

Estimation of individual causal effects in network setup for multiple treatments

Abhinav Thorat^{1,*}, Ravi Kolla^{1,*}, Niranjan Pedanekar¹, Naoyuki Onoe^{1,2}

¹Sony Research India

²Sony Global Corporation

{abhinav.thorat, ravi.kolla, niranjan.pedanekar, naoyuki.onoe}@sony.com

Abstract

We study the problem of estimation of Individual Treatment Effects (ITE) in the context of multiple treatments and networked observational data. Leveraging the network information, we aim to utilize hidden confounders that may not be directly accessible in the observed data, thereby enhancing the practical applicability of the strong ignorability assumption. To achieve this, we first employ Graph Convolutional Networks (GCN) to learn a shared representation of the confounders. Then, our approach utilizes separate neural networks to infer potential outcomes for each treatment. We design a loss function as a weighted combination of two components: representation loss and Mean Squared Error (MSE) loss on the factual outcomes. To measure the representation loss, we extend existing metrics such as Wasserstein and Maximum Mean Discrepancy (MMD) from the binary treatment setting to the multiple treatments scenario. To validate the effectiveness of our proposed methodology, we conduct a series of experiments on the benchmark datasets such as BlogCatalog and Flickr. The experimental results consistently demonstrate the superior performance of our models when compared to baseline methods.

Introduction

In the landscape of causal inference, the estimation of *ITEs* stands as a well-established yet intricate problem. It can be effectively utilized for the dynamic personalization of treatments in various domains, such as economics, education, healthcare, marketing, recommendation systems, and more. For example, it can be used to administer the best drug from the *many available* options (*multiple treatments*) for a patient based on their medical history; implement the best job program from the *many available* choices for a candidate in the education domain; and design the best incentive program from the *many available* options for a customer to prevent churn in any subscription-based industry, such as Over-The-Top (OTT), digital media, telecom, etc. In today's world nearly everyone is interconnected with a subset of others through some form of a (*social*) *network*. This allows us to harness this connectivity for uncovering hidden information that would have otherwise remained elusive without access to network information. In this work, we study the problem of the estimation of ITEs in observational studies in the

presence of multiple treatments and experimental units are connected through some network. The data we use has been collected or made available in more realistic observational studies, as opposed to the gold standard experiments known as Randomized Control Trials (RCTs), where the data is collected meticulously through a well-designed process. This may not be possible in all use cases due to various reasons such as ethical concerns. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first work on the estimation of ITEs in a networked setup with multiple treatments, which is motivated by the problem setup in (Guo, Li, and Liu 2020).

Strong ignorability is a standard assumption in causal inference literature, essentially stating that all confounders are directly measurable and present in the observed data, with no consideration for hidden confounders. Note that, this assumption is difficult to test in the practice as it requires a deep understanding of the causal relationships among all the variables. For example, in the drug administration use-case from (Guo, Li, and Liu 2020), an individual's socio-economic status serves as a confounding factor that influences both treatment assignment and outcomes. For instance, a lower socio-economic status may hinder one's ability to afford a more expensive drug, potentially leading to a negative impact on their health. However, directly measuring an individual's socio-economic status poses challenges due to the lack of available data. If we do not control for this confounder, it can lead to inaccurate ITE estimates. Consequently, proxies such as age, education, and income are often employed to control for socio-economic status. Nevertheless, in observational studies, the causal relationships between variables remain unknown. Here, we demonstrate that these scenarios can be effectively addressed by leveraging network information to understand the user's community by considering its one-hop neighbours. To be precise, we use the network information to uncover hidden confounders not directly available in the given data and observe superior performance of our models compared to the baselines that do not incorporate network information. Therefore, it is reasonable to argue that the strong ignorability assumption holds better in our case compared to scenarios without network data.

We now briefly highlight the key challenges associated with the problem at hand. It is well known that the observational studies naturally suffer from the treatment selec-

*These authors contributed equally.

This work has been accepted at AAAI-GCLR 2024 workshop.

tion bias as the assignment of treatments naturally takes place based on the covariates. Additionally, there is a potential issue of observing an imbalance in the number of samples available for each treatment in the given data. We would like to highlight that the above mentioned issues become more dominant especially when dealing with a multiple treatments setup. Furthermore, an individual unit’s outcome is causally influenced by the covariates of its one-hop neighbours, which means that the observations are non i.i.d. in nature. We try to counter these challenges by first learning a shared representation of the given units’ covariates using GCN (Kipf and Welling 2016), by leveraging the network information, as the first step of the estimation process. Then, we perform the prediction of counterfactuals through separate neural networks across all treatments by minimizing the weighted sum of loss functions associated with the shared representation and counterfactual prediction. Figure 1 depicts a high-level diagram of our setup and the proposed architecture.

