

Causal inference with a functional outcome

Kreske Ecker*, Xavier de Luna, and Lina Schelin

Department of Statistics,
Umeå School of Business, Economics and Statistics,
Umeå University, Umeå, Sweden

Abstract

This paper presents methods to study the causal effect of a binary treatment on a functional outcome with observational data. We define a functional causal parameter, the Functional Average Treatment Effect (FATE), and propose a semi-parametric outcome regression estimator. Quantifying the uncertainty in the estimation presents a challenge since existing inferential techniques developed for univariate outcomes cannot satisfactorily address the multiple comparison problem induced by the functional nature of the causal parameter. We show how to obtain valid inference on the FATE using simultaneous confidence bands, which cover the FATE with a given probability over the entire domain. Simulation experiments illustrate the empirical coverage of the simultaneous confidence bands in finite samples. Finally, we use the methods to infer the effect of early adult location on subsequent income development for one Swedish birth cohort.

Key words: Early adult location; functional average treatment effect; lifetime income trajectory; semi-parametric inference; simultaneous confidence bands.

1 Introduction

The impact of economic conditions at labour market entry on subsequent wage development and other labour market outcomes has been the focus of a range of recent studies; see e.g., Altonji et al. (2016); Kwon et al. (2010); Oreopoulos et al. (2012); Raaum and

*Corresponding author: kreske.ecker@umu.se

Røed (2006); Schwandt and von Wachter (2019); Åslund and Rooth (2007). In this paper, we contribute by utilising large-scale register data providing much longer follow-up periods, and by developing methods that allow us to draw valid inference in this context, i.e. taking into account an inherent multiple comparison problem regarding the causal effect of initial labour market conditions on income observed through whole working lives.

More precisely, we investigate the causal effect of early adult residence location on subsequent cumulative lifetime incomes for the 1954 Swedish birth cohort, based on population-wide register data. The data available allows us to follow income development through most of the cohort working life: from adolescence until the age of 63. We define the binary treatment of interest as living in either an urban or a rural area of Sweden at the age of 20 (in 1974). The outcome, logarithmized cumulative income (LCI), is observed annually. Figure 1 shows the mean differences in LCI between the two treatment groups (urban - rural location at age 20), computed separately for men and women, over the period 1975-2017, together with 95% pointwise confidence bands. This comparison is naive in two aspects: first, it has no causal interpretation since confounding variables are not controlled for; and second, the pointwise confidence bands are not meaningful because of the multiple comparison problem, i.e. the displayed bands yield only pointwise control of the coverage probability, whereas the actual nominal coverage over the entire domain of the income functions is considerably lower.

The observed incomes are assumed to arise from an underlying continuous income accumulation process, from which we take discrete observations. This motivates the use of methods from the field of functional data analysis (FDA) (see, e.g., Ramsay and Silverman, 2005; Wang et al., 2016, for an overview). While FDA methods are not the only way to analyse such data, they have the major advantage in that they allow to address the multicomparison problem in an elegant and practical fashion as described below. To deal with a non-randomised treatment assignment (here early adult residence location), we use the potential outcome framework (Rosenbaum and Rubin, 1983) to define a causal parameter, the Functional Average Treatment Effect (FATE), which takes the functional nature of the outcome into account. This paper is, up to our knowledge, the first attempt to formalise and study causal inference in the context of a functional outcome. Related literature using the terminology "panel outcomes" exists (Chib and Jacobi, 2007; Jacobi et al., 2016). In this literature, the multiple comparison problem is not dealt with, although it is also less severe since typically only a few time points of follow up are considered. Note that complex causal effects can also be defined when scalar potential outcomes are compared, e.g., by contrasting their distribution functions (Lin et al., 2021).

We propose and study a semi-parametric estimator of the FATE based on outcome regression (Tan, 2007). Quantifying the uncertainty in this estimation presents a challenge




Figure 1: Mean differences in LCI (urban versus rural location at age 20), together with 95% pointwise confidence bands, for the 1954 birth cohort in Sweden. By gender, blue: men, red: women.

since existing inferential techniques developed for univariate outcomes cannot satisfactorily address the multiple comparison problem induced by the functional nature of the causal parameter in this setting. Since the functional parameter is infinite-dimensional, standard techniques to control, e.g., for multiple testing (e.g. Holm, 1979) would be too conservative. Instead, techniques within the field of FDA provide a variety of solutions to the multiple comparisons problem, including, e.g., approaches for p-value adjustments in hypothesis testing (Vsevolozhskaya et al., 2014; Pini and Vantini, 2017b; Abramowicz et al., 2018) as well as simultaneous confidence bands based on results from random field theory (Liebl and Reimherr, 2019b, 2020; Telschow and Schwartzman, 2022). The former approaches rely on permutation tests rather than distributional assumptions and are therefore computationally intensive. We here expand the methods and results obtained by Liebl and Reimherr (2019b, 2020) to deal with a functional causal parameter estimated with an outcome regression estimator, and thereby obtain simultaneous confidence bands for FATE. These simultaneous confidence bands control the probability that the true FATE lies outside the bands over its entire domain and thus provide global control of the coverage probability. In addition, they are less computationally intensive than many simulation-based approaches, and their widths can adapt

to the local structure of the data (Liebl and Reimherr, 2019b).

The rest of the paper is organised as follows. Section 2 presents the theory and methods for drawing inference using simultaneous confidence bands for the functional causal parameter of interest. We first deduce the finite sample distribution of the functional estimator using stronger assumptions, and continue by giving asymptotic results under weaker conditions. Section 3 presents the study of the effect of early adult location on cumulative lifetime incomes using the methods introduced. Numerical experiments inspired from the real data application are used in Section 4 to evaluate the performance of the simultaneous confidence bands in finite samples. Section 5 concludes the paper with a discussion.

2 Theory: Functional average treatment effect

2.1 Definition and identification

Let z_i be a binary treatment indicator for individual i . We have $z_i = 1$ if individual i is exposed to treatment and $z_i = 0$ otherwise. Corresponding to these treatment levels, we define the two potential outcome processes $y_{1i} = \{y_{1i}(t) : t \in [0, 1]\}$ and $y_{0i} = \{y_{0i}(t) : t \in [0, 1]\}$, which are assumed to be once continuously differentiable almost surely. Without loss of generality, the domain of the argument t has been scaled to $[0, 1]$. To simplify notation, we do not distinguish between random variables and their realisations. A vector of pre-treatment covariates is denoted $\mathbf{x}_i = (1, x_{1i}, \dots, x_{Ki})^T$. This vector includes a 1-element for ease of notation later on. A random sample of size n , with $i = 1, \dots, n$, is available from the distribution law of $y_{1i}, y_{0i}, z_i \mid \mathbf{x}_i$. However, we observe only one of the potential outcomes, depending on the individual treatment assignment, so that the observed outcome is $y_i(t) = y_{1i}(t) z_i + y_{0i}(t) (1 - z_i)$.

