

# Single Proxy Synthetic Control

Chan Park and Eric J. Tchetgen Tchetgen

Department of Statistics and Data Science, The Wharton School, University of Pennsylvania

## Abstract

Synthetic control methods are widely used to estimate the treatment effect on a single treated unit in time series settings. A common approach for estimating synthetic controls is to regress the pre-treatment outcomes of the treated unit on those of untreated control units via ordinary least squares. However, this approach can perform poorly if the pre-treatment fit is not near perfect, whether the weights are normalized or not. In this paper, we introduce a single proxy synthetic control approach, which essentially views the outcomes of untreated control units as proxies of the treatment-free potential outcome of the treated unit, a perspective we formally leverage to construct a valid synthetic control. Under this framework, we establish alternative identification and estimation methodology for synthetic controls and, in turn, for the treatment effect on the treated unit. Notably, unlike a recently proposed proximal synthetic control approach which requires two types of proxies for identification, ours relies on a single type of proxy, thus facilitating its practical relevance. Additionally, we adapt a conformal inference approach to perform inference on the treatment effect, obviating the need for a large number of post-treatment data. Lastly, our framework can accommodate time-varying covariates and nonlinear models, allowing binary and count outcomes. We demonstrate the proposed approach in a simulation study and a real-world application.

*Keywords:* Average treatment effect on the treated, Conformal inference, Generalized method of moments, Prediction interval, Synthetic control

## 1 Introduction

Synthetic control methods are popular for estimating the treatment effect of an intervention in settings where a single unit is treated and pre- and post-treatment time series data are available on the treated unit and a heterogeneous pool of untreated control units ([Abadie and Gardeazabal](#),

2003; Abadie et al., 2010). In the absence of a natural control unit, the main idea of the approach hinges on constructing a so-called synthetic control, corresponding to a certain weighted average of control units' outcomes (and potentially covariates), obtained by matching the outcome time series of the treated unit to the weighted average in the pre-intervention period, to the extent empirically feasible. The resulting synthetic control is then used to forecast the treatment-free potential outcome of the treated unit in the post-treatment period, therefore delivering an estimate of the treatment effect by comparing the treated unit's outcome to the synthetic control forecast.

There is fast-growing literature concerned on various approaches to construct synthetic control weights. Following Abadie et al. (2010) and subsequent works, the most common approach is to use ordinary (or weighted) least squares by regressing the pre-treatment outcome and available covariates of the treated unit on those of control units, typically restricting the weights to nonnegative and sum to one; see Section 2.2 for a more detailed discussion. Despite intuitive appeal and simplicity, the performance of the standard synthetic control approach may break down in settings where the pre-treatment synthetic control match to the treated unit's outcomes is not nearly perfect; an eventuality Abadie et al. (2010) warns against. In order to improve the performance of the synthetic control approach in the event of an imperfect pre-treatment match, recent papers have considered alternative formulations of the synthetic control framework. For example, Xu (2017); Amjad et al. (2018); Ben-Michael et al. (2021); Ferman and Pinto (2021); Ferman (2021); Shi et al. (2023) rely on variants of a so-called interactive fixed effects model (Bai, 2009). In particular, the latter three papers specify a linear latent factor potential outcome model with an exogenous, common set of latent factors with corresponding unit-specific factor loadings. Under this linear factor model, a key identification condition is that the factor loading of the treated unit lies in the vector space spanned by factor loadings of donor units and, thus, there exists a linear combination of the latter that matches the former exactly. Using the corresponding matching weights, one can therefore construct an unbiased synthetic control of the treated unit's potential outcome which, under certain conditions, can be used to mimic the treated unit's outcome in the post-treatment period, had the intervention been withheld. At their core, these methods substitute the requirement of a perfect pre-treatment match of the outcome of the treated unit and the synthetic control (an empirically testable assumption) with finding a match for the treated unit's factor loadings in the linear span of the donors' factor loadings (an empirically untestable assumption). Despite

the growing interest in synthetic control methods, limited research has considered synthetic control methodology outside of the interactive fixed effects model or its nonparametric generalizations (Qiu et al., 2022; Shi et al., 2023); one notable exception is Shi et al. (2022) where the units’ outcomes are viewed as averages of more granular study units, allowing for construction of a synthetic control under specific restrictions on the model of granular study units’ outcomes.

In this work, we consider an alternative theoretical framework to formalize the synthetic control approach which obviates specification of an interactive fixed effects model. Specifically, we propose to view the synthetic control model from a measurement error model perspective, whereby donor units’ outcomes stand as error-prone proxy measurements of the treated unit’s treatment-free potential outcome. In this framework, a synthetic control outcome can be obtained via a simple form of calibration, say a linear combination of donor units, so that on average, it matches the treated unit’s outcome in the pre-treatment period. Whereas the standard interactive fixed effects model views the treated and control units’ outcomes as proxies of latent factors, our approach views donor units’ outcomes as direct proxies of the treated unit’s treatment-free potential outcome. Thus, the proposed framework shares similarity with the recent proximal synthetic control framework of Shi et al. (2023), which also formalizes donor outcomes as so-called outcome proxies. However, a major distinction is that the latter requires an additional group of proxies (so-called treatment proxies) to identify synthetic control weights; in contrast, our proposed approach solely relies on a single type of proxies, given by donor units and obviates the need to evoke existence of latent factors.

Interestingly, similar to the connection between the proximal synthetic control approach of Shi et al. (2023) and proximal causal inference for independent and identically distributed (i.i.d.) data (Miao et al., 2018; Tchetgen Tchetgen et al., 2020), the proposed synthetic control framework is likewise inspired by the control outcome calibration approach (Tchetgen Tchetgen, 2013) and its recent generalization to a so-called single proxy control framework (Tchetgen Tchetgen et al., 2023) both of which were proposed for i.i.d. samples subject to a stochastic treatment assignment mechanism, albeit endogenous as confounded by hidden factors predictive of outcome. Therefore, we aptly refer to our approach as single proxy synthetic control (SPSC) approach. Despite this connection, the synthetic control generalization presents several new challenges related to (i) only observing a single treated unit, and therefore treatment assignment is implicitly conditioned on, and (ii) having access to pre-and post-treatment time series data for a heterogeneous pool of

untreated donor units, none of which can serve as a natural control; and (iii) serial correlation and heteroskedasticity due to the time series nature of the data. We tackle each of challenges (i)-(iii) in turn and develop a general formal framework for single proxy control in a synthetic control setting.

## 2 Setup And Review of Existing Synthetic Control Framework

### 2.1 Setup

Let us consider a setting where  $N + 1$  units are observed over  $T$  time periods. Units and time periods are indexed by  $i = 0, 1, \dots, N$  and  $t = 1, \dots, T$ , respectively. Following the standard synthetic control setting, we suppose that only the first unit with index  $i = 0$  is treated whereas the latter  $N$  units with index  $i = 1, \dots, N$  are untreated control units. Consider a binary treatment indicator  $A_t$  which encodes whether time  $t$  is in the pre-treatment period, in which case  $A_t = 0$  for  $t = 1, \dots, T_0$ , or the post-treatment period, in which case  $A_t = 1$  for  $t = T_0 + 1, \dots, T$ , respectively. Thus,  $T_0$  is the number of pre-treatment periods and  $T_1 = T - T_0$  is the number of post-treatment periods. We assume that  $N$  is fixed and  $T_0$  and  $T_1$  are large with similar order of magnitude. Let  $Y_t$  and  $W_{it}$  denote observed outcomes of the treated unit and the  $i$ th control unit, respectively, for  $i = 1, \dots, N$ . We define  $W_t = (W_{1t}, \dots, W_{Nt})^T \in \mathbb{R}^N$  as the  $N$ -dimensional vector of the untreated units' outcome at time  $t$ . For a set  $\mathcal{D} = \{\mathcal{D}_1, \dots, \mathcal{D}_d\} \subseteq \{1, \dots, N\}$ , we define  $W_{\mathcal{D}t} = (W_{\mathcal{D}_1t}, \dots, W_{\mathcal{D}_dt})^T$  as a  $d$ -dimensional subvector of  $W_t$ . We define  $O_t = (Y_t, W_t^T, A_t)$  as the observed data at time  $t$ . Let  $Y_t^{(a)}$  and  $W_{it}^{(a)}$  denote the potential outcomes of the treated and  $i$ th control units, respectively, which one would have observed had, possibly contrary to fact, the treatment been set to  $A_t = a$  at time  $t$ .

We introduce additional notation used throughout. Let  $\mathbb{1}(\mathcal{A})$  be the indicator function of an event  $\mathcal{A}$ , i.e.,  $\mathbb{1}(\mathcal{A}) = 1$  if  $\mathcal{A}$  is satisfied and  $\mathbb{1}(\mathcal{A}) = 0$  otherwise. Let  $\mathbb{R}$  be the set of real numbers. Let  $V_1 \perp\!\!\!\perp V_2 \mid V_3$  denote that  $V_1$  and  $V_2$  are conditionally independent given  $V_3$ . Conversely, we use  $V_1 \not\perp\!\!\!\perp V_2 \mid V_3$  to denote that  $V_1$  and  $V_2$  are conditionally dependent given  $V_3$ .

## 2.2 Review of Existing Synthetic Control Framework

The common target estimand in the synthetic control setting is the average treatment effect on the treated unit (ATT) at time  $t$  in the post-treatment periods, i.e.,

$$\tau_t^* = \mathbb{E}\{Y_t^{(1)} - Y_t^{(0)}\}, \quad t = T_0 + 1, \dots, T.$$

Note that, by definition,  $Y_t^{(1)} - Y_t^{(0)} = \tau_t^* + \epsilon_t$  for  $t = T_0 + 1, \dots, T$  where  $\epsilon_t$  is a mean-zero idiosyncratic residual error and, therefore,  $\tau_t^*$  may be viewed as a deterministic function of time capturing the expected effect of the treatment experienced by the treated unit. In Section 3.3, we describe an approach for constructing prediction intervals for  $Y_t^{(1)} - Y_t^{(0)}$  by appropriately accounting for the idiosyncratic error term  $\epsilon_t$ . In order to make progress, we make the consistency assumption:

**Assumption 2.1** (Consistency).  $Y_t = Y_t^{(A_t)}$  almost surely and  $W_{it} = W_{it}^{(A_t)}$  almost surely for all  $i = 1, \dots, N$  and  $t = 1, \dots, T$ .

Additionally, we assume no interference, i.e., the treatment has no causal effect on control units.

**Assumption 2.2** (No Interference on Control Units).  $W_{it}^{(0)} = W_{it}^{(1)}$  almost surely for all  $i = 1, \dots, N$  and  $t = 1, \dots, T$ .

Under Assumptions 2.1 and 2.2, we have the following result almost surely:

$$Y_t = Y_t^{(0)}(1 - A_t) + Y_t^{(1)}A_t, \quad W_{it} = W_{it}^{(0)} = W_{it}^{(1)}, \quad i = 1, \dots, N, \quad t = 1, \dots, T.$$

Therefore, for the post-treatment period,  $Y_t^{(1)}$  matches the observed outcome  $Y_t$  while  $Y_t^{(0)}$  is unobserved. Therefore, an additional set of assumptions is required to establish identification of the ATT.

In the classical synthetic control setting, such assumptions are imposed by relating the observed outcomes of the untreated units with the treatment-free potential outcome of the treated unit. Specifically, following [Abadie et al. \(2010\)](#) and [Ferman and Pinto \(2021\)](#), suppose that units'

outcomes are generated from the following interactive fixed effects model (Bai, 2009):

$$\begin{aligned} Y_t &= \tau_t^* A_t + \mu_0^\top \lambda_t + e_{0t} , & \mathbb{E}(e_{0t} \mid \lambda_t) &= 0 \\ W_{it} &= \mu_i^\top \lambda_t + e_{it} , & \mathbb{E}(e_{it} \mid \lambda_t) &= 0 , & i &= 1, \dots, N , & t &= 1, \dots, T . \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

Here,  $\tau_t^*$  is the fixed treatment effect at time  $t$ ,  $\lambda_t \in \mathbb{R}^r$  is a random  $r$ -dimensional vector of latent factors which are known a priori to potentially causally impact the treated and donor units, despite being unobserved, and may exhibit either stationary or nonstationary behavior over time,  $\mu_i \in \mathbb{R}^r$  is a fixed  $r$ -dimensional vector of unit-specific factor loadings, and  $e_{it}$  is a random error. It is typically assumed that the number of latent factors  $r$  is no larger than the number of donor units  $N$  and the pre-treatment periods  $T_0$ . Combined with Assumptions 2.1 and 2.2, the interactive fixed effects model (1) implies  $Y_t^{(0)} = \mu_0^\top \lambda_t + e_{0t}$  and  $Y_t^{(1)} = \tau_t^* A_t + Y_t^{(0)}$  where the ATT is represented as  $\tau_t^* = Y_t^{(1)} - Y_t^{(0)}$  for  $t = T_0 + 1, \dots, T$ . In addition, if there exists a donor whose factor loading is equal to that of the treated unit, i.e.,  $\mu_i = \mu_0$  for some  $i = 1, \dots, N$ , then  $W_{it}$  is unbiased for  $Y_t^{(0)}$  and, therefore,  $Y_t^{(1)} - W_{it}$  is unbiased for the ATT. This indicates that confounding bias of the treatment effect on the treated unit's outcome arises to the extent that donors' factor loadings are different from those of the treated unit.

Next, following Ferman and Pinto (2021) and Shi et al. (2023), suppose that there exist a set of control units, denoted by  $\mathcal{D} = \{\mathcal{D}_1, \dots, \mathcal{D}_d\} \subseteq \{1, \dots, N\}$  and a set of weights  $\gamma^\dagger = (\gamma_{\mathcal{D}_1}^\dagger, \dots, \gamma_{\mathcal{D}_d}^\dagger)^\top$  satisfying

$$\mu_0 = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{D}} \gamma_i^\dagger \mu_i . \quad (2)$$

Equations (1) and (2) imply that there exists a synthetic control  $W_{\mathcal{D}t}^\top \gamma^\dagger = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{D}} \gamma_i^\dagger W_{it}$  satisfying

$$Y_t^{(0)} = W_{\mathcal{D}t}^\top \gamma^\dagger + e_{0t} - \sum_{i \in \mathcal{D}} \gamma_i^\dagger e_{it} , \quad t = 1, \dots, T . \quad (3)$$

Therefore,  $\tau_t^* = \mathbb{E}\{Y_t^{(1)} - W_{\mathcal{D}t}^\top \gamma^\dagger\}$  for  $t = T_0 + 1, \dots, T$ , i.e.,  $Y_t - W_{\mathcal{D}t}^\top \gamma^\dagger$  is unbiased for the ATT. Unfortunately, it is infeasible to directly estimate  $\gamma^\dagger$  from equation (2) because the factor loadings  $\mu_i$  are unknown. Importantly, the synthetic control weights satisfying (2) naturally accommodate an imperfect pre-treatment fit as shown in (3), i.e., the synthetic control can significantly deviate from

the observed pre-treatment fit, however, the corresponding error is equal to zero in expectation.

Based on (3), one can consider estimating the weights  $\gamma$  via penalized least squares minimization, say:

$$\hat{\gamma}_{\text{P-OLS}} = \arg \min_{\gamma} \left\{ \frac{1}{T_0} \sum_{t=1}^{T_0} (Y_t - W_{\mathcal{D}t}^{\text{T}} \gamma)^2 + \mathcal{R}(\gamma) \right\} \quad (4)$$

where  $\mathcal{R}(\gamma)$  is a penalty that places restrictions on  $\gamma$ . For instance, [Abadie et al. \(2010\)](#) restricts the weight to be non-negative and sum up to one, [Doudchenko and Imbens \(2016\)](#) uses elastic-net penalization, and [Robbins et al. \(2017\)](#) uses entropy penalization. In words,  $\hat{\gamma}_{\text{P-OLS}}$  is obtained by fitting a possibly constrained ordinary least squares (OLS) regression of  $Y_t$  on  $W_{it}$ . In particular, without penalization, the moment restriction solving (4) reduces to  $\text{E}\{\Psi_{\text{OLS}}(O_t; \gamma)\} = 0$  for  $t = 1, \dots, T_0$  where  $\Psi_{\text{OLS}}(O_t; \gamma) = W_{\mathcal{D}t}(Y_t - W_{\mathcal{D}t}^{\text{T}} \gamma)$  are standard least squares normal equations.

However, as discussed in [Ferman and Pinto \(2021\)](#) and [Shi et al. \(2023\)](#), the OLS weights from (4) are generally inconsistent as  $T_0$  goes to infinity, which can result in biased estimation of the treatment effect unless  $e_{it}$  is exactly zero for all  $i$  and  $t$ ; see Section A.1 of the Supplementary Material for details. We remark that this result does not conflict with [Abadie et al. \(2010\)](#) because their synthetic control weights are assumed to satisfy a perfect pre-treatment fit; specifically, there exist values  $\gamma^{\#} = (\gamma_{\mathcal{D}1}^{\#}, \dots, \gamma_{\mathcal{D}d}^{\#})^{\text{T}}$  satisfying

$$Y_t^{(0)} = W_{\mathcal{D}t}^{\text{T}} \gamma^{\#} , \quad t = 1, \dots, T_0 , \quad (5)$$

which is distinct from condition (2) of [Ferman and Pinto \(2021\)](#) and [Shi et al. \(2023\)](#). Moreover, as discussed in [Ferman and Pinto \(2021\)](#), (5) can be expected to hold approximately under (2) when the variance of the error  $e_{it}$  in (1) becomes negligible as  $T_0$  becomes large; see [Abadie et al. \(2010\)](#) for related results, and Sections 1 and 3.1 of [Ferman and Pinto \(2021\)](#), and Section 2 [Shi et al. \(2023\)](#) for detailed discussions.

Recently, [Shi et al. \(2023\)](#) introduced a proximal causal inference framework for synthetic controls. Specifically, they assume that they have also observed proxy variables  $Z_t = (Z_{1t}, \dots, Z_{Mt})^{\text{T}}$  a priori known to satisfy the following condition in the pre-treatment periods:

$$Z_t \perp\!\!\!\perp (Y_t, W_{\mathcal{D}t}) \mid \lambda_t , \quad t = 1, \dots, T_0 . \quad (6)$$

A reasonable candidate for  $Z_t$  is the outcome of units excluded from the donor pool, i.e.,  $Z_t$  is a collection of outcomes of observed units  $\{W_{it} \mid i \in \{1, \dots, N\} \setminus \{\mathcal{D}_1, \dots, \mathcal{D}_d\}\}$ ; see [Shi et al. \(2023\)](#) for alternative choices of proxies. Then, under Assumptions 2.1 and 2.2, the interactive fixed effects model (1), Assumption (2), and the existence of proxy as in (6), the synthetic control weights  $\gamma^\dagger$  in (2) satisfy  $E(Y_t - W_{\mathcal{D}_t}^\top \gamma^\dagger \mid Z_t) = 0$  and  $E\{\Psi_{\text{PSC}}(O_t; \gamma^\dagger)\} = 0$  for  $t = 1, \dots, T_0$  where  $\Psi_{\text{PSC}}(O_t; \gamma) = g(Z_t)(Y_t - W_{\mathcal{D}_t}^\top \gamma)$ ; here,  $g$  is a user-specified function of  $Z_t$  with  $\dim(g) \geq d$ . Using the second result as a basis, one can estimate the synthetic control weights as the solution to the generalized method of moments (GMM) ([Hansen, 1982](#)), i.e.,  $\hat{\gamma}_{\text{PSC}} = (\hat{\gamma}_{\text{PSC}, \mathcal{D}_1}, \dots, \hat{\gamma}_{\text{PSC}, \mathcal{D}_d})^\top$  is the minimizer of  $T_0^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^{T_0} \{\Psi_{\text{PSC}}(O_t; \gamma)\}^\top \hat{\Omega} \{\Psi_{\text{PSC}}(O_t; \gamma)\}$  where  $\hat{\Omega}$  is a user-specified symmetric and positive-definite weight matrix. Importantly, in contrast with the OLS-based estimator  $\hat{\gamma}_{\text{P-OLS}}$  in (4), the proximal estimator  $\hat{\gamma}_{\text{PSC}}$  is consistent for  $\gamma^\dagger$ . Under certain regularity conditions, [Shi et al. \(2023\)](#) established that the resulting GMM estimator of the ATT is consistent and asymptotically normal. For instance, in the special case of constant ATT, i.e.,  $\tau_t^* = \tau^*$  for all  $t = T_0 + 1, \dots, T$ , the estimator  $T_1^{-1} \sum_{t=T_0+1}^T (Y_t - W_{\mathcal{D}_t}^\top \hat{\gamma}_{\text{PSC}})$  is consistent for  $\tau^*$ ; see Section 3.2 of [Shi et al. \(2023\)](#) for details.

### 3 Single Proxy Synthetic Control Approach

#### 3.1 Identification of the Synthetic Control and the Treatment Effect

In this section, we provide a novel synthetic control approach which obviates the need for the interactive fixed effects model and, in fact, does not postulate the existence of a latent factor  $\lambda_t$ . At its core, the approach views the outcomes of the untreated units  $W_{it}$  as proxies for the treatment-free potential outcome of the treated unit  $Y_t^{(0)}$ , which is formally stated as follows:

**Assumption 3.1** (Proxy). There exists a set of control units  $\mathcal{D} = \{\mathcal{D}_1, \dots, \mathcal{D}_d\} \subseteq \{1, \dots, N\}$  satisfying

$$W_{it} \not\perp Y_t^{(0)}, \quad i \in \mathcal{D}, \quad t = 1, \dots, T_0. \quad (7)$$

Condition (7) encodes that the outcome of the untreated units  $W_{\mathcal{D}t}$  are associated with and, therefore, predictive of  $Y_t^{(0)}$  at time  $t = 1, \dots, T_0$ . Additionally, we assume that there exists a set



of synthetic control weights which satisfy the following condition:

**Assumption 3.2** (Existence of Synthetic Control). For all  $t = 1, \dots, T$ , there exists  $\gamma^* = (\gamma_{\mathcal{D}_1}^*, \dots, \gamma_{\mathcal{D}_d}^*)^\top$  satisfying  $Y_t^{(0)} = \mathbb{E}\{W_{\mathcal{D}t}^\top \gamma^* \mid Y_t^{(0)}\}$  almost surely.

Assumption 3.2 is the key identification assumption of the SPSC framework. It states that a synthetic control  $W_{it}^\top \gamma^*$  is conditionally unbiased for  $Y_t^{(0)}$ . The assumption essentially implies that  $Y_t^{(0)}$  falls in the linear span of  $\mathbb{E}\{W_{\mathcal{D}t} \mid Y_t^{(0)}\}$ . The assumption plays an analogous role as condition (2) in Ferman and Pinto (2021) and Shi et al. (2023) and condition (5) in Abadie et al. (2010); however, Assumption 3.2 is fundamentally different from these assumptions because it obviates the need for the existence of either latent factors and corresponding factor loadings, nor of the interactive fixed effects model (1) or any related latent factor model. Additionally, for the pre-treatment periods, Assumption 3.2 is strictly weaker than condition (5) as a mean-zero random variable is not necessarily zero. We remark that the weights satisfying Assumption 3.2 may not be unique, i.e., multiple values of  $\gamma^*$  that satisfy the equation.

To illustrate Assumptions 3.1 and 3.2, we consider the following simple data generating mechanism:

$$W_{it} = \alpha_{i0} + \alpha_{iY} Y_t^{(0)} + e_{it}, \quad \mathbb{E}\{e_{it} \mid Y_t^{(0)}\} = 0, \quad i \in \mathcal{D}, \quad t = 1, \dots, T. \quad (8)$$

Here,  $\alpha_{i0}$  and  $\alpha_{iY}$  are fixed constants with constraints  $\alpha_{iY} \neq 0$ , which encode Assumption 3.1. This regression model is reminiscent of the nonclassical measurement model in measurement error literature (Carroll et al., 2006; Freedman et al., 2008). In particular, if  $\alpha_{i0} = 0$  and  $\alpha_{iY} = 1$ , one recovers the classical measurement error model  $W_{it} = Y_t^{(0)} + e_{it}$  with conditional mean-zero error which has been studied extensively in measurement error literature. Note also that Assumption 3.2 implies certain constraints on  $\gamma^*$ , namely  $\sum_{i \in \mathcal{D}} \gamma_i^* \alpha_{i0} = 0$  and  $\sum_{i \in \mathcal{D}} \gamma_i^* \alpha_{iY} = 1$ ; clearly, multiple  $\gamma^*$  may satisfy these two constraints if the number of donors  $d$  is greater than 2. From a regression model perspective, the donors' outcomes  $W_{it}$  and the treated unit's treatment-free potential outcome  $Y_t^{(0)}$  in model (8) can be viewed as dependent and independent variables, respectively. This may appear somewhat unconventional at first glance, as some previous synthetic control methods treat  $Y_t^{(0)}$  and  $W_{it}$  as dependent and independent variables, respectively, in estimation of synthetic control weights. To be more precise, they use equation (4) to estimate the synthetic control weights

by regressing  $Y_t^{(0)}$  on  $W_{it}$  using standard ordinary (or weighted) least squares. However, as model (8) suggests, our framework is different from previous works in synthetic control and better aligned with regression calibration techniques in measurement error literature (Carroll et al., 2006) in that we view the problem as the reverse regression model of  $W_{it}$  on  $Y_t^{(0)}$ . From this perspective, synthetic control weights  $\gamma^*$  are sought to make the weighted response  $W_{it}^T \gamma^*$  as close as possible to the regressor  $Y_t^{(0)}$ .

As a direct consequence of Assumptions 2.1–3.2, the synthetic control weights  $\gamma^*$  can be represented as a solution to the moment equation given in the following result:

**Theorem 3.1.** *Under Assumptions 2.1–3.2, the synthetic control weights  $\gamma^*$  satisfy  $E(W_{\mathcal{D}t}^T \gamma^* | Y_t) = Y_t$  almost surely for  $t = 1, \dots, T_0$ .*

The proof of the Theorem, as well as all other proofs, are provided in Section C of the Supplementary Material. Theorem 3.1 serves to motivate our approach for estimating the synthetic control weights  $\gamma^*$ , as it only involves the observed data. Another consequence of Assumptions 2.1–3.2 is that, as formalized in Theorem 3.2 below, the synthetic control  $W_{\mathcal{D}t}^T \gamma^*$  can be used to identify  $\tau_t^*$ :

**Theorem 3.2.** *Under Assumptions 2.1–3.2, we have  $E\{Y_t^{(0)}\} = E(W_{\mathcal{D}t}^T \gamma^*)$  for any  $t = 1, \dots, T$ . Additionally, the ATT is identified as  $\tau_t^* = E(Y_t - W_{\mathcal{D}t}^T \gamma^*)$  for  $t = T_0 + 1, \dots, T$ .*

Theorem 3.2 provides a theoretical basis for employing the synthetic control method to estimate the ATT. In particular, following the observations in Abadie and Gardeazabal (2003) and Shi et al. (2023), we use  $Y_t - W_{\mathcal{D}t}^T \gamma^*$  in a standard time series regression where the ATT is identified as the deterministic component of the decomposition  $Y_t - W_{\mathcal{D}t}^T \gamma^* = \tau_t^* + \epsilon_t$ , with  $\epsilon_t$  representing a mean-zero error. The following Sections elaborate on this approach, first describing how the identification result leads to an estimator of  $\gamma^*$ .

### 3.2 Estimation and Inference of the Treatment Effect

We first discuss the estimation of the synthetic control weights  $\gamma^*$ . We consider the following estimating function for the pre-treatment periods:

$$\Psi_{\text{pre}}(O_t; \gamma) = g_t(Y_t)(Y_t - W_{\mathcal{D}t}^T \gamma), \quad t = 1, \dots, T_0. \quad (9)$$

Here,  $g_t$  is a  $p$ -dimensional user-specified function of the outcome of the treated unit at time  $t$ , where  $p \geq d = |\mathcal{D}|$ . For instance,  $g_t$  can be chosen as a collection of truncated polynomial bases functions up to the  $p$ th power of  $y$ , i.e.,  $g_t(y) = (y, y^2, \dots, y^p)^\top$ . Splines or wavelets among other options may be used to generate  $g_t(y)$ . In addition,  $g_t$  can be specified as a time-varying function, potentially enhancing the finite sample performance of the proposed estimator, especially in cases where the outcomes exhibit nonstationary behavior; see Section A.5 of the Supplementary Material for an example of time-varying  $g_t$ . From Theorem 3.1, the estimating function  $\Psi_{\text{pre}}$  satisfies  $\text{E}\{\Psi_{\text{pre}}(O_t; \gamma^*)\} = 0$  for  $t = 1, \dots, T_0$ .

An estimator  $\hat{\gamma}$  can in principle be obtained based on the empirical counterpart of the mean-zero moment condition on  $\Psi_{\text{pre}}$ . Since  $p$ , the dimension of  $\Psi_{\text{pre}}$ , is no smaller than  $d$ , the dimension of  $\gamma^*$ , standard GMM theory (Hansen, 1982) readily applies. Specifically, the GMM estimator  $\hat{\gamma}$  is the solution to the following minimization problem:

$$\hat{\gamma} = \arg \min_{\gamma} \{ \hat{\Psi}_{\text{pre}}(\gamma) \}^\top \hat{\Omega}_{\text{pre}} \{ \hat{\Psi}_{\text{pre}}(\gamma) \} , \quad (10)$$

where  $\hat{\Psi}_{\text{pre}}(\gamma) = T_0^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^{T_0} \Psi_{\text{pre}}(O_t; \gamma)$  is the empirical mean of the estimating function over the pre-treatment periods evaluated at  $\gamma$  and  $\hat{\Omega}_{\text{pre}} \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times p}$  is a user-specified symmetric positive definite matrix, which can be simply chosen as the identity matrix.

Equations (9) and (10) fortunately admit closed-form solutions. For instance, if  $\hat{\Omega}_{\text{pre}}$  is chosen as the identity matrix, we have  $\gamma^* = G_{YW}^{*+} G_{YY}^* + \eta_{YW}^*$  and  $\hat{\gamma} = \hat{G}_{YW}^+ \hat{G}_{YY} + \hat{\eta}_{YW}$  where

$$\begin{aligned} G_{YW}^* &= \frac{1}{T_0} \sum_{t=1}^{T_0} \text{E}\{g_t(Y_t) W_{Dt}^\top\} \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times d} , & G_{YY}^* &= \frac{1}{T_0} \sum_{t=1}^{T_0} \text{E}\{g_t(Y_t) Y_t\} \in \mathbb{R}^p , \\ \hat{G}_{YW} &= \frac{1}{T_0} \sum_{t=1}^{T_0} g_t(Y_t) W_{Dt}^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times d} , & \hat{G}_{YY} &= \frac{1}{T_0} \sum_{t=1}^{T_0} g_t(Y_t) Y_t \in \mathbb{R}^p . \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

Here,  $M^+$  denotes the Moore-Penrose inverse of a matrix  $M$ , and  $\eta_{YW}^*$  and  $\hat{\eta}_{YW}$  are arbitrary vectors in the null spaces of  $G_{YW}^*$  and  $\hat{G}_{YW}$ , respectively, i.e.,  $G_{YW}^* \eta_{YW}^* = 0$  and  $\hat{G}_{YW} \hat{\eta}_{YW} = 0$ . If  $G_{YW}^*$  and  $\hat{G}_{YW}$  are of full column rank, these solutions are uniquely defined as  $\gamma^* = (G_{YW}^{*T} G_{YW}^*)^{-1} G_{YW}^{*T} G_{YY}^*$  and  $\hat{\gamma} = (\hat{G}_{YW}^\top \hat{G}_{YW})^{-1} \hat{G}_{YW}^\top \hat{G}_{YY}$ . In practice, the rank conditions can be validated at least for  $\hat{G}_{YW}$  by investigating its singular values. In the event that  $\hat{G}_{YW}$  is found to be column rank deficient, or nearly so, one may select an alternative choice for  $g_t(\cdot)$  and/or

discard donors that do not appear to contribute information on  $Y_t$  in the pre-treatment period; see Section A.6 of the Supplementary Material for a specific example of the procedure. Alternatively, if  $\widehat{G}_{YW}$  is column rank deficient, one may regularize (10) and solve a penalized version of GMM; see Section A.2 of the Supplementary Material for details. In the remainder of the paper, we assume that  $G_{YW}^*$  is full column rank (a testable condition) such that  $\gamma^*$  is unique.

