

# Marginal Treatment Effects and Monotonicity

Henrik Sigstad\*

April 5, 2024

## Abstract

How robust are analyses based on marginal treatment effects (MTE) to violations of [Imbens & Angrist \(1994\)](#) monotonicity? In this note, I present weaker forms of monotonicity under which popular MTE-based estimands still identify the parameters of interest.

## 1 Introduction

Marginal treatment effects (MTE), introduced by [Björklund & Moffitt \(1987\)](#) and generalized by [Heckman & Vytlacil \(1999, 2005\)](#), provide a unified way of estimating various treatment effects with continuous instruments. For instance, MTE analysis can be used to identify the average treatment effect, the average treatment effect on the treated and the untreated, and other policy-relevant treatment effects. In contrast, with a continuous instrument, two-stage least squares identifies a convex combination of treatment effects that is not necessarily of policy interest ([Heckman & Vytlacil, 2007b](#)). MTE analysis, however, relies on [Imbens & Angrist \(1994\)](#) monotonicity—often a strong assumption. For instance, in the context of judge IV designs, [Imbens & Angrist \(1994\)](#) monotonicity requires that each judge is weakly stricter than more lenient judges *in each case*. Thus, if Judge A is stricter than Judge B in one case, Judge A can not be more lenient than Judge B in another case. As shown in [Sigstad \(2024\)](#), this assumption is frequently violated among judges.

---

\*BI Norwegian Business School, Department of Economics (e-mail: [henrik.sigstad@bi.no](mailto:henrik.sigstad@bi.no)). Thanks to Magne Mogstad and Vitor Possebom.

It is thus important to understand how MTE-based treatment effect estimates are affected by monotonicity violations. In this note, I derive necessary and sufficient monotonicity conditions for MTE-based estimates of popular treatment effects to identify the parameters of interest. Fortunately, it turns out that even when Imbens-Angrist monotonicity is violated, MTE-based estimates of these parameters might still be consistent. I first consider MTE-based estimates of LATE—the average treatment effect for agents affected by the instrument. The necessary and sufficient condition for MTE analysis to identify LATE is that monotonicity holds between the two most extreme instrument values. For instance, in the random-judge design, this condition requires that the strictest judge is always stricter than the most lenient judge. As shown in [Sigstad \(2024\)](#), this condition is much more plausible in random-judge designs than [Imbens & Angrist \(1994\)](#) monotonicity. Thus, even though conventional MTE analysis assumes Imbens-Angrist monotonicity, MTE-based LATE estimates can be highly robust to plausible levels of monotonicity violations.

Next, I consider estimates of the average treatment effect on the treated (ATT) and the untreated (ATUT) for the complier population. MTE-based ATT (ATUT) estimates are consistent as long as Imbens-Angrist monotonicity holds for all pairs of instrument values involving the lowest (highest) instrument value. For instance, in the random-judge design, these conditions require that the most lenient (stringent) judge is most lenient (stringent) in all cases. These conditions are more demanding than the condition required to estimate LATE. Estimates of ATT and ATUT are thus more sensitive to monotonicity violations.

I also consider MTE-based estimates of the average treatment effect (ATE), which require extrapolation beyond the observed instrument values. As long as this extrapolation is well specified, MTE-based ATE estimates are consistent without any monotonicity assumption. Such estimates are equivalent to the [Arnold \*et al.\* \(2021\)](#) approach to estimating average treatment effects. Finally, I consider the use of MTEs to assess heterogeneous treatment effects by treatment propensity. As long as attention is limited to aggregate properties of the MTE curve, this practice also requires only mild monotonicity assumptions.

