

Sequential Validation of Treatment Heterogeneity

Stefan Wager
Stanford GSB

May 10, 2024

Abstract

We use the martingale construction of [Luedtke and van der Laan \[2016\]](#) to develop tests for the presence of treatment heterogeneity. The resulting sequential validation approach can be instantiated using various validation metrics, such as BLPs, GATES, QINI curves, etc., and provides an alternative to cross-validation-like cross-fold application of these metrics. This note was prepared as a comment on the Fisher–Schultz paper by [Chernozhukov, Demirer, Duflo and Fernández-Val](#), forthcoming in *Econometrica*.

1 Introduction

Consider a randomized controlled trial (RCT) on $i = 1, \dots, n$ units with potential outcomes $Y_i(0), Y_i(1)$, pre-treatment covariates Z_i , and a binary treatment $D_i \mid Y_i(0), Y_i(1), Z_i \sim \text{Bernoulli}(\pi)$. The analyst observes (Z_i, Y_i, D_i) where $Y_i = Y_i(D_i)$. As discussed by in the paper by [Chernozhukov, Demirer, Duflo, and Fernández-Val \[2024, henceforth CDDF\]](#), given data from an RCT it is often of interest to estimate and understand treatment heterogeneity, and to use knowledge of such heterogeneity to design treatment-assignment rules.

It is well understood that the conditional average treatment effect (CATE),

$$\tau(z) = \mathbb{E} \left[Y_i(1) - Y_i(0) \mid Z_i = z \right], \quad (1)$$

is a natural metric for quantifying treatment heterogeneity under the potential outcomes model [[Athey and Imbens, 2016](#), [Manski, 2004](#)]; furthermore, in an RCT, the CATE admits a number of simple identification formulas in terms of observables, e.g., $\tau(z) = \mathbb{E}[Y_i \mid Z_i = z, D_i = 1] - \mathbb{E}[Y_i \mid Z_i = z, D_i = 0]$. What’s less clear is how we should go about estimating the CATE. There’s been considerable recent interest in developing machine-learning based methods for CATE estimation [e.g., [Athey et al., 2019](#), [Künzel et al., 2019](#), [Hahn et al., 2020](#), [Foster and Syrgkanis, 2023](#)]. However, consistency of these methods relies on often hard-to-verify properties of the data-generating distribution, and the same is true of the fundamental statistical difficulty of the CATE estimation task [[Kennedy et al., 2022](#)].

Given the challenges in obtaining provably valid estimates of $\tau(z)$ without making regularity (e.g., smoothness) assumptions, CDDF recommend that applied researchers refrain from directly relying on theoretical consistency guarantees for non-parametric CATE estimators. Instead, they recommend that researchers first make a best effort to estimate $\hat{\tau}(\cdot)$ well (e.g., using a machine learning method), and then focus on evaluating how well the

estimated $\hat{\tau}(\cdot)$ captures the true treatment heterogeneity on held-out data. The main argument of CDDF is that such evaluation metrics allow for simple and transparent large-sample inference without making any smoothness assumptions on $\tau(\cdot)$.

I second this recommendation, and found CDDF to make a compelling case for it. When estimating the CATE one of course wants to try to be as accurate as possible. But then, when communicating results the transparency and credibility of any claimed inferences is key—and validating a proposed $\hat{\tau}(\cdot)$ estimate on a fresh evaluation dataset is a much simpler task (and thus allows for more robust inferential strategies) than trying to estimate $\tau(\cdot)$ itself. The incentives are also well aligned: If a researcher is able to start with a good estimate $\hat{\tau}(\cdot)$, then such diagnostic exercises will often yield interesting insights; whereas a researcher starting with a poor estimate $\hat{\tau}(\cdot)$ will simply find themselves unable to say anything at all about potential treatment heterogeneity.

CDDF propose interrogating the alignment of $\hat{\tau}(x)$ with the true $\tau(x)$ using metrics which they refer to as the BLP and GATES.¹ The BLP metric estimates the regression coefficient of the true CATE $\tau(Z_i)$ on estimates $\hat{\tau}(Z_i)$ (and a coefficient of 1 means that $\hat{\tau}(\cdot)$ is well calibrated); whereas the GATES metric estimates average treatment effects across subgroups defined by stratifying $\hat{\tau}(Z_i)$ on the evaluation set (and verifies whether subgroups with claimed larger treatment effects in fact do). Other relevant metrics that can be used for this task include the QINI curve from the marketing literature [Radcliffe, 2007], the area-under-the-curve measure of Zhao et al. [2013], and generalizations which Yadlowsky et al. [2021] refer to as rank-weighted average treatment effects (RATES).