Once the synthetic control weights are estimated, one could in principle estimate the treatment-free potential outcome and the ATT as  $\widehat{Y}_t^{(0)} = W_{D_t}^T \widehat{\gamma}$  and  $\widehat{\tau}_t = Y_t - W_{D_t}^T \widehat{\gamma}$ , respectively, for  $t = T_0 + 1, \dots, T$ . Unfortunately, without additional assumptions, it is impossible to perform inference based on  $\widehat{\tau}_t$  because the latter will generally fail to be consistent given that we only have access to one observation per each  $t$ . Therefore, in practice, we posit a parsimonious working model for the treatment effect as a function of time. Specifically, we assume that the ATT follows a model indexed by a  $b$ -dimensional parameter  $\beta$  via a function  $\tau(\cdot; \cdot) : [0, \infty) \otimes \mathbb{R}^b \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ . Let  $\beta^* \in \mathbb{R}^b$  be the true parameter satisfying  $\tau_t^* = \tau(t; \beta^*)$  for  $t = 1, \dots, T$ . This parametrization allows us to pool information over time in the post-treatment period to infer  $\beta^*$  and, thus, the ATT. Possible forms for  $\tau(t; \beta)$  are given below:

**Example 3.1** (Constant Effect).  $\tau(t; \beta) = \beta$ ; this model is reasonable if the treatment yields a rapid, short-term effect and it persists for a long period.

**Example 3.2** (Linear Effect).  $\tau(t; \beta) = \beta_0 + \beta_1(t - T_0)_+/T_1$  where let  $(c)_+ = \max(c, 0)$  for a constant  $c$ ; this model is appropriate if the treatment yields a gradual, increasing effect over time.

**Example 3.3** (Nonlinear Effect). This includes a quadratic model  $\tau(t; \beta) = \beta_0 + \beta_1(t - T_0)_+/T_1 + \beta_2(t - T_0)_+^2/T_1$ , or an exponentially time-varying treatment model  $\tau(t; \beta) = \exp\{\beta_0 + \beta_1(t - T_0)_+/T_1\}$ ; this model is appropriate if the treatment yields a nonlinear effect over time.

For tractable inference, we assume that the error process is weakly independent, which is formally stated as follows:

**Assumption 3.3** (Weakly Dependent Error). Let  $\epsilon_t = Y_t - W_{D_t}^T \gamma^* - \tau(t; \beta^*)$  for  $t = 1, \dots, T$ . Then, the error process  $\{\epsilon_t \mid t = 1, \dots, T\}$  is weakly dependent, i.e.,  $\text{corr}(\epsilon_t, \epsilon_{t+t'})$  converges to 0 as  $t' \rightarrow \pm\infty$ .

Assumption 3.3 applies to many standard time series models, including autoregressive (AR) models, moving-average (MA) models, and autoregressive moving-average (ARMA) models.

Along with the assumptions, we will consider an asymptotic setting where  $T_0, T_1 \rightarrow \infty$  and  $T_1/T_0 \rightarrow r \in (0, \infty)$ . Specifically, let  $\Psi(O_t; \gamma, \beta)$  be the following  $(p + b)$ -dimensional estimating function:

$$\Psi(O_t; \gamma, \beta) = \begin{bmatrix} \Psi_{\text{pre}}(O_t; \gamma) \\ \Psi_{\text{post}}(O_t; \gamma, \beta) \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} (1 - A_t)g_t(Y_t)(Y_t - W_{\mathcal{D}t}^T \gamma) \\ A_t \frac{\partial \tau(t; \beta)}{\partial \beta} \{Y_t - W_{\mathcal{D}t}^T \gamma - \tau(t; \beta)\} \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{p+b} .$$

Then, GMM estimators of the synthetic control weights and treatment effect parameter are obtained as the solution to the following minimization problem:

$$(\hat{\gamma}, \hat{\beta}) = \arg \min_{(\gamma, \beta)} \{ \hat{\Psi}(\gamma, \beta) \}^T \hat{\Omega} \{ \hat{\Psi}(\gamma, \beta) \} ,$$

where  $\hat{\Psi}(\gamma, \beta) = T^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^T \Psi(O_t; \gamma, \beta)$  is the empirical mean of the estimating function and  $\hat{\Omega} \in \mathbb{R}^{(p+b) \times (p+b)}$  a user-specified symmetric positive definite block-diagonal matrix as  $\hat{\Omega} = \text{diag}(\hat{\Omega}_{\text{pre}}, \hat{\Omega}_{\text{post}})$ ; for simplicity,  $\hat{\Omega}$  can be chosen as the identity matrix. Under our assumptions, the following result establishes that  $(\hat{\gamma}, \hat{\beta})$  is asymptotically normal:

**Theorem 3.3.** *Suppose that Assumptions 2.1–3.3 holds,  $G_{YW}^*$  is full column rank, and regularity conditions in Section C.2 of the Supplementary Material hold. Then, as  $T \rightarrow \infty$ , we have*

$$\sqrt{T} \{ (\hat{\gamma}^T, \hat{\beta}^T)^T - (\gamma^{*T}, \beta^{*T})^T \} \text{ converges in distribution to } N(0, \Sigma_1^* \Sigma_2^* \Sigma_1^{*T}) .$$

Here,  $\Sigma_1^* = (G^{*T} \Omega^* G^*)^{-1} G^{*T} \Omega^*$  and  $\Sigma_2^* = \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \text{var}\{T^{1/2} \cdot \hat{\Psi}(\gamma^*, \beta^*)\}$  where

$$G^* = \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T E \left\{ \frac{\partial \Psi(O_t; \gamma, \beta)}{\partial (\gamma, \beta)^T} \right\} \Big|_{\gamma=\gamma^*, \beta=\beta^*}, \quad \Omega^* = \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \hat{\Omega} .$$

For inference, we propose the variance estimator  $\hat{\Sigma} = \hat{\Sigma}_1 \hat{\Sigma}_2 \hat{\Sigma}_1^T$ ; here,  $\hat{\Sigma}_1 = (\hat{G}^T \hat{\Omega} \hat{G})^{-1} \hat{G}^T \hat{\Omega}$  with  $\hat{G} = T^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^T \partial \Psi(O_t; \gamma, \beta) / \partial (\gamma, \beta)^T \Big|_{\gamma=\hat{\gamma}, \beta=\hat{\beta}}$ . For  $\hat{\Sigma}_2$ , we use a heteroskedasticity and autocorrelation consistent estimator (Newey and West, 1987; Andrews, 1991) given the time series nature of the observed sample; see Section A.3 of the Supplementary Material for details. Alternatively, one could implement the block bootstrap; see Section A.4 of the Supplementary Material for details.

In the event that donors appear to be highly correlated with each other, particularly in settings

with a large pool of donors, a form of regularization may be needed to improve the finite sample behavior of the proposed estimator. Likewise, a related problem may be due to the smallest singular value of the matrix  $G_{YW}^*$  in (11) being nearly equal to zero making the latter nearly singular so that the true parameter  $(\gamma^*, \beta^*)$  may not be well-estimated by GMM. To resolve these issues, one may include a regularization term for  $\gamma$  such as ridge regularization. One may infer the treatment effect based on the resulting regularized estimator provided that the regularization parameter is appropriately chosen; see Section A.2 of the Supplementary Material for details. The empirical results in the following sections demonstrate that such ridge regularization can improve finite sample inferences.

Lastly, in practice, one may indeed have access to exogenous covariates. Incorporating these covariates in the analysis may be of interest because it may improve the efficiency of the estimated treatment effect. In Section A.7 of the Supplementary Materials, we provide details on how to incorporate available covariates in the SPSC framework.

### 3.3 Conformal Inference of the Treatment Effect

Some drawbacks of the methodology proposed in the previous Section are that (i) a parsimonious model choice for  $\tau_t = \tau(t; \beta)$  may be misspecified and (ii) it potentially requires large  $T_0$  and  $T_1$  for both a law of large numbers and a central limit theorem to apply such that our large sample analysis can reliably be used to quantify uncertainty based on  $\hat{\gamma}$  and  $\hat{\beta}$ . The aforementioned limitations may be prohibitive in real-world applications with limited post-treatment follow-up data available. In order to address this specific challenge, previous works such as Cattaneo et al. (2021); Chernozhukov et al. (2021) develop prediction intervals to assess statistical uncertainty, obviating the need to specify a model for the treatment effect or require a large number of post-treatment time series data. While other approaches can in principle be applied, we focus on the conformal inference approach proposed by Chernozhukov et al. (2021) due to its ready adaptation to the SPSC framework. The key idea of the approach is to construct pointwise prediction intervals for the random treatment effects  $\xi_t^* = Y_t^{(1)} - Y_t^{(0)}$  for  $t = T_0 + 1, \dots, T$  by inverting permutation tests about certain null hypotheses about  $\xi_t^*$ . One crucial requirement for the approach is the existence of an unbiased predictor for  $Y_t^{(0)}$  for  $t = 1, \dots, T$ . In the context of SPSC, the synthetic control  $W_{Dt}^T \gamma^*$  is an unbiased predictor for  $Y_t^{(0)}$  as established in Theorem 3.2, and, consequently,

their approach readily applies. In what follows, we present the approach in detail adapted to the SPSC framework.

Consider an asymptotic regime whereby  $T_0$  goes to infinity while  $T_1$  is fixed. Let  $s \in \{T_0 + 1, \dots, T\}$  be a post-treatment period for which one aims to construct a prediction interval for the treatment effect; without loss of generality, we take  $s = T_0 + 1$ . The null hypothesis of interest can be expressed as  $H_{0,T_0+1} : \xi_{T_0+1}^* = \xi_{0,T_0+1}$ , where  $\xi_{0,T_0+1}$  represents a hypothesized treatment effect value. Under  $H_{0,T_0+1}$ , the treatment-free potential outcome at time  $T_0 + 1$  can be identified as  $Y_{T_0+1}^{(0)} = Y_{T_0+1} - \xi_{0,T_0+1}$  and, consequently, pre-treatment outcomes  $Y_1, \dots, Y_{T_0}$  may in fact be supplemented with  $Y_{T_0+1} - \xi_{0,T_0+1}$  to estimate the synthetic control weights. We may then redefine the pre-treatment estimating function  $\Psi_{\text{pre}}$  in equation (9) as follows:

$$\Psi_{\text{pre}}(O_t; \gamma, \xi_{0,T_0+1}) = \begin{cases} g_t(Y_t)(Y_t - W_{\mathcal{D}t}^T \gamma) , & t = 1, \dots, T_0 \\ g_t(Y_t - \xi_{0,T_0+1})(Y_t - \xi_{0,T_0+1} - W_{\mathcal{D}t}^T \gamma) , & t = T_0 + 1 \end{cases} .$$

At the true synthetic control weights  $\gamma^*$ , the redefined estimating function is mean-zero for  $t = 1, \dots, T_0 + 1$  under  $H_{0,T_0+1}$ . Therefore, a GMM estimator  $\hat{\gamma}(\xi_{0,T_0+1})$  can be obtained by solving the following minimization problem, which is similar to (10):

$$\hat{\gamma}(\xi_{0,T_0+1}) = \arg \min_{\gamma} \{ \hat{\Psi}_{\text{pre}}(\gamma, \xi_{0,T_0+1}) \}^T \hat{\Omega}_{\text{pre}} \{ \hat{\Psi}_{\text{pre}}(\gamma, \xi_{0,T_0+1}) \} ,$$

where  $\hat{\Psi}_{\text{pre}}(\gamma, \xi_{0,T_0+1}) = (T_0 + 1)^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^{T_0+1} \Psi_{\text{pre}}(O_t; \gamma, \xi_{0,T_0+1})$  and  $\hat{\Omega}_{\text{pre}}$  is the weight matrix used in (10). We may then compute residuals  $\hat{\epsilon}_t(\xi_{0,T_0+1}) = Y_t - \xi_{0,T_0+1} A_t - W_{\mathcal{D}t}^T \hat{\gamma}(\xi_{0,T_0+1})$ , and use these residuals to obtain a p-value for testing the null hypothesis as follows:

$$p_{T_0+1}(\xi_{0,T_0+1}) = \frac{1}{T_0 + 1} \sum_{t=1}^{T_0+1} \mathbb{1} \left\{ |\hat{\epsilon}_t(\xi_{0,T_0+1})| \geq |\hat{\epsilon}_{T_0+1}(\xi_{0,T_0+1})| \right\} .$$

In words, the p-value is the proportion of residuals of magnitudes no smaller than the post-treatment residual. Under  $H_{0,T_0+1}$  and regularity conditions including that the error  $\epsilon_t = Y_t - \xi_t^* - W_{\mathcal{D}t}^T \gamma^*$  is stationary and weakly dependent, the p-value is approximately unbiased, i.e.,  $\text{pr}\{p_{T_0+1}(\xi_{0,T_0+1}) \leq \alpha\} = \alpha + o(1)$  as  $T_0 \rightarrow \infty$  for a user-specified confidence level  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ ; we refer the readers to Theorem 1 of [Chernozhukov et al. \(2021\)](#) for technical details. Therefore, an approximate  $100(1 - \alpha)\%$  prediction interval for  $\xi_t^*$  can be constructed by inverting the hypothesis test based

on  $p_{T_0+1}(\xi_{0,T_0+1})$ . This prediction interval is formally defined as  $\mathcal{C}_{T_0+1}(1-\alpha) = \{\xi \mid p_{T_0+1}(\xi) > \alpha\}$  and can be found via grid-search. We remark that the proposed conformal inference approach is also valid for constructing a confidence interval for the ATT by replacing  $\xi_t^*$  with  $\tau_t^*$ .

## 4 Simulation

We conducted a simulation study to evaluate the finite sample performance of the proposed estimator under a variety of conditions. We considered the following data generating mechanisms with pre- and post-treatment periods of length  $T_0 = T_1 \in \{50, 100, 250, 1000\}$  and donor pools of size  $d \in \{2, 5, 9\}$ . For each value of  $T_0$ ,  $T_1$ , and  $d$ , we generated all residual errors for  $t = 1, \dots, T$  based on the AR(2):

$$\begin{aligned} \epsilon_{y,t} &= 0.2\epsilon_{y,t-1} + 0.1\epsilon_{y,t-2} + \eta_{y,t} , & \epsilon_{\tau,t} &= 0.2\epsilon_{\tau,t-1} + 0.1\epsilon_{\tau,t-2} + \eta_{\tau,t} , \\ \epsilon_{w_i,t} &= 0.2\epsilon_{w_i,t-1} + 0.1\epsilon_{w_i,t-2} + \eta_{w_i,t} , \quad i = 1, \dots, d , \end{aligned}$$

where  $\eta$  are generated from a standard normal distribution. The errors  $\epsilon_t$  at  $t = -1, 0$  were initialized to equal zero. The treatment-free potential outcomes at  $t = 1, \dots, T$  were generated as  $Y_t^{(0)} = 0.2Y_{t-1}^{(0)} + 0.1Y_{t-2}^{(0)} + t/T_0 + \epsilon_{y,t}$ . The potential outcomes under treatment at  $t = 1, \dots, T$  were generated as  $Y_t^{(1)} = Y_t^{(0)} + 3A_t + \epsilon_{\tau,t}$ ; therefore, the ATT is  $\tau_t^* = 3$  for all  $t = T_0 + 1, \dots, T$ . Lastly, we generated  $W_{\mathcal{D}t} \in \mathbb{R}^d$  under Assumptions 3.1 and 3.2; see Section A.8 of the Supplementary Material for details. We set  $g_t(\cdot)$  as time-invariant cubic B-spline bases functions with dimension equal to twice the number of donors, i.e.,  $\dim(g_t) = 2d \in \{4, 10, 18\}$ . The knots of the spline functions were chosen based on the empirical quantiles of the pre-treatment outcomes.

Using the generated data, we obtain two ATT estimators based on the proposed SPSC approaches both with and without ridge regularization; see Section A.2 of the Supplementary Material for details on the regularized SPSC estimator. These estimators are referred to as SPSC and SPSC-Ridge, respectively. For comparison, we also considered an OLS-based ATT estimator. Unfortunately, the ATT estimators proposed by [Abadie et al. \(2010\)](#), implemented in `synth` R-package ([Abadie et al., 2011](#)), and [Ben-Michael et al. \(2021\)](#) implemented in `augsynth` R-package ([Ben-Michael, 2023](#)), do not appear to provide readily available standard errors. As a result, we compared our methods to the OLS-based ATT estimator without regularization as described in



Section 2.2, which we simply refer to as OLS hereafter. We repeated the simulation 500 times.

Figure 1 summarizes the empirical distribution of the estimators graphically. Across all scenarios, we find that the OLS estimator is biased for the ATT, particularly when the number of donors is small, say  $d = 2$ ; these results largely confirm our theoretical expectation as discussed in Section 2.2 that the OLS estimator may be biased under a data generating process compatible with the SPSC framework. In contrast, we find the SPSC estimator appears to be unbiased across scenarios, and the corresponding 95% Monte Carlo confidence interval shrinks as the number of time periods increases. This is consistent with the results established in Section 3. Table 1 provides more detailed summary statistics under  $d = 9$ ; those under the other two simulation scenarios are reported in Section A.8 of the Supplementary Material. Unsurprisingly, confidence intervals based on the OLS estimator fail to attain the nominal coverage rate, especially when  $T_0$  and  $T_1$  are large due to non-diminishing bias. On the other hand, confidence intervals based on SPSC estimators attain the nominal coverage rate regardless of whether ridge regularization is used or not. Comparing the two SPSC estimators, we find that SPSC-Ridge has a somewhat larger bias, however, with a smaller standard error, resulting in a smaller mean squared error. In other words, we find that incorporating ridge regularization can improve the estimator’s performance in terms of mean squared error reflecting the well-known bias-variance trade-off phenomenon, which ridge regression has been shown to achieve in many settings (Theobald, 1974; Randolph et al., 2012).




Figure 1: Empirical Distributions of the Estimators for  $d = 2, 5, 9$ . The vertical solid segments represent 95% Monte Carlo confidence interval for each estimator. The dots represent the empirical mean of 500 estimates. The light gray, gray, and black colors encode a corresponding estimator, and the shape of the dots encode the length of the pre-treatment period, respectively. The  $y$ -axis represents the magnitude of bias.

Next, we evaluated the finite sample performance of the conformal inference approach in Section 3.3. As a competing method, we also implemented the approach proposed by Cattaneo et al. (2021), referred to as SCPI hereafter, using the publicly available `scpi` R-package (Cattaneo et al., 2023).

Estimator	OLS				SPSC				SPSC-Ridge			
	$T_0$	50	100	250	1000	50	100	250	1000	50	100	250
Bias ( $\times 10$ )	1.305	1.524	1.479	1.401	-0.206	0.055	-0.037	-0.098	-0.175	-0.035	-0.046	-0.128
ASE ( $\times 10$ )	2.356	1.674	1.098	0.568	4.461	3.008	1.927	0.930	3.245	2.358	1.487	0.747
ESE ( $\times 10$ )	2.956	1.934	1.149	0.603	4.182	2.434	1.614	0.800	3.578	2.261	1.455	0.721
MSE ( $\times 100$ )	10.422	6.054	3.507	2.325	17.500	5.916	2.600	0.648	12.810	5.104	2.116	0.536
Coverage	0.854	0.788	0.710	0.306	0.956	0.962	0.980	0.970	0.922	0.940	0.958	0.946

Table 1: Summary Statistics of Estimation Results. Bias row gives the empirical bias of 500 estimates. ASE row gives the asymptotic standard error obtained from the sandwich estimator of the GMM. ESE row gives the standard deviation of 500 estimates. MSE row gives the mean squared error of 500 estimates. Coverage row gives the empirical coverage rate of 95% confidence intervals based on the asymptotic standard error. Bias, standard errors, and mean squared error are scaled by factors of 10, 10, and 100, respectively.

For each simulated data set, we obtained pointwise 95% pointwise prediction intervals for the treatment effect at the first post-treatment time  $t = T_0 + 1$ , i.e.,  $\xi_{T_0+1}^* = 3 + \epsilon_{\tau, T_0+1}$ , using the proposed conformal inference approach and SCPI. We then calculated the empirical coverage rates of these pointwise prediction intervals based on 500 simulation repetitions, i.e., the proportions of repetitions where  $\xi_{T_0+1}^*$  is contained in 95% pointwise prediction intervals. Table 2 gives the empirical coverage rates for each simulation scenario. We find that the conformal inference approach for the SPSC attains the desired nominal coverage rate across all simulation scenarios in general with and without ridge regularization, aligning closely with theoretical expectations. However, we find that the SCPI approach sometimes fails to do so, especially when the number of donors is small and the time periods are long, say  $d = 2$  and  $T_0 = 1000$ . This finding demonstrates that existing inference methods may be invalid when applied to a dataset compatible with the SPSC framework.

Estimator	$T_0$	SPSC				SPSC-Ridge				SCPI			
		50	100	250	1000	50	100	250	1000	50	100	250	1000
$d$	2	0.964	0.946	0.940	0.948	0.968	0.950	0.940	0.948	0.948	0.924	0.920	0.904
	5	0.962	0.956	0.956	0.942	0.956	0.946	0.960	0.932	0.980	0.982	0.978	0.920
	9	0.954	0.948	0.966	0.944	0.942	0.942	0.964	0.952	0.984	0.990	0.978	0.954

Table 2: Empirical Coverage Rates of 95% Pointwise Prediction Intervals. The numbers in SPSC and SPSC-Ridge columns give the empirical coverage rates of 95% pointwise prediction intervals obtained from the conformal inference approach in Section 3.3. The numbers in SCPI column give the empirical coverage rates of 95% pointwise prediction intervals obtained from the approach proposed by Cattaneo et al. (2021).

In Section A.8 of the Supplementary Material, we report results for additional simulation studies where exogenous covariates are included and the ATT is linear. In brief, these additional results

largely agree with the asymptotic properties established in the previous sections. Furthermore, in Section A.9 of the Supplementary Material, we assess the finite sample performance of the proposed conformal inference approach based on the simulation scenario given in Cattaneo et al. (2021), which may not be compatible with the key identifying condition, Assumption 3.2, of SPSC. As expected, the approach of Cattaneo et al. (2021) performs well in this setting, and our approach sometimes fails to attain the nominal coverage rate, particularly when the outcomes are not stationary in the pre-treatment period. However, explicitly incorporating time dependence in specification of  $g_t$  in (9) appears to significantly improve the performance of our conformal inference approach in such cases.

## 5 Application

We applied the proposed method to analyze a real-world application. In particular, we revisited the dataset analyzed in Fohlin and Lu (2021), which consists of time series data of length 384 for 59 trust companies, recorded between January 5, 1906, and December 30, 1908, with a triweekly frequency. Notably, this time period includes the Panic of 1907 (Moen and Tallman, 1992), a financial panic that lasted for three weeks in the United States starting in mid-October, 1907. As a result of the panic, there was a significant drop in the stock market during this studied period. From this context, we focused on the effect of the financial panic in October 1907 on the log stock price of trust companies using  $T_0 = 217$  pre-treatment periods and  $T_1 = 167$  post-treatment periods, respectively.

The treated unit and donors were defined as follows. According to Fohlin and Lu (2021), Knickerbocker, Trust Company of America, and Lincoln were the three trust companies that were most severely affected during the panic. However, despite the absence of the financial panic, Lincoln’s stock price showed a strong downward trend over the pre-treatment period. Therefore, we defined the average of the log stock prices of the first two trust companies as  $Y_t$ , the outcome of the treated units at time  $t = 1, \dots, 384$ . As for potential donors, Fohlin and Lu (2021) identified 49 trust companies that had weak financial connections with the aforementioned three severely affected trust companies. However, some of these trust companies seem to violate the relevance condition (7). Therefore, we chose donors based on the procedure proposed in Section A.6 of the

Supplementary Material, which resulted in  $d = 24$  trust companies. Accordingly, the log stock prices of these 24 trust companies were defined as  $W_{\mathcal{D}t}$ , the outcome of the donors. We remark that the results remain consistent even when different donors are used; see Section A.10 of the Supplementary Material for details. Following the choice in the simulation study, we chose the function  $g_t(Y_t^{(0)})$  in (9) as time-invariant cubic B-spline bases functions of dimension  $2d = 48$  where the knots were chosen based on the empirical quantiles of the pre-treatment outcomes.

We first report the ATT estimates under a constant treatment effect model  $\tau(t; \beta) = \beta$ . Similar to Section 4, we compare the same three estimators: the unconstrained OLS synthetic control estimator and SPSC estimators with and without ridge regularization. In addition, we compare these estimators to the standard synthetic control approach proposed by Abadie et al. (2010), which is essentially the OLS synthetic control estimator with constraints on synthetic control weights to be non-negative and sum to one; we refer to this estimator as OLS-Standard hereafter. The results are summarized in Table 3. Interestingly, all four estimators yield similar point estimates of the treatment effect, ranging from  $-0.975$  to  $-0.830$ . According to the 95% confidence intervals, three estimates uniformly reject the null hypothesis of no treatment effect across time points, suggesting that the financial panic led to a significant decrease in the average log stock price of Knickerbocker and Trust Company of America. We remark that Abadie et al. (2010)’s approach does not provide a standard error or 95% confidence interval for the ATT. In terms of the length of the confidence interval, SPSC with ridge regularization yields the narrowest confidence interval, followed by SPSC with no regularization, and the approach based on OLS.

Statistic	Estimator			
	OLS	OLS-Standard	SPSC	SPSC-Ridge
Estimate	-0.966	-0.877	-0.975	-0.830
Asymptotic Standard Error	0.108	-	0.101	0.098
95% Confidence Interval	(-1.177, -0.755)	-	(-1.172, -0.777)	(-1.022, -0.638)

Table 3: Summary Statistics of the Estimation of the Average Treatment Effect on the Treated.

Next, we construct the pointwise confidence intervals based on the SPSC approach with ridge regularization using the conformal inference approach in Section 3.3. As a competing method, we consider the approach in Cattaneo et al. (2021). Figure 2 provides the visual summary of the result. For the post-treatment period  $t = 218, \dots, 384$ , we find that  $\hat{Y}_t^{(0)}$ , the predictive value of the treatment-free potential outcome, have similar shapes for all two methods. However, 95% pointwise

prediction intervals behave differently for the two methods. Specifically, we focus on the average width of the prediction intervals over the post-treatment periods. The prediction intervals from the approach proposed by Cattaneo et al. (2021) have an average width of 0.108; in contrast, our method with ridge regularization yields prediction intervals with average widths of 0.046, which is more than 50% narrower than those from the competing method. The comparison reveals that our method appears to produce tighter predictions of treatment effect trends. Combining results in the simulation study and the data application, we conclude that our approach appears to perform quite competitively when compared to some leading alternative methods in the literature.




Figure 2: Graphical Summaries of the 95% Prediction Intervals over the Post-treatment Periods. The left and right plots present the results using the approach proposed by Cattaneo et al. (2021) and the conformal inference approach presented in Section 3.3 with ridge regularization, respectively. The numbers show the average length of the 95% prediction intervals over the post-treatment periods.

Additionally, for the sake of credibility, we performed the following falsification study. We restricted the entire analysis to the pre-treatment period in which the causal effect is expected to be null. We artificially defined a financial panic time in late July 1907, which is roughly three months before the actual financial panic. This resulted in the lengths of the pre- and post-treatment periods equal to  $T'_0 = 181$  and  $T'_1 = 36$ , respectively. The proposed SPSC estimators with and without ridge regularization resulted in the placebo ATT estimates of 0.001 and 0.030 with 95% confidence intervals of  $(-0.009, 0.011)$  and  $(-0.029, 0.089)$ , respectively. The placebo ATT estimate obtained from the unconstrained OLS estimator was 0.009 with a 95% confidence interval of  $(-0.020, 0.014)$ . All 95% prediction intervals include the null, consistent with the expectation of no treatment effect in the placebo period. Lastly, the constrained OLS estimator (i.e., OLS-Standard) produced a placebo ATT estimate of  $-0.013$ , which is also close to zero; however, corresponding statistical inference was not available. Therefore, these results provide no evidence against any of the estima-

tors. In Figure 9 of the Supplementary Material, we provide a trajectory of the synthetic controls along with 95% prediction intervals under the placebo treatment.

In Section A.10 of the Supplementary Material, we provide additional results when different donor pools are used. In brief, all results are similar across choices of donors.

## 6 Concluding Remarks

In this paper, we propose a novel SPSC approach in which the synthetic control is defined as a linear combination of donors' outcomes whose conditional expectation matches the treatment-free potential outcome in both pre- and post-treatment periods. The model is analogous to a nonclassical measurement error model widely studied in standard measurement error literature. Under the framework, we establish the identification of a synthetic control, and provide an estimation strategy for the ATT. Furthermore, we introduce a method for inferring the treatment effect through pointwise prediction intervals, which remains valid even in the case of a short post-treatment period. We validate our methods through simulation studies and provide an application analyzing a real-world financial dataset related to the 1907 Panic.

As briefly mentioned in the introduction, the proposed SPSC framework has a connection to the single proxy control framework (Tchetgen Tchetgen, 2013; Tchetgen Tchetgen et al., 2023) developed for i.i.d. data. In particular, Tchetgen Tchetgen et al. (2023) proposed an approach that relies on a so-called outcome bridge function, which is a (potentially nonlinear) function of outcome proxies. Importantly, an important property of the outcome bridge function is that it is conditionally unbiased for the treatment-free potential outcome. Therefore, the proposed SPSC approach can be viewed as an adaptation of the outcome bridge function-based single proxy control approach to the synthetic control setting, where the outcome bridge function is known a priori to be a linear function of donors' outcomes. In Section B of the Supplementary Material, we present a general SPSC framework, which is designed to accommodate nonparametric and nonlinear synthetic controls. Therefore, this framework eliminates the need for employing linear synthetic controls and establishes a more direct connection with the outcome bridge function-based single proxy approach presented in Tchetgen Tchetgen et al. (2023). Notably, the general SPSC framework addresses the underdeveloped aspect of the synthetic control literature by allowing for various types of outcomes,

including continuous, binary, count, or a combination of these.

