

# Orthogonal Causal Calibration

Justin Whitehouse<sup>2</sup>, Christopher Jung<sup>1</sup>, Vasilis Syrgkanis<sup>1</sup>, Bryan Wilder<sup>2</sup>,  
and Zhiwei Steven Wu<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Stanford University

<sup>2</sup>Carnegie Mellon University

June 5, 2024

## Abstract

Estimates of causal parameters such as conditional average treatment effects (CATEs) and conditional quantile treatment effects (CQTEs) play an important role in real-world decision making. Given this importance, one should ensure these estimators are calibrated. While there is a rich literature on calibrating estimators of non-causal parameters, very few methods have been derived for calibrating estimators of causal parameters, or more generally estimators of quantities involving nuisance parameters.

In this work, we provide a general framework for calibrating predictors involving nuisance estimation. We consider a notion of calibration defined with respect to an arbitrary, nuisance-dependent loss  $\ell$ , under which we say an estimator  $\theta$  is calibrated if its predictions cannot be changed on any level set to decrease loss. We prove generic upper bounds on the calibration error of any causal parameter estimate  $\theta$  with respect to any loss  $\ell$  using a concept called *Neyman Orthogonality*. Our bounds involve two decoupled terms — one measuring the error in estimating the unknown nuisance parameters, and the other representing the calibration error in a hypothetical world where the learned nuisance estimates were true. We use our bound to analyze the convergence of two sample splitting algorithms for causal calibration. One algorithm, which applies to *universally orthogonalizable* loss functions, transforms the data into generalized pseudo-outcomes and applies an off-the-shelf calibration procedure. The other algorithm, which applies to *conditionally orthogonalizable* loss functions, extends the classical uniform mass binning algorithm to include nuisance estimation. Our results are exceedingly general, showing that essentially any existing calibration algorithm can be used in causal settings, with additional loss only arising from errors in nuisance estimation.

# Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1	Our Contributions . . . . .	2
1.2	Related Work . . . . .	4
<b>2</b>	<b>Calibration of Causal Effects</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>Neyman Orthogonality and Loss Orthogonalizability</b>	<b>8</b>
3.1	Universal Orthogonality . . . . .	9
3.2	Conditional Orthogonality . . . . .	10
3.3	Orthogonalized and Equivalent Losses . . . . .	11
<b>4</b>	<b>A Decomposition of Calibration Error</b>	<b>15</b>
4.1	Error Decomposition for Universally Orthogonalizable Losses . . . . .	16
4.2	Error Decomposition for Conditionally Orthogonalizable Losses . . . . .	18
<b>5</b>	<b>Algorithms for Causal Calibration</b>	<b>20</b>
5.1	Two-Way Sample Splitting for Universal Orthogonality . . . . .	21
5.2	Three-Way Sample Splitting for Conditional Orthogonality . . . . .	23
<b>6</b>	<b>Conclusion</b>	<b>27</b>
<b>A</b>	<b>Calibration Error Decomposition Proofs</b>	<b>32</b>
A.1	Universally Orthogonality . . . . .	32
A.2	Conditional Orthogonality . . . . .	34
<b>B</b>	<b>Algorithm Convergence Proofs</b>	<b>37</b>
B.1	Universal Orthogonality . . . . .	37
B.2	Conditionally Orthogonality . . . . .	38
<b>C</b>	<b>Additional Proofs</b>	<b>42</b>
C.1	Proofs from Section 3 . . . . .	42
C.2	Proofs from Section 4 . . . . .	42
C.3	Proofs from Section 5 . . . . .	43

# 1 Introduction

At the heart of causal inference is the estimation of causal effects or causal parameters. Various methods have been developed for estimating quantities such as conditional average treatment effects [1, 48, 11], conditional quantile treatment effects [12, 16, 28], policy treatment effects [26], and more. Due to the partially-observed nature of causal effect estimation, performing inference on causal parameters is often more difficult than traditional statistical estimation. In particular, producing efficient estimates of causal effects often requires estimating various nuisance parameters, such as propensity scores [45] and expected outcomes under control/treatment.

Orthogonal to the problem of causal estimation is the problem of calibration which has long been studied in both theory and practice by the general machine learning community [19, 36, 31, 35, 50, 27, 43, 25, 10, 9, 14]. As typically presented, an estimator is calibrated if, when it makes a given prediction, the observed outcome on average is said prediction. For a causal application, consider a doctor predicting the effectiveness of a cancer treatment. His predictions would be calibrated if, for the patients he predicts the prescribed treatment will provide a five year increase in lifespan, the actual average increase in lifespan is five years. An estimator of an unknown parameter need not be accurate to be calibrated. For instance, a constant predictor of the mean outcome would be a calibrated estimate of the regression function but would be considered inaccurate. What calibration does ensure is that given predictions are representative of true outcomes in order of signs and magnitudes. In fact, calibrated predictions can also be shown to enable optimal downstream decision-making in terms of expected utility maximization [41]. Furthermore, given some already trained model (e.g. a neural network or random forest), calibration can be obtained with relatively few additional data points and typically does not adversely impact model performance. Researchers have developed simple, univariate regression algorithms such as isotonic regression [56, 2], Platt scaling [44, 22], histogram/uniform mass binning [55, 21], and fixed-width binning to calibrate general machine learning models/statistical estimators.

Despite the vast literature on calibration, relatively little has been studied about the calibration of estimators for causal parameters/treatment effects. Moreover, existing results (which we discuss in the related work section below) only show that *specific calibration algorithms*, such as isotonic regression, exhibit convergence guarantees when applied to estimates of *specific causal parameters*, such as conditional average treatment effects. Since causal estimates, including as conditional average treatment effects and local average treatment effects, are used to design policies in fields such as advertising, medicine, and beyond, and since calibrated predictions facilitate optimal downstream decision making [41], it is thus crucial that these causal predictions are calibrated.

This lag in the development of causal calibration techniques is naturally due to the presence of nuisance parameters in causal tasks. For illustrative purposes, we discuss calibrating CATE estimates. Given observations  $Z = (X, A, Y)$ , where  $X \in \mathcal{X}$  represents the set of covariates,  $A \in \{0, 1\}$  indicates binary treatment, and  $Y = AY(1) + (1 - A)Y(0)$  represents observations for potential outcomes  $Y(0)$  and  $Y(1)$ , the CATE is defined as

$$\theta_{\text{CATE}}(x) := \mathbb{E}[Y(1) - Y(0) \mid X = x].$$

Naturally, an estimate  $\theta$  of  $\theta_{\text{CATE}}$  is (perfectly) calibrated if  $\theta(X) = \mathbb{E}[Y(1) - Y(0) \mid \theta(X)]$ .

Likewise,  $\theta$  could be said to be approximately calibrated if the  $L^2$  error  $\mathbb{E}((\theta(X) - \mathbb{E}[Y(1) - Y(0) \mid \theta(X)])^2)^{1/2}$  is small.

To calibrate an estimate  $\theta$  of  $\theta_{\text{CATE}}$  using an off-the-shelf method, one would need to observe *both* potential outcomes  $Y(0)$  and  $Y(1)$ , which cannot occur in practice. Instead the learner must instead estimate the propensity score  $\pi_0(x) := \mathbb{P}(A = 1 \mid X = x)$  and expected outcomes  $\mu_0(a, x) := \mathbb{E}[Y \mid A = a, X = x]$  from the data, which serve as nuisance parameters. Once these parameters are approximated, say by estimates  $\pi$  and  $\mu$ , the observed data can be transformed into “pseudo-outcomes,” which simulate full observations in expectation.

By appropriately leveraging the aforementioned pseudo-outcomes, van der Laan et al. [52] are able to show that isotonic regression, which fits a monotonically increasing post-processing to an estimator, can be used to calibrate CATE estimates. However, if one wants to calibrate estimates of other common causal parameters such as local average treatment effects and conditional quantile treatment effects, or if one wants to use other calibration algorithms such as histogram binning or Platt scaling, additional theory needs to be developed. While one could derive individual results for calibrating an estimate of “parameter A” under “algorithm B”, this would likely lead to repeatedly reinventing the wheel. The question considered in this paper is thus as follows: can one construct a framework that allows a statistician to calibrate general causal parameter estimates using an arbitrary, off-the-shelf calibration algorithm?

## 1.1 Our Contributions

In this paper, we provide a framework for calibrating estimates of general causal parameters in the presence of nuisance estimation. We study a general notion of calibration defined with respect to an arbitrary, nuisance-dependent loss  $\ell(\theta(x), g; z)$ , which has some unknown, true nuisance parameter  $g_0$ . We say a parameter  $\theta$  is calibrated with respect to  $\ell$  if  $\mathbb{E}[\partial\ell(\theta(X), g_0; Z) \mid \theta(X) = \nu] = 0^1$  for any prediction  $\nu$ , and that  $\theta$  is approximately calibrated if  $L^2$  error

$$\text{Cal}(\theta, g) = \mathbb{E} \left( \mathbb{E}[\partial\ell(\theta(X), g; Z) \mid \theta(X)]^2 \right)^{1/2}$$

is small when  $g$  is set as the true nuisance  $g_0$ . In words,  $\theta$  is calibrated if the predictions of  $\theta$  are “unimprovable” with respect to current level sets, a condition similar to the one outlined by Noarov and Roth [40] and the concept of swap regret [4, 14]. Under this notion of calibration, we typically imagine  $\theta$  as estimating  $\theta_0(x) := \arg \min_{\nu} \mathbb{E}[\ell(\nu, g_0; Z) \mid X = x]$ , which is the conditional loss minimizer under the true nuisance parameter.

As a concrete example, consider the loss  $\ell_{\text{CATE}}(\theta(x), \mu; z) := \frac{1}{2}(\theta(x) - \mu(1, x) + \mu(0, x))^2$ , where the true nuisance is just  $\mu_0(a, x) := \mathbb{E}[Y \mid A = a, X = x]$  and thus (under standard identification assumptions) the conditional minimizer is the conditional average treatment effect  $\theta_0(x) := \mathbb{E}[Y(1) - Y(0) \mid X = x]$ . We would say a CATE estimate  $\theta$  is calibrated (with respect to  $\ell_{\text{CATE}}$ ) if  $\theta(X) = \mathbb{E}[Y(1) - Y(0) \mid \theta(X)]$ . Likewise, we can define a variant of the  $Q$ -pinball loss by  $\ell_{\text{QTE}}(\theta(x), p; z) := ap(x)(y - \theta(x))(Q - \mathbb{1}_{g \leq \theta(x)})$ , where the true nuisance parameter is the inverse propensity  $p_0(x) := \mathbb{P}(A = 1 \mid X = x)^{-1}$ . For this setting,

---

<sup>1</sup>Here,  $\partial\ell(\theta(x), g; z)$  denotes the partial derivative of  $\ell$  with respect to its first argument  $\theta(x)$ , i.e. the quantity is defined by  $\frac{\partial}{\partial\nu}\ell(\nu, g; z)|_{\nu=\theta(x)}$ .

the conditional loss minimizer  $\theta_{QTE}(x)$  is just the conditional  $Q$ th quantile under treatment given  $X = x$ . Then, it is clear that an estimator  $\theta$  is calibrated with respect to  $\ell_{QTE}$  if  $\mathbb{P}(Y(1) \leq \theta(X) \mid \theta(X)) = Q$ .

Under this notion of calibration, we present a generic framework for calibrating a causal effect estimator  $\theta$  with respect to an arbitrary, nuisance-dependent loss  $\ell(\theta(x), g; z)$ . Our framework is based on a concept called Neyman orthogonality [39, 5, 15], and in particular our approach to the topic is closest to that used by Foster and Syrgkanis [15]. Heuristically, a nuisance-dependent loss  $\ell(\theta(x), g; z)$  is Neyman orthogonal if it is insensitive to mild estimation errors in the optimal parameter  $\theta_0$  and true nuisance parameter  $g_0$ , which is formalized by the vanishing cross-derivative condition

$$D_g \mathbb{E}[\partial \ell(\theta_0(X), g_0; Z) \mid X](g - g_0) = 0 \quad (1)$$

where  $D_g$  denotes a Gateaux derivative. We do not directly leverage the condition outlined in Equation (1), but rather two mild variants that are particularly amenable to the task of calibration. One condition we consider is called *universal orthogonality* [15], a stronger notion of orthogonality in which the optimal parameter  $\theta_0(x)$  in Equation (1) can be replaced by *any* estimate  $\theta(x)$ . Many losses that look like the squared-loss can be modified to satisfy universal orthogonality, and universally orthogonal losses offer particularly clean calibration guarantees. Another condition we consider is called *conditional orthogonality*, in which instead of conditioning on covariates  $X$  in Equation (1), one conditions on a post-processing  $\varphi(X)$  of covariates instead. Conditional orthogonality is a natural condition for calibration tasks, as we ultimately care about assessing the quality of an estimator  $\theta(X)$  conditional on its own predictions.

Throughout our work, we assume the learner starts with some base loss  $\ell$ , which or may not satisfy the desired orthogonality condition. The user then constructs a corresponding *orthogonalized loss*  $\tilde{\ell}$  by performing a first-order correction, i.e. they set

$$\underbrace{\tilde{\ell}(\theta(x), (g, b); z)}_{\text{orthogonalized loss}} = \underbrace{\ell(\theta(x), g; z)}_{\text{the base loss only depends on nuisance } g} - \underbrace{\theta(x) \cdot \text{Corr}((g, b); z)}_{\text{correction term linear in new nuisance } b}, \quad (2)$$

where  $b$  is some additional nuisance function to be estimated from the data and  $\text{Corr}((g, b); z)$  is some correction term. For a concrete example,  $\ell_{CATE}$  as defined above satisfies none of the three aforementioned forms of orthogonality. However, if the learner takes  $\text{Corr}((g, b); z) := b(a, x)(y - \mu(a, x))$  where  $b(a, x)$  is an estimate of  $b_0(a, x) := \frac{a}{\pi_0(x)} - \frac{1-a}{1-\pi_0(x)}$ , then  $\tilde{\ell}_{CATE}$  defined per Equation (2) actually satisfies universal orthogonality. More generally, by picking up an additional, linear correction term that depends on a new nuisance, one can guarantee that the loss  $\tilde{\ell}$  satisfies some form of Neyman orthogonality. In this case, we call the base loss  $\ell$  either *universally orthogonalizable* or *conditionally orthogonalizable*, depending on which condition it can be made to satisfy. We show in Section 4 that the  $L^2$  calibration error is invariant to orthogonalization, i.e. the calibration error of an estimator  $\theta$  is the same under  $\ell$  and  $\tilde{\ell}$ . With the preceding preamble in hand, we can introduce our main results on calibration in the presence of nuisance estimation. We now enumerate our two major contributions.

1. In Section 4, we show that the  $L^2$  calibration error of any estimator can be bounded above by two, decoupled terms: one involving nuisance estimation error and another

representing calibration error under the orthogonalized loss evaluated at the learned nuisances. We sketch our result in the case of universal orthogonality.

**Informal Theorem 1.** *Suppose  $\theta : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is some estimator,  $\ell$  is some base loss, and  $\tilde{\ell}$  is the corresponding orthogonalized loss. Let  $g_0, b_0$  denote the true, unknown nuisances, and  $(g, b)$  arbitrary nuisance estimates. We have*

$$\underbrace{\text{Cal}(\theta, g_0)}_{L^2 \text{ calibration error under } \ell(\theta(x), g_0; z)} \lesssim \underbrace{\|(g - g_0) \cdot (b - b_0)\|}_{\text{doubly-robust error}} + \underbrace{\widetilde{\text{Cal}}(\theta, (g, b))}_{L^2 \text{ calibration error under } \tilde{\ell}(\theta(x), (g, b); z)}$$

Recalling the example of CATE above, we would have  $g_0(a, x) = \mathbb{E}[Y \mid X = x, A = a]$  and  $b_0(a, x) = a/\pi_0(x) - (1 - a)/(1 - \pi_0(x))$ , which yields a standard “doubly-robust” error term. We view Informal Theorem 1 as a “change of measure” or “change of nuisance” result, allowing us to essentially pretend our learned nuisances represent reality while only paying a small error for misestimation.

2. Second, in Section 5, we present two simple sample splitting algorithms inspired by the error decomposition in Informal Theorem 1. In the case  $\ell$  is *universally orthogonalizable*, we use the first half of the dataset to estimate the nuisances and transform the second half with the nuisance estimate to generalized “pseudo-outcomes”. Then, we use an off-the-shelf calibration algorithm on these pseudo-outcomes to calibrate our causal estimate. In the case  $\ell$  is *conditionally orthogonalizable*, we present a three-way sample splitting algorithm, which generalizes the commonly-used uniform mass/histogram binning algorithm.

Given that our framework and results are quite general, we go through concrete examples to help with building intuition. We consider four practically relevant examples of parameters to calibrate: conditional average treatment effects, conditional average causal derivatives, conditional local average treatment effects, and conditional quantile treatment effects. In fact, we show that the work of van der Laan et al. [52] can be seen as a special instantiation of our framework.

## 1.2 Related Work

**Calibration:** Important to our work is the vast literature on calibration. Calibration was considered first in the context producing calibrated probabilities, both in the online [9, 14] and i.i.d. [44, 55] settings, but has since been considered in other contexts such as distribution calibration [49], threshold calibration [47, 53], and parity calibration [8]. Calibration is typically orthogonal to model training, and usually occurs as a simple post-processing routine. Some well-known algorithms for post-hoc calibration include Platt scaling [44, 22], histogram binning [55, 21], and isotonic regression [56, 2]. Many of these algorithms simultaneously offer strong theoretical guarantees (see Gupta [20] for an overview) and strong empirical performance when applied to practically-relevant ML models [19]. We view our work as complementary to existing, non-causal results on calibration. Our two-step algorithm allows a practitioner to directly apply any of the above listed algorithms, inheriting existing error guarantees so long as nuisance estimation is efficiently performed.

**Double/debiased Machine Learning:** In our work, we also draw heavily from the literature on double/debiased machine learning [5, 7, 6]. Methods relating to double machine learning aim to eschew classical non-parametric assumptions (e.g. Donsker properties) on nuisance functions, often through simple sample splitting schemes [24, 29, 3]. In particular, if target population parameters are estimated using a Neyman orthogonal loss function [39, 15], then these works show that empirical estimates of the population parameters converge rapidly to either a population or conditional loss minimizer.

Of the various works related to double/debiased machine learning, we draw most heavily on ideas from the framework of orthogonal statistical learning [15]. In their work, Foster and Syrgkanis [15] develop a simple two-step framework for statistical learning in the presence of nuisance estimation. In particular, they show that when the underlying loss is Neyman orthogonal, then the excess risk can be bounded by two decoupled error terms: error from estimating nuisances and the error incurring from applying a learning algorithm with a fixed nuisance. Following its introduction, the orthogonal statistical learning framework has found applications in tasks such as the design of causal random forests [42] and causal model ensembling via Q-aggregation [32]. In this work, we show that central ideas from orthogonal statistical learning are naturally applicable to the problem of calibrating estimators of causal parameters.

Lastly, our work can be seen as a significant generalization of existing results on the calibration of causal parameters. Primarily, we compare our results to the work of van der Laan et al. [52]. In their work, the authors construct a sample-splitting scheme for calibrating estimates of conditional average treatment effects (CATEs). The specific algorithm leveraged by the authors uses one half of the data to estimate nuisance parameters, namely propensities and expected outcomes under control/treatment. After nuisances are learned, the algorithm transforms the second half of the data into pseudo-observations and runs isotonic regression as a calibration procedure. Our results are applicable to estimates of any causal parameter that can be specified as the population minimizer of a loss function, not just CATEs. Additionally, our generic procedure allows the scientist to plug in any black-box method for calibration, not just a specific algorithm such as isotonic regression. Likewise, our work is also significantly more general than the work of Leng and Dimmery [34], who provide a maximum-likelihood based approach for performing *linear calibration*, a weaker notion of calibration, of CATE estimates.

## 2 Calibration of Causal Effects

We are interested in calibrating some estimator  $\theta \in \Theta \subset \{f : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}\}$  whose quality at some observation  $z \in \mathcal{Z}$  is assessed by  $\ell(\theta(x), g; z)$ , where  $\ell : \mathbb{R} \times \mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is some generic loss function. We assume  $\mathcal{Z}$  is some space containing observations, and write  $Z$  as a prototypical random element from this space, and  $P_Z$  as the distribution on  $\mathcal{Z}$  from which  $Z$  is drawn. We typically have  $Z = (X, A, Y)$ , where  $X \in \mathcal{X}$  represents covariates,  $A \in \mathcal{A}$  represents treatment, and  $Y \in \mathbb{R}$  represents an outcome in an experiment. More generally, we assume the nested structure  $\mathcal{X} \subset \mathcal{W} \subset \mathcal{Z}$ , where  $\mathcal{X}$  intuitively represents the space of covariates,  $\mathcal{W}$  represents an extended set of features on which the true nuisance parameter may also depend (e.g. treatment recommendation, whether or not an individual actually

accepted a treatment), and  $\mathcal{Z}$  may contain additional observable information (e.g. outcome  $Y$  under the given treatment). We write the marginal distributions of  $X$  and  $W$  respectively as  $P_X$  and  $P_W$ . We typically write  $\ell(\theta, g; z)$  instead of  $\ell(\theta(x), g; z)$  for succinctness, and we let  $\partial\ell(\theta, g; z) := \frac{\partial}{\partial\theta(x)}\ell(\theta(x), g; z)$  be the partial derivative of  $\ell$  with respect to it's first argument,  $\theta(x)$ . Generically, given some loss  $\ell$ , we let  $\theta_0 : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  denote the conditional loss minimizer, i.e.  $\theta_0(x) := \arg \min_{\nu} \mathbb{E}[\ell(\nu, g_0; Z) | X]$ .