All these methods can be used to produce test statistics that have expectation 0 when the estimates $\hat{\tau}(Z_i)$ are unaligned with any true treatment heterogeneity, and can be used to assess a null of no (explained) treatment heterogeneity. CDDF construct confidence intervals for both the BLP and GATES that hold under minimal assumptions (essentially the same assumptions needed to build confidence intervals for the average treatment effect); large-sample inference results for the QINI curve and its generalizations are available in Yadlowsky et al. [2021].

2 Cross-Fold Validation

One notable challenge with this approach—and a key focus of CDDF—is that in many applications we seek to both provide an estimate $\hat{\tau}(\cdot)$ and evaluate it, and that splitting the data into separate training and evaluation sets may be onerous. As such it is natural to explore cross-fold approaches. The usual cross-validation-like blueprint for cross-fold evaluation is as follows:

1. Randomly split the data into $k = 1, \dots, K$ evenly sized folds.
2. For each fold $k = 1, \dots, K$, obtain an estimate $\hat{\tau}^{(-k)}(\cdot)$ using the method of one’s choice applied to data from all but the k -th fold.
3. Evaluate CATE estimates $\hat{\tau}^{(-k)}(Z_i)$ for each observation i belonging to the k -th fold.

¹The authors also discuss the CLAN metric, but the focus of the CLAN is about describing the estimate $\hat{\tau}(x)$ rather than validating its alignment with $\tau(x)$. The main use of CLAN comes after we’ve already validated that $\hat{\tau}(x)$ captures real and meaningful heterogeneity—thus making a description of how this heterogeneity was captured relevant.

- Use these estimates, as well as the data from the k -th fold, to produce a test statistics T_k with the property that $T_k \Rightarrow \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ under the null hypothesis of no (explained) treatment heterogeneity.

One can leverage BLP, GATES, or other related metrics in step 4.

Now, given this setup, each of the T_k on its own can obviously be used to build a valid p -value against the null, $p_k = 2\Phi(-|T_k|)$, where $\Phi(t)$ denotes the standard normal distribution. In practice, however, only using one of the T_k may feel wasteful, and so it may be of interest to provide p -values that aggregate across all the T_k .

A first, naïve, approach to aggregation would be to treat the K test statistics as independent, and use

$$p_{naive} = 2\Phi\left(-\left|\frac{1}{\sqrt{K}}\sum_{k=1}^K T_k\right|\right). \quad (2)$$

This is, however, not valid, as the cross-fold construction doesn't imply independence of the T_k ; see the numerical experiment below for an example where these p -values do not achieve nominal rejection rates. From a statistical perspective, the failures of naïve aggregation become acute when there is no treatment heterogeneity to be found: In this regime, the estimates $\hat{\tau}^{(-k)}(\cdot)$ become highly responsive to the noise in the training folds, thus creating dependence between the T_k .²

What CDDF propose is to consider the median p -value instead:

$$p_{med} = \text{median}(p_k); \quad p_k = 2\Phi(-|T_k|). \quad (3)$$

Theorem 4.1 of CDDF establishes validity of this procedure under a median-concentration condition. The median aggregation approach is attractive in that it allows us to aggregate test statistics across folds while maintaining validity. However, this approach still may be seen as leaving information on the table. Each of the test statistics T_k is only computed using n/K samples and so (especially when K is large), any of the T_k on their own may not be particularly powerful. Ideally, one might hope that aggregation would allow us to pool information across folds to recover power comparable to a sample size of n as occurs with, e.g., cross-fitting methods for semiparametric inference [Chernozhukov et al., 2018, Schick, 1986]; however, with median-aggregation this is not the case.

Luedtke and van der Laan [2016] faced a similar challenge when studying inference for the value of the optimal treatment rule, and proposed addressing it using a martingale construction that goes through the folds in sequence and only uses data from past folds for estimation. In our setting, this construction can be adapted into the following sequential validation procedure:

- Randomly split the data into $k = 1, \dots, K$ evenly sized folds.
- For each fold $k = 2, \dots, K$, obtain an estimate $\hat{\tau}^{(1:(k-1))}(\cdot)$ using the method of one's choice applied to data from folds $1, \dots, k-1$.
- Evaluate estimates $\hat{\tau}^{(1:(k-1))}(Z_i)$ for each observation i belonging to the k -th fold.
- As before.