While these analyses show that MTE-based estimators are relatively robust to monotonicity violations, the intermediate step of estimating marginal treatment effects is not a meaningful exercise when monotonicity is violated. Instead, I propose to directly estimate the relevant treatment parameters without first estimating an “MTE

curve”. I show that whenever MTE analysis identifies LATE, LATE is identified by a standard Wald estimand: the difference in average outcomes between agents receiving the highest instrument value and agents receiving the lowest instrument value divided by the difference in treatment propensities. Similar results are obtained for the average treatment effects on the treated and on the untreated for the complier population. There are several reasons to prefer such a direct estimation of treatment parameters over MTE-based estimation when monotonicity is violated. First, the direct estimation is more honest and clarifies the necessary identification assumptions. Second, the direct estimates can easily be estimated non-parametrically and do not require a fully continuous instrument. Finally, by targeting a specific parameter rather than the full MTE curve, the parameter can be more precisely estimated.

## 2 Marginal Treatment Effects and Monotonicity

Fix a probability space with the outcome corresponding to a randomly drawn agent. Define the following random variables: A binary treatment  $D \in \{0, 1\}$ , an outcome  $Y \in \mathbb{R}$ , and a continuous instrument  $Z \in \mathbb{R}$  with support  $[\underline{z}, \bar{z}]$ . To capture the idea that different agents might be induced into treatment in different ways by the instrument, define a *response type* as a mapping  $s : [\underline{z}, \bar{z}] \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$  from instrument values to treatments.<sup>1</sup> Denote by the random variable  $S$  the response type of the randomly drawn agent. If  $S = s$  for agent  $i$ , then  $s(z) = 1$  indicates that agent  $i$  will receive the treatment if  $Z$  is set to  $z$ . Denote by  $\mathcal{S}$  the set of all response types in the population. Define  $Y(0)$  and  $Y(1)$  as the *potential outcomes* when  $D$  is set to 0 and 1, respectively. Denote by the random variable  $\beta \equiv Y(1) - Y(0)$  the treatment effect of agent  $i$ . Let  $p(z) \equiv \mathbb{E}[S(z)]$  be the share of agents receiving treatment at  $Z = z$ . I assume the following throughout

**Assumption 1.** (*Exogeneity and Exclusion*).  $\{Y(0), Y(1), S\} \perp Z$

**Assumption 2.** (*First stage*). The propensity  $p(z)$  is non-trivial function of  $z$ .

To simplify the notation, assume (without loss of generality) that the instrument values are labeled such that

**Assumption 3.**  $p(z) = z$ .

---

<sup>1</sup>Response types were introduced by Heckman & Pinto (2018).

Imbens & Angrist (1994) monotonicity is then defined by

**Definition 1** (Imbens-Angrist Monotonicity). For all  $z, z' \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $s \in \mathcal{S}$

$$z \geq z' \Rightarrow s(z) \geq s(z')$$

Marginal treatment effects were introduced by Björklund & Moffitt (1987) and generalized by Heckman & Vytlacil (1999).<sup>2</sup> In applied work (*e.g.*, Arnold *et al.* 2018; Bhuller *et al.* 2020), marginal treatment effect analysis relies on a generalized Roy (1951) selection model

$$D = \mathbf{1}[Z > U]$$

where  $U$  is a random variable.<sup>3</sup> The agent receives treatment if the instrument is above the agent's unobserved *resistance to treatment*  $U$ . This model implicitly assumes Imbens-Angrist monotonicity.<sup>4</sup> A *marginal treatment effect* is then defined as the average treatment effect for agents with a given treatment propensity:

$$\text{MTE}(u) = \text{E}[\beta \mid U = u]$$

Marginal treatment effects can then be identified using the local instrumental variable approach (Heckman & Vytlacil, 1999, 2005):

$$\text{LIV}(u) \equiv \frac{d\text{E}[Y \mid Z = u]}{du}$$

Assume this derivative exists. Under Imbens-Angrist monotonicity, we have  $\text{LIV}(u) = \text{MTE}(u)$ . But  $\text{LIV}(u)$  is defined even when Imbens-Angrist monotonicity does not hold.