In the above,  $\mathcal{G}$  is some space of nuisance functions, which are of the form  $g : \mathcal{W} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ . We assume that there is some true nuisance parameter  $g_0 \in \mathcal{G}$ , but that this parameter is unknown to the learner and must be estimated. We generally assume  $\mathcal{G}$  is a convex subset of  $L^2(P_W) := L^2(\mathcal{W}, P_W)$ , and so as a norm we can consider the  $\|g\|_{L^2(P_W)} := \int_{\mathcal{W}} \|g(w)\|^2 P_W(dw)$ , where  $\|\cdot\|$  denotes the standard Euclidean norm on  $\mathbb{R}^d$ .

In our work, we consider a general definition of calibration error that holds for any loss involving nuisance estimation. This general notion of calibration, which has been considered in works such as Noarov and Roth [40], Gopalan et al. [18], Foster and Vohra [13] and Globus-Harris et al. [17], implies an estimator cannot be “improved” on any level set of its prediction.

**Definition 2.1.** Let  $\theta : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be an estimator,  $\ell : \mathbb{R} \times \mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  a nuisance-dependent loss function, and  $g \in \mathcal{G}$  a fixed nuisance parameter. We define the  $L^2$  calibration error of  $\theta$  with respect to  $\ell$  and  $g$  to be

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Cal}(\theta, g) &:= \mathbb{E} \left( \mathbb{E} [\partial\ell(\theta, g; Z) | \theta(X)]^2 \right)^{1/2} \\ &= \int_{\mathcal{X}} \mathbb{E} [\partial\ell(\theta, g; Z) | \theta(X) = \theta(x)]^2 P_X(dx). \end{aligned}$$

We say  $\theta$  is perfectly calibrated if  $\text{Cal}(\theta, g_0) = 0$ , where  $g_0$  is the true, unknown nuisance parameter.

We are always interested in controlling  $\text{Cal}(\theta, g_0)$ , which is the calibration error under the true, unknown nuisance parameter. In words,  $\theta$  is calibrated if, on the level set  $\{x \in \mathcal{X} : \theta(x) = \nu\}$ , there is no constant value  $\omega \in \mathbb{R}$  we can switch the prediction  $\theta(x)$  to to obtain lower loss. We can glean further semantic meaning from the this definition of calibration by examining several examples below.

**Example 2.2.** Below, we almost always assume observations are of the form  $Z = (X, A, Y)$ , where  $X$  are covariates,  $A \in \{0, 1\}$  or  $[0, 1]$  indicates treatment, and  $Y = \sum_a Y(a) \mathbb{1}_{A=a}$  indicates outcome. The one exception is for local average treatment effects, when assigned treatment may be ignored.

1. **Conditional Average Treatment Effect:** Perhaps the most commonly studied object in causal inference is the *conditional average treatment effect*, which is given under standard identifying assumptions as

$$\theta_{\text{CATE}}(x) := \mathbb{E}[Y(1) - Y(0) | X = x] = \mathbb{E}[Y | A = 1, X = x] - \mathbb{E}[Y | A = 0, X = x].$$

Straightforward calculation yields that  $\theta_{\text{CATE}}(x) = \arg \min_{\nu} \mathbb{E}[\ell_{\text{CATE}}(\nu, \mu_0; z) | X = x]$ , where  $\mu_0(a, x) = \mathbb{E}[Y(a) | X = x] = \mathbb{E}[Y | A = a, X = x]$ , and

$$\ell_{\text{CATE}}(\theta, \mu; z) := \frac{1}{2}(\theta(x) - \mu(1, x) + \mu(0, x))^2.$$

An estimator of the CATE is perfectly calibrated with respect to  $\ell_{\text{CATE}}$  if

$$\theta(X) = \mathbb{E}[Y(1) - Y(0) \mid \theta(X)].$$

2. **Conditional Average Causal Derivative:** In a setting where treatments are not binary, but rather continuous (e.g.  $A \in [0, 1]$ ), it no longer makes sense to consider treatment effects. Instead, we can consider the *conditional average causal derivative*, which is defined by

$$\theta_{\text{ACD}}(x) := \mathbb{E}(\partial_a \mathbb{E}[Y(A) \mid X]).$$

$\theta_{\text{ACD}}$  is in fact the conditional minimizer of the loss  $\ell_{\text{ACD}}$  given by

$$\ell_{\text{ACD}}(\theta, g; z) = \frac{1}{2}(\theta(x) - \partial_a \mu(a, x))^2,$$

where here the true nuisance is  $\mu_0(a, x)$  again. Naturally,  $\theta$  is perfectly calibrated with respect to  $\ell_{\text{ACD}}$  if

$$\theta(X) = \mathbb{E}(\partial_a \mathbb{E}[Y(A) \mid X] \mid \theta(X)).$$

3. **Conditional Local Average Treatment Effect:** In settings with non-compliance, the prescribed treatment given to an individual may not be equivalent to the received treatment. Formally, we have  $Z = (X, A, D, Y)$ , where  $D \in \{0, 1\}$  represents the actual treatment received by an individual (not necessarily equivalent to the prescribed treatment). We assume  $D = D(1)A + D(0)(1 - A)$ , and  $Y = DY(1) + (1 - D)Y(0)$ , where  $D(a), Y(a)$  represent potential outcomes for treatment assignment  $a \in \{0, 1\}$ . We also assume monotonicity, i.e. that  $D(1) \geq D(0)$ , and that the propensity  $\pi_0(x) := \mathbb{P}(A = 1 \mid X = x)$  is known. The parameter of interest here is

$$\theta_{\text{LATE}}(x) := \mathbb{E}[Y(1) - Y(0) \mid D(1) > D(0), X = x],$$

which is identified (following standard computations, see Lan and Syrgkanis [32]) as

$$\theta_{\text{LATE}}(x) = \frac{\mathbb{E}[Y \mid A = 1, X = x] - \mathbb{E}[Y \mid A = 0, X = x]}{\mathbb{E}[D \mid A = 1, X = x] - \mathbb{E}[D \mid A = 0, X = x]}. \quad (3)$$

It follows that  $\theta_{\text{LATE}}$  is specified as the conditional minimizer of  $\ell_{\text{LATE}}$  given by  $\ell_{\text{LATE}}(\theta, g; z) := \frac{1}{2}(\theta(x) - g(x))^2$ , where  $g_0(x) = \frac{p_0(x)}{q_0(x)}$ , where  $p_0$  and  $q_0$  are respectively the numerator and denominator of Equation (3). Calibration with respect to  $\ell_{\text{LATE}}$  clearly becomes

$$\theta(X) = \mathbb{E}[Y(1) - Y(0) \mid D(1) > D(0), \theta(X)].$$

4. **Conditional Quantile Under Treatment:** Lastly, we consider the *conditional Qth quantile under treatment*, which is heuristically specified as “ $\theta_{\text{QTE}}(x) = F_1^{-1}(Q \mid x)$ ”<sup>2</sup> and is formally specified as

$$\theta_{\text{QTE}}(x) \in \arg \min_{\nu \in \mathbb{R}} \mathbb{E}[\ell_{\text{QTE}}(\nu, p_0; Z) \mid X = x].$$

---

<sup>2</sup> $F_1(\cdot \mid x)$  here denotes the conditional CDF of  $Y(1)$  given covariates  $X$

In the above,  $\ell_{\text{QTE}} : \mathbb{R} \times \mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  denotes the  $Q$ -pinball loss, which is defined as

$$\ell_{\text{QTE}}(\theta, p; z) := ap(x)(y - \theta(x)) (Q - \mathbb{1}_{y \leq \theta(x)}),$$

where the true, unknown nuisance is the inverse propensity score  $p_0(x) := \frac{1}{\pi_0(x)}$ , where  $\pi_0(x) := \mathbb{P}(A = 1 \mid X = x)$ . A direct computation yields that calibration under  $\ell_{\text{QTE}}$  becomes

$$\mathbb{P}(Y(1) \leq \theta(X) \mid \theta(X)) = Q.$$

The first three losses considered above are “easy” to calibrate with respect to, as  $\ell_{\text{CATE}}$ ,  $\ell_{\text{ACD}}$ , and  $\ell_{\text{LATE}}$  are *universally orthogonalizable*, a concept discussed in Sections 3.1 and 3.3 below. The pinball loss, on the other hand, is the quintessential example of a “hard” loss to calibrate with respect to. To facilitate calibration for this loss, we need to study the more complicated matter of *conditionally orthogonalizability* — which is the main topic of Sections 3.2 and 3.3.

As a final topic, we discuss *calibration functions*, objects central to studying the convergence of calibration algorithms. Given some initial estimator  $\theta : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , the goal of any calibration algorithm is to compute some post-processing  $\hat{\theta} : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  such that  $\text{Cal}(\hat{\theta}; g_0)$  is small. If the learner had access to the data generating distribution, then the optimal choice for  $\hat{\theta}$  would be the *calibration function*, defined below.

**Definition 2.3 (Calibration Function).** Given any  $\varphi : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}'$  and  $g \in \mathcal{G}$ , we define the *calibration function for  $\varphi$  at  $g$*  as the mapping  $\gamma_\varphi(\cdot; g) : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  given by

$$\gamma_\varphi(x; g) := \arg \min_{\nu} \mathbb{E}[\ell(\nu, g; Z) \mid \varphi(X) = \varphi(x)].$$

In particular, when  $g = g_0$ , we call  $\gamma_\varphi^* := \gamma_\varphi(\cdot; g_0)$  the *true calibration function*.

As hinted at, when  $\theta$  is real valued, first-order optimality conditions alongside the tower rule for conditional expectations imply that  $\mathbb{E}[\partial \ell(\gamma_\theta(\cdot; g), g; Z) \mid \gamma_\theta(X; g)] = 0$  for any  $g \in \mathcal{G}$ . This, in particular, implies that  $\gamma_\theta^*$  is perfectly calibrated. Thus, given many samples from the underlying data generating distribution, the goal of any calibration algorithm is to approximate  $\gamma_\theta^*$ . For the sake of generality, in Definition 2.3, we allow  $\varphi : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}'$  to have arbitrary range. In practice, we always assume we are calibrating estimators  $\theta$  that take on real values.

### 3 Neyman Orthogonality and Loss Orthogonalizability

In this section, we describe the key condition on the loss that we will use in proving our results — Neyman orthogonality [37, 38]. Heuristically, a loss function is Neyman orthogonal if it is “insensitive” to small estimation errors in both the unknown parameter  $\theta_0$  and the unknown nuisance function  $g_0$ . In what follows, for any function  $T : \mathcal{G} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , any point  $g' \in \mathcal{G}$ , and any “direction”  $h \in \mathcal{G}$  we let  $(D_g T(g'))(h)$  denote the Gateaux derivative (i.e. directional derivative) of  $T$  in the direction of  $h$  at  $g'$ . Formally,  $(D_g T(g'))(h)$  is defined as  $(D_g T(g'))(h) := \frac{d}{dt} T(g' + th)|_{t=0}$ . We say a loss function  $\ell$  is *Neyman orthogonal* if, for any direction  $g - g_0 \in \mathcal{G}$ , we have

$$D_g \mathbb{E}[\partial \ell(\theta_0, g_0; Z) \mid X](g - g_0) = 0. \tag{4}$$

where  $g_0$  is the true (unknown) nuisance parameter and  $\theta_0$  is the conditional minimizer as defined before.

Neyman orthogonality is a useful condition to consider as it allows us to relate the behavior of the loss  $\ell$  evaluated at learned parameters  $(\theta, g)$  to the behavior at the true parameters  $(\theta_0, g_0)$  by performing a second order Taylor expansion. Due to orthogonality, the error in the expansion only consists of the second order terms, thus justifying the notion of Neyman orthogonality as a “robustness” property of a loss.

In the sequel, we don’t consider Neyman orthogonality as outlined above, but rather two mild variants that are suited to the task of calibration: universal orthogonality and conditional orthogonality. The former is a stronger condition than Neyman orthogonality that is generally satisfied by losses that look roughly like squared losses. The latter is a generalization of Neyman orthogonality that ensures the cross derivative vanishes conditioned on some “post-processing”  $\varphi(X)$  of the covariates instead of just  $X$ . These notions of orthogonality will serve as the basis of our analyses and algorithms in the sections to come.

### 3.1 Universal Orthogonality

Universal orthogonality, first introduced in Foster and Syrgkanis [15], can be viewed as a robustness property of losses that are “close” to squared losses. Heuristically, a loss is universally orthogonal if it is insensitive to small errors in estimating the nuisance functions *regardless* of the current estimate on the conditional loss minimizer, i.e. Equation (4) holds when  $\theta_0$  is replaced by any function  $\theta : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ . We formalize this in the following definition.

**Definition 3.1** (Universal Orthogonality). Let  $\ell : \mathbb{R} \times \mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a loss involving nuisance, and let  $g_0$  denote the true nuisance parameter associated with  $\ell$ . We say  $\ell$  is universally orthogonal, if for any  $\theta : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  and  $g \in \mathcal{G}$ , we have

$$D_g \mathbb{E} [\partial \ell(\theta, g_0; Z) \mid X] (g - g_0) = 0.$$

It may be the case that a base loss  $\ell$  does not satisfy Definition 3.1. For instance, none of  $\ell_{\text{CATE}}$ ,  $\ell_{\text{ACD}}$ , nor  $\ell_{\text{LATE}}$  satisfies universal orthogonality without modification. In this case, it is typically possible to perform a linear correction to obtain an orthogonal loss. We examine the  $\ell_{\text{CATE}}$  in Example 3.2 below, and return to the additional losses  $\ell_{\text{ACD}}$  and  $\ell_{\text{LATE}}$  in the sequel.

**Example 3.2.** A straightforward computation yields that  $\ell_{\text{CATE}}$  doesn’t directly satisfy Definition 3.1, as one can compute

$$\begin{aligned} D_\mu \mathbb{E} [\partial \ell_{\text{CATE}}(\theta, \mu; Z) \mid X] (\mu - \mu_0) &= \mathbb{E} \left[ \left( \frac{A}{\pi(X)} - \frac{1-A}{1-\pi(X)} \right) (\mu_0(A, X) - \mu(A, X)) \mid X \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[ \left( \frac{A}{\pi(X)} - \frac{1-A}{1-\pi(X)} \right) (Y - \mu(A, X)) \mid X \right], \end{aligned}$$

which is not equal to zero simultaneously for all directions  $\mu - \mu_0 \in \mathcal{G}$ .

However, we can make a first order correction to guarantee universal orthogonality is satisfied. If we let  $\tilde{\mathcal{G}} := \mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{G}$  and define  $\tilde{\ell}_{\text{CATE}} : \mathbb{R} \times \tilde{\mathcal{G}} \times \mathcal{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  to be

$$\tilde{\ell}_{\text{CATE}}(\theta, (\mu, \pi); z) := \frac{1}{2} (\theta(x) - \mu(1, x) + \mu(0, x))^2 - \theta(x) \cdot \left( \frac{a}{\pi(x)} - \frac{1-a}{1-\pi(x)} \right) (y - \mu(a, x)),$$

we obtain a loss that (a) has the same conditional minimizer  $\theta_{\text{CATE}}$  and (b) now satisfies Definition 3.1 (as the cross-derivative taken above does not depend on the chosen parameter  $\theta$ ). One can further add and subtract terms that don't depend on  $\theta$  (and thus don't impact the conditional minimizer) to obtain an “equivalent” doubly robust loss in terms of pseudo-outcomes:

$$\tilde{\ell}_{\text{CATE}}^{\text{eq}}(\theta, (\mu, \pi); z) := \frac{1}{2} (\theta(x) - \chi_{\text{CATE}}(g; z))^2,$$

where  $\chi_{\text{CATE}}(g; z)$  is the “pseudo-outcome” given as

$$\chi_{\text{CATE}}(g; z) := \mu(1, x) - \mu(0, x) + \left( \frac{a}{\pi(x)} - \frac{1-a}{1-\pi(x)} \right) (y - \mu(a, x)).$$

While the above is an ad-hoc derivation, we provide a principled means for deriving such “orthogonalized” and “equivalent” losses in Section 3.3 below. We return to the losses  $\ell_{\text{ACD}}$  and  $\ell_{\text{LATE}}$  at that point in time.

Generally, universally orthogonal losses are the easiest to work with, as they can often be restated in terms of a squared loss, as seen in the example of the conditional average treatment effect above. Thus, after making appropriate transformation of the data, we will be able to apply off-the-shelf algorithms for squared loss calibration (e.g. isotonic regression, histogram binning) directly to the task of calibrating causal parameters. This is the main focus later in Sections 4.1 and 5.1.

## 3.2 Conditional Orthogonality

While many examples of losses such as  $\ell_{\text{CATE}}$ ,  $\ell_{\text{ACD}}$ , and  $\ell_{\text{LATE}}$  can be linearly corrected to satisfy universal orthogonality, some cannot. For instance, we will see that  $\ell_{\text{QTE}}$ , the pinball loss used in defining the conditional quantile under treatment, cannot be made to be universally orthogonal. To handle such losses, we need additional machinery.

We introduce *conditional Neyman orthogonality*, a generalization of Neyman orthogonality (Equation (4)) where the cross derivative vanishes *not* conditionally on covariates  $X$ , but rather on some post-processing  $\varphi(X)$ . This condition is a natural fit for calibration, as we want to ensure that the expected derivative of the loss is small *conditionally on the model's predictions*  $\theta(X)$ .

**Definition 3.3.** Let  $\ell : \mathbb{R} \times \mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a loss function, let  $g_0$  denote the true nuisance parameters, and let  $\varphi : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}'$  some function. We say  $\ell$  is *conditionally orthogonal given*  $\varphi(X)$  if for any  $g - g_0 \in \mathcal{G}$ ,

$$D_g \mathbb{E}[\partial \ell(\gamma_\varphi^*, g_0; Z) \mid \varphi(X)](g - g_0) = 0,$$

where  $\gamma_\varphi^*$  is the calibration function (Definition 2.3) associated with  $\varphi$ .

We can make sense of Definition 3.3 by looking at a couple special cases. First, when  $\varphi(x) = x$ , the above definition recovers Neyman orthogonality, as  $\gamma_\varphi^* = \theta_0$  in this case. Likewise, when  $\varphi(x) = C$  for any constant  $C$ ,  $\gamma_\varphi^*(x) = \arg \min_\nu \mathbb{E}[\ell(\nu, g_0; Z)]$ , and Definition 3.3 recovers the classical marginal notion of Neyman orthogonality considered in many works [5, 6, 7, 15, 32]. Other choices of  $\varphi$  simply interpolate between these two extremes.

While the above paragraph is a bit abstract, we can make Definition 3.3 a bit more concrete by considering  $\ell_{\text{QTE}}$ , the  $Q$ -pinball loss.

**Example 3.4.** Recall the  $Q$ -pinball loss is defined as  $\ell_{\text{QTE}}(\theta, p; z) := ap(x)(y - \theta(x)) (Q - \mathbb{1}_{y \leq \theta(x)})$ , where the true, unknown nuisance is the inverse propensity score  $p_0(x) := \frac{1}{\pi_0(x)}$ . Given a fixed function  $\varphi : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  and an arbitrary direction  $p - p_0 \in \mathcal{G}$ , we can compute that

$$\begin{aligned} D_p \mathbb{E}[\partial \ell_{\text{QTE}}(\gamma_\varphi^*, p; Z) \mid \varphi(X)](p - p_0) &= D_p \mathbb{E} [p(X)A (\mathbb{P}(Y(1) \leq \gamma_\varphi^*(X) \mid X) - Q) \mid \varphi(X)] (p - p_0) \\ &= \mathbb{E} [(p - p_0)(X)A (\mathbb{P}(Y(1) \leq \gamma_\varphi^*(X) \mid X) - Q) \mid \varphi(X)], \end{aligned}$$

and thus  $\ell_{\text{QTE}}$  is not conditionally orthogonal for arbitrary  $\varphi$ ; conditioning on  $\varphi(X) = c$  for some constant  $c$ ,  $\gamma_\varphi^*(X)$  returns the  $Q$ -th quantile averaged over all points where  $\varphi(X) = c$ , but averaging the quantile deviation  $\mathbb{P}(Y(1) \leq \gamma_\varphi^*(X) \mid X) - Q$  over each of the points will generally not result in 0. Interestingly, the final expression equals zero for  $\varphi(x) = x$ , since  $\mathbb{P}(Y(1) \leq \gamma_\varphi^*(X) \mid X) = Q$  in this setting. This shows the pinball loss *is* Neyman orthogonal (Equation (4)) conditional on covariates  $X$ .

While  $\ell_{\text{QTE}}$  is not generally conditionally orthogonal, we can make a first-order correction to ensure conditional orthogonality. Let  $f \in \mathcal{G}$  be an arbitrary function estimating  $f_\varphi(x) := \mathbb{P}(Y(1) \leq \gamma_\varphi^*(X) \mid X = x)$ . Ideally, to obtain a conditionally orthogonal loss, we would want to subtract the Gateaux derivative  $(p - p_0)(x) \cdot a \cdot (f(x) - Q)$  from  $\ell_{\text{QTE}}$ , as when  $f = f_\varphi$  this would ensure the cross derivative vanishes. Unfortunately, we cannot find an identifying variable  $U \subset Z$  such that  $p_0(X) = \mathbb{E}[U \mid X]$ . Noting instead that we have the identity

$$\mathbb{E}[Ap_0(X)(f(X) - Q) \mid X] = \mathbb{E}[f(X) - Q \mid X],$$

we can instead consider the loss  $\tilde{\ell}_{\text{QTE}} : \mathbb{R} \times \tilde{\mathcal{G}} \times \mathcal{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  given by

$$\tilde{\ell}_{\text{QTE}}(\theta, \tilde{g}; z) := \ell_{\text{QTE}}(\theta, p; z) - \theta(x) (ap(x)(f(x) - Q) + f(x) - Q),$$

which can be checked to be conditionally orthogonal (conditioned on  $\varphi(X)$ ) when the unknown nuisances are taken to be  $(p_0, f_\varphi)$ . One can check that  $\tilde{\ell}_{\text{QTE}}$  admits the same conditional minimizer as the base loss  $\ell_{\text{QTE}}$ .

