

Identification in Multiple Treatment Models under Discrete Variation*

Vishal Kamat
Toulouse School of Economics
University of Toulouse Capitole
vishal.kamat@tse-fr.eu

Samuel Norris
Department of Economics
University of British Columbia
sam.norris@ubc.ca

Matthew Pecenco
Department of Economics
Brown University
m.pecenco@brown.ca

July 13, 2023

Abstract

We develop a method to learn about treatment effects in multiple treatment models with discrete-valued instruments. We allow selection into treatment to be governed by a general class of threshold crossing models that permits multidimensional unobserved heterogeneity. Under a semi-parametric restriction on the distribution of unobserved heterogeneity, we show how a sequence of linear programs can be used to compute sharp bounds for a number of treatment effect parameters when the marginal treatment response functions underlying them remain nonparametric or are additionally parameterized.

KEYWORDS: Multiple treatments, discrete instrument, marginal treatment effects, partial identification.

JEL classification codes: C14, C31, C36, C61.

*Vishal Kamat gratefully acknowledges funding from ANR under grant ANR-17-EURE-0010 (Investissements d'Avenir program).

1 Introduction

In the analysis of treatment effects using instrumental variables, a threshold crossing selection model with a single dimension of unobserved heterogeneity underlies the predominant framework in the literature (Imbens and Angrist, 1994; Heckman and Vytlacil, 2005; Vytlacil, 2002). Designed for the canonical binary treatment setup, it takes individuals to be choosing solely between two treatments. In many scenarios, individuals, however, often choose between multiple treatments. Such cases naturally give rise to selection models with multiple dimensions of unobserved heterogeneity (Heckman et al., 2006, 2008; Lee and Salanié, 2018).

In this paper, we develop a method to learn about treatment effects in multiple treatment setups under a general class of selection models with multidimensional unobserved heterogeneity. Specifically, we consider the class of multidimensional threshold crossing models from Lee and Salanié (2018). As highlighted in Section 2.2, this class nests the standard binary treatment model, while allowing for a number of additional empirically relevant models from the literature that exhibit multidimensional unobserved heterogeneity such as those with multinomial or sequential choices, or double-hurdles.

In this class of models, our objective is to show how to learn about various treatment effects that can be written as weighted averages of the marginal treatment response functions (MTRs) (Heckman and Vytlacil, 1999, 2005; Mogstad et al., 2018), which capture the mean potential outcomes conditional on the unobserved heterogeneity governing the selection model. As in the standard binary treatment case, such parameters continue to provide a unifying framework to express a number of parameters of interest such as average treatment effects and versions of them that condition on some target subgroup such as those affected by a policy change of interest.

To analogously learn about such parameters, Lee and Salanié (2018) assume availability of data with continuous variation in the instrument. They show how sufficient amount of such variation allows nonparametrically identifying the MTRs over their entire support as well as the selection model, and in turn all the parameters of interest—see also Heckman et al. (2006, 2008), Mountjoy (2022) and Tsuda (2023) for related arguments in specific models. However, in many empirical scenarios, instruments are typically only discrete-valued. In such cases, the parameters are usually partially identified as there generally exist multiple admissible values of the MTRs and primitives characterizing the selection model that are consistent with the data.

We develop novel arguments to tractably compute the identified set for our parameters of interest in these cases. In particular, we build on the arguments from Mogstad et al. (2018), who study this identification problem in the special case of the standard binary treatment setup, where a single dimension of unobserved heterogeneity underlies the selection model. An inherent complication arising in the multidimensional case is that the primitives characterizing the selection model are not generally point-identified. In turn, the approach in Mogstad et al. (2018) which takes these

primitives to be point identified and exploits that the problem is linear in the remaining primitives, namely the MTRs, needs to be extended to account for the fact that all the primitives may now only be partially identified.

To do so, we propose a two-step procedure to exploit the underlying linearity present in the problem with respect to the MTRs. Specifically, in the first step, we exploit the fact that the problem continues to be linear in MTRs for each value of the selective primitives. In turn, for a given selection primitive, we show how to carefully leverage the threshold structure of our model and generalize the unidimensional arguments from [Mogstad et al. \(2018\)](#) to the case with multidimensional MTRs so that sharp bounds can continue to be constructed using two linear programming problems when the MTRs are allowed to remain nonparametric and satisfy only shape restrictions or when they are additionally flexibly parameterized.

The second step then requires taking the union of these identified sets across the admissible values of the selection primitives. To do so feasibly, we show how to consider a natural semi-parametric restriction on the distribution of unobserved heterogeneity such that the selection primitives can be characterized using a finite-dimensional parameter. While each dimension of the unobserved heterogeneity can be normalized to be uniformly distributed, the dependence between them is unknown. Indeed, this feature underlies why the selection primitives are generally not point identified in the presence of multidimensional unobserved heterogeneity. We show that parametrizing the dependence in several empirically relevant models can in fact ensure that the selection primitives are point identified for a given value of the dependence parameter. In turn, our method translates to solving two linear programs to compute the identified set across multiple values of this dependence parameter, and then taking the union of the sets over these values.

Our method shares several attractive features over a growing literature on multiple treatment setups with discrete-valued instruments that focuses on point identification of treatment effects.¹ A standard approach is to impose various monotonicity assumptions that restrict selection patterns and show how they allow nonparametric point identification of treatment effects for certain response subgroups (e.g., [Angrist and Imbens, 1995](#); [Heckman and Pinto, 2018](#); [Kline and Walters, 2016](#); [Kirkeboen et al., 2016](#); [Lee and Salanié, 2023](#); [Pinto, 2021](#)).² In cases where these patterns can be captured by a selection model falling in our general class, our method allows the primitives to be flexibly specified so that we can continue to produce the same nonparametric point identified estimates and maintain their internal validity, while additionally allowing us to learn about a number of additional effects of interest not necessarily point identified. Our method, moreover,

¹Our method complements alternative partial identification analyses in multiple treatment setups, where no assumptions on the selection model are imposed (e.g., [Manski, 1997](#); [Manski and Pepper, 2000, 2009](#)), and treatment effect setups where alternative, non-nested selection models with multidimensional unobserved heterogeneity are considered (e.g., [Kamat, 2021](#); [Mogstad et al., 2020](#)).

²[Pinto \(2021\)](#) and [Lee and Salanié \(2023\)](#) also provide partial identification results for effects for some of the remaining response groups in specific examples.

does not require point identification of such treatment effects and, in turn, also allows for models with richer selection patterns.

A smaller group of papers consider parameterized selection model to learn about additional treatment effects, but limits attention to specific models and parameterization where the underlying primitives are all point identified (e.g., [Hull, 2020](#); [Kline and Walters, 2016](#); [Pinto, 2021](#)). Our method contributes to these papers by providing a unifying framework to consider such parameterizations in a general class of richer models as well as to consider more robust and flexible parameterizations that do not necessarily imply point identification.

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. [Section 2](#) introduces our model, treatment effect parameters, and identification problem. [Section 3](#) develops our method to compute the identified set. [Section 4](#) concludes. Proofs and additional details are presented in the appendix.

2 Setup

2.1 Observed and Potential Variables

For each individual, we observe an outcome of interest Y , their received treatment D , their assigned instrument value Z , and baseline covariates X . We take the list of possible treatments to be given by a discrete set \mathcal{D} , and model the support of the instrument and covariates, respectively denoted by \mathcal{Z} and \mathcal{X} , to be discrete. We assume the outcome and treatment to be generated by the usual potential outcomes structure. In particular, denoting by $D(z)$ the potential treatment had the individual's assigned instrument value been $z \in \mathcal{Z}$, the observed treatment is given by

$$D = \sum_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} D(z) 1\{Z = z\} , \tag{1}$$

and, similarly, denoting by $Y(d)$ the potential outcome had the individual's received treatment been $d \in \mathcal{D}$, the observed outcome is given by

$$Y = \sum_{d \in \mathcal{D}} Y(d) 1\{D = d\} . \tag{2}$$

Moreover, as usual, we assume that the instrument is statistically independent of the potential variables conditional on the covariates as follows.

Assumption E. (Exogeneity) $(\{Y(d) : d \in \mathcal{D}\}, \{D(z) : z \in \mathcal{Z}\}) \perp Z | X$.

2.2 Selection Model

In addition to the above structure, we assume the potential treatments to be related across instrument values $z \in \mathcal{Z}$ through a selection model. Let $U \equiv (U_1, \dots, U_J)$ denote a vector of individual

unobservables governing selection. Following [Lee and Salanié \(2018, Assumption 2.1\)](#), we take potential treatment to be determined by the region in which these unobserved variables fall, where these regions satisfy certain properties in addition to being disjoint to logically ensure that a given region cannot imply several different treatments.

Assumption SM. (Selection Model) Conditional on $X = x \in \mathcal{X}$, let U be continuously distributed on $[0, 1]^J$ with uniform marginal distributions, and let

$$D(z) = \sum_{d \in \mathcal{D}} d 1\{U \in \mathcal{U}_{d,z|x}^{\text{sm}}\} \quad (3)$$

for each $z \in \mathcal{Z}$, where $\{\mathcal{U}_{d,z|x}^{\text{sm}} : d \in \mathcal{D}\}$ denotes a collection of disjoint subsets of $[0, 1]^J$ that are members of the σ -field generated by the sets $\{u \in [0, 1]^J : u_j \leq g_{j,z|x}\} : j = 1, \dots, J\}$ for some unknown threshold values $\{g_{j,z|x} : j = 1, \dots, J\}$.

As the generated σ -field is obtained by taking unions, intersections and complements of the sets in $\{u \in [0, 1]^J : u_j \leq g_{j,z|x}\} : j = 1, \dots, J\}$, [Assumption SM](#) requires that each of the regions $\mathcal{U}_{d,z|x}^{\text{sm}}$ determining potential treatment can be written as

$$\mathcal{U}_{d,z|x}^{\text{sm}} = \bigcup_{l=1}^{L_d} \prod_{j=1}^J [\underline{u}_{j,l,d,z|x}, \bar{u}_{j,l,d,z|x}] , \quad (4)$$

for some finite L_d and $\underline{u}_{j,l,d,z|x}, \bar{u}_{j,l,d,z|x} \in \{0, g_{j,z|x}, 1\}$, i.e. as a finite union of rectangular sets. Alternatively, this can be viewed as imposing

$$1\{D(z) = d\} = \sum_{l=1}^{L_d} \prod_{j=1}^J 1\{\underline{u}_{j,l,d,z|x} \leq U_j \leq \bar{u}_{j,l,d,z|x}\} ,$$

i.e. selection into each treatment is determined by the sum of products of multiple threshold crossing equations. As usual, since U is assumed to be continuously distributed, note that we can rewrite the above equation as

$$1\{D(z) = d\} = \sum_{l=1}^{L_d} \prod_{j=1}^J 1\{F_{j|x}(\underline{u}_{j,l,d,z|x}) \leq F_{j|x}(U_j) \leq F_{j|x}(\bar{u}_{j,l,d,z|x})\} ,$$

where $F_{j|x}$ denotes the distribution of U_j conditional on $X = x$. In turn, as $F_{j|x}(U_j)$ is uniformly distributed on $[0, 1]$, the requirement that U has support $[0, 1]^J$ with uniform marginals in [Assumption SM](#) can be viewed as a normalization.

