

Randomized Controlled Trials of Service Interventions: The Impact of Capacity Constraints

Justin J. Boutilier

Telfer School of Management, University of Ottawa boutilier@telfer.uottawa.edu

Jónas Oddur Jónasson

MIT Sloan School of Management, joj@mit.edu

Hannah Li

Columbia Business School, hannah.li@columbia.edu

Erez Yoeli

Keheala, eyoeli@keheala.com

Randomized controlled trials (RCTs), or experiments, are the gold standard for intervention evaluation. However, the main appeal of RCTs—the clean identification of causal effects—can be compromised by interference, when one subject’s treatment assignment can influence another subject’s behavior or outcomes. In this paper, we formalise and study a type of interference stemming from the operational implementation of a subclass of interventions we term Service Interventions (SIs): interventions that include an on-demand service component provided by a costly and limited resource (e.g., healthcare providers or teachers). We show that capacity constraints, induced by staffing and recruitment decisions made by the experimenter, can *mediate* the effect size of the intervention.

We first show that in such a system, the capacity constraints induce dependencies across experiment subjects, where an individual may need to wait before receiving the intervention. By modeling these dependencies using a queueing system, we show how increasing the number of subjects without increasing the capacity of the system can lead to a nonlinear decrease in the treatment effect size. This has implications for conventional power analysis and recruitment strategies: increasing the sample size of an RCT without appropriately expanding capacity can decrease the study’s power. To address this issue, we propose a method to jointly select the system capacity and number of users using the square root staffing rule from queueing theory. We show how incorporating knowledge of the queueing structure can help an experimenter reduce the amount of capacity and number of subjects required while still maintaining high power. In addition, our analysis of congestion-driven interference provides one concrete mechanism to explain why similar protocols can result in different RCT outcomes and why promising interventions at the RCT stage may not perform well at scale.

1. Introduction

Randomized Controlled Trials (RCTs) are widely accepted as the gold standard for impact evaluation. In their simplest form, a researcher first recruits a pool of subjects to enroll. Then, the researcher randomly assigns the subjects to a treatment group and a control group, administers an intervention to the treatment group, and compares the average outcomes across the two groups. Usually, choosing to enroll more subjects in a trial will result in the experiment having increased statistical power (defined as the likelihood of the RCT detecting a difference between the groups

if there is one). Motivated by a sequence of RCTs in digital health, we study RCTs of interventions with a capacity constrained structure—we label them *service interventions*, see below—where recruiting more subjects does *not* increase statistical power. In these settings, we find that the capacity constraints mediate the effect size of the intervention and the resulting statistical power of the RCT. Moreover, the experimenter can leverage this non-linear relationship to optimally select the system capacity and the number of recruited subjects in a way that ensures high power and low cost experiments.

1.1. Motivation

We define *service interventions* as interventions that have an on-demand service component, where the service is provided by a capacity constrained resource (e.g., human servers). In other words, subjects in the treatment group are enrolled in a program that involves a stochastic component where the subject periodically (e.g., depending on their behavior, disease status, or engagement) becomes eligible for a service. Subjects in the control group do not receive the intervention.

One example of such service interventions are treatment adherence support programs, in which patients on a medical treatment become eligible for outreach from a human support sponsor when they stop adhering to the treatment plan. One such program, and our running example for this paper, is *Keheala*, an organization that provides digital services to support treatment adherence among tuberculosis patients in Kenya. The organization has developed a mobile phone interface that provides information about the importance of treatment adherence and sends automated reminders to patients about adhering to their medication schedule. The enrolled patients are required to self-verify their treatment adherence daily (i.e., verify that they are in the desired state (adherence) as opposed to the undesired state (non-adherence)) and if they fail to do so they become eligible for support sponsor outreach (i.e., the service component of the intervention). The intervention has been evaluated in a randomized controlled trial (Yoeli et al. 2019) that demonstrated a significant reduction in treatment failure among the treated population, relative to a control group receiving the standard of care. Interestingly, despite the very strong performance of the intervention in the experiment, secondary analysis of the trial data has demonstrated that due to operational factors, the service component was not always available to the eligible patients as soon as they became eligible (Boutilier et al. 2022a). To the extent that this variation was generated by congestion effects, it highlights the issue at the core of this paper.

