

# Causality-oriented robustness: exploiting general additive interventions

Xinwei Shen\*, Peter Bühlmann\*, and Armeen Taeb†

\*Seminar for Statistics, ETH Zürich

†Department of Statistics, University of Washington

## Abstract

Since distribution shifts are common in real-world applications, there is a pressing need for developing prediction models that are robust against such shifts. Existing frameworks, such as empirical risk minimization or distributionally robust optimization, either lack generalizability for unseen distributions or rely on postulated distance measures. Alternatively, causality offers a data-driven and structural perspective to robust predictions. However, the assumptions necessary for causal inference can be overly stringent, and the robustness offered by such causal models often lacks flexibility. In this paper, we focus on causality-oriented robustness and propose Distributional Robustness via Invariant Gradients (DRIG), a method that exploits general additive interventions in training data for robust predictions against unseen interventions, and naturally interpolates between in-distribution prediction and causality. In a linear setting, we prove that DRIG yields predictions that are robust among a data-dependent class of distribution shifts. Furthermore, we show that our framework includes anchor regression (Rothenhäusler et al. 2021) as a special case, and that it yields prediction models that protect against more diverse perturbations. We extend our approach to the semi-supervised domain adaptation setting to further improve prediction performance. Finally, we empirically validate our methods on synthetic simulations and on single-cell data.

Keywords: distribution shifts, robust prediction, interventional data, structural causal models, invariance

## 1 Introduction

Statistical and machine learning models are often deployed on test data distributed differently from the training data. Such scenarios pose a major challenge for traditional learning methods that typically assume the test distribution is sufficiently close to the training distribution. For example, while empirical risk minimization (ERM) achieves minimal prediction error when the test and training data are identically distributed, the performance of this widely used prediction paradigm deteriorates significantly when the test distribution differs substantially from the training distribution (Geirhos et al., 2020; Sagawa et al., 2022).

Distributional robustness (Ben-Tal and Nemirovski, 1998; Ben-David et al., 2006; Sinha et al., 2017; Meinhäus, 2018) is an appealing framework for assessing how prediction models perform under distributional shifts. As the precise manner in which the test and training distributions differ is typically unknown, distributional robustness aims to identify a predictive model that performs favorably over a class of plausible test distributions. Formally, suppose  $X$  is a set of covariates or predictors and  $Y$  is a response or target variable of interest. Let  $\theta$  be the parameter of a prediction model from  $X$  to  $Y$ . Then, distributional robustness is formulated as the following minimax optimization problem

$$\min_{\theta} \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \mathbb{E}_P[\ell(X, Y; \theta)]. \quad (1)$$

Here,  $\ell$  is a given loss function and  $\mathcal{P}$  is a class containing plausible test distributions.

Naturally, the choice of the set of distributions  $\mathcal{P}$  is central to the distributional robustness framework (1). A common perspective taken by the literature in distributionally robust optimization (DRO) is to




Figure 1: An example of structural shifts: environment 0 represents training environment and environments 1-3 represent possible test environments, where the shift between the training and test distributions is in a particular “direction”.

define  $\mathcal{P}$  based on a pre-specified distance measure, e.g.,  $\mathcal{P} = \{P : D(P, P_0) \leq \rho\}$ , where  $P_0$  is the training distribution,  $D(\cdot, \cdot)$  is, e.g., the  $f$ -divergence, and  $\rho$  is the parameter that controls the strength of potential distribution shifts in the test data relative to the training data (Sinha et al., 2017; Duchi and Namkoong, 2021). DRO thus learns a prediction model that is robust against distributional shifts in a pre-specified “ball” of radius  $\rho$  around the training distribution. However, protecting against all distributions in a ball ignores structural information about the distributional shifts and can yield overly conservative predictions, especially in high dimensions. As an illustration, consider Figure 1, where the shifts from the training to the test distributions are in a certain “direction”. To achieve robustness with respect to test environment 3, DRO would require a large radius  $\rho$  (as environment 0 and 3 are far apart), and thus protects against many more distributions than necessary. As we elaborate next and throughout the paper, a causal perspective provides an approach to attain robustness against a distribution class  $\mathcal{P}$  driven from the heterogeneity in the observed data and exploits structural relations among the training and test distributions.

In many real-world data, the distribution of variables  $(X, Y)$  can be effectively described by a causal mechanism (Spirtes et al., 2000; Pearl, 2009). The virtue of causal modeling is that distributional shifts (and consequently the distribution class  $\mathcal{P}$ ) could be naturally formalized as interventions or perturbations to the observed or latent variables. This perspective, known as *causality-oriented robustness* (Bühlmann, 2020; Meinshausen, 2018; Rothenhäusler et al., 2021), enables us to model distribution shifts in a more structured and data-dependent manner than those considered in DRO. In such a framework, a natural prediction model to consider is one involving merely the causal parents of  $Y$ , known as a causal prediction model. Indeed, the causal prediction model performs equally well under any interventions on the covariates (Haavelmo, 1943; Bühlmann, 2020), thus providing certain robustness guarantees even when the interventions or shifts are arbitrarily strong.

Nevertheless, identifying the causal parents and estimating the causal effects are often ambitious tasks that rely on relatively strong assumptions about the data distribution. For example, instrumental variable (IV) regression (Bowden and Turkington, 1990; Angrist et al., 1996; Imbens and Rubin, 2015) is a popular approach to estimate causal effects in the presence of latent confounding. IV regression relies on the assumption that the instrumental variables are independent of the latent confounders and do not directly affect the response variable, known as the valid IV condition. When the instrumental variables are categorical, for example when they encode the different interventional environments, the valid IV condition requires that the interventions happen only on the covariates and the number of environments must exceed the number of covariates. However, in a wide range of real-world prediction scenarios, such identifiability conditions are rarely fulfilled. This inspires the pursuit of an alternative solution that relies on weaker assumptions and yet remains effective for producing robust predictions, which is the essence of causality-oriented robustness. In particular, causality-oriented robustness does not require the full knowledge of the underlying causal mechanism, but directly aims for robust prediction by leveraging insights from causality.




Figure 2: Causality-oriented robustness: a trade-off between in-distribution prediction and causality using our method DRIG that exploits general additive interventions in the data. DRIG encompasses anchor regression as a special case with mean shifts only. Our extended proposal DRIG-A provides a more flexible robustness framework.

Note that even when the underlying causal structure can be identified from data, the resulting prediction model may not be desirable in terms of robust prediction for the following reasons. First, the causal prediction model exhibits distributional robustness against interventions exclusively on the covariates, failing to protect against perturbations on the response or latent variables. In practice, interventions on variables beyond the covariates are often unavoidable. Second, the causal prediction model protects against arbitrarily strong interventions, and is thus a conservative approach with subpar predictive performance on moderately perturbed data.

The primary goal of this paper is to achieve *finite robustness*, i.e., robustness against distribution shifts of finite strengths, under a structural causal modeling framework without the knowledge of the causal (or anti-causal) structure. Our approach exploits heterogeneous training data of multiple environments arising from general additive interventions.

## 1.1 Our contributions

We propose in Section 2 our method *distributional robustness via invariant gradients (DRIG)*, a regularized ERM formulation, where the regularization term is inspired by a gradient invariance condition across the environments. In Section 3, we establish robustness guarantees of DRIG under a linear structural causal model. Specifically, we show that DRIG yields prediction models that achieve finite robustness against interventions whose strength is controlled via the regularization parameter in the DRIG formulation and whose directions depend on the heterogeneity in the training data. Furthermore, we prove that as long as there are some shifts in the variances (i.e., the interventions given each environment are random variables), DRIG leads to robustness against perturbations in strictly (and often much) more directions than those protected by anchor regression (Rothenhäusler et al., 2021). When there are only mean shifts (i.e., the interventions are deterministic given each environment), DRIG is identical to anchor regression. In addition, we discuss how the DRIG formulation with  $\gamma \rightarrow \infty$ , which attains robustness against infinitely strong perturbations, leads to causality under more restrictive assumptions, highlighting the essence of causality-oriented robustness.

To achieve more flexible robustness, in Section 4, we extend the DRIG formulation with a scalar regularization penalty to a matrix of hyperparameters; we dub the resulting adaptive method by DRIG-A. To alleviate the consequent burden of hyperparameter selection, we propose an adaptive method to choose the hyperparameters in a semi-supervised domain adaptation setting, where we have a small set of labeled examples from the test distribution. We theoretically demonstrate that DRIG-A is more predictive than the ordinary least squares (OLS) estimator obtained from the semi-supervised samples. Finally, we conduct finite-sample analysis and real-data analysis on single-cell data in Sections 5 and 6, respectively. The code for implementing our methods is available at <https://github.com/xwshen51/DRIG>.

A visual summary of our methodological contributions is presented in Figure 2, highlighting how DRIG (and its extensions) interpolate between in-distribution prediction and causality by exploiting heterogeneity in the training data.




Figure 3: Graphical models among covariates  $X$ , response variable  $Y$ , and latent variables  $H$  ( $X$  and  $H$  are possibly multivariate): a) observational setting without interventions, b) interventions  $E$  on all components, c) discrete interventions  $E$  and continuous interventions  $A$  on all components. All these structures are allowed for our method DRIG.

## 1.2 Related work

There is a growing literature in exploiting heterogeneous data for causal inference (Peters et al., 2016; Ghassami et al., 2017; Rothenhäusler et al., 2019; Huang et al., 2020; Long et al., 2022), stabilized variable selection (Pfister et al., 2019; Fan et al., 2023), as well as robust predictions (Meinshausen and Bühlmann, 2015; Magliacane et al., 2017; Sagawa et al., 2019; Rothenhäusler et al., 2021; Christiansen et al., 2021; Rojas-Carulla et al., 2015). In a similar spirit, another line of work aims for out-of-distribution prediction from multi-environment data based on invariance notions (Arjovsky et al., 2019; Koyama and Yamaguchi, 2020; Krueger et al., 2021; Shi et al., 2021; Ramé et al., 2022); we discuss the connections to them in Supplementary C. Most of these methods do not provide guarantees for finite robustness which is often more relevant to applications. Anchor regression (Rothenhäusler et al., 2021) is a prominent method that can provably achieve finite robustness. In anchor regression, interventions are assumed to only affect the conditional means of the variables and the method is designed to exploit heterogeneity in this form, leading to robustness against mean shifts in the test data. In contrast, we consider a more general setting, where higher order moments can also be affected due to interventions. This flexibility allows us to exploit richer heterogeneity within the training data, which results in robustness against potentially much more perturbations and causal identification with data collected from fewer environments.

In a concurrent work to our manuscript, Kennerberg and Wit (2023) extend the framework of Kania and Wit (2022) to achieve finite robustness from multi-environment data. While the method proposed in Kennerberg and Wit (2023) is similar to DRIG, our work differs in substantive ways. First, in our modeling framework, we allow for and exploit interventions on the response variable and on any potential latent confounders, which is more realistic and results in robustness against more general interventions. By contrast, in Kennerberg and Wit (2023), the environments arising from interventions appear in a much more restrictive way, excluding the above interventions. Second, we present precise connections with anchor regression – in particular, we show how anchor regression is a special case of our method where only mean shifts are exploited and how we are able to obtain strictly more robust predictions; we also present an extension where we incorporate continuous anchor variables in our estimator. Third, we study (approximate) causal identifiability results in general settings, whereas Kennerberg and Wit (2023) only consider the restrictive setting where there are no interventions on the response variable or on the latent variables. Finally, we propose the adaptive extension DRIG-A for more flexible robustness, yielding often substantially better prediction than other methods, as validated by both theoretical and numerical results.

## 2 Our method DRIG

### 2.1 Setup: Linear structural causal models

We begin with a causal graphical model in Figure 3(a) consisting of covariates  $X \in \mathbb{R}^p$ , response variable  $Y \in \mathbb{R}$ , and latent variables  $H \in \mathbb{R}^h$ . We posit that the random variables  $(X, Y)$  satisfy the following linear structural causal model (SCM)

$$\begin{pmatrix} X \\ Y \end{pmatrix} = B^* \begin{pmatrix} X \\ Y \end{pmatrix} + \varepsilon. \quad (2)$$

Here,  $B^* \in \mathbb{R}^{(p+1) \times (p+1)}$  is the adjacency matrix encoding the causal relations, namely  $B_{ij}^* \neq 0$  if and only if  $Z_j$  is a parent of  $Z_i$  in the graph among observed variables  $Z = (X, Y)$ . The  $(p+1)$ -th row vector  $B_{p+1,:}^*$  encodes the (observable) causal parents of the response variable and the magnitude of their effects. Throughout, we will use

$$b^* := B_{p+1,1:p}^*$$

to denote this vector and call it the *causal parameter*. Further,  $\varepsilon$  is a random vector, with potentially dependent components to account for the latent dependencies manifested through  $H$ . We assume that the matrix  $I - B^*$  is invertible, which is guaranteed if the subgraph consisting of only the observed variables is acyclic.

The compact SCM (2) describes the generating process of  $(X, Y)$  in the observational setting when there are no external perturbations on the system. Next, we describe how the data generation process alters due to interventions on the variables. We consider interventions that directly shift the distribution of random variables by some noise acting additively in the system. The interventions are generated randomly from a discrete random variable  $E$  taking on values in the set  $\mathcal{E}$ ; each  $e \in \mathcal{E}$  represents a different environment that generates the random variables  $(X^e, Y^e)$  satisfying the modified SCM

$$\begin{pmatrix} X^e \\ Y^e \end{pmatrix} = B^* \begin{pmatrix} X^e \\ Y^e \end{pmatrix} + \varepsilon + \delta^e. \quad (3)$$

The random vectors  $\varepsilon$  and  $\delta^e$  are independent for every  $e \in \mathcal{E}$ . Furthermore,  $\delta^e$  is an unobserved vector that represents additive interventions given environment  $E = e$ . We generally allow all components of  $\delta^e$  to be non-zero, corresponding to interventions possibly on the covariates, response, or latent variables. Some entries of  $\delta^e$  may be zero, indicating that no direct interventions occur on that variable, although its marginal distribution could still be changed due to interventions on its ancestral variables. Figure 3(b) presents the graphical perspective of model (3);  $E$  is exogenous and cannot be descendants of  $(X, Y, H)$ .

Throughout,  $0 \in \mathcal{E}$  is assumed to be a *reference environment*<sup>1</sup>, with the property  $\sum_{e \in \mathcal{E}} \omega^e \mathbb{E}[\delta^e \delta^{e\top}] \succeq \mathbb{E}[\delta^0 \delta^{0\top}]$ . Here,  $\omega^e$  are weights that satisfy  $\sum_{e \in \mathcal{E}} \omega^e = 1$  and  $\omega^e > 0$  with typical choices including the uniform weights  $\omega^e = 1/|\mathcal{E}|$  or  $\omega^e = n_e/n$ , where  $n_e$  is the number of samples in environment  $e$  and  $n = \sum_{e \in \mathcal{E}} n_e$ . We center the data  $(X^e, Y^e)$  in every environment  $e \in \mathcal{E}$  with the mean  $\mathbb{E}[(X^0, Y^0)]$  obtained from the reference environment. Thus, without loss of generality,  $\delta^0$  has mean equal to zero. Finally, the random vectors  $\varepsilon$  and  $\delta^e$  are assumed to have bounded second moments.

Our training data consists of  $(X^e, Y^e)$  across all environments  $e \in \mathcal{E}$ . We consider out-of-distribution prediction on a test distribution generated according to the following SCM:

$$\begin{pmatrix} X^v \\ Y^v \end{pmatrix} = B^* \begin{pmatrix} X^v \\ Y^v \end{pmatrix} + \varepsilon + v, \quad (4)$$

where  $\varepsilon$  and  $v$  are independent random vectors. Notably, the additive intervention  $v$  in the test data may follow a different distribution than the interventions  $\{\delta^e\}_{e \in \mathcal{E}}$  in the training data. Our objective is to develop a procedure that uses only the training data to learn a prediction model that performs well on test data generated according to (4).

## 2.2 Our formulation

We introduce our method DRIG at the population level; the empirical analogue is given in Section 5. Specifically, suppose the random variables  $(X^e, Y^e)$  are generated according to the SCM (3) for environments  $e \in \mathcal{E}$  with  $0 \in \mathcal{E}$  denoting the reference environment. Given a scalar  $\gamma \geq 0$ , the population version of our estimator DRIG minimizes the following risk

$$b_\gamma^{\text{opt}} := \underset{b}{\operatorname{argmin}} \mathcal{L}_\gamma(b), \quad (5)$$

where

$$\mathcal{L}_\gamma(b) := \mathbb{E}[\ell(X^0, Y^0; b)] + \gamma \sum_{e \in \mathcal{E}} \omega^e (\mathbb{E}[\ell(X^e, Y^e; b)] - \mathbb{E}[\ell(X^0, Y^0; b)]), \quad (6)$$

<sup>1</sup>The reference environment, e.g., can be an observational environment with no intervention, i.e.,  $\delta^0 \equiv 0$ .

and  $\ell(x, y; b) := (y - b^\top x)^2$  is the squared loss. The risk  $\mathcal{L}_\gamma(b)$  is a sum of the squared loss in the reference environment and the weighted average difference in the squared losses between every environment  $e \in \mathcal{E}$  and the reference environment, where the regularization parameter  $\gamma$  controls how much the latter component is penalized. For  $\gamma = 0$ , our estimator yields the least squares solution on the reference environment, named the observational OLS, as it is often the observational setting; for  $\gamma = 1$ , our estimator coincides with the OLS solution on the pooled data, called the pooled OLS; for  $\gamma \rightarrow \infty$ , when  $|\mathcal{E}| = 2$ , we show in Supplementary E.1 that our estimator converges to the causal Dantzig estimator (Rothenhäusler et al., 2019) which is shown to recover the causal parameter under some conditions. To understand the intuition behind the DRIG formulation, we introduce the notion of gradient invariance.

**Definition 1** (Gradient invariance). *A regression parameter  $b$  is said to satisfy the gradient invariance condition if  $\sum_{e \in \mathcal{E}} \omega^e \nabla_b \mathbb{E}[\ell(X^e, Y^e; b)] = \nabla_b \mathbb{E}[\ell(X^0, Y^0; b)]$ , that is the weighted average gradient of the loss function across the environments is the same as the gradient in the reference environment.*

In the limit of  $\gamma \rightarrow \infty$  and under some mild conditions, we show in Theorem 3 that the DRIG solution  $b_\gamma^{\text{opt}}$  satisfies the gradient invariance condition. We provide a thorough discussion on invariance in Supplementary C, including the gradient invariance and other existing notions such as invariance of the conditional distribution, the conditional mean, or the risk. We highlight that the gradient invariance can be fulfilled by the causal parameter under more general cases, especially with the presence of latent confounders and interventions on the response or the latent variables.

In summary, by encouraging invariant gradients across the environments (to the extent controlled by the parameter  $\gamma$ ), DRIG naturally interpolates between the ordinary least squares solution and the causal parameter. As we will discuss in Section 3, the main benefit of the proposed DRIG estimator is robust prediction on test environments that are potentially far from the training environments, where the degree to which the test and training environments can differ is controlled by the parameter  $\gamma$ .

Next, we connect DRIG to anchor regression that tackles distribution shifts merely in the conditional means.

## 2.3 Connections to anchor regression

Rothenhäusler et al. (2021) posit the following linear SCM:

$$\begin{pmatrix} X \\ Y \\ H \end{pmatrix} = \tilde{B}^* \begin{pmatrix} X \\ Y \\ H \end{pmatrix} + \varepsilon + MA, \quad (7)$$

where  $A$  are observed *anchor* variables that are independent of the noise  $\varepsilon$ . From a graphical perspective,  $A$  are exogenous and cannot be descendant of any of the variables  $(X, Y, H)$ . Under this model, anchor regression is formulated as minimizing the following risk:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{anchor}, \gamma}(b) := \mathbb{E}[(I - P_A)(Y - b^\top X)]^2 + \gamma \mathbb{E}[P_A(Y - b^\top X)]^2, \quad (8)$$

with  $P_A$  denoting the  $L_2$ -projection on the linear span from the components of  $A$ .

When the anchors  $A$  are discrete, our framework is a generalization of anchor regression; we further discuss in Supplementary B how DRIG can be modified to accommodate continuous anchors as well (corresponding to Figure 3(c)) and continue to be a generalization of anchor regression. Specifically, let  $A$  take values in the set  $\{a^e \in \mathbb{R}^{\dim(A)} : e \in \mathcal{E}\}$ . Then, setting  $\delta^e = Ma^e$ , we conclude that the model (7) proposed in Rothenhäusler et al. (2021) is a special case of our model (3), with the dependence on the anchor variable and the latent confounders restricted to be linear, and the intervention  $\delta^e$  being deterministic shifts that only affect the conditional mean of  $(X, Y)$  given  $A = a^e$ . Furthermore, under model (7), the two estimators match, as formalized in the following proposition.

**Proposition 1.** *Suppose that the data is generated according to the SCM (7). Let  $A$  be discrete anchors taking values in the set  $\{a^e \in \mathbb{R}^{\dim(A)} : e \in \mathcal{E}\}$ , where  $a^0 = 0$  without loss of generality. Assuming that  $\mathbb{P}(A = a^e) = \omega^e$ , the anchor regression loss function is the same as DRIG loss function (6), that is  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{anchor}, \gamma}(b) = \mathcal{L}_\gamma(b)$  for every regression parameter  $b$ .*

We prove Proposition 1 in Supplementary E.2. This result states that under the restrictive model assumed in Rothenhäusler et al. (2021) which only allows for mean shifts, the DRIG estimator matches the one from anchor regression. However, the two estimators are different under more general interventions. In particular, our estimator DRIG is designed for the more general modeling framework (3) that allows  $\delta^e$  to be random, and thus leverages interventions in the form of both mean and variance shifts. We will discuss in Section 3 how the additional flexibility that is provided by our framework leads to more robust predictions.