As highlighted in [Lee and Salanié \(2018\)](#), [Assumption SM](#) reduces to the standard threshold crossing model ([Heckman and Vytlacil, 2005](#); [Imbens and Angrist, 1994](#)) when we have a binary treatment and a single dimension of unobserved heterogeneity given by

$$D(z) = 1\{U_1 \leq g_{1,z|x}\} \quad (5)$$

for each $z \in \mathcal{Z}$ conditional on $X = x \in \mathcal{X}$. But, in cases where $J > 1$, it can allow for a number of additional empirically relevant models of selection with multiple as well as binary treatments. Below, we briefly provide examples of several such models—see also [Lee and Salanié \(2018\)](#) for additional examples. Our first two examples consider multiple treatment models, while our third example considers a binary treatment model. For simplicity, we take the number of treatments in the multiple treatment examples to be solely equal to three.

Example 1. (Multinomial Choice) Let $\mathcal{D} = \{0, 1, 2\}$, and, for each $z \in \mathcal{Z}$ conditional on $X = x \in \mathcal{X}$, let

$$D(z) = \arg \max_{d \in \mathcal{D}} \tilde{g}_{d,z|x} - \tilde{U}_d, \quad (6)$$

where $\tilde{g}_{1,z|x}$ and $\tilde{g}_{2,z|x}$ are unknown values and $(\tilde{U}_1, \tilde{U}_2)$ some continuous unobserved variables, and $\tilde{g}_{0,z|x}$ and \tilde{U}_0 are normalized to 0. This is the standard additively separable utility model used in analysis of multinomial choice (e.g., [Heckman et al., 2006, 2008](#); [Kline and Walters, 2016](#)).

To see how (6) can be transformed to be written in terms of Assumption [SM](#), following [Lee and Salanié \(2018, Example 5\)](#), let $U_j = \tilde{F}_{j|x}(\tilde{U}_j)$ and $g_{j,z|x} = \tilde{F}_{j|x}(\tilde{g}_{j,z|x})$ for $j \in \{1, 2\}$, where $\tilde{F}_{j|x}$ denotes the conditional on $X = x$ distribution function of \tilde{U}_j , and let $U_3 = \tilde{F}_{12|x}(\tilde{U}_1 - \tilde{U}_2)$ and $g_{3,z|x} = \tilde{F}_{12|x}(\tilde{g}_{1,z|x} - \tilde{g}_{2,z|x})$, where $\tilde{F}_{12|x}$ is the conditional on $X = x$ distribution function of $\tilde{U}_1 - \tilde{U}_2$. Observe that it then follows that (6) can be equivalently written as

$$D(z) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } U_1 > g_{1,z|x}, U_2 > g_{2,z|x}, \\ 1 & \text{if } U_1 \leq g_{1,z|x}, U_3 \leq g_{3,z|x}, \\ 2 & \text{if } U_2 \leq g_{2,z|x}, U_3 > g_{3,z|x}, \end{cases} \quad (7)$$

which can be straightforwardly re-written in terms of Assumption [SM](#) by taking $\mathcal{U}_{0,z|x}^{\text{sm}} = \{(u_1, u_2, u_3) \in [0, 1]^3 : u_1 > g_{1,z|x}, u_2 > g_{2,z|x}\}$, $\mathcal{U}_{1,z|x}^{\text{sm}} = \{(u_1, u_2, u_3) \in [0, 1]^3 : u_1 \leq g_{1,z|x}, u_3 \leq g_{3,z|x}\}$, and $\mathcal{U}_{2,z|x}^{\text{sm}} = \{(u_1, u_2, u_3) \in [0, 1]^3 : u_2 \leq g_{2,z|x}, u_3 > g_{3,z|x}\}$. ■

Example 2. (Sequential Choice) Let $\mathcal{D} = \{0, 1, 2\}$, and, for each $z \in \mathcal{Z}$ conditional on $X = x \in \mathcal{X}$, let

$$D(z) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } U_1 > g_{1,z|x}, \\ 1 & \text{if } U_1 \leq g_{1,z|x}, U_2 > g_{2,z|x}, \\ 2 & \text{if } U_1 \leq g_{1,z|x}, U_2 \leq g_{2,z|x}, \end{cases} \quad (8)$$

where $g_{1,z|x}$ and $g_{2,z|x}$ are unknown values. This model imposes a sequential nature to the decisions where individuals first select into treatment 0 or not, and if not, then select into treatment 1 or 2. Such a model arises in settings where decisions are made across multiple stages (e.g., [Arteaga, 2021](#); [Heckman et al., 2016](#); [Kamat et al., 2022](#)).

Observe that (8) can be straightforwardly re-written in terms of Assumption **SM** by taking $\mathcal{U}_{0,z|x}^{\text{sm}} = \{(u_1, u_2) \in [0, 1]^2 : u_1 > g_{1,z|x}\}$, $\mathcal{U}_{1,z|x}^{\text{sm}} = \{(u_1, u_2) \in [0, 1]^2 : u_1 \leq g_{1,z|x}, u_2 > g_{2,z|x}\}$, and $\mathcal{U}_{2,z|x}^{\text{sm}} = \{(u_1, u_2) \in [0, 1]^2 : u_1 \leq g_{1,z|x}, u_2 \leq g_{2,z|x}\}$. ■

Example 3. (Double Hurdle) Let $\mathcal{D} = \{0, 1\}$, and, for each $z \in \mathcal{Z}$ conditional on $X = x \in \mathcal{X}$, let

$$D(z) = 1\{U_1 \leq g_{1,z|x}, U_2 \leq g_{2,z|x}\}, \quad (9)$$

where $g_{1,z|x}$ and $g_{2,z|x}$ are unknown values, i.e. both unobserved variables have to be below their thresholds for the individual to receive treatment. Such a model can arise in settings where an individual has to make multiple decisions to receive a treatment (e.g., [Poirier, 1980](#)) or with multiple instruments (e.g., [Mogstad et al., 2020](#)).

Observe that (9) can be straightforwardly re-written in terms of Assumption **SM** by taking $\mathcal{U}_{0,z|x}^{\text{sm}} = \{(u_1, u_2) \in [0, 1]^2 : u_1 > g_{1,z|x}\} \cup \{(u_1, u_2) \in [0, 1]^2 : u_2 > g_{2,z|x}\}$, and $\mathcal{U}_{1,z|x}^{\text{sm}} = \{(u_1, u_2) \in [0, 1]^2 : u_1 \leq g_{1,z|x}, u_2 \leq g_{2,z|x}\}$. ■

2.3 Parameters of Interest

Given our model, we take the primitives to be the following: the marginal treatment response (MTR) functions ([Heckman and Vytlacil, 1999, 2005](#); [Mogstad et al., 2018](#)) defined by $m_{d|x}(u) = E[Y(d)|U = u, X = x]$, which capture the mean treatment response for $d \in \mathcal{D}$ conditional on unobservables governing the selection model $U = u$ and covariates $X = x$; the distribution of these unobservables conditional on covariates $X = x$ denoted by F_x ; and all the threshold values determining selection in Assumption **SM** denoted by $g = \{g_{j,z|x} : j = 1, \dots, J, z \in \mathcal{Z}, x \in \mathcal{X}\}$. Let $\beta = (m, h)$ summarize these variables together, where $m = (m_{d|x} : d \in \mathcal{D}, x \in \mathcal{X})$ captures the primitives related to the outcomes and $h = (g, F)$ with $F = (F_x : x \in \mathcal{X})$ captures those related to the selection model.

These are the primitives in the sense that our parameters of interest that we want to learn about can be written as functions of them. Our analysis allows for a general class of parameters of the form

$$\theta(\beta) = \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \sum_{l \in \mathcal{L}} \sum_{d \in \mathcal{D}} w_{d,l|x}(h) \int_{\mathcal{U}_{d,l|x}^\theta(g)} m_{d|x}(u) dF_x \quad (10)$$

for some known set \mathcal{L} , i.e. a weighted sum of integrals of the MTRs, where the weights $w_{d,l|x}$ are assumed to be known or identified functions of h , and the integrated areas $\mathcal{U}_{d,l|x}^\theta(g)$ are assumed to be able to be written as a union of sets of the form

$$\prod_{j=1}^J [\underline{u}_{j,d,l|x}(g), \bar{u}_{j,d,l|x}(g)], \quad (11)$$

i.e. rectangular as in (4), with endpoints $\underline{u}_{j,d,l|x}$ and $\bar{u}_{j,d,l|x}$ that are known or identified functions of g .

As illustrated in Table 1, a number of commonly studied treatment effect parameters can be written in terms of (10). These include the average treatment effect (ATE) between two treatments $d', d'' \in \mathcal{D}$ as well as their analogues that condition on $D = d$ to give the average treatment effect on the treated (ATT) or on a response type $D(z) = d_z \in \mathcal{D}$ for $z \in \mathcal{Z}' \subseteq \mathcal{Z}$ to give local average treatment effects (LATEs). Moreover, they also include the class of policy relevant treatment effects (Heckman and Vytlacil, 1999, 2005) that evaluate the effects of altering the thresholds determining selection. To formally define these latter effects, note that the sets determining treatment in (3) can be more explicitly stated as $\mathcal{U}_{d,z|x}^{\text{sm}} \equiv \mathcal{U}_{d,z|x}^{\text{sm}}(g)$, i.e. as functions of the unknown thresholds. A policy δ can then equivalently captured by the thresholds $g + \delta \equiv \{g_{j,z|x} + \delta_{j,z|x} : j = 1, \dots, J, z \in \mathcal{Z}, x \in \mathcal{X}\}$, i.e. changing the original thresholds by some known values $\delta \equiv \{\delta_{j,z|x} : j = 1, \dots, J, z \in \mathcal{Z}, x \in \mathcal{X}\}$, and let $D^\delta = \sum_{d \in \mathcal{D}} 1\{U \in \mathcal{U}_{d,Z|X}^{\text{sm}}(g + \delta)\}$ and $Y^\delta = Y^\delta(D^\delta)$ denote the individual's treatment and outcome under this policy, respectively. The policy relevant treatment effect (PRTE) between two policies δ' and δ'' can then be defined by

$$\text{PRTE}^{\delta', \delta''} = E[Y^{\delta'} - Y^{\delta''} | D^{\delta'} \neq D^{\delta''}] ,$$

i.e. the effect of the counterfactual change in overall outcomes between the two altered values of thresholds for those who are affected by this change.