The applied literature uses MTE analysis for two purposes. First, to estimate meaningful treatment parameters such as LATE and ATE (*e.g.*, Arnold *et al.* 2018; Bhuller *et al.* 2020). Second, to assess heterogeneous treatment effects based on the treatment propensity  $U$  by directly inspecting  $\text{LIV}(u)$  (*e.g.*, Doyle Jr 2007; Maestas *et al.* 2013; French & Song 2014).

---

<sup>2</sup>See Heckman & Vytlacil (2007b).

<sup>3</sup>See Heckman & Vytlacil (2007a,b). To simplify the exposition, I disregard covariates.

<sup>4</sup>Consider two instrument values  $z_1 \geq z_2$ . Then  $D(z_2) \geq D(z_1)$  for all agents.

## 2.1 Using MTE to Identify Meaningful Treatment Parameters

Heckman & Vytlacil (1999, 2005) showed that many popular treatment parameters—including the average treatment effect (ATE)—can be identified by a weighted average of marginal treatment effects. MTE analysis can thus be used to identify more meaningful treatment parameters than the weighted average of individual treatment effects produced by 2SLS. Identifying ATEs using MTE analysis, however, requires full support of  $Z$  in  $[0, 1]$  or extrapolation beyond the support of  $Z$ . Since  $Z$  typically does not have full support in practice, the literature instead normally seeks to estimate the local average treatment effect (LATE) for agents receiving treatment when  $Z = \bar{z}$  and not when  $Z = \underline{z}$ —agents with  $D(\underline{z}) < D(\bar{z})$ . This parameter differs from the 2SLS estimand by placing equal weight on all compliers. The literature (*e.g.*, Bhuller *et al.* 2020) has also considered the average treatment effect on the treated and the average treatment effect on the untreated for the same population. Since these treatment effects are “local”—defined on the complier population—I label them LATT and LATUT, respectively. Formally, define

$$\begin{aligned}\text{LATE} &\equiv \text{E}[\beta \mid S(\underline{z}) = 0, S(\bar{z}) = 1] \\ \text{LATT} &\equiv \text{E}[\beta \mid S(\underline{z}) = 0, D = 1] \\ \text{LATUT} &\equiv \text{E}[\beta \mid S(\bar{z}) = 1, D = 0]\end{aligned}$$

The LATE parameter is the local average treatment effect for agents receiving treatment under the highest instrument value but not under the lowest instrument value. The LATT and LATUT parameters are the (local) average treatment effects on the treated and the untreated for a similar complier population.<sup>5</sup> As shown by Heckman & Vytlacil (1999, 2005), these parameters are identified under Imbens-

---

<sup>5</sup>The LATT and LATUT complier population includes all agents except never-takers and always-takers. The LATE complier population also ignores, for instance, response types receiving treatment under some intermediate instrument values but not by the highest nor the lowest instrument value. I do not see a way to identify a local average treatment effect that covers also such compliers.

Angrist monotonicity by:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{L}\tilde{\text{A}}\text{TE} &\equiv \frac{1}{\bar{z} - \underline{z}} \int_{\underline{z}}^{\bar{z}} \text{LIV}(u) du \\ \text{L}\tilde{\text{A}}\text{TT} &\equiv \frac{1}{\text{E}[Z] - \underline{z}} \int_{\underline{z}}^{\bar{z}} \Pr[Z > u] \text{LIV}(u) du \\ \text{L}\tilde{\text{A}}\text{TUT} &\equiv \frac{1}{\bar{z} - \text{E}[Z]} \int_{\underline{z}}^{\bar{z}} \Pr[Z < u] \text{LIV}(u) du \end{aligned}$$

When Imbens-Angrist monotonicity is violated, however, this method might lead to wrong conclusions. How sensitive are these estimands to monotonicity violations? Fortunately, it turns out that MTE analysis might still identify LATE, LATT, and LATUT even when Imbens-Angrist monotonicity is violated.

