and their respective features. It is allowed to select a share s of these individuals, which get the treatment. The model should select these individuals such that the incremental gain (overall treatment effect) is maximized. A model which is good at ranking according to τ_x will be able to select the right individuals to achieve a high incremental gain. Based on this idea of performance, Radcliffe [2007] suggested the Qini curve, which shows estimates of this incremental gain, for each share s . Theoretically, we can express this incremental gain for each share s by

$$g_s(\hat{\tau}_x) = ATE_s(\hat{\tau}_x) \cdot N_W, \quad (3)$$

where $ATE_s(\hat{\tau}_x) := E[\tau_x]$ is the average treatment effect of the share s highest ranked individuals and N_W is the number of treated individuals within this share. Readers already familiar with the Qini curve, who feel unfamiliar with this theoretical expression, stay assured, that we will explain the relationship to the Qini curve in more detail in section 3.3 and Appendix C. We also suggest to look at figure 1, which shows the relationship between the theoretical performance measure and the Qini curve by Radcliffe [2007].

So, there are quite intuitive theoretical performance measures. But how to calculate them in practice? The problem is, that we do not observe τ_x in the test set. That is why we can not calculate $MSE(\hat{\tau}_x)$ and $ATE_s(\hat{\tau}_x)$ in practice. Instead, the literature suggests ways to estimate τ_x and use these estimates in the above definitions of the performance measures (2) and (3). It is this estimation of τ_x , where the variance creeps in the evaluation metrics. Instead of getting performance values (2) or (3), the obtained evaluation metrics are only estimates for them. These estimates vary a lot, depending on the observations in the test set.

In the next two sections, we will show how the evaluation metrics are calculated in practice. Thereby, we derive a simple mathematical expression for the variance in the evaluation metrics. Given this expression, it will be easy to see, that current uplift model evaluation practices suffer from unnecessarily high variance and how the variance of the metrics could be reduced.

3.2 Transformed outcome mean squared error

The transformed outcome mean squared error is an approach to evaluate uplift models according to the mean squared error loss defined in equation (2). Gutierrez and Gérardy [2017] and Hitsch and Misra [2018] suggest to replace τ_x by the transformed outcome $W^p Y$, where W^p is the *Horvitz-Thompson transformation*, defined by

$$W^p := \frac{W}{p} - \frac{1-W}{1-p}. \quad (4)$$

We denote the resulting *transformed outcome mean squared error* by

$$MSE_W(\hat{\tau}) := \frac{1}{N} \sum (W^p Y_i - \hat{\tau}_{x_i})^2. \quad (5)$$

In previous literature, this metric is applied to evaluate model predictions on RCT data [Hitsch and Misra, 2018, Haupt and Lessmann, 2022, Athey and Imbens, 2016]. For observational data, the same metric could be applied, with the only difference that the constant p in W^p , needs to be replaced by a propensity score $\hat{p}(x_i)$, estimating the treatment probability of each individual i .

Qini curve and theoretical performance measure




Figure 1: Theoretical ranking performance against the empirically calculated Qini curve. The left plot shows the theoretical performance $ATE_s \cdot N_W$ in comparison to the Qini curve calculated on a single simulated test set according to setting "nw" in section 5.3. The right plot shows the same, only for 100 simulated test sets. The dashed lines represent the highest/lowest 2.5-percentile of Qini curves at each point.

Now, let us analyze the expected value and variance of $MSE_W(\hat{\tau})$. For the expected value, it is useful to analyze the difference in MSE_W between two uplift models, because the expected value of the MSE_W for a single model entails some hard to interpret expressions, which would rather confuse our discussion [Gutierrez and Gérardy, 2017]. In Appendix A.1, we derive that the expected value of the difference in MSE_W between two models is given by

$$E[MSE_W^{\hat{\Phi}}(\hat{\tau}_x^{(1)}) - MSE_W^{\hat{\Phi}}(\hat{\tau}_x^{(2)})] = E[(\tau_x - \hat{\tau}_x^{(1)})^2] - E[(\tau_x - \hat{\tau}_x^{(2)})^2]. \quad (6)$$

This result is reassuring, as it shows that the evaluation is unbiased. In expected value, the difference in MSE_W is the difference in the theoretical MSE from equation (2). To give an illustration what this means, we imagine an infinitely large test set. The difference in MSE_W calculated on this test set would exactly correspond to the difference in MSE. This is exactly what we want.

In reality, however, the test set is never infinitely large. Accordingly, the difference in MSE_W will not exactly correspond to the difference in MSE , but rather vary around this value, depending on the test set sample. This is why in Appendix A.1, we analyze the variance of the difference in MSE_W . Since this analysis is quite complex, we rather present only the essence of our analysis here. The important result is that the variance of the difference in MSE_W depends on the variance of the transformed outcome $W^p Y$ and certain irreducible components. Using the law of total variance, the variance of the transformed outcome can be decomposed to

$$Var[W^p Y] = E[Var[W^p Y|W]] + Var[E[W^p Y|W]]. \quad (7)$$

Any methods striving for a variance reduction of the MSE_W thus need to reduce the two components on the right side of the above equation.

We close this section by providing some intuition about this result. The idea behind the MSE_W is to replace the true CATE τ_x by an unbiased estimator - the transformed outcome $W^p Y$. This transformed outcome varies around τ_x and this variance translates into the variance of the MSE_W . So, it is intuitive that any potentially reducible variance in the MSE_W is due to the variance of $W^p Y$.

3.3 Qini curve

The Qini curve is an approach to empirically evaluate uplift models on the test set, according to their ranking abilities. It was first suggested by Radcliffe [2007]. Since then, many slight variations of this approach appeared in the literature [Devriendt et al., 2020]. There are also other names like "uplift curve", which more or less refer to the same metric. In the following, we will limit the analysis to the Qini curve suggested by Radcliffe [2007]. However, the results of our analysis can also be transferred to the other versions of this evaluation principle. In Appendix C, we will discuss these other metrics in more detail.

For his Qini curve, Radcliffe [2007] measures for each share s of highest ranked individuals, by how much the outcome increased due to the treatment. He calls this the "incremental gain" and calculates it by

$$u_s = \sum Y_i|_{W=1} - \frac{N_W}{N_{\bar{W}}} \sum Y_i|_{W=0},$$

where N_W is the number of treated individuals within the share s , of the highest ranked individuals in the test set and $N_{\bar{W}}$ is the number of untreated individuals within the share s , of the highest ranked individuals in the test set. $Y_i|_{W=1}$ and $Y_i|_{W=0}$ refer to the outcomes of the treated respectively untreated individuals. The Qini curve is then just a plot of u_s for selected shares s .

To see how this Qini curve relates to the theoretical performance measure of equation (3), we write down an empirical estimator of the average treatment effect for the share s highest ranked individuals

$$\hat{ATE}_s(\hat{\tau}_x) = \frac{1}{N_W} \sum Y_i|_{W=1} - \frac{1}{N_{\bar{W}}} \sum Y_i|_{W=0}. \quad (8)$$

We note, that the qini curve u_s can then be written as

$$u_s = \hat{ATE}_s(\hat{\tau}_x) \cdot N_W$$

So, the Qini curve calculated on the test set can be seen as an estimate for the theoretical ranking performance $ATE_s \cdot N_W$. What does this mean? This means, depending on the observations sampled into the test set, the calculated Qini curve varies around the theoretical ranking performance. This is illustrated in figure 1. Like any other (unbiased) estimator, the Qini curve will converge against the theoretical ranking performance with growing test set sample size. For a finite sample size, the variation of the Qini curve around the theoretical ranking performance harms the quality of model evaluations, because the performance could be misjudged, simply due to sampling of the test set.