2.4 Identified Set

The objective of our analysis is to learn about a pre-specified parameter of interest $\theta(\beta)$ given by (10). As the function θ is known, what we can learn about the parameter depends on what we know about the primitives β . To this end, denoting by \mathbf{M}^\dagger , \mathbf{F}^\dagger and \mathbf{G}^\dagger the space of all functions m , distributions F , and thresholds g , respectively, let $\mathbf{B} \subseteq \mathbf{M}^\dagger \times \mathbf{F}^\dagger \times \mathbf{G}^\dagger$ be the space that β is restricted to lie in, which is determined by the various assumptions we may impose on the primitives. The data also provide information on β . The observed decision and outcome through (1) and (2), respectively, along with the selection model in (3) and Assumption E provide the following moments

$$P[D = d | Z = z, X = x] \equiv P_{d|z,x} = \int_{\mathcal{U}_{d,z|x}^{\text{sm}}(g)} dF_x , \quad (12)$$

$$E[Y 1\{D = d\} | Z = z, X = x] \equiv E_{d|z,x} = \int_{\mathcal{U}_{d,z|x}^{\text{sm}}(g)} m_{d|x}(u) dF_x , \quad (13)$$

for each $d \in \mathcal{D}$, $z \in \mathcal{Z}$ and $x \in \mathcal{X}$. For the purposes of the identification analysis, we assume that the moments of the data in the left hand sides of the above equations are perfectly known without uncertainty.

Table 1: Various treatment effect parameters and their restatements in terms of (10)

Parameter of interest	Expression	Rewriting in terms of (10)		
		\mathcal{L}	$w_{d,l x}$	$\mathcal{U}_{d,l x}^\theta$
Average Treatment Effect, ATE(d', d'')	$E[Y(d') - Y(d'')]$	$ \mathcal{L} = 1$	$P(X = x)(1\{d = d'\} - 1\{d = d''\})$	$[0, 1]^J$
Average Treatment Effect on the Treated, ATT(d', d'')	$E[Y(d') - Y(d'') D = d']$	\mathcal{Z}	$\frac{P(X = x, Z = l)(1\{d = d'\} - 1\{d = d''\})}{P(D = d)}$	$\mathcal{U}_{d,l x}^{\text{sm}}$
Local Average Treatment Effect, LATE $_{\{d_z, z \in \mathcal{Z}'\}}(d', d'')$	$E[Y(d') - Y(d'') (D(z) = d_z, z \in \mathcal{Z}')]$	$ \mathcal{L} = 1$	$\frac{P(X = x)(1\{d = d'\} - 1\{d = d''\})}{\sum_{x' \in \mathcal{X}} P(X = x') \int_{z \in \mathcal{Z}'} \bigcap_{z \in \mathcal{Z}'} \mathcal{U}_{d_z, z x}^{\text{sm}}} dF_{x'}}$	$\bigcap_{z \in \mathcal{Z}'} \mathcal{U}_{d_z, z x}^{\text{sm}}$
Probability of response group in LATE $_{\{d_z, z \in \mathcal{Z}'\}}(d', d'')$	$P(D(z) = d_z, z \in \mathcal{Z}')$	$ \mathcal{L} = 1$	$P(X = x) \int_{z \in \mathcal{Z}'} \bigcap_{z \in \mathcal{Z}'} \mathcal{U}_{d_z, z x}^{\text{sm}}} dF_x$	\emptyset
Policy Relevant Treatment Effect, PRTE $^{\delta', \delta''}$	$E[Y^{\delta'} - Y^{\delta''} D^{\delta'} \neq D^{\delta''}]$	$\mathcal{Z} \times \{\delta, \delta'\}$	$\frac{P(X = x, Z = l_1)(1\{l_2 = \delta'\} - 1\{l_2 = \delta''\})}{1 - \sum_{x' \in \mathcal{X}} \sum_{z' \in \mathcal{Z}} \sum_{d' \in \mathcal{D}} P(X = x', Z = z') \int_{\delta \in \{\delta', \delta''\}} \bigcap_{\delta \in \{\delta', \delta''\}} \mathcal{U}_{d', z' x'}^{\text{sm}}(g + \delta)} dF_{x'}}$	$\mathcal{U}_{d, l_1 x}^{\text{sm}}(g + l_2)$
Probability of subgroup in PRTE $^{\delta', \delta''}$	$P(D^\delta \neq D^{\delta'})$	\mathcal{Z}	$P(X = x, Z = l) \int_{[0,1]^J \setminus \bigcap_{\delta \in \{\delta', \delta''\}} \mathcal{U}_{d', z' x'}^{\text{sm}}(g + \delta)} dF_x$	\emptyset
Policy Relevant Treatment Effect given $(D^{\delta'}, D^{\delta''})$, PRTE $^{\delta', \delta''}(d', d'')$	$E[Y^{\delta'} - Y^{\delta''} D^{\delta'} = d', D^{\delta''} = d'']$	\mathcal{Z}	$\frac{P(X = x, Z = l)(1\{d = d'\} - 1\{d = d''\})}{\sum_{x' \in \mathcal{X}} \sum_{z' \in \mathcal{Z}} P(X = x', Z = z') \int_{\delta \in \{\delta', \delta''\}} \bigcap_{\delta \in \{\delta', \delta''\}} \mathcal{U}_{d', z' x'}^{\text{sm}}(g + \delta)} dF_{x'}}$	$\bigcap_{\delta \in \{\delta', \delta''\}} \mathcal{U}_{d', l x}^{\text{sm}}(g + \delta)$
Probability of subgroup in PRTE $^{\delta', \delta''}(d', d'')$	$P(D^{\delta'} = d', D^{\delta''} = d'')$	\mathcal{Z}	$P(X = x, Z = z) \int_{\bigcap_{\delta \in \{\delta', \delta''\}} \mathcal{U}_{d', l x}^{\text{sm}}(g + \delta)} dF_x$	\emptyset

When $|\mathcal{L}| = 1$, the index l is redundant and \mathcal{L} can be any arbitrary set with a single element. For PRTE $^{\delta, \delta'}$, $l \equiv (l_1, l_2)$, where $l_1 \in \mathcal{Z}$ and $l_2 \in \{\delta, \delta'\}$.

Denoting by $\mathbf{B}^* = \{\beta \in \mathbf{B} : \beta \text{ satisfies (12) -- (13)}\}$ the admissible set of primitives satisfying the assumptions and the data moments, what we can learn about the parameter of interest can then be formally captured by the identified set, which is defined by

$$\Theta \equiv \theta(\mathbf{B}^*) = \{\theta_0 \in \mathbf{R} : \theta(\beta) = \theta_0 \text{ for some } \beta \in \mathbf{B}^*\}, \quad (14)$$

i.e. the image of the space of admissible functions \mathbf{B}^* under the function θ . The objective is to show how to compute the identified set.

3 Computing the Identified Set

3.1 Two-Step Method

From the definition in (14), we can observe that computing the identified set requires searching through the space \mathbf{B}^* and then taking the image using the function θ . The main challenge is how to perform this search in a tractable manner.

To motivate our approach, we first briefly review the method in Mogstad et al. (2018), who show how to do so in the special case of a binary treatment when selection is given by (5). In this case, as a single dimension of unobserved heterogeneity governs selection, they first exploit the fact that h can be point identified as the distribution of unobserved heterogeneity is known to be uniform given the normalization in Assumption SM and g can then be directly point identified by the treatment shares using the selection moments in (12). This allows simplifying the definition of the identified set in (14) by substituting in the point identified value of h . Specifically, let $\theta_h(m) \equiv \theta(m, h)$ and $\mathbf{M}_h \equiv \{m \in \mathbf{M}^\dagger : (m, h) \in \mathbf{B}\}$ denote the parameter of interest and the admissible values of the MTRs implied by \mathbf{B} for a given $h \in \mathbf{F}^\dagger \times \mathbf{G}^\dagger \equiv \mathbf{H}^\dagger$, and let $\mathbf{M}_h^* = \{m \in \mathbf{M}_h : (m, h) \text{ satisfies (13)}\}$ denote the subset of \mathbf{M}_h additionally consistent with outcome moments. The identified set then simplifies to $\theta_{h^*}(\mathbf{M}_{h^*}^*)$, where h^* denotes the point identified value of h . Assuming \mathbf{M}_h to be linearly parameterized, they then show that the linearity of θ_h and \mathbf{M}_h^* can be exploited such that $\theta_{h^*}(\mathbf{M}_{h^*}^*) = [\underline{\theta}_{h^*}, \bar{\theta}_{h^*}]$ with

$$\underline{\theta}_{h^*} = \inf_{m \in \mathbf{M}_{h^*}^*} \theta_{h^*}(m) \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{\theta}_{h^*} = \sup_{m \in \mathbf{M}_{h^*}^*} \theta_{h^*}(m), \quad (15)$$

where these optimization problems correspond to linear programs.

In the case where multidimensional unobserved heterogeneity governs selection, an inherent complication, however, is that h may not necessarily be point identified. This is because, while the marginals continue to be normalized to uniform distributions, the dependence between them is not necessarily known, implying that both F and g are not necessarily known or point identified by the data. To this end, we propose a simple two-step extension to continue exploiting the linearity

of θ_h and \mathbf{M}_h^* for a given $h \in \mathbf{H}^\dagger$. Formally, let $\mathbf{H} = \{h \in \mathbf{H}^\dagger : (m, h) \in \mathbf{B} \text{ for some } m \in \mathbf{M}^\dagger\}$ denote the set of h implied by \mathbf{B} and $\mathbf{H}^* = \{h \in \mathbf{H} : h \text{ satisfies (12)}\}$ denote the subset of \mathbf{H}^* that additionally satisfies the selection moments. In this case, observe that identified set in (14) can more generally be written as

$$\Theta = \bigcup \{\theta_h(\mathbf{M}_h^*) : h \in \mathbf{H}^*\} , \quad (16)$$

i.e. a union of the identified sets for a given h across the admissible values of h consistent with the selection moments. In turn, we can first, as in the unidimensional case, exploit the linearity to tractably compute the identified set $\theta_h(\mathbf{M}_h^*)$ for a given $h \in \mathbf{H}^*$, and then additionally aggregate them across \mathbf{H}^* to obtain the final identified set.