The focus in this paper is on one causal parameter, the Functional Average Treatment Effect (FATE):

$$\theta := \{\theta(t) = \mathbb{E}(y_{1i}(t) - y_{0i}(t)) : t \in [0, 1]\}.$$

A alternative causal parameter of interest is the Functional Average Treatment Effect on the Treated population (FATT). The developments for this parameter are given in Appendix A.

When exposure to the treatment is not randomised, identification of these parameters from the observed data requires further assumptions (Rosenbaum and Rubin, 1983). We will use the following identification assumptions:

ASSUMPTION 1 (OVERLAP)

- a. $\Pr(z_i = 0 \mid \mathbf{x}_i) > 0, \quad \forall \mathbf{x}_i,$
- b. $\Pr(z_i = 1 \mid \mathbf{x}_i) > 0, \quad \forall \mathbf{x}_i.$

ASSUMPTION 2 (IGNORABILITY)

- a. $\mathbb{E}(y_{0i}(t) \mid z_i, \mathbf{x}_i) = \mathbb{E}(y_{0i}(t) \mid \mathbf{x}_i) \quad \forall t \in [0, 1],$
- b. $\mathbb{E}(y_{1i}(t) \mid z_i, \mathbf{x}_i) = \mathbb{E}(y_{1i}(t) \mid \mathbf{x}_i) \quad \forall t \in [0, 1].$

Assumption 1 can be tested, and the population redefined if necessary for it to hold. Assumption 2 holds when all confounders are included in the covariate vector \mathbf{x}_i . The causal parameter θ is identified under Assumptions 1 and 2, since we can then write, for all $t \in [0, 1]$: $\theta(t) = \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}(y_{1i}(t) \mid z_i = 1, \mathbf{x}_i) - \mathbb{E}(y_{0i}(t) \mid z_i = 0, \mathbf{x}_i)]$.

2.2 Estimation

We consider a semi-parametric estimator based on function-on-scalar regression models (Ramsay and Silverman, 2005) for the outcomes:

$$y_{zi}(t) = \mathbf{x}_i^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_z(t) + \varepsilon_{zi}(t), \quad z = 0, 1, \quad (1)$$

where $\boldsymbol{\beta}_z(t)$ are $K + 1$ -dimensional functional parameters, and the random errors $\varepsilon_{zi} = \{\varepsilon_{zi}(t) : t \in [0, 1]\}$ are assumed to be independent stochastic processes with zero mean functions and finite, non-zero covariance functions

$$\sigma_z(s, t) = \text{Cov}(\varepsilon_{zi}(s), \varepsilon_{zi}(t)), \quad s, t \in [0, 1].$$

While linearity in the parameters may seem restrictive, the covariate set is allowed to contain transformations of the original covariates.

Let $\mathbf{y}(t) = (y_1(t), \dots, y_n(t))^T$ be the vector of observed outcomes, and $\mathbf{y}_1(t) = \{y_i(t) : z_i = 1\}$ and $\mathbf{y}_0(t) = \{y_i(t) : z_i = 0\}$ the subsets for the n_1 treated and $n_0 = n - n_1$ non-treated observations respectively. Further, let \mathbf{X}_1 be a $n_1 \times (K + 1)$ matrix containing the n_1 treated observations for the K covariates (and a column of 1 for the intercept), and similarly \mathbf{X}_0 a $n_0 \times (K + 1)$ matrix of observed covariates for the non-treated. Then, the functional regression coefficients can be estimated by using ordinary least squares:

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_z(t) = (\mathbf{X}_z^T \mathbf{X}_z)^{-1} \mathbf{X}_z^T \mathbf{y}_z(t), \quad (2)$$

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_z = \{\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_z(t) : t \in [0, 1]\}.$$

We can then impute the unobserved potential outcomes with predictions for the above-fitted outcome models, thereby constructing a semi-parametric estimator for FATE:

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{\theta}(t) &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (\mathbf{x}_i^T \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_1(t) - \mathbf{x}_i^T \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_0(t)) \\ &= \bar{\mathbf{x}}^T \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_1(t) - \bar{\mathbf{x}}^T \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_0(t),\end{aligned}\tag{3}$$

where $\bar{\mathbf{x}} = \frac{1}{n} \mathbf{X}^T \mathbb{1}_{n \times 1}$ is the vector of sample means. This yields the estimator $\hat{\theta} = \{\hat{\theta}(t) : t \in [0, 1]\}$.

2.3 Exact inference

To quantify the uncertainty associated with the functional estimators described above, we build on the simultaneous confidence bands presented in Liebl and Reimherr (2019b, 2020), which allow for a simultaneous control of the coverage probability over the entire domain. The construction of these bands requires that the estimator in Eq. (3) is, at least asymptotically, a Gaussian process. In this section we show that under some additional assumptions, the estimator $\hat{\theta}$ is actually a Gaussian process for any sample size n . These additional assumptions are then relaxed in the next section.

We assume, as first step, a fixed design setup for the function-on-scalar regression models in Eq. (1). In addition, we assume that the random error functions are independent, zero mean Gaussian processes, $\varepsilon_{zi} \sim \mathcal{GP}(0, \sigma_z)$. Then the multivariate (n_z -variate) random error process $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_z = \{\varepsilon_{z1}, \dots, \varepsilon_{zn_z}\}$ is a multivariate Gaussian process (see definition in Appendix B) denoted as:

$$\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_z \sim \mathcal{MGPP}_{n_z}(0, \sigma_z, \mathbb{I}_{n_z}),$$

where $\sigma_z = \{\sigma_z(s, t) : s, t \in [0, 1]\}$ and \mathbb{I}_{n_z} is a $n_z \times n_z$ identity matrix. It follows that the estimated regression parameters in Eq. (2) are multivariate Gaussian processes:

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_z \sim \mathcal{MGPP}_{n_z}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_z, \sigma_z, (\mathbf{X}_z^T \mathbf{X}_z)^{-1}).\tag{4}$$

Consequently $\hat{\theta}$ is a Gaussian process:

$$\hat{\theta} \sim \mathcal{GP}(\bar{\mathbf{x}} \boldsymbol{\beta}_1 - \bar{\mathbf{x}} \boldsymbol{\beta}_0, C_\theta),\tag{5}$$

where

$$C_\theta(s, t) = \sigma_1(s, t) \bar{\mathbf{x}} (\mathbf{X}_1^T \mathbf{X}_1)^{-1} \bar{\mathbf{x}}^T + \sigma_0(s, t) \bar{\mathbf{x}} (\mathbf{X}_0^T \mathbf{X}_0)^{-1} \bar{\mathbf{x}}^T.\tag{6}$$

See Appendix B for details on how these distributions are derived.