So, it is worth to discuss bias and variance of the Qini curve. For these statistical properties, the factor N_W in the Qini curve is irrelevant. It is sufficient to examine the bias and variance of $\hat{ATE}_s(\hat{\tau}_x)$ as an estimator for $ATE_s(\tau_x)$. From the definition of $\hat{ATE}_s(\hat{\tau}_x)$, as the difference in sample means, it is clear that $\hat{ATE}_s(\hat{\tau}_x)$ is unbiased (see Appendix A.2), that is

$$E[\hat{ATE}_s(\hat{\tau}_x)] = E[\tau_x], \quad (9)$$

where τ_x belongs to the individuals in the highest ranked share s . For the variance we derive in Appendix A.2

$$Var[\hat{ATE}_s(\hat{\tau}_x)] = \frac{1}{N} E[Var[W^{\tilde{p}} Y | W]],$$

where the outcome Y on the right side of the equation belongs to the share s of highest ranked individuals. What is important here is that the metrics variance depends on $E[Var[W^{\tilde{p}} Y | W]]$. This is one of the two variance components of $Var[W^p Y]$ in equation (7), only with $\tilde{p}$ being the fraction of treated within the share s , instead of the treatment probability p in the RCT.

4 Metric variance reduction by outcome adjustment

4.1 The principle of variance reduction

In our analysis of the uplift evaluation metrics, we found that their variance depends on the variance of $W^p Y$. Accordingly, it is worthwhile to analyze the variance of $W^p Y$ in detail in find out whether it could be reduced. For this

purpose, it is useful to write W^pY in the following form

$$W^pY = \tau_x + W^p\Phi(X) + W^p\varepsilon, \quad (10)$$

where $\Phi(X) := \mu_x + (1 - p)\tau_x$ is called the *nuisance function* in the following. Given this equation, we can easily explain the idea of variance reduction: The purpose of W^pY in the evaluation metrics is always to replace the unobservable τ_x . Everything except τ_x on the right side of equation (10) only causes variance of W^pY around τ_x , and this variance will creep into the evaluation metrics. Hence, it would be ideal to remove $W^p\Phi(X)$ and $W^p\varepsilon$. $W^p\varepsilon$ is irreducible, because it is due to the unexplainable noise. But if we could remove $W^p\Phi(X)$, this would already lead to a reduction of variance. The idea behind outcome adjustment is simply to train a supervised learning model $\hat{\Phi}(X)$ for the nuisance function $\Phi(X)$ on the training data and adjust the outcome to $Y - \hat{\Phi}(X)$ on the test data. Then the reducible noise component becomes $W^p(\Phi(X) - \hat{\Phi}(X))$. In the following, we examine under which conditions such an outcome adjustment leads to a variance reduction of W^pY and thereby of the evaluation metrics.

First, we want to examine in more detail how the nuisance function $\Phi(X)$ affects the variance of the uplift evaluation metrics. Remember that the variance of W^pY can be decomposed in two components (see equation (7)). In Appendix B.1, we derive the following equations for these components

$$E[Var[W^pY|W]] = Var[\tau_x] + \frac{Var[\Phi(X)] + Var[\varepsilon]}{p(1-p)} \text{ and} \quad (11)$$

$$Var[E[W^pY|W]] = \frac{E[\Phi(X)]^2}{p(1-p)}. \quad (12)$$

These equations clearly show how the nuisance function affects the variance components of W^pY . In section 3.2, we have seen that both components determine the variance of the MSE_W . In section 3.3, we have seen that only the first component affects the Qini curve. This leads to the following conditions for variance reduction of the evaluation metrics: If an adjustment function $\hat{\Phi}(X)$ fulfills

$$|E[\Phi(X)] - E[\hat{\Phi}(X)]| < |E[\Phi(X)]|, \quad (C1)$$

this leads to a variance reduction of the MSE_W . If the adjustment function further fulfills

$$Var[\Phi(X) - \hat{\Phi}(X)] < Var[\Phi(X)], \quad (C2)$$

this leads to further variance reduction of the MSE_W and additionally reduces the variance of the Qini curve. The conditions (C1) and (C2) lead directly to plausible choices of adjustment functions $\hat{\Phi}(X)$.

4.2 Outcome adjustment methods

In this section, we will provide adjustment methods, which are to fulfill conditions (C1) and (C2) and thereby reduce the variance of the evaluation metrics. We start with condition (C1). This condition is already fulfilled if we construct a suitable estimate of $E[\Phi(X)]$. Using the outcome representation (1), we can verify that

$$E[\Phi(X)] = (1 - p)E[Y|W = 1] + pE[Y|W = 0].$$

So, an easy choice for an adjustment function would be the *unconditional mean adjustment*

$$\hat{\Phi}^{uc}(X) := (1 - p)\hat{\mu}_1 + p\hat{\mu}_0, \quad (AM1)$$

where $\hat{\mu}_1, \hat{\mu}_0$ are respectively the sample averages of the treated and untreated in the training set. Note that the unconditional mean adjustment is constant in X . This is why it has no effect on condition (C2). So, using this adjustment method, the variance of the Qini curve remains unaffected.

Next, we examine how an adjustment method could fulfill condition (C2). Again, we can use the outcome representation (1) to verify that

$$\Phi(X) = (1 - p)E[Y|W = 1, X] + pE[Y|W = 0, X].$$

The conditional expected values on the right hand side are the targets of supervised learning models for the outcome of the treated respectively untreated individuals. So, a natural choice for the adjustment function would be

$$\hat{\Phi}^{DR}(X) := (1 - p) \cdot \hat{\mu}_1(x) + p \cdot \hat{\mu}_0(x), \quad (AM2)$$

where $\hat{\mu}_1(x), \hat{\mu}_0(x)$ are supervised learning models trained on the treated respectively untreated individuals in the training set. We call this method *doubly-robust adjustment*, because we can show that $W^p(Y - \hat{\Phi}^{DR}(X))$ corresponds

to the famous doubly robust outcome transformation [Van der Laan and Robins, 2003] adapted to RCT data (that means p is a fixed value instead of a propensity score). In the most common RCT case, where $p = 0.5$, another adjustment method is plausible. This is because in this case

$$\Phi(X) = E[Y|X].$$

This makes *conditional outcome adjustment* a plausible method. The adjustment function is given by

$$\hat{\Phi}^c(X) := \hat{\mu}(x), \quad (\text{AM3})$$

with $\hat{\mu}(x)$ being a supervised learning model trained on the whole training data (treated and untreated individuals combined).

4.3 Practical impact of the adjustment methods

In the previous sections, we derived adjustment methods from theoretical results, regarding the variance of uplift evaluation methods. Now, we want to analyze what is expected to happen, if we apply them in practice. Specifically, we will deal with three questions: *Can outcome adjustment bias uplift evaluation metrics? Do they always reduce the metrics variance or is it possible, that they could even increase it? By how much do they actually decrease the variance?*

We start with the bias. Interestingly, the adjustment methods can not cause a bias in the evaluation metrics, simply because the adjustment functions $\hat{\Phi}(X)$ are fitted on the training set and not on the test set, where they are used for adjustment. On the test set, $\hat{\Phi}(X)$ is just a fixed function. In consequence, the outcome in equation (1) becomes

$$Y - \hat{\Phi}(X) = \bar{\mu}_x + W \cdot \tau_x + \varepsilon$$

with $\bar{\mu}_x = \mu_x - \hat{\Phi}(X)$. In the equations (6) and (9) for the expected value of the MSE_W and the Qini curve, the conditional expected value μ_x of the outcome does not appear. Accordingly, these expected values are unaffected by the shift in conditional expected value to $\bar{\mu}_x$. Hence, the metrics remain unbiased by outcome adjustment. We highlight that this only works, if the adjustment functions are not trained on the test set. The same principle of unbiasedness by doing model training and effect estimation on different data sets applies in previous literature about CATE model training under the name "cross fitting" [Chernozhukov et al., 2018] or "honest trees" [Wager and Athey, 2018].

Now, we discuss whether outcome adjustment always leads to variance reduction. This is equivalent to discussing whether conditions (C1) and (C2) always hold for the suggested adjustment methods. In Appendix B.2, we provide a theoretical argument why it is almost impossible for the adjustment methods to fail condition (C1), unless $E[\Phi(X)]$ is almost zero or the supervised learning models for the adjustment functions are fitted extremely poorly. Regarding condition (C2), we already noted that unconditional mean adjustment has no effect there. For the doubly-robust and the conditional mean adjustment, we show that condition (C2) is fulfilled, if their adjustment functions approximate $\Phi(X)$ better than a naive model ($\hat{\Phi}(X) = E[\Phi(X)]$). So, if the underlying supervised learning models of the adjustment methods are not fitted very poorly, condition (C2) holds. In summary, if the training of the adjustment functions is done properly, there will, except for very special settings ($E[\Phi(X)] \approx 0$ and $Var[\Phi(X)] \approx 0$), be a reduction of the metrics variance. However, it is not yet clear by how much this variance reduction is.