Formally, let  $\mathcal{G}$  be the set of all possible joint distributions of  $(Y(1), Y(0), S)$ . To allow for arbitrary heterogeneous effects, we do not want to place any restrictions on this joint distribution. The necessary and sufficient conditions for  $\text{L}\tilde{\text{A}}\text{TE}$ ,  $\text{L}\tilde{\text{A}}\text{TT}$ ,  $\text{L}\tilde{\text{A}}\text{TUT}$  to be consistent under arbitrary heterogeneous effects are the following much weaker monotonicity conditions:

**Theorem 1.** (*Identification results*).

- i)  $\text{L}\tilde{\text{A}}\text{TE} = \text{LATE}$  for all  $g \in \mathcal{G}$  if and only if  $s(\bar{z}) \geq s(\underline{z})$  for all  $s \in \mathcal{S}$ .
- ii)  $\text{L}\tilde{\text{A}}\text{TT} = \text{LATT}$  for all  $g \in \mathcal{G}$  if and only if  $s(z) \geq s(\underline{z})$  for all  $s \in \mathcal{S}$  and  $z$ .
- iii)  $\text{L}\tilde{\text{A}}\text{TUT} = \text{LATUT}$  for all  $g \in \mathcal{G}$  if and only if  $s(\bar{z}) \geq s(z)$  for all  $s \in \mathcal{S}$  and  $z$ .

Thus, for MTE analysis to identify LATE, it is sufficient that monotonicity holds between the lowest and the highest instrument value. This condition is substantially weaker than Imbens-Angrist monotonicity, especially when there are many possible instrument values. Similarly, LATT is identified by MTE analysis whenever monotonicity holds for all instrument value pairs that involve the lowest instrument value. This condition is stronger than LATE condition but still considerably weaker than Imbens-Angrist monotonicity—monotonicity is allowed to be violated for all instrument value pairs that do not include the lowest instrument value. For MTE analysis to identify LATUT, on the other hand, monotonicity must hold for all instrument value pairs that involve the *highest* instrument value.

## 2.2 Estimating ATE by Extrapolating the MTE curve

When  $f(u) \equiv E[Y | Z = u]$  is estimated parametrically, one might seek to extrapolate beyond the support of  $Z$  to estimate the average treatment effect,  $ATE \equiv E[\beta]$ . In particular, let  $\hat{f} : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be an extrapolation of  $f$  that covers the full interval  $[0, 1]$ . The corresponding MTE curve is defined by  $\hat{LIV}(u) \equiv \hat{f}'(u)$ . One can then estimate ATE by

$$A\tilde{T}E \equiv \int_0^1 \hat{LIV}(u) du$$

How do monotonicity violations influence such analysis? By the fundamental theorem of calculus,  $A\tilde{T}E = \hat{f}(1) - \hat{f}(0)$ . If the extrapolation is well specified,  $\hat{f}(1)$  can be thought of as the average outcome for agents in the hypothetical case of receiving  $Z = 1$ .<sup>6</sup> In that case,  $\hat{f}(1) = E[Y(1)]$ . Similarly,  $\hat{f}(0)$  can be thought of as the average outcome for agents had they been assigned  $Z = 0$  which gives  $\hat{f}(0) = E[Y(0)]$ . We thus get that  $A\tilde{T}E = E[Y(1) - Y(0)] = ATE$  if the extrapolation is well specified— $\hat{f}$  is able to identify the average outcome for agents in the hypothetical cases of receiving  $Z = 1$  and  $Z = 0$ . Formally

**Proposition 1.**  $A\tilde{T}E = ATE$  if  $\hat{f}(1) = E[Y(1)]$  and  $\hat{f}(0) = E[Y(0)]$ .

The MTE-based estimator of ATE is equivalent to the estimator proposed by [Arnold \*et al.\* \(2021\)](#), who extrapolate towards a supremely lenient judge to estimate the ATE of pre-trial release on pre-trial misconduct in a judge IV setting. As pointed out by [Arnold \*et al.\* \(2021\)](#), this approach does not require any monotonicity assumptions. Thus, monotonicity violations do not affect the validity of this approach.