To construct simultaneous confidence bands for θ , we must find a continuous threshold function $u_\alpha = \{u_\alpha(t) : t \in [0, 1]\}$ such that, for a given level α ,

$$P\left(\theta(t) \in \hat{\theta}(t) \pm u_\alpha(t) \sqrt{C_\theta(t, t)} \quad \forall t \in [0, 1]\right) \geq 1 - \alpha. \quad (7)$$

In other words, Eq. (7) yields a $(1 - \alpha)$ simultaneous confidence band for the functional parameter θ , which is such that $\theta(t)$ lies within the band over the entire domain with a probability of at least $(1 - \alpha)$. If we were to instead use the naive constant threshold $u_\alpha(t) = 1.96$ for all t , this would yield simultaneous coverage lower than $(1 - \alpha)$ due to the multiple comparison problem mentioned earlier.

Estimating the simultaneous confidence bands requires a roughness parameter function, τ , which measures the extent of the local multiple comparison problem over the domain. This function is defined as $\tau(t) = \sqrt{\text{Var}(V'(t))}$, where

$$V(t) = \frac{\hat{\theta}(t) - \theta(t)}{\sqrt{C_\theta(t, t)}} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1) \quad \forall t \in [0, 1],$$

and we let $\tau(t) > 0$, $\forall t \in [0, 1]$. Liebl and Reimherr (2019b) developed the theory and a procedure to obtain the threshold function of t , $u_\alpha(t)$, implemented in the R-package `ffscb` (Liebl and Reimherr, 2019a).

In practice, the covariance structure of the random errors functions (and in extension, C_θ) is likely unknown. However, we can use the residuals from the two outcome regression fits as estimates of the error functions, and their sample covariance function as a consistent estimate $\hat{\sigma}_z(s, t)$ of $\sigma_z(s, t)$ to obtain:

$$\hat{C}_\theta(s, t) = \hat{\sigma}_1(s, t) \bar{\mathbf{x}} (\mathbf{X}_1^T \mathbf{X}_1)^{-1} \bar{\mathbf{x}}^T + \hat{\sigma}_0(s, t) \bar{\mathbf{x}} (\mathbf{X}_0^T \mathbf{X}_0)^{-1} \bar{\mathbf{x}}^T. \quad (8)$$

An asymptotically (as $n \rightarrow \infty$) valid $100(1 - \alpha)\%$ simultaneous confidence band for $\theta(t)$ is then given by

$$\hat{\theta}(t) \pm \tilde{u}_\alpha(t) \sqrt{\hat{C}_\theta(t, t)}, \quad (9)$$

where $\tilde{u}_\alpha(t)$ is found using $\hat{C}_\theta(s, t)$ instead of $C_\theta(s, t)$ (see Liebl and Reimherr, 2019b). Appendix C contains a description of how the estimator and confidence bands were obtained in practice in the real data application reported below.

2.4 Asymptotic inference

The exact distributional results for $\hat{\theta}$ in the previous section are obtained by assuming a Gaussian error terms in Eq. (1) and a fixed design, i.e. conditional on the observed covariate values. We now relax these assumptions and consider only the assumptions

made in Sections 2.1 and 2.2. Then, by Reimherr and Nicolae (2014, Thm 5), $\hat{\beta}_z$ in Eq. (4) is asymptotically a multivariate Gaussian process. More precisely, asymptotically $\sqrt{n}(\hat{\beta}_z - \beta_z) \sim \mathcal{MG}\mathcal{P}_{n_z}(0, \sigma_z, \chi_z^{-1})$, with χ_z^{-1} the probability limit of $\frac{1}{n}\mathbf{X}_z^T\mathbf{X}_z$. Therefore, $\hat{\theta}$ is asymptotically a Gaussian process: $\sqrt{n}(\hat{\theta} - \theta) \sim \mathcal{GP}(0, \bar{C}_\theta)$, where $\bar{C}_\theta(s, t) = \sigma_1(s, t)E(\mathbf{x})\chi_1^{-1}E(\mathbf{x})^T + \sigma_0(s, t)E(\mathbf{x})\chi_0^{-1}E(\mathbf{x})^T$. As a consequence, the simultaneous confidence band described in the previous section is asymptotically valid.

3 The effects of early adult residence location on cumulative lifetime income

We aim at studying the consequences of the place of labour market entry on lifetime income trajectories. We focus our analysis on the cohort born 1954 in Sweden, using a population-wide and longitudinal database available at the Umeå SIMSAM Lab (Lindgren et al., 2016). This database allows us to follow income trajectories from the cohort entrance into the labour market until 2017 (age 63). The potential effect of the time (and place) of labour market entrance on incomes has been widely discussed in the Economics literature; see, e.g., Altonji et al. (2016); Kwon et al. (2010); Oreopoulos et al. (2012); Raaum and Røed (2006); Schwandt and von Wachter (2019); Åslund and Rooth (2007). We here follow an operationalisation of (exposure to) treatment similar to Raaum and Røed (2006) and define the location of the entry in the labour market as the place of residence at the age of 20, i.e. in 1974 for our cohort. Thus, we define a binary treatment, where $z=1$ is defined as living at the age of 20 in the local labour markets of the three biggest Swedish cities (Stockholm, Gothenburg or Malmö). The alternative treatment, $z = 0$, is defined as living in local labour markets in which the central municipality had less than 50 000 residents at the age of 20. Local labour markets are units defined by patterns of employment and commuting at the municipality level (Karlsson and Olsson, 2006; Statistics Sweden, 2010).

The outcome of interest, $y(t)$, is the total earned income (in SEK), defined as all taxable income except from capital. This covers wages and income from business/self-employment, unemployment, parental and sick leave benefits, and pensions. The outcome is measured annually, and data is available between 1968-2017. The income is adjusted for inflation to match the monetary value in 2017 and discounted with a factor of 0.03 (Johansson and Kriström, 2016). We calculate the cumulative income over the period 1975-2017, i.e., starting from the year following treatment exposure. Lastly, this cumulative income is logarithmized, a common transformation for incomes that normalises their distribution. In the sequel, "income" will refer to the logarithmized cumulative income.