Finally, we come to the third question about the magnitude of the variance reduction. In the above paragraph we used the fact that a reduction in $E[\Phi(X)]^2$ or $Var[\Phi(X)]$ inevitably leads to a variance reduction of the error metrics. But to judge the magnitude of this variance reduction, we need to consider the reducible noise components in the context of the irreducible noise components. Using equations (11) and (12), we could exactly derive the magnitude of variance reduction in dependence of the irreducible noise components $Var[\tau_x]$ and $Var[\varepsilon]$. However, for practical considerations this would be of limited use. Applicants do not know $Var[\tau_x]$ and $Var[\varepsilon]$ and could therefore not use such results to find out whether our adjustment methods improve their uplift model evaluations. Hence, it is more useful to derive some other measures for the impact of the adjustment methods. To do so, we recap from section 3.2 and 3.3, that the variance of the MSE_W depends on the $Var[W^p Y]$, while the variance of the Qini curve depends on $Var[W^{\tilde{p}} Y]$, with $\tilde{p}$ the fraction of the treated within the share s of the highest ranked individuals. Using these facts, we can define impact measures

$$\mathbb{V}^p(\hat{\Phi}) := 1 - \frac{Var[W^p(Y - \hat{\Phi}(X))]}{Var[W^p Y]} \quad \text{and} \quad (13)$$

$$\mathbb{V}_s^{\tilde{p}}(\hat{\Phi}) := 1 - \frac{Var[W^{\tilde{p}}(Y - \hat{\Phi}(X))]}{Var[W^{\tilde{p}} Y]}. \quad (14)$$

We call $\mathbb{V}^p(\hat{\Phi})$ the *share of explained variance for the MSE_W* and $\mathbb{V}_s^{\tilde{p}}(\hat{\Phi})$ the *share of explained variance for the Qini curve*. If these values are close to 1, almost the whole variance of the error metrics is removed. If they are close to 0,

almost non of the variance is removed. If they are negative, the variance is increased. Certainly, these measures of the explained variance are also unknown to the applicants, but they can easily be estimated. Applicants can simply calculate the empirical variance in the nominator and denominator of these two equations and thereby judge the impact outcome adjustment has for their application. If these measures of explained variance happen to be negative, then the adjustment should not be used. In this way, any potential harm to the quality of model evaluations can be prevented. The most likely reason for such a result is severe overfitting of the supervised learning models for the adjustment method.

5 Empirical analysis

In this section, we empirically analyze how well the MSE_W and the Qini curve can evaluate uplift models. We further assess whether the outcome adjustment methods from section 4.2 improve this quality. But first, we describe the uplift models, which we evaluate and the supervised learning models, which we use for outcome adjustment. Then, we reflect on how to measure "the quality of model evaluations". Finally, we describe our simulation in detail and provide the results.

5.1 Models for uplift and outcome adjustment

The actual choice of an uplift to evaluate is of little importance for the simulation. We do not want to find out which uplift modeling method is the best, but rather how to reliably evaluate an uplift model (no matter which). The only point to consider was that the MSE_W is only applicable to a model which yields CATE predictions. This is why we choose a causal random forest $\hat{\tau}_x^{CF}$ [Athey et al., 2019]. As tuning parameters we fixed 1.000 trees and the default tuning parameters, in the *causal_forest*-function [Tibshirani et al., 2022]. As it was not necessary for our research question to fit the best model, parameter tuning was not necessary.

To enable outcome adjustment, we further needed to fit supervised learning models $\hat{\mu}(x)$, $\hat{\mu}_0(x)$ and $\hat{\mu}_1(x)$ (see section 4.2). Here, we just applied random forest [Breiman, 2001]. We applied the *ranger*-function from the ranger package in R [Wright and Ziegler, 2017].

5.2 The quality of model evaluations

For the Qini curve, we measured how much it deviates from the theoretical ranking performance. Therefore, we simulated 10.000 test sets and on each of these test sets, we calculated the Qini curve. Just like in figure 1, the 10.000 Qini curves vary around the theoretical ranking performance. Given the representation from section 3.3, this means we analyze the variation of $u_s = \hat{ATE}_s \cdot N_w$ around $g_s = ATE_s \cdot N_w$. Because N_w is unrelated to the statistical properties, it is sufficient to analyze the variation of $\hat{ATE}_s$ around ATE_s . Since $\hat{ATE}_s$ is unbiased, we can simply measure its standard deviation in the 10.000 simulation runs. The quality of the model evaluation can thus be measured by the standard deviation of $\hat{ATE}_s$ at each share s . The higher the standard deviation, the more arbitrary a model evaluation is. To enable a concise presentation of the results, we only examine the standard deviation at the point $s = 0.1$. We visualize the distribution of $\hat{ATE}_{0.1}$ in figure 2. As we can see there, it is very straight forward to compare $\hat{ATE}_{0.1}$ based on the original outcome with $\hat{ATE}_{0.1}$ based on the adjusted outcome. The expected value remains unchanged by the outcome adjustment, only the standard deviation changes. This is why we can see the quality increase due to outcome adjustment simply by the narrower densities.

For the MSE_W , measuring the quality of model evaluation is not so straight forward. This is because the expected value of MSE_W changes by outcome adjustment. To assess the quality of this empirical evaluation metric, we rather consider differences

$$\Delta MSE_W(\hat{\tau}_x^{(1)}, \hat{\tau}_x^{(1)}) = MSE_W(\hat{\tau}_x^{(1)}) - MSE_W(\hat{\tau}_x^{(2)}).$$

These differences represent a comparison between $\hat{\tau}_x^{(1)}$ and $\hat{\tau}_x^{(2)}$. We evaluate the quality of the MSE_W by the quality of these comparisons in the following way: in addition to our causal random forest uplift model $\hat{\tau}_x^{CF}$, we generate three more models which are, by design, better or worse than $\hat{\tau}_x^{CF}$. The first competitor uplift model is the perfect model, which always yield the true CATE τ_x . This model obviously provides more accurate CATE estimates than $\hat{\tau}_x^{CF}$. The second competitor model is the trivial model $\hat{\tau}_x^{triv} = 0$. If training $\hat{\tau}_x^{CF}$ does not completely fail, $\hat{\tau}_x^{CF}$ is more accurate then $\hat{\tau}_x^{triv} = 0$. The third competitor uplift model is the original causal random forest with some added noise $\hat{\tau}_x^{worse} \sim N(\hat{\tau}_x^{CF}, 0.01\sigma_{CF}^2)$, where σ_{CF} is the standard deviation in the predictions of $\hat{\tau}_x^{CF}$. $\hat{\tau}_x^{worse}$ is by design less accurate then $\hat{\tau}_x^{CF}$. We call an evaluation "misleading", if $\Delta MSE_W(\hat{\tau}_x^{CF}, \hat{\tau}_x)$ is negative for the optimal model, positive for the trivial model or positive for the noise-added model $\hat{\tau}_x^{worse}$. We measure the quality of model evaluations by the share of misleading evaluations within the 10.000 simulation runs. In addition, we visualize the distribution

of $MSE_W(\hat{\tau}_x^{CF}, \hat{\tau}_x)$ for the original and the adjusted outcomes in figures 3, 4, 5. Because the expected value of $MSE_W(\hat{\tau}_x^{CF}, \hat{\tau}_x)$ is unaffected by outcome transformation, the quality improvement due to outcome adjustment can simply be seen by the narrower densities around the value $E[(\tau_x - \hat{\tau}_x^{CF})^2] - E[(\tau_x - \hat{\tau}_x)^2]$, which is marked by a red line.