In addition to the outcome bridge function-based approach, [Tchetgen Tchetgen et al. \(2023\)](#) introduced two other single proxy control approaches for i.i.d. sampling. One approach relies on propensity score weighting, eliminating the need for specifying an outcome bridge function. The second approach uses both the propensity score and the outcome bridge function and, more importantly, exhibits a doubly-robust property in that the treatment effect in view is identified if either propensity score or outcome bridge function, but not necessarily both, is correctly specified. Consequently, a promising direction for future research would be to develop new SPSC approaches by extending these single proxy methods to the synthetic control setting. Such new SPSC approaches can be viewed as complementing the doubly-robust proximal synthetic control approach ([Qiu et al., 2022](#)). However, such extensions pose significant challenges due to (i) a single treated unit with non-random treatment assignment, (ii) multiple heterogeneous untreated donor units; and (iii) serial correlation and heteroskedasticity due to the time series nature of the data. In particular, non-random treatment assignment undermines the conventional notion of the propensity score, rendering it undefined. Approaches for addressing these challenges and developing corresponding statistical methods will be considered elsewhere.

## Supplementary Material

This document provides details of “Single Proxy Synthetic Control.” In Section A, we provide details of the paper. In Section B, we provide details on the nonparametric single proxy synthetic control framework. Lastly, we provide the proofs of the results in Section C.

### A Details of the Paper

#### A.1 Inconsistency of the Ordinary Least Squares Estimator

Following [Ferman and Pinto \(2021\)](#), we provide details on why synthetic controls obtained from the ordinary least squares (OLS) may be inconsistent. For simplicity, we consider an unconstrained case, in which equation (4) of the main paper reduces to:

$$\hat{\gamma}_{\text{OLS}} = \arg \min_{\gamma} Q(\gamma), \quad Q(\gamma) = \frac{1}{T_0} \sum_{t=1}^{T_0} (Y_t - W_{\mathcal{D}t}^T \gamma)^2. \quad (4)$$

For a fixed  $\gamma = (\gamma_{\mathcal{D}_1}, \dots, \gamma_{\mathcal{D}_d})^T$ , the probability limit of  $Q(\gamma)$  as  $T_0 \rightarrow \infty$  is given as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{T_0 \rightarrow \infty} Q(\gamma) &= \lim_{T_0 \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{T_0} \sum_{t=1}^{T_0} (Y_t - W_{\mathcal{D}t}^T \gamma)^2 \\ &= \lim_{T_0 \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{T_0} \sum_{t=1}^{T_0} \left\{ W_{\mathcal{D}t}^T (\gamma^\dagger - \gamma) + e_{0t} - \sum_{i \in \mathcal{D}} \gamma_i^\dagger e_{it} \right\}^2 \\ &= \lim_{T_0 \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{T_0} \sum_{t=1}^{T_0} \left\{ \sum_{i \in \mathcal{D}} (\gamma_i^\dagger - \gamma_i) \mu_i^T \lambda_t + e_{0t} - \sum_{i=1}^N \gamma_i e_{it} \right\}^2 \\ &= \sum_{i \in \mathcal{D}} (\gamma_i^\dagger - \gamma_i)^2 \mu_i^T \Lambda \mu_i + \left( 1 + \sum_{i \in \mathcal{D}} \gamma_i^2 \right) \sigma_e^2. \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

where the second and third lines hold from (3) and (1) of the main paper, respectively, which are restated below:

$$\begin{aligned} Y_t &= \tau_t^* A_t + \mu_0^T \lambda_t + e_{0t}, & \mathbb{E}(e_{0t} \mid \lambda_t) &= 0 \\ W_{it} &= \mu_i^T \lambda_t + e_{it}, & \mathbb{E}(e_{it} \mid \lambda_t) &= 0, \quad i = 1, \dots, N, \quad t = 1, \dots, T. \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$



and

$$Y_t^{(0)} = W_{\mathcal{D}t}^T \gamma^\dagger + e_{0t} - \sum_{i \in \mathcal{D}} \gamma_i^\dagger e_{it}, \quad t = 1, \dots, T. \quad (3)$$

The last line holds under the following additional assumptions on  $\lambda_t$  and  $e_{it}$  as  $T_0 \rightarrow \infty$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{T_0} \sum_{t=1}^{T_0} \lambda_t &= o_P(1), & \frac{1}{T_0} \sum_{t=1}^{T_0} \lambda_t \lambda_t^T &= \Lambda + o_P(1) \\ \frac{1}{T_0} \sum_{t=1}^{T_0} e_{it} &= o_P(1), & \frac{1}{T_0} \sum_{t=1}^{T_0} e_{it} e_{jt} &= \mathbb{1}(i=j) \sigma_e^2, & \frac{1}{T_0} \sum_{t=1}^{T_0} e_{it} \lambda_t &= o_P(1). \end{aligned}$$

where  $\Lambda$  is positive semidefinite. Clearly,  $\gamma_i^\dagger$  is not the minimizer of (12) unless  $\sigma_e^2 = 0$ , i.e., a noiseless setting. Therefore, the OLS weights defined in (4) converge to the minimizer of  $Q(\gamma)$  as  $T_0 \rightarrow \infty$ , which is different from the true synthetic control weights  $\gamma^\dagger$  satisfying  $\mu_0 = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{D}} \gamma_i^\dagger \mu_i$ . This implies that the OLS estimator is inconsistent for  $\gamma^\dagger$  unless  $\sigma_e^2 = 0$ .

## A.2 A Synthetic Control Estimator based on Regularized Generalized Method of Moments

We consider the following  $\ell_2$ -regularized generalized method of moments (GMM) by including ridge regularization in GMM:

$$(\hat{\gamma}_\lambda, \hat{\beta}_\lambda) = \arg \min_{(\gamma, \beta)} \left[ \{\hat{\Psi}(\gamma, \beta)\}^T \hat{\Omega} \{\hat{\Psi}(\gamma, \beta)\} + \lambda \|\gamma\|_2^2 \right]. \quad (13)$$

We remark that other forms of regularization, such as lasso regularization (Tibshirani, 1996), are possible. However, there are several advantages of using ridge regularization. First, for given  $\lambda$ , we can obtain a closed-form solution of the synthetic control weights to (13) as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\gamma}_\lambda &= \left( \hat{G}_{YW}^T \hat{\Omega} \hat{G}_{YW} + \lambda \hat{\Omega} \right)^{-1} \left( \hat{G}_{YW}^T \hat{\Omega} \hat{G}_{YY} \right), \\ \hat{G}_{YW} &= \frac{1}{T_0} \sum_{t=1}^{T_0} g_t(Y_t) W_{\mathcal{D}t}^T, \quad \hat{G}_{YY} = \frac{1}{T_0} \sum_{t=1}^{T_0} g_t(Y_t) Y_t. \end{aligned}$$

Second, we can establish the asymptotic normality of the estimator in (13) when  $\lambda$  is chosen at a certain rate:

**Theorem A.1.** *Suppose the conditions of Theorem 3.3 of the main paper are satisfied. Additionally,*

suppose the regularization parameter has a rate of  $\lambda = o(T^{-1/2})$ . Then,  $T \rightarrow \infty$ , we have

$$\sqrt{T} \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} \widehat{\gamma}_\lambda \\ \widehat{\beta}_\lambda \end{pmatrix} - \begin{pmatrix} \gamma^* \\ \beta^* \end{pmatrix} \right\} \text{ converges in distribution to } N\left(0, \Sigma_1^* \Sigma_2^* \Sigma_1^{*\top}\right).$$

Here,  $\Sigma_1^* = (G^{*\top} \Omega^* G^*)^{-1} G^{*\top} \Omega^*$  and  $\Sigma_2^* = \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \text{var}\{\sqrt{T} \cdot \widehat{\Psi}(\gamma^*, \beta^*)\}$  where

$$G^* = \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T E \left\{ \frac{\partial \Psi(O_t; \gamma, \beta)}{\partial (\gamma, \beta)^\top} \right\} \Big|_{\gamma=\gamma^*, \beta=\beta^*}, \quad \Omega^* = \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \widehat{\Omega}.$$

We remark that similar results are established in [Fu and Knight \(2000\)](#); [Fu \(2003\)](#); [Caner \(2009\)](#).

In addition, we can establish a similar result when covariates are included.

Following [Theorem 3.3](#), we may use  $\widehat{\Sigma}_1 = (\widehat{G}^\top \widehat{\Omega} \widehat{G})^{-1} \widehat{G}^\top \widehat{\Omega}$  as an estimator of  $\Sigma_1^*$ . Alternatively, to incorporate ridge regularization, one can use  $\widehat{\Sigma}_1 = (\widehat{G}_\lambda^\top \widehat{\Omega} \widehat{G}_\lambda)^{-1} \widehat{G}_\lambda^\top \widehat{\Omega}$  where  $\widehat{G}_\lambda = T^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^T \partial \Psi_\lambda(O_t; \gamma, \beta) / \partial (\gamma, \beta)^\top \Big|_{\gamma=\widehat{\gamma}, \beta=\widehat{\beta}}$  where

$$\Psi_\lambda(O_t; \gamma, \beta) = \begin{bmatrix} (1 - A_t) g_t(Y_t) (Y_t - W_{\mathcal{D}t}^\top \gamma) \\ A_t \frac{\partial \tau(t; \beta)}{\partial \beta^\top} \{Y_t - W_{\mathcal{D}t}^\top \gamma - \tau(t; \beta)\} \\ \sqrt{\lambda} \cdot \gamma \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{p+b+d}.$$

The matrix  $\Sigma_2^*$  can be estimated by a heteroskedasticity and autocorrelation consistent estimator with or without incorporating ridge regularization. Or, one can use block bootstrap methods to construct a variance estimator; see [Section A.4](#) for details. Lastly, we choose  $\lambda$  based on leave-one-out cross-validation; see [Algorithm 1](#) below.

### A.3 A Heteroskedasticity and Autocorrelation Consistent Covariance Matrix Estimator

We provide details of a heteroskedasticity and autocorrelation consistent (HAC) covariance matrix estimator, which are obtained by following approaches of [Newey and West \(1987\)](#) and [Andrews \(1991\)](#). Let  $(\widehat{\gamma}, \widehat{\beta})$  and  $\Psi(O_t; \gamma, \beta)$  be the GMM estimators used in [Theorem 3.3](#) and the corresponding estimating function, respectively. Then, for a given bandwidth  $\omega > 0$  and a kernel function  $\mathcal{K}(z)$ , a heteroskedasticity and autocorrelation consistent estimator of  $\Sigma_2^* = \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \text{var}\{\sqrt{T} \cdot \widehat{\Psi}(\gamma^*, \beta^*)\}$

---

**Algorithm 1** Leave-one-out Cross-validation for Choosing the Regularization Parameter  $\lambda$ 


---

**Require:** Length of the pre-treatment periods  $T_0$

1: **for**  $t = 1, \dots, T_0$  **do**

2: Let  $\widehat{G}_{YW,(-t)}$  and  $\widehat{G}_{YY,(-t)}$  be

$$\widehat{G}_{YW,(-t)} = \frac{1}{T_0 - 1} \sum_{s=1, s \neq t}^{T_0} g_t(Y_s) W_{\mathcal{D}_s}^T, \quad \widehat{G}_{YY,(-t)} = \frac{1}{T_0 - 1} \sum_{s=1, s \neq t}^{T_0} g_t(Y_s) Y_s$$

3: Let  $\widehat{\gamma}_{(-t), \lambda} = \{\widehat{G}_{YW,(-t)}^T \widehat{\Omega} \widehat{G}_{YW,(-t)} + \lambda \widehat{\Omega}\}^{-1} \{\widehat{G}_{YW,(-t)}^T \widehat{\Omega} \widehat{G}_{YY,(-t)}\}$

4: Calculate the leave-one-out residual  $\widehat{e}_{t, \lambda} = Y_t - W_{\mathcal{D}_t}^T \widehat{\gamma}_{(-t), \lambda}$

5: **end for**

6: Obtain the mean on the leave-one-out residuals  $\bar{e}_{t, \lambda} = T_0^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^{T_0} \widehat{e}_{t, \lambda}$

7: **return** Obtain the optimal  $\lambda$  that minimizes the absolute value of  $\bar{e}_{t, \lambda}$ :

$$\lambda_{\text{opt}} = \arg \min_{\lambda} |\bar{e}_{t, \lambda}|$$


---

is given as

$$\widehat{\Sigma}_2 = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \begin{bmatrix} \{\Psi(O_t; \widehat{\gamma}, \widehat{\beta})\} \{\Psi(O_t; \widehat{\gamma}, \widehat{\beta})\}^T \\ + \sum_{s=1}^T \mathcal{K}(s/\omega) \{\Psi(O_t; \widehat{\gamma}, \widehat{\beta})\} \{\Psi(O_{t+s}; \widehat{\gamma}, \widehat{\beta})\}^T \\ + \sum_{s=1}^T \mathcal{K}(s/\omega) \{\Psi(O_{t+s}; \widehat{\gamma}, \widehat{\beta})\} \{\Psi(O_s; \widehat{\gamma}, \widehat{\beta})\}^T \end{bmatrix}.$$

Popular choices for the kernel function are Bartlett and quadratic spectral functions, which are defined as follows:

- Bartlett kernel:  $\mathcal{K}(z) = \{1 - |z|\} \mathbb{1}\{|z| \leq 1\}$
- Quadratic spectral kernel:  $\mathcal{K}(z) = \{25/(12\pi^2 z^2)\} \cdot \{\sin(6\pi z/5)/(6\pi z/5) - \cos(6\pi z/5)\}$

For these two kernel functions, the bandwidth parameter  $\omega$  can be chosen based on the approximation to the first-order autoregressive model; see Algorithm 2 for details. We use the quadratic spectral kernel function for the simulation studies and the data analysis of the main paper.

#### A.4 Block Bootstrap

In this section, we provide a moving block bootstrap method (Kunsch, 1989; Liu and Singh, 1992) adapted to our setting. Algorithm 3 provides details of the block bootstrap implementation. We remark that other block bootstrap methods can be adopted with minor modifications; see Lahiri (1999) for examples of block bootstrap methods.

---

**Algorithm 2** Choice of Bandwidth Parameters for Bartlett and Quadratic Spectral Kernel Functions

---

- 1: Let  $(\widehat{\gamma}, \widehat{\beta})$  and  $\Psi_{\text{post}}(O_t; \gamma, \beta) \in \mathbb{R}^b$  be the GMM estimators used in Theorem 3.3 and the corresponding estimating function related to  $\beta$ , respectively.
- 2: **for**  $s = 1, \dots, b$  **do**
- 3: Fit AR(1) model for the  $s$ th component of the time series  $\{\Psi_{\text{post}}(O_t; \widehat{\gamma}, \widehat{\beta})\}_{t=1, \dots, T}$ .
- 4: Let  $\widehat{\rho}_s$  and  $\widehat{\sigma}_s^2$  be the estimated coefficient of the autoregressive coefficient and the estimated variance of the error from the AR(1) model above, respectively.
- 5: **end for**
- 6: For Bartlett and quadratic spectral kernel functions, we choose the bandwidth as

$$\omega_{\text{Bartlett}} = 1.1447\{\alpha_1 \cdot T\}^{1/3}, \quad \alpha_1 = \left\{ \sum_{s=1}^b \frac{\widehat{\sigma}_s^4}{(1 - \widehat{\rho}_s)^4} \right\}^{-1} \left\{ \sum_{s=1}^b \frac{4\widehat{\rho}_s^2 \widehat{\sigma}_s^4}{(1 - \widehat{\rho}_s)^6 (1 + \widehat{\rho}_s)^2} \right\}$$

$$\omega_{\text{QS}} = 1.3221\{\alpha_2 \cdot T\}^{1/5}, \quad \alpha_2 = \left\{ \sum_{s=1}^b \frac{\widehat{\sigma}_s^4}{(1 - \widehat{\rho}_s)^4} \right\}^{-1} \left\{ \sum_{s=1}^b \frac{4\widehat{\rho}_s^2 \widehat{\sigma}_s^4}{(1 - \widehat{\rho}_s)^8} \right\}.$$

- 7: **return** Bandwidth parameters  $\omega_{\text{Bartlett}}$  and  $\omega_{\text{QS}}$ .
- 

**Algorithm 3** Moving Block Bootstrap in Single Proxy Synthetic Control Framework

---

**Require:** Length of the block  $L < T_0$ , Number of bootstrap repetitions  $B$

- 1: Let the pre- and post-treatment blocks be

$$B_{\text{pre},1} = \{O_1, \dots, O_L\}, \quad \dots, \quad B_{\text{pre},T_0-L+1} = \{O_{T_0-L+1}, \dots, O_{T_0}\}$$

$$B_{\text{post},1} = \{O_{T_0+1}, \dots, O_{T_0+L}\}, \quad \dots, \quad B_{\text{post},T_0-L+1} = \{O_{T-L+1}, \dots, O_T\}$$

- 2: **for**  $b = 1, \dots, B$  **do**
- 3: Randomly sample  $K_{\text{pre}} = \lceil T_0/L \rceil$  pre-treatment blocks and  $K_{\text{post}} = \lceil T_1/L \rceil$  post-treatment blocks with replacement, respectively; we denote these blocks as  $\{B_{\text{pre},1}^{(b)}, \dots, B_{\text{pre},K_{\text{pre}}}^{(b)}\}$  and  $\{B_{\text{post},1}^{(b)}, \dots, B_{\text{post},K_{\text{post}}}^{(b)}\}$
- 4: Choose the first  $T_0$  and  $T_1$  observations from the resampled blocks, i.e.,

$$\{O_1^{(b)}, \dots, O_{T_0}^{(b)}\} = \text{first } T_0 \text{ observations of } \{B_{\text{pre},1}^{(b)}, \dots, B_{\text{pre},K_{\text{pre}}}^{(b)}\}$$

$$\{O_{T_0+1}^{(b)}, \dots, O_T^{(b)}\} = \text{first } T_1 \text{ observations of } \{B_{\text{post},1}^{(b)}, \dots, B_{\text{post},K_{\text{post}}}^{(b)}\}$$

- 5: Calculate  $\widehat{\beta}^{(b)}$  from the GMM in Section 3.2 using  $\{O_1^{(b)}, \dots, O_{T_0}^{(b)}, O_{T_0+1}^{(b)}, \dots, O_T^{(b)}\}$ .
  - 6: **end for**
  - 7: **return** Report the variance of the bootstrap estimates  $\{\widehat{\beta}^{(1)}, \dots, \widehat{\beta}^{(B)}\}$
- 

The choice of block length  $L$  is critical to the performance of block bootstrap methods. The optimal choice of  $L$  for minimizing mean square error is known to be  $O(T^{1/3})$ . In the simulation studies in Section 4, we use the bandwidth of the Bartlett kernel function  $\omega_{\text{Bartlett}}$  in Algorithm 2 of which the rate is  $O(T^{1/3})$ . As discussed, this choice seems reasonable based on the simulation

results reported in Section A.8.

### A.5 An Example of Time-varying $g_t$ Functions

Suppose that  $Y_t^{(0)}$  in the pre-treatment period appears to be nonstationary based on statistical procedures, such as Box-Pierce and Ljung-Box tests (Box and Pierce, 1970; Ljung and Box, 1978). Under this case, one may use time periods in estimation of the synthetic control, which may improve performance. In order to implement this, one can use a time-varying coefficient function  $g_t$  in the pre-treatment estimating function  $\Psi_{\text{pre}}$ . For example, one can specify  $g_t$  as follows:

$$g_t(y) = \begin{bmatrix} \phi_{Y_t^{(0)}}(y) \\ \phi_{\mathcal{T}}(t) \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{p_y + p_t} \quad (14)$$

where  $\phi_{Y_t^{(0)}} : \text{supp}(\{Y_t^{(0)} \mid t = 1, \dots, T_0\}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{p_y}$  and  $\phi_{\mathcal{T}} : [0, T] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{p_t}$  are collections of  $p_y$  and  $p_t$  bases functions associated with  $Y_t^{(0)}$  and  $t$ , respectively. Using a time-varying  $g_t$ , one can obtain a synthetic control estimator and an ATT estimator by following the proposed approach in the main paper. The aforementioned adjustment is also applicable to the conformal inference discussed in Section 3.3. In particular, under null hypotheses  $H_0 : \xi_t^* = \xi_{0t}$  for  $t \in \{T_0 + 1, \dots, T\}$ , the pre-treatment estimating function  $\Psi_{\text{pre}}$  is given as follows:

$$\Psi_{\text{pre}}(O_t; \gamma, \xi_{0, T_0+1}, \dots, \xi_{0, T}) = \begin{cases} g_t(Y_t)(Y_t - W_{\mathcal{D}t}^T \gamma) & t = 1, \dots, T_0 \\ g_t(Y_t - \xi_{0t})(Y_t - \xi_{0t} - W_{\mathcal{D}t}^T \gamma) & t = T_0 + 1, \dots, T \end{cases},$$

where  $g_t$  is specified as (14). The rest of the procedure remains the same as in Section 3.3. In Section A.9, we demonstrate that incorporating a time-varying  $g_t$  improves the performance of the conformal approach in Section 3.3 in the presence of nonstationarity.

### A.6 Selection of a Donor Pool

We provide a procedure for how to choose a donor pool when many donor candidates are available. In Algorithm 4, we present details of the procedure. The key idea of the procedure is to select donors that seem to satisfy Assumption 3.1, which is  $W_{it} \perp\!\!\!\perp Y_t^{(0)}$  for all  $i \in \mathcal{D}$  and  $t = 1, \dots, T_0$ . In other words, donor candidates that appear to be independent of  $Y_t^{(0)}$  are discarded. The approach is akin to the widely-used backward selection technique employed in linear regression models.

---

**Algorithm 4** Choice of a Donor Pool

---

**Require:** Number of donor candidates  $N$ , Threshold p-value level  $\alpha$  (e.g.,  $\alpha = 0.05$ )

```
1: Initiate with  $\mathcal{D} = \{1, \dots, N\}$ 
2: while Until break in line 11 do
3:   for  $i \in \mathcal{D}$  do
4:     Using pre-treatment periods  $t = 1, \dots, T_0$ , fit a linear regression model of  $W_{it}$  on
        $(Y_t^{(0)}, \{W_{st}\}_{s \in \mathcal{D} \setminus \{i\}})$ , i.e.,  $W_{it} = b_{iY} Y_t^{(0)} + \sum_{s \neq t} b_{is} W_{st} + e_{it}$ 
5:     Let  $p_i$  be the p-value of testing  $H_0 : b_{iY} = 0$  based on the ordinary least squares estimator
6:   end for
7:   Find a donor associated with the largest p-value, i.e.,  $m = \arg \max_{i \in \mathcal{D}} p_i$ 
8:   if  $p_m > \alpha$  then
9:     Drop  $m$  from the donor pool, i.e.,  $\mathcal{D} \leftarrow \mathcal{D} \setminus \{m\}$ 
10:  else
11:    Break the while loop
12:  end if
13: end while
14: return A subset of donors  $\mathcal{D} \subseteq \{1, \dots, N\}$ 
```

---

We provide some detailed explanations for each step. Initially, we include all  $W_{it}$  for  $i = 1, \dots, N$  in the donor pool, denoted by  $\mathcal{D}$  (line 1). Next, we conduct regression models, treating each donor as a dependent variable, while considering  $Y_t^{(0)}$  and the other donors in  $\mathcal{D}$  as independent variables (line 4). From each regression model, we calculate the p-value of the coefficient associated with  $Y_t^{(0)}$  (line 5). If the largest p-value exceeds the predetermined threshold level  $\alpha$ , we discard the donor associated with the largest p-value from  $\mathcal{D}$  (line 9). This iterative process continues until all p-values are below the threshold level  $\alpha$  (line 11), resulting in the selection of the remaining donors as the final donor pool (line 14).

We provide further justification for employing the regression model in line 4 of Algorithm 4. It is well-recognized that spurious relationships among time series (especially in the presence of non-stationarity) can lead to misleading results. In the context of synthetic control, regressing a donor  $W_{it}$  solely on  $Y_t^{(0)}$  without adjusting other donors may exhibit a statistically significant relationship even if they are statistically independent. Thus, relying solely on this marginal regression model may not be sufficient for selecting appropriate donors. In order to address this concern, we propose including the other donors  $\{W_{st} \mid s \in \mathcal{D} \setminus i\}$  as additional regressors. By doing so, we can account for potential spurious relationships and better detect genuine associations between  $W_{it}$  and  $Y_t^{(0)}$ . This refined approach improves the reliability and accuracy of the donor pool selection process.

## A.7 Extension: Covariate Adjustment

In practice, a rich collection of measured exogenous covariates may be available. One may want to incorporate these covariates in the synthetic control analysis because using these covariates may improve efficiency. In this Section, we provide details on the SPSC framework by incorporating measured covariates. Specifically, we denote  $q$ -dimensional measured exogenous covariates for unit  $i = 0, \dots, N$  at time  $t = 1, \dots, T$  as  $X_{it} \in \mathbb{R}^q$ ; we remind the readers that  $i = 0$  is the treated unit and  $i = 1, \dots, N$  are the untreated units. Let  $X_{\mathcal{D}t} = (X_{\mathcal{D}_1t}^T, \dots, X_{\mathcal{D}_dt}^T)^T \in \mathbb{R}^{dq}$  be the collection of all measured covariates of donors  $\mathcal{D}$  at time  $t$ . To account for covariates, we modify Assumptions 3.1 and 3.2 as follows:

**Assumption A.1** (Proxy in the Presence of Covariates). There exists a set of control units  $\mathcal{D} = \{\mathcal{D}_1, \dots, \mathcal{D}_d\} \subseteq \{1, \dots, N\}$  satisfying

$$W_{it} \not\perp Y_t^{(0)} \mid (X_{0t}, X_{\mathcal{D}t}), \quad i \in \mathcal{D}, \quad t = 1, \dots, T_0.$$

**Assumption A.2** (Existence of Synthetic Control in the Presence of Covariates). For all  $t = 1, \dots, T$ , there exist  $\gamma^* = (\gamma_{\mathcal{D}_1}^*, \dots, \gamma_{\mathcal{D}_d}^*)^T$ ,  $\delta_0^* \in \mathbb{R}^q$ , and  $\delta_{\mathcal{D}}^* = (\delta_{\mathcal{D}_1}^{*T}, \dots, \delta_{\mathcal{D}_d}^{*T})^T \in \mathbb{R}^{dq}$  that satisfy  $E[\{Y_t^{(0)} - X_{0t}^T \delta_0^*\} - \{W_{\mathcal{D}t}^T \gamma^* - X_{\mathcal{D}t}^T \delta_{\mathcal{D}}^*\} \mid Y_t^{(0)}, X_{0t}, X_{\mathcal{D}t}] = 0$ .

Similar to the result established under the absence of covariates, we establish the following identification results under Assumptions A.1 and A.2 when covariates are available:

**Theorem A.2.** *Under Assumptions 2.1, 2.2, A.1, and A.2, the synthetic control weights  $\gamma^*$  satisfy  $E\{(Y_t - X_{0t}^T \delta_0^*) - (W_{it}^T \gamma^* - W_{\mathcal{D}t}^T \delta_{\mathcal{D}}^*) \mid Y_t, X_{0t}, X_{\mathcal{D}t}\} = 0$  for  $t = 1, \dots, T_0$ . Moreover, we have  $E\{Y_t^{(0)} - X_{0t}^T \delta_0^*\} = E(W_{\mathcal{D}t}^T \gamma^* - X_{\mathcal{D}t}^T \delta_{\mathcal{D}}^*)$  for any  $t = 1, \dots, T$ . Lastly, the ATT is identified as  $\tau_t^* = E\{(Y_t - X_{0t}^T \delta_0^*) - (W_{\mathcal{D}t}^T \gamma^* - X_{\mathcal{D}t}^T \delta_{\mathcal{D}}^*)\}$  for  $t = T_0 + 1, \dots, T$ .*

Leveraging the result of the Theorem, estimation and inference of the ATT with covariate adjustment can be established, which is a straightforward extension of Section 3.2. First, we define

the following estimating function:

$$\begin{aligned} & \Psi_{\text{Cov}}(O_t; \gamma, \beta, \delta_0, \delta_{\mathcal{D}}) \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} (1 - A_t)g_t(Y_t, X_{0t}, X_{\mathcal{D}t})\{(Y_t - X_{0t}^{\text{T}}\delta_0) - (W_{\mathcal{D}t}^{\text{T}}\gamma - X_{\mathcal{D}t}^{\text{T}}\delta_{\mathcal{D}})\} \\ A_t \frac{\partial \tau(t; \beta)}{\partial \beta} \{(Y_t - X_{0t}^{\text{T}}\delta_0) - (W_{\mathcal{D}t}^{\text{T}}\gamma - X_{\mathcal{D}t}^{\text{T}}\delta_{\mathcal{D}}) - \tau(t; \beta)\} \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{p_x+b}, \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

where  $O_t = (Y_t, W_{\mathcal{D}t}, X_{0t}, X_{\mathcal{D}t}, A_t)$  is the collection of the observed data at time  $t$ ,  $g_t(\cdot)$  is a  $p_x$ -dimensional user-specified function of  $(Y_t, X_{0t}, X_{\mathcal{D}t})$  (which can be time-varying) with  $p_x \geq \dim(W_{\mathcal{D}t}, X_{0t}, X_{\mathcal{D}t}) = d + q + dq$ , and  $\tau(t; \beta)$  is a user-specified treatment effect function. We assume that the treatment effect function is chosen so that the associated error process is weakly dependent:

**Assumption A.3** (Weakly Dependent Error in the Presence of Covariates). Let  $\epsilon_t$  be  $\epsilon_t = (Y_t - X_{0t}^{\text{T}}\delta_0^*) - (W_{\mathcal{D}t}^{\text{T}}\gamma^* - X_{\mathcal{D}t}^{\text{T}}\delta_{\mathcal{D}}^*) - \tau(t; \beta^*)$ . Then, the error process  $\{\epsilon_t \mid t = 1, \dots, T\}$  satisfies Assumption 3.3, i.e.,  $\text{corr}(\epsilon_t, \epsilon_{t+t'})$  converges to 0 as  $t' \rightarrow \pm\infty$ .