We now briefly present the salient contributions of our work.

- We consider a novel problem of the estimation of ITEs in a networked observational studies setting with multiple treatments.
- We propose deep learning models that utilize additional network information to mitigate the confounding bias arising from the hidden confounders not directly available in the data.
- In the context of multiple treatment setting, there is a lack of loss functions to measure the effectiveness of learned representation. We propose an extension of the existing representation loss functions in the binary treatment setting (Shalit, Johansson, and Sontag 2017), such as Wasserstein (Gretton et al. 2012) and MMD (Villani et al. 2009; Cuturi and Doucet 2014), to suit our framework.
- We conduct extensive experiments on two standard datasets, BlogCatalog and Flickr (Guo, Li, and Liu 2020), that demonstrate the superior performance of our proposed models compared to the baselines.

We organize the rest of the paper as follows. We provide the details of the related work in the following section. We provide the details of the considered problem statement in the Problem Formulation section. Then, the section Proposed Architecture introduces the architecture of the considered models and their technical details. We provide the details of the considered datasets and comparison of numerical results in the Numerical Results section. We finally conclude the work and provide directions for future work in the Conclusion section.

Literature survey

Our work deals with the estimation of ITEs, that differs significantly from the estimation of the treatment effects at whole population level such as Average Treatment Effect (ATE) (Shpitser and Pearl 2012; Pearl 2017). Majority of the ITE estimation works in the literature deals with the

case of binary treatments and without the network (Johansson, Shalit, and Sontag 2016; Wager and Athey 2018; Hill 2011). However, there have been a limited number of works in the literature that deal with the ITE estimation for multiple treatments without the network setting (Yoon, Jordon, and Van Der Schaar 2018; Schwab, Linhardt, and Karlen 2018; Schwab et al. 2020). Note that all these works assume that the strong ignorability assumption holds whereas it is difficult to test in the practice and may be violated as well. In contrast, we use the network information to obtain hidden confounders that are not directly available in the observed data that in turn helps the strong ignorability assumption to hold better in practice. We would like to point out that our work has close connections to the work in (Guo, Li, and Liu 2020). Specifically, the authors in (Guo, Li, and Liu 2020) consider the ITE estimation task in network setup for binary treatment setting. On the contrary, we extend it to the multiple treatments setting which introduces its own challenges as mentioned above. Furthermore, it is worth mentioning that GCNs have been used in various fields that have network data such as computer vision, natural language processing, traffic, recommender systems, chemistry etc, refer to a survey on GCNs here (Wu et al. 2020). Yet, we believe that ours is the first work to consider the application of GCNs in the ITE estimation task under the networked observational studies setting with multiple treatments.

Problem Formulation

In this section, we explain the considered problem statement in detail. We begin with the notation used in this paper. Scalars are denoted by non-bold faced letters, vectors by bold-faced lowercase letters, and matrices by bold-faced uppercase letters. We use subscripts and superscripts to denote instances (units) and treatments, respectively, when both are present in the notation; otherwise, their meaning can be understood from the context. We follow the Rubin-Neyman potential outcomes framework (Rubin 2005) to introduce the problem statement. Let $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^p$ and $t \in \mathbb{N}$ denote the covariates and assigned treatment of an instance. We use K to represent the number of available treatments, allowing K to be any finite number greater than or equal to 2. We use N to denote the number of instances in the dataset. Furthermore, let $y_i^t \in \mathbb{R}$ denote the potential outcome of instance i when treatment t is applied. We assume that all instances are connected through a (social) network, with its adjacency matrix denoted by \mathbf{A} . It is important to note that in this work, we restrict \mathbf{A} to be undirected and stationary. Additionally, we assume that the outcomes y_i^t of an instance i are causally influenced only by the covariates of its one-hop neighbors.

With this notation, we now define the ITE of treatment- a with respect to treatment b for a given instance- i and the adjacency matrix \mathbf{A} as follows:

$$\tau^{a,b}(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{A}) = \mathbb{E}[y_i^a | \mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{A}] - \mathbb{E}[y_i^b | \mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{A}]. \quad (1)$$

Intuitively, for the given instance, ITE measures the uplift obtained by the treatment- a compared to treatment- b . Given N instances, their assigned treatments, the corresponding observed (factual) outcomes and the network




Figure 1: A brief overview of the workflow considered in this work.

