

# Generative Bayesian Computation for Causal Inference

Maria Nareklishvili

*Ragnar Frisch Centre for Economic Research  
University of Oslo*

Nicholas Polson\*

*Booth School of Business  
University of Chicago*

Vadim Sokolov

*Department of Systems Engineering  
and Operations Research  
George Mason University*

First Draft: June 20, 2023  
This Draft: December 20, 2024

## Abstract

Generative Bayesian Computation (GBC) methods are developed for Casual Inference. Generative methods are simulation-based methods that use a large training dataset to represent posterior distributions as a map (a.k.a. optimal transport) to a base distribution. They avoid the use of MCMC by replacing the conditional posterior inference problem with a supervised learning problem. We further propose the use Quantile ReLU networks which are density free and hence apply in a variety of Econometric settings where data generating processes are specified by deterministic latent variables updates or as moment constraints. Generative approaches directly simulate large samples of observables and unobservable (parameters, latent variables) and then apply high-dimensional quantile regression to learn a nonlinear transport map from base distribution to parameter inference. We illustrate our methodology in the field of causal inference. Our approach can also handle nonlinearity and heterogeneity. Finally, we conclude with the directions for future research.

Keywords. Generative Bayesian Computation, Generative AI, Bayes, Causal inference, Deep Learning, Econometrics, Neural Networks,

---

\*Email: ngp@chicagobooth.edu

# 1 Introduction

Generative AI methods are proposed to solve problems of inference and prediction in econometrics. Generative methods require a use of large simulated training dataset which are prevalent in econometrics. The goal of such methods is to use deep neural networks to find a stochastic mapping between the parameters and data. Causal inference provides a natural testing ground for this methods. We develop NN architectures for this types of problems and future research is required for other problems such as DSGE models, auction models, IO models and others. There is a number of advantages over the simulation based techniques such as MCMC. Our quantile gen-AI method avoids using densities and can be applied to high dimensions problems. The approach can be extended to solve decision-making problems using reinforcement learning methods, see Polson et al. [2024].

Our work builds on ideas from earlier papers that proposed using Bayesian non-linear models to analyze treatment effects and causality Hill and McCulloch [2007], Hahn et al. [2020] and work on using deep learning for instrumented variables Nareklishvili et al. [2022a]. We study the implicit quantile neural networks Polson et al. [2024]. Further, we investigate a long standing debate of causal inference on weather the propensity score is necessary for estimating the treatment effect. The intersection of the Bayesian methods, machine learning [Bhadra et al., 2021, Xu et al., 2018] and causal inference in the context of observational data is a relatively new area of research. Both Bayesian and machine learning techniques provide intuitive and flexible tools for analyzing complex data. Specifically, non-linearity's and heterogeneous effects can be modeled using both Bayes and ML techniques. Some authors propose a compromise between frequentist and Bayesian methods, for example, Antonelli et al. [2022] consider using Bayesian methods to estimate both a propensity score and a response surface in the high-dimensional settings, and then using a doubly-robust estimator by averaging over draws from the posterior distribution of the parameters of these models. Stephens et al. [2023] argue that pure Bayesian methods are more suitable for causal inference.

Let  $(X, Y) \sim P_{X,Y}$  be input-output pairs and  $P_{X,Y}$  a joint measure. By factorizing this measure as  $P_X \times P_{Y|X}$  where  $P_{Y|X}$  is known as the forward map we can simulate a large training dataset  $(X_i, Y_i)_{i=1}^N \sim P_{X,Y}$ . The goal is to characterize the inverse conditional map  $P_{X|Y}$ . Standard prediction techniques can be used to find the conditional posterior mean  $\hat{X}(Y) = E(X|Y) = f(Y)$  of the input given the output via a multivariate non-parametric regression  $X = f(Y) + \epsilon$ . Typically estimators,  $\hat{f}$ , include KNN and Kernel methods. Recently, deep learners have been proposed and the theoretical properties of superpositions of affine functions (a.k.a. ridge functions) have been provided (see Diaconis and Shahshahani [1984], Montanelli and Yang [2020], Schmidt-Hieber [2020], Polson and Ročková [2018]).

Generative methods take this approach one step further. Let  $Z \sim P_Z$  be a base measure for a latent variable,  $Z$ , typically a standard multivariate normal or vector of uniforms. The goal of generative methods is to characterize the posterior measure  $P_{X|Y}$  from the training data  $(X_i, Y_i)_{i=1}^N \sim P_{X,Y}$  where  $N$  is chosen to be suitably large. A deep learner is used to estimate  $\hat{G}$  via the non-parametric regression  $X = G(Y, Z)$ . In the case, where  $Z$  is a unfrock, this amounts to inverse cdf sampling, namely  $X = F_{X|Y}^{-1}(U)$ .

Polson and Sokolov [2023] suggest the use of autoregressive RNNs for multivariate inference and Kim and Rockova [2023] propose the use of Brenier’s maps as a solution to the multivariate case, see also Carlier et al. [2016]. One can therefore view Bayesian inference is then a high dimensional non-parametric regression in terms of a supervised learning problem.