In the above example, we were able to construct a new loss  $\tilde{\ell}_{\text{QTE}}$  that could be made conditionally orthogonal at *any* choice of function  $\varphi$ . However, the additional “true” nuisance we picked up (denoted  $f_\varphi$  in the above) depended on the level  $\varphi(X)$  at which we were conditioned. There are some nuances in estimating  $f_\varphi$  given its dependence on  $\varphi$  — we discuss this matter in further detail in Section 5.2.

### 3.3 Orthogonalized and Equivalent Losses

As observed above, it is typically the case that the base loss  $\ell$  does not satisfy the desired orthogonality condition. In the cases of  $\ell_{\text{CATE}}$  and  $\ell_{\text{QTE}}$ , we saw that one could subtract an appropriate linear “correction” to obtain a new loss  $\tilde{\ell}_{\text{CATE}}$  and  $\tilde{\ell}_{\text{QTE}}$  satisfying the desired orthogonality condition. Our derivation before was ad-hoc, so we now present a more structured approach for orthogonalizing losses. We start by defining the *orthogonalized loss* below. From this point onward, we let  $\tilde{\mathcal{G}} := \mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{G}$  denote the space of nuisance tuples.

**Definition 3.5** (Orthogonalized Loss). Let  $\ell : \mathbb{R} \times \mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a loss. We define the corresponding *orthogonalized loss*  $\tilde{\ell} : \mathbb{R} \times \tilde{\mathcal{G}} \times \mathcal{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  by

$$\tilde{\ell}(\theta, \tilde{g}; z) = \ell(\theta, g; z) - \theta(x) \cdot \text{Corr}(\tilde{g}; z),$$

where  $\tilde{g} = (g, b) \in \tilde{\mathcal{G}}$  and  $\text{Corr} : \tilde{\mathcal{G}} \times \mathcal{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is any function satisfying  $\mathbb{E}[\text{Corr}(\tilde{g}; Z) \mid X] = \mathbb{E}[\langle b(W), (g - g_0)(W) \rangle \mid X]$ .

The correction term  $\text{Corr}$  needs to be carefully constructed by the statistician to be practically relevant, as it cannot explicitly depend on the unknown nuisance  $g_0$ . In the simplest setting (as will be the case for  $\ell_{\text{CATE}}$  and  $\ell_{\text{ACD}}$ ), one can find a subset of variables  $U \subset \mathcal{Z}$  satisfying  $g_0(w) = \mathbb{E}[U \mid W = w]$  for all  $w \in \mathcal{W}$ . In this case, the statistician can simply set the linear correction term to be

$$\text{Corr}((g, b); z) := \langle b(w), g(w) - u \rangle.$$

In other settings (such as in the case  $\ell_{\text{QTE}}$  and  $\ell_{\text{LATE}}$ ), finding such a variable  $U$  is not possible. Thus, the statistician must take more care in defining  $\text{Corr}$ . We discuss the explicit correction term for all losses in Example 3.7 below.

Going forward, instead of making the assumption that  $\ell$  satisfies some orthogonality condition (Neyman, universal, or conditional orthogonality, for instance), we find it more appropriate to say  $\ell$  is *orthogonalizable*, i.e. that we can try to estimate  $b_0 \in \tilde{\mathcal{G}}$  such that the target cross derivative of  $\tilde{\ell}$  vanishes. We crystallize this in the following definition.<sup>3</sup>

**Definition 3.6.** Let  $\ell : \mathbb{R} \times \mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be some loss and let  $\tilde{\ell} : \mathbb{R} \times \tilde{\mathcal{G}} \times \mathcal{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be the corresponding orthogonalized loss. We say  $\ell$  is

1. *Neyman orthogonalizable* if there exists some  $b_0 \in \mathcal{G}$  such that  $D_{\tilde{g}}\mathbb{E}[\partial\tilde{\ell}(\theta_0, \tilde{g}; Z) \mid X](\tilde{g} - \tilde{g}_0) = 0$  for all  $\tilde{g} - \tilde{g}_0 \in \tilde{\mathcal{G}}$ , where  $\tilde{g}_0 := (g_0, b_0)$ .
2. *universally orthogonalizable* if there exists some  $b_0 \in \mathcal{G}$  such that  $D_{\tilde{g}}\mathbb{E}[\partial\tilde{\ell}(\theta, \tilde{g}; Z) \mid X](\tilde{g} - \tilde{g}_0) = 0$  for all  $\theta \in \Theta$  and  $\tilde{g} - \tilde{g}_0 \in \tilde{\mathcal{G}}$ , where  $\tilde{g}_0 := (g_0, b_0)$ .
3. *conditionally orthogonalizable* if, for any  $\varphi : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}'$ , there exists some  $b_\varphi \in \mathcal{G}$  such that  $D_{\tilde{g}}\mathbb{E}[\partial\tilde{\ell}(\gamma_\varphi^*, \tilde{g}; Z) \mid \varphi(X)](\tilde{g} - \tilde{g}_\varphi) = 0$ , where  $\tilde{g}_\varphi = (g_0, b_\varphi)$ .

Losses are Neyman and conditionally orthogonalizable under very general conditions. On the other hand, universal orthogonalizability is a much stricter condition. In particular, a loss is universally orthogonalizable precisely when the Gateaux derivative  $D_g\mathbb{E}[\partial\ell(\theta, g_0; Z) \mid X]$  has no dependence on  $\theta$ . For instance, this will occur for any loss  $\ell$  satisfying  $\mathbb{E}[\partial\ell(\theta, g; Z) \mid X] = \theta(X) - \mathbb{E}[m(g; Z) \mid X]$  for some  $m : \mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ . In particular,  $\ell_{\text{CATE}}$ ,  $\ell_{\text{ACD}}$ , and  $\ell_{\text{LATE}}$  all satisfy this condition.

In effect, what Definition 3.6 accomplishes is that it allows the learner to take an initial, non-robust loss  $\ell$  and construct a new loss  $\tilde{\ell}$ , which is insensitive to parameter misestimation. With  $\tilde{\ell}$ , one can then perform risk minimization and calibration. The only catch is that the

---

<sup>3</sup>In Definition 3.6, the functional  $\mathbb{E}[\langle b_0(W), \cdot \rangle \mid X] : \mathcal{G} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is just the Riesz representer of the Gateaux derivative  $D_{\tilde{g}}\mathbb{E}[\partial\tilde{\ell}(\theta, \tilde{g}; Z) \mid X](\cdot) : \mathcal{G} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  [33].

learner must estimate an *additional* nuisance parameter, which is either  $b_0$  (in the case of Neyman or universal orthogonalizability) or  $b_\varphi$  (in the case of conditional orthogonalizability), which depends on the post-processing function  $\varphi$ . However, the task of estimating these parameters can often be accomplished with black-box machine learning or non-parametric methods. Further, as we will see in Section 4, one typically only needs to estimate one of  $g_0$  or  $b_0/b_\varphi$  well to perform reasonable calibration/inference.

With Definitions 3.5 and 3.6 at hand, we can return to the examples considered earlier in this paper. In particular, we take a more principled approach to orthogonalizing the losses.

**Example 3.7.** 1. We saw in Example 3.2 that although  $\ell_{\text{CATE}}$  wasn't universally orthogonal,  $\tilde{\ell}_{\text{CATE}}(\theta, (\mu, \pi); z) := \ell_{\text{CATE}}(\theta, \mu; z) - \theta(x) \cdot \left( \frac{a}{\pi(x)} - \frac{1-a}{1-\pi(x)} \right) (y - \mu(a, x))$  was. In our derivation, we explicitly computed that the additional nuisance  $b_0$  was simply

$$b_0(a, x) := \left( \frac{a}{\pi_0(x)} - \frac{1-a}{1-\pi_0(x)} \right),$$

and thus we can take the correction term to simply be  $\text{Corr}((\mu, b); z) := b(a, x)(y - \mu(a, x))$ . In practice, as seen above, one doesn't need to directly estimate  $b_0$ . Rather, one can estimate the propensity  $\pi_0$  instead. Note that, in this case, we have identified the variable  $Y$  as satisfying  $g_0(A, X) = \mathbb{E}[Y | X, A]$ .

2. In the case of  $\ell_{\text{ACD}}$ , one can compute that

$$\begin{aligned} D_\mu \mathbb{E}[\partial \ell_{\text{ACD}}(\theta, g_0; Z) | X](\mu - \mu_0) &= \mathbb{E}[\partial_a(\mu_0(A, X) - \mu(A, X)) | X] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{\partial_a \pi_0(A | X)}{\pi_0(A | X)} (\mu_0(A, X) - \mu(A, X)) | X \right], \end{aligned}$$

where the second equality follows from integration by parts so long as  $\pi(1 | x) \neq 0$  and  $\pi(0 | x) \neq 0$  for almost all  $x \in \mathcal{X}$ . Clearly, since the right hand doesn't depend on  $\theta$ ,  $\ell_{\text{ACD}}$  is universally orthogonalizable. Furthermore, it is clear that the additional nuisance parameter  $b_0$  that must be estimated is  $b_0(a, x) := \frac{\partial_a \pi_0(a|x)}{\pi_0(a|x)}$ . Thus, one should take the correction term to again be  $\text{Corr}((\mu, b); z) := b(a, x)(y - \mu(a, x))$ , where again we have made the identification  $g_0(A, X) = \mathbb{E}[Y | X, A]$  to remove dependence on the unknown nuisance.

3. Repeating the same general calculation for  $\ell_{\text{LATE}}$  and enforcing estimates  $g = \frac{p}{q}$ , straightforward computation yields

$$D_g \mathbb{E}[\partial \ell_{\text{LATE}}(\theta, g_0; Z) | X](g - g_0) = \left( \frac{p_0}{q_0} - \frac{p}{q} \right) (X),$$

where  $p_0$  and  $q_0$  are as in Example 2.2. Since the above expression does not depend on  $\theta(x)$ ,  $\ell_{\text{LATE}}$  is clearly universally orthogonalizable. It is now more subtle to construct the correction term, as we cannot find a subset of variables  $U \subset Z$  satisfying  $\frac{p_0(X)}{q_0(X)} = \mathbb{E}[U | X]$ . We can, however, make the identifications  $p_0(X) = \mathbb{E}[Y(A - \pi_0(X)) | X]$

and  $q_0(X) = \mathbb{E}[D(A - \pi_0(X)) \mid X]$ . From these identifications, we can rewrite the Gateaux derivative

$$\begin{aligned} \left( \frac{p}{q} - \frac{p_0}{q_0} \right) (X) &= \frac{1}{q_0(X)} \left( \frac{p(X)q_0(X)}{q(X)} - p_0(X) \right) \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{1}{q_0(X)} \left( \frac{p(X)D(A - \pi_0(X))}{q(X)} - Y(A - \pi_0(X)) \right) \mid X \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{D(A - \pi_0(X))}{q_0(X)} \left( \frac{p(X)}{q(X)} - \frac{Y(A - \pi_0(X))}{D(A - \pi_0(X))} \right) \mid X \right], \end{aligned}$$

where we make the convention that  $c/c \equiv 1$  for all  $c \in \mathbb{R}$ . Thus, taking  $b_0(a, d, x) := \frac{d(a - \pi_0(x))}{q_0(x)}$  and assuming all estimates to be of the form  $b(x) = \frac{d(a - \pi_0(x))}{q(x)}$ , we can take the correction as

$$\text{Corr}((g, b); z) := \frac{1}{q(x)} \left( y(a - \pi_0(x)) - \frac{p(x)d(a - \pi_0(x))}{q(x)} \right).$$

4. Lastly, Example 3.4 above reveals that  $\ell_{\text{QTE}}$  is not universally orthogonalizable, but rather conditionally orthogonalizable with  $b_\varphi(a, x) = a(f_\varphi - Q)$ , where  $f_\varphi(x) := \mathbb{P}(Y(1) \leq \gamma_\varphi^*(X) \mid X)$ . We took our correction term above to be given by

$$\text{Corr}((p, b); z) := ap(x)(f(x) - Q) + f(x) - Q,$$

where we have enforced  $b(w) = a(f(x) - Q)$  and we had the true additional nuisance as  $b_\theta(w) = a(f_\theta(x) - Q)$ , where  $f_\theta$  is as defined above.

As a final point, we discuss generically how universally orthogonalizable losses can be rewritten in terms of pseudo-outcomes. For instance, Example 3.2 showed that not only was  $\ell_{\text{CATE}}$  universally orthogonalizable, but also that one could construct an “equivalent” squared loss in terms of transformed data points that possessed the same analytical properties (e.g. conditional minimizer). This ability to find an “equivalent” loss in terms of pseudo-outcomes occurs quite generally for universally orthogonalizable losses, including the other two important examples of  $\ell_{\text{ACD}}$  and  $\ell_{\text{LATE}}$ . We provide a generic construction and sufficient condition for this phenomenon in the following Definition.

**Assumption 1.** We assume the base loss  $\ell : \mathbb{R} \times \mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  satisfies

$$\mathbb{E}[\partial\ell(\theta, g; Z) \mid X] = \theta(X) - \mathbb{E}[m(g; Z) \mid X]$$

for any  $g \in \mathcal{G}$  and  $\theta : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ .

**Definition 3.8** (Equivalent Loss). Let  $\ell : \mathbb{R} \times \mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be some base loss satisfying Assumption 1. The *equivalent orthogonal loss*  $\tilde{\ell}^{\text{eq}} : \mathbb{R} \times \tilde{\mathcal{G}} \times \mathcal{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is the loss defined by

$$\tilde{\ell}^{\text{eq}}(\theta, \tilde{g}; z) := \frac{1}{2} (\theta(x) - \chi(\tilde{g}; z))^2,$$

where  $\chi : \tilde{\mathcal{G}} \times \mathcal{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is the “pseudo-outcome” mapping, defined by

$$\chi(\tilde{g}; z) := m(z; g) + \text{Corr}(\tilde{g}; z)$$

The following lemma should convince the reader that  $\tilde{\ell}^{eq}$  and  $\tilde{\ell}$  are analytically the same for all relevant purposes. In particular, the following implies that  $\tilde{\ell}$  and  $\tilde{\ell}$  possess the same conditional minimizers and inherit the same notion of calibration.

**Lemma 3.9.** *Let  $\ell : \mathbb{R} \times \mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  satisfy Assumption 1. Let  $\tilde{\ell} : \mathbb{R} \times \tilde{\mathcal{G}} \times \mathcal{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be the orthogonalized loss, and let  $\tilde{\ell}^{eq}$  be the equivalent squared loss, as in Definition 3.8. Then, the following hold.*

1. *For any  $x \in \mathcal{X}$  and  $\tilde{g} \in \tilde{\mathcal{G}}$ , we have  $\arg \min_{\nu} \mathbb{E}[\tilde{\ell}(\nu, \tilde{g}; Z) \mid X = x] = \arg \min_{\omega} \mathbb{E}[\tilde{\ell}^{eq}(\omega, \tilde{g}; Z) \mid X = x]$ .*
2. *For any  $\theta : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ ,  $\tilde{g} \in \tilde{\mathcal{G}}$ ,  $m \geq 0$ , and  $n \geq 1$ , we have*

$$D_{\tilde{g}}^m \mathbb{E}[\partial^n \tilde{\ell}(\theta, \tilde{g}; Z) \mid X] = D_{\tilde{g}}^m \mathbb{E}[\partial^n \tilde{\ell}^{eq}(\theta, \tilde{g}; Z) \mid X].$$

With the above definition, we can compute the corresponding pseudo-outcomes  $\chi_{\text{ACD}}$  and  $\chi_{\text{LATE}}$  for the remaining losses  $\tilde{\ell}_{\text{ACD}}$  and  $\tilde{\ell}_{\text{LATE}}$  respectively. In particular, it is clear that we have  $\chi_{\text{ACD}}((\mu, \pi); z) = \partial_a \mu(a, x) + \frac{\partial_a \pi(a|x)}{\pi(a|x)}(y - \mu(a, x))$  and  $\chi_{\text{LATE}}((p, q); z) = \frac{p(x)}{q(x)} - \frac{1}{q(x)} \left( \frac{p(x)d(a-\pi_0(x))}{q(x)} - y(a - \pi_0(x)) \right)$ .

## 4 A Decomposition of Calibration Error

In the preceding several sections, we have laid the foundation for our work. In particular, we discussed two seemingly distinct topics. On one hand, we introduced a general notion of calibration that was defined with respect to a nuisance-dependent loss function. We argued the relevance of such a condition to causal calibration tasks, and then gave several specific examples. On the other hand, we discussed Neyman orthogonality, and showed how an arbitrary, nuisance-dependent loss could be orthogonalized by picking up an additional, linear correction term. However, in our treatment, we left a major lingering question: how do calibration and Neyman orthogonality relate to one another?

In this section, we answer the above question. We start by showing that the  $L^2$  calibration error (Definition 2.1) is *invariant to orthogonalization*, i.e. the calibration error of a parameter  $\theta$  is equivalent under  $\ell$  and  $\tilde{\ell}$ , so long as nuisances are accurately estimated. This equivalence allows the statistician to work directly with the orthogonalized loss  $\tilde{\ell}$ , which is inherently more robust to nuisance misestimation. From this identity, we formalize Informal Theorem 1, proving a two-term bound on the calibration error of an arbitrary estimator  $\theta : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ . We prove two similar bounds on calibration error, one under the stronger assumption that the loss  $\ell$  is *universally orthogonalizable* and the other under the weaker assumption that  $\ell$  is *conditionally orthogonalizable*. Our bounds implicitly decouple the task of nuisance estimation from the task of calibration, a similar phenomenon to what occurs in bounding excess loss in causal ML tasks that leverage Neyman orthogonality [15].

While the bounds on calibration error presented in this section are theoretical in nature, they do in fact hold practical relevance. In particular, we leverage both presented bound in Section 5, where we design and analyze two simple sample splitting algorithms for causal calibration.

**Invariance of Calibration Error:** We start by briefly showing that the  $L^2$  calibration error of an estimator  $\theta$  is invariant to orthogonalization. That is, the calibration error of  $\theta$  is the same with respect to  $\ell$  and  $\tilde{\ell}$  so long as the loss is evaluated at the true, unknown nuisance parameter.

To formalize this, we first define the calibration error of some parameter  $\theta$  under the orthogonalized loss  $\tilde{\ell}$ . For any nuisance estimates  $g, b \in \mathcal{G}$ , we define the calibration error  $\widetilde{\text{Cal}}(\theta, \tilde{g})$  as

$$\widetilde{\text{Cal}}(\theta, \tilde{g}) := \int_{\mathcal{X}} \mathbb{E} \left[ \partial \tilde{\ell}(\theta, \tilde{g}; Z) \mid \theta(X) = \theta(x) \right]^2 P_X(dx) = \mathbb{E} \left( \mathbb{E} \left[ \partial \tilde{\ell}(\theta, \tilde{g}; Z) \mid \theta(X) \right]^2 \right) \quad (5)$$

where  $\tilde{g} = (g, b)$ . The following lemma shows that when the original nuisance  $g_0$  is estimated perfectly, the calibration error for the orthogonalized loss  $\widetilde{\text{Cal}}(\theta, (g_0, b))$  coincides exactly with the calibration error  $\text{Cal}(\theta, g_0)$  under the *base loss*  $\ell$ , regardless matter what correction term  $b$  is used for orthogonalization. We prove the following in Appendix C.

**Lemma 4.1.** *Let  $\ell : \mathbb{R} \times \mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a loss, and let  $\tilde{\ell} : \mathbb{R} \times \tilde{\mathcal{G}} \times \mathcal{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  denote the corresponding orthogonalized loss. Let  $g_0 \in \mathcal{G}$  denote the true nuisances associated with  $\ell$ . We have, for any  $b \in \mathcal{G}$ ,*

$$\text{Cal}(\theta, g_0) = \widetilde{\text{Cal}}(\theta, (g_0, b)).$$

This result is not surprising. When  $g_0$  is perfectly estimated, the linear correction term added to the base loss  $\ell$  in orthogonalization vanishes in conditional expectation given covariates  $X$ . However, what happens when the nuisance parameters are imperfectly estimated? In general, we cannot expect  $\text{Cal}(\theta, g) = \widetilde{\text{Cal}}(\theta, (g, b))$  for all nuisances  $g, b \in \mathcal{G}$ . The goal of the remainder of the section is to show that the price paid for misestimation is ultimately small. That is, very roughly, we will show that

$$\text{Cal}(\theta, g_0) \lesssim \|(g - g_0)(b - b_0)\|_{L^2(P_W)} + \widetilde{\text{Cal}}(\theta, (g, b)),$$

i.e. the price paid for nuisance misestimation only depends on a cross-error in nuisance estimation. A similar rate has been seen in other works, with results by van der Laan et al. [52], Lan and Syrgkanis [32], and Foster and Syrgkanis [15] being key examples. We now move on to formalizing the above rate in the cases of universal and conditional orthogonality.

## 4.1 Error Decomposition for Universally Orthogonalizable Losses

We first formalize Informal Theorem 1 under the assumption that  $\ell$  is *universally orthogonalizable*. Our bound on  $\text{Cal}(\theta, g_0)$  consists of two decoupled terms. The first, denoted  $\text{err}(\tilde{g}, \tilde{g}_0; \theta)$ , intuitively measures the distance between some fixed nuisance estimate  $\tilde{g} \in \tilde{\mathcal{G}}$  and the unknown, true nuisance parameters  $\tilde{g}_0 = (g_0, b_0) \in \tilde{\mathcal{G}}$ . The second term represents the calibration error of  $\theta$  in a reality where the learned nuisances  $\tilde{g}$  were actually the true nuisances. As mentioned in the introduction, we view our bound as a “change of nuisance” result (akin to change of measure), allowing the learner to reason about the calibration error under unknown nuisances in terms of calibration error under potentially incorrect, learned nuisances plus a penalty term.

While the expression defining  $\text{err}(\tilde{g}, \tilde{g}_0; \theta)$  below looks unpalatable, this term can quite generally be bounded above by the cross-error in nuisance estimation, i.e. the quantity  $\|(g - g_0)(b - b_0)\|_{L^2(P_W)}$ . In particular, this sort of bound appears in other works on causal estimation [15, 52, 32]. We postpone a further discussion of the error term until after the theorem statement. We prove the following in Appendix A.