$\{(\mathbf{x}_i, t_i, y_i^t)_{i=1}^N, \mathbf{A}\}$, our goal is to estimate ITEs of all given instances across all pairs of treatments. Note that the problem is challenging due to the following factors: (i). In observational studies, it is natural to notice the confounding bias resulting from the way treatments are assigned and becomes stronger especially in the multiple treatments setting. (ii). Instances are inherently connected to others through the network, therefore the covariates' correspond to non i.i.d. samples. (iii). The adjacency matrix, \mathbf{A} , of the network is potentially high-dimensional and possibly shows substantial sparsity.

For the objective quantification of our proposed models, we extend the standard metrics in the literature such as Rooted Precision in the Estimation of Heterogeneous Effects, denoted by ϵ_{PEHE} , and Mean Absolute Error on the Average Treatment Effect, denoted by ϵ_{ATE} , defined for binary treatment setting (Guo, Li, and Liu 2020) to multiple treatment setting by taking the average across all treatment pairs whose formulations are given below. Let $\hat{\tau}^{a,b}(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{A})$ denotes the estimate of $\tau^{a,b}(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{A})$. Then,

$$\epsilon_{PEHE} = \frac{1}{\binom{K}{2}} \sum_{a=0}^{K-1} \sum_{b=0}^{a-1} \left[\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N (\hat{\tau}^{a,b}(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{A}) - \tau^{a,b}(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{A}))^2 \right] \quad (2)$$

$$\epsilon_{ATE} = \frac{1}{\binom{K}{2}} \sum_{a=0}^{K-1} \sum_{b=0}^{a-1} \left[\left| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \hat{\tau}^{a,b}(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{A}) - \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \tau^{a,b}(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{A}) \right| \right] \quad (3)$$

Proposed Architecture

We begin this section by providing a formal definition to the strong ignorability assumption.

Definition. Strong ignorability assumption rests on the following two key assumptions. First, it assumes the conditional independence of potential outcomes and treatment assignment given the covariates. In other words it assumes that

there are no hidden confounders in the observed data. Second, the probability of receiving any treatment falls *strictly* between 0 and 1 for any instance. Mathematically, it is expressed as $(y_0, y_1, \dots, y_K) \perp t \mid \mathbf{x}$ and $0 < P(t = a \mid \mathbf{x}) < 1 \forall \mathbf{x}$ and $\forall a \in \{0, 1, \dots, K\}$.

This assumption leads to the following equality $\mathbb{E}[y_a \mid \mathbf{x}] = \mathbb{E}[y \mid \mathbf{x}, t = a]$, where y_a represents the outcome associated with the covariates \mathbf{x} when the treatment- a is applied. Intuitively, it implies that all the confounders are present in the given data. However, the same may not hold in practice as there is a significant chance of existence of hidden confounders that are not directly available in the given data. In that case, the above equality will not hold thus resulting into a biased estimator. Therefore, in our setup, we use the additional network information to obtain any hidden confounders such that the strong ignorability assumption holds in a more realistic manner.

Our proposed model primarily involves two steps. First step is designed to learn a balanced representation of confounders across all treatments by taking \mathbf{X} and \mathbf{A} as inputs. The second step is focussed on training a separate model for each treatment to predict counterfactuals. A detailed explanation of how our model accomplishes these two steps is given in the following sections.

A. Learning Shared Representation of Confounders with Covariates and Network.

To mitigate the bias resulted from the assignment of treatments in observational studies we resort to learning a representation of confounders that is balanced across all treatment groups. It is to be noted that the representational learning has been utilized for the estimation of causal effects for binary treatments without the network in the literature (Johansson, Shalit, and Sontag 2016; Shalit, Johansson, and Sontag 2017). To learn representations from auxiliary network information and observational data, we refer to (Guo, Li, and Liu 2020), where the authors utilized the GCN for learning representations from the network and observational data for a binary treatment setup. Therefore, in the first part of our model, the representation learning function, $\Phi : \mathbf{X} \times \mathbf{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$, is pa-

Table 1: Summary of datasets.