Our goal then is to train a conditional deep learner  $t \hat{Q}_{Y|X} : (U, \mathcal{X}) \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$  where the conditional cdf is defined in terms of quantiles,  $\tau$ , via

$$\hat{Q}_{Y|X}(\tau, x) : (\tau, x) \rightarrow \in \{y \in \mathcal{R} : F_{Y|X}(y|x) \geq \tau\}$$

This will allow us to simulate from the posterior using the inverse cdf method of von Neumann. The inherent difficulty in the multivariate case is that there exists multiple transport maps to determiner a generative model. One approach is to use an autoregressive RNN architecture or to use a Brenier’s map Hütter and Rigollet [2021]. Specifically, to learn an inverse CDF, we use a kernel trick known as cosine embedding and augment the predictor space. This has the effect of using. discrete cosine transform for  $\tau$ . We use a different approach, to learn a single quantile function  $F_{Y|X}^{-1}(\tau, x) = f_{\theta_f}(\tau, x)$ , and then use the quantile function to generate samples from the target distribution. We represent the quantile function is a function of superposition for two other functions  $F^{-1}(\tau, x) = f_{\theta_f}(\tau, x) = g(\psi(x) \circ \phi(\tau))$ , as proposed in Dabney et al. [2018], where  $\circ$  is the element-wise multiplication operator. Both functions  $g$  and  $\phi$  are feed-forward neural networks. To avoid over-fitting, we use a sufficiently large training dataset. Another advantage of quantiles is that they naturally lead to estimates of posterior functionals such as means see Polson et al. [2024]. This is particularly useful in casual inference where one wants to learn the average treatment effect.

Polson and Sokolov [2023] propose Generative Bayesian Computation (GBC) as an alternative to MCMC and ABC methods. They propose the use of quantile ReLU deep neural networks to avoid the need for densities.

- Theoretical results for multivariate quantile networks, see work on TS by Gouttes et al. [2021], Ostrovski et al. [2018], Kronheim et al. [2021]
- Relation between quantiles and Wasserstein distance. Dabney et al. [2018], Ostrovski et al. [2018]
- Gen AI is greater than GAN models. Explain the difference in objective functions. Why SGD has hard time optimizing the GAN objective function. Why quantile networks are easier to train.
- Interpolation results for deep learning Belkin et al. [2018, 2019b,a], Telgarsky [2015, 2016], Polson and Ročková [2018], Padilla et al. [2022]
- Formal connection with ABC Wang and Ročková [2023], Kaji and Ročková [2022], Kim and Rockova [2023], Polson and Sokolov [2023], Nareklishvili et al. [2023b]

**Noise Outsourcing Theorem** If  $(X, Y)$  are random variables in a Borel space  $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y})$  then there exists an r.v.  $U$  which is independent of  $Y$  and a function  $G^* : [0, 1] \times \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$

$$(X, Y) \stackrel{a.s.}{=} (X, G^*(U, X))$$

Hence the existence of  $G^*$  follows from the noise outsourcing theorem Kallenberg [1997].

Moreover, if there is a conditional statistic  $\hat{Z}(x) = E(Z|X = x)$  with  $X \perp Y | \hat{Z}(X)$ , then

$$Y|X = x, Z \stackrel{a.s.}{=} G^*(U, \hat{Z}(X))$$

The role of  $\hat{Z}(X)$  is a summary statistic. It performs dimension reduction in  $n$ , the dimensionality of the signal. Here it replaces the allocation  $Z$  by its conditional mean

$$\hat{Z}(x) = E(Z|X = x) = P(Z = 1|X = x)$$

This acts as a propensity score. The propensity score can be used to fill in some of the missing counterfactual values. Propensity Score is a summary statistic function  $\pi(x) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ . A typical approach is to run a logistic regression of  $Z$  on  $x$ .

$$\pi(x) = g(\hat{Z}(x)),$$

where  $g$  is a logit function. This approach guarantees that when the  $x$ 's from treatment group and  $x$ 's from control group are similar distributionally (histograms are similar), the propensity scores are close. Other approaches include inverse weighting, stratification, matching, and subclassification. An overview and importance of propensity score is given by Rosenbaum and Rubin [1983], Jiang et al. [2017] show that the optimal choice of summary (a.k.a. sufficient statistics Kolmogorov [1942]) is the conditional mean, Brillinger describes consistent procedure based on OLS to estimate  $\hat{Z}(x)$ . Much of the literature in casual inference has focused on running a logistic regression and using that in the architecture to estimate the conditional distribution of the treatment effect  $\tau := Y(1) - Y(0)$ . In this theorem we will take  $U \sim U(0, 1)$  and the transport map  $G^*$  to be the inverse cumulative distribution function  $F_{Y|X=x}^{-1}$ .

A number of researchers have studied the theoretical properties of quantile deep learners in terms of their asymptotic properties. This is relevant as we can choose  $N$  the size of our training dataset. White [1992] uses the method of sieves to provide consistency results for a single layer feed forward network. Padilla et al. [2022] provides minimax rates for  $\beta$ -Hölder continuous functions. Schmidt-Hieber and Zamolodtchikov [2024] consider conditional quantile regression. Carlier et al. [2016] and Kim and Rockova [2023] consider the multivariate estimation of quantiles using a Brenier's map.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Section 1.1 provides a brief overview of the existing literature. Section 2 describes the proposed method. Section 3 presents the results of the simulation study. Section 4 concludes.

## 1.1 Causal AI

In studies of causality and treatment effects, each unit from  $U$  (sample) has one of  $k$  possible treatments. Thus a single treatment is assigned to each units. In a controlled

experiment, the treatment is assigned randomly. However, we study the case of an observational data, when the treatment is not assigned randomly and the treatment effect may occur due to confounding (a.k.a. selection bias). Selection bias is simply the dependency between the treatment assignment and the outcome  $y$ . The goal is to estimate the treatment effect. The treatment effect is defined as the difference between the outcome under treatment and the outcome under control. The outcome is a random variable  $Y$  and the treatment is a random variable  $Z$ . The treatment effect is a random variable  $\tau = Y(1) - Y(0)$ . We assume that we observe the confounding predictors  $x$ , meaning that  $x$  and  $z$  are conditionally independent, given  $x$ .