5.3 Simulated data

In each of the 10.000 simulation runs, we generated 15.000 samples as a data set and used 10.000 observations for training and 5.000 observations for evaluating the models. To generate the data, we choose simulated data from various previously published studies in uplift modeling. We used the R function "generate_causal_data" from the causal random forest package and generated all possible RCT settings supported by this function [Tibshirani et al., 2022]. In this way, we assured that we create synthetic data without customizing it to the results we want to prove. Each of the settings simulates the features X_i and the treatment group $W \sim \text{Bern}(0.5)$, as well as the outcome of the form

$$Y = \mu_x + W\tau_x + \varepsilon,$$

where $\varepsilon \sim N(0, \sigma^2)$. We always used 6 features X , because this is the minimum number of features required to generate data for setting "ai". We choose three different values of the error standard deviation $\sigma \in \{0.5, 1, 2\}$.

The first setting is taken from [Athey and Imbens, 2016] and denoted by "ai". Its simulation parameters are

$$\begin{aligned}\mu_x &= \frac{1}{2}(X_1 - \mathbb{1}_{X_1 > 0} + X_2 - \mathbb{1}_{X_2 > 0}) + \sum_{i=3}^6 X_i \\ \tau_x &= \mathbb{1}_{X_1 > 0} + \mathbb{1}_{X_2 > 0} \\ X_i &\sim N(0, 1).\end{aligned}$$

The second setting is taken from [Wager and Athey, 2018] and denoted by "aw". Its simulation parameters are

$$\begin{aligned}\mu_x &= 0 \\ \tau_x &= (1 + \frac{1}{1 + e^{-20(X_1 - 1/3)}})(1 + \frac{1}{1 + e^{-20(X_2 - 1/3)}}) \\ X_i &\sim U(0, 1).\end{aligned}$$

The third setting is taken from [Nie and Wager, 2021] and denoted by "nw". Its simulation parameters are

$$\begin{aligned}\mu_x &= \frac{3}{1 + \exp(X_3 - X_2)} - \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{1 + \exp(X_1 - X_2)} \\ \tau_x &= \frac{1}{1 + \exp(X_1 - X_2)} \\ X_i &\sim N(0, 1).\end{aligned}$$

5.4 Results

The results for the $\hat{ATE}_{0.1}$, as a representation of the Qini curve, are provided in figure 2 and table 1. We evaluated the $\hat{ATE}_{0.1}$ for the original outcome as well as for the conditional mean adjusted and doubly-robust adjusted outcome. We did not evaluate the unconditional mean adjustment because it has no effect on the Qini curve (constants cancel out when calculating differences of means). We can see that the conditional mean adjustment and doubly-robust adjustment leads in each setting to a reduction of the standard deviation from $\hat{ATE}_{0.1}$. So, the outcome adjustment methods lead to a reduction of the Qini curve's variance. The difference between the conditional mean adjustment and the doubly-robust adjustment is rather marginal, although the doubly-robust adjustment seems to have a slight edge. Overall, the variance reduction is of different magnitude for the different simulation settings. In some settings, like "nw" with $\sigma = 0.5$, the standard deviation shrinks by a half, which means that confidence intervals would also be half as wide as for the original outcome. In other settings, like "aw" with $\sigma = 0.5$, there is no significant variance reduction. We can see that the magnitude of variance reduction depends strongly on the share of explained variance $\hat{V}_s^{\hat{P}}(\hat{\Phi}^c)$ respectively $\hat{V}_s^{\hat{P}}(\hat{\Phi}^{dr})$. Hence, an applicant can calculate these values in practice and thereby assess whether it is worth to perform outcome adjustment before evaluating an uplift model. Overall, the results are perfectly in line with our theory of metric variance reduction due to outcome adjustment.

For the MSE_W , we see the original outcome again outperformed by all the adjustment methods in each setting (see table 2 and figures 3, 4, 5). In many cases, the performance differences are significant: E.g. in setting "ai" with $\sigma = 0.5$, the transformed outcome MSE with the original outcome wrongly evaluates the causal forest predictions better than the true CATE τ_x in 39.6% of all times. In contrast, such misleading evaluations only happen in 8.1% of the times for the unconditional mean adjustment and almost never for the other two adjustment methods. Conditional mean adjustment and doubly-robust adjustment perform better than unconditional mean adjustment in each setting. Often, like for "nw" with $\sigma = 1$, the difference in evaluation quality is significant. Like for the MSE_W , the difference between conditional mean adjustment and doubly-robust adjustment is quite small with a slight edge for the doubly-robust adjustment. Overall, the simulation results confirm our theory of metric variance reduction due to outcome adjustment.




Figure 2: Density of estimators for $ATE_{0.1}(\hat{\tau}_x)$ by causal random forest. For the pictures in the left column, the noise standard deviation was set to $\sigma = 0.5$, for the middle column to $\sigma = 1$ and for the right column to $\sigma = 2$.

Table 1: Results for Qini curve

Setting	σ	$\hat{V}_s^{\hat{p}}(\hat{\Phi}^c)$	$\hat{V}_s^{\hat{p}}(\hat{\Phi}^{dr})$	orig	cond	dr
"ai"	0.5	0.463	0.538	0.069	0.051	0.047
"ai"	1	0.160	0.250	0.108	0.099	0.093
"ai"	2	0.086	0.155	0.203	0.194	0.186
"aw"	0.5	0.114	0.128	0.048	0.046	0.045
"aw"	1	0.303	0.310	0.108	0.090	0.090
"aw"	2	0.144	0.153	0.197	0.182	0.181
"nw"	0.5	0.714	0.690	0.100	0.053	0.055
"nw"	1	0.476	0.470	0.128	0.093	0.093
"nw"	2	0.151	0.161	0.198	0.180	0.179

The table shows the standard deviations of the estimates for $ATE_{0.1}(\hat{\tau}_x)$, where $\hat{\tau}_x$ is the causal random forest. The ATE estimates were calculated by the original outcomes, the conditional mean adjusted and the doubly-robust adjusted outcomes. $\hat{V}_s^{\hat{p}}(\hat{\Phi}^c)$ and $\hat{V}_s^{\hat{p}}(\hat{\Phi}^{dr})$ are estimates of the share of explained variance in equation (14).




Figure 3: Results for the MSE_W in the setting "ai". The plots show the density of differences in MSE between causal random forest $\hat{\tau}_x^{CF}$ and optimal predictions τ_x (first row), trivial predictions $\hat{\tau}_x^{triv}$ (second row) and causal random forest predictions with added noise $\hat{\tau}_x^{worse}$ (third row). The considered setting is "ai". For the pictures in the left column, the noise standard deviation was set to $\sigma = 0.5$, for the middle column to $\sigma = 1$ and for the right column to $\sigma = 2$.




Figure 4: Results for the MSE_W in the setting "aw". The plots show the density of differences in MSE between causal random forest $\hat{\tau}_x^{CF}$ and optimal predictions τ_x (first row), trivial predictions $\hat{\tau}_x^{triv}$ (second row) and causal random forest predictions with added noise $\hat{\tau}_x^{worse}$ (third row). The considered setting is "ai". For the pictures in the left column, the noise standard deviation was set to $\sigma = 0.5$, for the middle column to $\sigma = 1$ and for the right column to $\sigma = 2$.




Figure 5: Results for the MSE_W in the setting "nw". The plots show the density of differences in MSE between causal random forest $\hat{\tau}_x^{CF}$ and optimal predictions τ_x (first row), trivial predictions $\hat{\tau}_x^{triv}$ (second row) and causal random forest predictions with added noise $\hat{\tau}_x^{worse}$ (third row). The considered setting is "ai". For the pictures in the left column, the noise standard deviation was set to $\sigma = 0.5$, for the middle column to $\sigma = 1$ and for the right column to $\sigma = 2$.

6 Conclusion

In this paper, we showed that the statistical properties of the uplift evaluation metrics depend on the variance of the transformed outcome $W^p Y$. We showed that by fitting appropriate models $\hat{\Phi}(X)$ on the training set and adjusting the outcome on the test set to $Y - \hat{\Phi}(X)$, the variance of the transformed outcome can be reduced. We showed that doing so leaves evaluation metrics unbiased and reduces their variance. This reduced variance leads to a more reliable evaluation of models according to the MSE_W and also according to the Qini curve. We showed for example, that there are far less misleading model comparisons by the MSE_W , if the outcome gets adjusted.