In what follows, we show how to operationalize this proposal. In Sections 3.2 and 3.3, we first show how to generalize the above arguments from the unidimensional case to that with multidimensional MTRs to tractably compute $\theta_h(\mathbf{M}_h)$ as in (15) for each $h \in \mathbf{H}^*$ when \mathbf{M}_h is parameterized or allowed to remain entirely nonparametric, respectively. In Section 3.4, we then show how to consider a semi-parametric parameterization of the selection model so that \mathbf{H}^* can be characterized by a finite-dimensional parameter to feasibly take the union across \mathbf{H}^* .

3.2 Identified Set under Parametric MTRs

As in Mogstad et al. (2018), we take \mathbf{M}_h to be linearly parameterized along with a parameter space determined by a system of linear equations. This allows computing $\theta_h(\mathbf{M}_h^*)$ using linear programs for each $h \in \mathbf{H}^*$.

Assumption PM. (Parametrizing MTRs) $\mathbf{M}_h = \{m \in \mathbf{M}^\dagger : m_{d|x}(u) = \sum_{k=0}^{K_h} \alpha_{k,d|x} b_{k|h}(u) \text{ for } d \in \mathcal{D}, x \in \mathcal{X}, \text{ and } \alpha_h \equiv (\alpha_{k,d|x} : 0 \leq k \leq K_h, d \in \mathcal{D}, x \in \mathcal{X}) \in \mathbf{A}_h\}$, where $\{b_{k|h} : 0 \leq k \leq K_h\}$ are known functions and $\mathbf{A}_h \subseteq \mathbf{R}^{\dim(\alpha_h)}$ is characterized by a system of linear equations.

To formally see how this allows computing the identified using linear programs as in (15), it is useful to rewrite the identified set in terms of α_h , the variable parameterizing $m \in \mathbf{M}_h$. As θ_h is linear in m and m is linear in α_h , we can substitute in the relation between m and α_h from Assumption PM into θ_h to obtain a linear function θ_h^A of α_h such that $\theta_h(m) = \theta_h^A(\alpha_h)$. Similarly, observe that we can write \mathbf{M}_h^* in terms of α_h by

$$\mathbf{A}_h^* = \left\{ \alpha_h \in \mathbf{A}_h : \sum_{k=0}^{K_h} \alpha_{k,d|x} \int_{\mathcal{U}_{d,z|x}^{\text{sm}}(g)} b_{k|h}(u) dF_x(u) = E_{d|z,x} \text{ for each } d \in \mathcal{D}, x \in \mathcal{X}, z \in \mathcal{Z} \right\} \quad (17)$$

i.e. a subset of \mathbf{A}_h with the additional linear restriction implied on α_h by the outcome moment in (13). The identified set in terms of α_h then corresponds to $\theta_h^A(\mathbf{A}_h^*)$. In the following proposition,

we show that the linearity implies that $\theta_h^A(\mathbf{A}_h)$ corresponds to an interval with endpoints that are given by two optimization problem, which correspond to linear programs as θ_h^A is a linear function and \mathbf{A}_h^* is given by a system of linear equations.

Proposition 1. For a given $h \in \mathbf{H}^\dagger$, let \mathbf{M}_h satisfy Assumption **PM**. If \mathbf{M}_h^* is empty then so is $\theta_h(\mathbf{M}_h^*)$, and if it is not empty, then $\text{closure}(\theta_h(\mathbf{M}_h^*)) = [\underline{\theta}_h, \bar{\theta}_h]$, where

$$\underline{\theta}_h = \inf_{\alpha_h \in \mathbf{A}_h^*} \theta_h^A(\alpha_h) \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{\theta}_h = \sup_{\alpha_h \in \mathbf{A}_h^*} \theta_h^A(\alpha_h). \quad (18)$$

Note that Assumption **PM** requires the restrictions on α_h to correspond to a system of linear equations. As explicitly derived in Table **A1**, we highlight that a number of common shape restrictions from the literature such as those listed in Table **1** correspond to linear restrictions on m and in turn correspond to a system of linear restrictions on α_h when generally considered over a finite grid of points of u in $[0, 1]^J$. Specifically, it allows assumptions such as boundedness typically required to ensure the bounds on mean effects are finite (Manski, 2008), or monotonicity in outcomes between two treatments as in the monotone treatment assumption from Manski (1997) to be imposed for a given value of the unobserved heterogeneity. Alternatively, it allows imposing monotonicity across different values of the unobserved heterogeneity in a given dimension, conditional or unconditional of the remaining dimensions, to capture how the outcome may vary for those more or less likely to select into treatment, as in the monotone treatment selection assumption from Manski and Pepper (2000). Lastly, it also allows imposing separability, again conditional or unconditional of the remaining dimensions, between the unobserved heterogeneity in a given dimension and the covariates as in Brinch et al. (2017).

3.3 Identified Set under Nonparametric MTRs

While Assumption **PM** parametrizes the MTRs, it in fact allows in special scenarios by a careful choice of functions $\{b_{k|h} : 0 \leq k \leq K_h\}$ to compute through Proposition **1** the identified set when the MTRs remain entirely nonparametric. In particular, let

$$\mathbf{M}_h^{\text{np}} = \left\{ m \in \mathbf{M}^\dagger : \begin{array}{l} m \text{ satisfies a subset of Assumptions B, MD}_{d', d''} \text{ for} \\ (d', d'') \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{MD}}, \text{ UM}_j \text{ for } j \in \mathcal{J}, \text{ and US}_{j'} \text{ for } j' \in \mathcal{J}' \end{array} \right\}, \quad (19)$$

where $\mathcal{D}_{\text{MD}} \subseteq \mathcal{D} \times \mathcal{D}$ and $\mathcal{J}, \mathcal{J}' \subseteq \{1, \dots, J\}$, denote the set of all nonparametric MTRs that potentially satisfy a subset of the restrictions in Table **2** with the exception of Assumptions CM_j and CS_j . For this subset of assumptions, we can show that $\theta_h(\mathbf{M}_h^{\text{np}}) = \theta_h(\mathbf{M}_h^*)$, where $\mathbf{M}_h^{\text{np}} = \{m \in \mathbf{M}_h^{\text{np}} : (m, h) \text{ satisfies (13)}\}$, and \mathbf{M}_h^* is constructed using \mathbf{M}_h satisfying Assumption **PM** with $\{b_{k|h} : 0 \leq k \leq K_h\}$ given by

$$b_{k|h}(u) = 1\{u \in \mathcal{U}_k\} \quad (20)$$

Table 2: Various shape restrictions on m that correspond to linear restrictions on α_h

Assumption	Restriction on MTRs
B (Bounded)	$\underline{m} \leq m_{d x}(u) \leq \bar{m}$ for each $d \in \mathcal{D}$, $x \in \mathcal{X}$ and $u \in [0, 1]^J$, where \underline{m} and \bar{m} are known constants.
MD $_{d', d''}$ (Monotonicity between d' and d'')	$m_{d' x}(u) - m_{d'' x}(u) \geq 0$ for each $x \in \mathcal{X}$ and $u \in [0, 1]^J$.
CM $_j$ (Conditional monotonicity in U_j)	$m_{d x}(u)$ is increasing (decreasing) in u_j for each $d \in \mathcal{D}$ and $x \in \mathcal{X}$.
UM $_j$ (Unconditional monotonicity in U_j)	$m_{j,d x}(u_j) \equiv E[m_{d x}(U) U_j = u_j, X = x]$ is increasing (decreasing) in u_j for each $d \in \mathcal{D}$ and $x \in \mathcal{X}$.
CS $_j$ (Conditional separability between U_j and X)	$m_{d x}(u) = m_d^U(u) + m_d^{U_{-j}, X}(u_{-j}, x)$ for each $d \in \mathcal{D}$, $x \in \mathcal{X}$ and $u \in [0, 1]^J$, where m_d^U and $m_d^{U_{-j}, X}$ are unknown functions and U_{-j} denotes the subvector of U without U_j .
US $_j$ (Unconditional separability between U_j and X)	$m_{j,d x}(u_j) \equiv E[m_{d x}(U) U_j = u_j, X = x] = m_d^{U_j}(u_j) + m_{j,d}^X(x)$ for each $d \in \mathcal{D}$, $x \in \mathcal{X}$ and $u \in [0, 1]^J$, where $m_d^{U_j}$ and $m_{j,d}^X$ are unknown functions.

for a carefully constructed partition $\mathbb{U}_h \equiv \{\mathcal{U}_{1|h}, \dots, \mathcal{U}_{K_h|h}\}$ of $[0, 1]^J$, and with

$$\mathbf{A}_h = \left\{ \alpha_h \in \mathbf{R}^{\dim(\alpha_h)} : \left(\sum_{k=0}^{K_h} \alpha_{k,d|x} b_{k|h} : d \in \mathcal{D}, x \in \mathcal{X} \right) \in \mathbf{M}_h^{\text{np}} \right\}, \quad (21)$$


which can be equivalently written as a system of linear equations—see Table A1 for an explicit derivation. This is analogous to the case with a single dimension of unobserved heterogeneity in Mogstad et al. (2018), who show that parametric MTRs taking constant values over partition of $[0, 1]$ can generate the nonparametric bounds for certain assumptions.

To construct this partition in the general case of multidimensional unobserved heterogeneity, let $\mathbb{U}_h^* = \{\mathcal{U}_{d,z|x}^{\text{sm}}(h) : d \in \mathcal{D}, z \in \mathcal{Z}, x \in \mathcal{X}\} \cup \{\mathcal{U}_{d,l|x}^\theta(h) : d \in \mathcal{D}, l \in \mathcal{L}, x \in \mathcal{X}\}$ denote the collection of sets used to define the data restrictions in (13) and the parameter of interest in (10). Using these sets, we can define a partition satisfying certain properties to sharply preserve the information provided by the various restrictions on the parameter of interest.

Definition P. (Partition) Let \mathbb{U}_h be a finite partition of $[0, 1]^J$ such that: (i) for each $\mathcal{U} \in \mathbb{U}_h^*$, we have that $\bigcup\{\mathcal{U}' : \mathcal{U}' \in \mathbb{U}'\} = \mathcal{U}$ for some $\mathbb{U}' \subseteq \mathbb{U}_h$; and (ii) for each $\mathcal{U} \in \mathbb{U}_h$ and $j \in \{1, \dots, J\}$, we have that $\mathcal{U}_{[j]} \equiv \{t \in \mathbf{R} : u_j = t \text{ for some } (u_1, \dots, u_J) \in \mathcal{U}\}$ is an interval, and $\mathcal{U}_{[j]} = \mathcal{U}'_{[j]}$ or $\mathcal{U}_{[j]} \cap \mathcal{U}'_{[j]} = \emptyset$ for all $\mathcal{U}' \in \mathbb{U}_h$.