One way to approach the problem of estimating the treatment effect is to construct a counterfactual sample. The counterfactual sample is a hypothetical sample, where each unit has all possible treatments. More generally, the counterfactual process is then  $Y(x, z)$  for all possible combinations of units  $x$  and treatments  $z$ . The realized sample (observed) on the other hand has only one observation per unit-treatment pair. In other words, the counterfactual process allows us to compute the conditional distribution of the response for the same unit under different treatments. The observed sample only allows us to compute the conditional distribution of the response for the same unit under the same treatment. One approach to causal inference is to estimate the counterfactual process from the observed sample. However, not everybody is enthusiastic about the approach of designing a counterfactual sample McCullagh [2022]. For example, The Dawid [2000] argues, is that the counterfactual framework adds much to the vocabulary but brings nothing of substance to the conversation regarding observables. Dawid [2000] presents an alternative approach, based on Bayesian decision analysis. The main criticism is that there are multiple ways to construct the counterfactual samples and none of them are checkable.

In regression setting, the propensity score is a function of the conditional probability of treatment given the covariates. The propensity score is a sufficient statistic for the treatment assignment. Then to estimate the treatment effect, we find “similar” units in the control group and compare their outcomes to the treatment group. The similarity is defined by the difference in propensity scores. In the controlled experiments the distributions over  $X | Z = 1$  and  $X | Z = 0$  should be the same. In observational studies, this is not the case. The main difference between a traditional predictive model and the propensity score model  $\pi(x)$  is that observed  $y$ 's are not used for training the propensity score model. Furthermore, a common feature of the real-life problems is that the response function  $f$  and the propensity score function  $\pi$  are highly-non linear. Which makes many Bayesian methods inapplicable. For example, the propensity score matching is a popular method for causal inference. However, it is not clear how to apply this method in the Bayesian setting. The propensity score matching is a non-parametric method, which means that it does not require any assumptions about the functional form of the propensity score. However, the Bayesian approach requires a parametric model for the propensity score. Yet, another complicating factor can be deterministic relationships between the covariates and the treatment/outcome. In this case, sample-based Bayesian methods are not applicable.

Hahn et al (2020) propose the use of Bayesian casual forests as a direct extend of the BART sum-of-trees approach of Hill [2011]. There are many other nonlinear regression

(a.k.a supervised learning) approaches for estimation and inference of average treatment effects (ATE) including double machine learning Carlier et al. [2016] and generalised boosting McCaffrey et al. [2004, 2013], More recently, Taddy et al. [2016] focus on estimating heterogeneous effects from experimental rather than observational data. Conditional ATE (or CATE) using regression trees is proposed in Wager and Athey [2018]. Athey et al. [2019] provide an inferential framework for CATE estimation. Zaidi and Mukherjee [2018] use Gaussian processes and directly model the transomed response surface.

While some researchers Banerjee et al. [2020], Duflo et al. [2007] argue that randomized experiments can and should be used to estimate the treatment effect, it is the case that randomized experiments are not always possible and that observational studies can be used to estimate the treatment effect. Rubin [1974] provides a good discussion of the difference in the estimation procedures for randomized and non-randomized studies.

It is contended that propensity score is not needed to estimate the treatment effects Hahn [1998], Hill and McCulloch [2007]. On the other hand, Rubin and Waterman [2006] argues that estimating propensity score, it is hard to distinguish the treatment effect from the change-over-time effect. Another debate is wether Bayesian techniques or traditional frequentist approaches are more suitable for the econometrics applications Stephens et al. [2023].

The case of binary treatments [Splawa-Neyman et al., 1990] and propensity score approach have been thoroughly studied Rubin [1974], Holland [1986]. The counterfactual approach due to Rubin [1974] is similar to the do-operator Pearl [2009], in fact the two approaches are identical, when  $Z$  is independent of  $x$ . For Bayesian techniques see Xu et al. [2018]. Machine learning techniques provide flexible approaches to more complex data generating processes, for example when networks are involved Puelz et al. [2022]. Tree based techniques are popular Wager and Athey [2018]. For a deep learning approach see Vasilescu [2022].

**Optimal rates of Statistical Learning.** Consider the non-parametric condition regression,  $y_i = f(x_i) + \epsilon_i$  where  $x_i = (x_{1i}, \dots, x_{di})$ . We wish to estimate a  $d$ -dimensional multivariate function  $f(x_1, \dots, x_d)$  where  $x = (x_1, \dots, x_d) \in [0, 1]^d$ . From a classical risk perspective, define

$$R(f, \hat{f}_N) = E_{X,Y} \left( \|f - \hat{f}_N\|^2 \right)$$

where  $\|\cdot\|$  denotes  $L^2(P_X)$ -norm.

Under standard assumptions, we have an optimal minimax rate  $\inf_{\hat{f}} \sup_f R(f, \hat{f}_N)$  of  $O_p \left( N^{-2\beta/(2\beta+d)} \right)$  for  $\beta$ -Hólder smooth functions  $f$ . Typically, this space is too large as the bound still depends on  $d$ . By restricting the class of functions better rates can be obtained including ones that do no depend on  $d$  and in this sense we avoid the curse of dimensionality. For example, it is common to consider the class of linear superpositions (a.k.a. ridge functions) and projection pursuit.

Another asymptotic result comes from a posterior concentration property. Here  $\hat{f}_N$  is constructed as a regularised MAP (maximum a posteriori) estimator which solves the

optimisation problem

$$\hat{f}_N = \arg \min_{\hat{f}_N} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N (y_i - \hat{f}_N(x_i))^2 + \phi(\hat{f}_N)$$

The ensuing posterior distribution  $\Pi(f|x, y)$  can be shown to have optimality results and concentrate on the minimax rate (up to a log  $N$  factors).