We described three possible outcome adjustment techniques, which we derived from the theoretical analysis. The unconditional mean adjustment leads to a reduction of variance for the MSE_W , but leaves the Qini curve unaffected. The conditional mean adjustment and the doubly-robust adjustment reduce the variance of the MSE_W as well as the Qini curve. In all considered empirical settings, the conditional mean adjustment and the doubly-robust adjustment reduced the variance of the metrics more than the unconditional outcome adjustment.

For practical applications, we suggest to never use the MSE_W with the original outcome. The results of our empirical analysis indicate that conclusions based on the MSE_W with the original outcome could be severely misleading. Our theoretical analysis and empirical results clearly show that it is generally better to use adjusted outcomes. The easiest adjustment method is unconditional mean adjustment, because it does not even require to fit a supervised learning model. But as we have seen, it is mostly worth to use conditional mean adjustment and doubly-robust adjustment. One way to judge the impact of the outcome adjustment methods is to calculate the share of explained variance for the MSE_W and the Qini curve.

In this paper, we focused on the MSE_W and the Qini curve as empirical uplift evaluation metrics. In the Appendix, we also summarised the other metrics, which appear in the uplift literature. We theoretically showed that the principle of variance reduction by outcome adjustment also applies there. In fact, we have barely seen a way of uplift model evaluation, which would not be improved by outcome adjustment. However, the magnitude of improvement depends on the concrete data set.

Finally, we hope that our theoretical analysis broadens the understanding of uplift evaluation metrics. Currently, ranking evaluation procedures in the uplift literature can be slightly confusing, due to the various ways how Qini, uplift or other ranking properties are calculated. Following our analysis, actually all these metrics revolve around the estimation of ATE_s . The many versions of Qini or uplift curves are all just (statistically more or less suitable) estimators for ATE_s ,

Table 2: Results for MSE_W

Setting	$\hat{\tau}_x'$	σ	orig	cond	uncond	dr
"ai"	τ_x	0.5	39.6	0.2	8.1	0.1
"ai"	τ_x	1	26.4	0.0	0.5	0.0
"ai"	τ_x	2	12.3	0.0	0.1	0.0
"ai"	$\hat{\tau}_x^{triv}$	0.5	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
"ai"	$\hat{\tau}_x^{triv}$	1	9.2	0.0	0.0	0.0
"ai"	$\hat{\tau}_x^{triv}$	2	24.7	1.9	2.1	1.5
"ai"	$\hat{\tau}_x^{worse}$	0.5	48.0	33.6	41.6	32.6
"ai"	$\hat{\tau}_x^{worse}$	1	46.9	33.6	36.8	32.8
"ai"	$\hat{\tau}_x^{worse}$	2	44.8	36.7	37.2	36.0
"aw"	τ_x	0.5	39.3	4.5	23.6	4.4
"aw"	τ_x	1	32.9	9.0	17.3	8.7
"aw"	τ_x	2	25.1	9.4	11.2	9.2
"aw"	$\hat{\tau}_x^{triv}$	0.5	6.1	0.0	0.0	0.0
"aw"	$\hat{\tau}_x^{triv}$	1	7.6	0.0	0.0	0.0
"aw"	$\hat{\tau}_x^{triv}$	2	9.9	0.7	1.3	0.7
"aw"	$\hat{\tau}_x^{worse}$	0.5	48.6	39.0	44.7	38.8
"aw"	$\hat{\tau}_x^{worse}$	1	47.7	43.6	45.4	43.4
"aw"	$\hat{\tau}_x^{worse}$	2	48.5	46.4	46.6	46.4
"nw"	τ_x	0.5	33.8	5.6	26.1	6.6
"nw"	τ_x	1	26.4	8.0	19.6	8.2
"nw"	τ_x	2	15.9	10.7	13.0	10.7
"nw"	$\hat{\tau}_x^{triv}$	0.5	16.8	0.0	7.0	0.0
"nw"	$\hat{\tau}_x^{triv}$	1	28.5	11.9	20.8	11.8
"nw"	$\hat{\tau}_x^{triv}$	2	56.9	40.8	41.7	40.8
"nw"	$\hat{\tau}_x^{worse}$	0.5	46.3	38.8	44.7	38.9
"nw"	$\hat{\tau}_x^{worse}$	1	46.7	43.8	44.8	43.7
"nw"	$\hat{\tau}_x^{worse}$	2	45.6	44.4	44.9	44.2

The table shows the percentage of misleading evaluations, that is the share of simulation runs, where the MSE for $\hat{\tau}_x^{CF}$ was lower than the MSE for τ_x , higher then for $\hat{\tau}_x^{triv}$ or higher than for $\hat{\tau}_x^{worse}$.

multiplied by different values which have nothing to do with model performance (e.g. number of treated individuals in the test set). The uplift literature would strongly profit from introducing standard procedures for model evaluation. We hope that with our paper, we can make a contribution towards this goal.

A Derivation of the metric distributions

A.1 Derivation of the transformed mean squared error distribution

Given the outcome representation in equation (1), we can write the transformed outcome as

$$W^p Y = \tau_x + \zeta,$$

with $\zeta := W^p(\mu_x + (1 - p)\tau_x) + W^p\varepsilon$. The difference in squared deviation from $W^p Y$ between two estimators $\hat{\tau}_x^{(1)}, \hat{\tau}_x^{(2)}$ then becomes

$$\begin{aligned} (W^p Y - \hat{\tau}_x^{(1)})^2 - (W^p Y - \hat{\tau}_x^{(2)})^2 &= (\tau_x + \zeta - \hat{\tau}_x^{(1)})^2 - (\tau_x + \zeta - \hat{\tau}_x^{(2)})^2 \\ &= (\tau_x - \hat{\tau}_x^{(1)})^2 - (\tau_x - \hat{\tau}_x^{(2)})^2 + 2\zeta(\hat{\tau}_x^{(2)} - \hat{\tau}_x^{(1)}). \end{aligned}$$

Using the fact that $E[\zeta|X] = 0$ and $\hat{\tau}_x^{(1)}, \hat{\tau}_x^{(2)}, \tau_x$ are functions in X , we can see that

$$\begin{aligned} E[(W^p Y - \hat{\tau}_x^{(1)})^2 - (W^p Y - \hat{\tau}_x^{(2)})^2 | X] &= (\tau_x - \hat{\tau}_x^{(1)})^2 - (\tau_x - \hat{\tau}_x^{(2)})^2 \text{ and} \\ Var[(W^p Y - \hat{\tau}_x^{(1)})^2 - (W^p Y - \hat{\tau}_x^{(2)})^2 | X] &= 4(\hat{\tau}_x^{(2)} - \hat{\tau}_x^{(1)})^2 Var[\zeta | X]. \end{aligned}$$

In this way, we can derive equations for the expected value and variance of the MSE_W . We denote the difference in MSE_W by $\Delta MSE_W(\hat{\tau}_x^{(1)}, \hat{\tau}_x^{(2)}) := MSE_W(\hat{\tau}_x^{(1)}) - MSE_W(\hat{\tau}_x^{(2)})$. Note that the MSE_W is an average of N squared deviations of the estimators from $W^p Y$. The above equations then become

$$E[\Delta MSE_W(\hat{\tau}_x^{(1)}, \hat{\tau}_x^{(2)})|X] = (\tau_x - \hat{\tau}_x^{(1)})^2 - (\tau_x - \hat{\tau}_x^{(2)})^2 \text{ and} \quad (15)$$

$$Var[\Delta MSE_W(\hat{\tau}_x^{(1)}, \hat{\tau}_x^{(2)})|X] = \frac{4(\hat{\tau}_x^{(2)} - \hat{\tau}_x^{(1)})^2}{N} Var[\zeta|X]. \quad (16)$$

Equation (15) shows that MSE_W is unbiased. Now, we examine the variance. Given the law of total variance we obtain

$$Var[\Delta MSE_W(\hat{\tau}_x^{(1)}, \hat{\tau}_x^{(2)})] = E[Var[\Delta MSE_W(\hat{\tau}_x^{(1)}, \hat{\tau}_x^{(2)})|X]] + Var[E[\Delta MSE_W(\hat{\tau}_x^{(1)}, \hat{\tau}_x^{(2)})|X]].$$