### 3 Distributional robustness

#### 3.1 Robustness guarantees

We investigate how well the prediction model yield by the DRIG estimator (5) generalizes to test environments generated by unseen interventions as in (4), and compare its performance with other methods. In particular, each of these methods will be shown to minimize the worst-case risk over test interventions  $v$  in a certain set  $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{p+1}$  of random variables, i.e.,

$$\operatorname{argmin}_{b \in \mathbb{R}^p} \sup_{v \in \mathcal{C}} \mathbb{E}[\ell(X^v, Y^v; b)]. \quad (9)$$

Throughout, we suppose that the training data is generated according to the SCM (3), and define  $S^e := \operatorname{Cov}(\delta^e)$  and  $\mu^e := \mathbb{E}[\delta^e]$  as the covariance and mean of the interventions for every training environment  $e \in \mathcal{E}$ . We further suppose that the test data is generated according to the SCM (4). The following theorem assesses the robustness of the DRIG prediction model.

**Theorem 2.** *The DRIG estimator  $b_\gamma^{\text{opt}}$  in (5) is the solution to the worst-case risk minimization (9) with  $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{C}_{\text{DRIG}}^\gamma$ , where*

$$\mathcal{C}_{\text{DRIG}}^\gamma := \left\{ v \in \mathbb{R}^{p+1} : \mathbb{E}[vv^\top] \preceq S^0 + \gamma \sum_{e \in \mathcal{E}} \omega^e \left( S^e - S^0 + \mu^e \mu^{e\top} \right) \right\}.$$

We prove Theorem 2 in Supplementary E.3. Here, for two positive semidefinite matrices  $A$  and  $B$ , we write  $B \succeq A$  if and only if  $B - A$  is positive semidefinite. This result states that our DRIG estimator is robust against intervention  $v$  that are in the set  $\mathcal{C}_{\text{DRIG}}^\gamma$ . The scalar  $\gamma \geq 0$ , which is a tuning parameter for our method DRIG, controls the strength of the perturbations that our prediction model is robust against. The larger this parameter, the larger the set  $\mathcal{C}_{\text{DRIG}}^\gamma$ , and the stronger the perturbations  $v$  can be. Furthermore, the column space of the matrix  $\sum_{e \in \mathcal{E}} \omega^e (S^e - S^0 + \mu^e \mu^{e\top})$  represents the “directions” of the perturbations that DRIG protects against with a controllable strength; the larger the dimension of this subspace, the more directions the DRIG estimator is robust against. We provide further illustrations of the perturbation class in Supplementary A.

We contrast the robustness guarantees provided by DRIG with the ones obtained by OLS estimates, the anchor regression estimate, group DRO (Sagawa et al., 2019), and the causal parameter  $b^*$ . Recall that the OLS estimate on the reference environment and the pooled OLS estimate are the DRIG estimates with  $\gamma = 0$  and  $\gamma = 1$ , respectively. Thus, appealing to Theorem 2, these estimates are minimizers of the worst case risk (9) with  $\mathcal{C}_{\text{ROLS}} := \mathcal{C}_{\text{DRIG}}^{\gamma=0}$  and  $\mathcal{C}_{\text{pOLS}} := \mathcal{C}_{\text{DRIG}}^{\gamma=1}$  with  $\mathcal{C}_{\text{ROLS}} \subseteq \mathcal{C}_{\text{pOLS}} \subseteq \mathcal{C}_{\text{DRIG}}^\gamma$  for any  $\gamma \geq 1$ . Thus, OLS on the reference environment does not protect against any perturbations that exceed the perturbations in the reference environment alone, and the pooled OLS protects against perturbations within the training heterogeneity; both approaches are inferior to the DRIG estimator in providing robust predictions under unseen (larger) test perturbations.

Anchor regression improves the OLS by protecting against potentially stronger (with  $\gamma > 1$ ) perturbations in  $\mathcal{C}_{\text{anchor}}^\gamma$ , where

$$\mathcal{C}_{\text{anchor}}^\gamma = \left\{ v \in \mathbb{R}^{p+1} : \mathbb{E}[vv^\top] \preceq \sum_{e \in \mathcal{E}} \omega^e \left( S^e + \gamma \mu^e \mu^{e\top} \right) \right\},$$

as proved in Supplementary E.4. Note that the perturbation strength  $\gamma$  is only acting on the means  $\mu^e$  and thus anchor regression only protects against potentially stronger perturbations in the means. As before,  $\gamma$

and the column space of  $\sum_{e \in \mathcal{E}} \omega^e \mu^e \mu^{e\top}$  represent the strength and directions of perturbations that anchor regression is robust against. While anchor regression provides more robust predictions than OLS, it protects against a smaller set of perturbations than DRIG as  $\mathcal{C}_{\text{anchor}}^\gamma \subseteq \mathcal{C}_{\text{DRIG}}^\gamma$ . In particular, since DRIG exploits both mean and variance shifts, it is robust against perturbations in strictly (and often much) more directions than anchor regression. For instance, when there are two observed environments, anchor regression can only protect against perturbations  $v$  that lie in a 2-dimensional subspace (regardless of the number and strength of perturbations observed in the training data), while DRIG can protect against  $v$  in arbitrary directions if the perturbations in those two environments are sufficiently rich. We will illustrate this comparison in Section 3.2.

In the context of linear models, group DRO is defined as  $\operatorname{argmin}_b \max_{e \in \mathcal{E}} \mathbb{E}[(Y^e - b^\top X^e)^2]$ . Suppose there exists an environment  $m \in \mathcal{E}$  such that  $\mathbb{E}[\delta^m \delta^{m\top}] \succeq \mathbb{E}[\delta^e \delta^{e\top}]$  for all  $e \in \mathcal{E}$ . Then, we show in Supplementary E.5 that group DRO is robust against the perturbation class  $\mathcal{C}_{\text{gDRO}} = \left\{ v \in \mathbb{R}^{p+1} : \mathbb{E}[vv^\top] \preceq \mathbb{E}[\delta^m \delta^{m\top}] \right\}$ . Without assuming the existence of a dominating environment  $m$ , it is not clear what perturbation class group DRO protects against. Moreover, unlike DRIG (and anchor regression), group DRO does not have a tuning parameter that actively controls the size of the perturbation class; it is rather a passive interpolation between in-sample prediction and causality, merely relying on the accessible training environments. As a result, group DRO cannot protect against test perturbations that are larger than training perturbations.

Finally, the causal parameter  $b^*$  is the solution to the worst-case risk minimization (9) with  $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{C}_{\text{causal}}$ , where

$$\mathcal{C}_{\text{causal}} = \left\{ v \in \mathbb{R}^{p+1} : v_{p+1} \equiv 0 \right\},$$

as proved in Supplementary E.6. The DRIG estimate may be preferred over the causal parameter for multiple reasons. First, since  $v_{p+1}$  is restricted to be zero in  $\mathcal{C}_{\text{causal}}$ , the causal parameter cannot be robust against perturbations on  $(Y, H)$ . Second, the causal parameter protects against arbitrary interventions on the covariates  $X$ , thus yielding overly conservative prediction models that come with a price of subpar predictive performance on moderately perturbed data. Finally, the causal parameter is often not identifiable, especially when the interventions during training are not sufficiently rich or happen not only to  $X$ .

In summary, DRIG is an attractive alternative for robust prediction over standard OLS estimators as well as anchor regression and the causal prediction model.

### 3.2 Illustrative examples

We give two simple examples to illustrate how our method performs under general additive interventions compared to existing methods. In particular, we compare our method DRIG (with  $\gamma = 5$ ), the observational OLS (DRIG with  $\gamma = 0$ ), the pooled OLS (DRIG with  $\gamma = 1$ ), causal parameter (DRIG with  $\gamma = \infty$  if identifiable), and anchor regression (DRIG with mean shifts only and  $\gamma = 5$ ), all of which are special cases of DRIG. For simplicity, we consider a univariate  $X \in \mathbb{R}$  and two training environments  $e = 0, 1$ . We compute the population versions of all estimators and also evaluate their test performance in population. We provide additional experiments for finite-sample estimators with multivariate covariates, multiple environments, as well as the oracle choice of  $\gamma$  in Supplementary G.2.

**Example 1** (Covariate-intervened). *The observational distribution  $\mathbb{P}^0$ , interventional distribution  $\mathbb{P}^1$ , and perturbed test distribution  $\mathbb{P}^v$  are defined by the following SCMs:*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}^0 : \quad X^0 &= \varepsilon_x & \mathbb{P}^1 : \quad X^1 &= \varepsilon_x + \delta_x^1 & \mathbb{P}^v : \quad X^v &= \varepsilon_x + v_x \\ Y^0 &= 2X^0 + \varepsilon_y & Y^1 &= 2X^1 + \varepsilon_y & Y^v &= 2X^v + \varepsilon_y \end{aligned}$$

where  $(\varepsilon_x, \varepsilon_y)$  follows a bivariate Gaussian with means 0, variances 1, and covariance 0.5, intervention  $\delta_x^1 \sim \mathcal{N}(0.5, 1)$  only affects  $X$ , and  $v_x \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu_v, \sigma_v^2)$  represents a different intervention where  $\mu_v^2 + \sigma_v^2 = 1.25\alpha$  with a factor  $\alpha$  controlling the test perturbation strength.

Figure 4(a) shows the mean squared errors (MSEs) of various methods in the perturbed test distribution  $\mathbb{P}^v$  for varying perturbation strengths  $\alpha$ . We see that the causal parameter is invariant (i.e., a constant MSE) for any perturbations on  $X$ , but is suboptimal when the perturbations are small or moderate. The observational OLS performs the best only when the test distribution is almost identical to the observational distribution,






Figure 4: Test MSEs for varying perturbation strengths  $\alpha$ . (a): perturbations on covariates only; (b): perturbations on the covariate, response, and latent variables.

while it starts to blow up quickly when the perturbation grows. Notably, DRIG achieves a trade-off between the causal parameter and observational OLS, leading to favorable robustness. In particular, under small or moderate perturbations, DRIG attains lower test MSE than the causal parameter; when the perturbations become relatively strong, DRIG is superior to the OLS estimators. Note that in this setting, DRIG with a finite  $\gamma$  protects against the perturbation class  $\{(v_x, v_y) : \mathbb{E}[v_x^2] \leq \frac{\gamma}{2}1.25, v_y = 0\}$ . Thus, for a test distribution with perturbation strength  $\alpha$ , the optimal  $\gamma$  in DRIG should be  $\gamma = 2\alpha$ , whereas we keep  $\gamma$  fixed in our simulations; this highlights the robustness of DRIG to the choice of  $\gamma$ .

In addition, anchor regression exploits heterogeneity in the means, thus outperforming OLS in general. However, since it can only exploit mean shifts, it tends to be inferior to DRIG. In Supplementary G, we show a case where the mean shift is weaker and anchor regression performs almost identically to the pooled OLS, whereas DRIG still exploits extra heterogeneity, thus maintaining its robustness.

**Example 2** (All-intervened). *Data are distributed according to the following SCMs:*

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathbb{P}^0 : \quad X^0 &= \varepsilon_x & \mathbb{P}^1 : \quad X^1 &= \varepsilon_x + \delta_x^1 & \mathbb{P}^v : \quad X^v &= \varepsilon_x + v_x \\
 Y^0 &= 2X^0 + \varepsilon_y & Y^1 &= 2X^1 + \varepsilon_y + \delta_y^1 & Y^v &= 2X^v + \varepsilon_y + v_y
 \end{aligned}$$

where all variables  $X$ ,  $Y$ , and latent confounder  $H$  (implicitly in the correlation between  $\varepsilon_x$  and  $\varepsilon_y$ ) are intervened on,  $(\varepsilon_x, \varepsilon_y)$  follows the same distribution as in Example 1, and  $(\delta_x^1, \delta_y^1)$  follows a bivariate Gaussian with mean  $(0.5, 0.1)$ , variances 1, 0.05, and covariance 0.1. For the perturbations in the test distribution, we set  $\mathbb{E}[vv^\top] = \frac{\alpha}{2} \begin{pmatrix} 1.25 & 0.15 \\ 0.15 & 0.06 \end{pmatrix}$ , where  $\alpha$  again controls the perturbation strength in the test environment.

As shown in Figure 4(b), due to interventions on all variables, the causal parameter is no longer invariant and its prediction performance degrades as the test perturbation strength increases. In contrast, DRIG exhibits a significant advantage compared to all other methods.

### 3.3 Infinite robustness and causality

We analyze DRIG when  $\gamma \rightarrow \infty$ , and highlight how infinite robustness (as guaranteed by Theorem 2) connects to causality and invariance. Let  $L^* = \sum_{e \in \mathcal{E}} \omega^e \mathbb{E}[\delta^e \delta^{e^\top} - \delta^0 \delta^{0^\top}]$  and  $C^* = (I - B^*)^{-1}$  with block forms,  $L^* = \begin{pmatrix} L_{xx}^* & L_{xy}^* \\ L_{xy}^{*\top} & L_y^* \end{pmatrix}$  and  $C^* = \begin{pmatrix} C_{xx}^* & C_{xy}^* \\ C_{yx}^{*\top} & C_y^* \end{pmatrix}$ , where  $L_y^*, C_y^* \in \mathbb{R}$ . The following theorem characterizes the solution of DRIG with  $\gamma \rightarrow \infty$ , denoted by  $b_\infty^{\text{opt}} := \lim_{\gamma \rightarrow \infty} b_\gamma^{\text{opt}}$ .

**Theorem 3.** Suppose that  $C_x^* L_{xy}^* + L_y^* C_{xy}^* \subseteq \text{column-space}([C^* L^* C^{*\top}]_{1:p,1:p})$ . Then

$$b_\infty^{\text{opt}} = \underset{b \in \mathcal{I}}{\text{argmin}} \mathbb{E}[(Y^0 - b^\top X^0)^2], \quad (10)$$

where  $\mathcal{I} := \{b \in \mathbb{R}^p : b \text{ satisfies the gradient invariance condition in Definition 1}\}$  is a non-empty set. If  $\text{rank}([C^* L^* C^{*\top}]_{1:p,1:p}) = p$ , then  $\mathcal{I}$  is a singleton, and

$$b_\infty^{\text{opt}} = b^* + \left([C^* L^* C^{*\top}]_{1:p,1:p}\right)^{-1} (C_x^* L_{xy}^* + L_y^* C_{xy}^*). \quad (11)$$

We prove Theorem 3 in Appendix E.7. The first part of the theorem states that under a certain subspace inclusion condition, DRIG with  $\gamma \rightarrow \infty$  identifies – among models in  $\mathcal{I}$  that have invariant gradient – the most predictive model in the reference environment. The second part states that if the aforementioned subspace is full dimensional, the set of gradient invariant models  $\mathcal{I}$  is a singleton; appealing to (10), the unique element in  $\mathcal{I}$  is the solution of DRIG when  $\gamma \rightarrow \infty$ , and is characterized explicitly in (11).

We provide a thorough discussion on Theorem 3 in Supplementary D. In particular, we investigate how  $b_\infty^{\text{opt}}$  is related to the causal parameter  $b^*$  under various scenarios of interventions and causal structures. To summarize,  $b_\infty^{\text{opt}}$  recovers  $b^*$  when assuming sufficient interventions on the covariates and no interventions on the response and latent variables. In addition, we study the bias of  $b_\infty^{\text{opt}}$  in estimating the causal parameter, when allowing for interventions on  $Y$  or  $H$ , or when encountering insufficient interventions on  $X$ .

In general, causal identification requires stronger assumptions about the underlying data distribution than those needed for robust prediction; the robustness guarantee in Theorem 2 remains valid regardless of the fulfillment of the identifiability conditions. This further highlights the merit of causality-oriented robustness for wider and more realistic applications.

## 4 Adaptive extension for improved robustness

### 4.1 Additional hyperparameters for more flexible robustness

In the DRIG objective (6), we used a scalar parameter  $\gamma$  to protect against potentially new perturbations in the test environment. However, the DRIG estimator could still be conservative, in that it is robust against a larger class of perturbations than necessary. In particular, by Theorem 2, the shape of the perturbation set, which is determined by the matrix  $\sum_{e \in \mathcal{E}} \omega^e (S^e - S^0 + \mu^e \mu^{e\top})$ , is fixed according to the training data, and the parameter  $\gamma$  only controls the size along the fixed directions. Naturally, it is possible that for some perturbation  $v$  in the test environment and for any  $\gamma$ , the gram matrix  $\mathbb{E}[vv^\top]$  is far from lying on the boundary of the set  $\mathcal{C}_{\text{DRIG}}^\gamma$ ; in such cases, DRIG may be overly conservative.

To remedy this potential issue, we propose an extension of the original formulation, where both the shape and the size of the perturbation class can be controlled. Specifically, we consider a matrix of hyperparameters  $\Gamma$  in the form  $\Gamma = \text{diag}(\Gamma_x, \gamma_y)$  with  $\Gamma_x \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times p}$  and  $\gamma_y \in \mathbb{R}$ . Given a positive semidefinite matrix  $\Gamma$ , we define the population version of the modified DRIG estimator, dubbed DRIG-A, as

$$b_\Gamma^{\text{opt}} := \underset{b}{\text{argmin}} \left\{ \mathbb{E}[(Y^0 - b^\top X^0)^2] + \sum_{e \in \mathcal{E}} \omega^e (\mathbb{E}[\gamma_y Y^e - b^\top \Gamma_x X^e]^2 - \mathbb{E}[\gamma_y Y^0 - b^\top \Gamma_x X^0]^2) \right\}. \quad (12)$$

Note that when  $\Gamma = \gamma I_{p+1}$  with a scalar  $\gamma \geq 0$ , the adaptive DRIG estimator  $b_\Gamma^{\text{opt}}$  reduces to the original DRIG estimator  $b_\gamma^{\text{opt}}$  in (5). Thus, the DRIG-A method is a generalization of DRIG with potentially more hyperparameters. As we show in the following theorem, the additional parameters provide flexibility in controlling both the size and shape of the perturbation class. We define  $\tilde{\Gamma} := (I - B^*)\Gamma(I - B^*)^{-1}$  for notational clarity.

**Theorem 4.** The DRIG-A estimator  $b_\Gamma^{\text{opt}}$  is the solution to the worst-case risk minimization (9) with  $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{C}_{\text{DRIG-A}}^\Gamma := \left\{v \in \mathbb{R}^{p+1} : \mathbb{E}[vv^\top] \preceq S^0 + \tilde{\Gamma} \sum_{e \in \mathcal{E}} \omega^e (S^e - S^0 + \mu^e \mu^{e\top}) \tilde{\Gamma}^\top\right\}$ .

We prove Theorem 4 in Supplementary E.8. The result states that the DRIG-A prediction model is robust against test perturbations that are in the set  $\mathcal{C}_{\text{DRIG-A}}^\Gamma$ ; both the size and shape of the perturbation class  $\mathcal{C}_{\text{DRIG-A}}^\Gamma$  can be adjusted by an appropriate choice of  $\Gamma$ .




Figure 5: Test MSE for varying perturbation strengths  $\alpha$  of various methods in Example 3.

In principle, one can select the matrix  $\Gamma$  based on some prior or expert knowledge on the relation between the test and training data. In the following example, we consider variable-specific shifts and use a diagonal matrix  $\Gamma = \gamma_1 \text{diag}(1, \gamma_2, \dots, \gamma_{p+1})$ , where  $\gamma_1$  is treated as a tuning parameter that controls the overall variation, whereas the remaining  $\gamma_i$ 's indicate the relative perturbation strength per variable and can be specified by the user. Here for ease of illustration, we assume an ideal case where we know the true relative variations while only keeping the scalar  $\gamma_1$  as a hyperparameter that controls the overall perturbation strength.

**Example 3.** We set  $p = 5$  and two training environments  $e = 0, 1$  with a randomly sampled mean vector  $\mu^1$  and covariance matrices  $S^0$  and  $S^1$ , where the last components, rows, or columns are zeros, indicating no interventions on  $Y$  or  $H$ . Details of the sampling scheme are given in Supplementary H. The test intervention  $v$  in (4) is such that  $\mathbb{E}[Z^v Z^{v^\top}] - \mathbb{E}[Z^0 Z^{0^\top}] = \alpha \Gamma_0 (\mathbb{E}[Z^1 Z^{1^\top}] - \mathbb{E}[Z^0 Z^{0^\top}]) \Gamma_0 / 2$ , where  $Z = (X, Y)$ ,  $\Gamma_0 = \text{diag}(1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6)$ , and a scalar  $\alpha$  that controls the overall perturbation strength. We consider DRIG-A with  $\Gamma = \gamma \Gamma_0$  with  $\gamma$  being a single tuning parameter. We fix  $\gamma = 10$  for DRIG-A, DRIG, and anchor regression. As shown in Figure 5, DRIG-A consistently performs the best.

In most practical settings, precise knowledge of how the test data is distributed comparing relative to the training data is not available. To this end, in the next section, we will propose a method to adaptively choose  $\Gamma$  when a small amount of labeled test examples are provided. It is worth noting that while DRIG-A can often provide more robustness compared to the original DRIG formulation, it in general moves further away from causality. In particular, we show in Supplementary E.11 that when  $\Gamma_x / \gamma_y \neq I$ , the DRIG-A estimator (12) does not recover the causal parameter even when it is identifiable (e.g., the setting in Corollary 8). This phenomenon highlights the trade-off between prediction and causality: DRIG-A, compared to DRIG, is designed more towards the goal of prediction (see Figure 2).

## 4.2 DRIG-A: adaptively choosing $\Gamma$ in semi-supervised settings

We propose a practical approach to adaptively choose  $\Gamma$  in the semi-supervised domain adaptation setting, where we have a large set of unlabeled test or target examples and a small set of labeled test examples. The idea is that this semi-supervised data from the target distribution provides some information on the strength of perturbations we may encounter and thus making use of such information could yield more robust prediction models.

Suppose the test distribution  $P_{\text{test}}$  is generated according to the SCM (4) with an unknown intervention variable  $v$ . We let  $P_{\text{test}}^x$  be the marginal distribution of the covariates  $X$ . We assume that we are given a collection of i.i.d. labeled test samples  $\{(X_i^v, Y_i^v) \sim P_{\text{test}}, i = 1 \dots, n_l\}$  with a fairly small  $n_l$  and a collection of i.i.d. unlabeled test samples  $\{X_i^v \sim P_{\text{test}}^x, i = 1 \dots, n_u\}$  with a large  $n_u$ . Our objective is to achieve a small test MSE under  $P_{\text{test}}$  by exploiting both the heterogeneity within the training data and the limited

unlabeled test samples. Throughout, we let  $\Sigma_x^v := \mathbb{E}[X^v X^{v\top}]$ ,  $\Sigma_{xy}^v := \mathbb{E}[X^v Y^v]$ , and their estimates based on the test samples  $\hat{\Sigma}_x^v := \frac{1}{n_u} \sum_{i=1}^{n_u} X_i^v X_i^{v\top}$  and  $\hat{\Sigma}_{xy}^v := \frac{1}{n_l} \sum_{i=1}^{n_l} X_i^v Y_i^v$ .