A key result in the deep learning literature is the following rate. Given a training dataset of input-output pairs  $(x_i, y_i)_{i=1}^N$  from the model  $y = f(x) + \epsilon$  where  $f$  is a deep learner (a.k.a. superposition of functions), denoted by  $f = g_L \circ \dots \circ g_1 \circ g_0$ , where  $g_i$  are  $\beta_i$ -smooth Hölder functions with  $d_i$  variables, that is  $|g_i(x) - g_i(y)| < |x - y|^{\beta_i}$ .

Then the estimator has optimal rate

$$O\left(\max_{1 \leq i \leq L} N^{-2\beta^*/(2\beta^* + d_i)}\right) \text{ where } \beta_i^* = \beta_i \prod_{l=i+1}^L \min(\beta_l, 1)$$

Applying this to the class of generalised additive models  $f_0(x) = h\left(\sum_{p=1}^d f_{0,p}(x_p)\right)$  where  $g_0(z) = h(z)$ ,  $g_1(x_1, \dots, x_d) = (f_{01}(x_1), \dots, f_{0d}(x_d))$  and  $g_2(y_1, \dots, y_d) = \sum_{i=1}^d y_i$ . So  $d_1 = 1, d_2 = 1$  and  $t_3 = 1$  as  $h$  is Lipschitz.

Therefore, the optimal rate is  $O(N^{-1/3})$ . Independent of  $d$  which is the same as a deep ReLU network. For 3-times differentiable (cubic B-splines), Coppejans [2004] finds an optimal rate of  $O(N^{-3/7}) = O(N^{-3/(2 \times 3 + 1)})$  matching the theory developed above.

## 2 Generative Bayesian Computation

Let  $Y$  denote a scalar response and  $Z$  denote a binary treatment, and  $x \in R^d$  be the covariates. We observe sample  $(Y_i, Z_i, x_i)$ , for  $i = 1, \dots, n$ . We use  $Y_i(0)$  and  $Y_i(1)$  to denote the outcome (hypothetical) with treatment zero or one. The observed outcome is given by

$$Y_i = Y_i(0) + Z_i(Y_i(1) - Y_i(0)).$$

We assume that the outcome is conditionally independent of the assigned treatment given the covariates, i.e.,  $Y_i(0)$  and  $Y_i(1)$  are independent of  $Z_i$  given  $x_i$ . We also assume that

$$P(Z_i = 1 | x_i) > 0.$$

The first condition assumes we have no unmeasured confounders. Given the two assumptions above, we can write the conditional mean of the outcome as

$$\tau(x_i) = E[Y_i(1) - Y_i(0) | x_i].$$

The goal is build a predictive model

$$Y_i = f(x_i, Z_i, \pi(x_i)) + \epsilon_i, \epsilon_i \sim N(0, \sigma_i^2),$$

where  $\pi(x_i)$  is the propensity score function. Then

$$\tau(x_i) = f(x_i, 1) - f(x_i, 0).$$

Casual inference then can be viewed as a missing data problem. The "complete data" is the bivariate potential outcomes  $(Y(1), Y(0))$ . We only get to see one of these at a time. Let  $Y$  denote a scalar response,  $Z$  a binary treatment indicator. Let  $x$  denote a  $d$ -dimensional vector of observed control variables. Consider an observed sample of size  $n$ , denoted by

$$(Y_i, Z_i, x_i), 1 \leq i \leq n.$$

We are interested in estimating various treatment effects. Conditional ATE effects correspond to  $E(Y_i|X_i, Z_i = 1)$  and  $E(Y_i|X_i, Z_i = 0)$ . We observe the potential outcome that corresponds to the realized treatment

$$Y_i = Z_i Y_i(1) + (1 - Z_i) Y_i(0).$$

Throughout we will make four assumptions that we make for casual estimation to be valid. In particular, strong ignobility and positivity given by

- Consistency: Observed data is unrelated to the potential outcomes via the identity

$$Y = Y(1)Z + Y(0)(1 - Z)$$

- Non-inference: For any samples size,

$$(Y_j(1), Y_j(0) \perp Z_j) \quad \forall i, j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$$

- Positivity:  $0 < P(Z = 1|X = x) < 1 \quad \forall x \in \mathcal{X}$ .
- Conditional Unconfoundedness: The following conditional independence condition holds

$$(Y(1), Y(0)) \perp Z_j | X$$

In frequentist approaches, adjustment is conducted by estimating parameters independently in the propensity score model  $\pi$  and the outcome model  $f, \epsilon$ . However, this two-step analysis is leads to inefficiencies. Instead, it is more intuitive to develop a single joint model that encompasses both the treatment and outcome variables. As a result, there has been a discussion regarding the applicability of Bayesian methods in causal analysis. The literature on advanced techniques for conducting Bayesian causal analysis is expanding, but certain aspects of these methodologies appear unconventional.



## 2.1 GBC for Casual Inference

Hence we have  $\tau = Y(1) - Y(0)$  and.  $\tau(x) := E(\tau|X = x) = E(Y(1) - Y(0)|X = x)$  be the average treatment effect ATE . Hence, we can write

$$\tau(x_i) = E(Y_i|X_i, Z_i = 1) - E(Y_i|X_i, Z_i = 0)$$

From a modeling perspective,  $Y_i = f(x_i, Z_i) + \epsilon_i$ ,  $\epsilon_i \sim N(0, \sigma^2)$  with  $E(Y_i|X_i, Z_i = z_i) = f(x_i, z_i)$  where  $Z_i = 0, 1$ . Alternatively, Hahn et al recommend repressing the response surface as

$$E(Y_i|X_i, Z_i = z_i) = \mu(x_i, \hat{\pi}(x_i)) + \tau(x_i)z_i$$

where  $\mu$  and  $\tau$  are given independent BART priors.