We then establish the asymptotic normality of the GMM estimators  $(\hat{\gamma}, \hat{\beta}, \hat{\delta}_0, \hat{\delta}_{\mathcal{D}})$ ; see the formal statement below:

**Theorem A.3.** Suppose Assumptions 2.1, 2.2, A.1, A.2, and A.3 hold,  $(\gamma^*, \beta^*, \delta_0^*, \delta_{\mathcal{D}}^*)$  are unique, and Regularity Conditions in Section C.2 hold. Let  $(\hat{\gamma}, \hat{\beta}, \hat{\delta}_0, \hat{\delta}_{\mathcal{D}})$  be the GMM estimators where the estimating function (15) is used, i.e.,

$$(\hat{\gamma}, \hat{\beta}, \hat{\delta}_0, \hat{\delta}_{\mathcal{D}}) = \arg \min_{(\gamma, \beta)} \{ \hat{\Psi}_{\text{Cov}}(\gamma, \beta, \delta_0, \delta_{\mathcal{D}}) \}^{\text{T}} \hat{\Omega}_{\text{Cov}} \{ \hat{\Psi}_{\text{Cov}}(\gamma, \beta, \delta_0, \delta_{\mathcal{D}}) \},$$

where  $\hat{\Psi}_{\text{Cov}}(\gamma, \beta, \delta_0, \delta_{\mathcal{D}}) = T^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^T \Psi_{\text{Cov}}(O_t; \gamma, \beta, \delta_0, \delta_{\mathcal{D}})$  is the empirical mean of the estimating function and  $\hat{\Omega}_{\text{Cov}} \in \mathbb{R}^{(p+b) \times (p+b)}$  a user-specified symmetric positive definite block-diagonal matrix as  $\hat{\Omega}_{\text{Cov}} = \text{diag}(\hat{\Omega}_{\text{Cov,pre}}, \hat{\Omega}_{\text{Cov,post}})$ . Then, as  $T \rightarrow \infty$ , we have

$$\sqrt{T} \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} \hat{\gamma} \\ \hat{\beta} \\ \hat{\delta}_0 \\ \hat{\delta}_{\mathcal{D}} \end{pmatrix} - \begin{pmatrix} \gamma^* \\ \beta^* \\ \delta_0^* \\ \delta_{\mathcal{D}}^* \end{pmatrix} \right\} \text{converges in distribution to } N(0, \Sigma_{\text{Cov},1}^* \Sigma_{\text{Cov},2}^* \Sigma_{\text{Cov},1}^{*\text{T}}),$$



where

$$\begin{aligned} \Sigma_{Cov,1}^* &= (G_{Cov}^{*\text{T}} \Omega_{Cov}^* G_{Cov}^*)^{-1} G_{Cov}^{*\text{T}} \Omega_{Cov}^* \quad , \quad \Sigma_{Cov,2}^* = \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \text{var}\{\sqrt{T} \cdot \widehat{\Psi}_{Cov}(\gamma^*, \beta^*, \delta_0^*, \delta_{\mathcal{D}}^*)\} \\ G_{Cov}^* &= \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T E \left\{ \frac{\partial \Psi_{Cov}(O_t; \gamma, \beta, \delta_0, \delta_{\mathcal{D}})}{\partial (\gamma, \beta, \delta_0, \delta_{\mathcal{D}})^{\text{T}}} \right\} \Big|_{\gamma=\gamma^*, \beta=\beta^*, \delta_0=\delta_0^*, \delta_{\mathcal{D}}=\delta_{\mathcal{D}}^*} \quad , \quad \Omega_{Cov}^* = \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \widehat{\Omega}_{Cov} . \end{aligned}$$

Estimators of  $\Sigma_{Cov,1}^*$  and  $\Sigma_{Cov,2}^*$  can be similarly defined as in Section 3.2, thus we omit the details here.

## A.8 Additional Simulation Studies

We restate the data generating process of the simulation studies in Section 4. The length of pre- and post-treatment periods were given by  $T_0 = T_1 \in \{50, 100, 250, 1000\}$  and the number of donors were given by  $d \in \{2, 5, 9\}$ . For each value of  $T_0$ ,  $T_1$ , and  $d$ , we generated all errors for  $t = 1, \dots, T$  based on the AR(2):

$$\begin{aligned} \epsilon_{x_i,t} &= 0.2\epsilon_{x_i,t-1} + 0.1\epsilon_{x_i,t-2} + \eta_{x_i,t} \quad , \quad i = 0, \dots, d \quad , \quad \epsilon_{y,t} = 0.2\epsilon_{y,t-1} + 0.1\epsilon_{y,t-2} + \eta_{y,t} \\ \epsilon_{w_i,t} &= 0.2\epsilon_{w_i,t-1} + 0.1\epsilon_{w_i,t-2} + \eta_{w_i,t} \quad , \quad i = 1, \dots, d \quad , \quad \epsilon_{\tau,t} = 0.2\epsilon_{\tau,t-1} + 0.1\epsilon_{\tau,t-2} + \eta_{\tau,t} \end{aligned}$$

where  $\eta$  were generated from a standard normal distribution. The errors  $\epsilon_t$  at  $t = -1, 0$  were initialized to equal zero. The exogenous covariates  $X_t = \{X_{0t}, X_{\mathcal{D}_1t}, \dots, X_{\mathcal{D}_dt}\}$  were generated as

$$X_{it} = 0.2X_{i,t-1} + 0.1X_{i,t-2} + \epsilon_{x_i,t} \quad , \quad i = 0, \dots, d \quad .$$

The treatment-free potential outcomes at  $t = 1, \dots, T$  were generated as

$$Y_t^{(0)} = 0.2Y_{t-1}^{(0)} + 0.1Y_{t-2}^{(0)} + t/T_0 + \delta X_{0t} + \epsilon_{y,t} \quad .$$

We considered two cases for  $\delta \in \{0, 1\}$ , which encodes whether the covariates are predictive of  $Y_t^{(0)}$ , in which case  $\delta = 1$ , or not predictive, in which case  $\delta = 0$ , respectively. The potential outcomes at  $t = 1, \dots, T$  were under treatment were generated as

$$Y_t^{(1)} = Y_t^{(0)} + 3A_t + \epsilon_{\tau,t} \quad , \quad t = 1, \dots, T \quad .$$

Therefore, the ATT is  $\tau_t^* = 3$  for all  $t = T_0 + 1, \dots, T$ , and  $\xi_t^* = Y_t^{(1)} - Y_t^{(0)} = 3\mathbb{1}(t \geq T_0) + \epsilon_{\tau,t}$ . Lastly, we generated  $W_{\mathcal{D}t} \in \mathbb{R}^d$  so that it satisfies Assumptions 3.1 and 3.2 if  $\delta = 0$ , and the corresponding assumptions made for incorporating covariates if  $\delta = 1$ . Specifically, we considered the following data generating process for  $W_{\mathcal{D}t}$  according to the number of donors  $d \in \{2, 5, 9\}$ :

( $d = 2$ )

$$W_{\mathcal{D}t} = \begin{bmatrix} 2 & -1 \\ -1 & 2 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ Y_t^{(0)} \end{bmatrix} + \delta X_{\mathcal{D}t} + \epsilon_{\mathcal{D}t}$$

The true synthetic control weights are  $\gamma^* = (1/3, 2/3)$ .

( $d = 5$ )

$$W_{\mathcal{D}t} = \begin{bmatrix} 2 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 2 & -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 2 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 2 & -1 \\ -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 2 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ Y_t^{(0)} \\ 0.5\{Y_t^{(0)}\}^2 \\ \mathbb{1}\{Y_t^{(0)} > 3\} \\ \mathbb{1}\{Y_t^{(0)} < 0\} \end{bmatrix} + \delta X_{\mathcal{D}t} + \epsilon_{\mathcal{D}t}$$

The true synthetic control weights are  $\gamma^* \simeq (0.26, 0.52, 0.03, 0.06, 0.13)$ .

( $d = 9$ )

$$W_{\mathcal{D}t} = \begin{bmatrix} 2 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 2 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 2 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 2 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 2 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 2 & -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 2 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 2 & -1 \\ -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 2 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ Y_t^{(0)} \\ 0.5\{Y_t^{(0)}\}^2 \\ \mathbb{1}\{Y_t^{(0)} > 3\} \\ \mathbb{1}\{Y_t^{(0)} < 0\} \\ \mathbb{1}\{Y_t^{(0)} \in [0, 1)\} \\ \mathbb{1}\{Y_t^{(0)} \in [1, 2)\} \\ \exp[0.4\{Y_t^{(0)} - 1.5\}] \\ \exp[-0.4\{Y_t^{(0)} - 1.5\}] \end{bmatrix} + \delta X_{\mathcal{D}t} + \epsilon_{\mathcal{D}t}$$

The true synthetic control weights are  $\gamma^* \simeq (0.25, 0.501, 0.002, 0.004, 0.008, 0.016, 0.031, 0.063, 0.125)$ .

We set  $g_t(Y_t^{(0)})$  as time-invariant cubic B-spline bases functions with dimensions equal to twice the number of donors, i.e.,  $g_t(y) = \mathbf{b}_{2d}(\cdot)$  where  $\mathbf{b}_k(\cdot)$  the  $k$ -dimensional cubic B-spline bases function. The knots of the spline functions were chosen based on the empirical quantiles of the pre-treatment outcomes.

In Table 4, we first present numerical summaries of the simulation studies considered in the main paper. Each table is written in the following format:

- Bias row shows the empirical bias of 500 estimates;
- ASE row shows the asymptotic standard error obtained from the sandwich variance estimator;
- BSE row shows the bootstrap standard error obtained from the approach in Section A.4 of the Supplementary Material;
- ESE row shows the standard deviation of 500 estimates;
- MSE row shows the mean squared error of 500 estimates;
- Cover (ASE) and Cover (BSE) show the empirical coverage rates of 95% confidence intervals based on the asymptotic and bootstrap standard errors, respectively;
- Bias, standard errors, and mean squared error are scaled by factors of 10, 10, and 100, respectively, for readability.

We remark that the results in Table 4 are similar to those in Table 1.




Figure 3: A Graphical Summary of Empirical Distributions of the Estimates for  $\tau_t^* = 3$  for  $t = T_0 + 1, \dots, T$ .

Estimator		OLS				SPSC				SPSC-Ridge					
$\delta$	$d$	$T_0$	50	100	250	1000	50	100	250	1000	50	100	250	1000	
0	2	Bias ( $\times 10$ )	5.042	4.987	4.931	4.918	-0.204	-0.107	-0.165	-0.003	0.325	0.170	-0.032	0.047	
		ASE ( $\times 10$ )	2.366	1.749	1.161	0.605	2.930	2.116	1.383	0.706	2.841	2.086	1.374	0.705	
		BSE ( $\times 10$ )	2.620	1.952	1.332	0.742	3.385	2.371	1.611	0.860	3.127	2.332	1.577	0.858	
		ESE ( $\times 10$ )	2.874	1.979	1.264	0.605	3.331	2.430	1.486	0.741	3.270	2.403	1.470	0.742	
		MSE ( $\times 100$ )	33.665	28.777	25.914	24.551	11.113	5.906	2.231	0.549	10.779	5.791	2.157	0.551	
		Cover (ASE)	0.458	0.230	0.034	0.000	0.916	0.904	0.928	0.940	0.908	0.902	0.932	0.940	
		Cover (BSE)	0.512	0.326	0.048	0.000	0.920	0.924	0.958	0.968	0.916	0.916	0.954	0.968	
	5	Bias ( $\times 10$ )	1.871	1.786	2.050	1.934	0.004	0.110	0.376	0.091	-0.222	-0.088	0.221	0.161	
		ASE ( $\times 10$ )	2.354	1.721	1.140	0.586	4.611	2.896	1.714	0.772	2.958	2.081	1.356	0.673	
		BSE ( $\times 10$ )	2.855	2.035	1.361	0.719	5.633	3.440	2.223	1.049	3.589	2.523	1.702	0.870	
		ESE ( $\times 10$ )	2.834	2.021	1.258	0.629	4.333	2.955	1.657	0.759	3.411	2.236	1.464	0.693	
		MSE ( $\times 100$ )	11.518	7.265	5.780	4.137	18.740	8.729	2.882	0.583	11.659	4.999	2.189	0.505	
		Cover (ASE)	0.808	0.782	0.550	0.106	0.952	0.960	0.956	0.958	0.898	0.922	0.930	0.942	
		Cover (BSE)	0.868	0.850	0.686	0.200	0.962	0.964	0.984	0.984	0.928	0.956	0.974	0.978	
	9	Bias ( $\times 10$ )	1.305	1.524	1.479	1.401	-0.206	0.055	-0.037	-0.098	-0.175	-0.035	-0.046	-0.128	
		ASE ( $\times 10$ )	2.356	1.674	1.098	0.568	4.461	3.008	1.927	0.930	3.245	2.358	1.487	0.747	
		BSE ( $\times 10$ )	2.999	1.990	1.303	0.700	5.549	3.433	2.127	1.107	4.049	2.777	1.799	0.938	
		ESE ( $\times 10$ )	2.956	1.934	1.149	0.603	4.182	2.434	1.614	0.800	3.578	2.261	1.455	0.721	
		MSE ( $\times 100$ )	10.422	6.054	3.507	2.325	17.500	5.916	2.600	0.648	12.810	5.104	2.116	0.536	
		Cover (ASE)	0.854	0.788	0.710	0.306	0.956	0.962	0.980	0.970	0.922	0.940	0.958	0.946	
		Cover (BSE)	0.916	0.842	0.802	0.480	0.978	0.980	0.984	0.982	0.950	0.958	0.986	0.986	
	1	2	Bias ( $\times 10$ )	4.175	3.921	3.928	3.941	-0.212	-0.260	-0.123	-0.001	0.197	-0.086	-0.044	0.028
			ASE ( $\times 10$ )	2.329	1.674	1.091	0.566	2.820	1.995	1.289	0.663	2.754	1.973	1.284	0.662
			BSE ( $\times 10$ )	2.485	1.845	1.275	0.697	4.281	3.087	2.089	1.117	4.178	3.118	2.063	1.103
ESE ( $\times 10$ )			2.780	1.854	1.223	0.581	3.313	2.125	1.453	0.677	3.356	2.120	1.450	0.673	
MSE ( $\times 100$ )			25.141	18.810	16.921	15.870	10.998	4.575	2.122	0.457	11.278	4.493	2.100	0.453	
Cover (ASE)			0.556	0.358	0.094	0.000	0.896	0.946	0.922	0.940	0.894	0.938	0.920	0.942	
Cover (BSE)			0.574	0.440	0.142	0.000	0.970	0.988	0.990	0.998	0.964	0.984	0.980	0.996	
5		Bias ( $\times 10$ )	1.646	1.686	1.620	1.630	-0.160	-0.002	-0.012	0.006	0.135	0.096	0.040	0.032	
		ASE ( $\times 10$ )	2.387	1.667	1.078	0.551	3.696	2.262	1.312	0.628	2.791	1.915	1.219	0.608	
		BSE ( $\times 10$ )	2.854	1.935	1.270	0.678	4.907	3.543	2.232	1.102	4.768	3.347	2.121	1.070	
		ESE ( $\times 10$ )	2.919	2.010	1.151	0.590	4.111	2.335	1.326	0.669	3.775	2.221	1.324	0.650	
		MSE ( $\times 100$ )	11.212	6.875	3.947	3.005	16.895	5.441	1.754	0.446	14.244	4.930	1.752	0.423	
		Cover (ASE)	0.822	0.778	0.660	0.180	0.946	0.946	0.940	0.932	0.884	0.914	0.938	0.928	
		Cover (BSE)	0.872	0.820	0.756	0.316	0.956	0.978	0.996	0.996	0.964	0.982	0.990	0.992	
9		Bias ( $\times 10$ )	1.358	1.188	1.236	1.277	-0.164	-0.329	-0.231	-0.092	0.058	-0.300	-0.348	-0.245	
		ASE ( $\times 10$ )	2.503	1.720	1.096	0.577	3.955	2.684	1.572	0.714	3.202	2.167	1.320	0.623	
		BSE ( $\times 10$ )	3.033	2.028	1.293	0.713	5.646	3.904	2.478	1.309	5.437	3.907	2.439	1.254	
		ESE ( $\times 10$ )	3.137	1.990	1.259	0.613	4.005	2.573	1.502	0.714	3.747	2.304	1.379	0.675	
		MSE ( $\times 100$ )	11.665	5.363	3.109	2.005	16.036	6.713	2.304	0.517	14.018	5.386	2.019	0.515	
		Cover (ASE)	0.842	0.832	0.742	0.396	0.954	0.970	0.946	0.956	0.930	0.940	0.926	0.908	
		Cover (BSE)	0.874	0.866	0.830	0.564	0.974	0.982	0.990	0.996	0.970	0.990	0.996	0.988	

Table 4: Summary Statistics of the Estimation Results Under the Constant ATT  $\tau_t^* = 3$  for  $t = T_0 + 1, \dots, T$ .

Next, we consider an additional case where the ATT is linear as  $Y_t^{(1)} = Y_t^{(0)} + \beta_0^* \mathbb{1}(T_0 < t) + \beta_1^* \mathbb{1}(t - T_0)_+ / T_0 + \epsilon_{\tau,t}$  where  $\beta_0^* = 3$  and  $\beta_1^* = 3$ , and  $(a)_+ = \max(a, 0)$ . As in the main paper, we first present plots for the empirical distributions of the estimators. The plots have the same format as Figure 1 of the main paper, i.e.,

- The left, center, and right columns are associated with the number of donors ( $d = 2, 5, 9$ );
- The top and bottom plots are associated with whether covariates are excluded ( $\delta = 0$ ) or not ( $\delta = 1$ );
- The vertical solid segments represent the range of the central 95% of 500 estimates obtained by each estimation method;
- The dots represent the empirical mean of 500 estimates obtained by each estimation method;
- The light gray, gray, and black colors show the estimator types and the shape of the dots show the length of the pre-treatment period, respectively;
- The red horizontal line shows the zero bias.

Figures 4 and 5 visually summarize the result. We remark that the OLS estimator is biased, especially for the intercept  $\beta_0^* = 3$ .




Figure 4: A Graphical Summary of Empirical Distributions of the Estimates for  $\beta_0^* = 3$ .




Figure 5: A Graphical Summary of Empirical Distributions of the Estimates for  $\beta_1^* = 3$ .

Next, we present the numerical summaries in Table 5 and Table 6. We find that the SPSC estimator with ridge regularization performs the best, agreeing with the findings in the main paper.

Estimator		OLS				SPSC				SPSC-Ridge					
$\delta$	$d$	$T_0$	50	100	250	1000	50	100	250	1000	50	100	250	1000	
0	2	Bias ( $\times 10$ )	4.230	3.675	3.992	3.955	0.065	-0.416	-0.008	0.006	0.405	-0.231	0.067	0.036	
		ASE ( $\times 10$ )	3.733	2.809	1.888	1.008	4.289	3.176	2.120	1.123	4.221	3.153	2.114	1.122	
		BSE ( $\times 10$ )	6.131	5.021	3.677	2.373	6.537	5.148	3.751	2.330	6.423	5.013	3.735	2.342	
		ESE ( $\times 10$ )	4.475	3.443	2.059	1.115	4.841	3.892	2.348	1.237	4.788	3.853	2.339	1.236	
		MSE ( $\times 100$ )	37.875	25.339	20.167	16.880	23.389	15.293	5.504	1.527	23.045	14.871	5.466	1.527	
		Cover (ASE)	0.738	0.678	0.436	0.040	0.916	0.874	0.912	0.934	0.906	0.876	0.906	0.932	
		Cover (BSE)	0.872	0.874	0.860	0.668	0.972	0.976	0.978	0.994	0.970	0.972	0.988	0.994	
	5	Bias ( $\times 10$ )	2.059	1.842	1.829	1.776	0.180	0.034	0.029	-0.096	0.441	0.221	0.120	-0.053	
		ASE ( $\times 10$ )	3.619	2.715	1.811	0.959	6.162	3.751	2.243	1.076	4.177	3.034	1.968	1.028	
		BSE ( $\times 10$ )	6.060	4.690	3.525	2.238	8.167	5.751	4.007	2.382	6.474	5.047	3.734	2.328	
		ESE ( $\times 10$ )	4.621	3.419	2.052	0.982	5.795	4.074	2.292	1.086	4.931	3.628	2.147	1.049	
		MSE ( $\times 100$ )	25.555	15.060	7.544	4.116	33.549	16.563	5.246	1.186	24.456	13.184	4.614	1.100	
		Cover (ASE)	0.814	0.818	0.788	0.534	0.924	0.916	0.942	0.950	0.866	0.874	0.928	0.944	
		Cover (BSE)	0.914	0.928	0.966	0.970	0.966	0.980	0.992	1.000	0.944	0.982	0.990	1.000	
	9	Bias ( $\times 10$ )	1.878	1.713	1.955	1.940	0.265	0.043	0.184	0.120	0.451	0.139	0.185	0.130	
		ASE ( $\times 10$ )	3.701	2.726	1.807	0.956	5.473	3.932	2.505	1.228	4.394	3.288	2.122	1.104	
		BSE ( $\times 10$ )	6.016	4.761	3.427	2.223	8.047	5.700	3.941	2.407	6.974	5.252	3.805	2.299	
		ESE ( $\times 10$ )	4.094	3.362	1.972	1.017	4.964	3.878	2.328	1.158	4.548	3.588	2.187	1.108	
		MSE ( $\times 100$ )	20.250	14.215	7.705	4.795	24.663	15.007	5.445	1.353	20.849	12.869	4.807	1.243	
		Cover (ASE)	0.882	0.822	0.770	0.450	0.948	0.946	0.946	0.968	0.920	0.912	0.940	0.946	
		Cover (BSE)	0.948	0.934	0.942	0.968	0.980	0.974	0.988	0.998	0.972	0.972	0.988	1.000	
	1	2	Bias ( $\times 10$ )	3.722	3.518	3.430	3.455	-0.037	-0.130	-0.128	-0.024	0.291	-0.009	-0.073	-0.004
			ASE ( $\times 10$ )	3.904	2.889	1.936	1.010	4.460	3.259	2.157	1.124	4.396	3.241	2.152	1.123
			BSE ( $\times 10$ )	6.223	4.843	3.717	2.356	7.106	5.507	4.038	2.418	7.298	5.545	4.099	2.451
ESE ( $\times 10$ )			4.501	3.445	2.166	1.060	5.086	3.713	2.454	1.172	5.068	3.703	2.448	1.170	
MSE ( $\times 100$ )			34.072	24.224	16.447	13.061	25.821	13.778	6.028	1.371	25.719	13.687	5.988	1.366	
Cover (ASE)			0.790	0.744	0.564	0.090	0.900	0.894	0.916	0.930	0.896	0.898	0.914	0.930	
Cover (BSE)			0.886	0.880	0.900	0.756	0.970	0.982	0.992	1.000	0.978	0.978	0.992	1.000	
5		Bias ( $\times 10$ )	1.527	1.462	1.444	1.469	-0.140	0.038	-0.091	-0.084	0.297	0.202	0.052	-0.031	
		ASE ( $\times 10$ )	3.913	2.827	1.876	0.973	5.415	3.490	2.115	1.049	4.338	3.082	2.004	1.029	
		BSE ( $\times 10$ )	6.405	4.794	3.589	2.273	7.771	5.668	4.029	2.363	7.649	5.481	3.949	2.389	
		ESE ( $\times 10$ )	4.941	3.387	2.002	0.984	5.933	3.883	2.215	1.055	5.303	3.627	2.163	1.045	
		MSE ( $\times 100$ )	26.693	13.584	6.084	3.124	35.154	15.049	4.905	1.117	28.150	13.168	4.674	1.090	
		Cover (ASE)	0.850	0.850	0.852	0.652	0.920	0.902	0.936	0.958	0.876	0.888	0.930	0.952	
		Cover (BSE)	0.930	0.946	0.980	0.992	0.964	0.984	0.998	0.998	0.958	0.986	0.996	1.000	
9		Bias ( $\times 10$ )	1.761	1.705	1.682	1.605	0.389	0.120	0.103	-0.011	0.625	0.178	0.129	-0.017	
		ASE ( $\times 10$ )	4.131	2.922	1.908	0.980	5.894	3.946	2.362	1.135	4.914	3.416	2.110	1.039	
		BSE ( $\times 10$ )	6.291	4.825	3.508	2.245	8.468	6.127	4.043	2.477	8.370	6.053	4.128	2.467	
		ESE ( $\times 10$ )	4.764	3.277	2.084	1.001	5.822	3.782	2.252	1.072	5.183	3.507	2.216	1.033	
		MSE ( $\times 100$ )	25.753	13.625	7.163	3.578	33.981	14.289	5.074	1.146	27.198	12.308	4.919	1.066	
		Cover (ASE)	0.878	0.860	0.836	0.624	0.942	0.954	0.942	0.954	0.920	0.932	0.914	0.940	
		Cover (BSE)	0.934	0.964	0.964	0.986	0.968	0.990	0.990	0.998	0.966	0.992	0.996	1.000	

Table 5: Summary Statistics of the Estimation Results for  $\beta_0^* = 3$ .

Estimator		OLS				SPSC				SPSC-Ridge					
$\delta$	$d$	$T_0$	50	100	250	1000	50	100	250	1000	50	100	250	1000	
0	2	Bias ( $\times 10$ )	1.593	2.404	1.988	1.990	-0.527	0.435	-0.078	-0.019	-0.158	0.648	0.018	0.023	
		ASE ( $\times 10$ )	6.261	4.786	3.213	1.722	6.967	5.243	3.516	1.868	6.880	5.215	3.508	1.867	
		BSE ( $\times 10$ )	10.319	8.607	6.442	4.203	10.677	8.659	6.388	4.107	10.567	8.509	6.422	4.138	
		ESE ( $\times 10$ )	7.815	5.807	3.529	1.854	8.576	6.311	3.843	2.021	8.525	6.302	3.843	2.016	
		MSE ( $\times 100$ )	63.489	39.435	16.381	7.391	73.683	39.942	14.746	4.075	72.557	40.052	14.740	4.059	
		Cover (ASE)	0.866	0.850	0.866	0.780	0.880	0.878	0.924	0.948	0.878	0.878	0.922	0.948	
		Cover (BSE)	0.972	0.974	0.998	1.000	0.956	0.974	0.984	0.994	0.952	0.966	0.988	0.994	
	5	Bias ( $\times 10$ )	-0.370	-0.075	0.179	0.291	-0.345	-0.093	0.528	0.332	-1.301	-0.679	0.026	0.384	
		ASE ( $\times 10$ )	6.275	4.710	3.164	1.670	11.299	6.747	4.183	1.969	7.370	5.312	3.472	1.804	
		BSE ( $\times 10$ )	9.965	7.980	6.167	3.946	11.499	8.774	6.596	4.068	10.297	8.257	6.256	4.011	
		ESE ( $\times 10$ )	8.016	5.903	3.377	1.740	9.887	7.479	4.133	1.954	8.509	6.570	3.658	1.845	
		MSE ( $\times 100$ )	64.259	34.787	11.415	3.107	97.671	55.828	17.324	3.919	73.956	43.544	13.353	3.543	
		Cover (ASE)	0.866	0.870	0.926	0.936	0.936	0.908	0.958	0.950	0.898	0.860	0.936	0.942	
		Cover (BSE)	0.952	0.962	0.996	1.000	0.938	0.946	0.980	1.000	0.932	0.948	0.992	0.998	
	9	Bias ( $\times 10$ )	-1.123	-0.472	-1.026	-0.910	-0.923	0.228	-0.402	-0.317	-1.228	-0.128	-0.527	-0.366	
		ASE ( $\times 10$ )	6.414	4.778	3.178	1.678	9.985	7.101	4.573	2.255	7.856	5.851	3.830	1.982	
		BSE ( $\times 10$ )	9.928	8.085	5.942	3.873	11.289	8.762	6.386	4.066	10.404	8.309	6.250	3.953	
		ESE ( $\times 10$ )	7.827	5.755	3.454	1.698	9.365	6.819	4.047	1.965	8.545	6.305	3.828	1.831	
		MSE ( $\times 100$ )	62.394	33.277	12.960	3.707	88.380	46.453	16.510	3.954	74.376	39.688	14.904	3.480	
		Cover (ASE)	0.872	0.884	0.918	0.906	0.952	0.940	0.970	0.980	0.920	0.912	0.942	0.952	
		Cover (BSE)	0.948	0.960	0.984	1.000	0.952	0.958	0.980	1.000	0.948	0.964	0.976	1.000	
	1	2	Bias ( $\times 10$ )	0.888	0.807	1.005	0.979	-0.344	-0.143	0.038	-0.000	-0.184	-0.073	0.082	0.018
			ASE ( $\times 10$ )	6.556	4.877	3.290	1.726	7.270	5.341	3.565	1.867	7.204	5.322	3.559	1.866
			BSE ( $\times 10$ )	10.532	8.277	6.463	4.124	10.970	8.681	6.591	4.087	10.960	8.701	6.621	4.090
ESE ( $\times 10$ )			7.847	5.732	3.657	1.846	8.649	6.106	3.989	2.014	8.615	6.087	3.984	2.014	
MSE ( $\times 100$ )			62.241	33.444	14.359	4.359	74.777	37.232	15.883	4.047	74.097	36.983	15.844	4.047	
Cover (ASE)			0.876	0.878	0.900	0.888	0.890	0.890	0.928	0.926	0.880	0.890	0.928	0.926	
Cover (BSE)			0.960	0.972	0.994	1.000	0.962	0.958	0.988	1.000	0.958	0.962	0.992	1.000	
5		Bias ( $\times 10$ )	0.233	0.237	0.373	0.289	-0.040	-0.081	0.251	0.113	-0.318	-0.302	0.058	0.065	
		ASE ( $\times 10$ )	6.646	4.836	3.206	1.663	8.961	5.860	3.585	1.772	7.362	5.229	3.418	1.742	
		BSE ( $\times 10$ )	10.576	8.273	6.267	3.991	11.565	8.625	6.510	4.055	11.463	8.620	6.365	4.022	
		ESE ( $\times 10$ )	8.392	5.998	3.359	1.649	9.034	6.635	3.719	1.778	8.532	6.377	3.656	1.739	
		MSE ( $\times 100$ )	70.342	35.961	11.400	2.798	81.459	43.944	13.870	3.169	72.748	40.676	13.346	3.022	
		Cover (ASE)	0.852	0.896	0.922	0.954	0.932	0.898	0.934	0.948	0.908	0.882	0.920	0.948	
		Cover (BSE)	0.960	0.960	0.992	0.998	0.962	0.944	0.998	1.000	0.968	0.952	0.992	0.998	
9		Bias ( $\times 10$ )	-0.791	-0.996	-0.848	-0.698	-1.083	-0.953	-0.647	-0.126	-1.113	-1.088	-0.862	-0.462	
		ASE ( $\times 10$ )	7.110	5.063	3.318	1.734	10.109	6.788	4.091	1.955	8.474	5.868	3.621	1.797	
		BSE ( $\times 10$ )	10.357	8.326	6.151	3.990	12.310	9.066	6.505	4.091	12.003	9.126	6.420	4.101	
		ESE ( $\times 10$ )	8.532	5.691	3.610	1.830	9.964	6.548	3.895	1.867	9.185	6.135	3.781	1.848	
		MSE ( $\times 100$ )	73.267	33.320	13.729	3.830	100.256	43.702	15.558	3.496	85.438	38.742	15.014	3.623	
		Cover (ASE)	0.894	0.908	0.908	0.910	0.948	0.960	0.956	0.952	0.926	0.930	0.924	0.940	
		Cover (BSE)	0.942	0.980	0.990	1.000	0.960	0.986	0.984	0.998	0.956	0.984	0.990	0.998	

Table 6: Summary Statistics of the Estimation Results for  $\beta_1^* = 3$ .