We control for several pre-exposure confounders, measured at baseline: *Year of first income*, the year in which an individual first received income if this occurs before exposure to the treatment (before 1974); *Previous income*, which is the logarithmized cumulative income an individual has accumulated before exposure; *Children before age 20*, a binary indicator of the subject having at least one child before exposure; and an indicator of completing (at least) upper *secondary education*. The latter is based on the subjects' highest achieved education level in 1990 as a proxy, as this is the first year for which the variable is available annually. In addition, we control for some family measures: The subjects' *number of siblings* (in 1973); *Parents' income* during the subjects' adolescence (the logarithmized total for both parents for the years 1968-1971); and an indicator indicating if both parents are born outside of Sweden (*Foreign-born parents*). We also control for the highest education level (lower secondary, upper secondary or tertiary) achieved by either mother, father, or both, in 1970, measured by the indicators of *parents' secondary education* and *parents' tertiary education*. Descriptive statistics for the confounders are shown in Table E.2 in Appendix E.

The 1954 birth cohort was chosen to give the longest possible period in which income data is available. We limit the analysis to individuals born in Sweden and excluded a total of around 4000 individuals due to missingness on one or more of the covariates, primarily those related to parental background. The resulting data consist of 54485 individuals: 27805 men (55.6% "exposed", $z = 1$) and 26680 women (59.3% "exposed", $z = 1$). All analyses are performed separately for the subsets of men and women.

To represent the discrete annual measurements of income as functional objects, we apply a low degree of monotone smoothing to the observed income data. The resulting functional data objects are then used to estimate the regression coefficients for the two potential outcome models. We estimate the FATE as in Eq. (3) and construct 95% confidence bands according to Eq. (9). All analyses are performed in R (Version 4.0.2) (R Core Team, 2020), using the `ffscb` package (Liebl and Reimherr, 2019a) to obtain the confidence bands; see Appendix C for further details.

Figure 2 shows the estimated FATE and 95% simultaneous confidence band for men (blue) and women (red). Additional figures comparing the simultaneous confidence bands to pointwise bands can be found in Appendix D. Especially in the early years, the effects display different patterns for these two groups. For men, there exists a negative causal effect of living in an urban area at the age of 20 on early incomes, between the ages of 21 and 26 (1975-1980). This might be due to differences in later educational attainment, i.e. that those who live in an urban area in early adulthood are more likely to continue tertiary education. From around age 30 and onward, the effect for men is positive, and the 95% simultaneous confidence bands do not contain zero for the majority of these years.

For women, on the other hand, the causal effect is positive for the entire period, and the

bands do not contain zero from 1979 onwards. Overall, the point estimate of the FATE is higher for women than for men. Figure 2 also illustrates the adaptive width property of the confidence bands. In the first years after (potential) labour market entry, the confidence bands are wider to account for the larger variability in cumulative incomes during that period. The results suggest that generally speaking, women benefit from starting in an urban labour market to a greater extent than men. However, there is a positive effect for both groups later in their working lives.




Figure 2: Estimates (solid lines) of the FATE of living in urban versus rural areas at the age of 20 on cumulative life income for the cohort born 1954 in Sweden. 95% simultaneous confidence bands (dashed lines) for the FATE. By gender, blue: men, red: women.

4 Simulation study

This section evaluates the finite sample performance of the confidence bands introduced in this paper using Monte Carlo simulations. A realistic setting is obtained by sampling covariate values from the sample used in the case study of Section 3 and simulating exposure and outcome using the fitted propensity score and outcome models.

4.1 Study design

The design described below is replicated for the women and men samples separately. We sample n vector values, \mathbf{x}_i , $i = 1, \dots, n$, with replacement from the sample used in Section 3 to form a simulation replicate of the original sample. We use stratified sampling since some covariate value combinations have few observations. The three strata used are "Children before age 20", "Foreign-born parents", and "Parents' tertiary education". These simulated values of \mathbf{x} are treated as fixed for all replicates in a fixed design setting. A random design setting will also be considered later on.

We generate the treatment assignments as $z_i \sim \text{Ber}(\pi_i)$, with

$$\pi_i = \Pr(z_i = 1 \mid \mathbf{x}_i) = \frac{\exp(\mathbf{x}_i^T \boldsymbol{\gamma})}{1 + \exp(\mathbf{x}_i^T \boldsymbol{\gamma})}, \quad (10)$$

Chapman where $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$ is based on estimates from the application study and given in Table E.1 in Appendix E. The potential outcomes are generated at 43 equidistant points t on $[0,1]$ as

$$y_i(t) = \begin{cases} \mathbf{x}_i^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_0(t) + \varepsilon_{0i}(t) & , \text{ for } i : z_i = 0, \\ \mathbf{x}_i^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_1(t) + \varepsilon_{1i}(t) & , \text{ for } i : z_i = 1, \end{cases} \quad (11)$$

where $\boldsymbol{\beta}_z(t)$, $z = 0, 1$, are based on the estimated regression coefficients from the corresponding models in the application study. They are displayed in Figure E.1 in the Appendix (exact numerical values can be obtained from the authors). Moreover, the random error functions $\varepsilon_{zi}(t)$ are generated such that

$$\varepsilon_{zi} \sim \mathcal{GP}(0, \sigma_z), \quad (12)$$

using the R-package `ffscb`, where σ_z are calculated from the residuals of the outcome regression models in Section 3. In the fixed design setting, the "true" FATE parameter is $\bar{\mathbf{x}}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_1(t) - \bar{\mathbf{x}}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_0(t)$, where $\bar{\mathbf{x}} = \frac{1}{n} \mathbf{x}^T \mathbb{1}_{n \times 1}$.

We use 1000 replicates to evaluate four different types of pointwise and simultaneous confidence bands for $\hat{\theta}(t)$:

(i) We assume that the covariance structures σ_0 and σ_1 , used to generate the random error functions in Eq. (12), are known. These covariances are used to calculate $C_\theta(s, t)$. We then construct 95% simultaneous confidence bands as in Eq. (7).

(ii) We estimate the error functions covariance structures σ_0 and σ_1 using the residuals from the regression models in the current simulation replicate. We thus obtain $\hat{C}_\theta(s, t)$ as in Eq. (8). This results in the asymptotically valid 95% simultaneous confidence bands given in Eq. (9).

(iii) We construct pointwise 95% confidence intervals separately at each of the 43 time points for which the outcome is observed. For this third type of band, we use the diagonal of the known true covariance matrix $C_\theta(s, t)$ to construct the pointwise 95%

confidence band:

$$\hat{\theta}(t) \pm t_{.05} \sqrt{C_{\theta}(t, t)}, \quad (13)$$

where $t_{.05}$ is the 97.5th percentile from the t-distribution with $n - 1$ degrees of freedom.

(iv) We construct the pointwise confidence bands as in Eq. (13), but using $\hat{C}_{\theta}(t, t)$ instead.