We want quantiles to calculate the treatment effect, namely the function  $F_{\tau|x}^{-1}(\cdot)$ . We start by simulating  $\theta_i, y_i$  pairs from prior and the forward model, then we reverse

$$\pi(x_i) = P(Z_i = 1 | x_i) = E(Z_i | x_i)$$

So we have sufficient statistics and can replace the dataset with  $\pi(x_i), y_i$ . We can then use the quantile regression to estimate the quantiles of  $Y_i(1) - Y_i(0)$  given  $x_i$ .

$$p(y, z | x) = p(y | x, z)p(z | x)$$

$$y(x, 1) = y(x, 0) = H(y, x, \pi(x)), \pi(x) = E(Z | x)$$

Having fitted the deep neural network, we can use the estimated inverse map to evaluate at new  $y$  and  $\tau$  to obtain a set of posterior samples for any new  $y$ . The caveat being is to how to choose  $N$  and how well the deep neural network interpolates for the new inputs. We also have flexibility in choosing the distribution of  $\tau$ , for example, we can also for  $\tau$  to be a high-dimensional vector of Gaussians, and essentially provide a mixture-Gaussian approximation for the set of posterior. MCMC, in comparison, is computationally expensive and needs to be re-run for any new data point.

The idea is quite simple. Use non-parametric regression to estimate  $f(x_i, 0)$  and  $f(x_i, 1)$  Our approach differs from traditional approaches in that we use conditional quantile function estimators based on deep ReLU networks. CATE is then estimated as an integrated quantile function by appealing to the following quantile identity for expectation given by

$$\hat{\tau}(x) = E(\tau|X = x) = \int_0^1 F_{\tilde{Y}|X=x}^{-1}(U)dU$$

Hence, we need only find a distributional generator for the conditional distribution posterior of  $p(\tilde{Y}|X = x)$ .

GBC in a simple way is using pattern matching to provide a look-up table for the map from data to treatment effect. Bayesian computation has then being replaced by the optimisation performed by Stochastic Gradient Descent (SGD). In our examples, we discuss choices of architectures for  $H$  and  $S$ . Specifically, we propose cosine-embedding for transforming  $\tau$ .

Hence, our addition to the literature is the use of generative methods which take advantage of the implicit model for the counterfactual response. Moreover, the use of

deep ReLU networks (a.k.a. hyperplanes) is more flexible than trees (a.k.a. cylinder sets).  
Quantile ReLU estimator.

**Double Descent** There is still the question of approximation and the interpolation properties of a DNN. Recent research on interpolation properties of quantile neural networks were recently studied by Padilla et al. [2022] and Shen et al. [2021], Schmidt-Hieber [2020]. See also Bach [2024], Belkin et al. [2019a] Shallow Deep Learners are known to provide good representations of multivariate functions and are good interpolators.

Hence even if  $y_{\text{obs}}$  is not in the simulated input-output dataset  $y_N$  we can still learn the posterior map of interest. The Kolmogorov-Arnold theorem says any multivariate function can be expressed this way. So in principle if  $N$  is large enough we can learn the manifold structure in the parameters for any arbitrary nonlinearity. As the dimension of the data  $y$  is large, in practice, this requires providing an efficient architecture. The main question of interest. We recommend quantile neural networks. ReLU and tanh networks are also natural candidates.

**Deep Learning for Propensity Scores** The usual modeling approach is to use logistic regression. An alternative is to use a deep learner. Jiang et al. [2017] proposes the following architecture for the summary statistic neural network

$$\begin{aligned} H^{(1)} &= \text{ReLU} \left( W^{(0)} H^{(0)} + b^{(0)} \right) \\ H^{(2)} &= \text{ReLU} \left( W^{(1)} H^{(1)} + b^{(1)} \right) \\ &\vdots \\ H^{(L)} &= \text{ReLU} \left( W^{(L-1)} H^{(L-1)} + b^{(L-1)} \right) \\ \hat{\pi}(x) &= W^{(L)} H^{(L)} + b^{(L)}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $H^{(0)} = Z$  is the input, and  $\hat{Z}$  is the summary statistic output.

The following algorithms summarize our approach

---

**Algorithm 1** Gen-AI for Bayesian Computation (GenAI-Bayes)

---

Simulate  $\theta^{(i)} \sim p(\theta)$ . Simulate  $y^{(i)} \mid \theta^{(i)} \sim p(y \mid \theta)$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, N$  or  $y^{(i)} = s(\theta^{(i)})$ .

Train  $H$  and  $S$ , using  $\theta^{(i)} = H(S(y^{(i)}, \epsilon^{(i)}))$ , where  $\epsilon^{(i)} \sim N(0, \sigma_\epsilon)$

For a given  $y$ , calculate a sample from  $p(\theta \mid y)$  by  $\theta \stackrel{D}{=} H(y, \tau)$  where  $\tau \sim U(0, 1)$

---

## 3 Application

### 3.1 Simulated Example

In this section we provide empirical examples and compare our approach with various alternatives. Specifically, we compare our method with generalized random forests Athey

et al. [2019], Wager and Athey [2018] and more traditional propensity score-based methods Imbens and Rubin [2015]. Our synthetic data is generated using heterogeneous treatment effects and nonlinear conditional expectation function (response surface) and a sample size  $n$  of 1000. We use a three-dimensional ( $p = 3$ ) covariate with all three components drawn from standard normal distribution. The data generating process is given by

$$\begin{aligned}
 x_{ij} &\sim N(0, 1), x \in R^{n \times p} \\
 \mu_i &= -6 + I(x_{i1} > x_{i2}) + 6|x_{i2} - 1| \text{ (Nonlinear effect)} \\
 \pi_i &\sim \sigma(\mu_i) \text{ (Sigmoid)} \\
 z_i &\sim \text{Bernoulli}(\pi_i) \\
 \tau_i &= 1 - 2x_{i2}x_{i3} \text{ (Nonlinear treatment effect)} \\
 E(y_i|x_i) &\sim \mu_i + \tau_i z_i \\
 y_i|x_i &\sim N(E(y_i|x_i), \sigma^2)
 \end{aligned}$$

Figure 3.1 below shows the histograms of generated  $y$ ,  $\mu$ , and  $\tau$ . Notice, that we standardized  $\tau$  to be of mean zero and variance of one.