We report the performance of the conformal inference in Section 3.3 of the main paper under the simulation scenarios in Section 4 of the main paper. First, we obtain the pointwise 95% pointwise prediction interval for the random treatment effect at the first post-treatment time  $t = T_0 + 1$ ,



which are

$$\text{Constant ATT : } \xi_{T_0+1}^* = 3 + \epsilon_{\tau, T_0+1} , \quad \text{Linear ATT : } \xi_{T_0+1}^* = 3 + 3/T_0 + \epsilon_{\tau, T_0+1} .$$

As a competing method, we construct 95% pointwise prediction intervals using the approach proposed by Cattaneo et al. (2021), which is implemented in `scpi` R-package (Cattaneo et al., 2023). In particular, we use the prediction interval estimating out-of-sample uncertainty with sub-Gaussian bounds, which is stored in `CI.all.gaussian` object of a `scpi` output; see below for an example R-code:

```
scpi.est ← scpi::scpi(SCD) # SCD is a sdata object
scpi.PI  ← scpi.est$inference.results$CI.all.gaussian
```

For each simulation repetition and each method, we calculate  $\mathbb{1}(\xi_{T_0+1}^* \in \mathcal{C}_{T_0+1})$  where  $\mathcal{C}_{T_0+1}$  is a 95% prediction interval obtained from each method, i.e., the indicator of whether a 95% prediction interval at  $t = T_0 + 1$  obtained from each method includes the random treatment effect. Ideally, the average of these indicators across simulation repetitions (i.e., the empirical coverage rate of 95% prediction intervals) should be close to the nominal coverage rate of 0.95.

Table 7 shows the empirical coverage rates obtained from 500 repetitions for each simulation scenario. We find that the conformal inference approach for the SPSC achieves the nominal coverage rate across all simulation scenarios in general. However, we find that `scpi` approach fails to achieve the nominal coverage rate, especially when the number of donors is small (i.e.,  $d = 2$ ), the time periods are long (i.e.,  $T_0 = 1000$ ), and the average treatment effect varies across time (i.e., linear treatment effects).

Next, we calculate the average length of the 95% prediction interval for  $t = T_0 + 1$ , i.e., the first post-treatment period, across 500 repetitions. Table 8 shows the average lengths. We find that the length of the prediction intervals decreases as the length of the pre-treatment periods increases. Additionally, we find that including ridge regularization in the estimation leads to shorter prediction intervals across all simulation scenarios. We remark that prediction intervals obtained from `scpi` are generally narrower than those obtained from the SPSC.

Lastly, we report the bias and the empirical standard error of the estimators for the average treatment effects on the treated (ATT) obtained from `scpi`. Specifically, the estimator is obtained

Estimator			SPSC				SPSC-Ridge				SCPI			
ATT	$\delta$	$d$	$T_0$				$T_0$				$T_0$			
			50	100	250	1000	50	100	250	1000	50	100	250	1000
Constant	0	2	0.964	0.946	0.940	0.948	0.968	0.950	0.940	0.948	0.948	0.924	0.920	0.904
		5	0.962	0.956	0.956	0.942	0.956	0.946	0.960	0.932	0.980	0.982	0.978	0.920
		9	0.954	0.948	0.966	0.944	0.942	0.942	0.964	0.952	0.984	0.990	0.978	0.954
	1	2	0.972	0.940	0.950	0.954	0.968	0.942	0.944	0.962	0.968	0.944	0.938	0.894
		5	0.956	0.948	0.956	0.958	0.954	0.934	0.960	0.958	0.980	0.984	0.966	0.922
		9	0.956	0.950	0.958	0.938	0.962	0.946	0.950	0.946	0.980	0.992	0.990	0.944
Linear	0	2	0.964	0.964	0.948	0.932	0.968	0.964	0.946	0.932	0.866	0.850	0.866	0.780
		5	0.962	0.940	0.958	0.954	0.956	0.954	0.946	0.954	0.866	0.870	0.926	0.936
		9	0.954	0.938	0.964	0.946	0.942	0.938	0.954	0.948	0.872	0.884	0.918	0.906
	1	2	0.972	0.936	0.954	0.948	0.968	0.946	0.954	0.952	0.876	0.878	0.900	0.888
		5	0.956	0.948	0.944	0.936	0.954	0.934	0.950	0.930	0.852	0.896	0.922	0.954
		9	0.956	0.940	0.954	0.942	0.962	0.938	0.950	0.950	0.894	0.908	0.908	0.910

Table 7: Empirical Coverage Rates of 95% Pointwise Prediction Intervals. The numbers in SPSC and SPSC-Ridge columns show the empirical coverage rates of 95% pointwise prediction intervals obtained from the conformal inference approach in Section 3.3. The numbers in SCPI column show the empirical coverage rates of 95% pointwise prediction intervals obtained from the approach proposed by Cattaneo et al. (2021) which is implemented in `scpi` R-package (Cattaneo et al., 2023).

Estimator			SPSC				SPSC-Ridge				SCPI			
ATT	$\delta$	$d$	$T_0$				$T_0$				$T_0$			
			50	100	250	1000	50	100	250	1000	50	100	250	1000
Constant	0	2	3.377	3.109	3.094	3.005	3.296	3.073	3.076	2.999	1.919	1.713	1.534	1.400
		5	3.263	2.834	2.686	2.466	2.511	2.281	2.287	2.263	2.799	2.415	1.956	1.583
		9	3.189	2.894	2.809	2.654	2.617	2.454	2.349	2.314	2.750	2.484	2.105	1.676
	1	2	3.459	3.126	3.091	3.007	3.387	3.097	3.078	3.004	2.189	1.960	1.729	1.495
		5	3.051	2.570	2.466	2.426	2.837	2.385	2.350	2.334	3.140	2.780	2.237	1.748
		9	3.184	2.549	2.446	2.334	2.948	2.375	2.272	2.173	3.098	2.694	2.246	1.772
Linear	0	2	3.377	3.119	3.085	3.006	3.296	3.081	3.069	3.000	1.032	0.861	0.644	0.420
		5	3.263	2.843	2.631	2.469	2.511	2.278	2.250	2.264	0.997	0.798	0.617	0.395
		9	3.189	2.879	2.823	2.619	2.617	2.421	2.395	2.324	0.993	0.809	0.594	0.387
	1	2	3.459	3.122	3.081	3.012	3.387	3.095	3.069	3.008	1.053	0.828	0.646	0.412
		5	3.051	2.538	2.478	2.427	2.837	2.373	2.356	2.339	1.058	0.827	0.627	0.399
		9	3.184	2.551	2.431	2.331	2.948	2.398	2.272	2.173	1.036	0.833	0.615	0.399

Table 8: Average Lengths of 95% Pointwise Prediction Intervals at  $t = T_0 + 1$ . The numbers in SPSC and SPSC-Ridge columns show the average length of 95% pointwise prediction intervals obtained from the conformal inference approach in Section 3.3. The numbers in SCPI column show the average length of 95% pointwise prediction intervals obtained from the approach proposed by Cattaneo et al. (2021) which is implemented in `scpi` R-package (Cattaneo et al., 2023).

as  $\hat{\tau}_{\text{ATT}} = T_1^{-1} \sum_{t=T_0+1}^T \{Y_t - \hat{Y}_t^{(0)}\}$  where  $\hat{Y}_t^{(0)}$  is a predicted value of the treatment-free potential outcome at time  $t$ . For simplicity, we only consider the constant treatment effect case  $\tau_t^* = 3$ . Table 9 summarizes the result. Compared with the two estimators obtained from the SPSC, we find the estimator obtained from `scpi` yields a significant magnitude of biases even under a large sample size. Moreover, compared to the empirical standard errors, these biases are not negligible. Therefore, we conclude that the undercoverage of `scpi` reported in Table 7 is because of the non-diminishing bias.

Estimator		SPSC				SPSC-Ridge				SCPI				
$\delta$	$d$	Statistic	$T_0$				$T_0$				$T_0$			
			50	100	250	1000	50	100	250	1000	50	100	250	1000
0	2	Bias ( $\times 10$ )	-0.527	0.435	-0.078	-0.019	-0.158	0.648	0.018	0.023	1.058	1.046	0.890	0.982
		ESE ( $\times 10$ )	8.576	6.311	3.843	2.021	8.525	6.302	3.843	2.016	3.116	2.305	1.431	0.719
	5	Bias ( $\times 10$ )	-0.345	-0.093	0.528	0.332	-1.301	-0.679	0.026	0.384	0.361	0.524	0.763	0.689
		ESE ( $\times 10$ )	9.887	7.479	4.133	1.954	8.509	6.570	3.658	1.845	3.044	2.089	1.309	0.642
	9	Bias ( $\times 10$ )	-0.923	0.228	-0.402	-0.317	-1.228	-0.128	-0.527	-0.366	0.676	0.821	0.776	0.686
		ESE ( $\times 10$ )	9.365	6.819	4.047	1.965	8.545	6.305	3.828	1.831	2.895	1.925	1.167	0.599
1	2	Bias ( $\times 10$ )	-0.344	-0.143	0.038	-0.000	-0.184	-0.073	0.082	0.018	0.538	0.377	0.394	0.479
		ESE ( $\times 10$ )	8.649	6.106	3.989	2.014	8.615	6.087	3.984	2.014	3.046	2.090	1.458	0.674
	5	Bias ( $\times 10$ )	-0.040	-0.081	0.251	0.113	-0.318	-0.302	0.058	0.065	0.336	0.621	0.593	0.587
		ESE ( $\times 10$ )	9.034	6.635	3.719	1.778	8.532	6.377	3.656	1.739	2.909	2.064	1.241	0.628
	9	Bias ( $\times 10$ )	-1.083	-0.953	-0.647	-0.126	-1.113	-1.088	-0.862	-0.462	0.122	0.226	0.295	0.358
		ESE ( $\times 10$ )	9.964	6.548	3.895	1.867	9.185	6.135	3.781	1.848	2.744	1.819	1.237	0.585

Table 9: Bias and Empirical Standard Errors of the Three ATT Estimators Obtained from Our Approach and the SCPI Approach Proposed by Cattaneo et al. (2021). We remark that the results of the SPSC estimators are the same as those in Table 4.

## A.9 Simulation Studies under the Simulation Scenario Given in Cattaneo et al. (2021)

For a fair comparison, we adopt a simulation scenario setup in Cattaneo et al. (2021). In particular, we consider the following data generating process. First, we consider the length of the pre- and post-treatment periods as  $T_0 = 100$  and  $T_1 = 1$ . Second, we choose the number of donors as  $d = 10$ , which are generated from the following AR(1) model:

$$W_{it} = \rho W_{i,t-1} + \eta_{it}, \quad t = 1, \dots, T_0, \quad i = 1, \dots, d.$$

Here, the autocorrelation coefficient  $\rho$  is chosen from  $\rho \in \{0, 0.5, 1\}$ ,  $\eta$  are generated from the standard normal distribution and are independent and identically distributed, and the baseline

value  $W_{i0}$  is set to zero. For the post-treatment period, we consider the following model for donors:

$$\begin{aligned} W_{1,T_0+1} &= \rho W_{1T_0} + \eta_{1,T_0+1} + \zeta \mathbf{sd}(W_{11}, \dots, W_{1T_0}) \\ W_{i,T_0+1} &= \rho W_{iT_0} + \eta_{i,T_0+1}, \quad i = 2, \dots, d, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\zeta \in \{-1, -0.5, 0, 0.5, 1\}$  parameterizes the degree of the shift in the first donor's post-treatment outcome. The treatment-free potential outcome of the treated unit is generated as follows:

$$Y_t^{(0)} = 0.3W_{1t} + 0.4W_{2t} + 0.3W_{3t} + 0.5e_t, \quad t = 1, \dots, T_0 + T_1,$$

where  $e_t$  are independently generated from a standard normal distribution. We consider  $Y_t^{(0)} = Y_t^{(1)}$ , i.e., no treatment effect. We remark that the data generating process violates Assumption 3.2 because  $E\{Y_t^{(0)} - (0.3W_{1t} + 0.4W_{2t} + 0.3W_{3t}) \mid Y_t^{(0)}\} \neq 0$ . Therefore, the proposed conformal inference approach for the SPSC framework in Section 3.3 may fail in this data generating process.

For our methods, we consider the SPSC estimators with ridge regularization. For function  $g_t$ , we consider the following two specifications: (i) time-invariant  $g$  and (ii) time-varying  $g_t$ , which are given as follows:

$$g(Y_t^{(0)}) = \mathbf{b}_{20}(Y_t^{(0)}), \quad g_t(Y_t^{(0)}) = \begin{cases} \mathbf{b}_{20}(Y_t^{(0)}) & \text{if } \{Y_1, \dots, Y_{T_0}\} \text{ is stationary} \\ \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{b}_{20}(Y_t^{(0)}) \\ \mathbf{b}_5(t) \end{bmatrix} & \text{if } \{Y_1, \dots, Y_{T_0}\} \text{ is not stationary} \end{cases} \quad (16)$$

Here,  $\mathbf{b}_d$  is chosen as the  $d$ -dimensional time-invariant cubic B-spline bases function. In order to check the stationarity of  $Y_t$ , we conduct Box-Pierce test (Box and Pierce, 1970) by using `Box.text` function implemented in the base R. If the p-value is less than 0.01, we conclude that  $Y_t$  is nonstationary. Note that the dimension of  $\mathbf{b}_5(t)$  is chosen as the closest integer of  $T_0^{1/3} = 100^{1/3} = 4.64$ .

We repeat the simulation 500 times and calculate the empirical coverage rates of 95% confidence intervals from these repetitions for each simulation scenario. The results are presented in Table 10, which exhibits somewhat opposite results compared to Table 7. More specifically, we find that the `scpi` approach achieves the nominal coverage rate across all simulation scenarios in general. However, we find that the conformal inference approach for the SPSC with time-invariant  $g$  fails

to achieve the nominal coverage rate, especially when the autocorrelation coefficient is large (i.e.,  $\rho = 1$ ) and the first donor’s post-treatment outcome is significantly different from its pre-treatment outcome (i.e.,  $\zeta = \pm 1$ ). We conjecture that the undercoverage observed in these cases may be attributed to the nonstationarity of  $W_{it}$  and  $Y_t^{(0)}$ . In these problematic cases, the conformal inference approach for the SPSC with time-varying  $g_t$  appears to significantly improve the performance of our conformal inference approach. This confirms that the specification in Section A.5 is useful for improving the performance of the proposed conformal inference approach in the presence of nonstationarity.

$\rho$		0					0.5					1				
$\zeta$		-1	-0.5	0	0.5	1	-1	-0.5	0	0.5	1	-1	-0.5	0	0.5	1
SPSC-Ridge	Time-invariant $g$	0.942	0.946	0.946	0.944	0.934	0.920	0.942	0.956	0.956	0.946	0.808	0.852	0.858	0.856	0.824
	Time-varying $g_t$	0.942	0.946	0.946	0.944	0.934	0.946	0.954	0.960	0.958	0.952	0.914	0.932	0.942	0.952	0.948
SCPI		0.974	0.976	0.974	0.976	0.978	0.974	0.970	0.970	0.978	0.980	0.984	0.980	0.978	0.982	0.988

Table 10: Empirical Coverage Rates of 95% Pointwise Prediction Intervals. The numbers in SPSC-Ridge columns show the results of the conformal inference approach in Section 3.3. Time-invariant  $g$  and time-varying  $g_t$  are chosen from (16). The numbers in SCPI column show the results from the approach proposed by Cattaneo et al. (2021) which is implemented in `scpi` R-package (Cattaneo et al., 2023).

Next, we calculate the average length of the 95% prediction interval for  $t = T_0 + 1$ , i.e., the first post-treatment period, across 500 repetitions. Table 11 shows the average lengths. We find that the prediction intervals obtained from `scpi` are generally narrower than those obtained from the SPSC, except for the cases where  $\rho = 1$  and  $\zeta = \pm 1$ .

$\rho$		0					0.5					1				
$\zeta$		-1	-0.5	0	0.5	1	-1	-0.5	0	0.5	1	-1	-0.5	0	0.5	1
SPSC-Ridge	Time-invariant $g$	3.018	3.035	3.040	3.046	3.052	2.963	2.967	2.970	2.991	2.971	3.262	3.288	3.272	3.285	3.281
	Time-varying $g_t$	3.018	3.035	3.039	3.045	3.052	2.904	2.903	2.902	2.921	2.931	2.926	2.900	2.904	2.931	2.979
SCPI		2.657	2.596	2.576	2.597	2.658	2.654	2.593	2.574	2.598	2.662	3.154	3.024	2.985	3.035	3.165

Table 11: Average Lengths of 95% Pointwise Prediction Intervals at  $t = T_0 + 1$ . Each column has the same specification as in Table 10.

Lastly, we report the bias and the empirical standard error of the estimators for the ATT obtained from `scpi`. Specifically, the estimator is obtained as  $\hat{\tau}_{\text{ATT}} = Y_t - \hat{Y}_t^{(0)}$  where  $\hat{Y}_t^{(0)}$  is a predicted value of the treatment-free potential outcome at time  $t = T_0 + 1$ . Comparing the estimator derived from `scpi` to the SPSC estimator, we observe that the latter leads to larger biases. Nevertheless, when considering the empirical standard errors, these biases become negligible. As a result, we deduce that the ATT estimator from the SPSC approach exhibits a negligible bias,

whereas the conformal inference approach can be anticonservative in the presence of nonstationarity.

$\rho$		0					0.5					1				
$\zeta$		-1	-0.5	0	0.5	1	-1	-0.5	0	0.5	1	-1	-0.5	0	0.5	1
SPSC-Ridge	Time-invariant $g$	-0.030	-0.034	-0.038	-0.041	-0.045	-0.084	-0.085	-0.085	-0.086	-0.086	-0.181	-0.102	-0.023	0.055	0.13
	Time-varying $g_t$	-0.030	-0.034	-0.038	-0.042	-0.046	-0.086	-0.082	-0.078	-0.075	-0.071	-0.158	-0.098	-0.039	0.021	0.08
SCPI		-0.063	-0.051	-0.038	-0.025	-0.013	-0.062	-0.048	-0.035	-0.021	-0.008	-0.068	-0.048	-0.028	-0.008	0.01

$\rho$		0					0.5					1				
$\zeta$		-1	-0.5	0	0.5	1	-1	-0.5	0	0.5	1	-1	-0.5	0	0.5	1
SPSC-Ridge	Time-invariant $g$	0.774	0.753	0.748	0.760	0.789	0.789	0.765	0.754	0.757	0.774	1.152	1.070	1.037	1.057	1.127
	Time-varying $g_t$	0.774	0.753	0.748	0.760	0.789	0.756	0.736	0.728	0.733	0.752	0.852	0.786	0.761	0.780	0.840
SCPI		0.516	0.512	0.510	0.509	0.509	0.517	0.514	0.512	0.510	0.510	0.536	0.533	0.533	0.535	0.540

Table 12: Biases (top table) and Empirical Standard Errors (bottom table) of the Three ATT Estimators Obtained from Our Approach and the SCPI Approach proposed by Cattaneo et al. (2021). We remark that the results of the SPSC estimators are the same as those in Table 4.

## A.10 Additional Results of the Data Analysis

In this Section, we provide additional results of the data analysis in Section 5. First, we provide details on how to choose the donor pool. As we briefly mentioned in the data analysis section, some donor candidates had severely different stock price values. In the most severe cases, the ranges of the pre- and post-treatment periods of the stock prices do not overlap. As a criterion for choosing the donor pools, we use the following overlap metric:

$$\text{Overlap}_k = \frac{1}{T_1} \sum_{t=T_0+1}^T \mathbb{1}\left\{W_{kt} \in \text{range}(W_{k1}, \dots, W_{kT_0})\right\}, \quad k = 1, \dots, 49.$$

Based on the overlap, we define the four groups of roughly equal size. Specifically, Group 1, 2, and 4 has 12 donors and Group 3 has 13 donors, respectively; see Figure 6.




Figure 6: Distribution of the Overlap Metric of the 49 Donor Candidates.

In addition to the four groups based on the overlap metric, we choose the donors based on lasso

regularization (Tibshirani, 1996). Specifically, we solve the following GMM with  $\ell_1$  regularization:

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{\gamma}_\lambda &= \arg \min_{\gamma} \left[ \{\hat{\Psi}_{\text{pre}}(\gamma)\}^T \{\hat{\Psi}_{\text{pre}}(\gamma)\} + \lambda \|\gamma\|_1 \right] \\ &= \arg \min_{\gamma} \left[ \|\hat{G}_{YY} - \hat{G}_{YW}^T \gamma\|_2^2 + \lambda \|\gamma\|_1 \right],\end{aligned}$$

where  $\hat{G}_{YW}$  and  $\hat{G}_{YY}$  are defined in (11). The regularization parameter is chosen from cross-validation. We remark that the number of non-zero  $\hat{\gamma}_\lambda$  depends on the dimension of  $g_t(Y_t^{(0)})$ . Therefore, we vary the dimension of  $g_t$  across a range from 2 to 98, which spans twice the number of donors. Nonetheless, as in Figure 7, we find the number of selected donors does not vary a lot across the dimension of  $g_t(Y_t^{(0)})$ . In particular, five donors are selected when  $\dim(g_t) = 10$ , in alignment with the relationship  $\dim(g_t) = 2d$  specified in the simulation studies. Therefore, we define these five donors as Group 5.




Figure 7: Number of Selected Donors Across the Dimension of  $g_t(Y_t^{(0)})$ . The dashed line visually guides the relationship  $\dim(g) = 2d$ .

Lastly, we follow the approach in Section A.6, which yields 24 donors. We refer to this donor pool as Group 6. Of note, this group is reported in the main paper.

For the coefficient function  $g_t$ , we consider the following two specifications  $g_t$ -(i) and  $g_t$ -(ii):

- (i) (*Time-invariant g*) Following the approach in the main paper, we define  $g(Y_t^{(0)})$  as a time-invariant function as follows:

$$g(Y_t^{(0)}) = \mathbf{b}_\ell(Y_t^{(0)}), \quad \ell \in \{24, 24, 24, 24, 10, 48\} \text{ for Groups 1-6}$$

where  $\mathbf{b}_\ell$  is the  $\ell$ -dimensional cubic B-spline bases function. In other words, for Groups 1–4, we define  $g$  as the 24-dimensional cubic B-spline bases function. For Group 5, we define  $g$  as the 10-dimensional cubic B-spline bases function. Lastly, for Group 6, we define  $g$  as the

48-dimensional cubic B-spline bases function.

- (ii) (*Time-varying  $g_t$* ) Next, we consider time-varying  $g_t(Y_t^{(0)})$  by following the specification in Section A.5. In particular, we define

$$g_t(Y_t^{(0)}) = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{b}_\ell(Y_t^{(0)}) \\ \mathbf{b}_6(t) \end{bmatrix}, \quad \ell \in \{24, 24, 24, 24, 10, 48\} \text{ for Groups 1--6}$$

where  $\mathbf{b}_6(t)$  is the 6-dimensional cubic B-spline bases function where the dimension is obtained by choosing the closest integer of  $T_0^{1/3} = 217^{1/3} = 6.01$ .

Using these six choices for the donor pool and the two choices for  $g_t$ , we focus on the estimation of the ATT. Table 13 summarizes the result. We find that the results are similar to each other. In terms of the length of the 95% confidence intervals, the SPSC with ridge regularization results in the narrowest confidence intervals in general, except for Group 2 with time-invariant  $g$ . These additional analyses for the ATT corroborate the results in Table 3 of the main paper.

Donor Pool	Statistic	Time-invariant $g$			Time-varying $g_t$		
		OLS	SPSC	SPSC-Ridge	OLS	SPSC	SPSC-Ridge
Group 1 (12)	Estimate	-0.906	-0.855	-0.855	-0.847	-0.883	-0.850
	ASE	0.101	0.115	0.100	0.117	0.124	0.094
	95% CI	(-1.103, -0.709)	(-1.081, -0.629)	(-1.051, -0.660)	(-1.076, -0.618)	(-1.127, -0.639)	(-1.034, -0.666)
Group 2 (12)	Estimate	-0.840	-0.787	-0.887	-0.897	-0.790	-0.892
	ASE	0.089	0.104	0.098	0.132	0.107	0.097
	95% CI	(-1.014, -0.667)	(-0.991, -0.583)	(-1.079, -0.696)	(-1.156, -0.638)	(-0.999, -0.580)	(-1.082, -0.703)
Group 3 (13)	Estimate	-0.875	-0.520	-0.798	-0.797	-0.614	-0.798
	ASE	0.154	0.235	0.084	0.184	0.212	0.084
	95% CI	(-1.177, -0.574)	(-0.982, -0.059)	(-0.963, -0.633)	(-1.158, -0.437)	(-1.030, -0.198)	(-0.963, -0.633)
Group 4 (12)	Estimate	-0.922	-0.852	-0.713	-0.708	-0.879	-0.710
	ASE	0.095	0.138	0.072	0.259	0.137	0.073
	95% CI	(-1.109, -0.735)	(-1.122, -0.581)	(-0.854, -0.571)	(-1.216, -0.200)	(-1.147, -0.610)	(-0.854, -0.567)
Group 5 (5)	Estimate	-0.852	-0.887	-0.886	-0.816	-0.868	-0.635
	ASE	0.120	0.111	0.107	0.102	0.106	0.080
	95% CI	(-1.087, -0.616)	(-1.105, -0.669)	(-1.096, -0.677)	(-1.016, -0.615)	(-1.077, -0.660)	(-0.791, -0.479)
Group 6 (24)	Estimate	-0.966	-0.975	-0.830	-0.822	-0.910	-0.797
	ASE	0.108	0.101	0.098	0.134	0.096	0.086
	95% CI	(-1.177, -0.755)	(-1.172, -0.777)	(-1.022, -0.638)	(-1.084, -0.560)	(-1.098, -0.722)	(-0.965, -0.628)

Table 13: Bias and Asymptotic Standard Errors of the Three ATT Estimators under time-invariant  $g$  and time-varying  $g_t$ . The numbers in the parentheses show the number of donors in each group. We remark that the results of Group 6 under  $g_t(Y_t^{(0)})$  are the same as those in Table 3 of the main paper.


Next, we conduct the conformal inference on the SPSC with ridge regularization. Following the



main paper, we compare the proposed approach to the recent work by [Cattaneo et al. \(2021\)](#). Of note, we increased `sims` parameter in `scpi` function from its default value of 200 to 2000. This adjustment was made to reduce variability in the results. [Figure 8](#) visually summarizes the predicted treatment-free outcome  $\widehat{Y}_t^{(0)}$  and the 95% prediction intervals for all five donor pool groups. In general, two approaches produce similar  $\widehat{Y}_t^{(0)}$  in terms of the shape. However, we find the average width of the prediction intervals over the post-treatment periods are significantly different, which is summarized in [Table 14](#). Except for Groups 2 and 4, our approach produces narrower prediction intervals compared to the approach by [Cattaneo et al. \(2021\)](#). These additional results from the conformal inference approaches certify the results in the main paper are robust to the choice of the donor pool.

Donor Pool		Group 1 (12)	Group 2 (12)	Group 3 (13)	Group 4 (12)	Group 5 (5)	Group 6 (24)
SCPI		0.197	0.104	0.410	0.178	0.430	0.108
SPSC-Ridge	Time-invariant $g$	0.054	0.108	0.149	0.205	0.119	0.046
	Time-varying $g_t$	0.067	0.104	0.148	0.208	0.249	0.072

Table 14: Average Width of the 95% Prediction Intervals over the Post-treatment Periods. The numbers in the parentheses show the number of donors in each group. The numbers in SCPI row show the average length of 95% pointwise prediction intervals obtained from the approach proposed by [Cattaneo et al. \(2021\)](#) which is implemented in `scpi` R-package ([Cattaneo et al., 2023](#)). The numbers in SPSC-Ridge rows show the average length of 95% pointwise prediction intervals obtained from the conformal inference approach in [Section 3.3](#) where  $g_t$  is either time-invariant or time-varying. We remark that the results of Group 6 are the same as those in [Figure 2](#) of the main paper.



Lastly, we provide the details of the placebo study. Table 15 shows the numerical summary of the analysis. We find that both placebo ATT estimators obtained from SPSC with and without ridge regularization suggest no effect across all donor specifications. Figure 9 visually shows the synthetic controls under the placebo treatment. Except for Group 1, we find 95% prediction intervals for  $Y_t^{(0)}$  include the true treatment-free potential outcome  $Y_t^{(0)}$ . These results suggest that our SPSC approach seems reasonable for analyzing the effect of the 1907 panic on the stock price of the two trust companies.

Based on these additional analyses, we can further strengthen the causal conclusions established in the main paper, i.e., the 1907 panic led to a decrease in the average log stock price of




Figure 8: Graphical Summaries of the 95% Prediction Intervals over the Post-treatment Periods. The left figures titled SCPI show 95% pointwise prediction intervals obtained from the approach proposed by Cattaneo et al. (2021) which is implemented in `scpi` R-package (Cattaneo et al., 2023). The right figures titled SPSC-Ridge show 95% pointwise prediction intervals obtained from the conformal inference approach in Section 3.3. We remark that the results under Group 6 are the same as those in Figure 2 of the main paper.

Knickerbocker and Trust Company of America.

Donor Pool	Statistic	Estimator		
		OLS	SPSC	SPSC-Ridge
Group 1 (12)	Estimate	-0.058	-0.088	-0.016
	ASE	0.025	0.049	0.013
	95% CI	(-0.107, -0.010)	(-0.184, 0.009)	(-0.042, 0.009)
Group 2 (12)	Estimate	-0.023	-0.015	-0.001
	ASE	0.015	0.023	0.010
	95% CI	(-0.053, 0.006)	(-0.061, 0.031)	(-0.020, 0.018)
Group 3 (13)	Estimate	-0.100	-0.075	0.002
	ASE	0.021	0.044	0.009
	95% CI	(-0.142, -0.058)	(-0.160, 0.010)	(-0.016, 0.020)
Group 4 (12)	Estimate	-0.016	0.028	0.020
	ASE	0.014	0.117	0.012
	95% CI	(-0.044, 0.011)	(-0.202, 0.258)	(-0.003, 0.043)
Group 5 (5)	Estimate	-0.002	0.003	0.018
	ASE	0.016	0.021	0.012
	95% CI	(-0.034, 0.029)	(-0.037, 0.043)	(-0.007, 0.042)
Group 6 (24)	Estimate	-0.003	0.030	0.001
	ASE	0.009	0.030	0.005
	95% CI	(-0.020, 0.014)	(-0.029, 0.089)	(-0.009, 0.011)

Table 15: Bias and Asymptotic Standard Errors of the Three ATT Estimators Under the Placebo Study. The numbers in the parentheses show the number of donors in each group. We remark that the results of Group 6 are the same as those in Section 5 of the main paper.




Figure 9: Graphical Summaries of the 95% Prediction Intervals over the Placebo Post-treatment Periods. Each plot shows 95% pointwise prediction intervals obtained from the conformal inference approach in Section 3.3 with ridge regularization.

## B Nonparametric Single Proxy Synthetic Control Framework

### B.1 General Methodology

The SPSC framework can be generalized to the case in which the synthetic control is nonlinear and/or nonparametric, thus allowing the outcome to have arbitrary types such as binary, count, and continuous over a bounded interval. The nonparametric identification of the synthetic control relies on the existence of the bridge function satisfying the following condition.

**Assumption B.1** (Existence of Nonparametric Bridge Function). For all  $t = 1, \dots, T$ , there exists a function  $h^* : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  that satisfies  $Y_t^{(0)} = E\{h^*(W_{\mathcal{D}t}) \mid Y_t^{(0)}\} = 0$  almost surely.