The empirical coverage rate is computed as 100 times the proportion of replicates for which the band contains $\theta(t)$ over all observed time points t . Four different sample sizes are used, $n = 250, 500, 1000$ and 10000 .

Aside from the fixed design setup and Gaussian random error case described above, we also compare the bands of type (ii) and (iv) in two other setups: Firstly, we perform the simulations in a random design setup, in which new covariate values are re-sampled for each replicate. For the evaluation of the confidence bands, we use the approximation of the "true" FATE parameter:

$$\frac{1}{1000} \sum_{b=1}^{1000} (\bar{\mathbf{x}}_b^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_1(t) - \bar{\mathbf{x}}_b^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_0(t)),$$

where \mathbf{x}_b is the covariate values in the b^{th} replicate.

Furthermore, for the fixed design setup, we allow in another scenario for an error process which is not Gaussian: instead of Eq. (12), we generate the error term from a multivariate t-distribution with ten degrees of freedom (Genz et al., 2020): $\varepsilon_{zi}(t) \sim t_{10}(\mathbf{0}, \sigma_z(t, t))$.

Finally, we explore the performance of the confidence bands for a different estimator of the FATE, the augmented inverse probability weighting (doubly robust, DR) estimator (Robins et al., 1994; Moosavi et al., 2022) given by

$$\hat{\theta}_{DR}(t) = \hat{\theta}(t) + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n z_i \frac{y_i(t) - \mathbf{x}_i^T \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_1(t)}{\hat{\pi}_i} - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (1 - z_i) \frac{y_i(t) - \mathbf{x}_i^T \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_0(t)}{1 - \hat{\pi}_i}.$$

As an ad-hoc estimator its covariance structure, we use \hat{C}_{θ} defined above, with its diagonal elements replaced by estimates of the pointwise variance of $\hat{\theta}_{DR}(t)$ (sandwich estimator, Lunceford and Davidian, 2004).

4.2 Results

Table 1 displays empirical coverage rates for the four confidence bands studied obtained over the 1000 replicates in the fixed design setup. There are no qualitative differences in the results between the simulations based on the data for men and women. The simultaneous confidence bands using the known covariance (type *i*) attain their nominal

Table 1: Empirical coverages based on 1000 replicates for four types of confidence bands in the fixed design, four sample sizes, presented for men and women separately. The nominal coverage level is 95%.

Fixed design Type\ n	Men				Women			
	250	500	1000	10000	250	500	1000	10000
(i)	95.0	96.4	95.7	95.2	95.2	96.0	95.9	95.7
(ii)	93.4	96.1	95.5	95.1	93.2	95.4	95.8	95.6
(iii)	70.6	69.7	70.9	72.1	71.0	71.2	72.7	70.1
(iv)	66.2	67.5	69.7	72.1	65.5	65.5	70.8	69.9

size of 95%. When estimating the covariance function $\hat{C}_\theta(s, t)$ (bands of type *ii*), we see that empirical coverages attain their nominal level of 95% for sample sizes $n = 500$ and larger. As expected, both types of pointwise confidence bands (type *iii* and *iv*) have too low empirical coverages due to the multiple comparison problem.

Figure 3 displays the results graphically from one simulation replicate with $n = 500$ using the fixed design and the male subset. The simultaneous confidence bands (type *i* and *ii*), shown as dotted and dashed red curves are wider than their pointwise counterparts and cover the true $\theta(t)$ at all points. An additional figure displaying the average estimates and confidence bands over these 1000 replicates can be found in Appendix E.3.

The results for the three additional scenarios can be found in Table 2. We can see that the results from the random design setting are similar to those from the fixed design, as expected from the asymptotic results of Section 2.4. The bands attain a coverage close to the nominal level of 95% for the sample sizes considered. In addition, the simultaneous confidence bands also perform well under non-Gaussian random error terms (see rows corresponding to Non-GP errors in Table 2). When simultaneous confidence bands are used in combination with a DR estimator, their coverage level is well above the nominal 95% for most sample sizes, indicating that the bands are unnecessarily wide, due probably to the ad-hoc nature of our covariance structure estimator in this particular case.




Figure 3: True and estimated FATE and the four types of confidence bands from one simulated replicate for the fixed design and male subset, $n=500$.

5 Discussion

This paper is, up to our knowledge, the first to present methods to study causal effects of a treatment on a functional outcome. In this context, we define a functional causal parameter (FATE or FATT), propose an estimator based on outcome regression, and provide simultaneous confidence bands that cover the true functional parameter over its entire domain with a given probability. The theoretical results are confirmed in simulation experiments, where the simultaneous confidence bands achieve the desired nominal coverage rate.

The methods derived here have allowed us to study the effect of early adult residence location on cumulative life incomes over the entire working life of a Swedish birth cohort. For men, we find a negative effect of living in an urban versus a rural area at the age of 20 on cumulative incomes in early career stages. This effect becomes positive later in life. For women, living in an urban area in early adulthood has a slightly stronger, positive effect on cumulative incomes throughout the working life. Other studies on the associations between initial labour market conditions and later labour market outcomes have used much shorter follow-up periods (Altonji et al., 2016; Kwon et al., 2010; Ore-

Table 2: Empirical coverages based on 1000 replicates for additional scenarios, presented for men and women separately. The nominal coverage level is 95%.

Setup	Type\ n	Men				Women			
		250	500	1000	10000	250	500	1000	10000
Random design	(ii)	93.8	95.3	94.6	96.9	95.5	94.6	95.6	96.3
	(iv)	67.3	70.3	72.4	72.9	67.0	67.3	69.0	69.9
Non-GP errors	(ii)	93.4	95.3	96.0	95.2	95.2	96.2	95.4	96.1
	(iv)	66.9	69.2	70.9	71.5	63.9	67.3	68.0	72.3
DR-estimator	(ii)	96.3	97.8	97.0	96.2	95.0	96.6	96.7	97.7
	(iv)	63.1	69.8	70.2	96.2	63.2	68.5	70.0	71.6

opoulos et al., 2012; Schwandt and von Wachter, 2019; Åslund and Rooth, 2007), or do not correct for the multiple comparison problem (Raaum and Røed, 2006).

The methods and theory presented are readily applicable to other contexts. For instance, patients may be monitored with electronic instruments yielding functional signal outcomes in medical applications. We have focused on outcome regression estimators. Extension of the theory to other semi-parametric estimators, including the augmented inverse probability weighting estimator studied in the simulation study and the closely related targeted learning estimator (van der Laan and Rose, 2018), would be a valuable future research direction. In such cases, the difficulty resides in showing that the resulting functional estimator is asymptotically a multivariate Gaussian process. In particular, the tightness of the pointwise estimators needs to be shown (Choi and Reimherr, 2018).