Definition P(i) requires the partition to be rich enough to be able to sharply construct the data restrictions and the parameter of interest, while Definition P(ii) requires each set to be a rectangle and further overlap or be disjoint in each coordinate with respect to every other set in the partition

Figure 1: Partition satisfying Definition **P** in Example **3** with $\mathcal{Z} = \{z, z'\}$ and $\mathcal{X} = \{x\}$, and where the parameter of interest is an ATE between two treatments. In Panel (a), note that $\mathcal{U}_{0,z|x}^{\text{sm}}(g) = \mathcal{U}'_3 \cup \mathcal{U}'_4$, $\mathcal{U}_{1,z|x}^{\text{sm}}(g) = \mathcal{U}'_1 \cup \mathcal{U}'_2$, $\mathcal{U}_{0,z'|x}^{\text{sm}}(g) = \mathcal{U}'_2 \cup \mathcal{U}'_4$, and $\mathcal{U}_{1,z'|x}^{\text{sm}}(g) = \mathcal{U}'_1 \cup \mathcal{U}'_3$.



so that they can be ordered in each coordinate to be able to sharply impose the restrictions in Assumption UM_j and US_j for different values of j .

To better understand Definition **P**, Figure **1** provides a graphical illustration in the context of a simple version of Example **3**. Figure **1(a)** presents the sets that underlie \mathbb{U}_h^* . Figure **1(b)** then shows how to exploit the underlying rectangular structure in (4) and (11) of these sets to construct a partition satisfying the properties in Definition **P**. In particular, it takes the endpoints of the various rectangles to form a number of disjoint rectangles that partition the entire space. This same idea can be applied to also construct a partition in the general case. Specifically, for each $j = 1, \dots, J$, let $u_{(1),j} \leq \dots \leq u_{(M_j),j}$ denote the ordered values of all the end points in the j th dimension of the underlying rectangular sets in (4) and (11) that form the sets in \mathbb{U}_h^* , and $\{0, 1\}$ in case they are not one of the end points. We can then take

$$\mathbb{U}_h = \prod_{j=1}^J \left\{ [u_{(1),j}, u_{(2),j}), \dots, [u_{(M_j-1),j}, u_{(M_j),j}) \right\},$$

i.e. a rectangular partition constructed by taking the Cartesian product of the set of intervals based on adjacent endpoints in each dimension.

In the following proposition, we show that taking \mathbb{U}_h to satisfy Definition **P** ensures that \mathbf{M}_h in Assumption **PM** using (20) and (21) gives the same identified set as that under \mathbf{M}_h^{np} .

Proposition 2. For a given $h \in \mathbf{H}^\dagger$, let \mathbf{M}_h^{np} be given by (19), and let \mathbf{M}_h satisfy Assumption

PM with $\{b_{k|h} : 0 \leq k \leq K_h\}$ given by (20), where \mathbb{U}_h satisfies Definition **P**, and with \mathbf{A}_h given by (21). It then follows that $\theta_h(\mathbf{M}_h^{*\text{,np}}) = \theta_h(\mathbf{M}_h^*)$.

We highlight that Definition **P** reduces to the partition considered in Mogstad et al. (2018) in the case where $J = 1$, which simply corresponds to intervals constructed by taking the intersection of those used in the definition of the data restrictions and the parameter of interest. Definition **P** in turn shows how to generalize the required properties in the multidimensional case, where importantly one needs to satisfy additional properties such as Definition **P**(ii) that are automatically implied by the fact that it is a partition in the unidimensional case. In this sense, Definition **P** shares conceptual similarities to multidimensional partitions considered in discrete choice analysis to obtain nonparametric bounds in alternative identification problems. For example, Definition **P**(i) is similar to the requirement considered in Chesher et al. (2013), Gu et al. (2022) and Tebaldi et al. (2023) to capture that values in each element of the partition predict the same choice behavior, while Definition **P**(ii) is similar to that in Kamat and Norris (2022) to sharply impose shape restrictions on the underlying function.

3.4 Parametrization of Selection Model Primitives

Next, to ensure that we can feasibly take the union of the identified set $\theta(\mathbf{M}_h^*)$ over $h \in \mathbf{H}^*$ and compute the final identified set through (16), we make the following semi-parametric assumption on the space of primitives characterizing the selection model.

Assumption PS. (Parametrizing Selection Primitives) $\mathbf{H} = \mathbf{F} \times \mathbf{G}$ such that $\mathbf{F} = \{F \in \mathbf{F}^\dagger : F = \bar{F}(\lambda), \lambda \in \mathbf{L}\}$, where \bar{F} and $\mathbf{L} \subseteq \mathbf{R}^{d_\lambda}$ are known, and $\mathbf{H}^*(\lambda) = \{(F, g) \in \mathbf{F} \times \mathbf{G} : F = \bar{F}(\lambda), (F, g) \text{ satisfies (12)}\}$ is a singleton or an empty set for each $\lambda \in \mathbf{L}$.

Recall that in the unidimensional case h is point identified as F is known and g can be point identified by the selection moments in (12). In this sense, as the marginals are normalized to be uniform, Assumption **PS** essentially imposes that the dependence between the multiple variables in the general case with multidimensional unobserved heterogeneity can be parameterized by $\lambda \in \mathbf{L}$ such that an analogous argument continues to apply for each $\lambda \in \mathbf{L}$. In particular, for each $\lambda \in \mathbf{L}$ when $F = \bar{F}(\lambda)$ is known, it requires \mathbf{G} and the data variation in (12) to be such that there exists a single unique value of g consistent with the data so that it is point identified or that no such g exists implying that the model is rejected.

For the purposes of computation, Assumption **PS** along with Proposition 1 allows us to compute the identified set using a sequence of linear programs. Specifically, we can first compute $\theta_h(\mathbf{M}_h^*)$ using Proposition 1 for the unique $h \in \mathbf{H}^*(\lambda)$ across $\lambda \in \mathbf{L}$, where \mathbf{L} is finite dimensional and in practice can be approximated by a fine grid of points in \mathbf{R}^{d_λ} . We can then take the union of these identified sets across the considered values of λ to compute the final identified set.

We conclude this section by highlighting that Assumption **PS** can be naturally satisfied in various selection models of interest under weak restrictions on F that are satisfied by many common parametric distributions. We do so by formally illustrating this in the context of the various examples considered in Section 2.2.

Example 1 (Continued). In this model, it is more convenient to work with the underlying representation in (6), which implies that in (7). In particular, showing $\tilde{g} \equiv (\tilde{g}_{d,z|x} : d \in \{1, 2\}, z \in \mathcal{Z}, x \in \mathcal{X})$ can be point identified given a known, parameterized $\tilde{F} \equiv (\tilde{F}_x : x \in \mathcal{X})$, where \tilde{F}_x denotes the conditional on $X = x \in \mathcal{X}$ distribution of $(\tilde{U}_1, \tilde{U}_2)$, will then imply that g is point identified for a given F and the parameterization on F through the relation between (\tilde{g}, \tilde{F}) and (g, F) . To this end, observe that (12) in terms of \tilde{g} and \tilde{F} can be written as

$$P(D = 0|Z = z, X = x) = \int 1\{u_1 > \tilde{g}_{1,z|x}, u_2 > \tilde{g}_{2,z|x}\} d\tilde{F}_x(u_1, u_2), \quad (22)$$

$$P(D = 1|Z = z, X = x) = \int 1\{u_1 < \tilde{g}_{1,z|x}, u_2 - u_1 > \tilde{g}_{2,z|x} - \tilde{g}_{1,z|x}\} d\tilde{F}_x(u_1, u_2), \quad (23)$$

for $z \in \mathcal{Z}$ and $x \in \mathcal{X}$, where the moments for $D = 2$ are not included as they are implied by the above two given that they sum to one.

In the following proposition, we show that if \tilde{F}_x is assumed to have a strictly positive density for each $x \in \mathcal{X}$, then only either a unique or no value of \tilde{g} can be consistent with these moments.

Proposition 3. If \tilde{F}_x is known, and has a strictly positive density on \mathbf{R}^2 for each $x \in \mathcal{X}$, then there exists at most a single value of \tilde{g} in \mathbf{R}^2 that satisfies (22) and (23).

To ensure Assumption **PS**, we can therefore take $\mathbf{G} = \mathbf{G}^\dagger$, i.e. allow g to be unrestricted, and \mathbf{F} to be such that \bar{F} is implied by a parameterization of the underlying \tilde{F} that takes \tilde{F}_x to have a strictly positive density for each $x \in \mathcal{X}$. Specifically, we can assume that $\tilde{F} \equiv \tilde{F}(\lambda)$, where $\tilde{F}_x(\lambda)$ is some known distribution with a strictly positive density and parameterized by $\lambda \in \mathbf{L}$, which then implies \bar{F} through the relation between \bar{F}_x and \tilde{F}_x implied by $U_1 = \tilde{F}_{1|x}(\lambda)(\tilde{U}_1)$, $U_2 = \tilde{F}_{2|x}(\lambda)(\tilde{U}_2)$ and $U_3 = \tilde{F}_{12|x}(\lambda)(\tilde{U}_1 - \tilde{U}_2)$. For example, we can take

$$\tilde{F}_x(\tilde{u}_1, \tilde{u}_2) = \Phi_{\lambda_x}(\tilde{u}_1, \tilde{u}_2) \quad (24)$$

where Φ_{λ_x} denotes the distribution function of a bivariate standard normal distribution with correlation coefficient $\lambda_x \in (-1, 1)$, i.e. a bi-variate normal distribution with equal variances normalized to one as in a probit model (e.g., Train, 2009, Chapter 6), or, more flexibly, we can take a finite mixture of M such normals as in

$$\tilde{F}_x(\tilde{u}_1, \tilde{u}_2) = \sum_{m=1}^M \lambda_{1,m|x} \Phi_{\lambda_{2,m|x}}(\tilde{u}_1, \tilde{u}_2) \quad (25)$$

where $\lambda_{1,m|x} \in [0, 1]$ and $\lambda_{2,m|x} \in (-1, 1)$ are the weight and correlation parameters for the m th mixture. ■

Example 2 (Continued). Observe that (12) in this model can be written as

$$P(D = 0|Z = z, X = x) = 1 - g_{1,z|x} , \quad (26)$$

$$P(D = 1|Z = z, X = x) = g_{1,z|x} - F_x(g_{1,z|x}, g_{2,z|x}) , \quad (27)$$

for $z \in \mathcal{Z}$ and $x \in \mathcal{X}$, where the moments for $D = 2$ are again not included as they are implied by the above two given that they sum to one. In the following proposition, we show that if F_x is assumed to be known and strictly increasing in one of the dimensions for each $x \in \mathcal{X}$, then only either a unique or no value of g can be consistent with the moments in (26) and (27).