In words, there exists a function of donors  $h^*$ , possibly linear or nonlinear, of which conditional expectation given  $Y_t^{(0)}$  recovers  $Y_t^{(0)}$ ; the function  $h^*$  is a kind of bridge functions (Tchetgen Tchetgen et al., 2020, 2023), and we aptly refer to  $h^*$  as the synthetic control bridge function in this paper. The synthetic control bridge function  $h^*$  is a solution to a Fredholm integral equation of the

first kind, and sufficient conditions for the existence of a solution are well studied in previous works such as Miao et al. (2018) and Cui et al. (2023); see Section B.2 of the Supplementary Material for details. We remark that Assumption 3.2 is a special case of Assumption B.1 where the synthetic control bridge function is restricted to a linear form of  $h(W_{\mathcal{D}t}) = W_{\mathcal{D}t}^T \gamma$ .

Similar to the results established under the linear synthetic control, the synthetic control bridge function  $h^*$  can be used as a basis for identifying the ATT; the following Theorem formally establishes the result.

**Theorem B.1.** *Under Assumptions 2.1–3.1 and B.1, the synthetic control bridge function  $h^*$  satisfies the following equation:*

$$E\{Y_t - h^*(W_{\mathcal{D}t}) \mid Y_t\} = 0 \text{ almost surely, } t = 1, \dots, T_0. \quad (17)$$

Moreover, we have  $E\{Y_t^{(0)} - h^*(W_{\mathcal{D}t})\} = 0$  for any  $t = 1, \dots, T$ . Lastly, the ATT at time  $t = T_0 + 1, \dots, T$  is identified as  $\tau_t^* = E\{Y_t - h^*(W_{\mathcal{D}t})\}$ .

Theorem B.1 is a generalization of Theorems 3.1 and 3.2 to nonparametric settings. If the synthetic control bridge function  $h^*$  is unique, standard nonparametric or parametric estimation strategies can result in consistent estimators for  $h^*$ ; the GMM estimator in Section 3.2 is an example of the parametric estimation strategy. However, in general, the integral equation (17) may have multiple solutions. Still, all solutions are valid synthetic controls and, consequently, result in the same ATT. When the bridge functions are not unique, we follow the approaches in Li et al. (2023) and Zhang et al. (2023) to obtain a nonparametric series estimator; see Section B.4. Given the synthetic control bridge function, the post-treatment residual process  $Y_t - h^*(W_{\mathcal{D}t})$  is equivalent to the ATT plus the post-treatment error, i.e.,  $Y_t - h^*(W_{\mathcal{D}t}) = \tau_t^* + \epsilon_t$  where the ATT  $\tau_t^*$  encodes the deterministic trend of the residual process via model  $\tau_t^* = \tau(t; \beta^*)$  and the error process  $\epsilon_t$  satisfies the conditions in Assumption 3.3. The estimation of the ATT parameter  $\beta^*$  can be easily performed by following the results in the previous section with minor modifications.

Lastly, we extend the results when exogenous covariates are available, which are parallel to Section A.7.

**Assumption B.2** (Existence of Bridge Function in the Presence of Covariates). For all  $t = 1, \dots, T$ , there exists a function  $h^* : \mathbb{R}^{d+q+dq} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  that satisfies  $Y_t^{(0)} = E\{h^*(W_{\mathcal{D}t}, X_{0t}, X_{\mathcal{D}t}) \mid Y_t^{(0)}, X_{0t}, X_{\mathcal{D}t}\}$

almost surely.

**Theorem B.2.** *Suppose Assumptions 2.1, 2.2, A.1, and B.2 are satisfied. Then, the synthetic control bridge function  $h^*$  satisfies  $E\{Y_t - h^*(W_{\mathcal{D}t}, X_{0t}, X_{\mathcal{D}t}) \mid Y_t, X_{0t}, X_{\mathcal{D}t}\} = 0$  for  $t = 1, \dots, T_0$ . Moreover, we have  $E\{Y_t^{(0)} - h^*(W_{\mathcal{D}t}, X_{0t}, X_{\mathcal{D}t})\} = 0$  for any  $t = 1, \dots, T$ . Lastly, the ATT at time  $t = T_0 + 1, \dots, T$  is identified as  $\tau_t^* = E\{Y_t - h^*(W_{\mathcal{D}t}, X_{0t}, X_{\mathcal{D}t})\}$ .*

The estimation of inference of the synthetic control bridge function and the ATT is analogous to that established in the absence of covariates, so we omit the details here.

## B.2 Sufficient Conditions for the Existence of the Synthetic Control Bridge Function

In this Section, we provide sufficient conditions for the existence of the synthetic control bridge function  $h^*$ . In brief, we follow the approach in Miao et al. (2018). The proof relies on Theorem 15.18 of Kress (2014), which is stated below for completeness.

**Theorem 15.18.** (Kress, 2014) Let  $A : X \rightarrow Y$  be a compact operator with singular system  $\{\mu_n, \phi_n, g_n\}_{n=1,2,\dots}$ . The integral equation of the first kind  $A\phi = f$  is solvable if and only if

$$1. \quad f \in \mathcal{N}(A^{\text{adjoint}})^{\perp} = \{f \mid A^{\text{adjoint}}(f) = 0\}^{\perp}, \quad 2. \quad \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mu_n^{-2} |\langle f, g_n \rangle|^2 < \infty$$

To apply the Theorem, we introduce some additional notations. Let  $\mathcal{L}_W$  and  $\mathcal{L}_{Y^{(0)}}$  be the spaces of square-integrable functions of  $W_{\mathcal{D}t}$  and  $Y_t^{(0)}$ , respectively, which are equipped with the inner products  $\langle h_1, h_2 \rangle_W = \int h_1(w)h_2(w) f_W(w) dw = E\{h_1(W_{\mathcal{D}t})h_2(W_{\mathcal{D}t})\}$  and  $\langle g_1, g_2 \rangle_{Y^{(0)}} = \int g_1(y)g_2(y) f_{Y^{(0)}}(y) dy = E\{g_1(Y_t^{(0)})g_2(Y_t^{(0)})\}$ , respectively. Let  $\mathcal{K} : \mathcal{L}_W \rightarrow \mathcal{L}_{Y^{(0)}}$  be the conditional expectation of  $h(W_{\mathcal{D}t}) \in \mathcal{L}_W$  given  $Y_t^{(0)}$ , i.e.,

$$\mathcal{K}(h) \in \mathcal{L}_{Y^{(0)}} \text{ satisfying } (\mathcal{K}(h))(y) = E\{h(W_{\mathcal{D}t}) \mid Y_t^{(0)} = y\} \text{ for } h \in \mathcal{L}_W$$

Then, the synthetic control bridge function  $h^* \in \mathcal{L}_W$  solves  $\mathcal{K}(h^*) = [\text{identity map}] \in \mathcal{L}_{Y^{(0)}}$ , i.e.,

$$\int h^*(w) f_{W|Y^{(0)}}(w \mid y) dw = y, \quad \forall y$$

Now, we assume the following conditions:

(NPSC-1) The variables  $(Y_t^{(0)}, W_{\mathcal{D}t})$  are stationary;

(NPSC-2)  $\iint f_{W|Y^{(0)}}(w|y)f_{Y^{(0)}|W}(y|w)dw dy < \infty$ ;

(NPSC-3) For  $g \in \mathcal{L}_{Y^{(0)}}$ ,  $\mathbb{E}\{g(Y_t^{(0)}) | W_{\mathcal{D}t}\} = 0$  implies  $g(Y_t^{(0)}) = 0$  almost surely;

(NPSC-4)  $\mathbb{E}[\{Y_t^{(0)}\}^2] < \infty$ ;

(NPSC-5) Let the singular system of  $\mathcal{K}$  be  $\{\mu_n, \phi_n, g_n\}_{n=1,2,\dots}$ . Then, we have  $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mu_n^{-2} |\langle Y_t^{(0)}, g_n \rangle|^2 < \infty$ .

We remark that the expectation can be defined without using  $t$  under Condition (NPSC-1). First, we show that  $\mathcal{K}$  is a compact operator under Condition (NPSC-2). Let  $\mathcal{K}^{\text{adjoint}} : \mathcal{L}_{Y^{(0)}} \rightarrow \mathcal{L}_W$  be the conditional expectation of  $g(Y_t^{(0)}) \in \mathcal{L}_{Y^{(0)}}$  given  $W_{\mathcal{D}t}$ , i.e.,

$$\mathcal{K}^{\text{adjoint}}(g) \in \mathcal{L}_W \text{ satisfying } (\mathcal{K}(g))(w) = \mathbb{E}\{g(Y_t^{(0)}) | W_{\mathcal{D}t} = w\} \text{ for } g \in \mathcal{L}_{Y^{(0)}}$$

Then,  $\mathcal{K}$  and  $\mathcal{K}^{\text{adjoint}}$  are the adjoint operator of each other as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \mathcal{K}(h), g \rangle_{Y^{(0)}} &= \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}\{h(W_{\mathcal{D}t}) | Y_t^{(0)}\}g(Y_t^{(0)})] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[h(W_{\mathcal{D}t})g(Y_t^{(0)})] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[h(W_{\mathcal{D}t})\mathbb{E}\{g(Y_t^{(0)}) | W_{\mathcal{D}t}\}] = \langle h, \mathcal{K}^{\text{adjoint}}(g) \rangle_W \end{aligned}$$

Additionally, as shown in page 5659 of Carrasco et al. (2007),  $\mathcal{K}$  and  $\mathcal{K}^{\text{adjoint}}$  are compact operators under Condition (NPSC-1). Moreover, by Theorem 15.16 of Kress (2014), there exists a singular value decomposition of  $\mathcal{K}$  as  $\{\mu_n, \phi_n, g_n\}_{n=1,2,\dots}$ .

Second, we show that  $\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{K}^{\text{adjoint}})^{\perp} = \mathcal{L}_{Y^{(0)}}$ , which suffices to show  $\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{K}^{\text{adjoint}}) = \{0\} \subseteq \mathcal{L}_{Y^{(0)}}$ . Under Condition (NPSC-3), we have

$$g \in \mathcal{N}(\mathcal{K}^{\text{adjoint}}) \Rightarrow \mathbb{E}\{g(Y_t^{(0)}) | W_{\mathcal{D}t} = w\} = 0, \forall w \Rightarrow g(Y_t^{(0)}) = 0$$

where the first arrow is from the definition of the null space  $\mathcal{N}$ , and the second arrow is from Condition (NPSC-3). Therefore, any  $g \in \mathcal{N}(\mathcal{K}^{\text{adjoint}})$  must satisfy  $g(y) = 0$  almost surely, i.e.,  $\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{K}^{\text{adjoint}}) = \{0\} \subseteq \mathcal{L}_{Y^{(0)}}$  almost surely.

Third, from the definition of  $\mathcal{L}_W$ ,  $g(Y_t^{(0)}) = Y_t^{(0)} \in \mathcal{L}_{Y^{(0)}} = \mathcal{N}(\mathcal{K}^{\text{adjoint}})^{\perp}$  under Condition (NPSC-4).



Combining the three results, we establish that  $Y_t^{(0)}$  satisfies the first condition of Theorem 15.18 of [Kress \(2014\)](#). The second condition of the Theorem is exactly the same as Condition [\(NPSC-5\)](#). Therefore, we establish that the Fredholm integral equation of the first kind  $\mathcal{K}(h) = [\text{identity map}]$  is solvable under Conditions [\(NPSC-1\)](#)-[\(NPSC-5\)](#).

### B.3 Uniqueness of Synthetic Control Bridge Function Under Completeness

In Section [B.1](#), we showed that [\(17\)](#) is satisfied under Assumptions [2.1–3.1](#) and [B.1](#); for readability, we restate Assumption [B.1](#) and [\(17\)](#) below:

*Assumption B.1 (Existence of Nonparametric Bridge Function)* For all  $t = 1, \dots, T$ , there exists a function  $h^* : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  that satisfies  $Y_t^{(0)} = E\{h^*(W_{\mathcal{D}t}) \mid Y_t^{(0)}\} = 0$  almost surely.

and

$$E\{Y_t - h^*(W_{\mathcal{D}t}) \mid Y_t\} = 0 \text{ almost surely, } t = 1, \dots, T_0. \quad (17)$$

In this section, we show the reverse is satisfied. Suppose a function  $h^*$  satisfies [\(17\)](#). Then, we obtain the following result for  $t = 1, \dots, T_0$ :

$$y = E\{h^*(W_{\mathcal{D}t}) \mid Y_t = y\} = E\{h^*(W_{\mathcal{D}t}) \mid Y_t^{(0)} = y\},$$

where the second equality holds from Assumption [2.1](#). Therefore,  $h^*$  satisfies Assumption [B.1](#).

We can further show that the bridge function  $h^*$  is indeed unique under an additional assumption, namely the completeness assumption:

**Assumption B.3 (Completeness).** For  $t = 1, \dots, T_0$ , suppose  $E\{q(W_{\mathcal{D}t}) \mid Y_t\} = 0$  almost surely for a square integrable function  $q$ . Then,  $q(W_{\mathcal{D}t}) = 0$  almost surely.

The assumption states that  $Y_t$  should be  $W_{\mathcal{D}t}$ -relevant over the pre-treatment periods in the sense that any variation in  $W_{\mathcal{D}t}$  is captured by variation in  $Y_t$  for the pre-treatment periods.

Under Assumptions [2.1–3.1](#), [B.1](#), and [B.3](#), the solution to [\(17\)](#) is unique almost surely. To show this, let  $h_1^*$  and  $h_2^*$  be synthetic control bridge functions that satisfy [\(17\)](#). We then find  $E\{h_1^*(W_{\mathcal{D}t}) - h_2^*(W_{\mathcal{D}t}) \mid Y_t\} = 0$  for  $t = 1, \dots, T_0$ , implying  $h_1^*(W_{\mathcal{D}t})$  and  $h_2^*(W_{\mathcal{D}t}) = 0$  almost surely from Assumption [B.3](#). Therefore, the solution to [\(17\)](#) must be unique almost surely, i.e.,

$h_1^*(W_{\mathcal{D}t}) = h_2^*(W_{\mathcal{D}t})$  almost surely. Moreover, suppose  $h_3^*$  be a synthetic control bridge function that satisfies Assumption B.1. Then,  $h_3^*$  is a solution to (17), indicating that  $h_1^*(W_{\mathcal{D}t}) = h_3^*(W_{\mathcal{D}t})$  almost surely because of the same reasoning. Therefore, the unique solution to (17) is also the unique function satisfying Assumption B.1.

We remark that Assumption B.3 may not be satisfied if the cardinality of the support of  $W_{\mathcal{D}t}$  is strictly larger than that of  $Y_t$ . For instance, suppose that the outcomes are binary and two donors are available, i.e.,  $W_{\mathcal{D}t} \in \{0, 1\}^2$  and  $Y_t \in \{0, 1\}$ . Then, the equation in Assumption B.3 reduces to

$$\begin{bmatrix} p_{W|Y}(0, 0 | 0) & p_{W|Y}(0, 1 | 0) & p_{W|Y}(1, 0 | 0) & p_{W|Y}(1, 1 | 0) \\ p_{W|Y}(0, 0 | 1) & p_{W|Y}(0, 1 | 1) & p_{W|Y}(1, 0 | 1) & p_{W|Y}(1, 1 | 1) \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} q(0, 0) \\ q(0, 1) \\ q(1, 0) \\ q(1, 1) \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} \quad (18)$$

where  $p_{W|Y}(a, b | y) = \Pr\{W_{\mathcal{D}t} = (a, b) | Y_t^{(0)} = y\}$ . Since (18) is an underdetermined system, there are multiple non-zero  $q$  functions satisfying (18), indicating that Assumption B.3 cannot be satisfied.

In the following section, we introduce a nonparametric SPSC framework that accommodates non-unique synthetic control bridge functions.

#### B.4 Single Proxy Synthetic Control Approach without the Uniqueness Assumption

The synthetic control bridge function  $h$  is defined as a function satisfying (17); we restate the equation below for readability.

$$\mathbb{E}\{Y_t - h^*(W_{\mathcal{D}t}) | Y_t\} = 0 \text{ almost surely, } t = 1, \dots, T_0. \quad (17)$$

We consider the case where there are multiple synthetic control bridge functions  $h$  satisfying (17). Even so, the identification of the ATT established in Theorem B.1 is satisfied regardless of the choice of the bridge function. However, estimation and inference of the ATT can be complicated in the presence of multiple synthetic control bridge functions. To resolve this issue, we use approaches proposed by a series of recent works (Li et al., 2023; Zhang et al., 2023). In brief, their approaches

involve the following three stages. In the first stage, we estimate a set of synthetic control bridge functions based on a sieve estimator; see Stage 1 below. In the second stage, we define a criterion function, denoted by  $M$ , and focus on the estimation of the minimizer of  $M$ , denoted by  $h_0$ . Then, an estimator of the ATT can be constructed based on the estimator of  $h_0$ ; see Stage 2 below. In the third stage, we consider a de-biasing procedure for the estimator obtained in the previous stage to attain the asymptotic normality; see Stage 3 below. The following sections present details under general nonparametric settings, but the method can be applied to the parametric synthetic controls, including cases where there are multiple synthetic control weights that satisfy Assumption 3.2. We have included only the essential assumptions and notations in this work to ensure clarity. We refer the readers to Li et al. (2023) and Zhang et al. (2023) for additional details.

**Stage 1:** Estimation of the Solution Set  $\mathcal{H}_0$

Let  $\mathcal{H}$  be a collection of user-specified smooth functions, and let  $\mathcal{H}_0$  be the collection of the solutions of (17), i.e.,

$$\mathcal{H}_0 = \left\{ h \in \mathcal{H} \mid Y_t = \mathbb{E}\{h(W_{\mathcal{D}t}) \mid Y_t\}, t = 1, \dots, T_0 \right\}$$

Alternatively, we can represent  $\mathcal{H}_0$  using a criterion function. Let  $\mathfrak{C} : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a criterion function having the following form:

$$\mathfrak{C}(h) = \mathbb{E} \left[ [Y_t - \mathbb{E}\{h(W_{\mathcal{D}t}) \mid Y_t\}]^2 \right], t = 1, \dots, T_0 .$$

It is straightforward to check that  $\mathcal{H}_0 = \{h \in \mathcal{H} \mid \mathfrak{C}(h) = 0\}$ .

We consider a sieve approach as follows. First, we choose a sequence of approximating bases functions of  $W_{\mathcal{D}t}$ , denoted by  $\{\varphi_k(w)\}_{k=1,2,\dots}$ . For this sequence, we define an approximating function space for  $\mathcal{H}$  by using the first  $k_T$  bases functions, i.e.,

$$\mathcal{H}_T = \left\{ h \in \mathcal{H} \mid h(w) = \sum_{\ell=1}^{k_T} b_\ell \varphi_\ell(w) \right\},$$

where  $k_T$  is a known parameter and  $b_1, \dots, b_{k_T}$  are unknown scalar parameters.

A sample analogue of the criterion function  $\mathfrak{C}$ , denoted by  $\mathfrak{C}_T$ , can be obtained based on

the sieve approach. We choose a sequence of approximating bases functions of  $Y_t^{(0)}$ , denoted by  $\{\phi_k(y)\}_{k=1,2,\dots}$ . Then, we choose the first  $k_T$  bases function and construct a  $k_T$ -dimensional function of  $y$ , denoted by  $\phi(y) = \{\phi_1(y), \dots, \phi_{k_T}(y)\}^T$ . Using the pre-treatment observations, we construct a  $(T_0 \times k_T)$  matrix as follows:

$$\Phi_{\text{pre}} = \begin{bmatrix} \phi^T(Y_1) \\ \vdots \\ \phi^T(Y_{T_0}) \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{T_0 \times k_T}.$$

For a given function  $h$ , a sieve estimator of the conditional expectation  $\mathbb{E}\{h(W_{\mathcal{D}t}) \mid Y_t\}$  for  $t = 1, \dots, T_0$  can be obtained by regressing  $h(W_{\mathcal{D}t})$  on  $\phi(Y_t)$ , i.e.,

$$\hat{\mu}_{\text{pre}}(y; h) = \text{sieve}\left(\mathbb{E}\{h(W_{\mathcal{D}t}) \mid Y_t = y\}\right) = \phi^T(y) (\Phi_{\text{pre}}^T \Phi_{\text{pre}})^{-1} \left\{ \sum_{t=1}^{T_0} h(W_{\mathcal{D}t}) \phi(Y_t) \right\}.$$

Therefore,  $\mathfrak{C}_T$  can be obtained based on a sieve estimator, i.e.,

$$\mathfrak{C}_T(h) = \frac{1}{T_0} \sum_{t=1}^{T_0} \left\{ Y_t - \hat{\mu}_{\text{pre}}(Y_t; h) \right\}^2$$

The proposed estimator of  $\mathcal{H}_0$  is

$$\hat{\mathcal{H}}_0 = \left\{ h \in \mathcal{H}_T \mid \mathfrak{C}_T(h) \leq c_T \right\}$$

where  $c_T$  is an appropriately chosen sequence with  $c_T \rightarrow 0$  as  $T \rightarrow \infty$ . Under regularity conditions, we have

$$d_H(\hat{\mathcal{H}}_0, \mathcal{H}_0, \|\cdot\|_\infty) = o_P(1)$$

where  $d_H(\mathcal{H}_1, \mathcal{H}_2, \|\cdot\|)$  is the Hausdorff distance between  $\mathcal{H}_1$  and  $\mathcal{H}_2$  with respect to a given norm  $\|\cdot\|$ ; see Section 3.2 of [Li et al. \(2023\)](#) and Section 3.2 of [Zhang et al. \(2023\)](#) for details.

## Stage 2: A Representer-based Estimator

After obtaining a consistent set estimator of  $\mathcal{H}_0$  (i.e.,  $\hat{\mathcal{H}}_0$ ), we select an estimator of  $h$  from  $\hat{\mathcal{H}}_0$  so that it converges to a unique element in  $\mathcal{H}_0$ . Specifically, we define a function  $M : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  that

has a unique minimum  $h_0$  on  $\mathcal{H}_0$ . Let  $M_T$  be its sample analogue, and let  $\widehat{h}_0$  be the minimum of  $M_T(h)$  over  $\widehat{\mathcal{H}}_0$ , i.e.,

$$\widehat{h}_0 \in \arg \min_{h \in \widehat{\mathcal{H}}_0} M_T(h) .$$

To obtain a unique minimum  $\widehat{h}_0$ ,  $\mathcal{H}$  and  $M$  are chosen to satisfy the following assumption:

**Assumption B.4.** The following conditions are satisfied:

1. The set  $\mathcal{H}$  is convex;
2. The functional  $M : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is strictly convex, and have a unique minimum at  $h_0$  on  $\mathcal{H}_0$ ;
3. The sample analogue  $M_T : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is continuous and  $\sup_{h \in \mathcal{H}} |M_T(h) - M(h)| = o_P(1)$ .

Possible choices for  $M$  and its sample analogue  $M_T$  are

$$M(h) = \mathbb{E}[\{h(W_{\mathcal{D}t})\}^2] , \quad t = 1, \dots, T_0 , \quad M_T(h) = \frac{1}{T_0} \sum_{t=1}^{T_0} \{h(W_{\mathcal{D}t})\}^2$$

Under regularity conditions, we have  $\|\widehat{h}_0 - h_0\|_\infty = o_P(1)$ ; see Theorem 3 of [Li et al. \(2023\)](#) and Proposition 3.2 of [Zhang et al. \(2023\)](#) for details. In turn, we obtain an estimator of the ATT as  $\widehat{\tau}_t = Y_t - \widehat{h}_0(W_{\mathcal{D}t})$  for  $t = T_0 + 1, \dots, T$  where inference based on  $\widehat{\tau}_t$  can be established by the conformal inference in Section 3.3 in the Supplementary Material. Alternatively, we may posit a parametric form for the ATT as  $\tau_t = \tau(t; \beta)$ . Considering  $\widehat{h}_0$  as a fixed function, an estimator of  $\beta$  can be obtained as a solution to the following equation:

$$\widehat{\beta} \text{ solves } \frac{1}{T_1} \sum_{t=T_0+1}^T \Psi_{\text{post}}(O_t; \beta, \widehat{h}_0) = 0 , \quad (19)$$

$$\Psi_{\text{post}}(O_t; \beta, h) = \frac{\partial \tau(t; \beta)}{\partial \beta} \left\{ Y_t - \tau(t; \beta) - h(W_{\mathcal{D}t}) \right\} \in \mathbb{R}^{\dim(\beta)} , \quad t = T_0 + 1, \dots, T . \quad (20)$$

To characterize the asymptotic property of  $\widehat{\beta}$ , we additionally define the following objects. Let  $\langle h_1, h_2 \rangle_w$  be

$$\langle h_1, h_2 \rangle_w = \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}\{h_1(W_{\mathcal{D}t}) \mid Y_t^{(0)}\} \mathbb{E}\{h_2(W_{\mathcal{D}t}) \mid Y_t^{(0)}\}] , \quad t = T_0 + 1, \dots, T ,$$

and  $\overline{\mathcal{H}}$  be the closure of the linear span of  $\mathcal{H}$  under  $\|\cdot\|_w$ . Then, we assume the following conditions.

**Assumption B.5.** The following conditions are satisfied:

1. For any  $h \in \overline{\mathcal{H}}$ , there exists a function  $g_{0,h} \in \mathcal{H}$  satisfying  $\langle g_{0,h}, h \rangle_w = \mathbb{E}\{h(W_{\mathcal{D}t})\}$  for  $t = T_0 + 1, \dots, T$ .
2. There exists a projection of  $\mathcal{H}$  on  $\mathcal{H}_T$ , denoted by  $\Pi_T : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_T$ , which satisfies

$$\sup_{h \in \mathcal{H}} \|h - \Pi_T h\| = O(\eta_T) .$$

where  $\eta_T = o(1)$  satisfies regularity conditions; see Assumptions 7-10 of [Li et al. \(2023\)](#) and Assumptions 4-7 of [Zhang et al. \(2023\)](#) for details.

We now characterize the asymptotic representation of  $T_1^{1/2}(\widehat{\beta} - \beta^*)$  under regularity conditions including stationarity and independent errors. Applying a first-order Taylor expansion, we find

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \frac{1}{T_1} \sum_{t=T_0+1}^T \Psi_{\text{post}}(O_t; \widehat{\beta}, \widehat{h}_0) \\ &= \frac{1}{T_1} \sum_{t=T_0+1}^T \left\{ \Psi_{\text{post}}(O_t; \beta^*, \widehat{h}_0) + \left. \frac{\partial \Psi_{\text{post}}(O_t; \beta, \widehat{h}_0)}{\partial \beta^T} \right|_{\beta=\beta^*} \cdot (\widehat{\beta} - \beta^*) \right\} + o_P(1) . \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we find that (19) has the following asymptotic representation for  $t = T_0 + 1, \dots, T$ :

$$\begin{aligned} &\sqrt{T_1}(\widehat{\beta} - \beta^*) \\ &= \left[ \underbrace{\frac{1}{T_1} \sum_{t=T_0+1}^T \left. \frac{\partial \Psi_{\text{post}}(O_t; \beta, \widehat{h}_0)}{\partial \beta^T} \right|_{\beta=\beta^*}}_{=: V(\beta^*, \widehat{h}_0)} \right]^{-1} \\ &\quad \times \left[ \frac{1}{\sqrt{T_1}} \sum_{t=T_0+1}^T \frac{\partial \tau(t; \beta^*)}{\partial \beta} \left\{ Y_t - \tau(t; \beta^*) - \widehat{h}_0(W_{\mathcal{D}t}) \right\} \right] + o_P(1) \\ &= V^{-1}(\beta^*, \widehat{h}_0) \left[ \frac{1}{\sqrt{T_1}} \sum_{t=T_0+1}^T \frac{\partial \tau(t; \beta^*)}{\partial \beta} \left\{ Y_t - \tau(t; \beta^*) - \widehat{h}_0(W_{\mathcal{D}t}) \right\} \right] + o_P(1) \\ &= V^{-1}(\beta^*, \widehat{h}_0) \left[ \frac{1}{\sqrt{T_1}} \sum_{t=T_0+1}^T \frac{\partial \tau(t; \beta^*)}{\partial \beta} \left\{ Y_t - \tau(t; \beta^*) - h_0(W_{\mathcal{D}t}) \right\} \right] \end{aligned} \tag{21}$$

$$+ V^{-1}(\beta^*, \widehat{h}_0) \left[ \frac{1}{\sqrt{T_1}} \sum_{t=T_0+1}^T \frac{\partial \tau(t; \beta^*)}{\partial \beta} \left[ \mathbb{E}\{h_0(W_{\mathcal{D}t}) - \widehat{h}_0(W_{\mathcal{D}t})\} \right] \right] \tag{22}$$

$$+ V^{-1}(\beta^*, \widehat{h}_0) \left[ \frac{1}{\sqrt{T_1}} \sum_{t=T_0+1}^T \frac{\partial \tau(t; \beta^*)}{\partial \beta} \left[ \begin{array}{c} \{h_0(W_{\mathcal{D}t}) - \widehat{h}_0(W_{\mathcal{D}t})\} \\ -\mathbb{E}\{h_0(W_{\mathcal{D}t}) - \widehat{h}_0(W_{\mathcal{D}t})\} \end{array} \right] \right] \tag{23}$$

$$+ o_P(1) .$$

Following Theorem 4 of [Li et al. \(2023\)](#) and Supplementary Material of [Zhang et al. \(2023\)](#), we establish that (23) is  $o_P(1)$ . In addition, for  $t = T_0 + 1, \dots, T$ , the numerator of (22) is equal to

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{\sqrt{T_1}} \sum_{t=T_0+1}^T \frac{\partial \tau(t; \beta^*)}{\partial \beta} \mathbb{E}\{h_0(W_{\mathcal{D}t}) - \widehat{h}_0(W_{\mathcal{D}t})\} \\ &= -\frac{1}{\sqrt{T_1}} \sum_{t=T_0+1}^T \frac{\partial \tau(t; \beta^*)}{\partial \beta} \mathbb{E}\{g_{0,h_0}(W_{\mathcal{D}t}) | Y_t^{(0)}\} \{Y_t^{(0)} - h_0(W_{\mathcal{D}t})\} \\ & \quad + \frac{1}{\sqrt{T_1}} \sum_{t=T_0+1}^T \frac{\partial \tau(t; \beta^*)}{\partial \beta} \widehat{\mathbb{E}}\{\Pi_T g_{0,h_0}(W_{\mathcal{D}t}) | Y_t^{(0)}\} [Y_t^{(0)} - \widehat{\mathbb{E}}\{\widehat{h}_0(W_{\mathcal{D}t}) | Y_t^{(0)}\}] + o_P(1). \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