The second example is in the context of medication adherence among myocardial infarction (also known as heart attack) patients. Volpp et al. (2017) describe an RCT of an intervention in which myocardial infarction survivors receive a combination of electronic pill bottles (for adherence monitoring), lottery incentives, automated reminders, as well as access to social work resources

and a staff engagement advisor (the service component). The trial concludes that the compound intervention has no impact on adherence or hospital readmission. In this case, secondary analysis has demonstrated that operational factors (including limited capacity) affected the timing of the service component for patients who entered the non-adherent state and that patients who received service quickly were more likely to re-enter the desired state (Lekwijit et al. 2023).

The third example is a sequence of RCTs evaluating a coach-enhanced behavioral health mobile phone application, *Noom*, for various use cases, including people with pancreatic cancer (Keum et al. 2021), metabolic abnormalities (Cho et al. 2020) and prediabetes (Toro-Ramos et al. 2020). In all cases, a part of the mobile phone application is a coach-user messaging interface, where some of the communication is planned and scheduled whereas some of the communication is on-demand (i.e., the user sends a message and the coach must reply). In fact, the stochasticity in the demand for coaching advice is acknowledged as part of the trial results, with Cho et al. (2020) stating that the “default frequency of personalized coaching was set to 3 times per week; however, the actual frequency varied depending on the user’s participation rate.”

All of the interventions described above have the characteristics that motivate our study. To summarize: the objective is to keep subjects in a desired state but periodically and randomly they stop the desired behavior and become eligible for service that is provided by costly human servers. While we do not comment on the magnitude of the empirical estimates reported in any of these specific studies, our point is that in any RCT with this service intervention structure, the effect sizes and the statistical power are conditional on the service level deployed during the trial. Yet, to the best of our knowledge (as far as we can gather based on the trial protocols) the decision of what capacity to staff the platform with is not an explicit part of trial planning. As a result, it is possible for an experimenter to conclude that an intervention is ineffective (based on the trial outcome) as a result of the operational implementation (i.e., service levels) rather than the intervention itself.

1.2. Contributions

In the language of experimental design, the above structure results in a specific type of interference (in which one subject’s behavior or treatment status can affect the outcome of other subjects) through capacity constraints, and these capacity constraints *mediate* the effect size of the intervention. In other words, an RCT of a service intervention can lead to a range of impact estimates—depending on the capacity devoted to the service component and, in turn, the service level experienced by the subjects of the treatment group. At one extreme, when there is ample capacity and the utilization level of the service component is low, one would expect the average impact of the intervention to be large since subjects would have direct access to the service when they become eligible. In most cases, this would correspond to the intended protocol of the intervention as subjects would not experience delays (and hence behave independently from each other,

without interference). At the other extreme, when very little capacity is devoted to the service component, delays would be long and one would expect the average impact of the intervention to be lowered. Further, across all service levels, the service component affects the variability in outcomes of the treatment group. The combination of these effects of service level on the mean and variance of outcomes makes trial planning and power analysis non-trivial.

In this paper, we formalize the mechanism for interference due to capacity constraints and describe its implications for trial design. We focus on the experimenter’s decision of how many treatment and control subjects to recruit into the trial, N_1 and N_0 , respectively, and how many servers M_1 to staff the treatment intervention with. We focus on the setting where $N_1 = N_0$.

Our first contribution is a modeling one (§3). We start by modeling the behavior of individual subjects as a stochastic process with two states—the desired state (e.g., the subject is adhering to a medication regime, exercising, or following a diet) and the undesired state (i.e., the subject has stopped the desired activity). Once in the undesired state, subjects become eligible for the service, which increases their probability of transitioning back to the desired state. The typical way to analyze these experiments is to think about subjects as independent objects. However, in order to capture the congestion interference of interest, we model the aggregate behavior of subjects of the service intervention RCT as a closed queueing system with a fixed number of subjects transitioning in and out of the queue. In other words, a subject who becomes eligible for service joins the queue to be attended to by a server and a subject who re-enters the desired state leaves the queue. The role of the service system is to maximize the amount of time subjects spend in the desired state. Finally, we turn our focus to experimentation with such systems and formalize the trial planning task in terms of the experimental metrics of interest and the key decisions of how many servers M_1 to hire and how many subjects $N_1 + N_0$ to recruit in order to maximize the statistical power of the RCT.