Proposition 4. If F_x is known and strictly increasing in the second dimension for each $x \in \mathcal{X}$, then there exists a unique value of g that satisfies (26) and (27).

To ensure Assumption PS, we can therefore take $\mathbf{G} = \mathbf{G}^\dagger$, i.e. allow g to be unrestricted, and \mathbf{F} to be such that $F \equiv \bar{F}(\lambda)$, where $\bar{F}_x(\lambda)$ is taken to be some pre-specified continuous copula and strictly increasing in the second dimension with $\lambda \in \mathbf{L}$ parameterizing the dependence between the marginals. For example, similar to (24), we can take

$$\bar{F}_x(u_1, u_2) = \Phi_{\lambda_x}(\Phi^{-1}(u_1), \Phi^{-1}(u_2)) , \quad (28)$$

where Φ additionally denotes the distribution function of a standard normal distribution, i.e. take \bar{F}_x to be a bivariate normal copula with correlation parameter $\lambda_x \in [-1, 1]$ —see Nelsen (2007) for examples of various other families of copulas. ■

Example 3 (Continued). Observe that (12) in this model can be written as

$$P(D = 1|Z = z, X = x) = F_x(g_{1,z|x}, g_{2,z|x}) , \quad (29)$$

for $z \in \mathcal{Z}$ and $x \in \mathcal{X}$, where the moments for $D = 0$ are again not included as it is implied by the above moment given that both the left and right side sum to one.

In this case, unlike Examples 1 and 2 above, there are two unknown thresholds, $g_{1,z|x}$ and $g_{2,z|x}$, but only a single moment for each $x \in \mathcal{X}$. In turn, even when F_x is known, it is generally difficult to identify the remaining two unknowns using a single moment. As in Lee and Salanié (2018, Section 4.2), it is therefore useful to suppose that $\mathcal{Z} = \mathcal{Z}_1 \times \mathcal{Z}_2$ and g to be restricted such that $g_{1,z|x} \equiv g_{1,z_1|x}$ and $g_{2,z|x} \equiv g_{2,z_2|x}$ for all $z = (z_1, z_2) \in \mathcal{Z}$ and $x \in \mathcal{X}$, i.e. there exists two instruments and an exclusion restriction imposing that each instrument affects only one of the thresholds, and that $g_{1,z'_1|z}$ is known for some $z'_1 \in \mathcal{Z}_1$. In the following proposition, we show that if F_x is assumed to be strictly increasing in both its dimensions then only at most one value of g can be consistent with the data moments.

Proposition 5. For each $x \in \mathcal{X}$, let $\mathcal{Z} = \mathcal{Z}_1 \times \mathcal{Z}_2$ be such that $g_{1,z|x} \equiv g_{1,z_1|x}$ and $g_{2,z|x} \equiv g_{2,z_2|x}$ for all $z = (z_1, z_2) \in \mathcal{Z}$, and $g_{1,z'_1|x}$ be known for some $z'_1 \in \mathcal{Z}_1$. If F_x is strictly increasing in both its dimensions for each $x \in \mathcal{X}$, then there exists at most a single value of g that satisfies (29).

To ensure Assumption **PS**, we can therefore take $\mathbf{G} \subset \mathbf{G}^\dagger$ such that $g_{1,z|x} \equiv g_{1,z_1|x}$ and $g_{2,z|x} \equiv g_{2,z_2|x}$ for all $z = (z_1, z_2) \in \mathcal{Z}_1 \times \mathcal{Z}_2 \equiv \mathcal{Z}$ and that $g_{1,z'_1|x}$ is equal to some known value for a given $z'_1 \in \mathcal{Z}_1$, and \mathbf{F} to be such that $F \equiv \bar{F}(\lambda)$, where $\bar{F}_x(\lambda)$ is taken to be some pre-specified continuous, strictly increasing copula with $\lambda \in \mathbf{L}$ parameterizing the dependence between the marginals, such as, for example, that in (28). The requirement that $g_{1,z'_1|x}$ is known captures the fact the $g_{1,z|x}$ and $g_{2,z|x}$ can generally be point identified only up to a constant, which intuitively arises given that the same function F_x is present across the different moments—see also Lee and Salanié (2018, Section 4.2) showing this even in the presence of continuous variation in the thresholds in the context of the class of Archimedean copulas. In practice, as $g_{1,z'_1|x}$ may not be known, we can perform the analysis and compute the identified set for multiple values of $g_{1,z'_1|x}$ and then take the union of these identified sets. ■

4 Conclusion

In many empirical scenarios, treatment selection models exhibit multidimensional unobserved heterogeneity. In this paper, we develop a method to learn about various treatment effect parameters in a general class of such models in the presence of discrete-valued instruments. Specifically, under a semi-parametric restriction on the dependence between the multiple dimensions of unobserved heterogeneity, we show how a sequence of linear programs can be used to compute the identified set for these parameters when the marginal treatment response functions that underlie them remain nonparametric or are additionally parameterized.

A Proofs of Propositions

A.1 Proof of Proposition 1

Given Assumption **PM**, \mathbf{A}_h corresponds to a convex set as it given by a system of linear equation and so does \mathbf{A}_h^* as it is a subset of \mathbf{A}_h with additional linear restrictions. Moreover, note that θ_h^A is a linear function. In turn, as the image of a convex set under a continuous function is also convex, it directly follows that the image of a non-empty \mathbf{A}_h^* under θ_h^A is a non-empty convex set on the real line, i.e. an interval with endpoints given in (18).

A.2 Proof of Proposition 2

As $\mathbf{M}_h^* \subseteq \mathbf{M}_h^{*,\text{np}}$, it directly follows that $\theta_h(\mathbf{M}_h^*) \subseteq \theta_h(\mathbf{M}_h^{*,\text{np}})$. In order to show that $\theta_h(\mathbf{M}_h^{*,\text{np}}) \subseteq \theta_h(\mathbf{M}_h^*)$, we show that for every $\theta_0 \in \theta_h(\mathbf{M}_h^{*,\text{np}})$, there exists a $m \in \mathbf{M}_h^*$ such that $\theta_h(m) = \theta_0$. To this end, as $\theta_0 \in \theta_h(\mathbf{M}_h^{*,\text{np}})$, there exists a $\tilde{m} \in \mathbf{M}_h^{*,\text{np}}$ such that $\theta_h(\tilde{m}) = \theta_0$. We use this \tilde{m} to construct our m . Specifically, we take

$$m_{d|x} = \sum_{\mathcal{U} \in \mathbb{U}_h} \alpha_{\mathcal{U},d|x} 1\{u \in \mathcal{U}\},$$

for $d \in \mathcal{D}$, $x \in \mathcal{X}$, where the coefficients $\alpha_h \equiv (\alpha_{\mathcal{U},d|x} : \mathcal{U} \in \mathbb{U}_h, d \in \mathcal{D}, x \in \mathcal{X})$ are constructed using \tilde{m} by

$$\alpha_{\mathcal{U},d|x} = E[\tilde{m}_{d|x}(u) | U \in \mathcal{U}, X = x] \equiv \frac{\int_{\mathcal{U}} \tilde{m}_{d|x}(u) dF_x}{\int_{\mathcal{U}} dF_x} \quad (\text{A-1})$$

for each $\mathcal{U} \in \mathbb{U}_h$, $d \in \mathcal{D}$ and $x \in \mathcal{X}$.

To show $\theta_h(m) = \theta_0$, we can equivalently show $\theta_h(\tilde{m}) = \theta_h^A(\alpha_h)$, which follows by

$$\begin{aligned} \theta_h(\tilde{m}) &= \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \sum_{l \in \mathcal{L}} \sum_{d \in \mathcal{D}} w_{d,l|x}(h) \int_{\mathcal{U}_{d,l|x}^\theta(g)} \tilde{m}_{d|x}(u) dF_x \\ &= \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \sum_{l \in \mathcal{L}} \sum_{d \in \mathcal{D}} w_{d,l|x}(h) \sum_{\mathcal{U} \in \mathbb{U}_{d,l|x,h}^\theta} \int_{\mathcal{U}} \tilde{m}_{d|x}(u) dF_x \\ &= \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \sum_{l \in \mathcal{L}} \sum_{d \in \mathcal{D}} w_{d,l|x}(h) \sum_{\mathcal{U} \in \mathbb{U}_{d,l|x,h}^\theta} \alpha_{d,\mathcal{U}|x} \int_{\mathcal{U}} dF_x \\ &\equiv \theta_h^A(\alpha_h) = \theta_h(m), \end{aligned}$$

where in the second equality $\mathbb{U}_{d,l|x,h}^\theta = \{\mathcal{U} \in \mathbb{U}_h : \mathcal{U} \subseteq \mathcal{U}_{d,l|x}^\theta(g)\}$, which follows given that \mathbb{U}_h satisfies Definition **P**(i).

To show $m \in \mathbf{M}_h^*$, we equivalently show $\alpha_h \in \mathbf{A}_h^*$. To this end, note that \mathbf{A}_h^* corresponds to the set of all α_h that satisfy

$$\sum_{\mathcal{U} \in \mathbb{U}_{d,z|x,h}^{\text{sm}}} \alpha_{\mathcal{U},d|x} \int_{\mathcal{U}} dF_x = E_{d|z,x} \quad (\text{A-2})$$

for $d \in \mathcal{D}$, $z \in \mathcal{Z}$ and $x \in \mathcal{X}$, where $\mathbb{U}_{d,z|x,h}^{\text{sm}} = \{\mathcal{U} \in \mathbb{U}_h : \mathcal{U} \subseteq \mathcal{U}_{d,z|x}^{\text{sm}}(g)\}$, and the restrictions on α_h in Table **A1** depending on which of Assumptions B, MD $_{d',d''}$, UM $_j$, and US $_j$ are imposed on m . Given $\tilde{m} \in \mathbf{M}^{*,\text{np}}$, we show that the constructed α_h in (A-1) satisfies these restrictions. With respect to the data restrictions, as \tilde{m} satisfies (13), we have that (A-2) is satisfied as

$$\int_{\mathcal{U}_{d,z|x}^{\text{sm}}(g)} \tilde{m}_{d|x} dF_x = \sum_{\mathcal{U} \in \mathbb{U}_{d,z|x,h}^{\text{sm}}} \int_{\mathcal{U}} \tilde{m}_{d|x} dF_x = \sum_{\mathcal{U} \in \mathbb{U}_{d,z|x,h}^{\text{sm}}} \alpha_{\mathcal{U},d|x} \int_{\mathcal{U}} dF_x = E_{d|z,x},$$