Here,  $g_{0,h}$  and its projection  $\Pi_T g_{0,h}$  are chosen to satisfy Assumption B.5, and  $\widehat{\mathbb{E}}$  is a generic estimator of the conditional expectation operator of the distribution  $W_{\mathcal{D}t} | Y_t^{(0)}$  having a fast convergence rate; see Stage 3 below for details on how these estimators are constructed. Combining all results, we have the following result for  $t = T_0 + 1, \dots, T$ :

$$\begin{aligned} & \sqrt{T_1}(\widehat{\beta} - \beta^*) \\ &= V^{-1}(\beta^*, \widehat{h}_0) \left[ \frac{1}{\sqrt{T_1}} \sum_{t=T_0+1}^T \frac{\partial \tau(t; \beta^*)}{\partial \beta} \begin{bmatrix} Y_t - \tau(t; \beta^*) - h_0(W_{\mathcal{D}t}) \\ -\mathbb{E}\{g_{0,h_0}(W_{\mathcal{D}t}) | Y_t^{(0)}\} \{Y_t^{(0)} - h_0(W_{\mathcal{D}t})\} \end{bmatrix} \right] \\ & \quad + V^{-1}(\beta^*, \widehat{h}_0) \sqrt{T_1} r_T(\widehat{h}_0) + o_P(1) \end{aligned}$$

where

$$r_T(\widehat{h}_0) = \frac{1}{T_1} \sum_{t=T_0+1}^T \frac{\partial \tau(t; \beta^*)}{\partial \beta} \widehat{\mathbb{E}}\{\Pi_T g_{0,h_0}(W_{\mathcal{D}t}) | Y_t^{(0)}\} [Y_t^{(0)} - \widehat{\mathbb{E}}\{\widehat{h}_0(W_{\mathcal{D}t}) | Y_t^{(0)}\}].$$

### Stage 3: A De-biased Estimator

To obtain the asymptotic normality of  $\widehat{\beta}$ , we need to de-bias  $\widehat{\beta}$  by subtracting an estimated value of  $r_T(\widehat{h}_0)$ . To do so, we define a new criterion function and its sample analogue for  $h \in \mathcal{H}$  as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{R}(h) &= \mathbb{E} \left[ \left[ \mathbb{E}\{h(W_{\mathcal{D}t}) | Y_t^{(0)}\} \right]^2 \right] - 2\mathbb{E}\{h(W_{\mathcal{D}t})\}, \quad t = T_0 + 1, \dots, T, \\ \mathcal{R}_T(h) &= \frac{1}{T_1} \sum_{t=T_0+1}^T \left[ \widehat{\mathbb{E}}\{h(W_{\mathcal{D}t}) | Y_t^{(0)}\} \right]^2 - \frac{2}{T_1} \sum_{t=T_0+1}^T h(W_{\mathcal{D}t}). \end{aligned}$$

We obtain an estimator of  $\Pi_T g_{0, h_0}$ , denoted by  $\widehat{g}$ , as

$$\widehat{g} \in \arg \min_{\widehat{h}_0 \in \mathcal{H}} \mathcal{R}_T(\widehat{h}_0)$$

and the resulting estimator of  $r_T(\widehat{h}_0)$  is

$$\widehat{r}_T^{\text{inf}}(\widehat{h}_0) = \frac{1}{T_1} \sum_{t=T_0+1}^T \frac{\partial \tau(t; \widehat{\beta})}{\partial \beta} \widehat{\text{E}}\{\widehat{g}(W_{\mathcal{D}t}) \mid Y_t^{(0)}\} [Y_t^{(0)} - \widehat{\text{E}}\{\widehat{h}_0(W_{\mathcal{D}t}) \mid Y_t^{(0)}\}] , \quad t = T_0 + 1, \dots, T .$$

Unfortunately, the above estimator  $\widehat{r}_T^{\text{inf}}$  is infeasible because it involves with counterfactual outcomes. Therefore, we use  $Y_t - \tau(t; \widehat{\beta})$  as realizations of the treatment-free potential outcomes  $Y_t^{(0)}$  and construct a  $(T_1 \times k_T)$  matrix as follows:

$$\Phi_{\text{post}} = \begin{bmatrix} \phi^T(Y_{T_0+1} - \tau(T_0 + 1; \widehat{\beta})) \\ \vdots \\ \phi^T(Y_T - \tau(T; \widehat{\beta})) \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{T_1 \times k_T} .$$

We consider additional sieve estimators of  $\text{E}\{\widehat{g}(W_{\mathcal{D}t}) \mid Y_t^{(0)}\}$  and  $\text{E}\{\widehat{h}_0(W_{\mathcal{D}t}) \mid Y_t^{(0)}\}$  for  $t = T_0 + 1, \dots, T$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\mu}_{\text{post}}(y; \widehat{g}) &= \text{sieve}\left(\text{E}\{\widehat{g}(W_{\mathcal{D}t}) \mid Y_t^{(0)} = y\}\right) \\ &= \phi^T(y) (\Phi_{\text{post}}^T \Phi_{\text{post}})^{-1} \left\{ \sum_{t=T_0+1}^T \widehat{g}(W_{\mathcal{D}t}) \phi(Y_t - \tau(t; \widehat{\beta})) \right\} \\ \widehat{\mu}_{\text{post}}(y; \widehat{h}_0) &= \text{sieve}\left(\text{E}\{\widehat{h}_0(W_{\mathcal{D}t}) \mid Y_t^{(0)} = y\}\right) \\ &= \phi^T(y) (\Phi_{\text{post}}^T \Phi_{\text{post}})^{-1} \left\{ \sum_{t=T_0+1}^T \widehat{h}_0(W_{\mathcal{D}t}) \phi(Y_t - \tau(t; \widehat{\beta})) \right\} . \end{aligned}$$

Using these sieve estimators, we obtain a feasible estimator of  $r_T(\widehat{h}_0)$  as

$$\widehat{r}_T(\widehat{h}_0) = \frac{1}{T_1} \sum_{t=T_0+1}^T \frac{\partial \tau(t; \widehat{\beta})}{\partial \beta} \left[ \widehat{\mu}_{\text{post}}(Y_t - \tau(t; \widehat{\beta}); \widehat{g}) \left\{ Y_t - \tau(t; \widehat{\beta}) - \widehat{\mu}_{\text{post}}(Y_t - \tau(t; \widehat{\beta}); \widehat{h}_0) \right\} \right] .$$

Under regularity conditions, we establish that

$$\sup_{\widehat{h}_0 \in \widehat{\mathcal{H}}_0} \sqrt{T_1} \left| \widehat{r}_T(\widehat{h}_0) - r_T(\widehat{h}_0) \right| = o_P(1) ;$$



see Lemma 1 of [Li et al. \(2023\)](#) and Lemma 3.3 of [Zhang et al. \(2023\)](#) for details. Based on this result, we subtract  $T_1^{1/2}\widehat{r}_T(\widehat{h}_0)$  in both hand sides of (24). We then obtain a de-biased estimator  $\widehat{\beta}_{\text{db}}$  as

$$\widehat{\beta}_{\text{db}} = \widehat{\beta} - V^{-1}(\widehat{\beta}, \widehat{h}_0)\sqrt{T_1}\widehat{r}_T(\widehat{h}_0) ,$$

which is asymptotically normal in that  $T_1^{1/2}(\widehat{\beta}_{\text{db}} - \beta^*)$  converges in distribution to  $N(0, S_1^* S_2^* S_1^{*\text{T}})$  as  $T \rightarrow \infty$  where  $S_1^*$  and  $S_2^*$  are given as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} S_1^* &= \left[ \frac{\partial \text{E}\{\Psi_{\text{post}}(O_t; \beta^*, h_0)\}}{\partial \beta} \right]^{-1} \\ S_2^* &= \text{var} \left[ \Psi_{\text{post}}(O_t; \beta^*, h_0) - \frac{\partial \tau(t; \beta^*)}{\partial \beta} \text{E}\{g_{0, h_0}(W_{\mathcal{D}t}) \mid Y_t^{(0)}\} \{Y_t^{(0)} - h_0(W_{\mathcal{D}t})\} \right] , \end{aligned}$$

Here,  $\Psi_{\text{post}}(O_t; \beta, h)$  is defined in (20) for  $t = T_0 + 1, \dots, T$ . The ATT estimator is obtained from the plug-in formula  $\widehat{\tau}_t = \tau(t; \widehat{\beta}_{\text{db}})$ . Consequently, inference of the ATT can be attained based on the standard delta-method applied to the asymptotic normal distribution of  $\widehat{\beta}_{\text{db}}$ .

## C Proof of Theorems

### C.1 Proof of Theorems 3.1, 3.2, A.2, B.1, and B.2

We first prove the most general case with a nonlinear bridge function  $h^*$  and under the presence of covariates (i.e., Theorem B.2). For the pre-treatment periods  $t = 1, \dots, T_0$ , we establish

$$y = \mathbb{E}\{h^*(W_{\mathcal{D}t}, X_{0t}, X_{\mathcal{D}t}) \mid Y_t^{(0)} = y, X_{0t}, X_{\mathcal{D}t}\} = \mathbb{E}\{h^*(W_{\mathcal{D}t}, X_{0t}, X_{\mathcal{D}t}) \mid Y_t = y, X_{0t}, X_{\mathcal{D}t}\}.$$

The first equality holds from Assumption B.2. The second equality holds from Assumption 2.1.

Furthermore, for any  $t = 1, \dots, T$ , we establish

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\{Y_t^{(0)} \mid X_{0t}, X_{\mathcal{D}t}\} &= \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}\{h^*(W_{\mathcal{D}t}, X_{0t}, X_{\mathcal{D}t}) \mid Y_t^{(0)}, X_{0t}, X_{\mathcal{D}t}\} \mid X_{0t}, X_{\mathcal{D}t}] \\ &= \mathbb{E}\{h^*(W_{\mathcal{D}t}, X_{0t}, X_{\mathcal{D}t}) \mid X_{0t}, X_{\mathcal{D}t}\}. \end{aligned}$$

The first equality holds from Assumption B.2, and the second equality holds from the law of iterated expectation. Therefore, we have

$$\mathbb{E}\{Y_t^{(0)}\} = \mathbb{E}\{h^*(W_{\mathcal{D}t}, X_{0t}, X_{\mathcal{D}t})\}. \quad (25)$$

Next, we prove the second result. For the post-treatment periods  $t = T_0 + 1, \dots, T$ , we have

$$\mathbb{E}\{Y_t^{(1)} - Y_t^{(0)}\} = \mathbb{E}\{Y_t - Y_t^{(0)}\} = \mathbb{E}\{Y_t - h^*(W_{\mathcal{D}t}, X_{0t}, X_{\mathcal{D}t})\}$$

The first equality holds from Assumption 2.1. The second equality holds from (25).

We remark that the other Theorems can be shown in a similar manner. Specifically, we take  $h^*(W_{\mathcal{D}t}, X_{0t}, X_{\mathcal{D}t}) = X_{0t}^T \delta_0^* + W_{\mathcal{D}t}^T \gamma^* - X_{\mathcal{D}t}^T \delta_{\mathcal{D}}^*$  for the linear bridge function case, and we view covariates as empty sets when there is no covariate available. The results can then be established under Assumptions 3.2, A.2, and B.1.

### C.2 Proof of Theorems 3.3 and A.3

We denote the collection of parameters as  $\theta$ . When there is no covariate as in Section 3.2, we have  $\theta = (\gamma, \beta)$ ; when there are covariates as in Section A.7, we have  $\theta = (\gamma, \beta, \delta)$ . Let the moment

function be  $\Psi(O_t; \theta)$  where  $\mathcal{O} = \text{supp}(O_t)$  and  $\Theta = \text{supp}(\theta)$ . We denote the true parameters as  $\theta^*$ .

*Remark C.1.* We will consider a simple case as an example to motivate the assumptions below. Specifically, suppose the treatment effect function is constant, i.e.,  $\Psi(O_t; \beta) = \beta$ . Then, the moment function is

$$\Psi(O_t; \gamma, \beta) = \begin{bmatrix} \Psi_{\text{pre}}(O_t; \gamma) \\ \Psi_{\text{post}}(O_t; \gamma, \beta) \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} (1 - A_t)g_t(Y_t)(Y_t - W_{\mathcal{D}t}^T \gamma) \\ A_t(Y_t - W_{\mathcal{D}t}^T \gamma - \beta) \end{bmatrix}. \quad (26)$$

Note that the derivative of (26) is

$$\frac{\partial \Psi(O_t; \gamma, \beta)}{\partial (\gamma, \beta)^T} = - \begin{bmatrix} (1 - A_t)g_t(Y_t)W_{\mathcal{D}t}^T & 0_p \\ A_t W_{\mathcal{D}t}^T & A_t \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{(p+1) \times (d+1)}.$$

We present proofs for Theorem 3.3 under different sets of regularity conditions. In the first proof, we establish the result using commonly employed conditions for time series data, such as strong stationarity and ergodicity. In the second proof, we establish the result under more general conditions, avoiding the need to rely on these strong assumptions of stationarity and ergodicity.

### Proof 1: Proof under Strong Stationarity and Ergodicity

We first present regularity conditions, which are the extensions of assumptions in Chapter 3 of Hall (2004).

**Regularity Condition 1** (Sufficiently Long Pre- and Post-treatment Periods). As  $T \rightarrow \infty$ ,  $T_0, T_1 \rightarrow \infty$  and  $T_1/T_0 \rightarrow r \in (0, \infty)$ .

Regularity Condition 1 is reasonable if the pre- and post-treatment periods are of roughly the same size and sufficiently large.

**Regularity Condition 2** (Compactness). The parameter space  $\Theta$  is compact.

Regularity Condition 2 is standard in parametric estimation.

**Regularity Condition 3** (Weighting Matrix).  $\widehat{\Omega}$  is a positive semi-definite matrix, and converges to a non-random positive definite matrix  $\Omega^*$  as  $T \rightarrow \infty$ .

Regularity Condition 3 is easily satisfied if  $\widehat{\Omega}$  is chosen as a fixed matrix such as the identity matrix.

**Regularity Condition 4** (Strict Stationarity). The process  $\{O_t\}_{t \in \mathbb{Z}}$  is strictly stationary, i.e., for any subset  $\{t_1, \dots, t_n\} \subseteq \mathbb{Z}$  and any  $c$ , we have  $\{O_{t_1}, \dots, O_{t_n}\} \stackrel{D}{=} \{O_{t_1+c}, \dots, O_{t_n+c}\}$ .

Regularity Condition 4 implies that any expectation of  $O_t$  does not depend on  $t$ . Unfortunately, Regularity Condition 4 is insufficient to apply the law of large numbers and central limit theorem. Therefore, the following ergodicity assumption is required:

**Regularity Condition 5** (Ergodicity). The process  $\{O_t\}_{t \in \mathbb{Z}}$  is ergodic.

Under Regularity Condition 4 and Regularity Condition 5, the sample average of  $f(O_t)$  converges to its expectation, i.e.,  $T^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^T f(O_t) \xrightarrow{P} \mathbb{E}\{f(O_t)\}$ .

**Regularity Condition 6** (Regularity Conditions for  $\Psi$ ). The moment function  $\Psi(O_t; \theta) : \mathcal{O} \otimes \Theta \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{p+b}$  satisfies

- (i)  $\Psi(O_t; \theta)$  is continuous on  $\Theta$  for each  $O_t \in \mathcal{O}$ ;
- (ii)  $\mathbb{E}\{\Psi(O_t; \theta)\}$  exists and is finite for any  $\theta \in \Theta$ ;
- (iii)  $\mathbb{E}\{\Psi(O_t; \theta)\}$  is continuous on  $\Theta$ .
- (iv)  $g_t$  is time-invariant, i.e.,  $g_t(y) = g(y)$  for all  $t$ .

Under model (26), Regularity Condition 6 is satisfied if  $\mathbb{E}\{g_t(Y_t)Y_t\}$  and  $\mathbb{E}\{g_t(Y_t)W_{\mathcal{D}t}^T\}$  for  $t = 1, \dots, T_0$  and  $\mathbb{E}(Y_t)$  and  $\mathbb{E}(W_{\mathcal{D}t})$  for  $t = T_0 + 1, \dots, T$  are finite and well-defined. Hereafter, we assume that these vectors and matrices are finite and well-defined.

**Regularity Condition 7** (Regularity for  $\partial\Psi(O_t; \theta)/\partial\theta^T$  & Local Identification). The function  $\partial\Psi(O_t; \theta)/\partial\theta^T \in \mathbb{R}^{(p+b) \times (d+b)}$  satisfies:

- (i)  $\partial\Psi(O_t; \theta)/\partial\theta^T$  exists and is continuous on  $\Theta$  for each  $O_t \in \mathcal{O}$ ;
- (ii)  $\theta^* \in \text{int}(\Theta)$ ;
- (iii)  $\mathbb{E}\{\partial\Psi(O_t; \theta)/\partial\theta^T\}$  exists and is finite;
- (iv)  $\text{rank}(\mathbb{E}\{\partial\Psi(O_t; \theta)/\partial\theta^T\}) = d + b$ .

Under model (26), Regularity Condition 7 (iii) is satisfied if  $E\{g_t(Y_t)W_{\mathcal{D}t}^T\}$  for  $t = 1, \dots, T_0$  and  $E(W_{\mathcal{D}t})$  for  $t = T_0 + 1, \dots, T$  are finite and well-defined. Condition (iv) is satisfied if the vectors  $r_i = E\{g_t(Y_t)W_{it}\}/E(W_{it}) \in \mathbb{R}^p$  ( $i \in \mathcal{D}_1, \dots, \mathcal{D}_d$ ) are linearly independent.

**Regularity Condition 8** (Population Moment Restriction & Global Identification). The true parameter  $\theta^*$  is the unique parameter that satisfies  $E\{\Psi(O_t; \theta^*)\} = 0$ .

Under model (26), Regularity Condition 8 is satisfied if  $G_{YW}^*$  is of full column rank, i.e.,  $\text{rank}(G_{YW}^*) = d$ .

**Regularity Condition 9** (Domination of  $\Psi$ ). The expectation of the moment function is uniformly bounded over  $\Theta$ , i.e.,  $\sup_{\theta \in \Theta} E\{\|\Psi(O_t; \theta)\|_2\} < \infty$ .

Under model (26), Regularity Condition 9 is satisfied if the second-order moments of  $g_t(Y_t)Y_t$  and  $g_t(Y_t)W_{\mathcal{D}t}$  for  $t = 1, \dots, T_0$  and  $Y_t$  and  $W_{\mathcal{D}t}$  for  $t = T_0 + 1, \dots, T$  are finite.

**Regularity Condition 10** (Properties of the Variance). Following conditions hold:

- (i)  $E\{\Psi(O_t; \theta^*)\Psi(O_t; \theta^*)^T\}$  exists and finite
- (ii)  $\Sigma_2^* = \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \text{var}\{T^{-1/2} \sum_{t=1}^T \Psi(O_t; \theta^*)\}$  exists and is a finite valued positive definite matrix.

Under model (26), Regularity Condition 10 (i) is satisfied if the second-order moments of  $g_t(Y_t)Y_t$ ,  $g_t(Y_t)W_{\mathcal{D}t}$  for  $t = 1, \dots, T_0$  and those of  $Y_t$  and  $W_{\mathcal{D}t}$  for  $t = T_0 + 1, \dots, T$  are finite. Condition (ii) is satisfied if  $\{O_t\}$  are weakly serially dependent (e.g., m-dependent).

**Regularity Condition 11** (Properties of Gradient). Following conditions hold for  $\Theta_N$ , some neighborhood of  $\theta^*$ :

- (i)  $E\{\partial\Psi(O_t; \theta)/\partial\theta^T\}$  is continuous on  $\Theta_N$ ;
- (ii)  $\sup_{\theta \in \Theta_N} \left\| T^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^T \partial\Psi(O_t; \theta)/\partial\theta^T - E\{\partial\Psi(O_t; \theta)/\partial\theta^T\} \right\|_2 = o_P(1)$ .

Under model (26), Regularity Condition 11 (i) is satisfied if  $E\{g_t(Y_t)W_{\mathcal{D}t}^T\}$  for  $t = 1, \dots, T_0$  and  $E(W_{\mathcal{D}t})$  for  $t = T_0 + 1, \dots, T$  are finite and well-defined. Regularity Condition 11 (ii) is satisfied if

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{T_0} \sum_{t=1}^{T_0} g_t(Y_t)W_{\mathcal{D}t}^T &\xrightarrow{P} E\{g_t(Y_t)W_{\mathcal{D}t}^T\}, & t = 1, \dots, T_0 \\ \frac{1}{T_1} \sum_{t=T_0+1}^T W_{\mathcal{D}t} &\xrightarrow{P} E(W_{\mathcal{D}t}), & t = T_0 + 1, \dots, T. \end{aligned}$$

Note that these two conditions are satisfied under the asymptotic regime in Regularity Condition 1, stationarity (Regularity Condition 4), and ergodicity (Regularity Condition 5).

Under these assumptions, the asymptotic normality of  $(\widehat{\gamma}, \widehat{\beta})$  is achieved by Theorem 3.2 of Hall (2004).

## Proof 2: Proof without Strong Stationarity and Ergodicity

We adapt the proof of Theorem S6 in Qiu et al. (2022) to our setting. First, we introduce regularity conditions that are applicable to general cases, without imposing strict requirements of strong stationarity and ergodicity.

**General Regularity Condition 1** (Sufficiently Long Pre- and Post-treatment Periods). As  $T \rightarrow \infty$ ,  $T_0, T_1 \rightarrow \infty$  and  $T_1/T_0 \rightarrow r \in (0, \infty)$ .

**General Regularity Condition 2** (Compactness). The parameter space  $\Theta$  is compact.

**General Regularity Condition 3** (Weighting Matrix).  $\widehat{\Omega}$  is a positive semi-definite matrix, and converges to a non-random positive definite matrix  $\Omega^*$  as  $T \rightarrow \infty$ .

General Regularity Conditions 1–3 are the same as Regularity Conditions 1–3, respectively.

**General Regularity Condition 4** (Regularity Conditions for  $\Psi$ ). The moment function  $\Psi(O_t; \theta) : \mathcal{O} \otimes \Theta \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{p+b}$  satisfies

- (i)  $\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \{T^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^T \Psi(O_t; \theta)\}$  is continuous on  $\Theta$  for each  $O_t \in \mathcal{O}$ ;
- (ii)  $\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} [T^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E}\{\Psi(O_t; \theta)\}]$  exists and is finite for any  $\theta \in \Theta$ ;
- (iii)  $\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} [T^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E}\{\Psi(O_t; \theta)\}]$  is continuous on  $\Theta$ .

**General Regularity Condition 5** (Regularity for  $\partial\Psi(O_t; \theta)/\partial\theta^T$  & Local Identification). The function  $\partial\Psi(O_t; \theta)/\partial\theta^T \in \mathbb{R}^{(p+b) \times (d+b)}$  satisfies:

- (i)  $\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \{T^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^T \partial\Psi(O_t; \theta)/\partial\theta^T\}$  exists and is continuous on  $\Theta$  for each  $O_t \in \mathcal{O}$ ;
- (ii)  $T^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^T \partial\Psi(O_t; \theta)/\partial\theta^T$  is uniformly bounded for all  $T = 1, 2, \dots$
- (iii)  $\theta^* \in \text{int}(\Theta)$ ;
- (iv)  $\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} [T^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E}\{\partial\Psi(O_t; \theta)/\partial\theta^T\}]$  exists and is finite;

$$(v) \text{ rank}(\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} [T^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E}\{\partial \Psi(O_t; \theta) / \partial \theta^\top\}]) = d + b.$$

**General Regularity Condition 6** (Population Moment Restriction & Global Identification). The true parameter  $\theta^*$  is the unique parameter that satisfies  $\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} [T^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E}\{\Psi(O_t; \theta^*)\}] = 0$ .

General Regularity Conditions 4–6 are similar to Regularity Conditions 6–8.

**General Regularity Condition 7** (Uniform Weak Law of Large Numbers for  $\Psi$ ).

$$\sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \left\| \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \Psi(O_t; \theta) - \lim_{T' \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{T'} \sum_{t=1}^{T'} \mathbb{E}\{\Psi(O_t; \theta)\} \right\| = o_P(1) \text{ as } T \rightarrow \infty.$$

**General Regularity Condition 8** (Uniform Weak Law of Large Numbers for the Gradient of  $\Psi$ ).

$$\sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \left\| \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta^\top} \Psi(O_t; \theta) - \lim_{T' \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{T'} \sum_{t=1}^{T'} \mathbb{E}\left\{ \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta^\top} \Psi(O_t; \theta) \right\} \right\| = o_P(1) \text{ as } T \rightarrow \infty.$$

General Regularity Conditions 7 and 8 hold if the underlying process is strictly stationary, strongly mixing, or  $\phi$ -mixing processes; see Andrews (1988), Pötscher and Prucha (1997, Chapter 5) and Qiu et al. (2022, Section S2) for details.

**General Regularity Condition 9** (Asymptotic Normality). As  $T \rightarrow \infty$ , we have

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \sum_{t=1}^T \Psi(O_t; \theta^*) \text{ converges in distribution to } N(0, \Sigma_2^*),$$

$$\Sigma_2^* = \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \text{var} \left\{ \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \sum_{t=1}^T \Psi(O_t; \theta^*) \right\}.$$

Here,  $\Sigma_2^*$  is a finite valued positive definite matrix.

Assumption 9 directly assumes the asymptotic normality of the sample mean of the estimating function; see Section S2 of Qiu et al. (2022) for the plausibility of the assumption. We remark that General Regularity Conditions 7–9 are satisfied under Regularity Conditions 4–11.

Under General Regularity Conditions 1–9, we establish the desired result. We simply denote  $\hat{\Psi}(\theta) = T^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^T \Psi(O_t; \theta)$  and  $\Psi(\theta) = \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} T^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E}\{\Psi(O_t; \theta)\}$ . First, we establish consistency, i.e.,  $\hat{\theta} = (\hat{\gamma}, \hat{\beta}) = (\gamma^*, \beta^*) + o_P(1) = \theta^* + o_P(1)$ . From General Regularity Conditions 3 and

7, we establish the following result as  $T \rightarrow \infty$ :

$$\sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \left\| \{ \widehat{\Psi}(\theta) \}^T \widehat{\Omega} \{ \widehat{\Psi}(\theta) \} - \{ \Psi(\theta) \}^T \Omega^* \{ \Psi(\theta) \} \right\| = o_P(1) . \quad (27)$$

Note that  $\widehat{\theta}$  is the minimizer of  $\{ \widehat{\Psi}(\theta) \}^T \widehat{\Omega} \{ \widehat{\Psi}(\theta) \}$ .

Let  $s > 0$  be an arbitrary positive constant. From (27) and the definition of  $\widehat{\theta}$ , the following conditions hold with probability tending to one:

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \{ \widehat{\Psi}(\theta^*) \}^T \widehat{\Omega} \{ \widehat{\Psi}(\theta^*) \} - \{ \Psi(\theta^*) \}^T \Omega^* \{ \Psi(\theta^*) \} \right\| < s/2 \\ & \left\| \{ \widehat{\Psi}(\widehat{\theta}) \}^T \widehat{\Omega} \{ \widehat{\Psi}(\widehat{\theta}) \} - \{ \Psi(\widehat{\theta}) \}^T \Omega^* \{ \Psi(\widehat{\theta}) \} \right\| < s/2 \\ & \{ \widehat{\Psi}(\widehat{\theta}) \}^T \widehat{\Omega} \{ \widehat{\Psi}(\widehat{\theta}) \} \leq \{ \widehat{\Psi}(\theta^*) \}^T \widehat{\Omega} \{ \widehat{\Psi}(\theta^*) \} . \end{aligned}$$

These three inequalities imply that

$$\{ \Psi(\widehat{\theta}) \}^T \Omega^* \{ \Psi(\widehat{\theta}) \} < \{ \Psi(\theta^*) \}^T \Omega^* \{ \Psi(\theta^*) \} + s = s .$$

The right hand side reduces to  $s$  under General Regularity Condition 6.

Let  $\mathcal{N} \in \Theta$  be an arbitrary open set containing  $\theta^*$ . Let us define the following quantity:

$$s_0 = \inf_{\theta \in \Theta \setminus \mathcal{N}} \{ \Psi(\theta) \}^T \Omega^* \{ \Psi(\theta) \} .$$

Combining the fact that  $\Theta \setminus \mathcal{N}$  is compact under General Regularity Condition 2, and General Regularity Conditions 2, 4, 6, we establish  $s_0$  is positive. Therefore, by taking  $s > s_0$ , the event  $\{ \{ \Psi(\widehat{\theta}) \}^T \Omega^* \{ \Psi(\widehat{\theta}) \} < s_0 \}$  occurs with probability tending to one, which further implies that  $\widehat{\theta} \in \mathcal{N}$ . Since  $\mathcal{N}$  is arbitrary chosen, this establishes  $\widehat{\theta} = \theta^* + o_P(1)$  as  $T \rightarrow \infty$ .

Next, we establish the asymptotic normality of  $\widehat{\theta}$ . Under General Regularity Condition 5, the following expansion holds from a first-order Taylor expansion and the consistency of  $\widehat{\theta}$ :

$$\widehat{\Psi}(\widehat{\theta}) = \widehat{\Psi}(\theta^*) + \left\{ \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta^T} \widehat{\Psi}(\theta) \Big|_{\theta=\theta^*} \right\} (\widehat{\theta} - \theta^*) + o_P(\|\widehat{\theta} - \theta^*\|) .$$



The first order condition of  $\widehat{\theta}$  along with General Regularity Condition 5 implies

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &= \frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta^T} \left[ \{\widehat{\Psi}(\theta)\}^T \widehat{\Omega} \{\widehat{\Psi}(\theta)\} \right] \Big|_{\theta=\widehat{\theta}} \\
&= \left\{ \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta^T} \widehat{\Psi}(\theta) \Big|_{\theta=\theta^*} \right\}^T \widehat{\Omega} \{\widehat{\Psi}(\widehat{\theta})\} \\
&= \left\{ \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta^T} \widehat{\Psi}(\theta) \Big|_{\theta=\theta^*} \right\}^T \widehat{\Omega} \{\widehat{\Psi}(\theta^*)\} + \left\{ \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta^T} \widehat{\Psi}(\theta) \Big|_{\theta=\theta^*} \right\}^T \widehat{\Omega} \left\{ \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta^T} \widehat{\Psi}(\theta) \Big|_{\theta=\theta^*} \right\} (\widehat{\theta} - \theta^*) \\
&\quad + o_P(\|\widehat{\theta} - \theta^*\|).
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, by multiplying  $T^{1/2}$ , we get

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &= \left\{ \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta^T} \widehat{\Psi}(\theta) \Big|_{\theta=\theta^*} \right\}^T \widehat{\Omega} \left\{ \frac{1}{T^{1/2}} \sum_{t=1}^T \Psi(O_t; \theta^*) \right\} \\
&\quad + \left\{ \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta^T} \widehat{\Psi}(\theta) \Big|_{\theta=\theta^*} \right\}^T \widehat{\Omega} \left\{ \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta^T} \widehat{\Psi}(\theta) \Big|_{\theta=\theta^*} \right\} T^{1/2} (\widehat{\theta} - \theta^*) + o_P(T^{1/2} \|\widehat{\theta} - \theta^*\|) \\
&= \underbrace{\left\{ \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta^T} \Psi(\theta) \Big|_{\theta=\theta^*} \right\}^T}_{=: G^{*T}} \Omega^* \left\{ \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{T^{1/2}} \sum_{t=1}^T \Psi(O_t; \theta^*) \right\} \\
&\quad + \left\{ \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta^T} \Psi(\theta) \Big|_{\theta=\theta^*} \right\}^T \Omega^* \left\{ \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta^T} \Psi(\theta) \Big|_{\theta=\theta^*} \right\} T^{1/2} (\widehat{\theta} - \theta^*) + o_P(T^{1/2} \|\widehat{\theta} - \theta^*\| + 1).
\end{aligned}$$

The last equality holds from General Regularity Conditions 3, 7, and 8 and the consistency of  $\widehat{\theta}$ .