Dataset	#users(instances)	#edges	#covariates	k_2	avg-pairwise-ate		
					$K = 4$	$K = 8$	$K = 16$
BlogCatalog	5196	171743	8189	0.5	4.08 ± 0.24	2.66 ± 0.49	2.40 ± 0.03
				1	8.48 ± 0.38	4.89 ± 0.19	3.78 ± 0.45
				2	15.76 ± 0.85	11.73 ± 1.00	6.04 ± 0.95
Flickr	7575	239738	12047	0.5	2.69 ± 0.07	1.49 ± 0.03	1.11 ± 0.04
				1	4.08 ± 0.02	2.24 ± 0.06	1.52 ± 0.04
				2	7.82 ± 0.08	4.82 ± 0.04	2.87 ± 0.02

parameterized using a GCN with multiple layers, whose effectiveness has been verified in various machine learning tasks across different types of networked data (Wu et al. 2020). Mathematical formulation of Φ for a single GCN layer¹ is as follows: $\Phi(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{A}) = \sigma((\mathbf{A} + \mathbf{I}_n)\mathbf{X}\mathbf{U})$, where $\mathbf{U} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$ represents the weight matrix to be learned, and σ stands for the ELU activation function. The challenge here lies in using an appropriate loss function for measuring the effectiveness of a representation in multiple treatments setting which will be discussed in the further sections.

B. Potential Outcomes Prediction. The second part of the model is dedicated for predicting potential outcomes of all treatments using the obtained shared representation detailed in the above section, and observed treatment. As there are K available treatments, we use $f^t : \mathbb{R}^d \times \{t\} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ to denote the potential outcome prediction function of the treatment- t . We use L number of Fully Connected (FC) layers followed by a regression layer for learning each function f^t that we refer as the network-head of treatment- t . Hence, in this part, we have an overall of K number of network heads corresponding to K distinct treatments. Let $\Phi_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$ be the learned shared representation of confounders of instance- i . Then, mathematically, f^t is defined as $f^t = w^t \sigma(W_L^t \dots \sigma(W_1^t, \Phi_i))$ for an instance- i where W_l^t and w^t denote the respective weights of the l^{th} FC layer and the regression layer in the network-head- t . The equations of neural network bias terms follow the same rule and are omitted here due to notational complexity. With both parts of the model described, our model’s prediction of potential outcome of a treatment- t for the given instance- i is defined as $\hat{y}_i^t = f^t(\Phi_i = \Phi(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{A})_i)$.

C. Loss Function. Our proposed model optimizes on a combination of two loss functions namely Regression Loss and Representation Loss across treatments.

(i). *Regression Loss.* This is a traditional loss function which is responsible for obtaining a good predictive accuracy of a model. It is the mean squared error between the ground truth, y_i , and the predicted potential outcomes, $\hat{y}_i^t \forall i, t$ which is given as:

$$\mathcal{L}_1 = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=0}^N (\hat{y}_i^t - y_i)^2. \quad (4)$$

In the case of observational studies where each treatment

¹To keep the notational complexity simple we provided the formulation for single GCN layer here. However, the same can be extended to any number of GCN layers as well.

group potentially exhibits a distinct distribution, minimizing the regression loss alone is insufficient for obtaining better models. Therefore, we consider another loss function that aims to measure the balance of covariates’ representation distributions across all treatments.

(ii). *Representation Loss.* Recall that the first part of our model’s goal is to obtain a balanced representation of covariates across all treatments to mitigate the treatment assignment bias. Hence, we look for a metric that measures the effectiveness of a balanced representation. The authors in (Shalit, Johansson, and Sontag 2017) use Integral Probability Metrics (IPM) for this task in the context of binary treatments. In particular, they use special cases of IPM such as Wasserstein and Maximum Mean Discrepancy (MMD) metrics for measuring the distance between the treated and control covariates’ distributions. We use Π to denote these metrics that take two distributions as inputs. In this work we propose extensions of these metrics to our multiple treatments setting by taking the average of the Wasserstein/MMD metrics computed between distributions corresponding to all pairwise combinations of treatments. Mathematically it is given as below:

$$\mathcal{L}_2 = \frac{1}{\binom{K}{2}} \sum_{a=0}^{K-1} \sum_{b=0}^{a-1} \Pi(\{\Phi(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{A})\}_{t=a}, \{\Phi(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{A})\}_{t=b}), \quad (5)$$

where $\{\Phi(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{A})\}_{t=a}$ and $\{\Phi(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{A})\}_{t=b}$ denote the representation $\Phi(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{A})$ restricted to samples that received treatment- a and b respectively. Intuitively, the minimization of the above metric results into a representation that is balanced across all pairwise treatments. We try to balance both the above loss functions, \mathcal{L}_1 and \mathcal{L}_2 for improved models by taking a weighted sum of them which is given below:

$$\mathcal{L} = \alpha \mathcal{L}_1 + \beta \mathcal{L}_2 = \alpha \cdot \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=0}^N (\hat{y}_i^t - y_i)^2 + \beta \cdot \frac{1}{\binom{K}{2}} \sum_{a=0}^{K-1} \sum_{b=0}^{a-1} \Pi(\{\Phi(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{A})\}_{t=a}, \{\Phi(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{A})\}_{t=b}), \quad (6)$$

where $\alpha > 0$ and $\beta > 0$ are the chosen weights. We propose two model variants denoted as GCN-Wass and GCN-MMD obtained by choosing Π in the above equation to Wasserstein and MMD metrics, respectively.

Table 2: Results comparison on BlogCatalog dataset and the number of treatments, K , equals to 4.

BlogCatalog for $K = 4$						
k_2	0.5		1		2	
	$\sqrt{\epsilon_{PEHE}}$	ϵ_{ATE}	$\sqrt{\epsilon_{PEHE}}$	ϵ_{ATE}	$\sqrt{\epsilon_{PEHE}}$	ϵ_{ATE}
GCN-Wass	4.95 ± 1.00	1.11 ± 0.62	7.16 ± 1.51	1.77 ± 0.82	12.98 ± 2.72	3.79 ± 1.60
GCN-MMD	5.01 ± 0.93	1.24 ± 0.63	7.47 ± 2.21	2.16 ± 1.65	13.63 ± 3.11	4.48 ± 1.92
TARNet	5.52 ± 1.62	2.03 ± 1.22	9.96 ± 2.77	4.28 ± 1.94	20.43 ± 5.55	10.38 ± 3.73
CFRNet-Wass	5.48 ± 1.62	2.11 ± 1.15	10.36 ± 2.99	4.74 ± 2.12	20.12 ± 5.79	10.1 ± 4.26
CFRNet-MMD	5.51 ± 1.59	2.02 ± 1.23	10.38 ± 2.95	4.72 ± 2.08	20.49 ± 5.56	10.30 ± 3.52

Table 3: Results comparison on Flickr dataset and the number of treatments, K , equals to 4.

Flickr for $K = 4$						
k_2	0.5		1		2	
	$\sqrt{\epsilon_{PEHE}}$	ϵ_{ATE}	$\sqrt{\epsilon_{PEHE}}$	ϵ_{ATE}	$\sqrt{\epsilon_{PEHE}}$	ϵ_{ATE}
GCN-Wass	4.25 ± 0.54	0.88 ± 0.25	5.84 ± 1.02	1.26 ± 0.45	11.67 ± 3.37	2.64 ± 1.24
GCN-MMD	4.25 ± 0.50	0.89 ± 0.19	5.95 ± 0.99	1.38 ± 0.39	11.48 ± 2.81	2.55 ± 0.54
TARNet	6.47 ± 0.68	1.97 ± 0.81	13.09 ± 1.78	5.19 ± 1.96	27.79 ± 3.18	12.50 ± 3.29
CFRNet-Wass	6.51 ± 0.72	2.06 ± 0.75	12.82 ± 1.76	5.09 ± 1.81	26.90 ± 3.20	12.61 ± 3.30
CFRNet-MMD	6.51 ± 0.67	1.98 ± 0.85	13.20 ± 1.77	5.20 ± 1.95	27.72 ± 3.18	12.52 ± 3.20

Table 4: Results comparison on BlogCatalog dataset and the number of treatments, K , equals to 8.

BlogCatalog for $K = 8$						
k_2	0.5		1		2	
	$\sqrt{\epsilon_{PEHE}}$	ϵ_{ATE}	$\sqrt{\epsilon_{PEHE}}$	ϵ_{ATE}	$\sqrt{\epsilon_{PEHE}}$	ϵ_{ATE}
GCN-Wass	6.86 ± 1.50	2.34 ± 0.65	11.29 ± 3.42	4.14 ± 1.40	23.49 ± 5.17	8.91 ± 2.20
GCN-MMD	6.97 ± 1.58	2.48 ± 0.71	11.51 ± 3.38	4.38 ± 1.46	24.67 ± 5.52	10.02 ± 2.86
TARNet	6.66 ± 1.53	2.49 ± 0.70	12.70 ± 2.51	6.00 ± 1.21	24.22 ± 4.45	12.52 ± 2.17
CFRNet-Wass	6.53 ± 1.45	2.46 ± 0.64	12.55 ± 2.64	5.99 ± 1.29	24.69 ± 4.39	13.33 ± 2.37
CFRNet-MMD	7.80 ± 1.91	2.46 ± 0.68	12.64 ± 2.74	6.03 ± 1.29	24.58 ± 4.78	12.88 ± 2.45

Table 5: Results comparison on Flickr dataset and the number of treatments, K , equals to 8.