where the first equality from the fact that \mathbb{U}_h satisfies Definition **P**(i), and the second equality follows by substituting in the relation between α_h and \tilde{m} from (A-1). With respect to the shape restrictions, if \tilde{m} satisfies Assumptions B or MD $_{d',d''}$, we can straightforwardly show that the constructed α_h satisfies their respective restrictions from Table **A1** by taking the integral of \tilde{m} over $\mathcal{U} \in \mathbb{U}_h$ and using the relation between α and \tilde{m} . For example, if $\tilde{m}_{d|x}(u) \leq \bar{m}$, we have that $\alpha_{\mathcal{U},d|x} \leq \bar{m}$ as

$$\alpha_{\mathcal{U},d|x} = \frac{\int_{\mathcal{U}} \tilde{m}_{d|x}(u) dF_x}{\int_{\mathcal{U}} dF_x} \leq \bar{m}$$

where the first equality recalls the relation between α and m' in (A-1) and second uses the fact that $\tilde{m}_{d|x}(u) \leq \bar{m}$. Next, if \tilde{m} satisfies UM $_j$, it directly implies that

$$E[\tilde{m}_{d|x}(U)|U_j \in \mathcal{U}'_{[j]}, X = x] \geq E[\tilde{m}_{d|x}(U)|U_j \in \mathcal{U}''_{[j]}, X = x]$$

for all $\mathcal{U}', \mathcal{U}'' \in \mathbb{U}_h$ such that $u'_j \geq u''_j$ for all $u_j \in \mathcal{U}'_{[j]}, u''_j \in \mathcal{U}''_{[j]}$. Given that we can write

$$E[\tilde{m}_{d|x}(U)|U_j \in \mathcal{U}'_{[j]}, X = x] = \sum_{\mathcal{U} \in \mathbb{U}_{j|h}(\mathcal{U}')} E[\tilde{m}_{d|x}(U)|U \in \mathcal{U}, X = x] P(U \in \mathcal{U}|U_j \in \mathcal{U}'_{[j]}, X = x), \quad (\text{A-3})$$

where $\mathbb{U}_{j|h}(\mathcal{U}) \equiv \{\mathcal{U}' \in \mathbb{U}_h : \mathcal{U}'_{[j]} = \mathcal{U}_{[j]}\}$, as \mathbb{U}_h satisfies Definition **P**(ii), substituting in the relation between α_h and \tilde{m} from (A-1) then implies that α_h satisfies the respective restriction in Table **A1**. Finally, if \tilde{m} satisfies Assumption US $_j$, we can introduce additional auxiliary variables ($\alpha_{j,\mathcal{U}_{[j]},d} : \mathcal{U}_{[j]} \in \mathbb{U}_{j,h}$, $d \in \mathcal{D}$) and ($\alpha_{j,d|x} : d \in \mathcal{D}, x \in \mathcal{X}$) that are constructed from $\tilde{m}_d^{U_j}$ and $\tilde{m}_{j,d}^X$ as follows

$$\alpha_{j,d|x} = \tilde{m}_{j,d}^X(x),$$

$$\alpha_{j,\mathcal{U},d} = E[\tilde{m}_d^{U_j}(U_j)|U_j \in \mathcal{U}_{[j]}, X = x] \equiv \frac{\int_{\mathcal{U}_{[j]}} \tilde{m}_d^{U_j}(u_j) du_j}{\int_{\mathcal{U}_{[j]}} du_j},$$

where in the second equation we have that the expectation does not depend on x as U_j is normalized to be uniformly distributed across all $x \in \mathcal{X}$. The respective restriction in Table **A1** on α_h then directly follows from (A-3) when substituting in the relation between α_h and \tilde{m} from (A-1) and the above relations between the auxiliary variables and $\tilde{m}_d^{U_j}$ and $\tilde{m}_{j,d}^X$. This concludes that $\alpha_h \in \mathbf{A}_h^*$.

A.3 Proof of Proposition 3

Note that the moments here are

$$P(D = 1|Z = z, X = x) = \int 1\{u_1 > \tilde{g}_{1,z|x}, u_1 - u_2 \geq \tilde{g}_{1,z|x} - \tilde{g}_{2,z|x}\} d\tilde{F}_x \equiv H_{1|x}(\tilde{g}_{2,z|x}, \tilde{g}_{1,z|x}),$$

$$P(D = 2|Z = z, X = x) = \int 1\{u_2 > \tilde{g}_{2,z|x}, u_1 - u_2 < \tilde{g}_{1,z|x} - \tilde{g}_{2,z|x}\} d\tilde{F}_x \equiv H_{2|x}(\tilde{g}_{2,z|x}, \tilde{g}_{1,z|x}) .$$

for a given $z \in \mathcal{Z}$ and $x \in \mathcal{X}$. We show the function $H_x(v_1, v_2) \equiv (H_{1|x}(v_1, v_2), H_{2|x}(v_1, v_2))$ is injective on the domain \mathbf{R}^2 for each $x \in \mathcal{X}$ given which it follows that if there exists a $(\tilde{g}_{1,z|x}, \tilde{g}_{2,z|x}) \in \mathbf{R}^2$ that solves the above system of equations for a given $z \in \mathcal{Z}$ and $x \in \mathcal{X}$ then it must be unique. From this, it will follow there exists at most one \tilde{g} that satisfies (22) and (23) and hence the result.

To do so, we use Berry et al. (2013, Corollary 1) that shows if $(H_{0|x}, H_{1|x}, H_{2|x})$, where $H_{0|x}(v_1, v_2) \equiv 1 - H_{1|x}(v_1, v_2) - H_{2|x}(v_1, v_2)$, satisfies a so-called weak substitutes and connected strict substitution condition—defined in Assumptions 2 and 3 in Berry et al. (2013), respectively—for all $(v_1, v_2) \in \mathbf{R}^2$ and each $x \in \mathcal{X}$ then H_x is injective on \mathbf{R}^2 for each $x \in \mathcal{X}$. For each $x \in \mathcal{X}$, as F_x is assumed to have a density, these conditions are satisfied in our setup if

$$\begin{aligned} H_{12|x}(v_1, v_2) &< 0 , \\ H_{21|x}(v_1, v_2) &< 0 , \\ H_{01|x}(v_1, v_2), H_{02|x}(v_1, v_2) &< 0 , \end{aligned}$$

where

$$H_{ij|x}(v_1, v_2) = \frac{\partial H_{i|x}}{\partial v_j}(v_1, v_2)$$

for $i \in \{0, 1, 2\}$ and $j \in \{1, 2\}$. Indeed, this directly follows by taking the derivatives of $H_{1|x}$ and $H_{2|x}$ with respect to v_1 and v_2 , respectively, and the assumption that F_x has a strictly positive density. This completes the proof.

A.4 Proof of Proposition 4

For a given $z \in \mathcal{Z}$ and $x \in \mathcal{X}$, we can identify $g_{1,z|x}$ using (26) as follows

$$g_{1,z|x} = 1 - P(D = 0|Z = z, X = x) \equiv P(D = 1|Z = z, X = x) + P(D = 2|Z = z, X = x) .$$

As $g_{1,z|x}$ is identified and F_x is known, we have a single unknown $g_{2,z|x}$ in (27), which recall corresponds to

$$P(D = 1|Z = z, X = x) = g_{1,z|x} - F_x(g_{1,z|x}, g_{2,z|x}) .$$

If $g_{2,z|x} = 1$, then the right hand side of the above equation is 0 as $F_x(g_{1,z|x}, 1) = g_{1,z|x}$ given that F_x is normalized to have uniformly distributed marginals. On the other hand, if $g_{2,z|x} = 0$, then the right hand side of the above equation is $g_{1,z|x}$ as $F_x(g_{1,z|x}, 0) = 0$, which is weakly greater than $P(D = 1|Z = z, X = x)$. In turn, as F_x is continuous, given that U is continuously distributed, and assumed to be strictly increasing in the second dimension, it follows by the intermediate value theorem that there must exist a unique $g_{2,z|x} \in [0, 1]$ that satisfies the above equation. Doing the same across $z \in \mathcal{Z}$ and $x \in \mathcal{X}$ implies that there exists a unique g that solves (26) and (27), which completes the proof.

A.5 Proof of Proposition 5

For a given $x \in \mathcal{X}$, as $g_{1,z'_1|x}$ is known for some $z'_1 \in \mathcal{Z}$ and F_x is known, we have a single unknown $g_{2,z_2|x}$ in the moment

$$P(D = 1|Z = (z'_1, z_2), X = x) = F_x(g_{1,z'_1|x}, g_{2,z_2|x})$$

for $z_2 \in \mathcal{Z}_2$. As F_x is strictly increasing in the second dimension, we have that if there exists a $g_{2,z_2|x}$ that solves the above equation, then it must be unique. Suppose that $g_{2,z_2|x}$ exists for each $z_2 \in \mathcal{Z}_2$. In an analogous manner, taking some $z'_2 \in \mathcal{Z}_2$, we have that as $g_{2,z'_2|x}$ is identified and F_x is known, there is a single unknown $g_{1,z_1|x}$ in the moment

$$P(D = 1|Z = (z_1, z'_2), X = x) = F_x(g_{1,z_1|x}, g_{2,z'_2|x})$$

for $z_1 \in \mathcal{Z}_1 \setminus \{z'_1\}$. As F_x is also strictly increasing in the first dimension, we again have that if there exists a $g_{1,z_1|x}$ that solves the above equation, then it must be unique. Doing the same across $x \in \mathcal{X}$ shows that that if there exists a g that solves (29) then it must be unique, which completes the proof.