**Theorem 4.2.** *Let  $\ell : \mathbb{R} \times \mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , and  $\tilde{\ell}$  to corresponding orthogonalized loss, which we assume satisfies Definition 3.1. Let  $\tilde{g}_0 := (g_0, b_0)$  denote the true nuisance parameters associated with  $\tilde{\ell}$ . Then, for any  $\tilde{g} \in \tilde{\mathcal{G}}$  and  $\theta : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , we have*

$$\text{Cal}(\theta, g_0) \leq \frac{1}{2} \text{err}(\tilde{g}, \tilde{g}_0; \theta) + \widetilde{\text{Cal}}(\theta, \tilde{g}),$$

where  $\text{err}(g, h; \theta) := \sup_{f \in [g, h]} \sqrt{\mathbb{E} \left( \left\{ D_g^2 \mathbb{E} \left[ \partial \tilde{\ell}(\theta, f; Z) \mid X \right] (h - g, h - g) \right\}^2 \right)}$ .<sup>4</sup>

We view the above result below as a major generalization of the main result (Theorem 1) of van der Laan et al. [52], which shows a similar bound for measuring the calibration error of estimates of conditional average treatment effects when calibration is performed according to isotonic regression. The aforementioned authors implicitly orthogonalize the base loss ( $\ell_{\text{CATE}}$  in this case) in their argument, which ultimately leads to a decoupled bound on the  $L^2$  calibration error  $\text{Cal}(\theta, g_0)$ . Our result, which more explicitly leverages the concept of Neyman orthogonality, can be used to recover that of van der Laan et al. [52] as a special case, including the error rate in nuisance estimation.

We also explain the practical utility of our bound, which we will expand upon in Section 5. In essence, our bound on  $\text{Cal}(\theta, g_0)$  reduces the problem of causal calibration (or, more generally, calibrating estimators with respect to losses involving nuisance parameters) to two, independent tasks. The first task involves using some off-the-shelf ML method to estimate the unknown nuisance parameters  $g_0$  and  $b_0$ . The second involves using the learned nuisances to map the data into a “fully observed” world, in which a black-box calibration algorithm (e.g. histogram binning, isotonic regression) can be used to calibrate an initial estimate. We make this reasoning rigorous in Algorithm 1 and Theorem 5.4, in which we respectively describe a simple sample splitting algorithm for performing causal calibration and prove convergence guarantees.

**Interpreting the error:** We conclude this subsection by spending some time interpreting the somewhat daunting error term  $\text{err}(\tilde{g}, \tilde{g}_0; \theta)$ . First, for any loss  $\ell$  satisfying the score condition presented in Assumption 1, which we recall was that  $\partial \ell(\theta, g; z) = \theta(x) - m(g; z)$  for some function  $m$ , the dependence on  $\theta$  will disappear. Thus, in this case, it makes sense to generically omit  $\theta$  from the error term, i.e. we will discuss the quantity  $\text{err}(\tilde{g}, \tilde{g}_0)$  in the remainder of the section. In addition, for all examples of universally orthogonal losses considered (e.g.  $\ell_{\text{CATE}}$ ,  $\ell_{\text{ACD}}$ , and  $\ell_{\text{LATE}}$ ), it is straightforward to see that  $m(g; z)$  is linear in the base nuisance  $g$ . In this setting, a straightforward calculation yields the following bound on  $\text{err}(\tilde{g}, \tilde{g}_0)$ .

---

<sup>4</sup>For  $f, h \in \mathcal{G}$ , we let the interval  $[f, h] := \{\lambda f + (1 - \lambda)h : \lambda \in [0, 1]\}$ .

**Proposition 4.3.** *Suppose the loss  $\ell$  satisfies Assumption 1 and that  $m(g; z)$  is linear in  $g$ . Then, we have*

$$\frac{1}{2}\text{err}(\tilde{g}, \tilde{g}_0) \leq \|(g - g_0)(b - b_0)\|_{L^2(P_W)},$$

where  $\tilde{g}_0 = (g_0, b_0)$  represent the true, unknown nuisance parameters, and  $\tilde{g} = (g, b)$  represent arbitrary, fixed nuisance estimates.

**Example 4.4.** We can use the above proposition to make a full comparison to the results of van der Laan et al. [52]. First, note that if we enforce  $b(a, x) = \frac{a}{\pi(x)} - \frac{1-a}{1-\pi(x)}$  for some propensity estimate  $\pi : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow (0, 1)$ , the bound on the error term presented in Proposition 4.3 simply becomes.

$$\frac{1}{2}\text{err}(\tilde{g}, \tilde{g}_0) \leq \left\| \left[ \left( \frac{A}{\pi(X)} - \frac{A}{\pi_0(X)} \right) - \left( \frac{1-A}{1-\pi(X)} - \frac{1-A}{1-\pi_0(X)} \right) \right] (\mu(A, X) - \mu_0(A, X)) \right\|_{L^2(P_W)}.$$

On the other hand, the error term considered in van der Laan et al. [52] grows as  $O(\|(\pi - \pi_0)(\mu - \mu_0)\|)$ . While this may not seem equivalent to our bound, if we assume  $\epsilon \leq \pi(x), \pi_0(x) \leq 1 - \epsilon$  for all  $x \in \mathcal{X}$  and some  $0 < \epsilon < \frac{1}{2}$  (as is done in van der Laan et al. [52]), we can compute that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2}\text{err}(\tilde{g}, \tilde{g}_0) &\leq \left\| \left[ \left( \frac{A}{\pi(X)} - \frac{A}{\pi_0(X)} \right) - \left( \frac{1-A}{1-\pi(X)} - \frac{1-A}{1-\pi_0(X)} \right) \right] (\mu(A, X) - \mu_0(A, X)) \right\|_{L^2(P_W)} \\ &\leq \left\| \left( \frac{1}{\pi(X)} - \frac{1}{\pi_0(X)} \right) (\mu(A, X) - \mu_0(A, X)) \right\|_{L^2(P_W)} \\ &\quad + \left\| \left( \frac{1}{1-\pi(X)} - \frac{1}{1-\pi_0(X)} \right) (\mu(A, X) - \mu_0(A, X)) \right\|_{L^2(P_W)} \\ &\leq \frac{2}{\epsilon^2} \|(\pi(X) - \pi_0(X))(\mu(A, X) - \mu_0(A, X))\|_{L^2(P_W)}. \end{aligned}$$

In particular, this computation recovers the nuisance estimation rate in van der Laan et al. [52] up to constants.

## 4.2 Error Decomposition for Conditionally Orthogonalizable Losses

We now prove a similar, decoupled bound on the calibration error  $\text{Cal}(\theta, g_0)$  under the weaker assumption that  $\ell$  is *conditionally orthogonalizable*. While we saw that many interesting examples of parameters could be specified as minimizers of universally orthogonalizable loss functions, other interesting parameters cannot be specified in such a way. The key example considered in this instance, the conditional  $Q$ -quantile under treatment (i.e. the parameter  $\theta_{\text{QTE}}(x) := F_1^{-1}(Q | X)$ , where  $F_1(v | x) := \mathbb{P}(Y(1) \leq v | X = x)$ ), is a minimizer of the pinball loss function, which we saw in Section 3.2 was not universally orthogonalizable. As we will see, bounding the calibration error of losses that are not universally orthogonalizable is a much more delicate task.

To prove our result, we will need some convexity assumptions on the underlying loss  $\ell$ . Since the orthogonalized loss  $\tilde{\ell}$  only differs from  $\ell$  by a correction term that is linear in the

prediction  $\theta(x)$ ,  $\tilde{\ell}$  will directly inherit the following from the original loss. We note that these convexity results are akin to those made in existing works, namely in the work of Foster and Syrgkanis [15].

**Assumption 2.** *We assume that the loss function conditioned on covariates  $X$  is  $\alpha$ -strongly convex, i.e. for any  $v \in \mathbb{R}$  and any  $g \in \mathcal{G}$ , we have*

$$\mathbb{E} [\partial^2 \ell(v, g; Z) | X] \geq \alpha.$$

**Assumption 3.** *We assume that the loss function conditioned on covariates  $X$  is  $\beta$ -smooth, i.e. for any  $v \in \mathbb{R}$  and any  $g \in \mathcal{G}$ , we have*

$$\mathbb{E} [\partial^2 \ell(v, g; Z) | X] \leq \beta.$$

We now state the main theorem of this section. The bound below appears largely identical to the one presented in Theorem 4.2 modulo two minor differences. First, we pay a multiplicative factor of  $\beta/\alpha$  in both of the decoupled terms, which ultimately is just the condition number of the base loss  $\ell$ . Second, the error term  $\text{err}(\tilde{g}, \tilde{g}_\theta; \gamma_\theta^*)$  is evaluated at the calibration function  $\gamma_\theta^*(x) := \arg \min_\nu \mathbb{E}[\ell(\nu, g_0; Z) | \theta(X) = \theta(x)]$  instead of the parameter estimate  $\theta$ . This difference is due to the fact that, in the proof of Theorem 4.5, we must perform a functional Taylor expansion around  $\gamma_\theta^*$  in order to invoke the orthogonality condition. This subtlety was absent in the case of universal orthogonality, as  $\tilde{\ell}$  was insensitive to nuisance misestimation for any parameter estimate  $\theta$ . We ultimately view this difference as minor, as for many examples (e.g. pinball loss  $\ell_{\text{QTE}}$ ) the dependence on  $\gamma_\theta^*$  vanishes. We prove Theorem 4.5 in Appendix A.

**Theorem 4.5.** *Let  $\ell$  be a conditionally orthogonalizable loss (Definition 3.3) that is  $\alpha$ -strongly convex (Assumption 2) and  $\beta$ -smooth (Assumption 3). Then, for any mapping  $\theta : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  and nuisance parameter  $\tilde{g} = (g, b)$ , we have*

$$\text{Cal}(\theta, g_0) \leq \frac{\beta}{2\alpha} \text{err}(\tilde{g}, \tilde{g}_\theta; \gamma_\theta^*) + \frac{\beta}{\alpha} \widetilde{\text{Cal}}(\theta, \tilde{g}),$$

where  $\tilde{g}_\theta = (g_\theta, b_\theta)$  are the true, unknown nuisance functions,  $\gamma_\theta^*$  is the calibration function associated with  $\theta$ , and  $\text{err}(\tilde{g}, \tilde{g}_\theta; \gamma_\theta^*)$  is as defined in Theorem 4.2.

Although the bound in Theorem 4.5 looks similar in spirit to the one presented in Theorem 4.2, there still remain questions to answer. For instance, what does the condition number  $\beta/\alpha$  look like for practically-relevant losses? Likewise, will the error term  $\text{err}(\tilde{g}, \tilde{g}_\theta; \gamma_\theta^*)$  simplify into a cross-error term as in the case of universally orthogonalizable losses? We interpret Theorem 4.5 by spending some time looking at the example of the pinball loss  $\ell_{\text{QTE}}$ .

**Example 4.6.** First, for any fixed quantile  $Q$ , we assess the strong convexity/smoothness properties of  $\ell_{\text{QTE}}$ . Let  $p : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$  represent any inverse-propensity estimate, and let  $\pi_0$  represent the true propensity score. Straightforward calculation yields

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\ell_{\text{QTE}}(\theta, p; Z) | X] &= \mathbb{E}[Ap(X)(Y - \theta(X))(Q - \mathbb{1}_{Y \leq \theta(X)}) | X] \\ &= p(X)\pi_0(X)\mathbb{E}[A\pi_0(X)^{-1}(Y - \theta(X))(Q - \mathbb{1}_{Y \leq \theta(X)}) | X] \\ &= p(X)\pi_0(X)\mathbb{E}[(Y(1) - \theta(X))(Q - \mathbb{1}_{Y(1) \leq \theta(X)}) | X] \end{aligned}$$

Next, assuming that  $Y(1)$  admits a conditional density  $f_1(y | x)$  with respect to the Lebesgue measure on  $\mathbb{R}$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned}\partial^2 \mathbb{E}[\ell_{\text{QTE}}(\theta, p; Z) | X] &= \partial^2[(Y(1) - \theta(X))(Q - \mathbb{1}_{Y(1) \leq \theta(X)}) | X] \\ &= \partial Q \mathbb{P}(Y(1) \geq \theta(X) | X) - (1 - Q) \mathbb{P}(Y(1) \leq \theta(X) | X) \\ &= f_1(\theta(x) | x).\end{aligned}$$

Thus, if  $a \leq f_1(y | x) \leq b$  for all  $y \in \mathbb{R}, x \in \mathcal{X}$  and  $\epsilon < \pi_0(x), p(x)^{-1} \leq 1 - \epsilon$  for all  $x \in \mathcal{X}$  for some  $0 < \epsilon < 1/2$ , then we have:

$$\frac{\epsilon^2}{(1 - \epsilon)^2} a \leq \partial^2 \mathbb{E}[\ell_{\text{QTE}}(\theta, p; Z) | X] \leq \frac{(1 - \epsilon)^2}{\epsilon^2} b,$$

i.e. that  $\ell_{\text{QTE}}$  satisfies Assumption 3 with  $\beta = \frac{1 - \epsilon}{\epsilon} b$  and Assumption 2 with  $\alpha = \frac{\epsilon}{1 - \epsilon} a$ .

We can further interpret the error term  $\text{err}(\tilde{g}, \tilde{g}_\theta; \gamma_\theta^*)$  in the case of the pinball loss. In particular, straightforward calculation yields

$$\mathbb{E}[\partial \tilde{\ell}_Q(\theta, \tilde{g}; Z) | X] = \frac{p(X)}{p_0(X)} (\mathbb{P}(Y(1) \leq \theta(X) | X) - Q) - \mathbb{E}[b(W)(p(W) - p_0(W)) | X].$$

As the first term is linear in the nuisance estimate  $p$ , its second derivative (with respect to  $\tilde{g}$ ) is identically zero. Thus, as seen in previous examples, the error term does not depend on  $\gamma_\theta^*$ , and thus we can write  $\text{err}(\tilde{g}, \tilde{g}_\theta)$  instead. Further, the expected correction term is identical to the expected correction term analyzed in the proof of Proposition 4.3. Thus, following the same line of reasoning, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{2} \text{err}(\tilde{g}, \tilde{g}_\theta) &\leq \|(b - b_0)(p - p_0)\|_{L^2(P_W)} \\ &= \|A(f(X) - f_\theta(X))(p(X) - p_0(X))\|_{L^2(P_W)},\end{aligned}$$

where we recall that  $f_\theta(x) := \mathbb{P}(Y(1) \leq \gamma_\theta^* | X = x)$ . Thus, even in the general case of conditional orthogonality, we can often obtain simple looking bounds on the error in nuisance estimation.

## 5 Algorithms for Causal Calibration

In the previous section, we constructed generic bounds on the calibration error of an arbitrary estimator  $\theta : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  with respect to some nuisance-dependent loss  $\ell$ . While we considered two regimes (that of universal and conditional orthogonalizability), our results in both were largely the same. Namely, the calibration error  $\text{Cal}(\theta, g_0)$  could be bounded (up to constants) by two terms — an error term  $\text{err}$ , which roughly measured the quality of learned nuisance estimates  $\tilde{g} = (g, b)$ , and  $\widetilde{\text{Cal}}(\theta, (g, b))$ , which measured calibration error under the orthogonalized loss  $\tilde{\ell}$  assuming the learned nuisances  $(g, b)$  were true.

We now use the aforementioned, largely theoretical results to develop sample splitting algorithms for causal calibration. Once again, we split our results into two regimes: one

where  $\ell$  is universally orthogonalizable and one where  $\ell$  is only conditionally orthogonalizable. In the former, we construct an algorithm which uses half of the data to estimate nuisances and then uses the learned transforms the second half into pseudo-outcomes. Once this happens, the learner applies some off-the-shelf calibration algorithm to the transformed data points, provably inheriting its convergence guarantees. In the latter regime, we present a histogram/uniform mass binning approach that uses an off-the-shelf algorithm to estimate nuisances like propensities. Both algorithms are exceedingly simple and general, allowing a learner to take advantage of existing theoretical results on nuisance estimation and calibration.

## 5.1 Two-Way Sample Splitting for Universal Orthogonality

We first construct a sample splitting algorithm in the setting where  $\ell$  is universally orthogonalizable. More specifically, we assume  $\ell$  satisfies the score condition  $\mathbb{E}[\partial\ell(\theta, g; Z) \mid X] = \theta(X) - \mathbb{E}[m(g; Z) \mid X]$  outlined in Assumption 1. This condition was quite general, and as noted earlier holds for  $\ell_{\text{CATE}}$ ,  $\ell_{\text{ACD}}$ , and  $\ell_{\text{LATE}}$ . At a high level, Assumption 1 will allow us to use estimated nuisance functions to reduce our causal/partially observed calibration problem to a fully-observed one defined in terms of equivalent losses and pseudo-outcomes (see Definition 3.8). At this point, we will be able to directly apply classically studied calibration algorithms to the pseudo-outcomes, directly inheriting convergence guarantees in a way to be specified in the sequel.

In describing our results, we make use of a quantity which we will refer to as the *classical  $L^2$  calibration error*, which has been extensively studied in other (non-causal) works on calibration [21, 46, 34].

**Definition 5.1** (Classical calibration error). Let  $\theta : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a fixed estimator, and let  $(X, Y) \sim P$ , where  $P$  is some arbitrary distribution on  $\mathcal{X} \times \mathbb{R}$ . The *classical  $L^2$  calibration error* is defined by

$$\text{Cal}(\theta; P) := \int_{\mathcal{X}} (\theta(x) - \mathbb{E}_{P_Y}[Y \mid \theta(X) = \theta(x)])^2 P_X(dx),$$

where we make dependence on the underlying distribution  $P$  clear for convenience.

Why is the classical calibration error useful in our setting? When  $\ell$  is universally orthogonalizable and satisfies the moment condition outlined in Assumption 1, the calibration  $\widetilde{\text{Cal}}(\theta, (g, b))$  under the orthogonalized loss  $\widetilde{\ell}$  exactly coincides with the classical calibration error  $\text{Cal}(\theta; P^\chi)$  for some appropriately defined distribution  $P^\chi$ . We formalize this in the following lemma, which we prove in Appendix B.

**Lemma 5.2.** *Let  $\theta : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  and  $\widetilde{g} = (g, b) \in \widetilde{\mathcal{G}}$  be respectively a fixed estimator and nuisance parameter. Then, we have the*

$$\widetilde{\text{Cal}}(\theta, \widetilde{g}) = \text{Cal}(\theta, P^\chi),$$

where  $P^\chi$  denotes the distribution of  $(X, \chi(\widetilde{g}; Z))$  on  $\mathcal{X} \times \mathbb{R}$ .

With the notions of pseudo-outcomes and equivalent losses at hand, we can describe our sample splitting algorithm. To summarize Algorithm 1, to perform calibration, one only needs to (a) estimate the unknown nuisance parameters  $\tilde{g}$  using some algorithm  $\mathcal{A}_1$ , (b) transform data points according to the pseudo outcome map  $\chi(\tilde{g}; \cdot) : \mathcal{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  defined above, and (c) run some calibration algorithm  $\mathcal{A}_2$  on the transformed data. So long as both  $\mathcal{A}_1$  and  $\mathcal{A}_2$  possess high-probability convergence guarantees, Algorithm 1 will possess high-probability convergence guarantees as well — the bound on  $\text{Cal}(\theta, g_0)$  will just be (up to constants) the sum of the bounds on each constituent algorithm. We present our assumptions on the constituent algorithms  $\mathcal{A}_1$  and  $\mathcal{A}_2$  now.

**Assumption 4.** Let  $\mathcal{A}_1 : \mathcal{Z}^* \rightarrow \tilde{\mathcal{G}}$  be a nuisance estimation algorithm taking in an arbitrary number of points, and let  $\mathcal{A}_2 : \Theta \times (\mathcal{X} \times [0, 1])^* \rightarrow \Theta$  be a calibration algorithm taking some initial estimator and an arbitrary number of covariate/label pairs. We assume

1. For any distribution  $P_Z$  on  $\mathcal{Z}$ ,  $Z_1, \dots, Z_n \sim P$  i.i.d., and failure probability  $\delta_1 \in (0, 1)$ , we have

$$\text{err}((\hat{g}, \hat{b}), (g_0, b_0); \theta) \leq r_1(n, \delta_1; P_Z),$$

where  $(\hat{g}, \hat{b}) \sim \mathcal{A}_1(Z_{1:n})$  and  $r_1$  is some rate function.

2. For any distribution  $Q$  on  $\mathcal{X} \times [0, 1]$ ,  $(X_1, Y_1), \dots, (X_n, Y_n) \sim Q$  i.i.d., and failure probability  $\delta_2 \in (0, 1)$ , we have

$$\text{Cal}(\theta; Q) \leq r_2(n, \delta_2),$$

where  $r_2$  is some rate function.

3. With probability one over the draws  $Z_1, \dots, Z_n \sim_{\text{i.i.d.}} P$  and  $(\hat{g}, \hat{b}) \sim \mathcal{A}_1(Z_{1:n}, \delta_2)$ , the pseudo outcomes<sup>5</sup>  $\chi((\hat{g}, \hat{b}); Z_i)$  satisfy  $\chi((\hat{g}, \hat{b}); Z_i) \in [0, 1]$ .

We briefly parse the above assumptions. The first assumption is very realistic, as when  $\text{err}(\tilde{g}, \tilde{g}_0; \theta) = \|(g - g_0)(b - b_0)\|_{L^2(P_W)}$ , one can directly apply ML, non-parametric, or semi-parametric methods to estimate the unknown nuisances. For instance, if  $g_0, b_0$  are assumed to satisfy Holder continuity assumptions or are assumed to belong to a ball in a reproducing kernel Hilbert space, one can apply classical kernel smoothing methods or kernel ridge regression respectively to estimate the unknown parameters van der Laan et al. [52], Tsybakov [51], Wainwright [54] to obtain optimal rates. Likewise, many well-known calibration algorithms satisfy the second assumption, often in a manner that doesn't depend on the underlying distribution  $P$ . For instance, results in Gupta and Ramdas [21] on  $L^\infty$  calibration error bounds imply that if  $\mathcal{A}_2$  is taken to be uniform mass/histogram binning, then the rate function  $r_2$  can be taken as  $r_2(n, \delta) = O\left(\sqrt{\frac{B \log(B/\delta)}{n}}\right)$ , where  $B$  denotes the number of bins/buckets. Note that the calibration algorithm does not depend on the nuisance parameters. This is intentional, as by appropriately defining pseudo-outcomes and the equivalent loss, we reduce the problem of causal calibration to that of vanilla, squared loss calibration.