Under the above setup, a naive prediction model is based on the OLS estimator under the test distribution. The population version of the test OLS is given by  $(\Sigma_x^v)^{-1} \Sigma_{xy}^v$  and the associated plug-in estimator based on the labeled and unlabeled test samples is given by

$$\hat{b}_{\text{tOLS}} := (\hat{\Sigma}_x^v)^{-1} \hat{\Sigma}_{xy}^v.$$

Naturally, if the number of labeled and unlabeled test samples  $n_l, n_u$  tend to infinity,  $\hat{b}_{\text{tOLS}}$  minimizes the test MSE with high probability. However, in our setting of a small number of labeled test samples,  $\hat{b}_{\text{tOLS}}$  can have a high variance and perform poorly.

We next describe how to specify  $\Gamma$  in our method so that the test MSE achieved by DRIG-A is smaller than the one achieved by the test OLS estimate. Note that when we take  $\Gamma = \text{diag}(\Gamma_x, \gamma_y)$ , the DRIG-A estimator has the closed form solution  $b_{\Gamma}^{\text{opt}} = [\mathbb{E}X^0 X^{0\top} + \Gamma_x \Delta_x \Gamma_x]^{-1} [\mathbb{E}X^0 Y^0 + \gamma_y \Gamma_x \Delta_{xy}]$ , where  $\Delta_x := \sum_{e \in \mathcal{E}} \omega^e [\mathbb{E}X^e X^{e\top} - \mathbb{E}X^0 X^{0\top}]$  and  $\Delta_{xy} := \sum_{e \in \mathcal{E}} \omega^e [\mathbb{E}X^e Y^e - \mathbb{E}X^0 Y^0]$ . Thus, compared to the population test OLS, DRIG-A replaces  $\Sigma_x^v$  with  $\mathbb{E}X^0 X^{0\top} + \Gamma_x \Delta_x \Gamma_x$  and  $\Sigma_{xy}^v$  with  $\mathbb{E}X^0 Y^0 + \gamma_y \Gamma_x \Delta_{xy}$ . As the gram matrix  $\Sigma_x^v$  can be accurately estimated with a large unlabeled samples, we set  $\Gamma_x$  so that  $\mathbb{E}X^0 X^{0\top} + \Gamma_x \Delta_x \Gamma_x = \Sigma_x^v$ , which yields  $\Gamma_x^* := \Delta_x^{-1/2} \left[ \Delta_x^{1/2} \left( \Sigma_x^v - \mathbb{E}X^0 X^{0\top} \right) \Delta_x^{1/2} \right]^{1/2} \Delta_x^{-1/2}$ . Given  $\Gamma_x = \Gamma_x^*$ , we then select  $\gamma_y$  to minimize the population test MSE of  $b_{\Gamma}^{\text{opt}}$ , which gives  $\gamma_y^* := \frac{(\Sigma_x^v)^{-1/2} \Gamma_x^* \Delta_{xy}}{\|(\Sigma_x^v)^{-1/2} \Gamma_x^* \Delta_{xy}\|^2} (\Sigma_x^v)^{-1/2} (\Sigma_{xy}^v - \mathbb{E}X^0 Y^0)$ .

Then based on the finite test samples, we define  $\hat{\Gamma}_x$  and  $\hat{\gamma}_y$  as the plug-in estimators of  $\Gamma_x^*$  and  $\gamma_y^*$ , where we replace  $\Sigma_x^v$  and  $\Sigma_{xy}^v$  by  $\hat{\Sigma}_x^v$  and  $\hat{\Sigma}_{xy}^v$ , respectively. We derive the above formulas in Supplementary E.9.

For coefficient  $b \in \mathbb{R}^p$ , denote the population test MSE by  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{test}}(b) = \mathbb{E}[(Y^v - b^\top X^v)^2]$ . The following theorem highlights the advantage of using the DRIG-A estimator with  $\hat{\Gamma} = \text{diag}(\hat{\Gamma}_x, \hat{\gamma}_y)$  over  $\hat{b}_{\text{tOLS}}$ . While the result considers access to the training distributions, similar results can be established for the estimator with finite training samples as well.

**Theorem 5.** *Assume  $p > 1$  and  $\text{Var}(X^v Y^v) \succ (\mathbb{E}[X^v Y^v] - \mathbb{E}[X^0 Y^0])(\mathbb{E}[X^v Y^v] - \mathbb{E}[X^0 Y^0])^\top$ . Then there exist positive integers  $N_l$  and  $N_u$  such that when  $n_u \geq N_u$  and  $n_l \leq N_l$ , we have  $\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{L}_{\text{test}}(b_{\Gamma}^{\text{opt}})] < \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{L}_{\text{test}}(\hat{b}_{\text{tOLS}})]$ , where the expectation is taken over all test samples.*

The proof is presented in Supplementary E.10. The condition indicates that the variance of the cross term  $X^v Y^v$  exceeds the expected difference between the cross terms on the test and observational distributions. Then, Theorem 5 implies that our DRIG-A estimator  $b_{\Gamma}^{\text{opt}}$  is favored over  $\hat{b}_{\text{tOLS}}$  in terms of the test MSE, when we have sufficiently many unlabeled samples and not sufficiently many labeled samples from the test distribution, which is the common setup of semi-supervised domain adaptation. Indeed, it is not yet clear when the gap between the two MSEs is significant. In the following, we use simulations to empirically demonstrate the advantage of our adaptive estimator.

**Example 4.** *We set  $p = 20$  and two training environments with  $\mu^1, S^0$ , and  $S^1$  randomly sampled as in Example 3. Consider a test distribution following SCM (4) with  $\mathbb{E}[v v^\top] = \alpha G^v$ , where  $G^v$  is a randomly sampled positive definite matrix whose last row and column are zeros. We assume a small labeled test sample of size  $n_l = 50$  and population of  $X^v$  (i.e.,  $n_u \rightarrow \infty$ ).*

In Figure 6, we plot the test MSEs of various methods including the methods that make use of the test samples (DRIG-A, test OLS and the population versions of them), the baseline approaches that only use the training data, and the oracle causal parameter. Compared to the test OLS estimator, DRIG-A consistently yields much smaller test MSEs, which is aligned with Theorem 5. Furthermore, compared to the other methods that do not leverage the test data, DRIG-A has better predictive performance; we show in Supplementary G.2 that DRIG-A remains superior even if an oracle choice of  $\gamma$  that minimizes test MSE is used in anchor regression and DRIG. Finally, the causal parameter, while invariant across all test perturbations, is overly conservative under moderate and weak perturbations.




Figure 6: Test MSEs for varying test perturbation strengths in Example 4. Here, “DRIG-A-pop” and “oracle” refer to  $b_{\Gamma}^{\text{opt}}$  and  $\hat{b}_{\text{tOLS}}$  as  $n_u, n_l \rightarrow \infty$ , respectively. For the DRIG-A and test-OLS estimators, we randomly draw a labeled sample size of  $n_l = 50$  from the test distribution. The DRIG-A estimator is obtained based on the labeled test sample and training population, and test-OLS is obtained from the labeled test sample. We repeat this procedure for 50 times and show the median test MSE along with the 95% quantiles.

## 5 Finite-sample DRIG

For each environment  $e \in \mathcal{E}$ , let  $(X_1^e, Y_1^e), \dots, (X_{n_e}^e, Y_{n_e}^e)$  be i.i.d. samples of the random pair  $(X^e, Y^e)$  distributed according to model (3). Then, the finite-sample analog of the DRIG estimator is given by  $\hat{b}_\gamma \in \text{argmin}_b \hat{\mathcal{L}}_\gamma(b)$ , where

$$\hat{\mathcal{L}}_\gamma(b) = \hat{\mathbb{E}}[Y^0 - b^\top X^0]^2 + \gamma \sum_{e \in \mathcal{E}} \omega^e \left( \hat{\mathbb{E}}[Y^e - b^\top X^e]^2 - \hat{\mathbb{E}}[Y^0 - b^\top X^0]^2 \right).$$

Here,  $\hat{\mathbb{E}}$  denotes the empirical expectation computed over samples of  $(X^e, Y^e)$  for every environment  $e$ , i.e.,  $\hat{\mathbb{E}}[Y^e - b^\top X^e]^2 = \frac{1}{n_e} \sum_{i=1}^{n_e} (Y_i^e - b^\top X_i^e)^2$ . Note that  $\hat{b}_\gamma$  is as an estimate for the population parameter  $b_\gamma^{\text{opt}}$ , and  $\hat{\mathcal{L}}_\gamma(\hat{b}_\gamma)$  is an estimate for the worst-case risk  $\mathcal{L}_\gamma(b_\gamma^{\text{opt}}) = \min_b \sup_{v \in \mathcal{C}_{\text{DRIG}}^\gamma} \mathbb{E}_v[Y - b^\top X]^2$ .

We provide finite-sample consistency guarantees for the finite-sample DRIG estimator. Specifically, we demonstrate convergence of prediction models  $\|\hat{b}_\gamma - b_\gamma^{\text{opt}}\|_2$  as well worst-case loss functions  $|\mathcal{L}_\gamma(b_\gamma^{\text{opt}}) - \hat{\mathcal{L}}_\gamma(\hat{b}_\gamma)|$ . For simplicity, we assume that the random variables  $\varepsilon$  and  $\delta^e$  in the model (3) are Gaussian, although the analysis can readily be extended to sub-Gaussian distributions. We let  $\psi_e$  be the spectral norm of the joint covariance of  $(X^e, Y^e)$ . Let  $\psi_{\max} = \max_{e \in \mathcal{E}} \psi_e$  and  $n_{\min} = \min_{e \in \mathcal{E}} n_e$ . Furthermore, let  $\tau_{\min}$  be the minimum eigenvalue of the matrix  $\sum_{e \in \mathcal{E}} \omega^e [\Sigma_e^* - \frac{(\gamma-1)}{\gamma} \Sigma_0^*]$  where  $\Sigma_e^*$  is the covariance matrix of  $X^e$ .

**Theorem 6.** *Suppose  $n_e \geq p \max\{1, 64\psi_e^2, \frac{64}{\min\{\tau_{\min}, 1\}^2} (\|b_\gamma^{\text{opt}}\|_2 + 1)(\max_e \psi_e + 1)^2\}$  for all  $e \in \mathcal{E}$ . Then with probability exceeding  $1 - |\mathcal{E}| \exp(-p/2)$ , for any  $\gamma \geq 1$ , we have*

$$\|\hat{b}_\gamma - b_\gamma^{\text{opt}}\|_2 \leq \frac{32(\|b_\gamma^{\text{opt}}\|_2 + 1)}{\min\{\tau_{\min}, 1\}} (1 + \psi_{\max}) \sqrt{\frac{p}{n_{\min}}}, \quad \text{and}$$

$$|\hat{\mathcal{L}}_\gamma(\hat{b}_\gamma) - \mathcal{L}_\gamma(b_\gamma^{\text{opt}})| \leq \frac{480(\|b_\gamma^{\text{opt}}\|_2 + 1)^3}{\min\{\tau_{\min}, 1\}} (1 + \psi_{\max})^2 \gamma \sqrt{\frac{p}{n_{\min}}}.$$




Figure 7: Quantiles of MSEs over 50 test environments for varying  $\gamma$ . The top line is the worst-case MSE; the black line is the median.

The proof of Theorem 6 is presented in Supplementary E.12. Note the scaling with the factor  $\sqrt{p/n_e}$  in the second statement. This is due to the fact that  $b_\gamma^{opt}$  gives residuals which are not independent nor orthogonal (in population) to the covariates  $X$ .

## 6 Real data analysis on single-cell data

Replege et al. (2022) published a large-scale single-cell RNA sequencing dataset where they performed genome-scale Perturb-seq targeting all expressed genes with CRISPR perturbations across millions of human cells. We utilize the dataset on the RPE1 cells, as it focuses on putatively important genes and tend to respond more to interventions. After preprocessing the data following the benchmark by Chevalley et al. (2022), we arrive at 10 genes with the highest expression level as the observed variables. We regard one gene as the response variable and the others as covariates, with reasoning given in Supplementary G.3. Our training data contains 11,485 observational data and 10 interventional environments in each of which one of the 10 genes is intervened on. The sample sizes of the interventional environments range from 100 to 500. Moreover, we have hundreds of additional environments, each of which involves the intervention on one hidden gene (i.e., a gene that is not among the 10 observed ones). These environments, potentially different from the training environments, serve as the test distributions to assess the robustness of prediction models.

We apply DRIG and anchor regression with a range of values for  $\gamma$  and evaluate the estimated model on the test environments. Among the hundreds of test environments, we select 50 environments where the observational OLS performs the worst, indicating the presence of potentially larger distributional shifts. The quantiles of the MSEs on the 50 test environments for varying  $\gamma$  are presented in Figure 7. We observe that DRIG with an increasing  $\gamma$  achieves a smaller worst-case test MSE, which is consistent with Theorem 2. Similarly, anchor regression also demonstrates a similar robustness behavior, although it generally performs worse than DRIG, exhibiting a larger worst-case MSE. This discrepancy indicates that shifts among different environments arise due to random interventions that affect not only the means but also the variances, and DRIG is able to better exploit the rich heterogeneity, especially that in variances. Recall that DRIG with  $\gamma = 0$  yields the observational OLS and DRIG with  $\gamma = 1$  is the pooled OLS. We observe that all the quantiles of test MSEs decrease as  $\gamma$  increases, especially the worst-case error, indicating that the OLS estimators are inferior to DRIG. Overall, the results here highlight the superiority of our DRIG in handling distribution shifts and achieving robust predictions.

In addition, it is worth noting that the robustness measured by the worst-case performance tends to stabilize with a moderate value of  $\gamma$ . For example, in this case, once  $\gamma$  exceeds a certain threshold, such as  $\gamma > 5$ , the performance becomes relatively stable. This suggests that there is less concern about metic-




Figure 8: Performance of DRIG-A for varying labeled sample sizes, in comparison to test-OLS and other methods that rely only on the training data. DRIG and anchor regression use fixed  $\gamma = 10$ .

ulously selecting the value of  $\gamma$  in order to achieve better robustness than standard approaches like OLS. Nevertheless, in Supplementary G.3, we investigate the performance of DRIG on test environments by some specific interventions. This indicates that the choice of  $\gamma$  could still have a potentially crucial impact on the performance for particular test distributions and brings up the issue of selection of  $\gamma$ .

When a small labeled sample from the test environment is available, our adaptive method DRIG-A offers a potential to enhance prediction performance without manually selecting  $\gamma$ . For evaluation, to ensure a larger test sample size, we pool the aforementioned 50 test environments together as our new test domain, which is a mixture of various interventions. Given a test sample size  $n_l$ , we randomly draw a subsample from the test domain and apply DRIG-A and test OLS. Note that different from (and weaker than) the setting in Section 4.2, here we use only the  $n_u = n_l$  labeled data instead of additionally having access to a large unlabeled sample of  $X$  in the test domain. As shown in Figure 8, with a relatively small number of labeled test data, DRIG-A outperforms all other methods that rely solely on the training data. It also exhibits superior performance and greater stability compared to test OLS. Finally, as the number of labeled test data increases, the advantage of DRIG-A over the test OLS diminishes, aligned with our theoretical result in Theorem 5.

## 7 Conclusion and future work

In this paper, we proposed DRIG, a procedure that exploits additive interventions to obtain distributionally robust prediction models. While DRO formalizes robustness based on a postulated distance measure, our method DRIG is based on causal modeling and focuses on structural and data-dependent distribution shifts. In contrast to methods aiming for causal inference or invariance, DRIG requires weaker assumptions and achieves guaranteed robustness against finite perturbation strengths that are often more appealing in applications. Compared to anchor regression that also provably attains finite robustness, DRIG exploits more general interventions, and thus yields robustness against more diverse perturbations.

A number of interesting future directions arise from our work. First, while we established robustness guarantees for DRIG in linear settings, the gradient invariance principle as well as the DRIG formulation are general and also applicable to nonlinear models. For example, one straightforward nonlinear adaption of DRIG is to find the nonlinear prediction model  $f(x)$  that minimizes  $\mathbb{E}[\ell(X^0, Y^0; f)] + \gamma \sum_{e \in \mathcal{E}} \omega^e (\mathbb{E}[\ell(X^e, Y^e; f)] - \mathbb{E}[\ell(X^0, Y^0; f)])$  where  $\ell(x, y; f) = (y - f(x))^2$ . The gradient invariance principle can be adapted in a similar fashion. Considering the expressiveness of nonlinear models and the established guarantees of linear DRIG, investigating nonlinear extensions would be of significant interest. Second, DRIG and its extensions can produce predictions in the form of point estimates; incorporating an assessment of uncertainty with corresponding prediction intervals would further expand the applicability of

our methods.

## Acknowledgments

X. Shen’s research was supported by the ETH AI Center. P. Bühlmann received funding from the European Research Council (ERC) under the European Union’s Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme (grant agreement No. 786461).

## References

- Angrist, J. D., Imbens, G. W., and Rubin, D. B. (1996). Identification of causal effects using instrumental variables. *Journal of the American statistical Association*, 91(434):444–455.
- Arjovsky, M., Bottou, L., Gulrajani, I., and Lopez-Paz, D. (2019). Invariant risk minimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1907.02893*.
- Ben-David, S., Blitzer, J., Crammer, K., and Pereira, F. (2006). Analysis of representations for domain adaptation. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 19.
- Ben-Tal, A. and Nemirovski, A. (1998). Robust convex optimization. *Mathematics of operations research*, 23(4):769–805.
- Bowden, R. J. and Turkington, D. A. (1990). *Instrumental variables*. Number 8. Cambridge university press.
- Bühlmann, P. (2020). Invariance, Causality and Robustness. *Statistical Science*, 35(3):404 – 426.
- Chandrasekaran, V., Parrilo, P., and Willsky, A. (2012). Latent variable graphical model selection via convex optimization. *Annals of Statistics*, 40:1935–1967.
- Chandrasekaran, V., Sanghavi, S., Parrilo, P., and Willsky, A. (2011). Rank-sparsity incoherence for matrix decomposition. *SIAM Journal of Optimization*, 21:572–596.
- Chen, Y. and Bühlmann, P. (2021). Domain adaptation under structural causal models. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 22(1):11856–11935.
- Chevalley, M., Roohani, Y., Mehrjou, A., Leskovec, J., and Schwab, P. (2022). Causalbench: A large-scale benchmark for network inference from single-cell perturbation data. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.17283*.
- Christiansen, R., Pfister, N., Jakobsen, M. E., Gnecco, N., and Peters, J. (2021). A causal framework for distribution generalization. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, 44(10):6614–6630.
- Duchi, J. C. and Namkoong, H. (2021). Learning models with uniform performance via distributionally robust optimization. *The Annals of Statistics*, 49(3):1378–1406.
- Fan, J., Fang, C., Gu, Y., and Zhang, T. (2023). Environment invariant linear least squares. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.03092*.
- Ganin, Y. and Lempitsky, V. (2015). Unsupervised domain adaptation by backpropagation. In Bach, F. and Blei, D., editors, *Proceedings of the 32nd International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 37 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 1180–1189, Lille, France. PMLR.
- Geirhos, R., Jacobsen, J.-H., Michaelis, C., Zemel, R. S., Brendel, W., Bethge, M., and Wichmann, F. (2020). Shortcut learning in deep neural networks. *Nature Machine Intelligence*, 2:665 – 673.
- Ghassami, A., Salehkaleybar, S., Kiyavash, N., and Zhang, K. (2017). Learning causal structures using regression invariance. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*.



- Glymour, C., Zhang, K., and Spirtes, P. (2019). Review of causal discovery methods based on graphical models. *Frontiers in genetics*, 10:524.
- Goodfellow, I. J., Shlens, J., and Szegedy, C. (2014). Explaining and harnessing adversarial examples. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1412.6572*.
- Haavelmo, T. (1943). The statistical implications of a system of simultaneous equations. *Econometrica, Journal of the Econometric Society*, pages 1–12.
- Huang, B., Zhang, K., Zhang, J., Ramsey, J., Sanchez-Romero, R., Glymour, C., and Schölkopf, B. (2020). Causal discovery from heterogeneous/nonstationary data. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 21(1):3482–3534.
- Imbens, G. W. and Rubin, D. B. (2015). *Causal inference in statistics, social, and biomedical sciences*. Cambridge University Press.
- Kania, L. and Wit, E. (2022). Causal regularization: On the trade-off between in-sample risk and out-of-sample risk guarantees. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.01593*.
- Kennerberg, P. and Wit, E. C. (2023). Convergence properties of multi-environment causal regularization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.03588*.
- Koyama, M. and Yamaguchi, S. (2020). When is invariance useful in an out-of-distribution generalization problem? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2008.01883*.
- Krueger, D., Caballero, E., Jacobsen, J.-H., Zhang, A., Binas, J., Zhang, D., Le Priol, R., and Courville, A. (2021). Out-of-distribution generalization via risk extrapolation (rex). In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 5815–5826.
- Long, J. P., Zhu, H., Do, K.-A., and Ha, M. J. (2022). The generalized causal dantzig: A unified approach to instruments and environments. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2207.14753*.
- Madry, A., Makelov, A., Schmidt, L., Tsipras, D., and Vladu, A. (2018). Towards deep learning models resistant to adversarial attacks. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Magliacane, S., van Ommen, T., Claassen, T., Bongers, S., Versteeg, P., and Mooij, J. M. (2017). Domain adaptation by using causal inference to predict invariant conditional distributions. In *Neural Information Processing Systems*.
- Meinshausen, N. (2018). Causality from a distributional robustness point of view. In *2018 IEEE Data Science Workshop (DSW)*, pages 6–10. IEEE.
- Meinshausen, N. and Bühlmann, P. (2015). Maximin effects in inhomogeneous large-scale data. *The Annals of Statistics*, 43(4):1801 – 1830.
- Pearl, J. (2009). *Causality*. Cambridge university press.
- Peters, J., Bühlmann, P., and Meinshausen, N. (2016). Causal inference by using invariant prediction: identification and confidence intervals. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series B (Statistical Methodology)*, pages 947–1012.
- Peters, J., Janzing, D., and Schölkopf, B. (2017). *Elements of Causal Inference: Foundations and Learning Algorithms*. The MIT Press.
- Pfister, N., Williams, E. G., Peters, J., Aebbersold, R., and Bühlmann, P. (2019). Stabilizing variable selection and regression. *The Annals of Applied Statistics*.
- Ramé, A., Dancette, C., and Cord, M. (2022). Fishr: Invariant gradient variances for out-of-distribution generalization. In *International Conference in Machine Learning*, page 18347–18377.