Flickr for $K = 8$						
k_2	0.5		1		2	
	$\sqrt{\epsilon_{PEHE}}$	ϵ_{ATE}	$\sqrt{\epsilon_{PEHE}}$	ϵ_{ATE}	$\sqrt{\epsilon_{PEHE}}$	ϵ_{ATE}
GCN-Wass	4.86 ± 0.70	1.51 ± 0.33	7.63 ± 0.97	1.84 ± 0.38	16.69 ± 2.99	3.53 ± 1.00
GCN-MMD	4.86 ± 0.69	1.50 ± 0.31	7.70 ± 1.04	1.86 ± 0.43	16.87 ± 3.19	3.61 ± 1.08
TARNet	6.44 ± 0.56	2.49 ± 0.70	13.94 ± 1.83	5.84 ± 1.22	29.18 ± 3.82	14.58 ± 2.50
CFRNet-Wass	6.22 ± 0.60	2.06 ± 0.45	13.20 ± 1.52	5.69 ± 1.29	28.20 ± 3.15	14.53 ± 2.42
CFRNet-MMD	6.45 ± 0.63	2.05 ± 0.44	13.96 ± 1.83	5.80 ± 1.38	29.26 ± 3.82	14.65 ± 2.44

Table 6: Results comparison on BlogCatalog dataset and the number of treatments, K , equals to 16.

BlogCatalog for $K = 16$						
k_2	0.5		1		2	
	$\sqrt{\epsilon_{PEHE}}$	ϵ_{ATE}	$\sqrt{\epsilon_{PEHE}}$	ϵ_{ATE}	$\sqrt{\epsilon_{PEHE}}$	ϵ_{ATE}
GCN-Wass	7.53 ± 1.12	2.46 ± 0.62	12.00 ± 2.00	4.39 ± 1.20	21.90 ± 4.00	8.42 ± 2.33
GCN-MMD	9.09 ± 1.73	3.68 ± 1.10	15.68 ± 3.00	5.89 ± 1.67	30.34 ± 4.50	11.40 ± 1.95
TARNet	7.07 ± 1.46	2.72 ± 1.00	13.45 ± 2.95	6.84 ± 1.90	26.25 ± 5.04	14.72 ± 2.90
CFRNet-Wass	7.02 ± 1.48	2.78 ± 0.96	13.25 ± 2.95	6.80 ± 1.95	26.42 ± 5.00	14.91 ± 2.88
CFRNet-MMD	7.08 ± 1.51	2.74 ± 1.02	13.49 ± 2.73	7.03 ± 1.69	26.36 ± 4.66	14.94 ± 2.49

Table 7: Results comparison on Flickr dataset and the number of treatments, K , equals to 16.

Flickr for $K = 16$						
k_2	0.5		1		2	
	$\sqrt{\epsilon_{PEHE}}$	ϵ_{ATE}	$\sqrt{\epsilon_{PEHE}}$	ϵ_{ATE}	$\sqrt{\epsilon_{PEHE}}$	ϵ_{ATE}
GCN-Wass	6.47 ± 0.32	0.82 ± 0.11	11.06 ± 0.64	1.43 ± 0.18	20.65 ± 1.12	2.76 ± 0.34
GCN-MMD	6.59 ± 0.53	2.32 ± 0.33	13.50 ± 2.37	3.48 ± 0.43	33.24 ± 6.11	7.93 ± 1.32
TARNet	8.28 ± 0.79	2.66 ± 0.49	16.19 ± 1.36	7.08 ± 0.72	31.13 ± 2.62	16.06 ± 1.61
CFRNet-Wass	8.08 ± 0.89	2.65 ± 0.50	15.89 ± 1.46	7.03 ± 8.81	30.29 ± 2.49	16.06 ± 1.54
CFRNet-MMD	8.40 ± 0.84	2.66 ± 0.50	16.10 ± 1.48	6.99 ± 0.72	31.10 ± 2.88	16.08 ± 1.59