---

<sup>5</sup>We recall that for  $\ell$  satisfying Assumption 1 and for any nuisance estimate  $\tilde{g} \in \tilde{\mathcal{G}}$ , the pseudo-outcome mapping is defined by  $\chi(\tilde{g}; z) := m(z; g) + \text{Corr}(\tilde{g}; z)$

*Remark 5.3.* In the first and second points of the above assumption, one could instead assume that  $\text{err}((\widehat{g}, \widehat{b}), (g_0, b_0); \theta) = O_{\mathbb{P}}(r_1(n; P_Z))$  and  $\text{Cal}(\theta; Q) = O_{\mathbb{P}}(r_2(n))$  for appropriately chosen rate functions  $r_1$  and  $r_2$ . This, for instance, would be useful if one wanted to apply the results on the convergence of isotonic regression due to van der Laan et al. [52], which show  $\text{Cal}(\theta; P) = O_{\mathbb{P}}(n^{-1/3})$ .

We now show that Algorithm 1 obeys a clean, high-probability guarantee. This result is essentially just a corollary of the error decomposition result presented in Theorem 4.2.

---

**Algorithm 1** A Calibration Algorithm for Universally Orthogonal Losses

---

- 1: **Input:**  $2n$  i.i.d. samples  $Z_1, \dots, Z_{2n} \sim P_Z$ , nuisance estimation algorithm  $\mathcal{A}_1$ , calibration algorithm  $\mathcal{A}_2$ , and an initial estimator  $\theta : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ .
  - 2: Produce estimator  $\tilde{g} = (\widehat{g}, \widehat{b}) \leftarrow \mathcal{A}_1(Z_{n+1:2n})$  to learn an approximation  $\tilde{g}$  of the true, unknown nuisances  $\tilde{g}_0$ .
  - 3: Define transformed data points  $Z'_1, \dots, Z'_n := \chi(\tilde{g}; Z_1), \dots, \chi(\tilde{g}; Z_n)$ .
  - 4: **Return**  $\widehat{\theta} \leftarrow \mathcal{A}_2(Z'_{1:n}, \theta)$ .
- 

**Theorem 5.4.** *Suppose  $\ell : \mathbb{R} \times \mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is an arbitrary, universally orthogonalizable loss satisfying Assumption 1. Let  $\mathcal{A}_1, \mathcal{A}_2$ , and  $\chi$  satisfy Assumption 4. Then, with probability at least  $1 - \delta_1 - \delta_2$ , the output  $\widehat{\theta}$  of Algorithm 1 run on a calibration dataset of  $2n$  i.i.d. data points  $Z_1, \dots, Z_{2n} \sim P$  satisfies*

$$\text{Cal}(\widehat{\theta}, g_0) \leq \frac{1}{2}r_1(n, \delta; P_Z) + r_2(n, \delta).$$

We prove the above theorem in Appendix B. The above result can be thought of as an analogue of Theorem 1 of Foster and Syrgkanis [15], which shows a similar bound on excess parameter risk, and also a generalization of Theorem 1 of van der Laan et al. [52], which shows a similar bound when isotonic regression is used to calibrate CATE estimates.

## 5.2 Three-Way Sample Splitting for Conditional Orthogonality

We now develop a three-way sample splitting algorithm for causal calibration based on uniform mass/histogram binning [23, 21, 30]. Our algorithm takes an initial estimator  $\theta$  and transforms it into a new one  $\widehat{\theta}$  that is approximately calibrated with respect to a *conditionally orthogonalizable* loss. Of particular importance, our algorithm can calibrate estimators with respect to the  $Q$ -pinball loss  $\ell_{Q\text{TE}}$ , which we saw had the conditional  $Q$ -quantile under treatment as its minimizer.

Our algorithm is implicitly based on the calibration error decomposition presented in Theorem 4.5. Instantiating Theorem 5.4 on the newly calibrated  $\widehat{\theta}$ , we see that the total calibration error of  $\text{Cal}(\widehat{\theta}, g_0)$  decomposes into nuisance estimation error  $\text{err}(\tilde{g}, \tilde{g}_0; \gamma_{\widehat{\theta}}^*)$  and calibration error  $\widetilde{\text{Cal}}(\widehat{\theta}, \tilde{g})$  under our nuisance estimate  $\tilde{g} = (\widehat{g}, \widehat{b})$ . Ideally, we would like to be able to take the same, sample-splitting approach done in Subsection 5.1. That is, we would like to use half of the data to compute nuisances and the other half to calibrate  $\theta$  assuming the learned nuisances reflected reality.

However, there is a major subtlety in taking this approach. In many settings, the error term simplifies as  $\text{err}(\tilde{g}, \tilde{g}_\theta; \gamma_{\hat{\theta}}^*) = \|(\hat{g} - g_0)(\hat{b} - b_{\hat{\theta}})\|$ . This error implicitly measures the distance from our estimated nuisance  $\tilde{g} = (\hat{g}, \hat{b})$  to the true nuisances  $(g_0, b_{\hat{\theta}})$ . The original nuisance parameter  $g_0$  depends on neither the initial estimator  $\theta$  nor the calibrated estimate  $\hat{\theta}$ , and thus can be reliably estimated from i.i.d. data. On the other hand, the additional nuisance  $b_{\hat{\theta}}$  (which comes from invoking the third part of Definition 3.6 with the “post-processing” function  $\hat{\theta}$ , as is required by Theorem 4.5) explicitly depends on the *calibrated parameter*  $\hat{\theta}$ . Due to this dependence on the *calibrated parameter*  $\hat{\theta}$ , which itself randomly depends on calibration data, it is unclear how to estimate  $b_{\hat{\theta}}$ .

Thus, we find ourselves with what at first appears as a chicken and egg problem. On one hand, to calibrate  $\theta$  efficiently, we must first estimate the nuisance  $b_{\hat{\theta}}$  associated with the calibrated parameter  $\hat{\theta}$ . On the other hand, how can we estimate  $b_{\hat{\theta}}$  without knowing  $\hat{\theta}$ ? Our key insight in this section is that  $b_{\hat{\theta}}$  only depends on  $\hat{\theta}$  through its level sets, as formalized in Lemma 5.5.

**Lemma 5.5.** *Suppose  $\ell$  is conditionally orthogonalizable, and suppose  $\varphi_1, \varphi_2 : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  have the same level sets, i.e. they satisfy  $\{\varphi_1^{-1}(c) : c \in \text{range}(\varphi_1)\} = \{\varphi_2^{-1}(c) : c \in \text{range}(\varphi_2)\}$ , of which we assume there are finitely or countably many.<sup>6</sup> Then, the calibration functions satisfy  $\gamma_{\varphi_1}^* = \gamma_{\varphi_2}^*$ . As a consequence, we have  $\mathbb{E}[\langle b_{\varphi_1}(W), (g - g_0)(W) \rangle \mid \varphi_1(X)] = \mathbb{E}[\langle b_{\varphi_2}(W), (g - g_0)(W) \rangle \mid \varphi_2(X)]$  almost surely for any  $b_{\varphi_1}$  and  $b_{\varphi_2}$  satisfying Definition 3.6. Thus, without loss of generality, we can assume  $b_{\varphi_1} \equiv b_{\varphi_2}$ .*

The argument used in proving Lemma 5.5 is straightforward, albeit mildly technical. Since  $\varphi_1$  and  $\varphi_2$  have the same level sets, they consequently have the same calibration function. This is because the calibration function is defined simply as the argument minimizer in each bucket/level set. From this, we can deduce that the additional nuisances  $b_{\varphi_1}$  and  $b_{\varphi_2}$  are the same. This is because these parameters simply serve as the Riesz representers of  $D_g \mathbb{E}[\partial \ell(\gamma_{\varphi_1}^*, g_0; Z) \mid \varphi_1(X)]$  and  $D_g \mathbb{E}[\partial \ell(\gamma_{\varphi_2}^*, g_0; Z) \mid \varphi_2(X)]$  respectively, and these Gateaux/Fréchet derivatives are identical.

In short, the above lemma can be thought of as a “bucket-preserving” property of conditional orthogonality — if two estimators share the same level sets, then they share the same nuisances/Riesz representers. The remaining question is as follows: how can we leverage this fact to our advantage? If we were able to somehow learn the level sets of  $\hat{\theta}$  as an initial step before estimating nuisances and calibrating  $\theta$ , then perhaps we would have a shot at accurately estimating the target nuisances. This is where the additional fold of data comes into play — we can use the first third of the data to learn level sets/buckets, and then these buckets can then be shared across the nuisance estimation/calibration algorithms.

We now provide a brief summary of our algorithm for calibrating conditionally orthogonalizable losses (Algorithm 3). The learner receives  $3n$  i.i.d. points from the population distribution  $P_Z$ . Given some pre-fixed number of buckets  $B$ , the learner defines a partition  $V_1, \dots, V_B$  of  $[0, 1]$  using the order statistics of  $\theta(X_1), \dots, \theta(X_n)$ . In particular, the learner creates the partition such that  $V_i$  contains (roughly)  $n/B$  points for each  $i \in [B]$ . These buckets implicitly define a partition  $\mathcal{E}_1, \dots, \mathcal{E}_B$  of the domain  $\mathcal{X}$  by  $\mathcal{E}_i = \theta^{-1}(V_i)$ . We describe this binning strategy more formally in Algorithm 2.

---

<sup>6</sup>For a function  $f : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$  that is not necessarily injective, we let  $f^{-1}(c) := \{x \in \mathcal{X} : f(x) = c\}$ .

Then, the learner now commits to returning  $\widehat{\theta}(x) = \sum_{i=1}^B \widehat{\nu}_i \mathbb{1}[x \in \mathcal{E}_i]$  for some distinct constants  $\widehat{\nu}_1, \dots, \widehat{\nu}_B$ , which need to be learned. No matter what these constants are, by Lemma 5.5 we can assume the additional target nuisance  $b_{\widehat{\theta}}$  remains fixed. Thus, the learner can use the second fold of the data  $Z_{n+1}, \dots, Z_{2n}$  alongside an off-the-shelf estimation algorithm (e.g. random forest, gradient-boosted decision trees, or kernel smoothed regression) to produce nuisances estimates  $\widetilde{g} = (\widehat{g}, \widehat{b})$ . Lastly, the learner uses the final fold of data  $Z_{2n+1}, \dots, Z_{3n}$  to estimate the value of  $\widehat{\theta}$  in each bucket, simply setting  $\widehat{\nu}_i := \arg \min_{\nu} \sum_{m=2n+1}^{3n} \ell(\nu, (\widehat{g}, \widehat{b}); Z_m) \mathbb{1}[X_m \in \mathcal{E}_i]$ . Before analyzing this algorithm, we present the assumptions we will operate under.

**Assumption 5.** *Let  $\mathcal{V}$  be a partition of  $[0, 1]$ ,  $\mathcal{A}_1 : \Theta \times \mathcal{Z}^* \times \mathcal{P}([0, 1]) \rightarrow \widetilde{\mathcal{G}}$  be a nuisance estimation algorithm<sup>7</sup>, and let  $\theta : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be an initial estimator. We make the following assumptions.*

1. *The range of the initial estimator  $\theta$  is  $[0, 1]$ .*
2. *The orthogonalized loss function  $\widetilde{\ell} : \mathbb{R} \times \widetilde{\mathcal{G}} \times \mathcal{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  satisfies*
  - (a) *For any  $(g, b) \in \widetilde{\mathcal{G}}, z \in \mathcal{Z}$ , the minimizer of the loss  $\nu^* = \arg \min_{\nu} \widetilde{\ell}(\nu, g; z)$  satisfies  $\nu^* \in [0, 1]$ .*
  - (b) *For any  $(g, b) \in \widetilde{\mathcal{G}}, z \in \mathcal{Z}$ , and  $\nu \in [0, 1]$ , we have  $\partial \widetilde{\ell}(\nu, g; z) \in [-C, C]$ .*
3. *For any distribution  $P_Z$  on  $\mathcal{Z}$ ,  $n \geq 1$ , and failure probability  $\delta_1 \in (0, 1)$ , with probability at least  $1 - \delta_1$  over the draws of  $Z_1, \dots, Z_n \sim P_Z$  i.i.d., we have*

$$\text{err}((g_0, b_{\widehat{\theta}}), (\widehat{g}, \widehat{b}); \gamma_{\widehat{\theta}}^*) \leq r(n, \delta_1; P_Z),$$

where  $(\widehat{g}, \widehat{b}) \leftarrow \mathcal{A}_1(Z_{1:n}, \mathcal{V})$  and  $r$  is some rate function.

We spend some time parsing the above assumptions, particularly in the context of calibrating estimates of the conditional  $Q$ th quantile  $\theta_{\text{QTE}}$  under treatment. We recall for this example that the associated loss was the  $Q$ -pinball loss  $\ell_{\text{QTE}}$ , the associated base nuisance  $g_0$  was the inverse propensity score  $p_0 := \mathbb{P}(A = 1 \mid X = x)^{-1}$ , and the additional nuisance  $b_{\widehat{\theta}}$  was  $b_{\widehat{\theta}}(a, x) := a(f_{\widehat{\theta}}(x) - Q)$ , where we had  $f_{\widehat{\theta}}(x) := \mathbb{P}(Y(1) \leq \gamma_{\widehat{\theta}}^*(x) \mid X = x)$ .

The first bullet, which enforces the initial estimator take values in the range  $[0, 1]$ , is often quite mild, and is assumed in existing works such as van der Laan et al. [52]. In the context of conditional quantiles under treatment, if the potential outcome  $Y(1)$  is bounded almost surely, then any reasonable estimate  $\theta$  will be bounded as well. We can then appropriately rescale observations and  $\theta$  to ensure they both take values in  $[0, 1]$ .

Now we look at the second point. Suppose we additionally guarantee estimates  $p$  of the inverse propensity  $p_0(x)$  and estimates  $b$  of  $b_{\widehat{\theta}}(a, x) := a(\mathbb{P}(Y(1) \leq \gamma_{\widehat{\theta}}^* \mid X = x) - Q)$  are bounded<sup>8</sup>. Then, the minimizer of the loss  $\nu^*$  is bounded, and we can rescale  $Y(1)$  to guarantee  $\nu^* \in [0, 1]$ . The second sub-point is naturally satisfied for the base pinball loss

<sup>7</sup>We let  $\mathcal{P}(S)$  be the set of all partitions of a set  $S$  into finitely-many elements.

<sup>8</sup>The boundedness of  $p_0$  is typically assumed in causal works. The boundedness of  $b_{\widehat{\theta}}$  will naturally hold as it is a shifted CDF.

$\ell_{\text{QTE}}$  with  $C' = \max\{Q, Q - 1\}$ , and thus will also be satisfied (for some  $C > C'$ ) if all nuisance estimates are again bounded.

Finally, the third assumption just assumes that there is an algorithm that can estimate the unknown nuisances while ensuring error, which is often bounded by  $\|(b - b_{\hat{\theta}})(g - g_0)\|_{L^2(P_W)}$ , is small. The role of passing the the partition of  $[0, 1]$  as a parameter to  $\mathcal{A}$  is just to fix the target estimand, per Lemma 5.5. For instance, if  $p_0$  or  $b_{\hat{\theta}}$  are assumed to be sufficiently smooth in their arguments, then non-parametric regression techniques can be used for estimation. While the nuisance  $b_{\hat{\theta}}$  appears as a complicated, CDF-like object, we believe approaches on localized de-biased estimation due to Kallus et al. [28] can be used to streamline parameter estimation. We now present the uniform binning scheme in Algorithm 2 along with its guarantee in Lemma 5.6.

---

**Algorithm 2** Uniform Mass Binning  $\mathcal{B}(X_{1:n}, \theta, B)$

---

- 1: **Input:**  $n$  i.i.d. samples  $X_1, \dots, X_n \sim P$ , an initial estimator  $\theta : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , and number of bins  $B \in \mathbb{N}$ .
  - 2: Compute order statistics  $\theta(X)_{(1)} \leq \dots \leq \theta(X)_{(N)}$  of  $\theta(X_1), \dots, \theta(X_N)$ .
  - 3: Set  $\theta(X)_{(0)} := 0$  and  $\theta(X)_{(N)} := 1$ .
  - 4: **for**  $i \in \{1, \dots, B\}$  **do**
  - 5:     Define  $V_i := [\theta(X)_{\lfloor (i-1)N/B \rfloor}, \theta(X)_{\lfloor iN/B \rfloor}]$
  - 6: **Return** partition  $\mathcal{V} := \{V_i\}_{i \in [B]}$ .
- 

**Lemma 5.6** ([30], Lemma 4.3; [23], Lemma 13). *For a universal constant  $c > 0$ , if  $n \geq cB \log(B/\delta)$ , the uniform mass binning scheme  $\mathcal{B}(X_{1:n}, \theta, B)$  produces bins  $\mathcal{V} = \{V_1, \dots, V_B\}$  satisfying*

$$\frac{1}{2B} \leq \mathbb{P}(\theta(X) \in V_i) \leq \frac{2}{B} \tag{6}$$

for every  $i \in [B]$  with probability at least  $1 - \delta$  over the randomness of  $X_{1:n}$ .

Finally, we present our main algorithm for calibrating conditionally orthogonalizable losses along with its guarantees. We first show that the algorithm can guarantee its calibration error with respect to the orthogonalized loss  $\tilde{\ell}$  under our estimated nuisances  $(\hat{g}, \hat{b})$  is small (Proposition B.4) with high probability and use the error decomposition result (Theorem 4.5) to show that its calibration error with respect to the original loss  $\ell$  under the true nuisance  $g_0$  is small with high probability.

*Remark 5.7.* For simplicity, we assume that the values  $\hat{\nu}_1, \dots, \hat{\nu}_B$  Algorithm 3 assigns to each of the buckets  $V_1, \dots, V_B$  are unique. This is to ensure two distinct buckets  $V_i \neq V_j$  do not merge, which would invalidate our application of Lemma 5.5. If, in practice, we have  $\hat{\nu}_i = \hat{\nu}_j$  for  $i \neq j$ , the learner can simply add  $\mathcal{U}([- \epsilon, \epsilon])$  noise to  $\hat{\nu}_i$  for  $\epsilon > 0$  arbitrarily small to guarantee uniqueness.

**Assumption 6.** *With probability 1 over the draws  $Z_1, \dots, Z_{3n} \sim P_Z$  i.i.d., we have that  $\hat{\nu}_1, \dots, \hat{\nu}_B \in [0, 1]$  are distinct.*

We now state the main result of this subsection, a technical convergence guarantee for Algorithm 3. We prove Theorem 5.8 (along with requisite lemmas and propositions) in Appendix B.

---

**Algorithm 3** A Calibration Algorithm for Conditionally Orthogonalizable Losses
 

---

1: **Input:** A dataset of  $3n$  i.i.d. samples  $Z_1, \dots, Z_{3n}$ , nuisance estimation algorithm  $\mathcal{A}$ , number of buckets  $B \in \mathbb{N}$ , orthogonalized loss function  $\tilde{\ell}$ , and an initial estimator  $\theta : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ .

2: Compute bins

$$\mathcal{V} = \{V_1, \dots, V_B\} \leftarrow \mathcal{B}(X_{1:n}, \theta, B).$$

3: Compute nuisance estimates  $\tilde{g} := (\hat{g}, \hat{b}) \leftarrow \mathcal{A}(Z_{n+1:2n}, \mathcal{V})$ .

4: **for**  $i \in \{1, \dots, B\}$  **do**

5:    $\hat{\nu}_i := \arg \min_{\nu} \sum_{m=2n+1}^{3n} \tilde{\ell}(\nu, (\hat{g}, \hat{b}); Z_m) \mathbb{1}[\theta(X_m) \in V_i]$ .

6: **Return:**  $\hat{\theta} : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  given by  $\hat{\theta}(x) := \sum_{i=1}^B \hat{\nu}_i \mathbb{1}[\theta(x) \in V_i]$ .

---

**Theorem 5.8.** Fix any initial estimator  $\theta : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , conditionally-orthogonalizable loss function  $\ell : [0, 1] \times \mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , and failure probabilities  $\delta_1, \delta_2 \in (0, 1)$ . Suppose Assumptions 2, 3, and 5 hold, and assume  $n \gtrsim B \log(B / \min(\delta_1, \delta_2))$ . Then, with probability at least  $1 - \delta_1 - \delta_2$  over the randomness of  $Z_1, \dots, Z_{3n} \sim P_Z$ , the output  $\hat{\theta}$  of Algorithm 3 satisfies

$$\text{Cal}(\hat{\theta}, g_0) \leq \frac{\beta}{2\alpha} r(n, \delta_1; P_Z) + \frac{2\beta}{\alpha} \left( \frac{\beta}{n} + C \sqrt{\frac{2B \log(2nB/\delta_2)}{n}} \right),$$

where  $C > 0$  is some constant that bounds the partial derivative as discussed in Assumption 5: i.e.  $|\partial \tilde{\ell}(\nu, g; z)| < C$ .

## 6 Conclusion

Calibration is an important notion of consistency that ensures model predictions are, on average, representative of observed outcomes. While there is a vast literature studying the calibration of machine learning models, very little is understood about calibrating estimators of causal effects. This is due to the partially-observed nature of causal inference — nuisance parameters such as propensity scores must be estimated from partially-observed data to effectively “simulate” fully-observed outcomes. While some results do exist, they only apply for the calibration of specific parameters under specific algorithms [52, 34].