Our second contribution is a descriptive one (§4 and §5). Equipped with the modeling framework described above, we focus our analysis on characterizing the two quantities that contribute to the statistical power of experiments—the effect size and its variance. In our closed queueing framework, maximizing the amount of time subjects spend in the desired state is equivalent to minimizing the amount of time they spent in the queue for service. As a result, the main objective of our analysis is to characterize the average queue length and its variance, as a function of the number of users and servers in the system. We first derive those quantities explicitly, effectively establishing the observation from above, that differences in service levels (determined jointly by the number of subjects and servers) in these types of experiments correspond to different levels of treatment effects. To generate analytical insights, we also obtain approximations of the effect size using a mean field limit. Using these approximations, we establish that when the number of servers M_1 is fixed,

the effect size is diminishing in the number of enrolled subjects, and in particular in the number of treatment subjects N_1 , but only when N_1 is above a given threshold. Furthermore, we demonstrate that the statistical power of a trial (for a given number of servers) is first increasing and then decreasing in the number of subjects. This has implications for trial planning and recruitment, as it contradicts the traditional wisdom that recruiting more subjects leads to better statistical power.

Our third contribution is a prescriptive one (§6). Given the non-monotonicity of statistical power as a function of enrolled subjects, the key question for trial planning is how many subjects to recruit and how many servers to hire. We conduct numerical experiments contrasting three approaches to determine M_1, N_1 and N_0 of an RCT following a small-scale pilot; (1) A naïve policy that assumes that the treatment effect does not depend on service levels and that variance decreases linearly in $N_1 + N_0$; (2) A proportional policy that chooses the same $N_1 + N_0$ as the naïve policy and increases M_1 proportionally; and (3) a queueing informed Square Root Policy that aims to achieve a high service level. Among other things, our experiments demonstrate that following a pilot study with low service levels, the desired power for a full scale RCT can either be achieved by scaling up both M_1, N_1 , and N_0 while maintaining the same low service level, or by increasing service levels through a higher M_1 . In some practical cases, this might result in an equally powered experiment that requires much fewer participants.

A main objective of this work is to help experimenters avoid the mistake of concluding a protocol is ineffective following RCT experimentation, simply because by enrolling a high number of subjects they believed the experiment to be high powered. This is a particularly relevant message for efficacy trials (as opposed to effectiveness trials) since their purpose is to evaluate whether a protocol or intervention has an impact under ideal circumstances. *Descriptively*, our paper serves as a reminder that, at a minimum, the outcomes of such service intervention RCTs should be interpreted as conditional on the implemented service level. In other words, the reason that such a trial shows small or no effect can either be attributed to the protocol itself not being effective (the usual interpretation) or the service level being insufficient. Therefore, papers describing RCT outcomes for service interventions should report operational outcomes describing empirical service levels along with all impact estimates. *Prescriptively*, we provide the experimenter with a framework to jointly optimize the size of the trial (i.e., the number of subjects) and its service level (i.e., the number of servers) in a queueing-informed manner, so as to maximize the probability of detecting a difference between a treatment group and a control group.

2. Literature

Our work is related to three distinct streams of literature. First, we contribute to the growing methodological toolkit of experimental designers. We give a brief summary of this stream of work

in §2.1. Second, our work is, at least in part, motivated by prior trials of service interventions, which usually do not report on capacity planning as part of their trial preparation or empirical service levels as part of their outcome measures. We provide some examples in §2.2. Finally, our methodology draws on prior results from the service operations and queueing theory literature. We highlight the main connections to our work in §2.3.

2.1. Interference in Experimentation

The capacity constraints induce what is known as *interference* in the experiment, where the outcome of one individual depends on the treatment assignments of other individuals (Imbens and Rubin 2010). It is well documented that interference leads to biased estimates of the treatment effect in a number of settings, including social networks (e.g., Eckles et al. (2016)) and marketplaces (Blake and Coey 2014, Holtz et al. 2020). Our setting is more closely related to interference in marketplaces, where supply constraints (analogous to the capacity constraints in service interventions) and demand constraints create dependencies across units (Wager and Xu 2021, Munro et al. 2021, Li et al. 2022, Johari et al. 2022, Bright et al. 2022, Dhaouadi et al. 2023). However, the service interventions introduce a queueing structure to the interference that does not arise in marketplaces. Further, the papers on marketplaces generally focus on estimating the treatment effect, whereas this paper also studies the impact of interference on statistical power.