References

- Abramowicz, K., Häger, C. K., Pini, A., Schelin, L., Sjöstedt de Luna, S. and Vantini, S. (2018) Nonparametric inference for functional-on scalar linear models applied to knee kinematic hop data after injury of the anterior cruciate ligament. *Scandinavian Journal of Statistics*, **45**, 1036–1061.
- Altonji, J. G., Kahn, L. B. and Speer, J. D. (2016) Cashier or Consultant? Entry Labor Market Conditions, Field of Study, and Career Success. *Journal of Labor Economics*, **34**, S361–S401.
- Chen, Z., Fan, J. and Wang, K. (2021) Remarks on multivariate Gaussian Process. URL: <https://arxiv.org/pdf/2010.09830.pdf>.
- Chen, Z., Wang, B. and Gorban, A. N. (2020) Multivariate Gaussian and Student-t

- process regression for multi-output prediction. *Neural Computing and Applications*, **32**, 3005–3028.
- Chib, S. and Jacobi, L. (2007) Modeling and calculating the effect of treatment at baseline from panel outcomes. *Journal of Econometrics*, **140**, 781–801.
- Choi, H. and Reimherr, M. (2018) A geometric approach to confidence regions and bands for functional parameters. *J.R. Statist. Soc B*, **80**, 239–260.
- Genz, A., Bretz, F., Miwa, T., Mi, X., Leisch, F., Scheipl, F. and Hothorn, T. (2020) *mvt-norm: Multivariate Normal and t Distributions*. URL: <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=mvtnorm>. R package version 1.1-1.
- Gupta, A. and Nagar, D. (2000) *Matrix variate distributions*. No. 104 in Monographs and surveys in pure and applied mathematics. Boca Raton, Chapman and Hall/CRC.
- Holm, S. (1979) A Simple Sequentially Rejective Multiple Test Procedure. *Scandinavian Journal of Statistics*, **6**, 65–70.
- Jacobi, L., Wagner, H. and Frühwirth-Schnatter, S. (2016) Bayesian treatment effects models with variable selection for panel outcomes with an application to earnings effects of maternity leave. *Journal of Econometrics*, **193**, 235–250.
- Johansson, P.-O. and Kriström, B. (2016) *Cost–Benefit Analysis for Project Appraisal*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Karlsson, C. and Olsson, M. (2006) The identification of functional regions: theory, methods, and applications. *The Annals of Regional Science*, **40**, 1–18.
- Kwon, I., Meyerson Milgrom, E. and Hwang, S. (2010) Cohort Effects in Promotions and Wages Evidence from Sweden and the United States. *Journal of Human Resources*, **45**.
- van der Laan, M. J. and Rose, S. (2018) *Targeted Learning in Data Science: Causal Inference for Complex Longitudinal Studies*. Berlin, Springer.
- Liebl, D. and Reimherr, M. (2019a) *ffscb: fast n’ fair simultaneous confidence bands for functional parameters*. URL: <https://github.com/lidom/ffscb>. R package version 0.0.10.
- (2019b) Fast and fair simultaneous confidence bands for functional parameters. URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/1910.00131>.

- (2020) Simultaneous Inference for Function-valued Parameters: a Fast and Fair Approach. In *Functional and High-Dimensional Statistics and Related Fields* (eds. G. Aneiros, I. Horová, M. Hušková and F. Vieu), chap. 21. Cham, Springer Nature Switzerland AG.
- Lin, Z., Kong, D. and Wang, L. (2021) Causal inference on distribution functions. URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2101.01599>.
- Lindgren, U., Nilsson, K., de Luna, X. and Ivarsson, A. (2016) Data Resource Profile: Swedish Microdata Research from Childhood into Lifelong Health and Welfare (Umeå SIMSAM Lab). *International Journal of Epidemiology*, **0**, 1–8.
- Lunceford, J. and Davidian, M. (2004) Stratification and weighting via the propensity score in estimation of causal treatment effects: a comparative study. *Statistics in Medicine*, **23**, 2937–2960.
- Moosavi, N., Häggström, J. and de Luna, X. (2022) The costs and benefits of uniformly valid causal inference with high-dimensional nuisance parameters. *Statistical Science (to appear)*, arXiv:2105.02071.
- Oreopoulos, P., von Wachter, T. and Heisz, A. (2012) The short and long-term career effects of graduating in a recession. *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics*, **4**.
- Pini, A. and Vantini, S. (2017a) *fdatest: Interval Testing Procedure for Functional Data*. URL: <https://github.com/alessiapini/fdatest>. R package version 2.1.0.
- (2017b) Interval-wise testing for functional data. *Journal of Nonparametric Statistics*, **29**, 407–424.
- Raaum, O. and Røed, K. (2006) Do Business Cycle Conditions at the Time of Labor Market Entry Affect Future Employment Prospects? *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, **88**, 193–210.
- Ramsay, J. O., Graves, S. and Hooker, G. (2020) *fda: Functional Data Analysis*. URL: <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=fda>. R package version 5.1.5.1.
- Ramsay, J. O. and Silverman, B. W. (2005) *Functional Data Analysis*. Springer Series in Statistics. New York, Springer, 2 edn.
- R Core Team (2020) *R: A language and environment for statistical computing*. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. URL: <https://R-project.org>.

- Reimherr, M. and Nicolae, D. (2014) A functional data analysis approach for genetic association studies. *The Annals of Applied Statistics*, **8**, 406 – 429. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1214/13-AOAS692>.
- Robins, J. M., Rotnitzky, A. and Zhao, L. P. (1994) Estimation of regression coefficients when some regressors are not always observed. *Journal of the American statistical Association*, **89**, 846–866.
- Rosenbaum, P. and Rubin, D. (1983) The central role of the propensity score in observational studies for causal effects. *Biometrika*, **70**, 41–55.
- Schwandt, H. and von Wachter, T. (2019) Unlucky Cohorts: Estimating the Long-Term Effects of Entering the Labor Market in a Recession in Large Cross-Sectional Data Sets. *Journal of Labor Economics*, **37**.
- Statistics Sweden (2010) *Lokala arbetsmarknader – egenskaper, utveckling och funktion*. Örebro, Statistics Sweden.
- Tan, Z. (2007) Comment: Understanding OR, PS and DR. *Statistical Science*, **22**, 560–568.
- Telschow, F. and Schwartzman, A. (2022) Simultaneous confidence bands for functional data using the Gaussian Kinematic Formula. *Journal of Statistical Planning and Inference*, **216**, 70–94.
- Vsevolozhskaya, O., Greenwood, M. and Holodov, D. (2014) Pairwise comparison of treatment levels in functional analysis of variance with application to erythrocyte hemolysis. *The Annals of Applied Statistics*, **8**, 905–925.
- Wang, J.-L., Chiou, J.-M. and Müller, H.-G. (2016) Functional Data Analysis. *The Annual Review of Statistics and Its Application*, **3**, 257–295.
- Åslund, O. and Rooth, D. (2007) Do when and where matter? Initial labour market conditions and immigrant earnings. *The Economic Journal*, **117**.