## 2.3 Using MTE to Analyze Heterogeneous Effects

The literature also uses the MTE framework to assess heterogeneous treatment effects based on the treatment propensity  $U$  by directly inspecting  $LIV(u)$ —the “MTE curve” (*e.g.*, [Doyle Jr 2007](#); [Maestas \*et al.\* 2013](#); [French & Song 2014](#)). But  $LIV(u)$  is difficult to interpret when Imbens-Angrist monotonicity is violated. To see this, it is instructive to consider  $LIV(u)$  as the limit of a standard Wald estimand:

$$LIV(u) = \lim_{v \rightarrow u} L\tilde{A}TE_{u,v}$$

---

<sup>6</sup>In the context of the judge IV design, it would correspond to the average outcomes for defendants randomly assigned a hypothetical supremely stringent judge that always incarcerates.

where

$$\text{L}\tilde{\text{A}}\text{T}\tilde{\text{E}}_{u,v} \equiv \frac{\text{E}[Y | Z = u] - \text{E}[Y | Z = v]}{u - v}$$

Under Imbens-Angrist monotonicity,  $\text{L}\tilde{\text{A}}\text{T}\tilde{\text{E}}_{u,v}$  identifies

$$\text{LATE}_{u,v} \equiv \text{E}[\beta | D(u) > D(v)]$$

the local average treatment effect for cases where receiving treatment at  $Z = u$  but not at  $Z = v$ . As  $v$  approaches  $u$ , however, Imbens-Angrist monotonicity between  $v$  and  $u$  might be unlikely.<sup>7</sup> Individual points of the MTE curve are then hard to interpret. But looking at more aggregate properties of the MTE curve could still be meaningful. For instance, the average of  $\text{LIV}(u)$  across a range  $u \in [\underline{u}, \bar{u}]$  identifies LATE for agents receiving treatment at  $Z = \bar{u}$  but not at  $Z = \underline{u}$  when monotonicity holds between these instrument values:

**Proposition 2.**

$$\text{E}[\text{LIV}(U) | \underline{u} \leq U \leq \bar{u}] = \text{LATE}_{\underline{u}, \bar{u}}$$

for all  $g \in \mathcal{G}$  if and only if  $s(\bar{u}) \geq s(\underline{u})$  for all  $s \in \mathcal{S}$ .

As  $\bar{u}$  and  $\underline{u}$  become more distant, monotonicity between these two values typically becomes more plausible.<sup>8</sup>

## 2.4 Identifying Meaningful Treatment Effects without MTE

While MTE analysis gives correct results under weaker assumptions than Imbens-Angrist monotonicity, the “MTE curve”  $\text{LIV}(u)$  is not a meaningful object when monotonicity is violated. A more honest approach is to estimate aggregate treatment effects directly, without first estimating an MTE curve. The following results show how LATE, LATT, and LATUT can be directly identified without first estimating  $\text{LIV}(u)$ .

**Theorem 2.** (*Identifying meaningful treatment effects without MTE analysis*).

i)  $\text{LATE} = \frac{\text{E}[Y|Z=\bar{z}] - \text{E}[Y|Z=\underline{z}]}{\bar{z} - \underline{z}}$  if  $s(\bar{z}) \geq s(\underline{z})$  for all  $s \in \mathcal{S}$ .

<sup>7</sup>In the context of judges, Imbens-Angrist monotonicity is less likely for judge pairs with similar stringencies than for judge pairs with more different stringencies (Sigstad, 2024).

<sup>8</sup>This is at least true for the random-judge design (Sigstad, 2024).



ii)  $LATT = \frac{E[Y] - E[Y|Z=\underline{z}]}{E[Z] - \underline{z}}$  if  $s(z) \geq s(\underline{z})$  for all  $s \in \mathcal{S}$  and  $z$ .

iii)  $LATUT = \frac{E[Y|Z=\bar{z}] - E[Y]}{\bar{z} - E[Z]}$  if  $s(\bar{z}) \geq s(z)$  for all  $s \in \mathcal{S}$  and  $z$ .

iv)  $LATE_{z_1, z_2} = \frac{E[Y|Z=z_1] - E[Y|Z=z_2]}{z_1 - z_2}$  if  $s(z_1) \geq s(z_2)$  for all  $s \in \mathcal{S}$ .