The most closely related paper is Li et al. (2023) which also studies experimentation in queueing systems and similarly illustrates how incorporating knowledge of the queueing system can lead to more efficient estimators. The problem motivation differs, where Li et al. (2023) focuses on experimenting on an existing platform infrastructure and our work studies how to set up the platform infrastructure to test a new intervention in development. More specifically, Li et al. (2023) focuses on a queueing setting with a fixed capacity and raw user arrival rate and studies interventions that change how likely a user joins the queue, conditional on seeing the queue at a certain length. In contrast, our work focuses on the problem of developing a new protocol and the *recruitment* decision of how many servers and subjects to recruit for the trial. This decision is necessary when developing a new intervention (for example, in Volpp et al. (2017), Yoeli et al. (2019)) and is separate from the problem in Li et al. (2023) which studies a platform with a fixed size.

2.2. Trials of Service Interventions

It is beyond the scope of this work to give a comprehensive account of all RCTs that had a service component. As examples of such experiments, we refer to the tuberculosis treatment adherence platform Keheala (Yoeli et al. 2019), the heart attack medication support program HeartStrong (Volpp et al. 2017), and the coach-enhanced behavioral health app Noom (Keum et al. 2021, Cho

et al. 2020, Toro-Ramos et al. 2020). All of these interventions have been evaluated in RCTs and (at least partly) rely on the type of *service intervention* component that motivates our work. In particular, the objective for all of them is to keep subjects in a desired state and, when the subject leaves the desired state, they become eligible for service that is provided by costly human servers.

In addition to the primary analysis of the data collected in the RCTs designed to evaluate the aforementioned behavioral health programs, secondary analysis of this data has provided additional insight. As an example, taking a closer look at the HeartStrong data, Lekwijit et al. (2023) find that patients do seem to respond to connected healthcare interventions, particularly those that involve personalized feedback and when interventions are escalated quickly and consistently. They also leverage the trial data to generate a risk-scoring method to target non-adherent patients. Similarly, secondary analysis of the Keheala data suggests that the operational efficiency of such behavioral health interventions can be greatly improved through machine learning enabled personalization (Boutillier et al. 2022a, Baek et al. 2023). Furthermore—focusing on ultimate health outcome—it has been established that Keheala’s effect was heterogeneous across patient types, with the highest impact on the patient types that were most likely to have poor health outcomes in the absence of behavioral support (Boutillier et al. 2022b).

2.3. Queueing theory

A key step in our analysis is to model the congestion interference of one user’s behavior on other user’s experience using a queueing theory model. Most related to our work are a sequence of papers focusing on staffing in closed queueing systems (De Véricourt and Jennings 2008, Véricourt and Jennings 2011). Similar to our setting they consider a finite set of users that periodically transition into needing service that is provided by a fixed set of servers. In De Véricourt and Jennings (2008), the objective is to develop staffing policies for these types of membership services, based on many server theorems that correspond to different staffing regimes. Importantly, they derive a staffing policy that minimizes capacity investment while ensuring a certain service level. Véricourt and Jennings (2011) also use many server asymptotic results to generate staffing policies but for the specific case of nursing teams. Our setting is also related to the work of Ancker Jr and Gafarian (1963), who study an infinite source queue with balking and reneging, where balking refers to users choosing not to join the queue if the queue is too long. They consider a setting where the probability of joining a queue, upon arrival, is proportional to the queue length. This process, though inspired by a different setting, has the exact same transition probabilities as our setup. Our model is also related to the Machine Interference Problem (see Haque and Armstrong (2007) for a survey on these problems), where machines are operating until they break, after which they require service from a provider to be fixed. Unlike a typical MIP problem, our setting has reneging, or machines (subjects) that can recover without the help of a server.




Figure 1 A depiction of the two-state system for a single user, in the absence of intervention.

While some of our results (see §4) are related to the analysis presented in this literature, our objective is completely different. This literature has focused on generating staffing policies whereas we focus on the implications of staffing on the statistical power of RCTs of service interventions.