From equation (15) we see that the second term does not depend on the outcome Y and is hence not reducible. Accordingly, the reducible part of the variance is

$$R := \frac{4}{N} E[(\hat{\tau}_x^{(2)} - \hat{\tau}_x^{(1)})^2 Var[W^p Y|X]].$$

Some transformations yield

$$\frac{N}{4} R = Cov((\hat{\tau}_x^{(2)} - \hat{\tau}_x^{(1)})^2, Var[W^p Y|X]) + E[(\hat{\tau}_x^{(2)} - \hat{\tau}_x^{(1)})^2] \cdot E[Var[W^p Y|X]].$$

Minimizing this irrespective of the choice of $\hat{\tau}_x^{(1)}$ and $\hat{\tau}_x^{(2)}$, which is a plausible proceeding as the metric should be optimal for the evaluation of all estimators, corresponds to minimizing $E[Var[W^p Y|X]]$. To do this we again apply the law of total variance

$$\begin{aligned} E[Var[W^p Y|X]] &= Var[W^p Y] - Var[E[W^p Y|X]] \\ &= Var[W^p Y] - Var[\tau_x]. \end{aligned}$$

So, in summary, a reduction of $Var[\Delta MSE_W(\hat{\tau}_x^{(1)}, \hat{\tau}_x^{(2)})]$ corresponds to a reduction of $Var[W^p Y]$.

A.2 Derivation of the Qini metric distribution

The estimate $\hat{ATE}_s$ of the average treatment effect for the share s of highest ranked individuals is given by

$$\hat{ATE}_s(\hat{\tau}_x) = \frac{1}{N_W} \sum Y_i|_{W=1} - \frac{1}{N_{\bar{W}}} \sum Y_i|_{W=0},$$

where the outcomes Y_i belong to individuals which are ranked in the highest share s . And $N_W, N_{\bar{W}}$ denote the amount of treated respectively untreated individuals within this share. This expression can be transformed to

$$\hat{ATE}_s(\hat{\tau}_x) = \frac{1}{N} \sum W_i^{\tilde{p}} Y_i,$$

where $N = N_W + N_{\bar{W}}$ and $\tilde{p} = \frac{N_W}{N}$.

This estimate is unbiased:

$$\begin{aligned} E[\hat{ATE}_s(\hat{\tau}_x)] &= \frac{1}{N} \sum E[W_i^{\tilde{p}} Y_i] \\ &= E[\tau_x], \end{aligned}$$

where the CATE τ_x belongs to individuals which are ranked in the highest share s . Now, we analyze the variance. By the law of total variance, we can derive

$$\begin{aligned} Var[\frac{1}{N} \sum W_i^{\tilde{p}} Y_i] &= \frac{1}{N} Var[W_i^{\tilde{p}} Y_i] \\ &= \frac{1}{N} (E[Var[W_i^{\tilde{p}} Y_i|(W_i)_{i=1,\dots,N}]] + Var[E[W_i^{\tilde{p}} Y_i|(W_i)_{i=1,\dots,N}]] \\ &= \frac{1}{N} E[Var[W^{\tilde{p}} Y|W]]. \end{aligned}$$

In this derivation, $Var[E[W_i^{\tilde{p}} Y_i|(W_i)_{i=1,\dots,N}]] = 0$ follows from the definition of $\tilde{p} = \frac{\sum W_i}{N}$, which makes $E[W_i^{\tilde{p}} Y_i|(W_i)_{i=1,\dots,N}] = E[\tau_x]$ constant irrespective of $(W_i)_{i=1,\dots,N}$. Thus the variance of $\hat{ATE}_s(\hat{\tau}_x)$ is given by

$$Var[\hat{ATE}_s(\hat{\tau}_x)] = \frac{1}{N} E[Var[W^{\tilde{p}} Y|W]],$$

where we keep in mind, that the outcome Y on the right side of the equation belongs to individuals in the share s of the highest ranked.

B Variance components of the transformed outcome

B.1 Calculation of the variance components

In section 4, Appendix A.1 and A.2, we analyzed the variance of the uplift evaluation metrics. We found that the variance of the MSE_W depends on both of the components $E[Var[W^p Y|W]]$ and $Var[E[W^p Y|W]]$. We further found, that the variance of the Qini curve only depends on the first of this components, with the slight modification that the treatment probability p in the RCT needs to be replaced by the fraction of treated $\tilde{p}$ within the share s of highest ranked individuals.

Here, we further decompose these variance components, to reveal their relationship to the nuisance function $\Phi(X)$. It holds

$$\begin{aligned} E[Var[W^p Y|W]] &= E[Var[\tau_x + W^p \Phi(X) + W^p \varepsilon|W]] \\ &= E[Var[\tau_x] + W^p Cov(\tau_x, \Phi(X)) + (W^p)^2 Var[\Phi(X)] + (W^p)^2 Var[\varepsilon]] \\ &= Var[\tau_x] + \frac{Var[\Phi(X)] + Var[\varepsilon]}{p(1-p)} \text{ and} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} Var[E[W^p Y|W]] &= Var[E[\tau_x + W^p \Phi(X) + W^p \varepsilon|W]] \\ &= Var[E[\tau_x] + W^p E[\Phi(X)]] \\ &= \frac{E[\Phi(X)]^2}{p(1-p)}. \end{aligned}$$

To reduce the variance of the transformed outcome, we need to reduce $Var[\Phi(X)]$ and $E[\Phi(X)]^2$. Note that the latter term only effects the transformed outcome for the MSE, while the former affects also the transformed outcome for the rank metrics.

B.2 Reduction of the variance components

In this section, we show that a supervised learning model $\hat{\Phi}(X)$ for the target $\Phi(X)$ will generally fulfill conditions (C1) and (C2) for variance reduction. We start with condition (C1). The mean squared error, which is the plausible optimization criterion for $\hat{\Phi}(X)$, can be written as

$$E[(\Phi(X) - \hat{\Phi}(X))^2] = Var[\Phi(X) - \hat{\Phi}(X)] + (E[\Phi(X)] - E[\hat{\Phi}(X)])^2.$$

Assume, condition (C1) is not fulfilled, then the difference in expected values, in the second component, would be larger than $|E[\Phi(X)]|$ in expected value. In case the difference in expected values is positive and we shift our model by a constant $c \in (0, 2|E[\Phi(X)]|)$, the second component would be reduced. In case the difference in expected values is negative and we choose $c \in (-2|E[\Phi(X)]|, 0)$, the second component would again be reduced. Such a constant shift of the model $\hat{\Phi}(X) + c$ would not affect the first component on the right hand side. Accordingly, such a shift would reduce the MSE. For a properly fitted model, it is impossible to miss such a simple shift during the training, unless $E[\Phi(X)]$ is close to zero. So, if $E[\Phi(X)]$ is not close to zero, we can be pretty sure that condition (C1) will be fulfilled. Now, we come to condition (C2). If $\hat{\Phi}(X)$ is an estimator for $\Phi(X)$, which is more precise than the trivial $E[\Phi(X)]$ in terms of MSE loss, then

$$\begin{aligned} Var[\Phi(X) - \hat{\Phi}(X)] &= E[(\Phi(X) - \hat{\Phi}(X))^2] - E[(\Phi(X) - E[\Phi(X)])^2] \\ &\leq E[(\Phi(X) - \hat{\Phi}(X))^2] \\ &< E[(\Phi(X) - E[\Phi(X)])^2] \\ &= Var[\Phi(X)]. \end{aligned}$$

So, any supervised learning model $\hat{\Phi}(X)$ for the parameter $\Phi(X)$, which is not completely mis-fitted, will fulfill condition (C2) for variance reduction.

C Other evaluation metrics

In our analysis of the error metrics, we focused on the Qini curve and the MSE_W . These are common evaluation metrics in the uplift literature, but not the only ones. The question arises, whether our results about the variance

reduction also apply to these other metrics. In this section, we will summarise the other evaluation metrics, found in the literature, and show that our results indeed apply there. In general there are three classes of empirical evaluation metrics: rank metrics, treatment decision metrics, which measure the impact of allocating treatment according to the uplift model and accuracy metrics. The Qini curve belongs to the first class and the MSE_W to the third. In the following, we will examine other members of these three metric classes.