- Replogle, J. M., Saunders, R. A., Pogson, A. N., Hussmann, J. A., Lenail, A., Guna, A., Mascibroda, L., et al. (2022). Mapping information-rich genotype-phenotype landscapes with genome-scale perturb-seq. *Cell*, 185(14):2559–2575.
- Rojas-Carulla, M., Scholkopf, B., Turner, R. E., and Peters, J. (2015). Invariant models for causal transfer learning. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 19:36:1–36:34.
- Rothenhäusler, D., Buhlmann, P., and Meinshausen, N. (2019). Causal dantzig: Fast inference in linear structural equation models with hidden variables under additive interventions. *The Annals of Statistics*, 47(3):1688–1722.
- Rothenhäusler, D., Meinshausen, N., Bühlmann, P., and Peters, J. (2021). Anchor regression: Heterogeneous data meet causality. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B: Statistical Methodology*, 83(2):215–246.
- Sagawa, S., Koh, P. W., Hashimoto, T. B., and Liang, P. (2019). Distributionally robust neural networks for group shifts: On the importance of regularization for worst-case generalization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1911.08731*.
- Sagawa, S., Koh, P. W., Lee, T., Gao, I., Xie, S. M., Shen, K., Kumar, A., et al. (2022). Extending the wilds benchmark for unsupervised adaptation. In *International Conference on Representation Learning*.
- Shi, Y., Seely, J., Torr, P. H., Siddharth, N., Hannun, A., Usunier, N., and Synnaeve, G. (2021). Gradient matching for domain generalization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2104.09937*.
- Sinha, A., Namkoong, H., and Duchi, J. (2017). Certifiable distributional robustness with principled adversarial training. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1710.10571*.
- Spirtes, P., Glymour, C. N., Scheines, R., and Heckerman, D. (2000). *Causation, Prediction, and Search*. MIT press.
- Taeb, A., Gamella, J. L., Heinze-Deml, C., and Bühlmann, P. (2021). Perturbations and causality in gaussian latent variable models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2101.06950*.

## A Illustrations of the perturbation class

We provide some illustrations of the perturbation class that DRIG is robust against, i.e.,

$$\mathcal{C}_{\text{DRIG}}^\gamma = \left\{ v \in \mathbb{R}^{p+1} : \mathbb{E}[vv^\top] \preceq S^0 + \gamma \sum_{e \in \mathcal{E}} \omega^e (S^e - S^0 + \mu^e \mu^{e\top}) \right\}.$$

The column space of the matrix  $U := \sum_{e \in \mathcal{E}} \omega^e (S^e - S^0 + \mu^e \mu^{e\top})$  represents the “directions” of the perturbations that DRIG protects against with a controllable strength via  $\gamma$ . Specifically, denote by  $U = Q\Lambda Q^\top$  the spectral decomposition of  $U$ , where  $\Lambda = \text{diag}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_{p+1})$  and  $Q = (q_1, \dots, q_{p+1})$  with  $(\lambda_i, q_i)$  being an eigenvalue/eigenvector pair. Let  $r = \text{rank}(U)$  be the rank of the matrix  $U$  so that  $\lambda_i > 0$  for  $i \leq r$  and  $\lambda_i = 0$  for  $i \geq r+1$ ; here, the eigenvectors  $q_1, \dots, q_r$  span the column space of  $U$ . Then for all  $v \in \mathcal{C}_{\text{DRIG}}^\gamma$ , we have  $\mathbb{E}[Q^\top v (Q^\top v)^\top] \preceq \Lambda$ , implying  $q_i^\top v \equiv 0$  for  $i \geq r+1$ . That is, the DRIG estimator can only be robust to perturbations that lie in the column space of  $U$ . As such, the larger the dimension of this column space, the more directions the DRIG estimator is robust against.

**Example 5.** We consider two covariates  $X_1, X_2$ , uniform weights  $\omega^e \equiv 1/|\mathcal{E}|$ , and interventions on only the covariates. We first assume there is one interventional environment  $e = 1$  apart from the observational environment  $e = 0$  with  $\delta^0 = 0$ , where both covariates are perturbed. If only the mean is affected (the anchor regression setting), i.e.,  $\delta^1 = \mu^1$  for some deterministic vector  $\mu^1 \neq 0$ , we have  $U = \gamma \mu^1 \mu^{1\top} / 2$  with rank 1. If the variance is affected, i.e.,  $\delta^1 \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu^1, S^1)$  we have  $U = \gamma(\mu^1 \mu^{1\top} + S^1) / 2$  which is in general full-rank. The perturbations that we are potentially robust against in the cases of mean shifts and variance shifts are depicted in Figures 9(a) and 9(b), respectively.

Next, we assume that only  $X_1$  is perturbed in the interventional environment  $e = 1$ . Thus  $\delta_2^1 = 0$ , and the matrix  $U = \gamma(\mu^1 \mu^{1\top} + S^1) / 2$  has rank equal to one since the second diagonal entry is zero. Now if we have one more interventional environment  $e = 2$  where  $X_2$  receives an intervention, it then holds that the matrix  $U = \gamma(\mu^1 \mu^{1\top} + S^1 + \mu^2 \mu^{2\top} + S^2) / 3$  is full-rank. The perturbations that DRIG is robust against in these two cases also follow the same pattern as in Figures 9(a) and 9(b), respectively.




Figure 9: Perturbations that DRIG is controllably robust against in scenarios in Example 5.

## B Incorporating continuous exogenous variables

Our modeling framework (3) contains only interventions through a discrete anchor (environment) variable  $E$ . We can also incorporate interventions due to continuous anchor variables  $A$  which are exogenous. Specifically, for every environment  $e \in \mathcal{E}$ , the data  $(X^e, Y^e)$  is generated according to the following modified SCM:

$$\begin{pmatrix} X^e \\ Y^e \\ H^e \end{pmatrix} = \tilde{B}^* \begin{pmatrix} X^e \\ Y^e \\ H^e \end{pmatrix} + \varepsilon + MA^e + \delta^e, \quad (13)$$

with the matrix  $I - \tilde{B}^*$  being invertible. Here,  $A^e$  denotes the observed continuous anchor variable in environment  $e$  with  $A^e$  being a random variable following the conditional distribution of  $A$  given  $E = e$ . As before, for every  $e \in \mathcal{E}$ ,  $(\varepsilon, \delta^e)$  are jointly independent. Furthermore,  $(\varepsilon, A^e)$  are jointly independent. We do

not assume dependence of the random variables  $A^e$  and  $\delta^e$ . Figure 3(c) presents the graphical perspective of the model (13); the variables  $A$  and  $E$  are exogenous and cannot be descendants of any of the variables  $(X, Y, H)$ .

For every environment  $e \in \mathcal{E}$ , we define  $\tilde{Y}^e = Y^e - \mathbb{E}[Y^e|A^e]$  and  $\tilde{X}^e = X^e - \mathbb{E}[X^e|A^e]$ . The population version of the modified DRIG estimator (to account for continuous anchors) is

$$b_{\lambda,\gamma}^{\text{opt}} = \underset{b}{\operatorname{argmin}} \mathcal{L}_{\lambda,\gamma}(b). \quad (14)$$

Here,  $\lambda, \gamma \geq 0$  are regularization parameters and the objective  $\mathcal{L}_{\lambda,\gamma}(b)$  is

$$\mathcal{L}_{\lambda,\gamma}(b) := \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{\gamma}(b) + \lambda \sum_{e \in \mathcal{E}} \omega^e \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}(Y^e - b^\top X^e | A^e)]^2,$$

where  $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{\gamma}(b)$  is the original DRIG objective function in (6) applied to the transformed data  $(\tilde{X}^e, \tilde{Y}^e)$ .

## B.1 Robustness guarantees with discrete and continuous exogenous variables

Above we introduced a generalization of DRIG (14) for incorporating both discrete and continuous exogenous variables. We now assess the robustness of this estimator, and establish once again that our estimator has stronger robustness guarantees than anchor regression. Throughout, we suppose that the training data is generated according to the SCM (13) and the test data is generated according to the SCM (4). Let  $\tilde{S}^e = \mathbb{E}[\operatorname{Cov}(\delta^e | A^e)]$ .

**Theorem 7.** *The modified DRIG estimator  $b_{\lambda,\gamma}^{\text{opt}}$  in (14) is the solution to the worst-case risk minimization (9) with  $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{C}_{\text{DRIG}}^{\lambda,\gamma}$ , where*

$$\mathcal{C}_{\text{DRIG}}^{\lambda,\gamma} = \left\{ v \in \mathbb{R}^{p+1} : \mathbb{E}[vv^\top] \preceq \tilde{S}^0 + \sum_{e \in \mathcal{E}} \omega^e \left[ \gamma(\tilde{S}^e - \tilde{S}^0) + \lambda \left( \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}(\delta^e | A^e) \mathbb{E}(\delta^e | A^e)^\top] + M \mathbb{E}[A^e A^{e\top}] M^\top \right) \right] \right\}.$$

We prove Theorem 7 in Supplementary F.1. This result states that the modified DRIG estimator  $b_{\lambda,\gamma}^{\text{opt}}$  protects against perturbations in the class  $\mathcal{C}_{\text{DRIG}}^{\lambda,\gamma}$ . Notice that if the environment (discrete) variables  $E$  are independent of the continuous anchors  $A$ , then the perturbation class simplifies to

$$\mathcal{C}_{\text{DRIG}}^{\lambda,\gamma} = \left\{ v \in \mathbb{R}^{p+1} : \mathbb{E}[vv^\top] \preceq S^0 + \sum_{e \in \mathcal{E}} \omega^e \left( \gamma(S^e - S^0) + \lambda \mu^e \mu^{e\top} + \lambda M \mathbb{E}[A A^\top] M^\top \right) \right\}.$$

Furthermore, when there are no continuous anchors, we recover the result of Theorem 2.

The anchor regression estimator (8) proposed in Rothenhäusler et al. (2021) can be applied to data generated according to the model (13). Appealing to Theorem 1 of Rothenhäusler et al. (2021), we can conclude that anchor regression with turning parameter  $\lambda$  protects against perturbations in the set

$$\mathcal{C}_{\text{anchor}}^\lambda = \left\{ v \in \mathbb{R}^{p+1} : \mathbb{E}[vv^\top] \preceq \sum_{e \in \mathcal{E}} \omega^e \left[ \tilde{S}^e + \lambda \left( \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}(\delta^e | A^e) \mathbb{E}(\delta^e | A^e)^\top] + M \mathbb{E}[A^e A^{e\top}] M^\top \right) \right] \right\}.$$

Thus, analogous to the discrete exogenous setting, our estimator (14) in the continuous and discrete exogenous setting is robust against strictly more directions than those protected by anchor regression as  $\mathcal{C}_{\text{DRIG}}^{\lambda,\gamma} \supseteq \mathcal{C}_{\text{anchor}}^\lambda$ .

## C Connections to other invariance notions

We devote a comprehensive discussion on existing notions of invariance in the literature, and how they are related to the gradient invariance notion in our work. Throughout, we assume that the data is generated according to the SCM (3).

The notion of invariance dates back to Haavelmo (1943) who realized the invariant property of the causal variables. Formally, a subset  $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \{1, \dots, p\}$  of covariates is said to be *conditionally invariant* if the distribution of the response  $Y^e$  given  $X_{\mathcal{S}}^e$  is the same for all  $e \in \mathcal{E}$ . In the SCM (3), when there are no interventions on  $Y$  or  $H$  so that  $\delta_y^e = 0$  for all  $e \in \mathcal{E}$ , the parental set of  $Y$ , denoted by  $\text{pa}(Y)$ , satisfies the conditional invariance in that  $Y^e | X_{\text{pa}(Y)}^e$  is the same for all  $e \in \mathcal{E}$ . This property was explored in the reverse direction by Peters et al. (2016) for discovering the parental set of  $Y$ . However, the conditional invariance may sometimes fail to identify the causal parameter; in particular, the conditional invariance property does not hold for the causal parameter when  $X$  and  $Y$  are confounded by a latent variable (Rothenhäusler et al., 2019). In recent literature, several alternative notions of invariance have been proposed; these are then used for causal discovery or distributional robustness. Below we list several representatives followed by a discussion.

The first alternative proposed in Arjovsky et al. (2019) looks at the invariance of the conditional mean or the solution of  $L_2$  risk minimization within each environment, instead of the conditional distribution. Formally, a subset  $\mathcal{S}^* \subseteq \{1, \dots, p\}$  of covariates is said to be *solution invariant* if there exists  $b^* \in \mathbb{R}^p$  supported on  $\mathcal{S}$  such that

$$b^* \in \underset{b}{\operatorname{argmin}} \mathbb{E}[\ell(X_{\mathcal{S}^*}^e, Y^e; b)], \quad \forall e \in \mathcal{E}$$

where  $X_{\mathcal{S}} \in \mathbb{R}^p$  denotes the random vector that copies the coordinates of  $X$  in  $\mathcal{S}$  and has zero components elsewhere. Based on this notion of invariance, Arjovsky et al. (2019) then proposed a method called invariant risk minimization (IRM) for out-of-distribution generalization. In the variable selection setting, IRM interpolates between the pooled OLS and solution invariance. Formally, IRM solves the following problem

$$\min_{\mathcal{S}, b} \left\{ \frac{1}{|\mathcal{E}|} \sum_{e \in \mathcal{E}} \mathbb{E}[\ell(\tilde{X}_{\mathcal{S}}^e, Y^e; b)] + \frac{\lambda}{|\mathcal{E}|} \sum_{e \in \mathcal{E}} \left[ \mathbb{E}[\ell(\tilde{X}_{\mathcal{S}}^e, Y^e; b)] - \min_{b'} \mathbb{E}[\ell(\tilde{X}_{\mathcal{S}}^e, Y^e; b')] \right] \right\},$$

where  $\lambda$  is a hyperparameter that controls the regularization strength with  $\lambda \rightarrow \infty$  enforcing the solution invariance, whenever it is achievable.

Apart from the conditional distribution and the conditional mean, another alternative considers the invariance of the risk of a prediction model from  $X$  to  $Y$ . Specifically, a regression coefficient  $b \in \mathbb{R}^p$  is said to fulfill *risk invariance* if the risk  $\mathbb{E}[(Y^e - b^\top X^e)^2]$  is the same for all  $e \in \mathcal{E}$ . Krueger et al. (2021) proposed to regularize the pooled OLS towards risk invariance:

$$\min_b \frac{1}{|\mathcal{E}|} \sum_{e \in \mathcal{E}} \mathbb{E}[\ell(X^e, Y^e; b)] + \lambda \operatorname{Var}(\{\mathbb{E}[\ell(X^e, Y^e; b)] : e \in \mathcal{E}\}),$$

where  $\operatorname{Var}$  denotes here the empirical variance over all  $e \in \mathcal{E}$ .

The last notion of invariance that we would like to highlight is the most closely related to our gradient invariance. We say a regression coefficient  $b \in \mathbb{R}^p$  satisfies *full gradient invariance* if  $\nabla_b \mathbb{E}[\ell(X^e, Y^e; b)]$  is the same for all  $e \in \mathcal{E}$ . This notion was introduced by Rothenhäusler et al. (2019) with the name inner-product invariance since in linear models, inner-product invariance is equivalent to  $\mathbb{E}[X^e(Y^e - b^\top X^e)]$  being the same for all  $e \in \mathcal{E}$ . Rothenhäusler et al. (2019) then proposed the causal Dantzig to identify the causal parameter by exploiting full gradient invariance in the setting with two environments. As we have seen earlier, DRIG with  $\gamma \rightarrow \infty$  and  $|\mathcal{E}| = 2$  recovers the causal Dantzig. A similar invariance notion was also explored in the context of out-of-distribution generalization by Koyama and Yamaguchi (2020); Shi et al. (2021); Ramé et al. (2022). Specifically, the authors in Koyama and Yamaguchi (2020); Ramé et al. (2022) propose the following formulation

$$\min_b \frac{1}{|\mathcal{E}|} \sum_{e \in \mathcal{E}} \mathbb{E}[\ell(X^e, Y^e; b)] + \lambda \operatorname{trace}(\operatorname{Var}(\{\nabla_b \mathbb{E}[\ell(X^e, Y^e; b)] : e \in \mathcal{E}\})),$$

enforcing full gradient invariance when the regularization parameter  $\lambda$  tends to infinity. Shi et al. (2021) also enforces full gradient invariance via regularization based on the inner products among pairs of gradients. Our gradient invariance in Definition 1 is a relaxed version of the full gradient invariance. In particular, instead of enforcing the gradients in all environments to be the same, we require only a weighted average of the gradients to be stable in the sense of equaling the gradient in the reference environment. Thus, gradient

Table 1: Whether the causal parameter satisfies a certain type of invariance under different cases of interventions and latent effects. Superscripts means some additional conditions are needed. 1:  $\mathbb{E}[\Delta_x^e \delta_y^e]$  is the same for all  $e \in \mathcal{E}$  and  $B_{yx}^* = 0$  (i.e.,  $Y$  is childless in  $X$ ); 2:  $\sum_{e \in \mathcal{E}} \omega^e \mathbb{E}[\Delta_x^e \delta_y^e] = \mathbb{E}[\Delta_x^0 \delta_y^0]$  and  $\sum_{e \in \mathcal{E}} \omega^e \mathbb{E}[\delta_y^{e2}] = \mathbb{E}[\delta_y^{02}]$  or  $B_{yx}^* = 0$ .

intervention on $Y$ latent confounder	$\delta_y^e = 0$		$\exists e, e' \in \mathcal{E} : \mathbb{E}[\delta_y^e] \neq 0, \mathbb{E}[(\delta_y^{e'})^2] \neq 0$	
	w/o	w/	w/o	w/
conditional invariance	✓	✗	✗	✗
risk invariance	✓	✓	✗	✗
solution invariance	✓	✗	✗	✗
full gradient invariance	✓	✓	✓ <sup>1</sup>	✓ <sup>1</sup>
gradient invariance	✓	✓	✓ <sup>2</sup>	✓ <sup>2</sup>

invariance is strictly weaker than the full gradient invariance except when there are two environments, where the two notions are identical.

Under data generated according to the linear SCM (3), among all the preceding invariance notions, our notion of gradient invariance necessitates the weakest conditions to identify the causal parameter (see below for a more detailed discussion). Furthermore, although gradient invariance is not strictly satisfied with a finite regularization parameter  $\gamma$ , DRIG achieves distributional robustness against moderate interventions. In contrast, all the aforementioned methods do not have finite robustness guarantees.

### C.1 Necessary conditions for invariance conditions to identify the causal parameter

We discuss the necessary conditions for the above notions of invariance to identify the causal parameter under the general linear SCM with multiple environments  $e \in \mathcal{E}$  as posited in (3):

$$\begin{pmatrix} X^e \\ Y^e \end{pmatrix} = B^* \begin{pmatrix} X^e \\ Y^e \end{pmatrix} + \varepsilon + \delta^e.$$

That is, we investigate when the causal parameter satisfies a certain type of invariance. We summarize the conclusions in Table 1 and the following, which indicates that our gradient invariance requires the weakest conditions among all. The proof is given below.

- In the simplest case without latent confounder and intervention on  $Y$ , all invariance conditions true for the causal parameter. Additionally under some sufficient conditions, e.g. when there are sufficient interventions on  $X$  as illustrated in Section D.1, and all methods can identify the causal parameter. The existence of latent confounders and interventions on  $Y$  bring in complications for causal identification.
- When there are latent confounders, the conditional and solution invariance fail to hold for the causal parameter, while the risk and gradient invariance remain valid if  $Y$  is not intervened on.
- Interventions on  $Y$  causes even more trouble, under which only the full and our gradient invariance can be fulfilled by the causal parameter under some conditions on the interventions and the structural relationship between  $Y$  and  $X$ . Compared to the full gradient invariance that requires the inner-product of interventions to be exactly the same across all environments, our gradient invariance requires a strictly weaker condition in that in some environments, the interventions on  $X$  and  $Y$  could have different correlations, although their weighted average has to be stable. In addition, the full gradient invariance does not allow  $Y$  to have children in  $X$ , that is, the structural relationship from  $X$  to  $Y$  can only be causal rather than anti-causal. Intuitively, this protects the gradients from varying due to interventions on  $Y$  that does not propagate to some of  $X$ . Nevertheless, our gradient invariance could relax this assumption if  $Y$  is intervened in a stable way across environments.

*Proof.* According to model (3), we have  $Y^e = b^{*\top} X + \varepsilon_y + \delta_y^e$ .

**Case I.  $\delta_y^e = 0$ , without latent confounder.** In this case, we have  $Y^e = b^{\star\top}X + \varepsilon_y$ , where  $\varepsilon_y$  is independent of  $X^e$  and has the same marginal distribution across all environments. Hence the conditional distribution of  $Y^e$  given  $X_{\text{pa}(Y)}^e = x_{\text{pa}(Y)}$  which is the distribution of  $b_{\text{pa}(Y)}^{\star\top}x_{\text{pa}(Y)} + \varepsilon_y$  remains invariant for all  $e$ , which suggests the conditional invariance holds for the parental set of  $Y$ .

The optimal solution given the parental set is  $\mathbb{E}[Y^e|X_{\text{pa}(Y)}^e] = b_{\text{pa}(Y)}^{\star\top}X_{\text{pa}(Y)}^e$ . Hence the parental set and  $b^{\star}$  satisfy the solution invariance.