Figure 1: Synthetic data histograms

We calculate three metrics to evaluate and benchmark our method. We consider the average treatment effect (ATE) calculated from the sample and compute mean squared error (MSE) as well as coverage and average interval length. Further, we consider conditional average treatment effect (CATE), averaged over the sample.

First, we show some plots that demonstrate the quality of our fit of the response, shown in Figure 3.1.




Figure 2: The middle plot compares fitted responses  $\hat{y}$  and simulated ones  $y$ . Left plot compares the simulated  $y$  vs the noiseless values  $E(y)$ . Right plot shows  $y$  vs  $\mu$ .

We use neural networks as building blocks of our model. Each layer of a neural network is a function of the form

$$f(x; W, l) = h(Wx), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^d, \quad W \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times l},$$

where  $h$  is a nonlinear univariate function, such as ReLU, applied element-wise to  $x$ , and  $l$  is the number of neurons in the layer. We use the following architecture for the response surface. We start by calculating a cosine embedding of the quantile  $q$

$$s = (\cos(i\pi q), \dots, \cos(32\pi q))$$

Representing a discrete cosine transform embedding. The kernel embedding trick allows us to identify the density more efficiently with this set of basis functions. We use the following architecture:

$$\begin{aligned} s &= f(s; W_1, 32) \\ \tilde{\pi} &= f(x; W_2, 8) \\ \hat{\pi} &= f(\tilde{\pi}; W_3, 32) \\ \hat{z} &= \sigma(\hat{\pi}) \\ \mu &= q \circ f([x, \hat{\pi}]; W_4, 32) \\ \tau &= q \circ f(x; W_5, 32) \\ \hat{y} &= W_6(\mu + \tau \circ \hat{z}), \quad W_6 \in \mathbb{R}^{32 \times 2}. \end{aligned}$$

Here  $\circ$  stands for element-wise multiplication. Our model generates a two-dimensional output  $\hat{y}$ , first element is the mean response and the second is the quantile response. We

use the following loss function to jointly estimate the components of our model

$$\begin{aligned}
 q &\sim U(0, 1) \\
 l_z &= (1/n) \sum_{i=1}^n z_i \log \hat{z}_i + (1 - z_i) \log(1 - \hat{z}_i) \\
 e_i &= y_i - \hat{y}_i \\
 l_{\text{MSE}} &= (1/n) \sum_{i=1}^n e_{i1}^2 \\
 l_q &= (1/n) \sum_{i=1}^n \max(qe_{i2}, (q - 1)e_{i2}) \\
 l &= w_1 l_z + w_2 l_q + w_3 l_{\text{MSE}}
 \end{aligned}$$

We add a constraint to the loss function to prevent the quantiles to cross, specifically our constraints are

$$\begin{cases} \hat{y}(\tau) < y, & \text{when } \tau < 0.5 \\ \hat{y}(\tau) > y, & \text{when } \tau > 0.5. \end{cases}$$

We add this constraint as a penalty term to the loss function.




Figure 3: Histogram of fitted propensity scores  $\hat{\pi}(x)$




Figure 4: Histogram of posterior values of treatment effect  $\tau$  for randomly selected units that were assigned no treatment ( $z = 0$ ).

Figure 3.1 shows the posterior distribution of the treatment effect  $\tau$  for randomly selected units that were assigned no treatment ( $z = 0$ ). The vertical red line is the true value of the treatment effect. The posterior distribution of  $\tau$  is also very tight, which is consistent with the fact that the control group is large.

## 4 Discussion

Generative methods differ from traditional simulation based tools in that they use a large training data set to infer predictive mappings rather than density methods. The main tool is high-dimensional nonlinear nonparametric regression using deep neural networks. Inference for the observed data is then evaluation of the network and is therefore an interpolation approach to inference. There are many avenues for future research. Given wide applicability of simulation in econometrics models, designing architectures for specific problems is a paramount interest.

## References

- Joseph Antonelli, Georgia Papadogeorgou, and Francesca Dominici. Causal inference in high dimensions: A marriage between Bayesian modeling and good frequentist properties. *Biometrics*, 78(1):100–114, March 2022.
- Susan Athey, Julie Tibshirani, and Stefan Wager. Generalized random forests. *The Annals of Statistics*, 47(2):1148–1178, April 2019.
- Francis Bach. High-dimensional analysis of double descent for linear regression with random projections. *SIAM Journal on Mathematics of Data Science*, 6(1):26–50, 2024.
- Abhijit Banerjee, Esther Duflo, and Nancy Qian. On the road: Access to transportation infrastructure and economic growth in China. *Journal of Development Economics*, 145: 102442, 2020.
- Mikhail Belkin, Siyuan Ma, and Soumik Mandal. To Understand Deep Learning We Need to Understand Kernel Learning. In *Proceedings of the 35th International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 541–549. PMLR, July 2018.
- Mikhail Belkin, Daniel Hsu, Siyuan Ma, and Soumik Mandal. Reconciling modern machine-learning practice and the classical bias–variance trade-off. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 116(32):15849–15854, August 2019a.
- Mikhail Belkin, Alexander Rakhlin, and Alexandre B. Tsybakov. Does data interpolation contradict statistical optimality? In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Second International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 1611–1619. PMLR, April 2019b.
- Jose M. Bernardo. Expected Information as Expected Utility. *The Annals of Statistics*, 7(3), May 1979.
- Anindya Bhadra, Jyotishka Datta, Nick Polson, Vadim Sokolov, and Jianeng Xu. Merging two cultures: deep and statistical learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.11561*, 2021.
- Guillaume Carlier, Victor Chernozhukov, and Alfred Galichon. Vector quantile regression: An optimal transport approach. *The Annals of Statistics*, 44(3):1165–1192, June 2016.