In particular, LATE is identified by the standard Wald estimand of the effect of receiving the highest instrument value compared to receiving the lowest instrument value.<sup>9</sup> Furthermore, LATT and LATUT are identified by the difference between the mean outcome and the expected outcomes for agents receiving the lowest and highest instrument values, respectively. The only parameters that need to be estimated are thus  $\bar{z}$ ,  $\underline{z}$ ,  $E[Y | Z = \underline{z}]$  and  $E[Y | Z = \bar{z}]$ . There are two advantages of this approach. First, it is not needed to estimate a full MTE curve. Estimating an MTE curve is difficult in practice due to data limitations and typically requires parametric assumptions. When the aim is to estimate only  $E[Y | Z = \underline{z}]$  and  $E[Y | Z = \bar{z}]$  instead of the full MTE curve, one can do this non-parametrically.<sup>10</sup> Second, the results above are valid also for discrete instruments when MTE analysis is not applicable.<sup>11</sup>

### 3 Conclusions

Marginal treatment effects can be used to estimate more meaningful treatment parameters than two-stage least squares but require Imbens-Angrist monotonicity. In this note, I have presented conditions under which MTE-based estimates still identify the parameters of interest when Imbens-Angrist monotonicity is violated. I also showed how the same parameters can be identified without relying on the MTE framework. I leave questions of estimation for future work.

---

<sup>9</sup>A similar estimand is discussed by Frölich (2007) (Theorem 8).

<sup>10</sup>For instance, one can directly estimate  $E[Y | Z = \bar{z}]$  using the sample analog, or one can estimate it using a local linear regression (with, *e.g.*, a triangular kernel) on a sample of the highest instrument values. Note that such LATE estimates (obtained either through MTE analysis or the Wald approach) essentially ignore agents receiving medium instrument values. These estimates will thus typically be less precise than 2SLS estimates which exploit all instrument values. Also, note that in finite samples, the sample analog of  $\bar{z} - \underline{z}$  will be upward biased. For instance, even if all instrument values have the same treatment propensity ( $\bar{z} = \underline{z}$ ), the sample analog of  $\bar{z} - \underline{z}$  will still be positive. To avoid this bias, one could use a split-sample approach: Estimate which instrument values are associated with the highest and lowest treatment propensities in one sample and estimate the treatment propensities associated with these instrument values in another sample. I leave a thorough discussion of inference to future research.

<sup>11</sup>For instance, applying MTE-analysis in the judge IV setting formally requires a continuum of judges.