The  $L_2$  risk of the causal parameter is given by  $\mathbb{E}[(Y^e - b^{\star\top}X)^2] = \mathbb{E}[(Y^e - b_{\text{pa}(Y)}^{\star\top}X_{\text{pa}(Y)}^e)^2] = \mathbb{E}[\varepsilon_y^2]$  which is the same for all  $e$ , so we conclude the risk invariance.

The gradient of the  $L_2$  risk for each  $e$  evaluated at  $b^{\star}$  is  $\mathbb{E}[X^e(Y^e - b^{\star\top}X^e)] = \mathbb{E}[X^e\varepsilon_y^e] = 0$ . Hence we conclude the full and our gradient invariance.

**Case II.  $\delta_y^e = 0$ , with latent confounder.** The conditional distribution of  $Y^e|X_{\text{pa}(Y)}^e = x_{\text{pa}(Y)}$  is the conditional distribution of  $\varepsilon_y|X_{\text{pa}(Y)}^e = x_{\text{pa}(Y)}$ , shifted by a constant  $b_{\text{pa}(Y)}^{\star\top}x_{\text{pa}(Y)}$ , which in general varies for different interventions on  $X_{\text{pa}(Y)}^e$ . The conditional mean  $\mathbb{E}[Y^e|X_{\text{pa}(Y)}^e] = b_{\text{pa}(Y)}^{\star\top}X_{\text{pa}(Y)}^e + \mathbb{E}[\varepsilon_y|X_{\text{pa}(Y)}^e]$ , similarly, depends on  $e$  as well. So both the conditional and solution invariance in general fail to hold for the causal parameter.

We have  $\mathbb{E}[(Y^e - b_{\text{pa}(Y)}^{\star\top}X_{\text{pa}(Y)}^e)^2] = \mathbb{E}[\varepsilon_y^2]$ , suggesting the risk invariance. To see the gradient invariance, recalling the model (3), we have

$$X^e = C_x^{\star}(\varepsilon_x + \Delta_x^e) + C_{xy}^{\star}\varepsilon_y.$$

Thus, the gradient at the causal parameter is given by  $\mathbb{E}[X^e(Y^e - b^{\star\top}X^e)] = \mathbb{E}[(C_x^{\star}(\varepsilon_x + \Delta_x^e) + C_{xy}^{\star}\varepsilon_y)(\varepsilon_y)] = C_x^{\star}\mathbb{E}[\varepsilon_x\varepsilon_y] + C_{xy}^{\star}\mathbb{E}[\varepsilon_y^2]$ , which is free of  $e$ . So we conclude the full gradient invariance which also implies our gradient invariance.

**Case III.  $\mathbb{E}[\delta_y^e] \neq c, \mathbb{E}[\delta_y^{e2}] \neq c$ , w/ or w/o latent confounders.** The conditional distribution of  $Y^e|X_{\text{pa}(Y)}^e = x_{\text{pa}(Y)}$  is the conditional distribution of  $b_{\text{pa}(Y)}^{\star\top}x_{\text{pa}(Y)} + \varepsilon_y + \delta_y^e$  given  $X_{\text{pa}(Y)}^e = x_{\text{pa}(Y)}$  which apparently varies for different  $e$  regardless of the existence of the latent confounders. The conditional expectation  $\mathbb{E}[Y^e|X_{\text{pa}(Y)}^e] = b_{\text{pa}(Y)}^{\star\top}X_{\text{pa}(Y)}^e + \mathbb{E}[\varepsilon_y|X_{\text{pa}(Y)}^e] + \mathbb{E}[\delta_y^e]$  depends on  $e$ . The risk is now given by  $\mathbb{E}[\varepsilon_y^2] + \mathbb{E}[\delta_y^{e2}]$  which also depends on  $e$ . In contrast, the gradient becomes

$$C_x^{\star}(\mathbb{E}[\varepsilon_x\varepsilon_y] + \mathbb{E}[\Delta_x^e\delta_y^e]) + C_{xy}^{\star}(\mathbb{E}[\varepsilon_y^2] + \mathbb{E}[\delta_y^{e2}]).$$

Under the conditions that  $\mathbb{E}[\Delta_x^e\delta_y^e] \equiv c$  and  $C_{xy}^{\star} = 0$ , we have the full gradient invariance. Our gradient invariance, in this case, is equivalent to say

$$C_x^{\star} \sum_{e \in \mathcal{E}} \omega^e \mathbb{E}[\Delta_x^e \delta_y^e] + C_{xy}^{\star} \sum_{e \in \mathcal{E}} \omega^e \mathbb{E}[\delta_y^{e2}] = C_x^{\star} \mathbb{E}[\Delta_x^0 \delta_y^0] + C_{xy}^{\star} \mathbb{E}[\delta_y^{02}].$$

So it is adequate to assume  $\sum_{e \in \mathcal{E}} \omega^e \mathbb{E}[\Delta_x^e \delta_y^e] = \mathbb{E}[\Delta_x^0 \delta_y^0]$  and  $\sum_{e \in \mathcal{E}} \omega^e \mathbb{E}[\delta_y^{e2}] = \mathbb{E}[\delta_y^{02}]$  or  $C_{xy} = 0$ , for the causal parameter to satisfy our gradient invariance.  $\square$

## D Causal identification via DRIG

We investigate causal identifiability with the DRIG estimator (5) when  $\gamma \rightarrow \infty$ .

In Theorem 3, the subspace inclusion condition  $C_x^{\star}L_{xy}^{\star} + L_y^{\star}C_{xy}^{\star} \subseteq \text{column-space}([C^{\star}L^{\star}C^{\star\top}]_{1:p,1:p})$  is trivially satisfied if  $\text{rank}([C^{\star}L^{\star}C^{\star\top}]_{1:p,1:p}) = p$  or if  $C_x^{\star}L_{xy}^{\star} + L_y^{\star}C_{xy}^{\star} = 0$ . In Section D.1, we show that if there are sufficient interventions on the covariates  $X$ , then  $\text{rank}([C^{\star}L^{\star}C^{\star\top}]_{1:p,1:p}) = p$  and the set of models  $\mathcal{I}$  with invariant gradients is a singleton. In this setting, according to (11), the optimal solution of DRIG when  $\gamma \rightarrow \infty$  is a biased version of the causal parameter  $b^{\star}$ , where the bias is given by  $([C^{\star}L^{\star}C^{\star\top}]_{1:p,1:p})^{-1}(C_x^{\star}L_{xy}^{\star} + L_y^{\star}C_{xy}^{\star})$ . We analyze in Section D.1 the magnitude of this bias under various structural assumptions. In Section D.2, we consider the setting where there are insufficient interventions on the covariates  $X$  but impose structural assumptions so that  $C_x^{\star}L_{xy}^{\star} + L_y^{\star}C_{xy}^{\star} = 0$ ; here, the set of models  $\mathcal{I}$  with invariant gradients typically consists of multiple elements, and we identify the most predictive model according to (10).

## D.1 Sufficient interventions on the covariates $X$

Recalling that the matrix  $L_x^*$  encodes interventions on the covariates we impose conditions on  $L_x^*$ . In particular, in Section D.1.1, we assume no interventions on the response or latent variables, leading to a identifiable case for the causal parameter; in Section D.1.2, we allow for interventions on the latent variable and the response variable and study the approximate causal identifiability by quantifying the bias with respect to the causal parameter.

### D.1.1 No interventions on the response variable $Y$ or latent variables $H$

By making structural assumptions on the underlying graphical model, the result of Theorem 3 can be specialized to attain full causal identifiability, namely the DRIG estimator recovering the causal parameter.

**Corollary 8** (causally identifiable and robust). *Suppose that  $\delta_{p+1}^e \equiv 0$  for every  $e \in \mathcal{E}$  and  $L_x^* \succ 0$ . Then, we have that*

$$b_\infty^{\text{opt}} = b^* \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{\gamma \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{L}_\gamma(b_\infty^{\text{opt}}) = E[\varepsilon_y^2],$$

where  $\varepsilon_y := \varepsilon_{p+1}$  represents the component of the noise  $\varepsilon$  corresponding to  $Y$ .

See Supplementary F.2 for the proof. Corollary 8 states that under some assumptions, the causal parameter  $b^*$  can be identified by the DRIG estimator with  $\gamma \rightarrow \infty$ . The assumption  $\delta_{p+1}^e \equiv 0$  requires that there are no interventions on the response  $Y$  or any latent variables  $H$ , that is  $E$  does not point to  $H$  or  $Y$  in the graphical model 3(b). The assumption  $L_x^* \succ 0$  ensures that there are interventions on all the covariates  $X$ , that is  $E$  points to every covariate in  $X$ . Under these conditions, the invertibility assumption in Theorem 3 is satisfied, and the matrices  $L_{xy}^*$  and  $L_y^*$  are both equal to zero. We note that a similar result as Corollary 8 was also established in Rothenhäusler et al. (2019) without touching upon the objective that quantifies the robustness, although Rothenhäusler et al. (2019) only considers the specialized settings discussed above, and does not provide guarantees on approximate identifiability under more general settings (as we do in subsequent sections).

The assumption that the interventions do not directly affect the response variable or the latent variables is common for identifiability in the causal inference literature. Similarly, the assumption that the covariates all receive an intervention is also prevalent, although the manifestation of this assumption is different in our setting than in instrumental variable regression or in anchor regression. To take a closer look at the latter condition, namely  $L_x^* \succ 0$ , note that  $L_x^* = \sum_{e \in \mathcal{E}} \omega^e (S^e - S^0 + \mu^e \mu^{e\top})_{1:p,1:p}$  where as defined in Section 3.1,  $S^e := \text{Cov}(\delta^e)$  and  $\mu^e := \mathbb{E}[\delta^e]$  with  $\mu^0 = 0$ . Thus the condition that  $L_x^*$  is positive definite can be satisfied with data from two environments (a reference environment and an additional environment). In particular, as long as  $(S^e + \mu^e \mu^{e\top})_{1:p,1:p} \succ S_{1:p,1:p}^0$  for the non-reference environment  $e$ , we have that  $L_x^* \succ 0$ , and can guarantee identifiability. In contrast, instrumental variable regression or anchor regression on data from SCM (3) can only guarantee identifiability if  $\sum_{e \in \mathcal{E}} \omega^e (\mu^e \mu^{e\top})_{1:p,1:p} \succ 0$ . In other words, these methods require at least  $p$  environments to recover the causal parameter, which is generally far larger than the number of environments required by DRIG. Conceptually, the improvement in identifiability offered by DRIG comes from the fact that it exploits both mean and variance shifts, whereas the other two methods only exploit mean shifts. A similar attribute of DRIG led to substantial improvement in using DRIG for obtaining robust predictions over other methods (see Section 3.1).

Besides identifying the causal parameter, the optimal objective function, which is the worst-case risk according to Theorem 2, is finite and depends on the variance of the exogenous noise associated with  $Y$ . Recall that the causal parameter is robust against arbitrary interventions on  $X$ , namely the perturbation class  $\mathcal{C}_{\text{causal}}$ . Thus, the prediction model  $b^*$  is guaranteed to have a bounded mean squared error under arbitrarily strong interventions on  $X$ , which is appealing in some applications.

**Independent interventions on the response variable** Previously, we assumed that there are no interventions on  $Y$ , so that  $L_y^* > 0$ . We next relax this condition, and allow independent interventions on  $Y$ . Formally, we assume that  $\mathbb{E}[\delta_x^e \delta_y^e] = 0$  for every  $e \in \mathcal{E}$ ; this assumption will be satisfied if there are no interventions on the latent variables  $H$ , and if the interventions on  $X$  and  $Y$  are independent. As with Corollary 8, we assume that there are interventions on all the covariates  $X$  (i.e.,  $L_x \succ 0$ ). Under these



assumptions, we have  $L_{xy}^* = 0$ , and the result of Theorem 3 can be specialized to attain (approximate) causal identifiability even when  $Y$  is intervened on.

**Corollary 9** (independent interventions on  $Y$ ). *Suppose that  $\mathbb{E}[\delta_x^e \delta_y^e] = 0$  for every  $e \in \mathcal{E}$ , and that  $L_x^* \succ 0$  and  $L_y^* > 0$ . Then,*

$$\|b_\infty^{\text{opt}} - b^*\|_\infty \leq \frac{\|C_{xy}^*\|_\infty}{\min_{\|u\|_\infty=1} \|(C_x^* L_x^* C_x^{*\top} / L_y^* + C_{xy}^* C_{xy}^{*\top})u\|_\infty}. \quad (15)$$

Further, assuming that  $Y$  is not an ancestor of any covariate  $X$ , then we have

$$b_\infty^{\text{opt}} = b^* \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{\gamma \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{L}_\gamma(b_\infty^{\text{opt}}) \rightarrow \infty.$$

See Supplementary F.3 for the proof. Corollary 9 states that under the setting where the interventions on  $Y$  are independent of those on  $X$  and when all covariates are intervened on, the DRIG estimator with  $\gamma \rightarrow \infty$  approximates the causal parameter at the resolution in (15). Notice that the approximation becomes tighter the smaller  $L_y^*$  or equivalently the weaker the interventions on  $Y$ . Corollary 9 further states that if the response  $Y$  is a descendant of all the covariates, then we have full identifiability, regardless of the intervention strength on the response variable. However, in contrast to Corollary 8, now the objective function evaluated at the optimum is approaching infinity as  $\gamma \rightarrow \infty$ . In other words, even though DRIG can identify the causal parameter when there are interventions on  $Y$ , it does not protect against arbitrarily strong interventions on both  $X$  and  $Y$ . Specifically, all linear prediction models, which includes the causal parameter, would attain an infinite worst-case error.

Nevertheless, the following proposition shows that the causal parameter is robust against another perturbation class which consists of arbitrarily strong interventions on  $X$  but bounded interventions on  $Y$ . This is a slight generalization of the robustness result of the causal parameter discussed in Section 3.1. See Supplementary F.4 for the proof.

**Proposition 10.** *Suppose that the test data is generated according to the SCM (4). Under the assumptions in Corollary 9, for any  $c \geq 0$ , we have*

$$b^* = \underset{b}{\operatorname{argmin}} \sup_{v \in \mathbb{R}^{p+1}: \mathbb{E}[v_y^2] \leq c} \mathbb{E}[(Y - b^\top X)^2],$$

where  $v_y$  is the component of  $v$  corresponding to  $Y$ .

### D.1.2 Interventions on the latent variables with dense latent effects

When there are interventions on the latent variables or on the response variable that is the parent of some covariates, the assumptions in Section D.1 are not satisfied, and thus identifiability cannot be guaranteed. Nonetheless, we will demonstrate in this section that under some assumptions on the strength of perturbations on the covariates, and structural assumptions on the latent variables, we can guarantee that the DRIG estimator with  $\gamma \rightarrow \infty$  can approximately identify the causal parameter  $b^*$ . To formally state assumptions needed for approximate identifiability, we model the effects of those latent variables that vary explicitly (Taeb et al., 2021):

$$\begin{pmatrix} X^e \\ Y^e \end{pmatrix} = B^* \begin{pmatrix} X^e \\ Y^e \end{pmatrix} + \Gamma^* H^e + \varepsilon + \delta^e \quad ; \quad H^e = H + \eta^e,$$

where  $H \in \mathbb{R}^h$  represents the unperturbed latent variables and  $\eta^e$  represents interventions on these latent variables. The matrix  $\Gamma^* \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times h}$  encodes the effect of the latent variables on the observed variables. As the latent effects and their perturbations are fully captured by the term  $\Gamma^* H^e$ , the quantity  $\delta^e$  represents the perturbations on only the observed variables, and is independent of  $H^e$ . Finally,  $\varepsilon$  is an independent noise term that is independent of both  $\delta^e$  and  $H^e$ . For simplicity, we assume that  $e = 0$  is an observational setting with  $\delta^0 \equiv 0$  and  $\eta^0 \equiv 0$ .

Before describing the assumptions needed for our theoretical guarantees, we present some notations. Specifically, we denote  $\sigma_{\max}(\cdot)$  and  $\sigma_{\min}(\cdot)$  as the maximum and minimum singular value of an input matrix.

**Assumption 1.** *Our analysis is based on the setting where the number of covariates  $p$  is tending to infinity, and makes the following assumptions:*

A1 *The sub-graph among the observed variables is a DAG.*

A2 *The latent variables  $H$  are ancestors of the observed variables.*

A3 *The number of latent variables  $h$  is much smaller than the number of observed variables:  $h = o(p)$ .*

A4 *The latent effects are dense, that is:  $\max_{i \in [p]} \|\mathcal{P}_{\text{col-space}(\Gamma^*)} e_i\|_2^2 = \mathcal{O}(h/p)$ .*

A5 *The latent effects are bounded, i.e.,  $\|\Gamma^*\|_2^2 = \mathcal{O}(h)$ .*

A6 *The interventions on the covariates  $X$  are sufficiently strong:  $\sigma_{\min}(L_x^*) > \frac{4\|L_{xy}^*\|_2 \sigma_{\max}(I-B^*)^2}{\sigma_{\min}(I-B^*)}$ .*

A7 *The causal coefficients are not too large, i.e.,  $d \max_{i,j} |B_{ij}^*| < 1/2$ , where  $d$  is the largest number of incoming and outgoing edges among the nodes in the subgraph among observed variables.*

Assumption A1 requires that there are no cycles in the graph among the observed variables. Assumption A2 assumes that the latent variables  $H$  act exogenously on the observed variables. Assumption A3 requires that the number of latent variables is much smaller than number of observed variables. Assumption A4 can be interpreted as the effects of the latent variables spread across all the observed variables. The quantity  $\max_{i \in [p]} \|\mathcal{P}_{\text{col-space}(\Gamma^*)} e_i\|_2$  in this condition is an incoherence parameter (Chandrasekaran et al., 2011) measuring the ‘‘diffuseness’’ of the latent effects, where  $\mathcal{P}_{\text{col-space}(\Gamma^*)}$  is the projection onto the column-space of  $\Gamma^*$  and  $e_i$  is a standard coordinate basis. The smaller the value of  $\max_{i \in [p]} \|\mathcal{P}_{\text{col-space}(\Gamma^*)} e_i\|_2$ , the less concentrated the effect of the latent variables on any single observed variable. As  $\max_{i \in [p]} \|\mathcal{P}_T(e_i)\|_2 \in [\sqrt{\dim(T)/p}, 1]$  for any subspace  $T \subseteq \mathbb{R}^p$ , Assumption A4 ensures that the latent effects are sufficiently diffuse. Assumption A5 requires that the latent effects are bounded; for example entries of  $\Gamma^*$  being distributed as  $\mathcal{N}(0, 1/p)$  satisfies this condition. Assumption A6 requires sufficiently strong interventions on the covariates  $X$ . Finally, Assumption A7 ensures that the strength of the causal effects among observed variables is not too large.

**Proposition 11.** *(approximate identifiability with interventions on the latent variables) Suppose that Assumptions A2-A7 are satisfied. As the number of covariates  $p$  tends to infinity, we have:*

$$\|b_{\infty}^{\text{opt}} - b^*\|_{\infty} = \mathcal{O} \left( \frac{h^{5/2} \max_e \|\text{Cov}(\eta^e)\|_{\infty} + \max_e \mathbb{E}[(\delta_y^e)^2]}{\sigma_{\min}(L_x^*)} \right).$$

We prove Proposition 11 in Supplementary F.5. This result states that while identifiability may not be possible in the setting where there are interventions on the latent variables and on the response variable  $Y$ , the DRIG estimator with  $\gamma \rightarrow \infty$  can approximate the causal parameter  $b^*$  up to some resolution. Specifically, note that  $\text{Cov}(\eta^e)$  is the covariance matrix of the latent perturbations  $\eta^e$ ,  $\mathbb{E}[(\delta_y^e)^2]$  encodes the variance of perturbations on the response variable  $Y$ , and  $L_x^*$  encodes perturbation strengths on the covariates  $X$ . Thus, Proposition 11 claims that the stronger the perturbations on the covariates  $X$  (i.e., larger  $\sigma_{\min}(L_x^*)$ ) relative to perturbations on the latent variables and on the response variable, the better the DRIG estimate approximates the causal parameter  $b^*$ .

## D.2 Insufficient interventions on $X$

So far, we have assumed that there are interventions on all the covariates  $X$ , so that the set of models  $\mathcal{I}$  in Theorem 3 that satisfy the invariant gradient condition is a singleton. We next relax this condition, resulting in multiple models that exhibits invariant gradients.

For simplicity, throughout the following discussion, we assume that there are no interventions on the response variable  $Y$  or on the latent variables  $H$  so that  $L_{xy}^* = 0$  and  $L_y^* = 0$ , and only focus on insufficient interventions on  $X$ . We denote  $\varepsilon_x$  and  $\varepsilon_y$  as the components of  $\varepsilon$  corresponding to the covariates and the response variable, respectively.

**Proposition 12.** *Suppose  $L_{xy}^* = 0$  and  $L_y^* = 0$ . Then,  $\mathcal{I} = \{b^* + b' : \Delta_x b' = 0\}$  where  $\Delta_x := \sum_{e \in \mathcal{E}} \omega^e (\mathbb{E}[X^e X^{e\top}] - \mathbb{E}[X^0 X^{0\top}])$ . Furthermore, we have*

$$b_\infty^{\text{opt}} = b^* + D\mathbb{E}[X^0 \varepsilon_y], \quad (16)$$

where  $D := \lim_{\gamma \rightarrow \infty} (\mathbb{E}[X^0 X^{0\top}] + \gamma \Delta_x)^{-1}$ . Finally,

$$\|b_\infty^{\text{opt}} - b^*\|_\infty \leq \|D\|_\infty (\|C_x^* \mathbb{E}[\varepsilon_x \varepsilon_y]\|_\infty + \|C_{xy}^* \mathbb{E}[\varepsilon_y^2]\|_\infty). \quad (17)$$

We prove Proposition 12 in Supplementary F.6. It first states that when there are not sufficient interventions on  $X$  so that  $\Delta_x$  is not positive definite, the set  $\mathcal{I}$  is not a singleton but an equivalence class. Then by (10), DRIG with  $\gamma \rightarrow \infty$  is searching for the best predictive solution among this equivalence class. Next, formula (16) and bound (17) quantify the closeness of the causal parameter to the DRIG estimator  $b_\gamma^{\text{opt}}$  when  $\gamma \rightarrow \infty$ . The bias in estimating the causal parameter stems from two sources. First, under insufficient interventions on the covariates, the matrix  $\Delta_x$  is not positive definite so  $D \neq 0$ . Second, when there are latent confounders or when some covariates are descendants of  $Y$ , we have  $\mathbb{E}[\varepsilon_x \varepsilon_y] \neq 0$  or  $C_{xy}^* \neq 0$ , respectively. Nevertheless, we will show next that under some structural assumptions, DRIG can achieve partial identifiability, and produces a smaller bias than both pooled and observational OLS estimators.