- Mark Coppejans. On Kolmogorov’s representation of functions of several variables by functions of one variable. *Journal of Econometrics*, 123(1):1–31, November 2004.
- Will Dabney, Georg Ostrovski, David Silver, and Rémi Munos. Implicit Quantile Networks for Distributional Reinforcement Learning, June 2018.
- A. P. Dawid. Causal Inference without Counterfactuals. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 95(450):407–424, June 2000.
- Persi Diaconis and Mehrdad Shahshahani. On nonlinear functions of linear combinations. *SIAM Journal on Scientific and Statistical Computing*, 5(1):175–191, 1984.
- Esther Duflo, Rachel Glennerster, and Michael Kremer. Using Randomization in Development Economics Research: A Toolkit. In T. Paul Schultz and John A. Strauss, editors, *Handbook of Development Economics*, volume 4, pages 3895–3962. Elsevier, January 2007.
- A. Ronald Gallant and Halbert White. There exists a neural network that does not make avoidable mistakes. In *Proceedings of the Second Annual IEEE Conference on Neural Networks, San Diego, CA, I*, 1988.
- Adèle Gouttes, Kashif Rasul, Mateusz Koren, Johannes Stephan, and Tofiqh Naghibi. Probabilistic Time Series Forecasting with Implicit Quantile Networks, July 2021.
- Jinyong Hahn. On the Role of the Propensity Score in Efficient Semiparametric Estimation of Average Treatment Effects. *Econometrica*, 66(2):315–331, 1998.
- P. Richard Hahn, Carlos M. Carvalho, David Puelz, and Jingyu He. Regularization and Confounding in Linear Regression for Treatment Effect Estimation. *Bayesian Analysis*, 13(1):163–182, March 2018.
- P. Richard Hahn, Jared S. Murray, and Carlos M. Carvalho. Bayesian Regression Tree Models for Causal Inference: Regularization, Confounding, and Heterogeneous Effects (with Discussion). *Bayesian Analysis*, 15(3):965–1056, September 2020.
- Jennifer Hill and Robert McCulloch. Bayesian Nonparametric Modeling for Causal Inference. Technical report, June 2007.
- Jennifer L. Hill. Bayesian Nonparametric Modeling for Causal Inference. *Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics*, 20(1):217–240, January 2011.
- Keisuke Hirano, Guido W. Imbens, and Geert Ridder. Efficient Estimation of Average Treatment Effects Using the Estimated Propensity Score. *Econometrica*, 71(4):1161–1189, 2003.
- Paul W. Holland. Statistics and Causal Inference. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 81(396):945–960, 1986.
- Jan-Christian Hütter and Philippe Rigollet. Minimax estimation of smooth optimal transport maps. *The Annals of Statistics*, 49(2):1166–1194, April 2021.



- Guido W Imbens and Donald B Rubin. *Causal Inference in Statistics, Social, and Biomedical Sciences*. Cambridge University Press, 2015.
- Bai Jiang, Tung-Yu Wu, Charles Zheng, and Wing H. Wong. Learning Summary Statistic For Approximate Bayesian Computation Via Deep Neural Network. *Statistica Sinica*, 27(4):1595–1618, 2017.
- Tetsuya Kaji and Veronika Ročková. Metropolis–Hastings via Classification. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, pages 1–15, May 2022.
- Olav Kallenberg. *Foundations of Modern Probability*. Springer, 2nd ed. edition edition, January 1997. ISBN 978-0-387-94957-4.
- Jungeum Kim and Veronika Rockova. Deep Bayes Factors, December 2023.
- AN Kolmogorov. Definition of center of dispersion and measure of accuracy from a finite number of observations (in Russian). *Izv. Akad. Nauk SSSR Ser. Mat.*, 6:3–32, 1942.
- Braden Kronheim, Michelle P. Kuchera, Harrison B. Prosper, and Raghuram Ramanujan. Implicit Quantile Neural Networks for Jet Simulation and Correction, November 2021.
- Julia A Lasserre, Christopher M Bishop, and Thomas P Minka. Principled hybrids of generative and discriminative models. In *2006 IEEE Computer Society Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR'06)*, volume 1, pages 87–94. IEEE, 2006.
- Daniel F. McCaffrey, Greg Ridgeway, and Andrew R. Morral. Propensity Score Estimation With Boosted Regression for Evaluating Causal Effects in Observational Studies. *Psychological Methods*, 9(4):403–425, 2004.
- Daniel F. McCaffrey, Beth Ann Griffin, Daniel Almirall, Mary Ellen Slaughter, Rajeev Ramchand, and Lane F. Burgette. A tutorial on propensity score estimation for multiple treatments using generalized boosted models. *Statistics in Medicine*, 32(19):3388–3414, 2013.
- Peter McCullagh. *Ten Projects in Applied Statistics*. Springer Series in Statistics. Springer International Publishing, Cham, 2022. ISBN 978-3-031-14274-1 978-3-031-14275-8.
- Hadrien Montanelli and Haizhao Yang. Error bounds for deep ReLU networks using the Kolmogorov–Arnold superposition theorem, May 2020.
- Maria Nareklishvili, Nicholas Polson, and Vadim Sokolov. Deep partial least squares for iv regression. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2207.02612*, 2022a.
- Maria Nareklishvili, Nicholas Polson, and Vadim Sokolov. Feature selection for personalized policy analysis. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2301.00251*, 2022b.
- Maria Nareklishvili, Nicholas Polson, and Vadim Sokolov. Deep partial least squares for instrumental variable regression. *Applied Stochastic Models in Business and Industry*, 2023a.