C.1 Rank metrics: Qini curve, uplift curve and related measures

In section 3.3, we analyzed the Qini curve by Radcliffe [2007], as the most famous empirical ranking evaluation method. This curve is given by

$$u_s = \sum Y_i|_{W=1} - \frac{N_W(s)}{N_{\bar{W}}(s)} \sum Y_i|_{W=0}, \quad (Q1)$$

where $N_W(s)$ and $N_{\bar{W}}(s)$ denote the number of treated respectively untreated in the share s of highest ranked individuals. Note, that here we use $N_W(s)$ in the notation and not N_W , to highlight that we only count the number of treated within the share s and not in the whole data set. This is important, to represent differences to other suggested evaluation metrics, which are provided here. Devriendt et al. [2020] provide an extensive review of the variants to the above Qini curve calculation approach, which appear in the previous literature. In the following, we will quickly go through these variants and show, why our statistical analysis for the original Qini curve also applies there.

The first variation of the Qini curve, which we discuss, is for example applied by Diemert et al. [2018]. There the Qini curve is calculated as

$$u_s = \sum Y_i|_{W=1} - \frac{N_W}{N_{\bar{W}}} \sum Y_i|_{W=0}. \quad (Q2)$$

Another version of the Qini curve is provided, for example, by Guelman [2015], where it is defined by

$$u_s = \frac{1}{N_W} \sum Y_i|_{W=1} - \frac{1}{N_{\bar{W}}} \sum Y_i|_{W=0}. \quad (Q3)$$

Now, we will see that these alternative Qini curves fit our analysis of the statistical properties of the original Qini curve. For (Q1), it holds $u_s = \hat{ATE}_s \cdot N_W(s)$. For (Q2), it holds due to the random treatment allocation $N_W(s) \approx s \cdot N_W$ and $N_{\bar{W}}(s) \approx s \cdot N_{\bar{W}}$. This leads to $u_s \approx \hat{ATE}_s N_W(s)$. For (Q3), it holds for similar reasons $u_s \approx \hat{ATE}_s \cdot s$. So, all the Qini curve versions correspond to $\hat{ATE}_s$, multiplied by a factor which is unrelated to the distribution of the outcome. This is exactly the situation as for the original Qini curve. In the analysis of its statistical properties we only needed to examine the properties of $\hat{ATE}_s$. And as we can see, these also determine the statistical properties of the other Qini curve versions.

One "alternative" to the Qini curve is the so called "uplift curve". In some studies like Gutierrez and Gérardy [2017], the uplift curve is given by

$$\bar{u}_s = \left(\frac{1}{N_W(s)} \sum Y_i|_{W=1} - \frac{1}{N_{\bar{W}}(s)} \sum Y_i|_{W=0} \right) \cdot (N_W(s) + N_{\bar{W}}(s)). \quad (UC1)$$

In other papers, like Jaskowski and Jaroszewicz [2012], it is given by

$$\bar{u}_s = \frac{1}{N_W} \sum Y_i|_{W=1} - \frac{1}{N_{\bar{W}}} \sum Y_i|_{W=0}. \quad (UC2)$$

Another alternative is provided by Kuusisto et al. [2014] who calculate the uplift curve by

$$\bar{u}_s = \sum Y_i|_{W=1} - \sum Y_i|_{W=0}. \quad (UC3)$$

Now, we show that they all fit to our analysis of the statistical properties of the original Qini curve: For (UC1), we can see that $\bar{u}_s = \hat{ATE}_s \cdot (N_W(s) + N_{\bar{W}}(s))$. For (UC2), we can see that due to random treatment allocation $N_W(s) \approx s \cdot N_W$ and $N_{\bar{W}}(s) \approx s \cdot N_{\bar{W}}$. This then leads to $\bar{u}_s \approx \hat{ATE}_s \cdot s$. Und for (UC3), this metric only works of the treatment property if $p = 0.5$. Then $N_W(s) \approx N_{\bar{W}}(s)$ and therefore $\bar{u}_s \approx \hat{ATE}_s \cdot \frac{N_W(s) + N_{\bar{W}}(s)}{2}$. So, with the same argumentation as for the alternative Qini curves, we can see that the statistical analysis of the original Qini curve also applies to the uplift curves.

Another related way to empirically evaluate the ranking of a model is to visualize the "uplift per decile", as done, for example, by Kane et al. [2014]. This works by estimating the average treatment effects $\hat{ATE}_{[0,0.1]}$, $\hat{ATE}_{[0,0.2]}$, ...

per decile, by difference in means of outcomes between the treated and untreated. This is statistically, the same what happens in equation (3), only that the outcomes belong to individuals who's predictions are in a certain decile, instead of in a share s of the highest ranked. The statistical analysis can hence, be also transferred to this evaluation metric.

In addition to the various Qini and uplift curve versions, there are also some measures which are derived from these curves. There is the *area under the uplift curve* (AUUC), which Devriendt et al. [2020] calculates by

$$AUUC \approx \sum_{k=1}^{100} \bar{u}_{k/100}.$$

Of course, the statistical properties of this measure depend on the statistical properties of the uplift curve $\bar{u}_{k/100}$. Since the statistical properties of the uplift curve can be analyzed in the same way as the statistical properties of the Qini curve by Radcliffe [2007]. Our results can be directly transferred here.

Finally, Radcliffe [2007] defined two *Qini* values, which are derived from the Qini curve. They measure two versions of a ratio between the Qini curve and a theoretical optimum. Again, our statistical analysis is also relevant for these measures, as it concerns the statistical properties of the Qini curve.

C.2 Treatment decision metrics

Instead of measuring how well a model ranks individuals according to τ_x , it is also possible to measure what happens if we derive concrete treatment allocation decisions $d(X)$ from our uplift model. There are two theoretical parameters, which would measure model performance: The *gain* $E[\tau_x | d(X) = 1]$ and the *expected outcome* $E[Y | W = d(X)]$ if *treatment allocation works according to the model decisions*.

The gain could be estimated by

$$ATE_{d=1} = \frac{1}{N_W} \sum Y_i |_{W=1} - \frac{1}{N_{\bar{W}}} \sum Y_i |_{W=0},$$

where the outcomes belong to individuals, for which the model would decide for treatment [Schuler and Shah, 2018]. This is again an average treatment effect estimator by differences in the means between the treated and the untreated. So just like in the analysis of the Qini curve after Radcliffe [2007], our results about variance reduction apply.

The expected outcome if treatment allocation works according to the model decisions, can be estimated by

$$\hat{v}(d) = \frac{1}{N} \left(\sum \frac{W_i \cdot d(X_i)}{\tilde{p}} Y_i + \sum \frac{(1 - W_i)(1 - d(X_i))}{1 - \tilde{p}} Y_i \right),$$

where $\tilde{p} = \frac{\sum W_i}{N}$. This metric appears in the literature under the name "decision value" [Schuler and Shah, 2018, Kapelner et al., 2014, Zhao et al., 2017]. Hitsch and Misra [2018] use the same metric under the name "targeting profit". The only difference is, that they added a cost c for each decision decision to treat, which is irrelevant in terms of the statistical properties. $\hat{v}(d)$ is actually slightly harder to discuss than any of the other empirical evaluation metrics described so far. The is because outcome adjustment would bias this metric (because $E[Y - \hat{\Phi}(X) | W = d(X)] \neq E[Y | W = d(X)]$). But if we use this metric to evaluate which of two decision models $d_1(x), d_2(x)$ yields better decisions, the bias due to outcome adjustment disappears because

$$\begin{aligned} E[Y - \hat{\Phi}(X) | W = d_1(X)] - E[Y - \hat{\Phi}(X) | W = d_2(X)] &= E[Y | W = d_1(X)] - E[\hat{\Phi}(X) | W = d_1(X)] \\ &\quad - E[Y | W = d_2(X)] + E[\hat{\Phi}(X) | W = d_2(X)] \\ &= E[Y | W = d_1(X)] - E[Y | W = d_2(X)] \end{aligned}$$

To derive, that the variance can be reduced, we write the difference between the empirical estimates as

$$\hat{v}(d_1) - \hat{v}(d_2) = \frac{1}{N} \left(\sum_{\substack{d_1=1 \\ d_2=0}} W_i^p Y_i - \sum_{\substack{d_1=0 \\ d_2=1}} W_i^p Y_i \right).$$

So, we have sums of transformed outcomes $W_i^p Y_i$ in this expression. In section 4, we have shown that outcome adjustment leads to a reduction of $Var[W_i^p Y_i]$. This would then also apply for the difference $\hat{v}(d_1) - \hat{v}(d_2)$.