In this work, we constructed a framework for calibrating a general estimator  $\theta$  with respect to some loss  $\ell$  involving a nuisance component. By leveraging a concept known as Neyman orthogonality, we were able to bound the  $L^2$  calibration error of  $\theta$  by two decoupled terms. One term, roughly, represented the error in nuisance estimation, while the other term represented the  $L^2$  calibration error of  $\theta$  in a world where the learned nuisances were true. We viewed this result as a “change of nuisance” theorem, allowing a learner to reason about the calibration error of an estimator under unknown nuisances in terms of the calibration error under learned nuisances plus a misestimation penalty.

From our general bounds on calibration error, we were able to derive simple sample splitting algorithms for causal calibration. In the case  $\ell$  was universally orthogonalizable, we derived a two-fold splitting algorithm that could use existing, off-the-shelf algorithms

as subroutines for both nuisance estimation and calibration. If  $\ell$  was instead conditionally orthogonalizable, we derived a three-fold splitting algorithm that extended the uniform mass/histogram binning algorithm to settings involving nuisance estimation. We proved high-probability convergence guarantees for both of these algorithms.

While our provided contributions are quite general, there are still interesting directions for future work. First, in our work, we only measure the convergence of our algorithms via the  $L^2$ -calibration error. Depending on the situation, other notions of calibration error may be more appropriate. For instance, Gupta and Ramdas [21] analyze the convergence of histogram/uniform mass binning in terms of  $L^\infty$  calibration error. Likewise, Globus-Harris et al. [17] study  $L^1$  multi-calibration error. We leave it as interesting future work to extend our results to the general setting of measuring  $L^p$  calibration error.

## References

- [1] Jason Abrevaya, Yu-Chin Hsu, and Robert P Lieli. Estimating conditional average treatment effects. *Journal of Business & Economic Statistics*, 33(4):485–505, 2015.
- [2] Richard E Barlow and Hugh D Brunk. The isotonic regression problem and its dual. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 67(337):140–147, 1972.
- [3] Peter J Bickel, Chris AJ Klaassen, Peter J Bickel, Ya’acov Ritov, J Klaassen, Jon A Wellner, and YA’Acov Ritov. *Efficient and adaptive estimation for semiparametric models*, volume 4. Springer, 1993.
- [4] Avrim Blum and Yishay Mansour. From external to internal regret. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 8(6), 2007.
- [5] Victor Chernozhukov, Denis Chetverikov, Mert Demirer, Esther Duflo, Christian Hansen, Whitney Newey, and James Robins. Double/debiased machine learning for treatment and structural parameters, 2018.
- [6] Victor Chernozhukov, Whitney K Newey, and Rahul Singh. Automatic debiased machine learning of causal and structural effects. *Econometrica*, 90(3):967–1027, 2022.
- [7] Victor Chernozhukov, Whitney K Newey, and Rahul Singh. Debiased machine learning of global and local parameters using regularized riesz representers. *The Econometrics Journal*, 25(3):576–601, 2022.
- [8] Youngseog Chung, Aaron Rumack, and Chirag Gupta. Parity calibration. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.18655*, 2023.
- [9] A Philip Dawid. The well-calibrated bayesian. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 77(379):605–610, 1982.
- [10] A Philip Dawid. Calibration-based empirical probability. *The Annals of Statistics*, 13(4):1251–1274, 1985.

- [11] Qingliang Fan, Yu-Chin Hsu, Robert P Lieli, and Yichong Zhang. Estimation of conditional average treatment effects with high-dimensional data. *Journal of Business & Economic Statistics*, 40(1):313–327, 2022.
- [12] Sergio Firpo. Efficient semiparametric estimation of quantile treatment effects. *Econometrica*, 75(1):259–276, 2007.
- [13] Dean P Foster and Rakesh Vohra. Regret in the on-line decision problem. *Games and Economic Behavior*, 29(1-2):7–35, 1999.
- [14] Dean P Foster and Rakesh V Vohra. Asymptotic calibration. *Biometrika*, 85(2):379–390, 1998.
- [15] Dylan J Foster and Vasilis Syrgkanis. Orthogonal statistical learning. *The Annals of Statistics*, 51(3):879–908, 2023.
- [16] Markus Frölich and Blaise Melly. Estimation of quantile treatment effects with stata. *The Stata Journal*, 10(3):423–457, 2010.
- [17] Ira Globus-Harris, Declan Harrison, Michael Kearns, Aaron Roth, and Jessica Sorrell. Multicalibration as boosting for regression. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2301.13767*, 2023.
- [18] Parikshit Gopalan, Michael Kim, and Omer Reingold. Swap agnostic learning, or characterizing omniprediction via multicalibration. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36, 2024.
- [19] Chuan Guo, Geoff Pleiss, Yu Sun, and Kilian Q Weinberger. On calibration of modern neural networks. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 1321–1330. PMLR, 2017.
- [20] Chirag Gupta. *Post-hoc calibration without distributional assumptions*. PhD thesis, PhD thesis, Carnegie Mellon University Pittsburgh, PA 15213, USA, 2022.
- [21] Chirag Gupta and Aaditya Ramdas. Distribution-free calibration guarantees for histogram binning without sample splitting. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 3942–3952. PMLR, 2021.
- [22] Chirag Gupta and Aaditya Ramdas. Online platt scaling with calibeating. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.00070*, 2023.
- [23] Chirag Gupta, Aleksandr Podkopaev, and Aaditya Ramdas. Distribution-free binary classification: prediction sets, confidence intervals and calibration. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33:3711–3723, 2020.
- [24] Rafail Z Hasminskii and Ildar A Ibragimov. On the nonparametric estimation of functionals. In *Proceedings of the Second Prague Symposium on Asymptotic Statistics*, volume 473, pages 474–482. North-Holland Amsterdam, 1979.

- [25] Ursula Hébert-Johnson, Michael Kim, Omer Reingold, and Guy Rothblum. Multicalibration: Calibration for the (computationally-identifiable) masses. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 1939–1948. PMLR, 2018.
- [26] James J Heckman and Edward Vytlacil. Structural equations, treatment effects, and econometric policy evaluation 1. *Econometrica*, 73(3):669–738, 2005.
- [27] Dan Hendrycks, Norman Mu, Ekin D Cubuk, Barret Zoph, Justin Gilmer, and Balaji Lakshminarayanan. Augmix: A simple data processing method to improve robustness and uncertainty. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1912.02781*, 2019.
- [28] Nathan Kallus, Xiaojie Mao, and Masatoshi Uehara. Localized debiased machine learning: Efficient inference on quantile treatment effects and beyond. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 25(16):1–59, 2024.
- [29] Edward H Kennedy. Semiparametric doubly robust targeted double machine learning: a review. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2203.06469*, 2022.
- [30] Ananya Kumar, Percy S Liang, and Tengyu Ma. Verified uncertainty calibration. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 32, 2019.
- [31] Balaji Lakshminarayanan, Alexander Pritzel, and Charles Blundell. Simple and scalable predictive uncertainty estimation using deep ensembles. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 30, 2017.
- [32] Hui Lan and Vasilis Syrgkanis. Causal q-aggregation for cate model selection. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.16945*, 2023.
- [33] Peter D Lax. *Functional analysis*, volume 55. John Wiley & Sons, 2002.
- [34] Yan Leng and Drew Dimmery. Calibration of heterogeneous treatment effects in randomized experiments. *Information Systems Research*, 2024.
- [35] Andrey Malinin and Mark Gales. Predictive uncertainty estimation via prior networks. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 31, 2018.
- [36] Matthias Minderer, Josip Djolonga, Rob Romijnders, Frances Hubis, Xiaohua Zhai, Neil Houlsby, Dustin Tran, and Mario Lucic. Revisiting the calibration of modern neural networks. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 34:15682–15694, 2021.
- [37] Jerzy Neyman. Optimal asymptotic tests of composite hypotheses. *Probability and statistics*, pages 213–234, 1959.
- [38] Jerzy Neyman.  $c(\alpha)$  tests and their use. *Sankhyā: The Indian Journal of Statistics, Series A*, pages 1–21, 1979.
- [39] Jerzy Neyman.  $C(\alpha)$  tests and their use. *Sankhyā: The Indian Journal of Statistics, Series A (1961-2002)*, 41(1/2):1–21, 1979. ISSN 0581572X. URL <http://www.jstor.org/stable/25050174>.

- [40] Georgy Noarov and Aaron Roth. The scope of multicalibration: Characterizing multi-calibration via property elicitation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.08507*, 2023.
- [41] Georgy Noarov, Ramya Ramalingam, Aaron Roth, and Stephan Xie. High-dimensional prediction for sequential decision making. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.17651*, 2023.
- [42] Miruna Oprescu, Vasilis Syrgkanis, and Zhiwei Steven Wu. Orthogonal random forest for causal inference. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 4932–4941. PMLR, 2019.
- [43] Yaniv Ovadia, Emily Fertig, Jie Ren, Zachary Nado, David Sculley, Sebastian Nowozin, Joshua Dillon, Balaji Lakshminarayanan, and Jasper Snoek. Can you trust your model’s uncertainty? evaluating predictive uncertainty under dataset shift. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 32, 2019.
- [44] John Platt et al. Probabilistic outputs for support vector machines and comparisons to regularized likelihood methods. *Advances in large margin classifiers*, 10(3):61–74, 1999.
- [45] Paul R Rosenbaum and Donald B Rubin. The central role of the propensity score in observational studies for causal effects. *Biometrika*, 70(1):41–55, 1983.
- [46] Aaron Roth. Uncertain: Modern topics in uncertainty estimation, 2022.
- [47] Roshni Sahoo, Shengjia Zhao, Alyssa Chen, and Stefano Ermon. Reliable decisions with threshold calibration. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 34: 1831–1844, 2021.
- [48] Vira Semenova and Victor Chernozhukov. Debaised machine learning of conditional average treatment effects and other causal functions. *The Econometrics Journal*, 24(2): 264–289, 2021.
- [49] Hao Song, Tom Diethe, Meelis Kull, and Peter Flach. Distribution calibration for regression. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 5897–5906. PMLR, 2019.
- [50] Sunil Thulasidasan, Gopinath Chennupati, Jeff A Bilmes, Tanmoy Bhattacharya, and Sarah Michalak. On mixup training: Improved calibration and predictive uncertainty for deep neural networks. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 32, 2019.
- [51] Alexandre B. Tsybakov. *Introduction to Nonparametric Estimation*. Springer series in statistics. Springer, 2009. ISBN 978-0-387-79051-0. doi: 10.1007/B13794. URL <https://doi.org/10.1007/b13794>.
- [52] Lars van der Laan, Ernesto Ulloa-Pérez, Marco Carone, and Alex Luedtke. Causal isotonic calibration for heterogeneous treatment effects. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.14011*, 2023.
- [53] Vladimir Vovk. On-line confidence machines are well-calibrated. In *The 43rd Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, 2002. Proceedings.*, pages 187–196. IEEE, 2002.

- [54] Martin J Wainwright. *High-dimensional statistics: A non-asymptotic viewpoint*, volume 48. Cambridge university press, 2019.
- [55] Bianca Zadrozny and Charles Elkan. Obtaining calibrated probability estimates from decision trees and naive bayesian classifiers. In *Icml*, volume 1, pages 609–616, 2001.
- [56] Bianca Zadrozny and Charles Elkan. Transforming classifier scores into accurate multiclass probability estimates. In *Proceedings of the eighth ACM SIGKDD international conference on Knowledge discovery and data mining*, pages 694–699, 2002.

## A Calibration Error Decomposition Proofs

In this appendix, we prove the main theorems from Section 4. These results provide two-term, decoupled bounds on the  $L^2$  calibration error of an arbitrary, fixed parameter  $\theta : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  in terms of  $L^2$  calibration error assuming the learned nuisances were correct, and a term measuring the distance between the learned nuisances and the true, unknown nuisance parameters.

### A.1 Universally Orthogonality

We start by proving Theorem 4.2, which provides the claimed decoupled bound under the assumption that  $\ell$  is universally orthogonalizable (Definition 3.1).

**Theorem 4.2.** *Let  $\ell : \mathbb{R} \times \mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , and  $\tilde{\ell}$  to corresponding orthogonalized loss, which we assume satisfies Definition 3.1. Let  $\tilde{g}_0 := (g_0, b_0)$  denote the true nuisance parameters associated with  $\tilde{\ell}$ . Then, for any  $\tilde{g} \in \tilde{\mathcal{G}}$  and  $\theta : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , we have*

$$\text{Cal}(\theta, g_0) \leq \frac{1}{2} \text{err}(\tilde{g}, \tilde{g}_0; \theta) + \widetilde{\text{Cal}}(\theta, \tilde{g}),$$

where  $\text{err}(g, h; \theta) := \sup_{f \in [g, h]} \sqrt{\mathbb{E} \left( \left\{ D_g^2 \mathbb{E} \left[ \partial \tilde{\ell}(\theta, f; Z) \mid X \right] (h - g, h - g) \right\}^2 \right)}$ .<sup>9</sup>

*Proof of Theorem 4.2.* We start by applying Lemma 4.1 and adding a helpful form of zero.

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[ \partial \tilde{\ell}(\theta, g_0; Z) \mid \theta(X) \right] &= \mathbb{E} \left[ \partial \tilde{\ell}(\theta, \tilde{g}_0; Z) \mid \theta(X) \right] \\ &= \left( \mathbb{E} \left[ \partial \tilde{\ell}(\theta, \tilde{g}_0; Z) \mid \theta(X) \right] - \mathbb{E} \left[ \partial \tilde{\ell}(\theta, \tilde{g}; Z) \mid \theta(X) \right] \right) \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E} \left[ \partial \tilde{\ell}(\theta, \tilde{g}; Z) \mid \theta(X) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

---

<sup>9</sup>For  $f, h \in \mathcal{G}$ , we let the interval  $[f, h] := \{\lambda f + (1 - \lambda)h : \lambda \in [0, 1]\}$ .

Looking at the calibration error in light of the above, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{Cal}(\theta, g_0)^2 &= \mathbb{E} \left( \mathbb{E} [\partial\ell(\theta, g_0; Z) \mid \theta(X)]^2 \right) \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left( \underbrace{\mathbb{E} [\partial\ell(\theta, g_0; Z) \mid \theta(X)] \cdot \left\{ \mathbb{E} [\partial\tilde{\ell}(\theta, \tilde{g}_0; Z) \mid \theta(X)] - \mathbb{E} [\partial\tilde{\ell}(\theta, \tilde{g}; Z) \mid \theta(X)] \right\}}_{T_1} \right) \\
&\quad + \mathbb{E} \left( \underbrace{\mathbb{E} [\partial\ell(\theta, g_0; Z) \mid \theta(X)] \cdot \mathbb{E} [\partial\tilde{\ell}(\theta, \tilde{g}; Z) \mid \theta(X)]}_{T_2} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

We bound  $T_1$  and  $T_2$  separately. As a first step in bounding  $T_1$ , note that by a second order Taylor expansion with Lagrange remainder, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& - \mathbb{E} [\partial\tilde{\ell}(\theta, \tilde{g}_0; Z) \mid \theta(X)] + \mathbb{E} [\partial\tilde{\ell}(\theta, \tilde{g}; Z) \mid \theta(X)] \\
&= D_{\tilde{g}} \mathbb{E} [\partial\tilde{\ell}(\theta, \tilde{g}_0; Z) \mid \theta(X)] (\tilde{g} - \tilde{g}_0) + \frac{1}{2} D_{\tilde{g}}^2 \mathbb{E} [\partial\tilde{\ell}(\theta, \bar{g}; Z) \mid \theta(X)] (\tilde{g} - \tilde{g}_0, \tilde{g} - \tilde{g}_0) \\
&= \frac{1}{2} D_{\tilde{g}}^2 \mathbb{E} [\partial\tilde{\ell}(\theta, \bar{g}; Z) \mid \theta(X)] (\tilde{g} - \tilde{g}_0, \tilde{g} - \tilde{g}_0).
\end{aligned}$$

In the above,  $\bar{g} \in [g_0, \hat{g}]$ , and the first-order derivative (with respect to  $g$ ) vanishes due to the assumption of Definition 3.1. This is because we have Taylor expanded around the true, unknown nuisance  $\tilde{g}_0 = (g_0, b_0)$ .

With this, we can apply the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, which furnishes

$$\begin{aligned}
T_1 &\leq \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{\mathbb{E} \left( \mathbb{E} [\partial\ell(\theta, g_0; Z) \mid \theta(X)]^2 \right)} \sqrt{\mathbb{E} \left( \left\{ D_{\tilde{g}}^2 \mathbb{E} [\partial\tilde{\ell}(\theta, \bar{g}; Z) \mid \theta(X)] (\tilde{g} - \tilde{g}_0, \tilde{g} - \tilde{g}_0) \right\}^2 \right)} \\
&\leq \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{\mathbb{E} \left( \mathbb{E} [\partial\ell(\theta, g_0; Z) \mid \theta(X)]^2 \right)} \sqrt{\mathbb{E} \left( \left\{ D_{\tilde{g}}^2 \mathbb{E} [\partial\tilde{\ell}(\theta, \bar{g}; Z) \mid X] (\tilde{g} - \tilde{g}_0, \tilde{g} - \tilde{g}_0) \right\}^2 \right)} \\
&\leq \frac{1}{2} \text{Cal}(\theta, g_0) \cdot \text{err}(\tilde{g}, \tilde{g}_0; \theta)
\end{aligned}$$

In the second line, we apply Jensen's inequality inside the conditional expectation.

Bounding  $T_2$  is more straightforward. Applying the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
T_2 &\leq \sqrt{\mathbb{E} \left( \mathbb{E} [\partial\ell(\theta, g_0; Z) \mid \theta(X)]^2 \right)} \sqrt{\mathbb{E} \left( \mathbb{E} [\partial\tilde{\ell}(\theta, \tilde{g}; Z) \mid \theta(X)]^2 \right)} \\
&= \text{Cal}(\theta, g_0) \cdot \widetilde{\text{Cal}}(\theta, \tilde{g})
\end{aligned}$$

This line of reasoning, in total, yields that

$$\text{Cal}(\theta, g_0)^2 \leq \frac{1}{2} \text{Cal}(\theta, g_0) \cdot \text{err}(\tilde{g}, \tilde{g}_0; \theta) + \text{Cal}(\theta, g_0) \cdot \widetilde{\text{Cal}}(\theta, \tilde{g}).$$

Dividing through by  $\text{Cal}(\theta, g_0)$  yields the claimed bound. ■

## A.2 Conditional Orthogonality

We now turn to proving the second error bound, which holds in the case that  $\ell$  satisfies the weaker assumption of conditional orthogonalizability. To prove Theorem 4.5, we will need two technical lemmas. In what follows, we let  $\tilde{\gamma}_\theta : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \tilde{\mathcal{G}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  denote the calibration function under the orthogonalized loss  $\tilde{\ell}$ , i.e.  $\tilde{\gamma}_\theta$  is specified by

$$\tilde{\gamma}_\theta(x; \tilde{g}) := \arg \min_{\nu} \mathbb{E}[\tilde{\ell}(\theta, \tilde{g}; Z) \mid \theta(X) = \theta(x)],$$

where  $\tilde{g} = (g, b)$  denotes an arbitrary, fixed pair of nuisance estimates. We note the identity  $\gamma_\theta^* \equiv \tilde{\gamma}_\theta^*$ , which will be useful in the sequel.

The first lemma we prove measures the distance (in terms of the  $L^2(P_X)$  norm) between the true calibration  $\gamma_\theta^* = \gamma_\theta(\cdot; g_0)$  and the calibration function under the learned nuisances,  $\tilde{\gamma}_\theta(\cdot; \tilde{g})$ . We can bound this distance in terms of the complicated looking error term, which was introduced in Theorem 4.5. This term actually simplifies rather nicely, as was seen in the prequel when we computed the quantity for the task of calibrating estimates of conditional  $Q$ -quantile under treatment.

**Lemma A.1.** *Let  $\theta : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be an arbitrary function, and assume  $\ell$  is conditionally orthogonalizable given  $\theta(X)$ . Let  $\tilde{g}_\theta = (g_0, b_\theta)$  be the true, unknown nuisance functions, and let  $\tilde{g} = (g, b)$  be some other fixed pair of nuisance functions. Let  $\tilde{\gamma}_\theta : \mathcal{X} \times \tilde{\mathcal{G}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be the calibration function, as defined above. Then, assuming the base loss  $\ell$  satisfies  $\alpha$ -strong convexity (Assumption 2), we have*

$$\|\gamma_\theta^* - \tilde{\gamma}_\theta(\cdot; \tilde{g})\|_{L^2(P_X)} \leq \frac{1}{2\alpha} \text{err}(\tilde{g}, \tilde{g}_\theta; \gamma_\theta^*),$$

where we define  $\text{err}(g, h; \varphi) := \sup_{f \in [g, h]} \sqrt{\mathbb{E} \left( \left\{ D_g^2 \mathbb{E} \left[ \partial \tilde{\ell}(\varphi, f; Z) \mid X \right] (g - h, g - h) \right\}^2 \right)}$ .

*Proof.* First, strong convexity (Assumption 2) alongside equivalent conditions for strong convexity (namely that  $\alpha(x - y)^2 \leq (\partial f(x) - \partial f(y))(x - y)$ ) yields:

$$\begin{aligned} & \alpha (\tilde{\gamma}_\theta(X; \tilde{g}_\theta) - \tilde{\gamma}_\theta(X; \tilde{g}))^2 \\ & \leq \left( \mathbb{E} \left[ \partial \tilde{\ell}(\tilde{\gamma}_\theta(\cdot; \tilde{g}_\theta), \tilde{g}; Z) \mid \theta(X) \right] - \mathbb{E} \left[ \partial \tilde{\ell}(\tilde{\gamma}_\theta(\cdot; \tilde{g}), \tilde{g}; Z) \mid \theta(X) \right] \right) (\tilde{\gamma}_\theta(X; \tilde{g}_\theta) - \tilde{\gamma}_\theta(X; \tilde{g})) \\ & = \mathbb{E} \left[ \partial \tilde{\ell}(\tilde{\gamma}_\theta(\cdot; \tilde{g}_\theta), \tilde{g}; Z) \mid \theta(X) \right] (\tilde{\gamma}_\theta(X; \tilde{g}_\theta) - \tilde{\gamma}_\theta(X; \tilde{g})) \end{aligned}$$

In the above, the equality on the third line follows from the definition of  $\tilde{\gamma}_\theta(\cdot; \tilde{g})$ , as first order optimality conditions on  $\tilde{\gamma}_\theta(x; \tilde{g}) = \arg \min_{\nu \in \mathbb{R}} \mathbb{E} \left[ \tilde{\ell}(\nu, \tilde{g}; Z) \mid \theta(X) \right]$  imply  $\mathbb{E} \left[ \partial \tilde{\ell}(\gamma_\theta(\cdot; \tilde{g}), \tilde{g}; Z) \mid \theta(X) \right] = 0$ .