B Appendix Tables

Table A1: Linear restrictions on α_h for the various assumption in Table 2

Assumption	Restriction	
	Over $\mathcal{U}_{\text{grid}}$	Under (20) with \mathbb{U}_h satisfying Definition P
B	$\underline{m} \leq \sum_{k=0}^{K_h} \alpha_{k,d x} b_{k h}(u) \leq \bar{m}$	$\underline{m} \leq \alpha_{\mathcal{U},d x} \leq \bar{m}$
	for all $u \in \mathcal{U}_{\text{grid}}$, $d \in \mathcal{D}$ and $x \in \mathcal{X}$.	for all $\mathcal{U} \in \mathbb{U}_h$, $d \in \mathcal{D}$ and $x \in \mathcal{X}$.
MD $_{d',d''}$	$\sum_{k=0}^{K_h} (\alpha_{k,d' x} - \alpha_{k,d'' x}) b_{k h}(u) \geq 0$	$\alpha_{\mathcal{U},d' x} - \alpha_{\mathcal{U},d'' x} \geq 0$
	for all $u \in \mathcal{U}_{\text{grid}}$ and $x \in \mathcal{X}$.	for all $\mathcal{U} \in \mathbb{U}_h$ and $x \in \mathcal{X}$.
CM $_j$	$\sum_{k=0}^{K_h} \alpha_{k,d x} (b_{k h}(u') - b_{k h}(u'')) \geq 0$	$\alpha_{\mathcal{U}',d x} - \alpha_{\mathcal{U}'',d x} \geq 0$
	for all $u', u'' \in \mathcal{U}_{\text{grid}}$, $d \in \mathcal{D}$ and $x \in \mathcal{X}$, where $u'_j \geq u''_j$ and $u'_i = u''_i$ for $i \neq j$.	for all $\mathcal{U}', \mathcal{U}'' \in \mathbb{U}_h$, $d \in \mathcal{D}$ and $x \in \mathcal{X}$, where $u'_j \geq u''_j$ for all $u'_i \in \mathcal{U}'_{[j]}$, $u''_i \in \mathcal{U}''_{[j]}$ and $\mathcal{U}'_{[i]} = \mathcal{U}''_{[i]}$ for $i \neq j$.
UM $_j$	$\sum_{k=0}^{K_h} \alpha_{k,d x} (E[b_{k h}(U) U_j = u'_j, X = x] - E[b_{k h}(U) U_j = u''_j, X = x]) \geq 0.$	$\sum_{\mathcal{U} \in \mathbb{U}_{j h}(\mathcal{U}')} \alpha_{\mathcal{U},d x} P(U \in \mathcal{U} U_j \in \mathcal{U}_{[j]}, X = x) - \sum_{\mathcal{U} \in \mathbb{U}_{j h}(\mathcal{U}'')} \alpha_{\mathcal{U},d x} P(U \in \mathcal{U} U_j \in \mathcal{U}_{[j]}, X = x) \geq 0.$
	for all $u'_j, u''_j \in \mathcal{U}_{[j],\text{grid}}$ such that $u'_j \geq u''_j$, $d \in \mathcal{D}$ and $x \in \mathcal{X}$.	for all $\mathcal{U}', \mathcal{U}'' \in \mathbb{U}_h$, $d \in \mathcal{D}$ and $x \in \mathcal{X}$, where $u'_j \geq u''_j$ for all $u'_i \in \mathcal{U}'_{[j]}$, $u''_i \in \mathcal{U}''_{[j]}$.
CS $_j$	$\sum_{k=0}^{K_h} (\alpha_{k,d x} - \alpha_{k,d x'}) (b_{k h}(u) - b_{k h}(u')) = 0$	Introduce auxiliary variables ($\alpha_{\mathcal{U},d} : \mathcal{U} \in \mathbb{U}_h$, $d \in \mathcal{D}$) and ($\alpha_{d x} : d \in \mathcal{D}$, $x \in \mathcal{X}$) such that
	for all $u, u' \in \mathcal{U}_{\text{grid}}$, $d \in \mathcal{D}$ and $x, x' \in \mathcal{X}$.	$\alpha_{\mathcal{U},d x} = \alpha_{\mathcal{U},d} + \alpha_{d x}$
		for all $\mathcal{U} \in \mathbb{U}_h$, $d \in \mathcal{D}$ and $x \in \mathcal{X}$.
US $_j$	$\sum_{k=0}^{K_h} \alpha_{k,d x} (E[b_{k h}(U) U_j = u_j, X = x] - E[b_{k h}(U) U_j = u'_j, X = x])$	Introduce auxiliary variables ($\alpha_{j,\mathcal{U}_{[j]},d} : \mathcal{U}_{[j]} \in \mathbb{U}_{j,h}$, $d \in \mathcal{D}$) and ($\alpha_{j,d x} : d \in \mathcal{D}$, $x \in \mathcal{X}$) such that
	$= \sum_{k=0}^{K_h} \alpha_{k,d x'} (E[b_{k h}(U) U_j = u_j, X = x'] - E[b_{k h}(U) U_j = u'_j, X = x'])$	$\sum_{\mathcal{U}' \in \mathbb{U}_{j h}(\mathcal{U})} \alpha_{\mathcal{U}',d x} P(U \in \mathcal{U}' U_j \in \mathcal{U}'_{[j]}, X = x) = \alpha_{j,\mathcal{U}_{[j]},d} + \alpha_{j,d x}$
	for all $u_j, u'_j \in \mathcal{U}_{[j],\text{grid}}$, $d \in \mathcal{D}$ and $x, x' \in \mathcal{X}$.	for all $\mathcal{U} \in \mathbb{U}_h$, $d \in \mathcal{D}$ and $x \in \mathcal{X}$.

Table presents the system of linear restrictions on α_h for the various assumptions on the MTRs in Table 2 when considered over a grid of points $\mathcal{U}_{\text{grid}}$ in $[0, 1]^J$ as well as their exact derivation, i.e. \mathbf{A}_h in (21), in the case when $\{b_k(u) : 0 \leq k \leq K\}$ is given by (20) with \mathbb{U}_h satisfying Definition P. For a given $j = 1, \dots, J$, we take $\mathcal{U}_{[j],\text{grid}} \equiv \{t \in \mathbf{R} : u_j = t \text{ for some } u \in \mathcal{U}_{\text{grid}}\}$, $\mathbb{U}_{[j]|h} \equiv \{\mathcal{U}_{[j]} : \mathcal{U} \in \mathbb{U}_h\}$, and $\mathbb{U}_{j|h}(\mathcal{U}) \equiv \{\mathcal{U}' \in \mathbb{U}_h : \mathcal{U}'_{[j]} = \mathcal{U}_{[j]}\}$.

References

- ANGRIST, J. D. and IMBENS, G. W. (1995). Two-stage least squares estimation of average causal effects in models with variable treatment intensity. *Journal of the American statistical Association*, **90** 431–442.
- ARTEAGA, C. (2021). Parental incarceration and children’s educational attainment. *The Review of Economics and Statistics* 1–45.
- BERRY, S., GANDHI, A. and HAILE, P. (2013). Connected substitutes and invertibility of demand. *Econometrica*, **81** 2087–2111.
- BRINCH, C. N., MOGSTAD, M. and WISWALL, M. (2017). Beyond late with a discrete instrument. *Journal of Political Economy*, **125** 985–1039.
- CHESHER, A., ROSEN, A. M. and SMOLINSKI, K. (2013). An instrumental variable model of multiple discrete choice. *Quantitative Economics*, **4** 157–196.
- GU, J., RUSSELL, T. and STRINGHAM, T. (2022). Counterfactual identification and latent space enumeration in discrete outcome models. *Available at SSRN 4188109*.
- HECKMAN, J. J., HUMPHRIES, J. E. and VERAMENDI, G. (2016). Dynamic treatment effects. *Journal of econometrics*, **191** 276–292.
- HECKMAN, J. J. and PINTO, R. (2018). Unordered monotonicity. *Econometrica*, **86** 1–35.
- HECKMAN, J. J., URZUA, S. and VYTLACIL, E. (2006). Understanding instrumental variables in models with essential heterogeneity. *The review of economics and statistics*, **88** 389–432.
- HECKMAN, J. J., URZUA, S. and VYTLACIL, E. (2008). Instrumental variables in models with multiple outcomes: the general unordered case. *Annales d’Économie et de Statistique* 151–174.
- HECKMAN, J. J. and VYTLACIL, E. (2005). Structural equations, treatment effects, and econometric policy evaluation 1. *Econometrica*, **73** 669–738.
- HECKMAN, J. J. and VYTLACIL, E. J. (1999). Local instrumental variables and latent variable models for identifying and bounding treatment effects. *Proceedings of the national Academy of Sciences*, **96** 4730–4734.
- HULL, P. (2020). Estimating hospital quality with quasi-experimental data. *Available at SSRN 3118358*.
- IMBENS, G. W. and ANGRIST, J. D. (1994). Identification and estimation of local average treatment effects. *Econometrica*, **62** 467–475.

- KAMAT, V. (2021). Identifying the effects of a program offer with an application to head start. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1711.02048*.
- KAMAT, V. and NORRIS, S. (2022). Estimating welfare effects in a nonparametric choice model: The case of school vouchers. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2002.00103*.
- KAMAT, V., NORRIS, S. and PECENCO, M. (2022). Examiner designs with multiple treatments: Conviction, incarceration and policy effects. Tech. rep.
- KIRKEBOEN, L. J., LEUVEN, E. and MOGSTAD, M. (2016). Field of study, earnings, and self-selection. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, **131** 1057–1111.
- KLINE, P. and WALTERS, C. R. (2016). Evaluating public programs with close substitutes: The case of head start. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, **131** 1795–1848.
- LEE, S. and SALANIÉ, B. (2018). Identifying effects of multivalued treatments. *Econometrica*, **86** 1939–1963.
- LEE, S. and SALANIÉ, B. (2023). Filtered and unfiltered treatment effects with targeting instruments. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2007.10432*.
- MANSKI, C. F. (1997). Monotone treatment response. *Econometrica: Journal of the Econometric Society* 1311–1334.
- MANSKI, C. F. (2008). *Identification for prediction and decision*. Harvard University Press.
- MANSKI, C. F. and PEPPER, J. V. (2000). Monotone instrumental variables: With an application to the returns to schooling. *Econometrica*, **68** 997–1010.
- MANSKI, C. F. and PEPPER, J. V. (2009). More on monotone instrumental variables. *The Econometrics Journal*, **12** S200–S216.
- MOGSTAD, M., SANTOS, A. and TORGOVITSKY, A. (2018). Using instrumental variables for inference about policy relevant treatment parameters. *Econometrica*, **86** 1589–1619.
- MOGSTAD, M., TORGOVITSKY, A. and WALTERS, C. R. (2020). Policy evaluation with multiple instrumental variables. Tech. rep., National Bureau of Economic Research.
- MOUNTJOY, J. (2022). Community colleges and upward mobility. *Available at SSRN 3373801*.
- NELSEN, R. B. (2007). *An introduction to copulas*. Springer science & business media.
- PINTO, R. (2021). Beyond intention to treat: Using the incentives in moving to opportunity to identify neighborhood effects. *NBER Working Paper*.
- POIRIER, D. J. (1980). Partial observability in bivariate probit models. *Journal of econometrics*, **12** 209–217.

- TEBALDI, P., TORGOVITSKY, A. and YANG, H. (2023). Nonparametric estimates of demand in the california health insurance exchange. *Econometrica*, **91** 107–146.
- TRAIN, K. E. (2009). *Discrete choice methods with simulation*. Cambridge university press.
- TSUDA, T. (2023). Identification of the marginal treatment effect with multivalued treatments. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2209.11444*.
- VYTLACIL, E. (2002). Independence, monotonicity, and latent index models: An equivalence result. *Econometrica*, **70** 331–341.