## References

- ARNOLD, DAVID, DOBBIE, WILL, & YANG, CRYSTAL S. 2018. Racial Bias in Bail Decisions. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, **133**(4), 1885–1932.
- ARNOLD, DAVID, DOBBIE, WILL, & HULL, PETER. 2021. Measuring racial discrimination in algorithms. *Pages 49–54 of: AEA Papers and Proceedings*, vol. 111.
- BHULLER, MANUDEEP, DAHL, GORDON B, LØKEN, KATRINE V, & MOGSTAD, MAGNE. 2020. Incarceration, recidivism, and employment. *Journal of Political Economy*, **128**(4), 1269–1324.
- BJÖRKLUND, ANDERS, & MOFFITT, ROBERT. 1987. The estimation of wage gains and welfare gains in self-selection models. *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, 42–49.
- DOYLE JR, JOSEPH J. 2007. Child protection and child outcomes: Measuring the effects of foster care. *American Economic Review*, **97**(5), 1583–1610.
- FRENCH, ERIC, & SONG, JAE. 2014. The effect of disability insurance receipt on labor supply. *American Economic Journal: Economic Policy*, **6**(2), 291–337.
- FRÖLICH, MARKUS. 2007. Nonparametric IV estimation of local average treatment effects with covariates. *Journal of Econometrics*, **139**(1), 35–75.
- HECKMAN, JAMES J, & PINTO, RODRIGO. 2018. Unordered monotonicity. *Econometrica*, **86**(1), 1–35.
- HECKMAN, JAMES J, & VYTLACIL, EDWARD. 2005. Structural equations, treatment effects, and econometric policy evaluation 1. *Econometrica*, **73**(3), 669–738.
- HECKMAN, JAMES J, & VYTLACIL, EDWARD J. 1999. Local instrumental variables and latent variable models for identifying and bounding treatment effects. *Proceedings of the national Academy of Sciences*, **96**(8), 4730–4734.
- HECKMAN, JAMES J, & VYTLACIL, EDWARD J. 2007a. Econometric evaluation of social programs, part I: Causal models, structural models and econometric policy evaluation. *Handbook of econometrics*, **6**, 4779–4874.
- HECKMAN, JAMES J, & VYTLACIL, EDWARD J. 2007b. Econometric evaluation of social programs, part II: Using the marginal treatment effect to organize alternative econometric estimators to evaluate social programs, and to forecast their effects in new environments. *Handbook of econometrics*, **6**, 4875–5143.

- IMBENS, GUIDO W., & ANGRIST, JOSHUA D. 1994. Identification and Estimation of Local Average Treatment Effects. *Econometrica*, **62**(2), 467–475.
- MAESTAS, NICOLE, MULLEN, KATHLEEN J., & STRAND, ALEXANDER. 2013. Does disability insurance receipt discourage work? Using examiner assignment to estimate causal effects of SSDI receipt. *American economic review*, **103**(5), 1797–1829.
- ROY, ANDREW DONALD. 1951. Some thoughts on the distribution of earnings. *Oxford economic papers*, **3**(2), 135–146.
- SIGSTAD, HENRIK. 2024. Monotonicity among judges: Evidence from judicial panels and consequences for judge IV designs. *Available at SSRN 4534809*.

## A Proofs

*Proof.* (Theorem 1.) *Part i).*

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{L\AA\Tilde{E}} &= \frac{1}{\bar{z} - \underline{z}} \int_{\underline{z}}^{\bar{z}} \frac{d\mathbb{E}[Y \mid Z = u]}{du} du \\
&= \frac{1}{\bar{z} - \underline{z}} (\mathbb{E}[Y \mid Z = \bar{z}] - \mathbb{E}[Y \mid Z = \underline{z}]) \\
&= \frac{1}{\bar{z} - \underline{z}} (\mathbb{E}[DY(1) + (1 - D)Y(0) \mid Z = \bar{z}] - \mathbb{E}[DY(1) - (1 - D)Y(0) \mid Z = \underline{z}]) \\
&= \frac{\Pr[D(\bar{z}) > D(\underline{z})]}{\bar{z} - \underline{z}} \mathbb{E}[Y(1) - Y(0) \mid D(\bar{z}) > D(\underline{z})] \\
&\quad - \frac{\Pr[D(\bar{z}) < D(\underline{z})]}{\bar{z} - \underline{z}} \mathbb{E}[Y(1) - Y(0) \mid D(\bar{z}) < D(\underline{z})]
\end{aligned}$$

The first equality invokes the fundamental theorem of calculus and the fourth equality uses Assumption 1. This expression equals LATE for all  $g \in \mathcal{G}$  if and only if  $\Pr[D(\bar{z}) < D(\underline{z})] = 0$ .