²The usual argument deployed by Chernozhukov et al. [2018] to justify cross-fitting does not hold here because these methods do not target a pathwise-differentiable parameter [Hirano and Porter, 2012].

Finally, we aggregate the p -values as with the naïve construction:

$$p_{seq} = 2\Phi \left(- \left| \frac{1}{\sqrt{K-1}} \sum_{k=2}^K T_k \right| \right) \quad (4)$$

This sequential construction is able to pool information across folds but, unlike the naïve method described above, is valid. The result below is adapted from [Luedtke and van der Laan \[2016\]](#); the proof hinges on noting that, under the assumptions made, the T_k (approximately) form a martingale difference sequence with predictable variance.

Proposition 1. *Suppose data from the K folds are independent of each other and that, for each $k = 2, \dots, K$, the test statistic T_k is valid under the null, i.e., $T_k \Rightarrow \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ conditionally on the provided estimates $\hat{\tau}^{(1:(k-1))}$. Then $p_{seq} \Rightarrow \text{Unif}([0, 1])$ under the null.*

3 A Numerical Experiment

To better understand power of different methods for aggregating test statistics, we consider a simple numerical evaluation on GATES with two-groups: Our test statistic is the difference in ATEs for the top- vs bottom-half of units as ordered by the estate $\hat{\tau}(Z_i)$. We instantiate the workflows described above as follows:

- We produce (training set) estimates $\hat{\tau}(\cdot)$ using causal forests as implemented in the R package `grf` of [Athey et al. \[2019\]](#).
- On the evaluation fold k , we produce groups $G_{k,1}$ and $G_{k,0}$ depending on whether or not $\hat{\tau}^{(-k)}(Z_i)$ (or $\hat{\tau}^{(1:(k-1))}(Z_i)$) is greater than its median value in that fold.
- We produce our test statistic via an estimate of the treatment effect contrast,

$$\hat{\delta}_k = \frac{\sum_{\{i:i \in G_{k,1}, D_i=1\}} Y_i}{|\{i : i \in G_{k,1}, D_i = 1\}|} - \frac{\sum_{\{i:i \in G_{k,1}, D_i=0\}} Y_i}{|\{i : i \in G_{k,1}, D_i = 0\}|} - \frac{\sum_{\{i:i \in G_{k,0}, D_i=1\}} Y_i}{|\{i : i \in G_{k,0}, D_i = 1\}|} + \frac{\sum_{\{i:i \in G_{k,0}, D_i=0\}} Y_i}{|\{i : i \in G_{k,0}, D_i = 0\}|}, \quad (5)$$

along with a standard error estimate $\hat{\sigma}_k$ obtained via the jackknife [[Efron, 1982](#)]; we use the implementation in the `sandwich` package of [Zeileis \[2004\]](#). The test statistic is $T_k = \hat{\delta}_k / \hat{\sigma}_k$.

- We use $K = 5$ folds.

We consider a simple RCT simulation with $n = 1,000$ units and $p = 10$ dimensional covariates. We generate $Z_i \sim \text{Unif}([-1, 1]^p)$, $Y_i(d) | Z_i \sim \mathcal{N}(d\tau(z), 1)$, and $D_i \sim \text{Bernoulli}(\pi = 0.5)$. We consider two settings for evaluation: One with $\tau(z) = 0$ (so the null holds), and one with $\tau(z) = (z_1)_+$ (so treatment heterogeneity exists and is relatively easy to find).

Results are shown in [Table 1](#). The first row shows rejection rates at a nominal 5% level under a setting where the null holds. We see that the naïve cross-fold aggregation method fails, and gets a 10% failure rate which is greater than the nominal 5% level. In contrast, both the median cross-fold aggregation and sequential validation methods are

| rejection rate | naïve | median | sequential |
|---------------------|--------------|--------|---------------|
| $\tau(z) = 0$ | <i>9.68%</i> | 0.16% | 5.21% |
| $\tau(z) = (z_1)_+$ | 83.40% | 21.14% | 65.52% |

Table 1: Rejection probabilities for different p -value constructions, with a 5% significance level. In the first row, the null hypothesis holds and so a rejection rate greater than 5% implies that the method is not valid; we denote this in italic. In the second row, we denote highest achieved rejection rate (i.e., power) among valid methods in bold. Results are aggregated across 10,000 simulation replications.

valid (median aggregation is conservative, while sequential validation is exact to within the precision of our simulation experiment). The second row shows power in a setting where treatment heterogeneity exists. Here, we see that the sequential validation method is much more powerful than median aggregation. The reason for the improved power of sequential validation is simple: For example, if all the $\hat{\delta}_k$ are positive but none of the T_k reaches significance on its own, then the sequential validation can take this shared directionality into account whereas median aggregation cannot.