Numerical Results

Evaluation of causal effect models is challenging in practice as there is no available ground truth data. Due to that, it has become a convention in the literature to use either synthetic or semi-synthetic datasets for the evaluation. In this work, we use two standard datasets, BlogCatalog and Flickr used in (Guo, Li, and Liu 2020), to evaluate our proposed models. These datasets are semi-synthetic implying that the covariates and the adjacency matrix correspond to the real world data, while others are synthetically generated. It is important to note that these datasets are used in the literature under binary treatments setting. Here, we extend the same to multiple treatments scenario as detailed in the following subsection.

Datasets generation

BlogCatalog: It is an online platform that hosts blogs posted by users. An instance (a row) in the dataset corresponds to a blogger, and the covariates are a bag-of-words representation of the blogger’s keywords in the description. The graph represents the social network among the bloggers. Here, the treatments correspond to devices such as type of mobile (Android or iOS), tablet, computer, etc. used for consuming the blogs, and the outcomes correspond to the readers’ opinion of the blogs.

Flickr: It is an online platform for sharing images and videos among users connected through a network. Each instance in the dataset corresponds to a user, and the covariates consist of a list of tags of interest. Similar to the BlogCatalog dataset, treatments represent devices, and outcomes represent users’ opinion on the shared content.

To generate the potential outcomes of all available treatments, we first generate K centroids as follows. We train an LDA topic model on a large set of documents with a fixed number of topics. Let $\mathbf{z}(\mathbf{x}_i)$ denote the topic distribution of unit- i . Then, we assign $(K - 1)$ centroids as the topic distributions of randomly selected $(K - 1)$ units and the K^{th} centroid as the mean of the topic distributions of all the units. We use \mathbf{z}_i to denote the centroid- i . With this notation, we define unscaled potential outcomes p_a^i for unit- i and treatment- a as follows:

$$p_a^i = k_1 \mathbf{z}(\mathbf{x}_i)^T \mathbf{z}_a + k_2 \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}(i)} \mathbf{z}(\mathbf{x}_j)^T \mathbf{z}_a, \quad (7)$$

where $k_1, k_2 \geq 0$ capture the effect of confounding bias on outcomes of unit- i through itself and its immediate neighbours, respectively. The treatment assignment probabilities

of a unit- i , $\mathbb{P}(t = a | \mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{A})$, are given below:

$$\mathbb{P}(t = a | \mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{A}) = \frac{\exp(p_a^i)}{\sum_{a'=0}^K \exp(p_{a'}^i)}. \quad (8)$$

Then, the final potential outcomes are given as follows:

$$y_t^i = \begin{cases} Cp_0^i + \epsilon, & \text{if } t = 0 \\ C \left[p_0^i + \sum_{a=1}^K \mathbb{I}(t = a) p_a^i \right] + \epsilon, & \text{if } t \in \{1, 2, \dots, K\}, \end{cases} \quad (9)$$

where $\mathbb{I}(\cdot)$, C and ϵ are Indicator function, a constant and a random variable drawn from $\mathcal{N}(0, 1)$, respectively. We provide a summary of the above generated datasets in Table 1 where avg-pairwise-ate contains the mean and standard deviation of the average of ATEs computed using all pair combinations of treatments across 10 random runs.

Baselines and Results Comparison

It is important to note that, to the best of our knowledge, there are no prior works in the literature addressing the estimation of ITEs in the context of network data with multiple treatments. Therefore, we naturally chose to extend models from the binary treatment setting, such as TARNet, CFRNET-Wass, and CFRNET-MMD proposed in (Shalit, Johansson, and Sontag 2017), to multiple treatments. These models initially learn a shared representation of the given covariates and subsequently predict outcomes for all treatments using separate head networks. It is worth mentioning that these models are developed under the assumption of strong ignorability.