For simplicity, we consider a specialized setting where the covariates are jointly independent and so are the interventions on them, that is,  $\mathbb{E}[X^0 X^{0\top}]$  and  $\Delta_x$  are both diagonal matrices. Then, it is straightforward to show that the bias  $\|b_\gamma^{\text{opt}} - b^*\|_\infty$  is monotonically decreasing with respect to  $\gamma \geq 0$ . Further assume there exists  $i \in \{1, \dots, p\}$  such that the  $i$ th diagonal entry of  $\Delta_x$  and the  $i$ th component of  $\mathbb{E}[X^0 \varepsilon_y]$  are nonzero, i.e., when the intervention happens to a covariate that is confounded with  $Y$ . Then, the bias  $\|b_\gamma^{\text{opt}} - b^*\|_\infty$  is strictly decreasing with respect to  $\gamma \geq 0$ , which implies that DRIG with  $\gamma > 1$  always has a smaller bias than observational and pooled OLS. Moreover, for any coordinate  $i$  such that the  $i$ th diagonal entry of  $\Delta_x$  is nonzero or the  $i$ th component of  $\mathbb{E}[X^0 \varepsilon_y]$  is zero, we have  $\lim_{\gamma \rightarrow \infty} b_{\gamma,i}^{\text{opt}} = b_i^*$ . In other words, DRIG with  $\gamma \rightarrow \infty$  identifies the causal parameter associated with the  $i$ -th covariate (i) if there is no latent confounder between  $X_i$  and  $Y$ , or (ii) if there is an intervention on this covariate. Thus, even under insufficient interventions on  $X$ , DRIG can still leverage the limited amount of interventions to partially eliminate the bias caused by the latent confounding effects and partially identify the causal effects.

## E Proofs

### E.1 Connections to causal Dantzig

When  $|\mathcal{E}| = 2$ , as  $\gamma \rightarrow \infty$ , DRIG formulation (6) becomes

$$\min_b \mathbb{E}[\ell(X^1, Y^1; b)] - \mathbb{E}[\ell(X^0, Y^0; b)]$$

Setting the gradient of the above objective function to 0 yields

$$\left[ \mathbb{E}X^1 X^{1\top} - \mathbb{E}X^0 X^{0\top} \right] b = \mathbb{E}X^1 Y^1 - \mathbb{E}X^0 Y^0$$

which is the population version of the causal Dantzig estimator.

### E.2 Proof of Proposition 1

*Proof of Proposition 1.* Denote by  $(X^e, Y^e)$  the random variables follow the conditional distribution of  $(X, Y)$  given  $A = a^e$ . Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_{\text{anchor}, \gamma}(b) &= \mathbb{E}[(I - P_A)(Y - b^\top X)^2] + \gamma \mathbb{E}[(P_A(Y - b^\top X))^2] \\ &= \sum_{e \in \mathcal{E}} \omega^e \mathbb{E}[(Y^e - b^\top X^e - \mathbb{E}(Y^e - b^\top X^e))^2] + \gamma \sum_{e \in \mathcal{E}} \omega^e [\mathbb{E}(Y^e - b^\top X^e)]^2 \\ &= \sum_{e \in \mathcal{E}} \omega^e \mathbb{E}[(Y^e - b^\top X^e)^2] + (\gamma - 1) \sum_{e \in \mathcal{E}} \omega^e [\mathbb{E}(Y^e - b^\top X^e)]^2. \end{aligned}$$

Rewrite the DRIG loss function as

$$\mathcal{L}_\gamma(b) = \sum_{e \in \mathcal{E}} \omega^e \mathbb{E}[(Y^e - b^\top X^e)^2] + (\gamma - 1) \sum_{e \in \mathcal{E}} \omega^e (\mathbb{E}[(Y^e - b^\top X^e)^2] - \mathbb{E}[(Y^0 - b^\top X^0)^2]).$$

Note that the difference between the two loss functions lies in the second terms.

For any regression coefficient  $b$ , define the vector  $w$  as

$$w := [(I - B^*)_{p+1,:}^{-1} - b^\top (I - B^*)_{1:p,:}^{-1}]^\top. \quad (18)$$

We note from the SCM (3) that

$$\begin{aligned} Y^e - b^\top X^e &= w^\top (\varepsilon + \delta^e), \\ \mathbb{E}(Y^e - b^\top X^e) &= w^\top \mu^e, \end{aligned}$$

with  $\mu^e = M a^e = \delta^e$  in this case with deterministic perturbations. Then we have

$$[\mathbb{E}(Y^e - b^\top X^e)]^2 = w^\top \mu^e \mu^{e\top} w$$

and

$$\mathbb{E}[(Y^e - b^\top X^e)^2] - \mathbb{E}[(Y^0 - b^\top X^0)^2] = w^\top (\mathbb{E}[\delta^e \delta^{e\top}] - \mathbb{E}[\delta^0 \delta^{0\top}]) w = w^\top \mu^e \mu^{e\top} w.$$

Thus, the two loss functions are equal.  $\square$

### E.3 Proof of Theorem 2

*Proof.* For any regression coefficient  $b$ , define the vector  $w$  as in (18). Note that  $Y^v - b^\top X^v = w^\top (\varepsilon + v)$ . Then due to  $\varepsilon$  and  $v$  being uncorrelated, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{v \in \mathcal{C}_{\text{DRIG}}^\gamma} \mathbb{E}[(Y^v - b^\top X^v)^2] &= w^\top \mathbb{E}[\varepsilon \varepsilon^\top] w + \sup_{v \in \mathcal{C}_{\text{DRIG}}^\gamma} w^\top \mathbb{E}[v v^\top] w \\ &= w^\top \mathbb{E}[\varepsilon \varepsilon^\top] w + w^\top S^0 w + \gamma w^\top \left[ \sum_{e \in \mathcal{E}} \omega^e (S^e - S^0 + \mu^e \mu^{e\top}) \right] w \\ &= \mathbb{E}[(Y^0 - b^\top X^0)^2] + \gamma w^\top \left[ \sum_{e \in \mathcal{E}} \omega^e (S^e - S^0 + \mu^e \mu^{e\top}) \right] w. \end{aligned}$$

It remains to show that:

$$\gamma \sum_{e \in \mathcal{E}} \omega^e (\mathbb{E}[(Y^e - b^\top X^e)^2] - \mathbb{E}[(Y^0 - b^\top X^0)^2]) = \gamma w^\top \left[ \sum_{e \in \mathcal{E}} \omega^e (S^e - S^0 + \mu^e \mu^{e\top}) \right] w. \quad (19)$$

Note that for any  $e = 1, 2, \dots, m$

$$\mathbb{E}[(Y^e - b^\top X^e)^2] = \mathbb{E}[w^\top \varepsilon \varepsilon^\top w] + \mathbb{E}[w^\top \delta^e \delta^{e\top} w]$$

and thus,  $\mathbb{E}[(Y^e - b^\top X^e)^2] - \mathbb{E}[(Y^0 - b^\top X^0)^2] = \mathbb{E}[w^\top \delta^e \delta^{e\top} w] = w^\top (S^e - S^0 + \mu^e \mu^{e\top}) w$ . This allows us to conclude (19).  $\square$

### E.4 Proof of the robustness results for anchor regression

*Proof for anchor regression.* For any regression coefficient  $b$ , define the vector  $w$  as in (18). We note from the SCM (3) that

$$\begin{aligned} Y^e - b^\top X^e &= w^\top (\varepsilon + \delta^e), \\ \mathbb{E}(Y^e - b^\top X^e) &= w^\top \mu^e. \end{aligned}$$

Denote by  $(X^e, Y^e)$  the random variables follow the conditional distribution of  $(X, Y)$  given  $A = a^e$ . Then we have

$$\mathbb{E}[(P_A(Y - b^\top X))^2] = \sum_{e \in \mathcal{E}} \omega^e [\mathbb{E}(Y^e - b^\top X^e)]^2 = w^\top \left[ \sum_{e \in \mathcal{E}} \omega^e \mu^e \mu^{e\top} \right] w$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[(I - P_A)(Y - b^\top X)^2] &= \mathbb{E}[(Y - b^\top X - \mathbb{E}(Y - b^\top X|A))^2] \\ &= \sum_{e \in \mathcal{E}} \omega^e \mathbb{E}[(Y^e - b^\top X^e - \mathbb{E}(Y^e - b^\top X^e))]^2 \\ &= \frac{1}{m+1} \sum_{e=0}^m \mathbb{E}[(Y^e - \mathbb{E}Y^e - b^\top(X^e - \mathbb{E}X^e))^2] \\ &= \sum_{e \in \mathcal{E}} \omega^e \mathbb{E}[(w^\top(\varepsilon + \delta^e - \mu^e))^2] \\ &= w^\top \mathbb{E}[\varepsilon \varepsilon^\top] w + w^\top \left[ \sum_{e \in \mathcal{E}} \omega^e \mathbb{E}(\delta^e - \mu^e)(\delta^e - \mu^e)^\top \right] w, \end{aligned}$$

where the second term on the RHS is equal to 0 when  $S^e = S^0$  for all  $e$ . Thus,

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{anchor}, \gamma}(b) = w^\top \mathbb{E}[\varepsilon \varepsilon^\top] w + w^\top \left[ \sum_{e \in \mathcal{E}} \omega^e \mathbb{E}(\delta^e - \mu^e)(\delta^e - \mu^e)^\top \right] w + \gamma w^\top \left[ \sum_{e \in \mathcal{E}} \omega^e \mu^e \mu^{e\top} \right] w.$$

Then by analyzing the worst-case risk similarly to the proof of Theorem 2, we have

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{anchor}, \gamma}(b) = \sup_{v \in \mathcal{C}_{\text{anchor}}^\gamma} \mathbb{E}[(Y^v - b^\top X^v)^2].$$

□

## E.5 Proof of the robustness results for group DRO

The objective function of group DRO is

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{e \in \mathcal{E}} \mathbb{E}[(Y^e - b^\top X^e)^2] &= \max_{e \in \mathcal{E}} w^\top (\mathbb{E}[\varepsilon \varepsilon^\top] + \mathbb{E}[\delta^e \delta^{e\top}]) w \\ &= w^\top \mathbb{E}[\varepsilon \varepsilon^\top] w + w^\top \mathbb{E}[\delta^m \delta^{m\top}] w \\ &= \sup_{v \in \mathcal{C}_{\text{gDRO}}} \mathbb{E}[(Y^v - b^\top X^v)^2], \end{aligned}$$

which concludes the proof.

## E.6 Proof of the robustness results for the causal parameter

*Proof for the causal parameter.* From the proof of Theorem 2, we have

$$\sup_{v \in \mathcal{C}_{\text{DRIG}}^\gamma} \mathbb{E}[(Y^v - b^\top X^v)^2] = E[(Y^0 - b^\top X^0)^2] + \sup_{v \in \mathcal{C}_{\text{DRIG}}^\gamma} w^\top \mathbb{E}[v v^\top] w.$$

When  $v_{p+1} = 0$ , the second term becomes

$$\sup_{v_x \in \mathbb{R}^p} w_x^\top \mathbb{E}[v_x v_x^\top] w_x = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } w_x = 0 \\ \infty & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

where  $v_x$  and  $w_x$  denote the first  $p$  components of  $v$  and  $w$ , respectively. Note that  $w_x = 0$  if and only if  $b = b^*$ . Thus

$$\operatorname{argmin}_b \sup_{v \in \mathcal{C}_{\text{causal}}} \mathbb{E}[(Y^v - b^\top X^v)^2] = b^*.$$

□

## E.7 Proof of Theorem 3

*Proof of Theorem 3.* Recall our block notations  $B^* = \begin{pmatrix} B_x^* & b^* \\ B_{yx}^* & 0 \end{pmatrix}$  where  $b^* = b^*$ , and  $C^* = \begin{pmatrix} C_x^* & C_{xy}^* \\ C_{yx}^* & C_y^* \end{pmatrix}$ . Denote by  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{reg}}(b)$  the regularization term in the objective function (6). According to model (3), we have

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{reg}}(b) = w^\top L^* w,$$

where  $w$  depends on  $b$ , as defined in (18).

Let  $\alpha = 1 - B_{xy}^{*\top}(I_p - B_x^*)^{-1}B_{yx}^*$ . We have

$$\begin{aligned} C_x^* &= (I_p - B_x^* - B_{yx}^* b^{*\top})^{-1} \\ C_{xy}^* &= (I_p - B_x^*)^{-1} B_{yx}^* / \alpha \\ C_{yx}^* &= C_x^{*\top} b^* \\ C_y^* &= 1/\alpha \end{aligned}$$

Then we have

$$w = \begin{pmatrix} C_x^{*\top}(b^* - b) \\ 1/\alpha - C_{xy}^{*\top} b \end{pmatrix} =: \begin{pmatrix} w_x \\ w_y \end{pmatrix},$$

where  $w_y \in \mathbb{R}$  is the last component of  $w$ . Then

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{reg}}(b) = w_x^\top L_x^* w_x + 2w_x^\top L_{xy}^* w_y + w_y^2 L_y^*.$$

Taking the gradient of  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{reg}}(b)$  with respect to  $b$  and setting it to zero, we have

$$\begin{aligned} C_x^* L_{xy}^* + L_y^* C_{xy}^* &= (C_x^* L_x^* C_x^{*\top} + C_x^* L_{xy}^* C_{xy}^{*\top} + C_{xy}^* L_{xy}^* C_x^{*\top} + L_y^* C_{xy}^* C_{xy}^{*\top})(b_\infty^{\text{opt}} - b^*) \\ &= [C^* L^* C^{*\top}]_{1:p, 1:p}(b_\infty^{\text{opt}} - b^*) \end{aligned}$$

which leads to the desired result.  $\square$

## E.8 Proof of Theorem 4

*Proof of Theorem 4.* We have

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{v \in \mathcal{C}_\Gamma^a} \mathbb{E}_v[Y - b^\top X]^2 &= w^\top \mathbb{E} \varepsilon \varepsilon^\top w + \sup_{v \in \mathcal{C}_\Gamma^a} (-b^\top \quad 1) (I - B)^{-1} \mathbb{E}[v v^\top] (I - B)^{-\top} \begin{pmatrix} -b \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} \\ &= w^\top \mathbb{E} \varepsilon \varepsilon^\top w + w^\top \mathbb{E}[\delta^0 \delta^{0\top}] w \\ &\quad + (-b^\top \quad 1) \Gamma (I - B)^{-1} \sum_{e \in \mathcal{E}} \omega^e (\mathbb{E}[\delta^e \delta^{e\top}] - \mathbb{E}[\delta^0 \delta^{0\top}]) (I - B)^{-\top} \Gamma \begin{pmatrix} -b \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} \\ &= w^\top \mathbb{E} \varepsilon \varepsilon^\top w + w^\top \mathbb{E}[\delta^0 \delta^{0\top}] w + \tilde{w}^\top \sum_{e \in \mathcal{E}} \omega^e (\mathbb{E}[\delta^e \delta^{e\top}] - \mathbb{E}[\delta^0 \delta^{0\top}]) \tilde{w}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\tilde{w} = (I - B)^{-\top} \Gamma \begin{pmatrix} -b \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}$ .

Note that

$$\gamma_y Y^e - b^\top \Gamma_x X^e = (-b^\top \quad 1) \Gamma (I - B)^{-1} (\varepsilon + \delta^e) = \tilde{w}^\top (\varepsilon + \delta^e).$$

Then for all  $e \in \mathcal{E}$ ,

$$\mathbb{E}(\gamma_y Y^e - b^\top \Gamma_x X^e)^2 = \tilde{w}^\top (\mathbb{E} \varepsilon \varepsilon^\top + \mathbb{E} \delta^e \delta^{e\top}) \tilde{w}$$

and thus

$$\mathbb{E}(\gamma_y Y^e - b^\top \Gamma_x X^e)^2 - \mathbb{E}(\gamma_y Y^0 - b^\top \Gamma_x X^0)^2 = \tilde{w}^\top (\mathbb{E}[\delta^e \delta^{e\top}] - \mathbb{E}[\delta^0 \delta^{0\top}]) \tilde{w}$$

Also we have  $\mathbb{E}(Y^0 - b^\top X^0)^2 = w^\top (\mathbb{E}[\varepsilon \varepsilon^\top] + \mathbb{E}[\delta^0 \delta^{0\top}]) w$  as above. Thereby, the desired result follows.  $\square$

## E.9 Deriving $\Gamma^*$

**Lemma 13.** *Let  $A$  and  $B$  be  $p \times p$  positive definite matrices. The solution to the equation  $XBX = A$  is uniquely given by  $X = B^{-1/2}(B^{1/2}AB^{1/2})^{1/2}B^{-1/2}$ .*

*Proof.* The equation  $XBX = A$  is equivalent to  $(XB)^2 = AB = B^{-1/2}ZB^{1/2}$  with  $Z = B^{1/2}AB^{1/2}$ . Then we have  $XB = B^{-1/2}Z^{1/2}B^{1/2}$ , leading to the desired result.  $\square$

*Proof of deriving  $\Gamma^*$ .* By Lemma 13, we know the solution to  $\mathbb{E}X^0X^{0\top} + \Gamma_x\Delta_x\Gamma_x = \Sigma_x^v$  is uniquely given by

$$\Gamma_x^* := \Delta_x^{-1/2} \left[ \Delta_x^{1/2} \left( \Sigma_x^v - \mathbb{E}X^0X^{0\top} \right) \Delta_x^{1/2} \right]^{1/2} \Delta_x^{-1/2}.$$

On the other hand,  $\gamma_y^*$  is defined as the solution to minimizing the test MSE of the DRIG-A solution  $b_{\Gamma}^{\text{opt}}$ . That is,

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_y^* &= \underset{\gamma_y}{\operatorname{argmin}} \mathbb{E} \left[ (Y^v - [\Sigma_x^{v-1}(\mathbb{E}X^0Y^0 + \gamma_y\Gamma_x^*\Delta_{xy})]^\top X^v)^2 \right] \\ &= \underset{\gamma_y}{\operatorname{argmin}} \left[ \gamma_y^2 \Delta_{xy}^\top \Gamma_x^* \Sigma_x^{v-1} \Gamma_x^* \Delta_{xy} + 2\gamma_y \Delta_{xy}^\top \Gamma_x^* \Sigma_x^{v-1} (\mathbb{E}X^0Y^0 - \mathbb{E}X^vY^v) \right] \\ &= \frac{((\Sigma_x^v)^{-1/2} \Gamma_x^* \Delta_{xy})^\top (\Sigma_x^v)^{-1/2} (\Sigma_{xy}^v - \mathbb{E}X^0Y^0)}{\|(\Sigma_x^v)^{-1/2} \Gamma_x^* \Delta_{xy}\|^2}, \end{aligned}$$

which concludes the proof.  $\square$

## E.10 Proof of Theorem 5

**Lemma 14.** *Given a unit vector  $\nu \in \mathbb{R}^p$  ( $p > 1$ ) and a  $p \times p$  positive definite real matrix  $K \succ 0$ , we have  $\operatorname{tr}(K) > \operatorname{tr}(\nu\nu^\top K\nu\nu^\top)$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $K = Q\Lambda Q^\top$  be the eigendecomposition of  $K$  where  $\Lambda$  is a diagonal matrix of eigenvalues  $\lambda_i > 0$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, p$  and  $Q$  is orthogonal. Let  $\tilde{\nu} = Q^\top \nu$ , so  $\|\tilde{\nu}\|^2 = 1$ . We have

$$\operatorname{tr}(\nu\nu^\top K\nu\nu^\top) = \nu^\top K\nu\nu^\top \nu = \nu^\top Q\Lambda Q^\top \nu = \tilde{\nu}^\top \Lambda \tilde{\nu} = \sum_{i=1}^p \lambda_i \tilde{\nu}_i^2$$

Note from  $\|\tilde{\nu}\|^2 = 1$  that  $\sum_{i=1}^p \lambda_i \tilde{\nu}_i^2 \leq \sum_{i=1}^p \lambda_i$ . Now, claim  $\sum_{i=1}^p \lambda_i \tilde{\nu}_i^2 < \sum_{i=1}^p \lambda_i$ . Otherwise, we must have for all  $i$  that  $\lambda_i \tilde{\nu}_i^2 = \lambda_i$  and then  $\tilde{\nu}_i^2 = 1$ . This means  $\|\tilde{\nu}\|^2 = p > 1$ . Contradiction.

Thus,

$$\operatorname{tr}(\nu\nu^\top K\nu\nu^\top) < \sum_{i=1}^p \lambda_i = \operatorname{tr}(K),$$

which concludes the proof.  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 5.* Let

$$\tilde{\gamma}_y = \frac{((\Sigma_x^v)^{-1/2} \Gamma_x^* \Delta_{xy})^\top (\Sigma_x^v)^{-1/2} (\hat{\Sigma}_{xy}^v - \mathbb{E}X^0Y^0)}{\|(\Sigma_x^v)^{-1/2} \Gamma_x^* \Delta_{xy}\|^2}$$

Let  $b_{\tilde{\Gamma}}^{\text{opt}}$  be the DRIG-A solution with  $\tilde{\Gamma} = \begin{pmatrix} \Gamma_x^* & 0 \\ 0 & \tilde{\gamma}_y \end{pmatrix}$  and  $\tilde{b}_{\text{tOLS}} = \Sigma_x^{v-1} \hat{\Sigma}_{xy}^v$  which are obtained based on the finite labeled sample and infinite unlabeled sample  $P_{\text{test}}^x$ . Note that

$$b_{\tilde{\Gamma}}^{\text{opt}} = (\Sigma_x^v)^{-1} [\mathbb{E}X^0Y^0 + \tilde{\gamma}_y \Gamma_x^* \Delta_{xy}] =: (\Sigma_x^v)^{-1} \hat{\Sigma}_{xy}^{(2)}.$$

For notational simplicity, below we omit the superscript  $v$  in  $\Sigma_x^v$ ,  $\Sigma_{xy}^v$ ,  $\hat{\Sigma}_x^v$ ,  $\hat{\Sigma}_{xy}^v$  without introducing ambiguity. The remainder of the proof proceeds in two steps.