3. Modeling framework

In this section, we formalize our problem setting. We gradually establish the structure of *service intervention experiments* by first introducing a model of individual subject behavior both with and without the intervention (§3.1) as well as the service system they interact with (§3.2). We then define the outcome metrics of interest (§3.3). Finally, we adapt these models to analyze randomized controlled trials of service interventions (§3.4).

3.1. Individual subject behavior

The defining feature of subjects in our setting is that they can be described by a two-state stochastic process. We let \mathcal{U} denote the set of subjects or users (with $|\mathcal{U}| = N$) and $\mathcal{T} = \mathbb{R}_+$ denote time. Then the state of user $u \in \mathcal{U}$ at time $t \in \mathcal{T}$ is denoted by $x(u, t) \in \{0, 1\}$. Here, state 0 represents a desirable state (from the perspective of both the servers and the users), while state 1 represents an undesirable state. For example, in a medication adherence setting, a desirable state is one where the user has taken their medication on a given day, or in a customer service setting, a desirable state is one where the user does not have any issues.

The transition dynamics of a given subject depend on whether or not they receive intervention from the system. In the absence of intervention, they transition from the desirable state 0 to the undesirable state 1 with rate λ and back from state 1 to state 0 with rate τ . In the presence of intervention, each server has a service rate of μ and so a user (assuming there is a server available immediately) transitions from the undesirable state 1 to the desirable state 0 with rate $\tau + p\mu$, where p represents the probability that a user transitions to the desirable state after receiving service while $1 - p$ represents the probability that the user does not transition, and thus remains in the queue for intervention. For our theoretical analysis, we assume subjects are homogeneous in terms of their state transition rates.

3.2. Queueing model of service intervention system

One way to analyze the performance of the types of systems we have described is by analyzing the individual stochastic processes, with intricate dependencies across the users. However, given that the type of interference we are interested in stems from congestion, a better approach may be to consider the service intervention as a closed queueing system (i.e., with a fixed number of subjects transitioning in and out of the queue). The system aims to serve users in state 1 so that they transition to (and ideally remain in) state 0. In other words, if $x(u, t) = 0$ then user u does not require service but if $x(u, t) = 1$ then user u is eligible for service and joins the queue.

We define a Markov chain to describe the closed queueing system in a setting with M servers and N users (we describe how to apply this model to the study of experimentation in Section 3.4). We denote an individual's state at time t with $x_{M,N}(u, t)$, indexed by M and N . The state of the system at time t is the number of users in the undesirable state. Specifically, let $X_{M,N}(t) \in \{0, \dots, N\}$ such that $X_{M,N}(t) = \sum_u x_{M,N}(u, t)$, where M is the number of servers and N is the number of users. This quantity $X_{M,N}(t)$ corresponds to the total number of users in the undesirable state 1 at time t , or in other words the number of people either waiting in the queue or being served at time t (for a system with M servers and N users). This notation explicitly references the fact that this quantity depends on both M and N .

The dynamics of the queueing Markov chain are governed by a transition rate matrix \mathcal{Q} , where $\mathcal{Q}_{M,N}(i, j)$ represents the rate that the system moves from state $X_{M,N}(t) = i$ to state $X_{M,N}(t) = j$. On the one hand, there is a rate of users entering the queue, i.e., $\mathcal{Q}_{M,N}(i, i+1)$. If there are i users in the queue, then there are $N - i$ users in a state 0 and so the rate at which users enter the queue is $(N - i)\lambda$. On the other hand, the rate of users leaving the queue depends on the congestion level. Each server has a service rate μ and so they can serve the users at a rate of $\min\{i\mu, M\mu\}$ (limited by the number of users in the queue and number of servers). If the number of users in the queue at time t is less than the number of servers (i.e., $X_{M,N}(t) = i \leq M$), then users transition out of the queue with a transition rate of $i\mu + i\tau$. If the number of users in the queue at time t exceeds the number of servers (i.e., $X_{M,N}(t) = i > M$) then users transition out of the queue with rate $M\mu + i\tau$. If the user remains in the undesired state, despite being served, the user rejoins the queue. Summarizing, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{Q}_{M,N}(i, i+1) &= (N - i)\lambda, & \text{for } 0 \leq i < N, \\ \mathcal{Q}_{M,N}(i, i-1) &= \begin{cases} i\mu + i\tau, & \text{if } i \leq M, \\ M\mu + i\tau, & \text{if } M < i \leq N. \end{cases} \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

The rate of all other transitions $\mathcal{Q}_{M,N}(i, j)$ for $i \neq j$ is 0. Finally, the quantity $\mathcal{Q}_{M,N}(i, i)$ is defined so that the sum of each row is 0. The above model captures congestion due to the interference of

interest because the length of time between when a user transitions into the undesired state and when they are served by the service intervention depends on the number of other users who also need to be served.