- Maria Nareklishvili, Nicholas Polson, and Vadim Sokolov. Generative Causal Inference, June 2023b.
- Georg Ostrovski, Will Dabney, and Rémi Munos. Autoregressive Quantile Networks for Generative Modeling, June 2018.
- Oscar Hernan Madrid Padilla, Wesley Tansey, and Yanzhen Chen. Quantile regression with ReLU networks: Estimators and minimax rates. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 23(1):247:11251–247:11292, January 2022.
- Emanuel Parzen. Quantile Probability and Statistical Data Modeling. *Statistical Science*, 19(4):652–662, 2004.
- Judea Pearl. *Causality*. Cambridge university press, 2009.
- Nicholas Polson, Vadim Sokolov, and Jianeng Xu. Deep learning partial least squares. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2106.14085*, 2021.
- Nicholas G Polson and Veronika Ročková. Posterior Concentration for Sparse Deep Learning. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 31. Curran Associates, Inc., 2018.
- Nicholas G. Polson and Vadim Sokolov. Generative AI for Bayesian Computation, June 2023.
- Nick Polson, Fabrizio Ruggeri, and Vadim Sokolov. Generative Bayesian Computation for Maximum Expected Utility. *Entropy*, 26(12):1076, December 2024.
- David Puelz, Guillaume Basse, Avi Feller, and Panos Toulis. A Graph-Theoretic Approach to Randomization Tests of Causal Effects under General Interference. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B: Statistical Methodology*, 84(1):174–204, February 2022.
- Paul R Rosenbaum and Donald B Rubin. The central role of the propensity score in observational studies for causal effects. *Biometrika*, 70(1):41–55, 1983.
- Donald B. Rubin. Estimating causal effects of treatments in randomized and nonrandomized studies. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 66(5):688–701, October 1974.
- Donald B. Rubin and Richard P. Waterman. Estimating the Causal Effects of Marketing Interventions Using Propensity Score Methodology. *Statistical Science*, 21(2):206–222, 2006.
- Johannes Schmidt-Hieber. Nonparametric regression using deep neural networks with ReLU activation function. *The Annals of Statistics*, 48(4):1875–1897, August 2020.
- Johannes Schmidt-Hieber and Petr Zamolodtchikov. Generative Modelling via Quantile Regression, September 2024.

- Guohao Shen, Yuling Jiao, Yuanyuan Lin, Joel L. Horowitz, and Jian Huang. Deep Quantile Regression: Mitigating the Curse of Dimensionality Through Composition, July 2021.
- Jascha Sohl-Dickstein, Eric A. Weiss, Niru Maheswaranathan, and Surya Ganguli. Deep Unsupervised Learning using Nonequilibrium Thermodynamics, November 2015.
- Jerzy Splawa-Neyman, D. M. Dabrowska, and T. P. Speed. On the Application of Probability Theory to Agricultural Experiments. Essay on Principles. Section 9. *Statistical Science*, 5(4), November 1990.
- David A. Stephens, Widemberg S. Nobre, Erica E. M. Moodie, and Alexandra M. Schmidt. Causal Inference Under Mis-Specification: Adjustment Based on the Propensity Score. *Bayesian Analysis*, -1(-1):1–46, January 2023.
- Matt Taddy, Matt Gardner, Liyun Chen, and David Draper. A Nonparametric Bayesian Analysis of Heterogenous Treatment Effects in Digital Experimentation. *Journal of Business & Economic Statistics*, 34(4):661–672, October 2016.
- Matus Telgarsky. Representation Benefits of Deep Feedforward Networks, September 2015.
- Matus Telgarsky. Benefits of depth in neural networks. In *Conference on Learning Theory*, pages 1517–1539. PMLR, June 2016.
- Jin Tian and Judea Pearl. Probabilities of Causation: Bounds and Identification, January 2013.
- M. Alex O. Vasilescu. Causal Deep Learning: Causal Capsules and Tensor Transformers, December 2022.
- 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, July 2018.
- Yuexi Wang and Veronika Ročková. Adversarial Bayesian Simulation, July 2023.
- Yuexi Wang, Nicholas Polson, and Vadim O Sokolov. Data augmentation for bayesian deep learning. *Bayesian Analysis*, 1(1):1–29, 2022.
- Halbert White. Some Asymptotic Results for Learning in Single Hidden-Layer Feedforward Network Models. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 84(408):1003–1013, December 1989.
- Halbert White. Nonparametric Estimation of Conditional Quantiles Using Neural Networks. In Connie Page and Raoul LePage, editors, *Computing Science and Statistics*, pages 190–199, New York, NY, 1992. Springer. ISBN 978-1-4612-2856-1.

Dandan Xu, Michael J. Daniels, and Almut G. Winterstein. A Bayesian nonparametric approach to causal inference on quantiles: A Bayesian Nonparametric Approach to Causal Inference on Quantiles. *Biometrics*, 74(3):986–996, September 2018.

Abbas Zaidi and Sayan Mukherjee. Gaussian Process Mixtures for Estimating Heterogeneous Treatment Effects, December 2018.