Now, we briefly present the settings considered in the experiments and the obtained results. We conduct experiments for various of number of treatments, K , such as 4, 8 and 16. As the hidden confounding bias increases with the increase of the parameter k_2 in equation (7), we study its behaviour by running experiments for various values of k_2 from $\{0.5, 1, 2\}$. We use 50 number of topics to train an LDA topic model on both the datasets separately for the calculation of centroids. We fine-tune the parameters of all our models, GCN-Wass, GCN-MMD and the baselines to achieve their best performances. For our proposed models, we use 3 GCN layers with 25 nodes each for the representation learning part and 2 Fully Connected (FC) layers with 10 nodes each for the counterfactual prediction of each treatment. For the baselines, we use 2 FC layers with 25 nodes each in the

representation stage and 2 FC layers with 25 nodes each for the counterfactual prediction. We employ a batch size of 512 and apply an $L2$ -regularizer with a weight of 0.01. We use a learning rate of 0.01 for all the models. We use the weights of loss functions, α and β , given in the equation (6) as 1 and 0.5 respectively. We choose the value of C as 5 in the equation (9). We repeat experiments for 10 iterations and report the mean and standard deviation values in the results given in Table 2-7. Note that we denote the best results using bold-face in the tables. From the results, we observe that our models outperform the baselines by a significant margins on both the datasets and on both the metrics $\sqrt{\epsilon_{PEHE}}$ and ϵ_{ATE} for all values of k_2 . Further, note that the gap in the performance of our models to the baselines increases as k_2 increases. This confirms that our models significantly improve in performance with the additional component of learning hidden confounders that is in tune with the findings of (Guo, Li, and Liu 2020) for the binary treatment setting.

Conclusion

We proposed and studied a challenging yet crucial problem: the estimation of ITEs under networked observational studies with multiple treatments. We utilized network information to mitigate hidden confounding bias, thereby enhancing the practical adherence to the strong ignorability assumption. Our approach used GCNs to construct more sophisticated neural network architectures suitable for ITE estimation. Our numerical results establish the superior performance of our models compared to the baselines. We conclude the work by highlighting a few promising directions for future research. While our work exclusively addresses stationary networks, real-world networks are often dynamic in nature. An intriguing avenue for future exploration involves extending ITE estimation techniques to evolving networks, including weighted and directional networks. Additionally, a particularly captivating yet formidable challenge for future research is advancing ITE estimations within this framework to accommodate continuous treatment dosage values.

References

- Cuturi, M.; and Doucet, A. 2014. Fast computation of Wasserstein barycenters. In *International conference on machine learning*, 685–693. PMLR.
- Gretton, A.; Borgwardt, K. M.; Rasch, M. J.; Schölkopf, B.; and Smola, A. 2012. A kernel two-sample test. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 13(1): 723–773.
- Guo, R.; Li, J.; and Liu, H. 2020. Learning individual causal effects from networked observational data. In *Proceedings of the 13th international conference on web search and data mining*, 232–240.
- Hill, J. L. 2011. Bayesian nonparametric modeling for causal inference. *Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics*, 20(1): 217–240.
- Johansson, F.; Shalit, U.; and Sontag, D. 2016. Learning representations for counterfactual inference. In *International conference on machine learning*, 3020–3029. PMLR.
- Kipf, T. N.; and Welling, M. 2016. Semi-supervised classification with graph convolutional networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1609.02907*.
- Pearl, J. 2017. Detecting Latent Heterogeneity. *Sociological Methods & Research*, 46(3): 370–389.
- Rubin, D. B. 2005. Causal inference using potential outcomes: Design, modeling, decisions. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 100(469): 322–331.
- Schwab, P.; Linhardt, L.; Bauer, S.; Buhmann, J. M.; and Karlen, W. 2020. Learning counterfactual representations for estimating individual dose-response curves. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 34, 5612–5619.
- Schwab, P.; Linhardt, L.; and Karlen, W. 2018. Perfect match: A simple method for learning representations for counterfactual inference with neural networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.00656*.
- Shalit, U.; Johansson, F. D.; and Sontag, D. 2017. Estimating individual treatment effect: generalization bounds and algorithms. In *International conference on machine learning*, 3076–3085. PMLR.
- Shpitser, I.; and Pearl, J. 2012. Identification of conditional interventional distributions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1206.6876*.
- Villani, C.; et al. 2009. *Optimal transport: old and new*, volume 338. Springer.
- Wager, S.; and Athey, S. 2018. Estimation and inference of heterogeneous treatment effects using random forests. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 113(523): 1228–1242.
- Wu, Z.; Pan, S.; Chen, F.; Long, G.; Zhang, C.; and Philip, S. Y. 2020. A comprehensive survey on graph neural networks. *IEEE transactions on neural networks and learning systems*, 32(1): 4–24.
- Yoon, J.; Jordon, J.; and Van Der Schaar, M. 2018. GANITE: Estimation of individualized treatment effects using generative adversarial nets. In *International conference on learning representations*.