We note that this Markov chain is ergodic and has a unique stationary distribution, which we denote $\pi_{M,N}$, where $\pi_{M,N}(k)$ denotes the steady state probability of there being k users in the undesirable state. This notation captures the fact that the steady state distribution depends on the number of users N and servers M in the system. The steady state is characterized by the following equations:

$$\pi_{M,N}(j) = \begin{cases} \pi_{M,N}(j-1) \cdot \frac{(N-j+1)\lambda}{j\mu p + j\tau} & \text{for } 1 \leq j \leq M \\ \pi_{M,N}(j-1) \cdot \frac{(N-j+1)\lambda}{M\mu p + j\tau} & \text{for } j \geq M. \end{cases} \quad (2)$$

and $\sum_{j=0}^N \pi_{M,N}(j) = 1$.

We also define the steady state *expected queue length* $\bar{K}_{M,N}$ a standard queueing metric, given by

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{K}_{M,N} &= \sum_{j=1}^N j \cdot \pi_{M,N}(j) \\ &= \pi_0 \cdot \sum_{k=1}^m k \cdot \frac{N! \lambda^j}{k! k! (\mu p + \tau)^k} + \pi_0 \cdot \sum_{k=m+1}^N k \cdot \frac{N! \lambda^j}{j! M! (\mu p + \tau)^M \prod_{i=M+1}^j (M\mu p + i\tau)} \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

In our setting, $\bar{K}_{M,N}$ corresponds to the expected number of users in the undesirable state.

3.2.1. Queueing system regimes and offered load. To illustrate the impact of the queueing system structure on service interventions, we begin by introducing the concepts of Efficiency-Driven (ED), Quality-Driven (QD), and Quality-and-Efficiency-Driven (QED) regimes from queueing theory. These regimes will be instrumental in interpreting the outcomes of the experiments. We provide a brief introduction here; for more detail, see Shortle et al. (2018) for an introduction in general queues and De Véricourt and Jennings (2008) for discussion specific to closed queueing systems.

A key parameter in the subsequent analysis is the *critical ratio* r , defined as

$$r = \frac{\lambda}{\lambda + \tau + \mu p}. \quad (4)$$

Then rN is the *offered load*, which can be interpreted as the expected number of users in the undesirable state if the system had an infinite number of servers, or, in other words, if a server were available as soon as a user enters the undesirable state.

The relationship between the offered load and the number of servers M determines which regime the queue operates in. In the Efficiency-Driven (ED) regime, the number of servers is less than the offered load ($M \ll rN$) and servers are efficiently used with little idle time, at the cost of longer

wait times for users. In the Quality-Driven (QD) regime, the number of servers is larger than the offered load ($M \gg rN$) and the probability that a user must wait to be served is low, at the cost of maintaining more servers. The Quality-Efficiency-Driven (QED) regime refers to a regime that balances both quality and efficiency, where the capacity is chosen such that it is approximately equal to the offered load ($M \approx rN$), but with an additional “buffer” to account for randomness in user arrival and service times. A simple heuristic to staff in the QED regime is use the Square Root Staffing rule, which chooses $M = rN + \gamma\sqrt{N}$ for some constant γ . We will utilize this staffing policy and the queueing regimes in the later analysis.