APPENDIX

A Functional Average Treatment effect on the Treated population

The Functional Average Treatment effect on the Treated population (FATT) is defined as:

$$\eta := \{\eta(t) = \mathbb{E}(y_{1i}(t) - y_{0i}(t) \mid z_i = 1) : t \in [0, 1]\}.$$

It can be identified under Assumptions 1.a and 2.a in section 2.1. Under the model in Eq. (1), a semi-parametric estimator for the FATT is given by:

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\eta}(t) &= \frac{1}{n_1} \sum_{i=1}^n z_i (\mathbf{x}_i^T \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_1(t) - \mathbf{x}_i^T \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_0(t)) \\ &= \bar{\mathbf{x}}_1 \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_1(t) - \bar{\mathbf{x}}_1 \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_0(t), \end{aligned}$$

where $\bar{\mathbf{x}}_1 = \frac{1}{n_1} \mathbb{1}_{1 \times n_1} \mathbf{X}_1$ is the vector of sample means for the subset of treated observations. Analogous to equations (5)-(6), we have that $\hat{\eta} = \{\hat{\eta}(t) : t \in [0, 1]\}$ is a Gaussian process:

$$\hat{\eta} \sim \mathcal{GP}(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_1 \boldsymbol{\beta}_1 - \bar{\mathbf{x}}_1 \boldsymbol{\beta}_0, C_\eta),$$

where

$$C_\eta(s, t) = \sigma_1(s, t) \bar{\mathbf{x}}_1 (\mathbf{X}_1^T \mathbf{X}_1)^{-1} \bar{\mathbf{x}}_1^T + \sigma_0(s, t) \bar{\mathbf{x}}_1 (\mathbf{X}_0^T \mathbf{X}_0)^{-1} \bar{\mathbf{x}}_1^T.$$

B Estimator of FATE is a Gaussian process

We reproduce here the definition of a multivariate Gaussian process given in Chen et al. (2020):

Let \mathbf{f} be a multivariate Gaussian process on \mathcal{X} with vector-valued mean function $\boldsymbol{\mu} : \mathcal{X} \mapsto \mathbb{R}^n$, covariance function $\sigma : \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X} \mapsto \mathbb{R}$, and positive semi-definite parameter matrix $\Omega \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$. We denote this process $\mathbf{f} \sim \text{MG}\mathcal{P}(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \sigma, \Omega)$. Then the vectorization of any finite collection of L vector-valued variables have a joint multi-variate Gaussian distribution:

$$\text{vec}([\mathbf{f}(x_1)^T, \dots, \mathbf{f}(x_L)^T]^T) \sim \mathcal{N}_{dn}(\text{vec}(M), \Sigma \otimes \Omega), L \in \mathbb{N},$$

where $M \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times L}$ with $M_{ij} = \mu_j(x_i)$ and $\Sigma > 0$, $\Sigma \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ with $\Sigma_{ij} = \sigma(x_i, x_j)$. Furthermore, $\mathbf{f}, \boldsymbol{\mu} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ are row vectors whose components are the functions $\{f_i\}_{i=1}^n$ and $\{\mu_i\}_{i=1}^n$, respectively. Sometimes Σ is called the column covariance matrix, while Ω is the row covariance matrix. See also Chen et al. (2021) for proof of existence and further properties. This in turn implies that any finite collection of L vector-valued variables have a joint matrix variate Gaussian distribution (Gupta and Nagar, 2000):

$$[\mathbf{f}(x_1)^T, \dots, \mathbf{f}(x_L)^T]^T \sim \mathcal{N}_{d,n}(M, \Sigma \otimes \Omega).$$

The error terms in model Eq. (1) are assumed to be multivariate Gaussian processes, denoted as

$$\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_z \sim \text{MG}\mathcal{P}(0, \sigma_z, \mathbb{I}_{n_z}),$$

where \mathbb{I}_{n_z} is a $n_z \times n_z$ identity matrix.

Using the definition above we have that, for any finite collection $\{t_l\}_{l=1}^L$ of points in the domain, the error terms for each treatment group follow a joint matrix-variate Gaussian distribution:

$$\mathbf{E}_z := [\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_z(t_1)^T, \dots, \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_z(t_L)^T] \sim \mathcal{N}_{n_z, L}(0_{n_z, L}, \mathbb{I}_{n_z} \otimes \Sigma_z),$$

where $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_z(t_l)$, $l = 1, \dots, L$, are row vectors of length n_z ; $0_{n_z, L}$ is a $n_z \times L$ null matrix, and Σ_z is a $L \times L$ matrix with elements $[\Sigma_z]_{i,j} = \sigma_z(t_i, t_j)$.

We further specify the following matrices: $\Omega_z := (\mathbf{X}_z^T \mathbf{X}_z)^{-1}$, $\mathbf{B}_z := [\boldsymbol{\beta}_z(t_1), \dots, \boldsymbol{\beta}_z(t_L)]$, and $\hat{\mathbf{B}}_z := [\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_z(t_1), \dots, \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_z(t_L)]$. Given a fixed design matrix, the matrix of estimated regression coefficients can be expressed as

$$\hat{\mathbf{B}}_z = \mathbf{B}_z + \Omega_z \mathbf{X}_z^T \mathbf{E}_z.$$

Then, for any finite collection of points, $\hat{\mathbf{B}}_z$ follows a matrix-variate Gaussian distribution (Gupta and Nagar, 2000) with

$$\hat{\mathbf{B}}_z \sim \mathcal{N}_{(K+1),L} \left(\Omega_z \mathbf{X}_z^T \mathbf{0}_{n_z, L} + \mathbf{B}_z, \left[\Omega_z \mathbf{X}_z^T \mathbb{1}_{n_z} (\Omega_z \mathbf{X}_z^T)^T \right] \otimes \Sigma_z \right),$$

which simplifies to

$$\hat{\mathbf{B}}_z \sim \mathcal{N}_{(K+1),L} (\mathbf{B}_z, \Omega_z \otimes \Sigma_z).$$

Because the above statement holds for any finite collection $\{t_l\}_{l=1}^L$, the process $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_z = \{\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_z(t) : t \in [0, 1]\}$ is a multivariate Gaussian process:

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_z \sim \mathcal{MG}\mathcal{P}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_z, \sigma_z, (\mathbf{X}_z^T \mathbf{X}_z)^{-1}).$$