C.3 Accuracy metrics

Here we briefly list some other accuracy metrics than MSE_W , which previously appeared in the literature. Schuler and Shah [2018] list two more empirical metrics to assess an uplift model's performance according to the MSE $E[(\tau_x - \hat{\tau}_x)^2]$

for uplift models: The first one is called "matched MSE". It works by replacing τ_x with the difference in outcomes between two matched individuals, where the first individual is treated and the second individual is not. The other metric Schuler and Shah [2018] describes is the " μ -loss". It is only applicable to uplift models which yield for each individual two outcome predictions: $\hat{\mu}_1(x_i)$, if the individual is treated and $\hat{\mu}_0(x_i)$, if the individual is not treated. The μ -loss is then calculated by

$$MSE_{\mu} = \frac{1}{N} \sum (Y_i - W\hat{\mu}_1(x_i) - (1 - W)\hat{\mu}_0(x_i))^2.$$

We decided neither to include the matched MSE nor the μ -loss in our analysis, because they are neither frequently seen in the literature, nor generally applicable.

References

- David van Klaveren, Ewout W Steyerberg, Patrick W Serruys, and David M Kent. The proposed ‘concordance-statistic for benefit’ provided a useful metric when modeling heterogeneous treatment effects. *Journal of clinical epidemiology*, 94:59–68, 2018.
- Johannes Haupt and Stefan Lessmann. Targeting customers under response-dependent costs. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 297(1):369–379, 2022.
- Aurélien Lemmens and Sunil Gupta. Managing churn to maximize profits. *Marketing Science*, 39(5):956–973, 2020.
- Susan Athey and Stefan Wager. Policy learning with observational data. *Econometrica*, 89(1):133–161, 2021.
- Pierre Gutierrez and Jean-Yves G  rardy. Causal inference and uplift modelling: A review of the literature. In *International conference on predictive applications and APIs*, pages 1–13. PMLR, 2017.
- Jiuyong Li, Weijia Zhang, Lin Liu, Kui Yu, Thuc Duy Le, and Jixue Liu. A general framework for causal classification. *International Journal of Data Science and Analytics*, 11(2):127–139, 2021.
- Wouter Verbeke, Diego Olaya, Marie-Anne Guerry, and Jente Van Belle. To do or not to do? Cost-sensitive causal classification with individual treatment effect estimates. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 2022.
- Floris Devriendt, Jente Van Belle, Tias Guns, and Wouter Verbeke. Learning to rank for uplift modeling. *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering*, 2020.
- Nicholas Radcliffe. Using control groups to target on predicted lift: Building and assessing uplift model. *Direct Marketing Analytics Journal*, pages 14–21, 2007.
- Szymon Jaroszewicz and Piotr Rzepakowski. Uplift modeling with survival data. In *ACM SIGKDD Workshop on Health Informatics (HI-KDD-14)*, New York City, 2014.
- Susan Athey and Guido Imbens. Recursive partitioning for heterogeneous causal effects. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 113(27):7353–7360, 2016.
- Robin M Gubela, Stefan Lessmann, and Szymon Jaroszewicz. Response transformation and profit decomposition for revenue uplift modeling. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 283(2):647–661, 2020.
- Carlos Fern  ndez-Lor  a and Foster Provost. Causal classification: Treatment effect estimation vs. outcome prediction. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 23(59):1–35, 2022.
- Floris Devriendt, Darie Moldovan, and Wouter Verbeke. A literature survey and experimental evaluation of the state-of-the-art in uplift modeling: A stepping stone toward the development of prescriptive analytics. *Big data*, 6(1): 13–41, 2018.
- Alejandro Schuler and Nigam Shah. General-purpose validation and model selection when estimating individual treatment effects. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1804.05146*, 2018.
- Yuta Saito, Hayato Sakata, and Kazuhide Nakata. Doubly robust prediction and evaluation methods improve uplift modeling for observational data. In *Proceedings of the 2019 SIAM International Conference on Data Mining*, pages 468–476. SIAM, 2019.
- Yuta Saito. Doubly robust estimator for ranking metrics with post-click conversions. In *Fourteenth ACM Conference on Recommender Systems*, pages 92–100, 2020.
- Daniel Jacob. Cate meets ml. *Digital Finance*, 3(2):99–148, 2021.
- G  nter J Hitsch and Sanjog Misra. Heterogeneous treatment effects and optimal targeting policy evaluation. *Available at SSRN 3111957*, 2018.
- Ronald Aylmer Fisher et al. Statistical methods for research workers. (*Oliver and Boyd, Edinburgh, UK*), 1925.

- Adam Bloniarz, Hanzhong Liu, Cun-Hui Zhang, Jasjeet S Sekhon, and Bin Yu. Lasso adjustments of treatment effect estimates in randomized experiments. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 113(27):7383–7390, 2016.
- Daniel B Rubin and Mark J van der Laan. Covariate adjustment for the intention-to-treat parameter with empirical efficiency maximization. 2008.
- Stefan Wager, Wenfei Du, Jonathan Taylor, and Robert J Tibshirani. High-dimensional regression adjustments in randomized experiments. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 113(45):12673–12678, 2016.
- Victor Chernozhukov, Denis Chetverikov, Mert Demirer, Esther Duflo, Christian Hansen, Whitney Newey, and James Robins. Double/debiased machine learning for treatment and structural parameters, 2018.
- Stefan Wager and Susan Athey. Estimation and inference of heterogeneous treatment effects using random forests. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 113(523):1228–1242, 2018.
- Mark J Van der Laan and James M Robins. *Unified methods for censored longitudinal data and causality*, volume 5. Springer, 2003.
- Susan Athey, Julie Tibshirani, and Stefan Wager. Generalized random forests. *The Annals of Statistics*, 47(2):1148–1178, 2019.
- Julie Tibshirani, Susan Athey, Erik Sverdrup, and Stefan Wager. *grf: Generalized Random Forests*, 2022. URL <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=grf>. R package version 2.1.0.
- Leo Breiman. Random forests. *Machine learning*, 45(1):5–32, 2001.
- Marvin N. Wright and Andreas Ziegler. ranger: A fast implementation of random forests for high dimensional data in C++ and R. *Journal of Statistical Software*, 77(1):1–17, 2017. doi:10.18637/jss.v077.i01.
- Xinkun Nie and Stefan Wager. Quasi-oracle estimation of heterogeneous treatment effects. *Biometrika*, 108(2):299–319, 2021.
- Eustache Diemert, Artem Betlei, Christophe Renaudin, and Massih-Reza Amini. A large scale benchmark for uplift modeling. In *KDD*, 2018.
- Leo Guelman. Optimal personalized treatment learning models with insurance applications. 2015.
- Maciej Jaskowski and Szymon Jaroszewicz. Uplift modeling for clinical trial data. In *ICML Workshop on Clinical Data Analysis*, volume 46, pages 79–95, 2012.
- Finn Kuusisto, Vitor Santos Costa, Houssam Nassif, Elizabeth Burnside, David Page, and Jude Shavlik. Support vector machines for differential prediction. In *Joint European Conference on Machine Learning and Knowledge Discovery in Databases*, pages 50–65. Springer, 2014.
- Kathleen Kane, Victor SY Lo, and Jane Zheng. Mining for the truly responsive customers and prospects using true-lift modeling: Comparison of new and existing methods. *Journal of Marketing Analytics*, 2(4):218–238, 2014.
- A Kapelner, J Bleich, A Levine, ZD Cohen, RJ DeRubeis, and R Berk. Inference for the effectiveness of personalized medicine with software. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1404.7844*, 2014.
- Yan Zhao, Xiao Fang, and David Simchi-Levi. Uplift modeling with multiple treatments and general response types. In *Proceedings of the 2017 SIAM International Conference on Data Mining*, pages 588–596. SIAM, 2017.