Step I. We first compare the test MSEs of  $b_{\tilde{\Gamma}}^{\text{opt}}$  and  $\tilde{b}_{\text{tOLS}}$ , given by

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{L}_{\text{test}}(\tilde{b}_{\text{tOLS}}) &= \hat{\Sigma}_{xy}^{\top} \Sigma_x^{-1} \hat{\Sigma}_{xy} - 2 \Sigma_{xy} \Sigma_x^{-1} \hat{\Sigma}_{xy} + \mathbb{E}[Y^v]^2 \\ \mathcal{L}_{\text{test}}(b_{\tilde{\Gamma}}^{\text{opt}}) &= \hat{\Sigma}_{xy}^{(2)\top} \Sigma_x^{-1} \hat{\Sigma}_{xy}^{(2)} - 2 \Sigma_{xy} \Sigma_x^{-1} \hat{\Sigma}_{xy}^{(2)} + \mathbb{E}[Y^v]^2.\end{aligned}$$

The expected differences from the minimal test MSE are

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{L}_{\text{test}}(\tilde{b}_{\text{tOLS}})] - \min_b \mathcal{L}_{\text{test}}(b) &= \text{tr} \left[ \Sigma_x^{-1} \left( \mathbb{E} \hat{\Sigma}_{xy} \hat{\Sigma}_{xy}^{\top} - \Sigma_{xy} \Sigma_{xy}^{\top} \right) \right] - 2 \Sigma_{xy}^{\top} \Sigma_x^{-1} (\mathbb{E} \hat{\Sigma}_{xy} - \Sigma_{xy}) \\ &= \text{tr} \left[ \text{Cov} \left( \Sigma_x^{-1/2} \hat{\Sigma}_{xy} \right) \right]\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{L}_{\text{test}}(b_{\tilde{\Gamma}}^{\text{opt}})] - \min_b \mathcal{L}_{\text{test}}(b) &= \text{tr} \left[ \Sigma_x^{-1} \left( \mathbb{E} \hat{\Sigma}_{xy}^{(2)} \hat{\Sigma}_{xy}^{(2)\top} - \mathbb{E} \hat{\Sigma}_{xy}^{(2)} \mathbb{E} \hat{\Sigma}_{xy}^{(2)\top} \right) \right] + \text{tr} \left[ \Sigma_x^{-1} (\mathbb{E} \hat{\Sigma}_{xy}^{(2)} - \Sigma_{xy}) (\mathbb{E} \hat{\Sigma}_{xy}^{(2)} - \Sigma_{xy})^{\top} \right] \\ &= \text{tr} \left[ \text{Cov} \left( \Sigma_x^{-1/2} \hat{\Sigma}_{xy}^{(2)} \right) \right] + \text{tr} \left[ (\Sigma_x^{-1/2} \mathbb{E} \hat{\Sigma}_{xy}^{(2)} - \Sigma_x^{-1/2} \Sigma_{xy}) (\Sigma_x^{-1/2} \mathbb{E} \hat{\Sigma}_{xy}^{(2)} - \Sigma_x^{-1/2} \Sigma_{xy})^{\top} \right].\end{aligned}$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{L}_{\text{test}}(\tilde{b}_{\text{tOLS}})] - \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{L}_{\text{test}}(b_{\tilde{\Gamma}}^{\text{opt}})] &= \text{tr} \left[ \text{Cov} \left( \Sigma_x^{-1/2} \hat{\Sigma}_{xy} \right) - \text{Cov} \left( \Sigma_x^{-1/2} \hat{\Sigma}_{xy}^{(2)} \right) \right] - \text{tr} \left[ (\Sigma_x^{-1/2} \mathbb{E} \hat{\Sigma}_{xy}^{(2)} - \Sigma_x^{-1/2} \Sigma_{xy}) (\Sigma_x^{-1/2} \mathbb{E} \hat{\Sigma}_{xy}^{(2)} - \Sigma_x^{-1/2} \Sigma_{xy})^{\top} \right].\end{aligned}$$

Let  $\tilde{\Sigma} = \Sigma_x^{-1/2} \text{Cov}(X^v Y^v) \Sigma_x^{-1/2}$ . Then  $\text{Cov}(\Sigma_x^{-1/2} \hat{\Sigma}_{xy}) = \tilde{\Sigma}/n_l$ . By definition,

$$\Sigma_x^{-1/2} \hat{\Sigma}_{xy}^{(2)} = \Sigma_x^{-1/2} \Gamma_x \Delta_{xy} \frac{(\Sigma_x^{-1/2} \Gamma_x \Delta_{xy})^{\top}}{\|\Sigma_x^{-1/2} \Gamma_x \Delta_{xy}\|_2^2} \Sigma_x^{-1/2} (\hat{\Sigma}_{xy} - \mathbb{E} X^0 Y^0) + \Sigma_x^{-1/2} \mathbb{E} X^0 Y^0.$$

Let

$$\xi = \Sigma_x^{-1/2} \Gamma_x \Delta_{xy} / \|\Sigma_x^{-1/2} \Gamma_x \Delta_{xy}\|_2.$$

We know  $\|\xi\|_2 = 1$  and

$$\Sigma_x^{-1/2} \hat{\Sigma}_{xy}^{(2)} = \xi \xi^{\top} \Sigma_x^{-1/2} (\hat{\Sigma}_{xy} - \mathbb{E} X^0 Y^0) + \Sigma_x^{-1/2} \mathbb{E} X^0 Y^0.$$

Then

$$\text{Cov}(\Sigma_x^{-1/2} \hat{\Sigma}_{xy}^{(2)}) = \text{Cov}(\xi \xi^{\top} \Sigma_x^{-1/2} \hat{\Sigma}_{xy}) = \xi \xi^{\top} \text{Cov}(\Sigma_x^{-1/2} \hat{\Sigma}_{xy}) \xi \xi^{\top}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\Sigma_x^{-1/2} \mathbb{E} \hat{\Sigma}_{xy}^{(2)} - \Sigma_x^{-1/2} \Sigma_{xy} &= \xi \xi^{\top} \Sigma_x^{-1/2} (\Sigma_{xy} - \mathbb{E} X^0 Y^0) + \Sigma_x^{-1/2} \mathbb{E} X^0 Y^0 - \Sigma_x^{-1/2} \Sigma_{xy} \\ &= (\xi \xi^{\top} - I) \Sigma_x^{-1/2} (\Sigma_{xy} - \mathbb{E} X^0 Y^0).\end{aligned}$$

Let  $\eta = \Sigma_x^{-1/2} (\Sigma_{xy} - \mathbb{E} X^0 Y^0)$ .

Then

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{L}_{\text{test}}(\tilde{b}_{\text{tOLS}})] - \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{L}_{\text{test}}(b_{\tilde{\Gamma}}^{\text{opt}})] = \frac{1}{m} \text{tr} \left( \tilde{\Sigma} - \xi \xi^{\top} \tilde{\Sigma} \xi \xi^{\top} \right) - \text{tr} \left[ (\xi \xi^{\top} - I) \eta \eta^{\top} (\xi \xi^{\top} - I)^{\top} \right].$$

Since  $\|\xi\|_2 = 1$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned}\text{tr} \left[ (\xi \xi^{\top} - I) \eta \eta^{\top} (\xi \xi^{\top} - I)^{\top} \right] &= \eta^{\top} (\xi \xi^{\top} - I) (\xi \xi^{\top} - I)^{\top} \eta = \eta^{\top} (I - \xi \xi^{\top}) \eta \\ &= \eta^{\top} \eta - \xi^{\top} \eta \eta^{\top} \xi = \text{tr}(\eta \eta^{\top} - \xi \xi^{\top} \eta \eta^{\top} \xi \xi^{\top}).\end{aligned}$$

Then

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{L}_{\text{test}}(\tilde{b}_{\text{tOLS}})] - \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{L}_{\text{test}}(b_{\tilde{\Gamma}}^{\text{opt}})] = \frac{1}{n_l} \text{tr}(\tilde{\Sigma} - \xi \xi^{\top} \tilde{\Sigma} \xi \xi^{\top}) - \text{tr}(\eta \eta^{\top} - \xi \xi^{\top} \eta \eta^{\top} \xi \xi^{\top})$$



Thus, it suffices to show

$$\begin{aligned}
& \text{tr}(\tilde{\Sigma} - \xi\xi^\top \tilde{\Sigma} \xi\xi^\top) > \text{tr}(\eta\eta^\top - \xi\xi^\top \eta\eta^\top \xi\xi^\top) \\
\Leftrightarrow & \text{tr}(\tilde{\Sigma} - \eta\eta^\top) > \text{tr}[\xi\xi^\top (\Sigma - \eta\eta^\top) \xi\xi^\top] \\
\Leftrightarrow & \tilde{\Sigma} - \eta\eta^\top \succ 0 \\
\Leftrightarrow & \Sigma_x^{-1/2} \text{Cov}(X^v Y^v) \Sigma_x^{-1/2} \succ \Sigma_x^{-1/2} (\Sigma_{xy} - \mathbb{E}[X^0 Y^0]) (\Sigma_{xy} - \mathbb{E}[X^0 Y^0])^\top \Sigma_x^{-1/2} \\
\Leftrightarrow & \text{Cov}(X^v Y^v) \succ (\Sigma_{xy} - \mathbb{E}[X^0 Y^0]) (\Sigma_{xy} - \mathbb{E}[X^0 Y^0])^\top,
\end{aligned}$$

where the second equivalence follows by applying Lemma 14 with  $A = \tilde{\Sigma} - \eta\eta^\top$  and  $\nu = \xi$ , and the third equivalence comes from the notations. Then by taking  $N_l$  as the largest integer that is smaller than  $\text{tr}(\tilde{\Sigma} - \xi\xi^\top \tilde{\Sigma} \xi\xi^\top) / \text{tr}(\eta\eta^\top - \xi\xi^\top \eta\eta^\top \xi\xi^\top) > 1$  as already shown, we have

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{L}_{\text{test}}(\tilde{b}_{\text{OLS}})] > \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{L}_{\text{test}}(b_{\tilde{\Gamma}}^{\text{opt}})].$$

*Step II.* By the weak law of large numbers, we have  $\|\hat{\Sigma}_x - \Sigma_x\| \rightarrow 0$  as  $n_u \rightarrow \infty$ . Then by Slutsky's theorem, we have  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{test}}(\hat{b}_{\text{OLS}}) \xrightarrow{P} \mathcal{L}_{\text{test}}(\tilde{b}_{\text{OLS}})$  and  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{test}}(b_{\tilde{\Gamma}}^{\text{opt}}) \xrightarrow{P} \mathcal{L}_{\text{test}}(b_{\Gamma^*}^{\text{opt}})$  as  $n_u \rightarrow \infty$ .

This implies  $\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{L}_{\text{test}}(\hat{b}_{\text{OLS}})] \rightarrow \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{L}_{\text{test}}(\tilde{b}_{\text{OLS}})]$  and  $\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{L}_{\text{test}}(b_{\tilde{\Gamma}}^{\text{opt}})] \rightarrow \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{L}_{\text{test}}(b_{\Gamma^*}^{\text{opt}})]$  as  $n_u \rightarrow \infty$ . Thus, there exists  $N_u$  such that for all  $n_u > N_u$ , it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
& |\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{L}_{\text{test}}(\hat{b}_{\text{OLS}})] - \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{L}_{\text{test}}(\tilde{b}_{\text{OLS}})]| < (\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{L}_{\text{test}}(\tilde{b}_{\text{OLS}})] - \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{L}_{\text{test}}(b_{\tilde{\Gamma}}^{\text{opt}})]) / 2 \\
& |\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{L}_{\text{test}}(b_{\tilde{\Gamma}}^{\text{opt}})] - \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{L}_{\text{test}}(b_{\Gamma^*}^{\text{opt}})]| < (\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{L}_{\text{test}}(\tilde{b}_{\text{OLS}})] - \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{L}_{\text{test}}(b_{\tilde{\Gamma}}^{\text{opt}})]) / 2
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, we have  $\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{L}_{\text{test}}(\hat{b}_{\text{OLS}})] > \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{L}_{\text{test}}(b_{\tilde{\Gamma}}^{\text{opt}})]$ , which concludes the proof.  $\square$

## E.11 Infinite robustness of DRIG-A

**Proposition 15.** *If  $\text{rank}([C^* L^* C^{*\top}]_{1:p,1:p}) = p$ , the DRIG-A solution as  $\|\Gamma\|_2 \rightarrow \infty$  is uniquely given by*

$$\gamma_y \Gamma_x^{-1} \left[ b^* + \left( [C^* L^* C^{*\top}]_{1:p,1:p} \right)^{-1} (C_x^* L_{xy}^* + L_y^* C_{xy}^*) \right],$$

which is not equal to the causal parameter  $b^*$  when  $\Gamma_x / \gamma_y \neq I_p$ , even in the identifiable case of Corollary 8.

*Proof of Proposition 15.* Under the assumption in Proposition 15, DRIG-A with  $\|\Gamma\|_2 \rightarrow \infty$  is equivalent to

$$\min_b \sum_{e \in \mathcal{E}} \omega^e \left[ \mathbb{E}(\gamma_y Y^e - b^\top \Gamma_x X^e)^2 - \mathbb{E}(\gamma_y Y^0 - b^\top \Gamma_x X^0)^2 \right].$$

Then similar to the proof of Theorem 3, we obtain the minimum solution.

Then under the conditions of Corollary 8, it is straightforward to see the solution becomes  $\gamma_y \Gamma_x^{-1} b^* \neq b^*$  unless  $\Gamma_x / \gamma_y = I_p$ .  $\square$

## E.12 Proof of Theorem 6

We first introduce some notations. Let  $\hat{\Sigma}^e$  be the sample covariance of the data  $(X^e, Y^e)$  and  $\Sigma^{e,*}$  be the population covariance. We will let  $\hat{\Sigma}_X^e$  and  $\hat{\Sigma}_{XY}^e$  be the sub-blocks of  $\hat{\Sigma}^e$ ; we will use the same notation for the population analog. Finally, we will let  $\hat{F} = \sum_{e \in \mathcal{E}} \omega^e \left( \gamma \hat{\Sigma}_X^e - (\gamma - 1) \hat{\Sigma}_X^0 \right)$  and  $\hat{g} = \sum_{e \in \mathcal{E}} \omega^e \left( \gamma \hat{\Sigma}_{XY}^e - (\gamma - 1) \hat{\Sigma}_{XY}^0 \right)$ ; we will let  $F^*$  and  $g^*$  be the population analogue.

Our analysis will rely on the following well-known concentration results for the sample covariance matrix of Gaussian random variables.

**Lemma 16** (Lemma 3.9 in Chandrasekaran et al. (2012)). *Let  $\Sigma^* \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$  be the population covariance of a Gaussian random vector and  $\hat{\Sigma}$  be the sample covariance from  $n$  iid observations. Let  $\psi = \|\Sigma^*\|_2$ . Given any  $\delta > 0$  and  $\delta \leq 8\psi$ , let the number of samples  $n$  be such that  $n \geq \frac{64p\psi^2}{\delta}$ . Then, we have that:*

$$\Pr \left[ \|\hat{\Sigma} - \Sigma^*\|_2 \geq \delta \right] \leq 2 \exp \left\{ \frac{-n\delta^2}{128\psi^2} \right\}.$$

$\hat{b}_\gamma$  **convergence** We will begin with proving the convergence result for an estimate  $\hat{b}_\gamma$ . From optimality conditions, we have that  $\hat{b}_\gamma$  satisfies  $\hat{F}\hat{\beta}_\gamma = \hat{g}$ . Note that:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{minimum eigenvalue}(\hat{F}) &\geq \tau_{\min} - \|\hat{F} - F^*\|_2 \\ &\geq \tau_{\min} - \left[ \sum_{e \in \mathcal{E}} \omega^e \left( \gamma \|\hat{\Sigma}^e - \Sigma^{e,*}\|_2 + |\gamma - 1| \|\hat{\Sigma}^0 - \Sigma^{0,*}\|_2 \right) \right] \end{aligned}$$

For any environment  $e \in \mathcal{E}$ , we let  $\delta = 8\psi_e \sqrt{\frac{p}{n_e}}$ . Appealing to Lemma 16 and the lower-bound on  $n_e$  for every  $e$ , we have that with probability  $1 - 2|\mathcal{E}| \exp(-p/2)$ ,  $\text{minimum eigenvalue}(\hat{F}) \geq \tau_{\min}/2 > 0$ . Thus,  $\hat{b}_\gamma$  is a unique solution to finite-sample DRIG estimator. Note that the optimality condition  $\hat{F}\hat{b}_\gamma = \hat{g}$  can be equivalently written as:

$$\hat{F}(\hat{b}_\gamma - b_\gamma^{\text{opt}}) + (\hat{F} - F^*)b_\gamma^{\text{opt}} + (\hat{g} - g^*) + F^*b_\gamma^{\text{opt}} + g^* = 0.$$

From the optimality condition of the population DRIG estimator (5), we have that  $F^*b_\gamma^{\text{opt}} + g^* = 0$ . Thus,

$$\hat{b}_\gamma - b_\gamma^{\text{opt}} = \hat{F}^{-1} \left[ (\hat{F} - F^*)b_\gamma^{\text{opt}} + (\hat{g} - g^*) \right]$$

Thus, we can arrive at the following euclidean norm bound for the difference  $\hat{b}_\gamma - b_\gamma^{\text{opt}}$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \|\hat{b}_\gamma - b_\gamma^{\text{opt}}\|_2 &\leq \frac{1}{\text{minimum eigenvalue}(\hat{F})} \left[ \|\hat{F} - F^*\|_2 \|b_\gamma^{\text{opt}}\|_2 + \|\hat{g} - g^*\|_2 \right] \\ &\leq \frac{2}{\tau_{\min}} \left[ \|\hat{F} - F^*\|_2 \|b_\gamma^{\text{opt}}\|_2 + \|\hat{g} - g^*\|_2 \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Note that:

$$\max\{\|\hat{F} - F^*\|_2, \|\hat{g} - g^*\|_2\} \leq \left[ \sum_{e \in \mathcal{E}} \omega^e \left( \gamma \|\hat{\Sigma}^e - \Sigma^{e,*}\|_2 + |\gamma - 1| \|\hat{\Sigma}^0 - \Sigma^{0,*}\|_2 \right) \right].$$

Letting  $\delta = 8\psi_e \sqrt{\frac{p}{n_e}}$  for every  $e$  and appealing to Lemma 16 and the lower-bound on  $n_e$  for every  $e$ , we arrive at the bound for  $\|\hat{b}_\gamma - b_\gamma^{\text{opt}}\|_2$  in the theorem statement.

$\hat{L}_\gamma(\hat{b}_\gamma)$  **convergence** Note for every  $e$ , some simple calculations yield:

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E}[(Y^e - (b_\gamma^{\text{opt}})^T X^e)^2] - \hat{\mathbb{E}}[(Y^e - (\hat{b}_\gamma)^T X^e)^2] \\ &= \hat{\Sigma}_Y^e - \Sigma_{Y^*}^{e,*} - 2[(\hat{b}_\gamma - b_\gamma^{\text{opt}})^T \hat{\Sigma}_{XY}^e + (b_\gamma^{\text{opt}})^T (\hat{\Sigma}_{XY}^e - \Sigma_{XY^*}^{e,*})] \\ &\quad + (\hat{b}_\gamma - b_\gamma^{\text{opt}})^T \hat{\Sigma}_X^e \hat{b}_\gamma + (b_\gamma^{\text{opt}})^T \hat{\Sigma}_X^e (\hat{b}_\gamma - b_\gamma^{\text{opt}}) + (b_\gamma^{\text{opt}})^T (\hat{\Sigma}_X^e - \Sigma_X^{e,*}) b_\gamma^{\text{opt}} \end{aligned}$$

For notational ease, let  $\xi_e = 8\psi_e \sqrt{\frac{p}{n_e}}$  and  $\theta$  be the bound for  $\hat{b}_\gamma - b_\gamma^{\text{opt}}$ . Then, appealing to Lemma 16 and the lower-bound on the sample size  $n_e$ , we have with probability  $1 - 2|\mathcal{E}| \exp(-p/2)$ ,  $\|\hat{\Sigma}^e - \Sigma^{e,*}\|_2 \leq \xi_e$ . Thus, some manipulations yield:

$$\begin{aligned} &|\mathbb{E}[(Y^e - (b_\gamma^{\text{opt}})^T X^e)^2] - \hat{\mathbb{E}}[(Y^e - (\hat{b}_\gamma)^T X^e)^2]| \\ &\leq \xi_e + 2(\xi_e + \psi_e)\theta + \xi \|b_\gamma^{\text{opt}}\|_2 + 2\theta(\xi_e + \psi_e)(\theta + \|b^*\|_2) + \|b^*\|_2^2 \xi_e. \end{aligned}$$

By the lower-bound on the sample size  $n_e$ , we have that  $\xi_e \leq \theta$ ,  $\xi_e \leq \psi_e$ , and  $\theta \leq 4(1 + \|b_\gamma^{\text{opt}}\|_2)$ . Putting everything together, we can conclude that:

$$|\mathbb{E}[(Y^e - (b_\gamma^{\text{opt}})^T X^e)^2] - \hat{\mathbb{E}}[(Y^e - (b_\gamma^{\text{opt}})^T X^e)^2]| \leq 15\theta(1 + \psi_e)(1 + \|b_\gamma^{\text{opt}}\|_2)^2$$

We can then conclude that:

$$\begin{aligned} |\hat{L}_\gamma(\hat{b}_\gamma) - L(b_\gamma^{\text{opt}})| &\leq \max\{\gamma, |1 - \gamma|\} \max_e |\mathbb{E}[(Y^e - (b_\gamma^{\text{opt}})^T X^e)^2] - \hat{\mathbb{E}}[(Y^e - (b_\gamma^{\text{opt}})^T X^e)^2]| \\ &\leq 15 \max\{\gamma, |1 - \gamma|\} \theta (1 + \max_e \psi_e) (1 + \|b_\gamma^{\text{opt}}\|_2)^2 \end{aligned}$$

Plugging in the value of  $\theta$ , we have desired result.