To derive the distribution of $\hat{\theta}$, we can use the distribution of $\hat{\mathbf{B}}_z$ in Eq. (B) and see that the product

$$\bar{\mathbf{x}} \hat{\mathbf{B}}_z \sim \mathcal{N}_{1,L}(\bar{\mathbf{x}} \mathbf{B}_z, [\bar{\mathbf{x}} \Omega_z \bar{\mathbf{x}}^T] \otimes \Sigma_z).$$

This $1 \times M$ -dimensional matrix-variate Gaussian distribution coincides with a M -dimensional multivariate Gaussian distribution. Since these distributional statements, again, hold for any finite collection of points in the domain, it follows that $\bar{\mathbf{x}} \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_z = \{\bar{\mathbf{x}} \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_z(t) : t \in [0, 1]\}$ is a Gaussian process:

$$\bar{\mathbf{x}} \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_z \sim \mathcal{GP}(\bar{\mathbf{x}} \boldsymbol{\beta}_z, \bar{\mathbf{x}} (\mathbf{X}_z^T \mathbf{X}_z)^{-1} \bar{\mathbf{x}}^T \sigma_z).$$

Under the assumption of ignorability, $\bar{\mathbf{x}} \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_0$ and $\bar{\mathbf{x}} \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_1$ are independent, meaning that the difference between them also is a Gaussian process:

$$\hat{\theta} \sim \mathcal{GP}(\bar{\mathbf{x}} \boldsymbol{\beta}_1 - \bar{\mathbf{x}} \boldsymbol{\beta}_0, C_\theta),$$

with C_θ given in Eq. (6).

C Practical details of estimating the FATE and constructing confidence bands

The following section describes the technical details of the application study in section 3. All steps were performed in R (R Core Team, 2020), and done separately for men and women.

1. To represent the discrete annual measurements of income as functional objects, we apply a low degree of monotone smoothing to the logarithmized cumulative incomes. The smoothing is performed using the `smooth.monotone` function in the `fda` package (Ramsay et al., 2020), and we use a basis of 45 cubic B-splines and a smoothing parameter of $\lambda = 0.1$, penalising the second derivative. During this stage, an additional 28 individuals had to be excluded from the analysis, because the shape of their income accumulations (very steep inclines followed by long plateaus) did not allow for a low degree of monotone smoothing. The resulting functional data objects are evaluated at a quarterly basis, i.e. yielding four evaluations per calendar year.
2. Next, we subset the observed data into two groups: treated ($z = 1$) and controls ($z = 0$).
3. In each treatment group, we regress the quarterly evaluations of the smoothed functions, $y(t)$, on the covariates \mathbf{x} , using the `IWTlm` function in the `fdatest` package (Pini and Vantini, 2017a). The estimated regression coefficients $\hat{\beta}_z(t)$ and the residuals from the two outcome regression models are saved.
4. We then use the estimated regression coefficients and the covariate means to estimate the ATE with $\hat{\theta}(t)$, as in Eq. (3).
5. We compute the sample covariances of the residuals from the two outcome regression models in step 2; yielding $\hat{\sigma}_1(s, t)$ and $\hat{\sigma}_0(s, t)$. These are used to compute \hat{C}_θ as given in Eq. (8).
6. With \hat{C}_θ , we use the `cov2tau_fun` function in the `ffscb` package (Liebl and Reimherr, 2019a) to obtain the estimated roughness parameter function $\hat{\tau}$.
7. In the same package, we use the `confidence_bands` function to construct the simultaneous confidence bands using $\hat{\theta}$, \hat{C}_θ and $\hat{\tau}$. We choose to obtain 95% simultaneous confidence bands for $\theta(t)$ as well as the corresponding naive point-wise confidence bands based on the t-distribution. All other arguments of this function are set to their defaults.

D Comparison of pointwise and simultaneous confidence bands

Figures D.1 and D.2 display 95% pointwise confidence bands from the application study in section 3, in addition to the simultaneous bands, for men and women respectively. We can see that the pointwise bands are more narrow, most notably so for women in the first 10 years.




Figure D.1: Estimates (solid line) of the FATE of living in urban versus rural areas at the age of 20 on cumulative life income for the male cohort born 1954 in Sweden. 95% simultaneous confidence bands (dashed line) and 95% pointwise confidence bands (dotted line) for the FATE.




Figure D.2: Estimates (solid line) of the FATE of living in urban versus rural areas at the age of 20 on cumulative life income for the female cohort born 1954 in Sweden. 95% simultaneous confidence bands (dashed line) and 95% pointwise confidence bands (dotted line) for the FATE.

E Details of the simulation study in Section 4

E.1 Parameters used to generate data

The coefficients used in the outcome models in Eq. (11) are displayed in Figure E.1; exact values can be obtained from the authors. The coefficients used in the propensity score models in Eq. (10) are shown in Table E.1.

Estimated regression coefficients




Figure E.1: Estimated regression coefficients for the two treatment groups, for men and women.

Table E.1: Estimated coefficients (γ) from the propensity score models (logistic regression). Coefficients in bold are significant at $\alpha = 0.05$.

Variable	Men	Women
Intercept	-2.194	3.872
Year of first income	-0.052	-0.124
Previous income	-0.001	0.054
Children before age 20	0.020	-0.378
Secondary education	-0.097	0.109
Number of siblings	-0.056	-0.052
Parents' income	0.510	0.407
Foreign-born parents	0.568	0.541
Parents' secondary education	0.674	0.690
Parents' tertiary education	0.851	0.933

E.2 Descriptives on the covariates

Table E.2 shows the distribution of the covariates for men and women separately.

Table E.2: Descriptive information on the covariates, presented as mean (standard deviation) or as % for indicator variables.

Variable	Men	Women
Year of first income	1971.7 (1.2)	1972.1 (1.0)
Previous income	8.3 (4.1)	7.2 (4.5)
Children before age 20	1.9%	10.0%
Secondary education	71.0%	79.0%
Number of siblings	2.3 (1.8)	2.3 (1.8)
Parents' income	11.8 (0.9)	11.9 (0.9)
Foreign-born parents	2.3%	2.3%
Parents' secondary education	29.7%	30.0%
Parents' tertiary education	11.2%	11.3%

E.3 Average estimates and confidence bands

Figure E.2 shows the averages of the estimated FATE and the four different types of confidence bands, taken over 10000 replicates of the simulation study in section 4. The results are for the male subset and a sample size of $n = 500$ in the fixed design setup, corresponding to the second column in Table 1.




Figure E.2: Means of the FATE estimates and four types of confidence bands over the 1000 simulation replicates for male subset, $n = 500$.