Rearranging the above inequality and taking absolute values yields

$$\alpha |\tilde{\gamma}_\theta(X; \tilde{g}_\theta) - \tilde{\gamma}_\theta(X; \tilde{g})| \leq \left| \mathbb{E} \left[ \partial \tilde{\ell}(\tilde{\gamma}_\theta(\cdot; \tilde{g}_\theta), \tilde{g}; Z) \mid \theta(X) \right] \right|.$$

Next, observe that from the condition  $\mathbb{E} \left[ \partial \tilde{\ell}(\tilde{\gamma}_\theta(\cdot; \tilde{g}_\theta), \tilde{g}_\theta; Z) \mid \theta(X) \right] = 0$  alongside a second order Taylor expansion (with respect to nuisance pairs  $\tilde{g}$ ) with Lagrange form remainder plus conditional orthogonality/orthogonalizability (Definitions 3.3 and 3.6), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} \left[ \partial \tilde{\ell}(\tilde{\gamma}_\theta(\cdot; \tilde{g}_\theta), \tilde{g}; Z) \mid \theta(X) \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left[ \partial \tilde{\ell}(\tilde{\gamma}_\theta(\cdot; \tilde{g}_\theta), \tilde{g}; Z) \mid \theta(X) \right] - \mathbb{E} \left[ \partial \tilde{\ell}(\tilde{\gamma}_\theta(\cdot; \tilde{g}_\theta), \tilde{g}_\theta; Z) \mid \theta(X) \right] \\
&= D_{\tilde{g}} \mathbb{E} \left[ \partial \tilde{\ell}(\tilde{\gamma}_\theta(\cdot; \tilde{g}_\theta), \tilde{g}_\theta; Z) \mid \theta(X) \right] (\tilde{g} - \tilde{g}_\theta) + \frac{1}{2} D_{\tilde{g}}^2 \mathbb{E} \left[ \partial \tilde{\ell}(\tilde{\gamma}_\theta(\cdot; \tilde{g}_\theta), \bar{g}; Z) \mid \theta(X) \right] (\tilde{g} - \tilde{g}_\theta, \tilde{g} - \tilde{g}_\theta) \\
&= \frac{1}{2} D_{\tilde{g}}^2 \mathbb{E} \left[ \partial \tilde{\ell}(\tilde{\gamma}_\theta(\cdot; \tilde{g}_\theta), \bar{g}; Z) \mid \theta(X) \right] (\tilde{g} - \tilde{g}_\theta, \tilde{g} - \tilde{g}_\theta) \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E} \left( D_{\tilde{g}}^2 \mathbb{E} \left[ \partial \tilde{\ell}(\tilde{\gamma}_\theta(\cdot; \tilde{g}_\theta), \bar{g}; Z) \mid X \right] (\tilde{g} - \tilde{g}_\theta, \tilde{g} - \tilde{g}_\theta) \mid \theta(X) \right),
\end{aligned}$$

where  $\bar{g} \in [\tilde{g}, \tilde{g}_\theta]$  (here,  $\bar{g} \in [\tilde{g}, \tilde{g}_\theta]$  indicates  $\bar{g} = \lambda \tilde{g} + (1 - \lambda) \tilde{g}_\theta$  for some  $\lambda \in [0, 1]$ ). Consequently, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|\tilde{\gamma}_\theta(X; \tilde{g}_\theta) - \tilde{\gamma}_\theta(X; \tilde{g})\|_{L^2(P_X)} \\
&= \left( \int_{\mathcal{X}} |\tilde{\gamma}_\theta(x; \tilde{g}_\theta) - \tilde{\gamma}_\theta(x; \tilde{g})| P_X(dx) \right)^{1/2} \\
&\leq \frac{1}{\alpha} \left( \int_{\mathcal{X}} \mathbb{E} \left[ \partial \tilde{\ell}(\tilde{\gamma}_\theta, \tilde{g}; Z) \mid \theta(X) = \theta(x) \right]^2 P_X(dx) \right)^{1/2} \\
&\leq \frac{1}{2\alpha} \left( \int_{\mathcal{X}} \mathbb{E} \left( D_{\tilde{g}}^2 \mathbb{E} \left[ \partial \tilde{\ell}(\tilde{\gamma}_\theta(\cdot; \tilde{g}_\theta), \bar{g}; Z) \mid X \right] (\tilde{g} - \tilde{g}_\theta, \tilde{g} - \tilde{g}_\theta) \mid \theta(X) = \theta(x) \right)^2 P_X(dx) \right)^{1/2} \\
&\leq \frac{1}{2\alpha} \left( \int_{\mathcal{X}} \left\{ D_{\tilde{g}}^2 \mathbb{E} \left[ \partial \tilde{\ell}(\tilde{\gamma}_\theta(\cdot; \tilde{g}_\theta), \bar{g}; Z) \mid X = x \right] (\tilde{g} - \tilde{g}_\theta, \tilde{g} - \tilde{g}_\theta) \right\}^2 P_X(dx) \right)^{1/2} \\
&\leq \frac{1}{2\alpha} \text{err}(\tilde{g}, \tilde{g}_\theta; \tilde{\gamma}_\theta(\cdot; \tilde{g}_\theta)).
\end{aligned}$$

Noting the identity  $\tilde{\gamma}_\theta(\cdot; \tilde{g}_\theta) \equiv \gamma_\theta^*$  proves the claimed result.  $\blacksquare$

The second lemma we prove bounds the  $L^2(P_X)$  distance between the parameter estimate  $\theta$  and the calibration function under the learned nuisances  $\tilde{g}_\theta(\cdot; \tilde{g})$  in terms of the calibration error.

**Lemma A.2.** *Let  $\theta : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a fixed estimator,  $\tilde{g} = (g, b) \in \tilde{\mathcal{G}}$  an arbitrary, fixed nuisance function, and  $\tilde{\gamma}_\theta : \mathcal{X} \times \tilde{\mathcal{G}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  the calibration function associated with  $\theta$ . Assume  $\ell$  is  $\alpha$ -strongly convex (Assumption 2). We have*

$$\|\theta - \tilde{\gamma}_\theta(\cdot; \tilde{g})\|_{L^2(P_X)} \leq \frac{1}{\alpha} \widetilde{\text{Cal}}(\theta, \tilde{g}).$$

*Proof.* First, observe that from strong convexity (as in the proof of the above lemma), we

have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \alpha (\theta(X) - \tilde{\gamma}_\theta(X; \tilde{g}))^2 \\
& \leq \left( \mathbb{E} \left[ \partial \tilde{\ell}(\theta, \tilde{g}; Z) \mid \theta(X) \right] - \mathbb{E} \left[ \partial \tilde{\ell}(\tilde{\gamma}_\theta(\cdot, \tilde{g}), \tilde{g}; Z) \mid \theta(X) \right] \right) (\theta(X) - \tilde{\gamma}_\theta(X; \tilde{g})) \\
& = \mathbb{E} \left[ \partial \tilde{\ell}(\theta, \tilde{g}; Z) \mid \theta(X) \right] (\theta(X) - \tilde{\gamma}_\theta(X; \tilde{g})).
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, dividing through and taking the absolute value yields:

$$|\theta(X) - \tilde{\gamma}_\theta(X; \tilde{g})| \leq \frac{1}{\alpha} \left| \mathbb{E} \left[ \partial \tilde{\ell}(\theta, \tilde{g}; Z) \mid \theta(X) \right] \right|.$$

We now integrate to get the desired result. In particular, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\theta - \tilde{\gamma}_\theta(\cdot; \tilde{g})\|_{L^2(P_X)} &= \left( \int_{\mathcal{X}} |\theta(x) - \tilde{\gamma}_\theta(x; \tilde{g})|^2 P_X(dx) \right)^{1/2} \\
&\leq \frac{1}{\alpha} \left( \int_{\mathcal{X}} \mathbb{E} \left[ \partial \tilde{\ell}(\theta, \tilde{g}; Z) \mid \theta(X) = \theta(x) \right]^2 P_X(dx) \right)^{1/2} \\
&= \frac{1}{\alpha} \widetilde{\text{Cal}}(\theta, \tilde{g}).
\end{aligned}$$

■

With the above two lemmas in hand, we can now prove Theorem 4.5, which recall shows a decoupled bound on the calibration of a parameter  $\theta$  with respect to a conditionally orthogonalizable loss function  $\ell$ .

**Theorem 4.5.** *Let  $\ell$  be a conditionally orthogonalizable loss (Definition 3.3) that is  $\alpha$ -strong convex (Assumption 2) and  $\beta$ -smooth (Assumption 3). Then, for any mapping  $\theta : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  and nuisance parameter  $\tilde{g} = (g, b)$ , we have*

$$\text{Cal}(\theta, g_0) \leq \frac{\beta}{2\alpha} \text{err}(\tilde{g}, \tilde{g}_\theta; \gamma_\theta^*) + \frac{\beta}{\alpha} \widetilde{\text{Cal}}(\theta, \tilde{g}),$$

where  $\tilde{g}_\theta = (g_0, b_\theta)$  are the true, unknown nuisance functions,  $\gamma_\theta^*$  is the calibration function associated with  $\theta$ , and  $\text{err}(\tilde{g}, \tilde{g}_\theta; \gamma_\theta^*)$  is as defined in Theorem 4.2.

*Proof of Theorem 4.5.* First, we note that we have the identity

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \partial \tilde{\ell}(\theta, \tilde{g}_\theta; Z) \mid \theta(X) \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[ \partial \ell(\theta, g_0; Z) \mid \theta(X) \right],$$

which follows from the proof of Lemma 4.1. From this, observe that we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E} \left[ \partial \ell(\theta, g_0; Z) \mid \theta(X) \right] &= \mathbb{E} \left[ \partial \tilde{\ell}(\theta, \tilde{g}_\theta; Z) \mid \theta(X) \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left[ \partial \tilde{\ell}(\theta, \tilde{g}_\theta; Z) \mid \theta(X) \right] - \mathbb{E} \left[ \partial \tilde{\ell}(\gamma_\theta^*, \tilde{g}_\theta; Z) \mid \theta(X) \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left[ \partial^2 \tilde{\ell}(\bar{\theta}, \tilde{g}_\theta; Z) \mid \theta(X) \right] (\theta(X) - \gamma_\theta^*(X)) \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left[ \partial^2 \tilde{\ell}(\bar{\theta}, \tilde{g}_\theta; Z) \mid \theta(X) \right] (\theta(X) - \tilde{\gamma}_\theta(X; \tilde{g})) \\
&\quad + \mathbb{E} \left[ \partial^2 \tilde{\ell}(\bar{\theta}, \tilde{g}_\theta; Z) \mid \theta(X) \right] (\tilde{\gamma}_\theta(X; \tilde{g}) - \gamma_\theta^*(X)),
\end{aligned}$$

where the first equality follows from the above calculation, the second from the fact  $\tilde{\gamma}_\theta(x, (g_0, b)) = \gamma_\theta^*(x)$  regardless of choice of additional nuisance  $b$ , and the third from a first order Taylor expansion with Lagrange form remainder on  $\theta(X)$  (here  $\bar{\theta} \in [\theta, \gamma_\theta^*]$ ). The final equality follows from adding a subtracting  $\tilde{\gamma}_\theta(X; \tilde{g})$ . Thus, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{Cal}(\theta, g_0)^2 &= \mathbb{E} \left( \mathbb{E} [\partial \ell(\theta, g_0; Z) \mid \theta(X)]^2 \right) \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left( \mathbb{E} [\partial \ell(\theta, g_0; Z) \mid \theta(X)] \cdot \mathbb{E} \left[ \partial^2 \tilde{\ell}(\bar{\theta}, \tilde{g}_\theta; Z) \mid \theta(X) \right] \cdot (\theta(X) - \tilde{\gamma}_\theta(X; \tilde{g})) \right) \\
&\quad + \mathbb{E} \left( \mathbb{E} [\partial \ell(\theta, g_0; Z) \mid \theta(X)] \cdot \mathbb{E} \left[ \partial^2 \tilde{\ell}(\bar{\theta}, \tilde{g}_\theta; Z) \mid \theta(X) \right] \cdot (\tilde{\gamma}_\theta(X; \tilde{g}) - \gamma_\theta^*(X)) \right) \\
&\leq \beta \text{Cal}(\theta, g_0) \sqrt{\mathbb{E} [(\theta(X) - \tilde{\gamma}_\theta(X; \tilde{g}))^2]} + \beta \text{Cal}(\theta, g_0) \sqrt{\mathbb{E} [(\tilde{\gamma}_\theta(X; \tilde{g}) - \gamma_\theta^*(X))^2]} \\
&= \beta \text{Cal}(\theta, g_0) \left\{ \|\theta - \tilde{\gamma}_\theta(\cdot; \tilde{g})\|_{L^2(P_X)} + \|\tilde{\gamma}_\theta(\cdot; \tilde{g}) - \gamma_\theta^*\|_{L^2(P_X)} \right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Now, dividing through by  $\text{Cal}(\theta, g_0)$  and plugging in the bounds provided by Lemma A.1 and Lemma A.2, we have

$$\text{Cal}(\theta, g_0) \leq \frac{\beta}{\alpha} \widetilde{\text{Cal}}(\theta, \tilde{g}) + \frac{\beta}{2\alpha} \text{err}(\tilde{g}, \tilde{g}_\theta; \gamma_\theta^*),$$

which is precisely the claimed result. ■

## B Algorithm Convergence Proofs

### B.1 Universal Orthogonality

We now restate and prove the convergence guarantee of the sample splitting algorithm for calibration with respect to universally orthogonalizable loss functions. The result below is largely just an application of Theorem 4.2, with the only caveat being that some care must be taken to handle the fact that  $\hat{\theta}$  and  $\tilde{g} = (\hat{g}, \hat{b})$  are now random variables, not fixed parameters.

**Theorem 5.4.** *Suppose  $\ell : \mathbb{R} \times \mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is an arbitrary, universally orthogonalizable loss satisfying Assumption 1. Let  $\mathcal{A}_1, \mathcal{A}_2$ , and  $\chi$  satisfy Assumption 4. Then, with probability at least  $1 - \delta_1 - \delta_2$ , the output  $\hat{\theta}$  of Algorithm 1 run on a calibration dataset of  $2n$  i.i.d. data points  $Z_1, \dots, Z_{2n} \sim P$  satisfies*

$$\text{Cal}(\hat{\theta}, g_0) \leq \frac{1}{2} r_1(n, \delta; P_Z) + r_2(n, \delta).$$

*Proof of Theorem 5.4.* First, Lemma 5.2 yields that, for any fixed  $\theta$  and  $\tilde{g} = (g, b)$ , we have

$$\widetilde{\text{Cal}}(\theta, \tilde{g}) = \text{Cal}(\theta, P^x),$$

and the latter quantity is controlled with high-probability by Assumption 4. However, since the above values are not random variables, but rather deterministic quantities, the equality also holds when  $\theta, g$ , or  $b$  are replaced by the random quantities  $\hat{\theta}, \hat{g}$ , and  $\hat{b}$  produced in Algorithm 4.

Define the “bad” events as  $B_1 := \{\text{err}(\hat{g}, \tilde{g}_0) > r_1(n, \delta; P_Z)\}$  and  $B_2 := \{\text{Cal}(\hat{\theta}, \hat{P}^\chi) > r_2(n, \delta)\}$  where  $\hat{P}^\chi$  denotes the (random) probability measure associated with  $\chi(\hat{g}; Z)$ . Clearly, Assumption 4 yields that  $\mathbb{P}(B_1) \leq \delta_1$ . Likewise, Assumption 1 also yields that  $\mathbb{P}(B_2 \mid Z_{n+1:2n}) \leq \delta_1$ , as fixing  $Z_{n+1}, \dots, Z_{2n}$  fixes the learned nuisances  $(\hat{g}, \hat{b})$ , per Algorithm 1. Thus, applying the law of total probability, we have that the marginal probability of  $B_2$  (over both draws of  $Z_1, \dots, Z_n$  and  $Z_{n+1}, \dots, Z_{2n}$ ) is bounded by

$$\mathbb{P}(B_2) = \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{P}(B_2 \mid Z_{n+1:2n})] \leq \delta_2.$$

Thus, on the “good” event  $B_1^c \cap B_2^c$ , which occurs with probability at least  $1 - \delta_1 - \delta_2$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Cal}(\hat{\theta}, g_0) &\leq \frac{1}{2} \text{err}(\hat{g}, \tilde{g}_0) + \widetilde{\text{Cal}}(\hat{\theta}, \hat{g}) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \text{err}(\hat{g}, \tilde{g}_0) + \text{Cal}(\hat{\theta}; P^\chi) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} r_1(n, \delta; P_Z) + r_2(n, \delta), \end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality follows from Theorem 4.2 and the second equality follows from the preamble at the beginning of this proof. ■

## B.2 Conditionally Orthogonality

We now prove the convergence guarantees for Algorithm 3, which for convenience are restated below. Before proving this result, we need a variety of technical lemmas. The lemmas and more generally the proof structure below are guided by results on calibration due to Kumar et al. [30].

**Lemma B.1.** *Fix any initial estimator  $\theta : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , the loss function  $\ell : [0, 1] \times \mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , and a nuisance estimate  $\tilde{g} = (\hat{g}, \hat{b})$ . Suppose the partition  $\mathcal{V} = \{V_i\}_{i \in [B]}$  is such that*

$$\frac{1}{2B} \leq \mathbb{P}(\theta(X) \in V_i) \leq \frac{2}{B}$$

*for every  $i \in [B]$  and  $n \geq 8B \log(B/\delta)$ . Suppose Assumption 5 holds. Then, with probability at least  $1 - \delta$  over the randomness of  $Z_{2n+1:3n} \sim P_Z^n$ , we have for all  $i \in [B]$  and all  $\nu \in [0, 1]$*

$$\left| \mathbb{E}[\partial \tilde{\ell}(\nu, \tilde{g}; Z) \mid \theta(X) \in V_i] - \mathbb{E}_n[\partial \tilde{\ell}(\nu, \tilde{g}; Z) \mid \theta(X) \in V_i] \right| \leq \frac{2\beta}{n} + 2C \sqrt{\frac{2B \log(\frac{4nB}{\delta})}{n}}$$

where

$$\mathbb{E}_n[\partial \tilde{\ell}(\nu, \tilde{g}; Z) \mid \theta(X) \in V_i] := \frac{\sum_{m=2n+1}^{3n} \partial \ell(\nu, \tilde{g}; Z_m) \cdot \mathbb{1}[\theta(X_m) \in V_i]}{\sum_{m=2n+1}^{3n} \mathbb{1}[\theta(X_m) \in V_i]}$$

denotes the empirical conditional mean over the calibration dataset  $Z_{2n+1}, \dots, Z_{3n}$ .

*Proof.* For convenience, write

$$S_i := \{2n + 1 \leq m \leq 3m : \theta(X_m) \in V_i\}$$

to denote set of indices that fall in  $V_i$ . Given that  $n \geq 8B \log(B/\delta)$ , multiplicative Chernoff bound tells us that with probability  $1 - \delta$ ,

$$|S_i| \geq \frac{n}{4B}. \quad (7)$$

for all  $i \in [B]$ .