This implies

$$T^{1/2}(\widehat{\theta} - \theta^*) = \left( G^{*T} \Omega^* G^* \right)^{-1} G^{*T} \Omega^* \left\{ \frac{1}{T^{1/2}} \sum_{t=1}^T \Psi(O_t; \theta^*) \right\} + o_P(T^{1/2} \|\widehat{\theta} - \theta^*\| + 1).$$

From General Regularity Condition 3 and 9, we find  $T^{1/2}(\widehat{\theta} - \theta^*) = O_P(1)$ , implying that  $o_P(T^{1/2} \|\widehat{\theta} - \theta^*\| + 1) = o_P(1)$ . Therefore, from Slutsky's theorem, we find

$$T^{1/2}(\widehat{\theta} - \theta^*) \text{ converges in distribution to } N(0, \{G^{*T} \Omega^* G^*\}^{-1} G^{*T} \Omega^* \Sigma_2 G^* \Omega^* \{G^{*T} \Omega^* G^*\}^{-T})$$

Note that  $\{G^{*T} \Omega^* G^*\}^{-1} G^{*T} \Omega^* \Sigma_2 G^* \Omega^* \{G^{*T} \Omega^* G^*\}^{-T} = \Sigma_1^* \Sigma_2 \Sigma_1^{*T}$ . This concludes the proof.

### C.3 Proof of Theorem A.1

We denote the collection of parameters as  $\theta = (\gamma, \beta)$  and the true parameters as  $\theta^* = (\gamma^*, \beta^*)$ .

Similar to the proofs of Theorem 3.3 in Section C.2, we present proofs under different sets of

regularity conditions.

### Proof 1: Proof under Strong Stationarity and Ergodicity

The solution to  $\ell_2$ -penalized GMM is given as follows:

$$\hat{\theta}_\lambda = \arg \min_{\theta} \left[ \{\widehat{\Psi}(\theta)\}^T \widehat{\Omega} \{\widehat{\Psi}(\theta)\} + \lambda \|\gamma\|_2^2 \right], \quad \widehat{\Omega} = \begin{bmatrix} \widehat{\Omega}_{\text{pre}} & 0 \\ 0 & \widehat{\Omega}_{\text{post}} \end{bmatrix}.$$

The solution to the minimization problem satisfies the following first order condition, i.e.,

$$0 = \frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta^T} \left[ \{\widehat{\Psi}(\theta)\}^T \widehat{\Omega} \{\widehat{\Psi}(\theta)\} + \lambda \|\gamma\|_2^2 \right] \Big|_{\theta = \hat{\theta}_\lambda}.$$

Therefore, from a few lines of algebra, we find  $\hat{\gamma}_\lambda$  and  $\gamma^*$  are represented as

$$\hat{\gamma}_\lambda = (\widehat{G}_{YW}^T \widehat{\Omega}_{\text{pre}} \widehat{G}_{YW} + \lambda \widehat{\Omega}_{\text{pre}})^{-1} (\widehat{G}_{YW}^T \widehat{\Omega}_{\text{pre}} \widehat{G}_{YY}), \quad \gamma = (G_{YW}^{*T} \Omega_{\text{pre}}^* G_{YW}^*)^{-1} (G_{YW}^{*T} \Omega_{\text{pre}}^* G_{YY}^*).$$

where  $G_{YW}^*$ ,  $G_{YY}^*$ ,  $\widehat{G}_{YW}$ , and  $\widehat{G}_{YY}$  are defined in (11), which is rewritten below for readability:

$$\begin{aligned} G_{YW}^* &= \frac{1}{T_0} \sum_{t=1}^{T_0} \mathbb{E}\{g_t(Y_t) W_{Dt}^T\} \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times d}, & G_{YY}^* &= \frac{1}{T_0} \sum_{t=1}^{T_0} \mathbb{E}\{g_t(Y_t) Y_t\} \in \mathbb{R}^p, \\ \widehat{G}_{YW} &= \frac{1}{T_0} \sum_{t=1}^{T_0} g_t(Y_t) W_{Dt}^T \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times d}, & \widehat{G}_{YY} &= \frac{1}{T_0} \sum_{t=1}^{T_0} g_t(Y_t) Y_t \in \mathbb{R}^p. \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

The forms of  $\hat{\beta}_\lambda$  and  $\beta_\lambda^*$  depend on  $\tau(t; \beta)$ , which are defined as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\beta}_\lambda &= \arg \min_{\beta} \left\{ \widehat{\Psi}_{\text{post}}(\hat{\gamma}_\lambda, \beta) \right\}^T \widehat{\Omega}_{\text{post}} \left\{ \widehat{\Psi}_{\text{post}}(\hat{\gamma}_\lambda, \beta) \right\}, \\ \beta^* &= \arg \min_{\beta} \left\{ \Psi_{\text{post}}(\gamma^*, \beta) \right\}^T \Omega_{\text{post}}^* \left\{ \Psi_{\text{post}}(\gamma^*, \beta) \right\} \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\Psi}_{\text{post}}(\gamma, \beta) &= \frac{1}{T_1} \sum_{t=T+0+1}^T \frac{\partial}{\partial \beta^T} \tau(t; \beta) \{Y_t - W_{Dt}^T \gamma - \tau(t; \beta)\}, \\ \Psi_{\text{post}}(\gamma, \beta) &= \frac{1}{T_1} \sum_{t=T+0+1}^T \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{\partial}{\partial \beta^T} \tau(t; \beta) \{Y_t - W_{Dt}^T \gamma - \tau(t; \beta)\} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

In the constant treatment effect case,  $\widehat{\beta}_\lambda$  and  $\beta^*$  reduces to

$$\widehat{\beta}_\lambda = \frac{1}{T_1} \sum_{t=T_0+1}^T (Y_t - W_{\mathcal{D}t}^\top \widehat{\gamma}_\lambda), \quad \beta^* = \frac{1}{T_1} \sum_{t=T_0+1}^T \mathbb{E}(Y_t - W_{\mathcal{D}t}^\top \gamma^*).$$

First, we prove that  $(\widehat{\gamma}_\lambda, \widehat{\beta}_\lambda) \xrightarrow{P} (\gamma^*, \beta^*)$ . This is trivial because, under the asymptotic regime in Regularity Condition 1, stationarity (Regularity Condition 4), and ergodicity (Regularity Condition 5), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{G}_{YY} &\xrightarrow{P} G_{YY}^*, \quad \widehat{G}_{YW} \xrightarrow{P} G_{YW}^*, \quad \frac{T_1}{T_0} \rightarrow r, \\ \frac{1}{T_1} \sum_{t=T_0+1}^T Y_t &\xrightarrow{P} \frac{1}{T_1} \sum_{t=T_0+1}^T \mathbb{E}(Y_t), \quad \frac{1}{T_1} \sum_{t=T_0+1}^T W_{\mathcal{D}t} \xrightarrow{P} \frac{1}{T_1} \sum_{t=T_0+1}^T \mathbb{E}(W_{\mathcal{D}t}). \end{aligned}$$

We then have the following result from the continuous mapping theorem:

$$\widehat{\gamma}_\lambda = (\widehat{G}_{YW}^\top \widehat{\Omega} \widehat{G}_{YW} + \lambda \widehat{\Omega})^{-1} (\widehat{G}_{YW}^\top \widehat{\Omega} \widehat{G}_{YY}) \xrightarrow{P} (G_{YW}^{*\top} \Omega^* G_{YW}^*)^{-1} (G_{YW}^{*\top} \Omega^* G_{YY}^*) = \gamma^*.$$

Therefore, using the convergence of  $\widehat{\gamma}_\lambda \xrightarrow{P} \gamma^*$ , we can establish the convergence of  $\widehat{\beta}_\lambda \xrightarrow{P} \beta^*$ . For instance, under the constant treatment effect case, we have

$$\widehat{\beta}_\lambda = \left( \frac{1}{T_1} \sum_{t=T_0+1}^T Y_t - \frac{1}{T_1} \sum_{t=T_0+1}^T W_{\mathcal{D}t}^\top \widehat{\gamma}_\lambda \right) \xrightarrow{P} \mathbb{E}(Y_t - W_{\mathcal{D}t}^\top \gamma^*) = \beta_\lambda^*.$$

We can establish the consistency under nonlinear treatment effects using the uniform weak law of large numbers; see **Proof 2** below for details.

To establish the asymptotic normality, we use the following Taylor expansion, which holds from the consistency of  $\widehat{\theta}$  and the Regularity Conditions 1–11:

$$\widehat{\Psi}(\widehat{\theta}_\lambda) = \widehat{\Psi}(\theta^*) + \left\{ \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta^\top} \widehat{\Psi}(\theta) \Big|_{\theta=\theta^*} \right\} (\widehat{\theta}_\lambda - \theta^*) + o_P(\|\widehat{\theta}_\lambda - \theta^*\|).$$

Combining the first order condition of  $\widehat{\theta}_\lambda$  and regularity conditions on  $\Psi(O_t; \theta)$  and  $\partial \Psi(O_t; \theta) / \partial \theta^\top$ ,

we get

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &= \frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta^T} \left[ \{\widehat{\Psi}(\theta)\}^T \widehat{\Omega} \{\widehat{\Psi}(\theta)\} + \lambda \|\gamma\|_2^2 \right] \Big|_{\theta=\widehat{\theta}_\lambda} \\
&= \left\{ \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta^T} \widehat{\Psi}(\theta) \Big|_{\theta=\theta^*} \right\}^T \widehat{\Omega} \{\widehat{\Psi}(\widehat{\theta}_\lambda)\} + \lambda \widehat{\gamma}_\lambda \\
&= \left\{ \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta^T} \widehat{\Psi}(\theta) \Big|_{\theta=\theta^*} \right\}^T \widehat{\Omega} \{\widehat{\Psi}(\theta^*)\} + \left\{ \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta^T} \widehat{\Psi}(\theta) \Big|_{\theta=\theta^*} \right\}^T \widehat{\Omega} \left\{ \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta^T} \widehat{\Psi}(\theta) \Big|_{\theta=\theta^*} \right\} (\widehat{\theta} - \theta^*) \\
&\quad + o_P \left( \|\widehat{\theta}_\lambda - \theta^*\| + T^{-1/2} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

The last line is from  $T^{1/2} \lambda \widehat{\gamma}_\lambda = T^{1/2} \lambda (\widehat{\gamma}_\lambda + \gamma^*) = o_P(1)$ . Therefore, by multiplying  $T^{1/2}$ , we get

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &= \left\{ \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta^T} \widehat{\Psi}(\theta) \Big|_{\theta=\theta^*} \right\}^T \widehat{\Omega} \left\{ \frac{1}{T^{1/2}} \sum_{t=1}^T \Psi(O_t; \theta^*) \right\} \\
&\quad + \left\{ \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta^T} \widehat{\Psi}(\theta) \Big|_{\theta=\theta^*} \right\}^T \widehat{\Omega} \left\{ \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta^T} \widehat{\Psi}(\theta) \Big|_{\theta=\theta^*} \right\} T^{1/2} (\widehat{\theta}_\lambda - \theta^*) + o_P \left( T^{1/2} \|\widehat{\theta}_\lambda - \theta^*\| + 1 \right) \\
&= \underbrace{\left\{ \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta^T} \Psi(\theta) \Big|_{\theta=\theta^*} \right\}^T}_{=: G^*} \Omega^* \left\{ \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{T^{1/2}} \sum_{t=1}^T \Psi(O_t; \theta^*) \right\} \\
&\quad + \left\{ \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta^T} \Psi(\theta) \Big|_{\theta=\theta^*} \right\}^T \Omega^* \left\{ \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta^T} \Psi(\theta) \Big|_{\theta=\theta^*} \right\} T^{1/2} (\widehat{\theta}_\lambda - \theta^*) + o_P \left( T^{1/2} \|\widehat{\theta}_\lambda - \theta^*\| + 1 \right).
\end{aligned}$$

This implies

$$T^{1/2} (\widehat{\theta}_\lambda - \theta^*) = \left( G^{*T} \Omega^* G^* \right)^{-1} G^{*T} \Omega^* \left\{ \frac{1}{T^{1/2}} \sum_{t=1}^T \Psi(O_t; \theta^*) \right\} + o_P \left( T^{1/2} \|\widehat{\theta}_\lambda - \theta^*\| + 1 \right).$$

Since  $T^{-1/2} \sum_{t=1}^T \Psi(O_t; \theta^*) = o_P(1)$ , we find  $T^{1/2} (\widehat{\theta}_\lambda - \theta^*) = o_P(1)$ , implying that  $o_P(T^{1/2} \|\widehat{\theta}_\lambda - \theta^*\| + 1) = o_P(1)$ . Therefore, from Slutsky's theorem, we find

$$T^{1/2} (\widehat{\theta}_\lambda - \theta^*) \text{ converges in distribution to } N(0, \{G^{*T} \Omega^* G^*\}^{-1} G^{*T} \Omega^* \Sigma_2 G^* \Omega^* \{G^{*T} \Omega^* G^*\}^{-T}).$$

Note that  $\{G^{*T} \Omega^* G^*\}^{-1} G^{*T} \Omega^* \Sigma_2 G^* \Omega^* \{G^{*T} \Omega^* G^*\}^{-T} = \Sigma_1^* \Sigma_2 \Sigma_1^{*T}$ . This concludes the proof.

## Proof 2: Proof without Strong Stationarity and Ergodicity

Under General Regularity Conditions 1–9, we establish the desired result. We simply denote  $\widehat{\Psi}(\theta) = T^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^T \Psi(O_t; \theta)$  and  $\Psi(\theta) = \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} T^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E} \{ \Psi(O_t; \theta) \}$ . First, we establish consistency, i.e.,  $\widehat{\theta}_\lambda = (\widehat{\gamma}_\lambda, \widehat{\beta}_\lambda) = (\gamma^*, \beta^*) + o_P(1) = \theta^* + o_P(1)$ . From the triangle inequality, we

find

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \{\widehat{\Psi}(\theta)\}^T \widehat{\Omega} \{\widehat{\Psi}(\theta)\} + \lambda \|\gamma\|_2^2 - \{\Psi(\theta)\}^T \Omega^* \{\Psi(\theta)\} \right\| \\ & \leq \left\| \{\widehat{\Psi}(\theta)\}^T \widehat{\Omega} \{\widehat{\Psi}(\theta)\} - \{\Psi(\theta)\}^T \Omega^* \{\Psi(\theta)\} \right\| + \lambda \|\gamma\|_2^2. \end{aligned}$$

Note that  $\lambda = o(T^{-1/2})$  and  $\|\gamma\|_2 \leq \text{diam}(\Theta)$  for any  $\gamma$ . which implies  $\sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \lambda \|\gamma\|_2^2 = o(1)$ . Therefore, combining with (27) which is valid under General Regularity Conditions 3 and 7, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \left\| \{\widehat{\Psi}(\theta)\}^T \widehat{\Omega} \{\widehat{\Psi}(\theta)\} + \lambda \|\gamma\|_2^2 - \{\Psi(\theta)\}^T \Omega^* \{\Psi(\theta)\} \right\| \\ & \leq \sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \left\| \{\widehat{\Psi}(\theta)\}^T \widehat{\Omega} \{\widehat{\Psi}(\theta)\} - \{\Psi(\theta)\}^T \Omega^* \{\Psi(\theta)\} \right\| + \sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \lambda \|\gamma\|_2^2 \\ & = o_P(1). \end{aligned} \tag{28}$$

Note that  $\widehat{\theta}_\lambda$  is the minimizer of  $\{\widehat{\Psi}(\theta)\}^T \widehat{\Omega} \{\widehat{\Psi}(\theta)\} + \lambda \|\gamma\|_2^2$ .

Let  $s > 0$  be an arbitrary positive constant. From (28) and the definition of  $\widehat{\theta}_\lambda$ , the following conditions hold with probability tending to one:

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \{\widehat{\Psi}(\theta^*)\}^T \widehat{\Omega} \{\widehat{\Psi}(\theta^*)\} + \lambda \|\gamma^*\|_2^2 - \{\Psi(\theta^*)\}^T \Omega^* \{\Psi(\theta^*)\} \right\| < s/2 \\ & \left\| \{\widehat{\Psi}(\widehat{\theta}_\lambda)\}^T \widehat{\Omega} \{\widehat{\Psi}(\widehat{\theta}_\lambda)\} + \lambda \|\widehat{\gamma}_\lambda\|_2^2 - \{\Psi(\widehat{\theta}_\lambda)\}^T \Omega^* \{\Psi(\widehat{\theta}_\lambda)\} \right\| < s/2 \\ & \{\widehat{\Psi}(\widehat{\theta}_\lambda)\}^T \widehat{\Omega} \{\widehat{\Psi}(\widehat{\theta}_\lambda)\} + \lambda \|\widehat{\gamma}_\lambda\|_2^2 \leq \{\widehat{\Psi}(\theta^*)\}^T \widehat{\Omega} \{\widehat{\Psi}(\theta^*)\} + \lambda \|\gamma^*\|_2^2. \end{aligned}$$

These three inequalities imply that

$$\{\Psi(\widehat{\theta}_\lambda)\}^T \Omega^* \{\Psi(\widehat{\theta}_\lambda)\} < \{\Psi(\theta^*)\}^T \Omega^* \{\Psi(\theta^*)\} + s = s.$$

The right hand side reduces to  $s$  under General Regularity Condition 6.

Let  $\mathcal{N} \in \Theta$  be an arbitrary open set containing  $\theta^*$ . Let us define the following quantity:

$$s_0 = \inf_{\theta \in \Theta \setminus \mathcal{N}} \{\Psi(\theta)\}^T \Omega^* \{\Psi(\theta)\}.$$

Combining the fact that  $\Theta \setminus \mathcal{N}$  is compact under General Regularity Condition 2, and General Regularity Conditions 2, 4, 6, we establish  $s_0$  is positive. Therefore, by taking  $s > s_0$ , the event

$\{\{\Psi(\widehat{\theta}_\lambda)\}^T \widehat{\Omega}\{\Psi(\widehat{\theta}_\lambda)\} < s_0\}$  occurs with probability tending to one, which further implies that  $\widehat{\theta}_\lambda \in \mathcal{N}$ . Since  $\mathcal{N}$  is arbitrary chosen, this establishes  $\widehat{\theta}_\lambda = \theta^* + o_P(1)$  as  $T \rightarrow \infty$ .

Next, we establish the asymptotic normality of  $\widehat{\theta}_\lambda$ . Under General Regularity Condition 5, the following expansion holds from a first-order Taylor expansion and the consistency of  $\widehat{\theta}$ :

$$\widehat{\Psi}(\widehat{\theta}_\lambda) = \widehat{\Psi}(\theta^*) + \left\{ \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta^T} \widehat{\Psi}(\theta) \Big|_{\theta=\theta^*} \right\} (\widehat{\theta}_\lambda - \theta^*) + o_P(\|\widehat{\theta}_\lambda - \theta^*\|).$$

The first order condition of  $\widehat{\theta}_\lambda$  along with General Regularity Condition 5 implies

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta^T} \left[ \{\widehat{\Psi}(\theta)\}^T \widehat{\Omega}\{\widehat{\Psi}(\theta)\} + \lambda \|\gamma\|_2^2 \right] \Big|_{\theta=\widehat{\theta}_\lambda} \\ &= \left\{ \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta^T} \widehat{\Psi}(\theta) \Big|_{\theta=\theta^*} \right\}^T \widehat{\Omega}\{\widehat{\Psi}(\widehat{\theta}_\lambda)\} + \lambda \widehat{\gamma}_\lambda \\ &= \left\{ \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta^T} \widehat{\Psi}(\theta) \Big|_{\theta=\theta^*} \right\}^T \widehat{\Omega}\{\widehat{\Psi}(\theta^*)\} + \left\{ \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta^T} \widehat{\Psi}(\theta) \Big|_{\theta=\theta^*} \right\}^T \widehat{\Omega} \left\{ \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta^T} \widehat{\Psi}(\theta) \Big|_{\theta=\theta^*} \right\} (\widehat{\theta} - \theta^*) \\ &\quad + o_P(\|\widehat{\theta}_\lambda - \theta^*\| + T^{-1/2}). \end{aligned}$$

The last line is from  $T^{1/2} \lambda \widehat{\gamma}_\lambda = T^{1/2} \lambda (\widehat{\gamma}_\lambda + \gamma^*) = o_P(1)$ . Therefore, by multiplying  $T^{1/2}$ , we get

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \left\{ \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta^T} \widehat{\Psi}(\theta) \Big|_{\theta=\theta^*} \right\}^T \widehat{\Omega} \left\{ \frac{1}{T^{1/2}} \sum_{t=1}^T \Psi(O_t; \theta^*) \right\} \\ &\quad + \left\{ \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta^T} \widehat{\Psi}(\theta) \Big|_{\theta=\theta^*} \right\}^T \widehat{\Omega} \left\{ \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta^T} \widehat{\Psi}(\theta) \Big|_{\theta=\theta^*} \right\} T^{1/2} (\widehat{\theta}_\lambda - \theta^*) + o_P(T^{1/2} \|\widehat{\theta}_\lambda - \theta^*\| + 1) \\ &= \underbrace{\left\{ \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta^T} \Psi(\theta) \Big|_{\theta=\theta^*} \right\}^T}_{=: G^*} \Omega^* \left\{ \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{T^{1/2}} \sum_{t=1}^T \Psi(O_t; \theta^*) \right\} \\ &\quad + \left\{ \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta^T} \Psi(\theta) \Big|_{\theta=\theta^*} \right\}^T \Omega^* \left\{ \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta^T} \Psi(\theta) \Big|_{\theta=\theta^*} \right\} T^{1/2} (\widehat{\theta}_\lambda - \theta^*) + o_P(T^{1/2} \|\widehat{\theta}_\lambda - \theta^*\| + 1). \end{aligned}$$

The last equality holds from General Regularity Conditions 3, 7, and 8 and the consistency of  $\widehat{\theta}_\lambda$ .

This implies

$$T^{1/2} (\widehat{\theta}_\lambda - \theta^*) = \left( G^{*T} \Omega^* G^* \right)^{-1} G^{*T} \Omega^* \left\{ \frac{1}{T^{1/2}} \sum_{t=1}^T \Psi(O_t; \theta^*) \right\} + o_P(T^{1/2} \|\widehat{\theta}_\lambda - \theta^*\| + 1).$$

From General Regularity Condition 3 and 9, we find  $T^{1/2} (\widehat{\theta}_\lambda - \theta^*) = O_P(1)$ , implying that

$o_P(T^{1/2}\|\widehat{\theta}_\lambda - \theta^*\| + 1) = o_P(1)$ . Therefore, from Slutsky's theorem, we find

$T^{1/2}(\widehat{\theta}_\lambda - \theta^*)$  converges in distribution to  $N(0, \{G^{*T}\Omega^*G^*\}^{-1}G^{*T}\Omega^*\Sigma_2G^*\Omega^*\{G^{*T}\Omega^*G^*\}^{-T})$ .

Note that  $\{G^{*T}\Omega^*G^*\}^{-1}G^{*T}\Omega^*\Sigma_2G^*\Omega^*\{G^{*T}\Omega^*G^*\}^{-T} = \Sigma_1^*\Sigma_2\Sigma_1^{*T}$ . This concludes the proof.

## References

- Abadie, A., Diamond, A., and Hainmueller, J. (2010). Synthetic control methods for comparative case studies: Estimating the effect of California’s tobacco control program. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 105(490):493–505.
- Abadie, A., Diamond, A., and Hainmueller, J. (2011). Synth: An r package for synthetic control methods in comparative case studies. *Journal of Statistical Software*, 42(13):1–17.
- Abadie, A. and Gardeazabal, J. (2003). The economic costs of conflict: A case study of the basque country. *American Economic Review*, 93(1):113–132.
- Amjad, M., Shah, D., and Shen, D. (2018). Robust synthetic control. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 19(22):1–51.
- Andrews, D. W. K. (1988). Laws of large numbers for dependent non-identically distributed random variables. *Econometric Theory*, 4(3):458–467.
- Andrews, D. W. K. (1991). Heteroskedasticity and autocorrelation consistent covariance matrix estimation. *Econometrica*, 59(3):817–858.
- Bai, J. (2009). Panel data models with interactive fixed effects. *Econometrica*, 77(4):1229–1279.
- Ben-Michael, E. (2023). *augsynth: The Augmented Synthetic Control Method*. R package version 0.2.0.
- Ben-Michael, E., Feller, A., and Rothstein, J. (2021). The augmented synthetic control method. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 116(536):1789–1803.
- Box, G. E. P. and Pierce, D. A. (1970). Distribution of residual autocorrelations in autoregressive-integrated moving average time series models. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 65(332):1509–1526.
- Caner, M. (2009). Lasso-type gmm estimator. *Econometric Theory*, 25(1):270–290.



- Carrasco, M., Florens, J.-P., and Renault, E. (2007). Linear inverse problems in structural econometrics estimation based on spectral decomposition and regularization. In Heckman, J. J. and Leamer, E. E., editors, *Handbook of Econometrics*, volume 6, pages 5633–5751. Elsevier.
- Carroll, R. J., Ruppert, D., Stefanski, L. A., and Crainiceanu, C. M. (2006). *Measurement Error in Nonlinear Models: A Modern Perspective*. Chapman and Hall/CRC, second edition.
- Cattaneo, M., Feng, Y., Palomba, F., and Titiunik, R. (2023). *scpi: Prediction Intervals for Synthetic Control Methods with Multiple Treated Units and Staggered Adoption*. R package version 2.2.2.
- Cattaneo, M. D., Feng, Y., and Titiunik, R. (2021). Prediction intervals for synthetic control methods. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 116(536):1865–1880.
- Chernozhukov, V., Wüthrich, K., and Zhu, Y. (2021). An exact and robust conformal inference method for counterfactual and synthetic controls. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 116(536):1849–1864.
- Cui, Y., Pu, H., Shi, X., Miao, W., and Tchetgen Tchetgen, E. (2023). Semiparametric proximal causal inference. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, pages 1–12. In Press.
- Doudchenko, N. and Imbens, G. W. (2016). Balancing, regression, difference-in-differences and synthetic control methods: A synthesis. *Technical Report*. National Bureau of Economic Research.
- Ferman, B. (2021). On the properties of the synthetic control estimator with many periods and many controls. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 116(536):1764–1772.
- Ferman, B. and Pinto, C. (2021). Synthetic controls with imperfect pretreatment fit. *Quantitative Economics*, 12(4):1197–1221.
- Fohlin, C. and Lu, Z. (2021). How contagious was the panic of 1907? New evidence from trust company stocks. *AEA Papers and Proceedings*, 111.
- Freedman, L. S., Midthune, D., Carroll, R. J., and Kipnis, V. (2008). A comparison of regression calibration, moment reconstruction and imputation for adjusting for covariate measurement error in regression. *Statistics in Medicine*, 27(25):5195–5216.

- Fu, W. and Knight, K. (2000). Asymptotics for lasso-type estimators. *The Annals of Statistics*, 28(5):1356 – 1378.
- Fu, W. J. (2003). Penalized estimating equations. *Biometrics*, 59(1):126–132.
- Hall, A. R. (2004). *Generalized Method of Moments*. OUP Oxford.
- Hansen, L. P. (1982). Large sample properties of generalized method of moments estimators. *Econometrica*, 50(4):1029–1054.
- Kress, R. (2014). *Linear Integral Equations*. Springer, 3 edition.
- Kunsch, H. R. (1989). The Jackknife and the Bootstrap for General Stationary Observations. *The Annals of Statistics*, 17(3):1217 – 1241.
- Lahiri, S. N. (1999). Theoretical comparisons of block bootstrap methods. *The Annals of Statistics*, 27(1):386 – 404.
- Li, W., Miao, W., and Tchetgen Tchetgen, E. (2023). Non-parametric inference about mean functionals of non-ignorable non-response data without identifying the joint distribution. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B: Statistical Methodology*, 85(3):913–935.
- Liu, R. Y. and Singh, K. (1992). Moving blocks jackknife and bootstrap capture weak dependence. In Lepage, R. and Billard, L., editors, *Exploring the Limits of Bootstrap*. John Wiley, New York.
- Ljung, G. M. and Box, G. E. P. (1978). On a measure of lack of fit in time series models. *Biometrika*, 65(2):297–303.
- Miao, W., Geng, Z., and Tchetgen Tchetgen, E. J. (2018). Identifying causal effects with proxy variables of an unmeasured confounder. *Biometrika*, 105(4):987–993.
- Moen, J. and Tallman, E. W. (1992). The bank panic of 1907: The role of trust companies. *The Journal of Economic History*, 52(3):611–630.
- Newey, W. K. and West, K. D. (1987). A simple, positive semi-definite, heteroskedasticity and autocorrelation consistent covariance matrix. *Econometrica*, 55(3):703–708.

- Pötscher, B. M. and Prucha, I. (1997). *Dynamic Nonlinear Econometric Models: Asymptotic Theory*. Springer Science & Business Media.
- Qiu, H., Shi, X., Miao, W., Dobriban, E., and Tchetgen, E. T. (2022). Doubly robust proximal synthetic controls. *Preprint arXiv:2210.02014*.
- Randolph, T. W., Harezlak, J., and Feng, Z. (2012). Structured penalties for functional linear models—partially empirical eigenvectors for regression. *Electronic Journal of Statistics*, 6:323 – 353.
- Robbins, M. W., Saunders, J., and Kilmer, B. (2017). A framework for synthetic control methods with high-dimensional, micro-level data: Evaluating a neighborhood-specific crime intervention. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 112(517):109–126.
- Shi, C., Sridhar, D., Misra, V., and Blei, D. (2022). On the assumptions of synthetic control methods. In Camps-Valls, G., Ruiz, F. J. R., and Valera, I., editors, *Proceedings of The 25th International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, volume 151 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 7163–7175. PMLR.
- Shi, X., Li, K., Miao, W., Hu, M., and Tchetgen Tchetgen, E. (2023). Theory for identification and inference with synthetic controls: A proximal causal inference framework. *Preprint arXiv:2108.13935*.
- Tchetgen Tchetgen, E. (2013). The Control Outcome Calibration Approach for Causal Inference With Unobserved Confounding. *American Journal of Epidemiology*, 179(5):633–640.
- Tchetgen Tchetgen, E., Park, C., and Richardson, D. (2023). Single proxy control. *Preprint arXiv:2302.06054*.
- Tchetgen Tchetgen, E. J., Ying, A., Cui, Y., Shi, X., and Miao, W. (2020). An introduction to proximal causal learning. *Preprint arXiv:2009.10982*.
- Theobald, C. M. (1974). Generalizations of mean square error applied to ridge regression. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series B (Methodological)*, 36(1):103–106.

- Tibshirani, R. (1996). Regression shrinkage and selection via the lasso. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series B (Methodological)*, 58(1):267–288.
- Xu, Y. (2017). Generalized synthetic control method: Causal inference with interactive fixed effects models. *Political Analysis*, 25(1):57–76.
- Zhang, J., Li, W., Miao, W., and Tchetgen Tchetgen, E. (2023). Proximal causal inference without uniqueness assumptions. *Statistics & Probability Letters*, 198:109836.