*Part ii).* Let  $f(u)$  denote the density of  $Z$  at  $u$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{L\AA\Tilde{T}} &= \frac{1}{\mathbb{E}[Z] - \underline{z}} \int_{\underline{z}}^{\bar{z}} \Pr[Z > u] \frac{d\mathbb{E}[Y \mid Z = u]}{du} du \\
&= \frac{1}{\mathbb{E}[Z] - \underline{z}} \int_{\underline{z}}^{\bar{z}} (\mathbb{E}[Y \mid Z = u] - \mathbb{E}[Y \mid Z = \underline{z}]) f(u) du \\
&= \frac{1}{\mathbb{E}[Z] - \underline{z}} (\mathbb{E}[Y] - \mathbb{E}[Y \mid Z = \underline{z}]) \\
&= \frac{1}{\mathbb{E}[Z] - \underline{z}} \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[Y \mid S] - \mathbb{E}[Y \mid Z = \underline{z}, S]] \\
&= \frac{1}{\mathbb{E}[Z] - \underline{z}} \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[DY(1) + (1 - D)Y(0) \mid S] - \mathbb{E}[Y \mid Z = \underline{z}, S]] \\
&= \frac{1}{\mathbb{E}[Z] - \underline{z}} \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[D \mid S] \mathbb{E}[Y(1) \mid S] + (1 - \mathbb{E}[D \mid S]) \mathbb{E}[Y(0) \mid S] - \mathbb{E}[Y \mid Z = \underline{z}, S]] \\
&= \frac{1}{\mathbb{E}[Z] - \underline{z}} \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[D \mid S] \mathbb{E}[Y(1) - Y(0) \mid S] + \mathbb{E}[Y(0) \mid S] - \mathbb{E}[Y \mid Z = \underline{z}, S]]
\end{aligned}$$

The second equality uses that both integrals represent the area between the curve  $\mathbb{E}[Y \mid Z = u]$  and  $\mathbb{E}[Y \mid Z = \underline{z}]$  (weighted by the density  $f$ ). The fourth equality uses the law of iterated expectations, and the sixth equality invokes Assumption 1.

For this to equal

$$\begin{aligned} \text{LATT} &= \text{E}[Y(1) - Y(0) \mid D(\underline{z}) < D(\bar{z}), D = 1] \\ &= \frac{1}{\text{E}[D \mid D(\underline{z}) < D(\bar{z})]} \text{E}[D(Y(1) - Y(0)) \mid D(\underline{z}) < D(\bar{z})] \end{aligned}$$

for all  $g \in \mathcal{G}$ , we need that for each  $s \in \mathcal{S}$ , either  $s(\underline{z}) = 0$  or  $\text{E}[D \mid S = s] = 1$ .<sup>12</sup> In other words, we need  $D(z) \geq D(\underline{z})$  for all  $z$ . The proof of part iii) is analogous to part ii).  $\square$

*Proof.* (Theorem 2.) This follows from the proof of Theorem 1.  $\square$

*Proof.* (Proposition 2.)

$$\begin{aligned} \text{E}[\text{LIV}(U) \mid \underline{u} \leq U \leq \bar{u}] &= \frac{1}{\bar{u} - \underline{u}} \int_{\underline{u}}^{\bar{u}} \text{LIV}(u) du \\ &= \frac{\text{E}[Y \mid Z = \bar{u}] - \text{E}[Y \mid Z = \underline{u}]}{\bar{u} - \underline{u}} \end{aligned}$$

The latter Wald estimand identifies  $\text{LATE}_{\underline{u}, \bar{u}}$  for all  $g \in \mathcal{G}$  if and only if there are no “defiers”,  $\text{Pr}[D(\underline{u}) > D(\bar{u})] = 0$ .  $\square$

---

<sup>12</sup>If  $\text{E}[D \mid S = s] < 1$  and  $s(\underline{z}) = 1$  for a response type  $s \in \mathcal{S}$ ,  $\tilde{\text{LATT}}$  will—unlike LATT—place a negative weight on  $\text{E}[Y(1) - Y(0) \mid S = s]$ . It is straightforward to check that the expressions for LATT and  $\tilde{\text{LATT}}$  coincide when either  $s(\underline{z}) = 0$  or  $\text{E}[D \mid S = s] = 1$  for all  $s \in \mathcal{S}$ .