Note that  $\mathbb{E}_n[\partial\tilde{\ell}(\nu, \tilde{g}; Z)|\theta(X) \in V_i]$  is the empirical mean over  $|S_i|$  many points. Therefore, with inequality (7) and Hoeffding's inequality (Lemma B.3), we have for any fixed  $\nu \in [0, 1]$ , with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ , simultaneously for all  $i \in [B]$ ,

$$\left| \mathbb{E}[\partial\tilde{\ell}(\nu, \tilde{g}; Z)|\theta(X) \in V_i] - \mathbb{E}_n[\partial\tilde{\ell}(\nu, \tilde{g}; Z)|\theta(X) \in V_i] \right| \leq 2C \sqrt{\frac{\log(4B/\delta)}{2|S_i|}} \leq 2C \sqrt{\frac{2B \log(4B/\delta)}{n}}.$$

Now, for some  $\epsilon > 0$  that is to be chosen later (for which we will implicitly assume satisfies  $1/\epsilon \in \mathbb{N}$ ), we now take a union bound over an  $\epsilon$ -covering of  $[0, 1]$ : with probability  $1 - \delta$ , we have for all  $\nu \in \{0, \epsilon, 2\epsilon, \dots, 1 - \epsilon\}$

$$\left| \mathbb{E}[\partial\tilde{\ell}(\nu, \tilde{g}; Z_m) \cdot |\theta(X) \in V_i] - \mathbb{E}_n[\partial\tilde{\ell}(\nu, \tilde{g}; Z_m)|\theta(X) \in V_i] \right| \leq 2C \sqrt{\frac{2B \log(\frac{4B}{\epsilon\delta})}{n}}.$$

For any  $\nu \notin \{0, \epsilon, 2\epsilon, \dots, 1 - \epsilon\}$ , taking its closest point  $\nu_\epsilon$  in the  $\epsilon$ -grid yields

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \mathbb{E}[\partial\tilde{\ell}(\nu, \tilde{g}; Z) \cdot |\theta(X) \in V_i] - \mathbb{E}[\partial\tilde{\ell}(\nu_\epsilon, \tilde{g}; Z)|\theta(X) \in V_i] \right| &\leq \beta\epsilon \\ \left| \mathbb{E}_n[\partial\tilde{\ell}(\nu, \tilde{g}; Z)|\theta(X) \in V_i] - \mathbb{E}_n[\partial\tilde{\ell}(\nu_\epsilon, \tilde{g}; Z)|\theta(X) \in V_i] \right| &\leq \beta\epsilon \end{aligned}$$

as  $\partial\tilde{\ell}$  is  $\beta$ -Lipschitz by Assumption 3:  $\tilde{\ell}$  has an additional correction term that is linear in the first argument, and under our assumption,  $\ell$  is  $\beta$ -smooth, so  $\tilde{\ell}$  must be  $\beta$ -smooth as well. Hence, with probability  $1 - \delta$ , we have for any  $i \in [B]$  and  $\nu \in [0, 1]$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \mathbb{E}[\partial\ell(\nu, \tilde{g}; Z)|\theta(X) \in V_i] - \mathbb{E}_n[\partial\ell(\nu, \tilde{g}; Z)|\theta(X) \in V_i] \right| \\ & \leq \left| \mathbb{E}[\partial\ell(\nu, \tilde{g}; Z)|\theta(X) \in V_i] - \mathbb{E}[\partial\ell(\nu_\epsilon, \tilde{g}; Z)|\theta(X) \in V_i] \right| \\ & \quad + \left| \mathbb{E}[\partial\ell(\nu_\epsilon, \tilde{g}; Z)|\theta(X) \in V_i] - \mathbb{E}_n[\partial\ell(\nu_\epsilon, \tilde{g}; Z)|\theta(X) \in V_i] \right| \\ & \quad + \left| \mathbb{E}_n[\partial\ell(\nu, \tilde{g}; Z)|\theta(X) \in V_i] - \mathbb{E}_n[\partial\ell(\nu_\epsilon, \tilde{g}; Z)|\theta(X) \in V_i] \right| \\ & \leq 2\beta\epsilon + 2C \sqrt{\frac{\log(2B/\epsilon\delta)}{2n}}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we have with probability  $1 - \delta$ ,

$$\left| \mathbb{E}[\partial\tilde{\ell}(\nu, \tilde{g}; Z)|\theta(X) \in V_i] - \mathbb{E}_n[\partial\tilde{\ell}(\nu, \tilde{g}; Z)|\theta(X) \in V_i] \right| \leq 2\beta\epsilon + 2C \sqrt{\frac{2B \log(\frac{4B}{\epsilon\delta})}{n}}.$$

for all  $i \in [B]$  and  $\nu \in [0, 1]$ . Setting  $\epsilon = \frac{1}{n}$  yields the result ■

**Lemma B.2** (Multiplicative Chernoff Bound). *Let  $X_1, \dots, X_n$  be independent random variables such that  $X_i \in \{0, 1\}$  and  $\mathbb{E}[X_i] = p$  for all  $i \in [n]$ . For all  $t \in (0, 1)$ ,*

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{i=1}^n X_i \leq (1-t)np\right) \leq \exp\left(-\frac{npt^2}{3}\right).$$

**Lemma B.3** (Hoeffding's Inequality). *Let  $X_1, \dots, X_n$  be independent random variables such that  $X_i \in [a, b]$ . Consider the sum of these random variables  $S_n = X_1 + \dots + X_n$ . For all  $t > 0$ ,*

$$\mathbb{P}(|S_n - \mathbb{E}[S_n]| > t) \leq 2 \exp\left(-\frac{2t^2}{n(b-a)^2}\right).$$

We use Lemma B.1 to now prove the following Proposition.

**Proposition B.4.** *Assume the same setup as Lemma B.1 and suppose Assumption 5 holds.. Let  $Z_1, \dots, Z_n \sim P_Z$  be i.i.d. and set  $\hat{\theta} := \sum_{i=1}^B \hat{\nu}_i \mathbb{1}[\theta(x) \in V_i]$ , where*

$$\hat{\nu}_i = \arg \min_{\nu} \sum_{m=1}^n \tilde{\ell}(\nu, \tilde{g}; Z_m) \mathbb{1}[\theta(X_m) \in V_i].$$

*Assume the  $\hat{\nu}_i$  are distinct almost surely. Then, for any  $\delta \in (0, 1)$ , we have with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ ,*

$$\widetilde{\text{Cal}}(\hat{\theta}, \tilde{g}) \leq \frac{2\beta}{n} + 2C \sqrt{\frac{2B \log(4nB/\delta)}{n}}$$

*where  $C > 0$  is some constant that bounds the partial derivative as discussed in Assumption 5: i.e.  $|\partial \tilde{\ell}(\nu, g; z)| < C$ .*

*Proof.* Now, as we have assumed without loss of generality,  $\nu_i$ 's are all distinct, we have

$$\widetilde{\text{Cal}}(\hat{\theta}, \tilde{g}) = \sqrt{\sum_{i \in [B]} \mathbb{P}(\hat{\theta}(X) = \nu_i) \cdot \mathbb{E}\left[\partial \tilde{\ell}(\nu_i, \tilde{g}; Z) \mid \hat{\theta}(X) = \nu_i\right]^2}$$

Since we have assumed  $n \geq 8B \log(B/\delta)$ , we have from Lemma B.1 that, with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ , simultaneously for each  $i \in [B]$

$$\mathbb{E}[\partial \tilde{\ell}(\hat{\nu}_i, \tilde{g}; Z) \mid \hat{\theta}(X) = \hat{\nu}_i] = \mathbb{E}[\partial \tilde{\ell}(\hat{\nu}_i, \tilde{g}; Z) \mid \theta(X) \in V_i] \leq \frac{2\beta}{n} + 2C \sqrt{\frac{2B \log(\frac{4nB}{\delta})}{n}},$$

which follows since  $\mathbb{E}_n[\partial \tilde{\ell}(\hat{\nu}_i, \tilde{g}; Z) \mid \theta(X) \in V_i] = 0$  by definition of  $\hat{\nu}_i$ . Thus, with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ , we get

$$\begin{aligned} \widetilde{\text{Cal}}(\hat{\theta}, \tilde{g}) &= \sqrt{\sum_{i \in [B]} \mathbb{P}(\theta(X) \in V_i) \cdot \mathbb{E}\left[\partial \tilde{\ell}(\hat{\nu}_i, \tilde{g}; Z) \mid \hat{\theta}(X) = \hat{\nu}_i\right]^2} \\ &\leq \sqrt{\sum_{i \in [B]} \mathbb{P}(\theta(X) \in V_i) \cdot \left(\frac{2\beta}{n} + 2C \sqrt{\frac{2B \log(\frac{4nB}{\delta})}{n}}\right)^2} \\ &= \frac{2\beta}{n} + 2C \sqrt{\frac{2B \log(\frac{4nB}{\delta})}{n}}. \end{aligned}$$

■

We now have the requisite tools to prove Theorem 5.8. Our argument proceeds in largely the same way that the proof of Theorem 5.4 — we start by defining appropriate “good” events, and then subsequently bound the overall probability of their failure.

**Theorem 5.8.** *Fix any initial estimator  $\theta : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , conditionally-orthogonalizable loss function  $\ell : [0, 1] \times \mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , and failure probabilities  $\delta_1, \delta_2 \in (0, 1)$ . Suppose Assumptions 2, 3, and 5 hold, and assume  $n \gtrsim B \log(B / \min(\delta_1, \delta_2))$ . Then, with probability at least  $1 - \delta_1 - \delta_2$  over the randomness of  $Z_1, \dots, Z_{3n} \sim P_Z$ , the output  $\hat{\theta}$  of Algorithm 3 satisfies*

$$\text{Cal}(\hat{\theta}, g_0) \leq \frac{\beta}{2\alpha} r(n, \delta_1; P_Z) + \frac{2\beta}{\alpha} \left( \frac{\beta}{n} + C \sqrt{\frac{2B \log(2nB/\delta_2)}{n}} \right),$$

where  $C > 0$  is some constant that bounds the partial derivative as discussed in Assumption 5: i.e.  $|\partial \ell(\nu, g; z)| < C$ .

*Proof.* As before we start by defining some “bad” events. In particular, consider the events  $B_1$  and  $B_2$  defined respectively by

$$B_1 := \{\text{err}(\tilde{g}, \tilde{g}_{\hat{\theta}}; \gamma_{\hat{\theta}^*}) > r(n, \delta_1; P_Z)\} \quad \text{and} \quad B_2 := \left\{ \widetilde{\text{Cal}}(\hat{\theta}, \tilde{g}) > \frac{2\beta}{n} + 2C \sqrt{\frac{2B \log(8nB/\delta)}{n}} \right\}$$

where  $\tilde{g} = \mathcal{A}(Z_{n+1:2n}, \mathcal{V})$  is the output of the nuisance estimation algorithm using  $Z_{n+1:2n}$ . It is clear that  $\mathbb{P}(B_1 | Z_{1:n}) \leq \delta_1$  by Assumption 5, since fixing  $Z_{1:n}$  fixed the partition  $\mathcal{V}$  of  $[0, 1]$ . Thus, the law of total expectation yields that  $\mathbb{P}(B_1) \leq \delta_1$ .

Bounding  $\mathbb{P}(B_2)$  takes mildly more care. Define the event

$$E := \left\{ \forall i \in [B], \frac{1}{2B} \leq \mathbb{P}(\theta(X) \in V_i) \leq \frac{2}{B} \right\},$$

which by Lemma 5.6 occurs with probability at least  $1 - \delta_2/2$  by the assumption that  $n \geq cB \log(2B/\delta_2)$ . We have the following bound:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(B_2) &= \mathbb{P}(B_2 | E) \mathbb{P}(E) + \mathbb{P}(B_2 | E^c) \mathbb{P}(E^c) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}(B_2 | E) + \mathbb{P}(E^c) \\ &= \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{P}(B_2 | E, Z_{1:2n}) | E] + \mathbb{P}(E^c) \\ &\leq \delta_2/2 + \delta_2/2 = \delta_2, \end{aligned}$$

where the second to last inequality follows from the fact that  $\mathbb{P}(B_2 | E, Z_{1:2n}) \leq \delta_2$  by Proposition B.4. We now apply Theorem 4.5 to see that, on the “good” event  $G = B_1^c \cap B_2^c$  (which occurs with probability at least  $1 - \delta_1 - \delta_2$ ) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Cal}(\hat{\theta}, g_0) &\leq \frac{\beta}{2\alpha} \text{err}(\tilde{g}, \tilde{g}_{\hat{\theta}}; \gamma_{\hat{\theta}^*}) + \frac{\beta}{\alpha} \widetilde{\text{Cal}}(\hat{\theta}, \tilde{g}) \\ &\leq \frac{\beta}{2\alpha} r(n, \delta_1; P_Z) + \frac{2\beta}{\alpha} \left( \frac{\beta}{n} + C \sqrt{\frac{2B \log(8nB/\delta_2)}{n}} \right), \end{aligned}$$

which proves the desired result. ■

## C Additional Proofs

In this appendix, we prove additional claims that do not constitute our primary results. We proceed by section of the paper.

### C.1 Proofs from Section 3

**Lemma 3.9.** *Let  $\ell : \mathbb{R} \times \mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  satisfy Assumption 1. Let  $\tilde{\ell} : \mathbb{R} \times \tilde{\mathcal{G}} \times \mathcal{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be the orthogonalized loss, and let  $\tilde{\ell}^{eq}$  be the equivalent squared loss, as in Definition 3.8. Then, the following hold.*

1. For any  $x \in \mathcal{X}$  and  $\tilde{g} \in \tilde{\mathcal{G}}$ , we have  $\arg \min_{\nu} \mathbb{E}[\tilde{\ell}(\nu, \tilde{g}; Z) \mid X = x] = \arg \min_{\omega} \mathbb{E}[\tilde{\ell}^{eq}(\omega, \tilde{g}; Z) \mid X = x]$ .
2. For any  $\theta : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ ,  $\tilde{g} \in \tilde{\mathcal{G}}$ ,  $m \geq 0$ , and  $n \geq 1$ , we have

$$D_{\tilde{g}}^m \mathbb{E}[\partial^n \tilde{\ell}(\theta, \tilde{g}; Z) \mid X] = D_{\tilde{g}}^m \mathbb{E}[\partial^n \tilde{\ell}^{eq}(\theta, \tilde{g}; Z) \mid X].$$

*Proof of Lemma 3.9.* To prove the desired result, it suffices to show that

$$\mathbb{E}[\partial \tilde{\ell}(\theta, \tilde{g}; z) \mid X] = \mathbb{E}[\partial \tilde{\ell}^{eq}(\theta, \tilde{g}; z) \mid X].$$

Straightforward differentiation yields

$$\partial \tilde{\ell}^{eq}(\theta, \tilde{g}; z) = \theta(x) - m(g; z) - \text{Corr}(\tilde{g}; z) = \partial \tilde{\ell}(\theta, \tilde{g}; z),$$

and taking (conditional) expectations yields the rest. ■

### C.2 Proofs from Section 4

**Lemma 4.1.** *Let  $\ell : \mathbb{R} \times \mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a loss, and let  $\tilde{\ell} : \mathbb{R} \times \tilde{\mathcal{G}} \times \mathcal{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  denote the corresponding orthogonalized loss. Let  $g_0 \in \mathcal{G}$  denote the true nuisances associated with  $\ell$ . We have, for any  $b \in \mathcal{G}$ ,*

$$\text{Cal}(\theta, g_0) = \widetilde{\text{Cal}}(\theta, (g_0, b)).$$

*Proof of Lemma 4.1.* The claim follows from the observation that

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[ \partial \tilde{\ell}(\theta, (g_0, b); Z) \mid \theta(X) \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} [\partial \ell(\theta, g_0; Z) \mid \theta(X)] + \mathbb{E} [\text{Corr}((g_0, b); Z) \mid \theta(X)] \\ &= \mathbb{E} [\partial \ell(\theta, g_0; Z) \mid \theta(X)] + \mathbb{E} [\langle b(W), g_0(W) - g_0(W) \rangle \mid \theta(X)] \\ &= \mathbb{E} [\partial \ell(\theta, g_0; Z) \mid \theta(X)]. \end{aligned}$$
■

**Proposition 4.3.** *Suppose the loss  $\ell$  satisfies Assumption 1 and that  $m(g; z)$  is linear in  $g$ . Then, we have*

$$\frac{1}{2}\text{err}(\tilde{g}, \tilde{g}_0) \leq \|(g - g_0)(b - b_0)\|_{L^2(P_W)},$$

where  $\tilde{g}_0 = (g_0, b_0)$  represent the true, unknown nuisance parameters, and  $\tilde{g} = (g, b)$  represent arbitrary, fixed nuisance estimates.

*Proof of Proposition 4.3.* First, observe that we have

$$\begin{aligned} & D_{\tilde{g}}^2 \mathbb{E}[\partial \tilde{\ell}(\theta, \tilde{h}; Z) \mid X](\tilde{g} - \tilde{g}_0, \tilde{g} - \tilde{g}_0) \\ &= D_{\tilde{g}}^2 \mathbb{E}[\theta(X) - m(g; Z) \mid X](\tilde{g} - \tilde{g}_0, \tilde{g} - \tilde{g}_0) \\ &\quad - D_{\tilde{g}}^2 \mathbb{E}[b(W)(h(W) - g_0(W)) \mid X](\tilde{g} - \tilde{g}_0, \tilde{g} - \tilde{g}_0) \quad (\text{Assumption 1}) \\ &= D_{\tilde{g}}^2 \mathbb{E}[b(W)(h(W) - g_0(W)) \mid X](\tilde{g} - \tilde{g}_0, \tilde{g} - \tilde{g}_0) \quad (\text{Linearity of } m(g; z)). \end{aligned}$$

Now, we compute the Hessian that appears on the second line. In particular, further calculation yields that

$$\begin{aligned} & D_{\tilde{g}}^2 \mathbb{E}[b(W)(h(W) - g_0(W)) \mid X](\tilde{g} - \tilde{g}_0, \tilde{g} - \tilde{g}_0) \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[ (g(W) - g_0(W), b(W) - b_0(W))^\top \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -1 \\ -1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} (g(W) - g_0(W), b(W) - b_0(W)) \mid X \right] \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we can write the error term down as

$$\begin{aligned} \text{err}(\tilde{g}, \tilde{g}_0)^2 &:= \sup_{f \in [\tilde{g}, \tilde{g}_0]} \mathbb{E} \left( \left\{ D_{\tilde{g}}^2 \mathbb{E} \left[ \partial \tilde{\ell}(\theta, f; Z) \mid X \right] (\tilde{g} - \tilde{g}_0, \tilde{g} - \tilde{g}_0) \right\}^2 \right) \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left( \mathbb{E} \left[ \left( (g - g_0)(W), (b - b_0)(W) \right)^\top \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -1 \\ -1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \left( (g - g_0)(W), (b - b_0)(W) \right) \mid X \right]^2 \right) \\ &= 4 \mathbb{E} \left( \mathbb{E} \left[ (g - g_0)(W) \cdot (b - b_0)(W) \mid X \right]^2 \right) \\ &\leq 4 \|(g - g_0)(b - b_0)\|_{L^2(P_W)}^2 \quad (\text{Jensen's Inequality and Tower Rule}). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, taking square roots, we see that we have

$$\text{err}(\tilde{g}, \tilde{g}_0) \leq 2 \|(g - g_0)(b - b_0)\|_{L^2(P_W)}.$$

Dividing both sides by two yields the claimed result. ■

### C.3 Proofs from Section 5

**Lemma 5.2.** *Let  $\theta : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  and  $\tilde{g} = (g, b) \in \tilde{\mathcal{G}}$  be respectively a fixed estimator and nuisance parameter. Then, we have the*

$$\widetilde{\text{Cal}}(\theta, \tilde{g}) = \text{Cal}(\theta, P^{\mathcal{X}}),$$

where  $P^{\mathcal{X}}$  denotes the distribution of  $(X, \chi(\tilde{g}; Z))$  on  $\mathcal{X} \times \mathbb{R}$ .

*Proof of Lemma 5.2.* Observe that, from the second conclusion of Lemma 3.9, for any fixed nuisance estimate  $\tilde{g} \in \tilde{\mathcal{G}}$  and estimator  $\theta : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , we have the equality

$$\begin{aligned}
\widetilde{\text{Cal}}(\theta, \tilde{g}) &:= \int_{\mathcal{X}} \mathbb{E}[\partial \tilde{\ell}(\theta, \tilde{g}; Z) \mid \theta(X) = \theta(x)]^2 P_X(dx) \\
&= \int_{\mathcal{X}} \mathbb{E}[\partial \tilde{\ell}^{eq}(\theta, \tilde{g}; Z) \mid \theta(X) = \theta(x)]^2 P_X(dx) \\
&= \int_{\mathcal{X}} (\theta(x) - \mathbb{E}[\chi(\tilde{g}; Z) \mid \theta(X) = \theta(x)])^2 P_X(dx) \\
&= \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left( \theta(x) - \mathbb{E}_{P_Y^x}[Y \mid \theta(X) = \theta(x)] \right)^2 P_X(dx) \\
&= \text{Cal}(\theta, P^x),
\end{aligned}$$

which shows the desired result. ■

**Lemma 5.5.** *Suppose  $\ell$  is conditionally orthogonalizable, and suppose  $\varphi_1, \varphi_2 : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  have the same level sets, i.e. they satisfy  $\{\varphi_1^{-1}(c) : c \in \text{range}(\varphi_1)\} = \{\varphi_2^{-1}(c) : c \in \text{range}(\varphi_2)\}$ , of which we assume there are finitely or countably many. Then, the calibration functions satisfy  $\gamma_{\varphi_1}^* = \gamma_{\varphi_2}^*$ . As a consequence, we have  $\mathbb{E}[\langle b_{\varphi_1}(W), (g - g_0)(W) \rangle \mid \varphi_1(X)] = \mathbb{E}[\langle b_{\varphi_2}(W), (g - g_0)(W) \rangle \mid \varphi_2(X)]$  almost surely for any  $b_{\varphi_1}$  and  $b_{\varphi_2}$  satisfying Definition 3.6. Thus, without loss of generality, we can assume  $b_{\varphi_1} \equiv b_{\varphi_2}$ .*

*Proof of Lemma 5.5.* We prove the second claim en route to proving the first. Let  $x \in \mathcal{X}$  be arbitrary, and suppose  $x \in B \in \{\varphi_1^{-1}(c) : c \in \text{range}(\theta)\} = \{\varphi_2^{-1}(c) : c \in \text{range}(\varphi)\}$ . Then, by definition, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\gamma_{\varphi_1}^*(x) &= \arg \min_{\nu} \mathbb{E}[\ell(\nu, g_0; Z) \mid \varphi_1(X) = \varphi_1(x)] \\
&= \arg \min_{\nu} \mathbb{E}[\ell(\nu, g_0; Z) \mid X \in B] \\
&= \arg \min_{\nu} \mathbb{E}[\ell(\nu, g_0; Z) \mid \varphi_2(X) = \varphi_2(x)] = \gamma_{\varphi_2}^*(x).
\end{aligned}$$

Now, the first claim readily follows. In particular, we have the equivalence

$$D_g \mathbb{E}[\partial \ell(\gamma_{\varphi_1}^*, g_0; Z) \mid \varphi_1(X)](h) = D_g \mathbb{E}[\partial \ell(\gamma_{\varphi_2}^*, g_0; Z) \mid \varphi_2(X)](h)$$

from the first claim, where  $h \in \mathcal{G}$  is an arbitrary direction. From the definitions of  $b_{\varphi_1}$  and  $b_{\varphi_2}$ , we know that we must have

$$D_g \mathbb{E}[\partial \ell(\gamma_{\varphi_c}^*, g_0; Z) \mid \varphi_c(X)](h) = \mathbb{E}[\langle b_{\varphi_c}(W), h(W) \rangle \mid \varphi_c]$$

for all directions  $h \in \mathcal{G}$ , where  $c \in \{1, 2\}$  is arbitrary. Combining these two equalities yields the second result. ■