## F Proofs for results in supplementary materials

### F.1 Proof of Theorem 7

*Proof.* We have

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \begin{pmatrix} X^e \\ Y^e \\ H^e \end{pmatrix} | A \right] = (I - \tilde{B}^*)^{-1} (MA + \mathbb{E}[\delta^e | A^e]).$$

For any regression coefficient  $b$ , define the vector  $w$  as in (18). Then  $\tilde{Y}^e - b^\top \tilde{X}^e = w^\top (\varepsilon + \delta^e - \mathbb{E}[\delta^e | A^e])$  and

$$\mathbb{E}[(\tilde{Y}^e - b^\top \tilde{X}^e)^2] = w^\top \mathbb{E}[\varepsilon \varepsilon^\top] w + w^\top \tilde{S}^e w.$$

Thus

$$\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_\gamma(b) = w^\top \mathbb{E}[\varepsilon \varepsilon^\top] w + w^\top \tilde{S}^0 w + \gamma w^\top \sum_{e \in \mathcal{E}} \omega^e (\tilde{S}^e - \tilde{S}^0) w.$$

Also note that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}(Y^e - b^\top X^e | A) &= w^\top (\mathbb{E}[\delta^e | A] + MA), \\ \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}(Y^e - b^\top X^e | A)^2] &= w^\top (\mathbb{E}[\delta^e | A] \mathbb{E}[\delta^e | A]^\top + M \mathbb{E}[AA^\top] M^\top) w, \end{aligned}$$

which leads to

$$\lambda \sum_{e \in \mathcal{E}} \omega^e \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}(Y^e - b^\top X^e | A)^2] = \lambda w^\top \left[ \sum_{e \in \mathcal{E}} \omega^e \mathbb{E}[\delta^e | A] \mathbb{E}[\delta^e | A]^\top + M \mathbb{E}[AA^\top] M^\top \right] w.$$

Thereby, we conclude the proof.  $\square$

### F.2 Proof of Corollary 8

*Proof.* As  $\delta_{p+1}^e = 0$ , we have  $L_y^* = 0$  and  $L_{xy}^* = 0$ . Thus, by Theorem 3, we immediately know that  $b_\infty^{\text{opt}} = b^*$ . To see the second part of the corollary, note that in this case we have  $w_x(b_\infty^{\text{opt}}) = 0$  and thus  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{reg}}(b_\infty^{\text{opt}}) = w_x(b_\infty^{\text{opt}})^\top L_x^* w_x(b_\infty^{\text{opt}}) = 0$ . Also we have  $\mathbb{E}[(Y^0 - b^{*\top} X^0)^2] = \mathbb{E}[\varepsilon_y^2]$ , which concludes the proof.  $\square$

### F.3 Proof of Corollary 9

*Proof.* By Theorem 3, in this case we have

$$b_\infty^{\text{opt}} - b^* = (C_x^* L_x^* C_x^{*\top} / L_y^* + C_{xy}^* C_{xy}^{*\top})^{-1} C_{xy}^*.$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \|b_\infty^{\text{opt}} - b^*\|_\infty &= \|(C_x^* L_x^* C_x^{*\top} / L_y^* + C_{xy}^* C_{xy}^{*\top})^{-1} C_{xy}^*\|_\infty \\ &\leq \frac{\|C_{xy}^*\|_\infty}{\min_{\|u\|_\infty=1} \|(C_x^* L_x^* C_x^{*\top} / L_y^* + C_{xy}^* C_{xy}^{*\top}) u\|_\infty}. \end{aligned}$$

When  $b^* = 0$ ,  $C_{xy}^* = 0$  and thus the above upper bound vanishes, leading to  $b_\infty^{\text{opt}} = b^*$ . Also we have  $w_x(b_\infty^{\text{opt}}) = 0$  and  $w_y(b_\infty^{\text{opt}}) = 1$ . Thus, we have

$$\mathcal{L}_\gamma(b_\infty^{\text{opt}}) = \mathbb{E}[\varepsilon_y^2] + \mathbb{E}[\delta_y^{0^2}] + \gamma L_y^*.$$

which tends to infinity as  $\gamma \rightarrow \infty$ .  $\square$

## F.4 Proof of Proposition 10

*Proof.* Notice that

$$\begin{aligned}
\sup_{v \in \mathbb{R}^{p+1}: \mathbb{E}[v_y^2] \leq c} \mathbb{E}[(Y^v - b^\top X^v)^2] &= w^\top \mathbb{E}[\varepsilon \varepsilon^\top] w + \sup_{v: \mathbb{E}[v_y^2] \leq c} w^\top \mathbb{E}[v v^\top] w \\
&= w^\top \mathbb{E}[\varepsilon \varepsilon^\top] w + \sup_{v: \mathbb{E}[v_y^2] \leq c} [w_x^\top \mathbb{E}(v_x v_x^\top) w_x + w_y^2 \mathbb{E}(v_y^2) + 2w_x^\top \mathbb{E}(v_x v_y) w_y] \\
&= w^\top \mathbb{E}[\varepsilon \varepsilon^\top] w + w_x^\top \sup_{v_x} \mathbb{E}(v_x v_x^\top) w_x + c w_y^2 + 2w_x^\top \sup_{\mathbb{E}[v_y^2] \leq c} \mathbb{E}(v_x v_y) w_y \\
&= \begin{cases} \mathbb{E} \varepsilon_y^2 + c, & b = b^* \\ \infty, & b \neq b^* \end{cases}
\end{aligned}$$

We thereby conclude the proof.  $\square$

## F.5 Proof of Proposition 11

Recall that:

$$b_\infty^{\text{opt}} = b^* + \left( [C^* L^* C^{*\top}]_{1:p, 1:p} \right)^{-1} (C_x^* L_{xy}^* + L_y^* C_{xy}^*). \quad (20)$$

Let

$$M = \left( [C^* L^* C^{*\top}]_{1:p, 1:p} \right)^{-1} = (C_x^* L_x^* C_x^{*\top} + C_x^* L_{xy}^* C_{xy}^{*\top} + C_{xy}^* L_{xy}^{*\top} C_x^{*\top} + L_y^* C_{xy}^* C_{xy}^{*\top})^{-1}.$$

Since the graph underlying the observed variables is a DAG according to Assumption A1, we have that  $[I - B^*]_{1:p, 1:p}$  is an invertible matrix. Since the matrix  $I - B^*$  is also invertible, by Schur's complement, we have that the matrix  $C_x^*$  is an invertible matrix. Furthermore, we have the inequalities:

$$\begin{aligned}
\sigma_{\min}(C_x^*) &\geq \sigma_{\min}(C^*) \geq 1/\sigma_{\max}(I - B^*) \geq 1/(1 + d\|B^*\|_\infty) \geq 2/3, \\
\sigma_{\max}(C_x^*) &\leq \sigma_{\max}(C^*) \leq 1/\sigma_{\min}(I - B^*) \leq 1/(1 - d\|B^*\|_\infty) \leq 2, \\
\sigma_{\max}(C_{xy}^*) &\leq \sigma_{\max}(C^*) \leq 1/\sigma_{\min}(I - B^*) \leq 1/(1 - d\|B^*\|_\infty) \leq 2,
\end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

where the last inequalities in each equation follow from the Assumption A7 and the bound that for any matrix  $N$ ,  $\|N\|_2 \leq \|N\|_\infty s$ , where  $s$  is the maximum number of zeros in any column or row of  $N$ . We thus conclude that:

$$\sigma_{\min}([C^* L^* C^{*\top}]_{1:p, 1:p}) \geq \frac{\sigma_{\min}(L_x^*)}{\sigma_{\max}(I - B^*)^2} - \frac{2\sigma_{\max}(L_{xy}^*) + L_y^*}{\sigma_{\min}(I - B^*)^2} > \frac{\sigma_{\min}(L_x^*)}{2\sigma_{\max}(I - B^*)^2} = \mathcal{O}(\sigma_{\min}(L_x^*)),$$

where the second inequality follows from Assumption A6. The equality follows from (21). By the definition of the matrix  $M$ , we have that  $\|M\|_2 = \frac{1}{\mathcal{O}(\sigma_{\min}(L_x^*))}$ . Furthermore, by Assumption A2, notice that

$$L_y^* = \sum_{e \in \mathcal{E}} \omega^e (E[(\delta_y^e)^2] + [\Gamma^* \Sigma_{\eta^e} \Gamma^*]_{p+1, p+1}),$$

where  $\Sigma_{\eta^e}$  is the covariance of the perturbations on the latent variables. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
|L_y^*| &= \max_{e \in \mathcal{E}} E[(\delta_y^e)^2] + \|\Gamma^*\|_2^2 \max_i \|\mathcal{P}_{\text{col-space}(\Gamma^*)} e_i\|_2^2 h^{3/2} \max_e \|\Sigma_{\eta^e}\|_\infty \\
&= \max_{e \in \mathcal{E}} E[(\delta_y^e)^2] + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{h^{5/2} \max_e \|\Sigma_{\eta^e}\|_\infty}{p}\right),
\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows from Assumptions A4 and A5. Note that:

$$L_{xy}^* = \sum_{e \in \mathcal{E}} \omega^e (\mathcal{I}_p \quad 0) \Gamma^* \Sigma_{\eta^e} \Gamma^{*\top} e_{p+1}.$$

Similar as  $L_y^*$ , we conclude:

$$\|L_{xy}^*\|_\infty \leq \|\Gamma^*\|_2^2 \max_i \|\mathcal{P}_{\text{col-space}(\Gamma^*)} e_i\|_2^2 h^{3/2} \max_e \|\Sigma_{\eta^e}\|_\infty = \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{h^{5/2} \max_e \|\Sigma_{\eta^e}\|_\infty}{p}\right)$$

We further have that:

$$\begin{aligned} \|MC_x^* L_{xy}^*\|_\infty &\leq p \|MC_x^*\|_2 \|L_{xy}^*\|_\infty = \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{p \|L_{xy}^*\|_\infty}{\sigma_{\min}(L_x^*)}\right), \\ \|MC_{xy}^* L_y^*\|_\infty &\leq \|M\|_2 \|L_y^*\| \|C_{xy}^*\|_2 = \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{\|L_y^*\|}{\sigma_{\min}(L_x^*)}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Putting everything together, we have the desired bound.

## F.6 Proof of Proposition 12

*Proof.* As  $L_{xy}^* = 0$  and  $L_y^* = 0$ , we have

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{reg}}(b) = w_x^\top L_x^* w_x = (b^* - b)^\top \Delta_x (b^* - b)$$

which is minimized whenever  $\Delta_x(b^* - b) = 0$ . This immediately leads to  $\mathcal{I} = \{b^* + b' : \Delta_x b' = 0\}$ .

When  $L_{xy}^* = 0$  and  $L_y^* = 0$ , the original objective function given any  $\gamma$  becomes

$$\mathcal{L}(b) = \mathbb{E}[(Y^0 - b^\top X^0)^2] + \gamma (b^* - b)^\top \Delta_x (b^* - b),$$

where the first term is equal to  $\mathbb{E}[(\varepsilon_y - (b - b^*)^\top X^0)^2]$ . Minimizing  $\mathcal{L}(b)$  leads to

$$b_\gamma^{\text{opt}} - b^* = [\mathbb{E}X^0 X^{0\top} + \gamma \Delta_x]^{-1} \mathbb{E}[X^0 \varepsilon_y].$$

Letting  $\gamma \rightarrow \infty$  leads to

$$b_\infty^{\text{opt}} = b^* + D \mathbb{E}[X^0 \varepsilon_y],$$

where  $D = \lim_{\gamma \rightarrow \infty} [\mathbb{E}X^0 X^{0\top} + \gamma \Delta_x]^{-1}$ .

Also notice that  $\mathbb{E}[X^0 \varepsilon_y] = \mathbb{E}[(C_x^* \varepsilon_x + C_{xy}^* \varepsilon_y) \varepsilon_y] = C_x^* \mathbb{E}[\varepsilon_x \varepsilon_y] + C_{xy}^* \mathbb{E}[\varepsilon_y^2]$ . Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|b_\infty^{\text{opt}} - b^*\|_\infty &= \|D \mathbb{E}[X^0 \varepsilon_y]\|_\infty \\ &\leq \|D\|_\infty \|C_x^* \mathbb{E}[\varepsilon_x \varepsilon_y] + C_{xy}^* \mathbb{E}[\varepsilon_y^2]\|_\infty, \end{aligned}$$

which concludes the proof.  $\square$

## F.7 Proof of the results in the specialized setting

Let  $\mathbb{E}[X^0 X^{0\top}] = \text{diag}(\sigma_1^2, \dots, \sigma_p^2)$  and  $\Delta_x = \text{diag}(\Delta_1, \dots, \Delta_p)$ . From the proof of Proposition 12 we know

$$b_\gamma^{\text{opt}} - b^* = [\mathbb{E}X^0 X^{0\top} + \gamma \Delta_x]^{-1} \mathbb{E}[X^0 \varepsilon_y]$$

whose  $i$ th component is  $\mathbb{E}[X_i^0 \varepsilon_y] / (\sigma_i^2 + \gamma \Delta_i)$ , where  $X_i^0$  is the  $i$ th component of  $X^0$ . The OLS estimator on the observational environment satisfies

$$b_{\text{OLS}}^0 - b^* = [\mathbb{E}X^0 X^{0\top}]^{-1} \mathbb{E}[X^0 \varepsilon_y]$$

whose  $i$ th component is  $\mathbb{E}[X_i^0 \varepsilon_y] / \sigma_i^2$ . Since  $\gamma \Delta_i \geq 0$ , we immediately know that  $\|b_\gamma^{\text{opt}} - b^*\|_2 \leq \|b_{\text{OLS}}^0 - b^*\|$ . When  $\mathbb{E}[X_i^0 \varepsilon_y] > 0$  and  $\Delta_i > 0$ , we have  $|\mathbb{E}[X_i^0 \varepsilon_y]| / (\sigma_i^2 + \gamma \Delta_i) < |\mathbb{E}[X_i^0 \varepsilon_y]| / \sigma_i^2$  and thus the inequality is strict.




Figure 10: Illustrative examples with small mean shifts.

## G Additional empirical results

### G.1 Illustrative examples

In Section 3.2, we present two illustrative examples to demonstrate the advantages of DRIG in robust prediction. Here, we provide an additional example, where the training data contains a limited amount of heterogeneity in the mean. Specifically, in Example 1 (a covariate-intervened setting), we now set  $\mathbb{E}[\delta_x^1] = 0.1$ , that is, there are limited mean shifts in  $X$ ; in Example 2 (an all-intervened setting), we now set

$$\begin{pmatrix} \delta_x^1 \\ \delta_y^1 \end{pmatrix} \sim \mathcal{N}\left(\begin{pmatrix} 0.1 \\ 0.1 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0.1 \\ 0.1 & 0.05 \end{pmatrix}\right)$$

where we only change  $\mathbb{E}[\delta_x^1]$  from 0.5 to 0.1 so the amount of mean shifts is again limited. As shown in Figure 10, anchor regression that can only exploit mean shifts performs very close to the pooled OLS. In contrast, DRIG maintains competitive robustness performance.

### G.2 Synthetic simulations

We next provide additional synthetic simulations to compare the robustness performance of DRIG and DRIG-A with competing methods. We consider a setting with  $p = 10$  covariates and a response variable and simulate  $10^4$  observational data according to the linear SCM in (2), where  $B^*$  is a randomly generated Erdos-Renyi directed acyclic graph and  $\varepsilon \sim \mathcal{N}(0, S^0)$  with  $S^0$  being a randomly sampled positive definite matrix. Details of the sampling scheme are given in Supplementary H. We also simulate  $10^4$  interventional data each from three environments, governed by SCMs (3), where  $\delta^e \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu^e, S^e)$ ,  $e = 1, 2, 3$ . Finally, we generate 20 test environments according to SCM (4), where  $B^*$  is the same as the training SCM, while the intervention variables in the test environment are generated according to  $v_j \sim \mathcal{N}(\sqrt{\alpha}\mu_j, \alpha S_j)$ ,  $j = 1, \dots, 20$  where the scalar  $\alpha > 0$  controls the perturbation strengths in the test environment. We consider the following two scenarios within the setting described above:

1. covariate-intervened case with interventions on  $X$  but no intervention on  $Y$  or  $H$ : here, we set the last entry of  $(\mu^e, \mu_j)$ ,  $e = 1, 2, 3, j = 1, 2, \dots, 20$  and the last row and column of  $(S^e, S_j)$ ,  $e = 1, 2, 3, j = 1, 2, \dots, 20$  to zero, and choose the remaining components at random.
2. all-intervened case with interventions on all of  $X$ ,  $Y$ , and  $H$ : the vectors  $(\mu^e, \mu_j)$  and the matrices  $(S^e, S_j)$  are chosen at random for every  $e = 1, 2, 3$  and  $j = 1, 2, \dots, 20$ .

Given a training data distribution, we repeat the process of drawing training samples, as described above, for 50 times and report the average performance.

We apply our proposed methods as well as existing approaches on the training data to obtain linear prediction models. We then compute the population MSE of each estimated model on each of the 20




Figure 11: (a) the worst-case test MSEs for varying perturbation strengths in the covariate-intervened case; (b) the oracle  $\gamma$  for DRIG for different perturbation strengths.

test environments, and report the worst-case error among all of the environments. For DRIG and anchor regression, we consider three schemes for choosing the regularization strength  $\gamma$ : a fixed  $\gamma = 10$ , an oracle choice of  $\gamma$  for each test environment that gives the smallest MSE on that environment, and our proposed DRIG-A that chooses a matrix  $\Gamma$  for each test environment by exploiting a small test sample of size 50 from that environment. For DRIG and DRIG-A, we assign uniform weights to each environment, i.e.,  $\omega^e = 1/4$ .

Figures 11-12 present the worst-case test MSEs for varying perturbation strengths  $\alpha$  in the test distributions, where we plot the mean of the worst-case errors over the 50 random repetitions with the 95% bootstrapped confidence intervals. Overall, DRIG estimators tend to be the most competitive method. With either a fixed or the oracle choice of  $\gamma$ , DRIG exhibits better performance than anchor regression with the same scheme of choosing  $\gamma$ . Anchor regression, while better than the OLS estimators, offers limited advantages compared to DRIG. This suggests that DRIG achieves better distributional robustness, potentially due to its ability to exploit heterogeneity in the variances.

Regarding the selection of hyperparameter  $\gamma$ , DRIG with a fixed  $\gamma > 1$  can already yield satisfying robust performance compared to baseline approaches, especially in the causal-identifiable case, while the oracle choice further enhance the advantage. As shown in panel (b) in both figures, the oracle  $\gamma$  monotonically increases with respect to the perturbation strength, which aligns with the earlier message that a larger  $\gamma$  enhances robustness against stronger perturbations. More interestingly, our DRIG-A that leverages additional test information consistently stands out as the best-performing method due to its more flexible and adaptive regularization scheme. These observations suggest that in practice a fixed  $\gamma > 1$  could already lead to reasonably well robustness compared to OLS; when a small number of samples from the test distribution is available, we further

The causal parameter exhibits invariant performance regardless of the perturbation strength in the covariate-intervened case, but performs significantly worse than the other methods when all variables are intervened on.

### G.3 Single-cell data

Figure 13 shows the variances of all observed variables in each environment, shedding light on the heterogeneity of gene expression across different interventions. We observe that the last variable is the only one that consistently exhibits a higher variance in interventional environments than in the observational environment. Also, when intervening on the last variable, we barely see increases in the variances of the other variables. This observation roughly suggests that interventions on the last gene have limited impact on the variability of the other genes, supporting the conjecture that the last gene may act as a leaf node in the causal graph




Figure 12: Same plots for the all-intervened case.




Figure 13: Variances of each observed variable in each environment. For the purpose of illustration, we take a transformation  $h(v_i) = \tanh(2(v_i/v_0 - 1))$ , where  $v$  is the variance of a variable on the  $i$ -th environment and  $v_0$  is its variance on the observational environment.

among the 10 observed genes. Based on this reasoning, we select the last gene as our response variable and consider the remaining 9 genes as covariates.

Next, we investigate how the methods perform differently on test environments generated by some specific interventions. In Figure 14, we show the MSEs on several test environments with different patterns of interventions. In the first row of the figure, we observe that the MSE decreases as  $\gamma$  increases, which, according to our theory, suggests that these interventions are relatively strong. In the middle row, the MSE initially decreases and then increases with increasing  $\gamma$ , indicating a moderate perturbation strength. In the bottom row, we observe that the MSE consistently grows with  $\gamma > 0$ , which suggests that these environments are likely to be close to the observational environment.

## H Experimental details

We describe how we sample the mean vectors and covariance matrices for the noise  $\varepsilon$  and the intervention variables  $\delta^e$  in Examples 3 and 4 and simulations in Section G.2. We sample the components of the mean vectors independently from  $\text{Unif}[0, 1]$ . For the covariance matrices, we first sample a random matrix  $\tilde{S}$  whose components are independently drawn from  $\text{Unif}[0, 1]$  and then get the covariance matrix by  $\tilde{S}\tilde{S}^\top$ . To explicitly control the perturbation strength, we normalize the means and covariances of the interventions






Figure 14: Performance of DRIG on several specific test environments with different patterns of interventions.

variables to always have vector or matrix 2-norm 1. If  $Y$  and  $H$  are assumed not to be intervened on, we set the last component of the mean vectors and the last row and column of the covariance matrices to zero. For simulations in Section G.2, we sample the mean vectors and covariance matrices of all interventions variables  $\delta^e$ ,  $e = 1, 2, 3$  in training environments as well as  $v$  in test environments. To ensure there is sufficient amount of heterogeneity among training environments, we multiply the mean vectors of  $\delta^e$  by a factor of  $\sqrt{10}$  and multiply the covariance matrices by a factor of 10. Note that during test, we vary the perturbation strength from 1 to 100, as shown in Figures 11-12. Thus, the perturbation strength during test exceeds substantially that during training, resulting in a challenging task for robustness.