4 Closing Remarks

CDDF highlight the importance of robust and transparent validation tests for treatment heterogeneity, and discuss a number of nice options. This is a good recommendation, and I hope the CDDF paper will help promote the use of such tests. One seemingly esoteric and technical—yet in practice important—consideration is how to develop in-sample validation tests that allow for both estimating $\hat{\tau}(\cdot)$ and validating it withing the same sample. Simple cross-fold aggregation, i.e., the naïve method, is not valid here. CDDF propose median aggregation, which recovers validity at the cost of lower power. Here, we argued that sequential validation appears more powerful than median aggregation, all while retaining validity. Understanding optimal performance for in-sample validation of treatment heterogeneity—and developing practical methods that achieve such performance—seems like a promising goal for future work.

Acknowledgment

I am grateful for many enlightening conversations with Susan Athey and Erik Sverdrup on how best to estimate and validate heterogeneous treatment effects in practice, and to Gene Katsevich for asking a very interesting question. This research was supported by NSF grant SES-2242876.

References

- Susan Athey and Guido W Imbens. Recursive partitioning for heterogeneous causal effects. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 113(27):7353–7360, 2016.
- Susan Athey, Julie Tibshirani, and Stefan Wager. Generalized random forests. *The Annals of Statistics*, 47(2):1148–1178, 2019.

- Victor Chernozhukov, Denis Chetverikov, Mert Demirer, Esther Duflo, Christian Hansen, Whitney Newey, and James Robins. Double/debiased machine learning for treatment and structural parameters. *The Econometrics Journal*, 21(1):1–68, 2018.
- Victor Chernozhukov, Mert Demirer, Esther Duflo, and Iván Fernández-Val. Fisher–Schultz lecture: Generic machine learning inference on heterogeneous treatment effects in randomized experiments, with an application to immunization in India. *Econometrica*, forthcoming, 2024.
- Bradley Efron. *The Jackknife, the Bootstrap, and other Resampling Plans*. Siam, 1982.
- Dylan J Foster and Vasilis Syrgkanis. Orthogonal statistical learning. *The Annals of Statistics*, 51(3):879–908, 2023.
- P Richard Hahn, Jared S Murray, and Carlos M Carvalho. Bayesian regression tree models for causal inference: Regularization, confounding, and heterogeneous effects. *Bayesian Analysis*, 15(3):965–1056, 2020.
- Keisuke Hirano and Jack R Porter. Impossibility results for nondifferentiable functionals. *Econometrica*, 80(4):1769–1790, 2012.
- Edward H Kennedy, Sivaraman Balakrishnan, and Larry Wasserman. Minimax rates for heterogeneous causal effect estimation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2203.00837*, 2022.
- Sören R Künzel, Jasjeet S Sekhon, Peter J Bickel, and Bin Yu. Metalearners for estimating heterogeneous treatment effects using machine learning. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 116(10):4156–4165, 2019.
- Alexander R Luedtke and Mark J van der Laan. Statistical inference for the mean outcome under a possibly non-unique optimal treatment strategy. *The Annals of Statistics*, 44(2):713, 2016.
- Charles F Manski. Statistical treatment rules for heterogeneous populations. *Econometrica*, 72(4):1221–1246, 2004.
- Nicholas Radcliffe. Using control groups to target on predicted lift: Building and assessing uplift model. *Direct Marketing Analytics Journal*, pages 14–21, 2007.
- Anton Schick. On asymptotically efficient estimation in semiparametric models. *The Annals of Statistics*, 14(3):1139–1151, 1986.
- Steve Yadlowsky, Scott Fleming, Nigam Shah, Emma Brunskill, and Stefan Wager. Evaluating treatment prioritization rules via rank-weighted average treatment effects. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2111.07966*, 2021.
- Achim Zeileis. Econometric computing with HC and HAC covariance matrix estimators. *Journal of Statistical Software*, 11(i10), 2004.
- Lihui Zhao, Lu Tian, Tianxi Cai, Brian Claggett, and Lee-Jen Wei. Effectively selecting a target population for a future comparative study. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 108(502):527–539, 2013.