3.3. Metric of interest

The intervention aims to increase the average time that users spend in the desired state, or equivalently, reduce the average time spent in the undesirable state. Starting with a single user u , define $Y(u, T)$ to be the proportion of time spent in the undesirable state over a finite horizon $[0, T]$:

$$Y_{M,N}(u, T) = \frac{1}{T} \cdot \int_{t=0}^T x_{M,N}(u, t) dt.$$

The proportion of time spent in the desirable state is $1 - Y_{M,N}(u, T)$. The intervention then aims to reduce the average time that all N users spend in the undesirable state.

$$\frac{1}{N} \cdot \sum_u Y_{M,N}(u, T). \quad (5)$$

To focus on the long run behavior, we consider the *steady state* proportion of time user u spends in the undesirable state, denoted $\mathbb{E}_{\pi_{M,N}} [x_{M,N}(u, t)]$, where the expectation is taken over the stationary distribution. Since the system is an ergodic Markov chain, it follows that

$$\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} Y_{M,N}(u, T) = \mathbb{E}_{\pi_{M,N}} [x_{M,N}(u, t)], \text{ and} \quad (6)$$

$$\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \cdot \sum_u Y_{M,N}(u, T) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_u \mathbb{E}_{\pi_{M,N}} [x_{M,N}(u, t)] = \mathbb{E}_{\pi_{M,N}} [x_{M,N}(u, t)], \quad (7)$$

where the second equality in Equation (7) comes from the fact that users are homogeneous in the current setting.

The left hand side of Equation (7) involves a sum of dependent random variables where one subject’s time spent in the undesirable state can depend on whether the provider was busy serving another subject. Further, each random variable $Y_{M,N}(u, T)$ is an average of the subject’s state up until time T , and the subject’s state at time t can affect their state at some later time t' .

Nevertheless, we are able to study this metric by connecting the outcomes of individual users to metrics of the queueing system. The following lemma shows that the average of the individual quantities $Y_{M,N}(u, T)$ is equivalent to the time average of the queue length, a well studied quantity in queueing theory. While straightforward, this observation enables us to leverage queueing theory results in order to study these service intervention experiments.

LEMMA 1 (**Relationship between proportion of time verified and queue length**). *Let $X_{M,N}(t)$ denote the number of people being served or waiting to be served in the queue. Then the proportion of time that the user spends in the undesirable state, averaged across users, can be expressed as*

$$\frac{1}{N} \cdot \sum_u Y_{M,N}(u, T) = \frac{1}{NT} \cdot \int_{t=0}^T X_{M,N}(t) dt$$

The long run (steady state) proportion of time the user spends in the undesirable state can be expressed as

$$\mathbb{E}_{\pi_{M,N}} [x_{M,N}(u, t)] = \bar{K}_{M,N}/N.$$

Proof of Lemma 1. For the equation for finite T ,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{N} \cdot \sum_u Y_{M,N}(u, T) &= \frac{1}{N} \sum_u \frac{1}{T} \int_{t=0}^T x_{M,N}(u, t) dt \\ &= \frac{1}{NT} \int_{t=0}^T \sum_u x_{M,N}(u, T) dt \\ &= \frac{1}{NT} \cdot \int_{t=0}^T X_{M,N}(t) dt \end{aligned}$$

The equation for the steady state quantity follows from taking the limit on both sides of the above expression, since the Markov chain is ergodic.

3.4. Experimentation

We now start considering impact evaluation for the kind of system we have described above. In particular, we will describe the control group, the treatment group, the treatment effect and estimator, and how the power of such an experiment depends on both the number of users enrolled and the number of servers staffing the service component.

3.4.1. Recruitment decisions for users and servers The experimenter recruits N subjects, which we call users, into the experiment. These users are then randomized into the treatment group, which receives the service intervention, and the control group, which does not. For each user u , we let Z_u indicate whether the user is assigned to the treatment group ($Z_u = 1$) or the control group ($Z_u = 0$). Let N_1 and N_0 denote the number of treatment and control subjects, respectively. We focus on the setting where there are the same number of subjects in the treatment and control group $N_1 = N_0 = N/2$, though all of the analysis can extend to the general setting.

The experimenter hires M_1 servers to provide the service intervention, where the subscript denotes that the service intervention is provided only to the subjects in the treatment group. These servers correspond to the individuals or resources that are providing the costly, on-demand interactions in the service intervention. In the context of the medication adherence programs in Yoeli

(2019) and Volpp et al. (2017), a server corresponds to the provider who reaches out patients who are not adhering to their medication schedule. Servers may also correspond to healthcare providers in medical experiments or teachers in education experiments.

3.4.2. Behavior of treatment and control groups. Note that the treatment group and the control group form two distinct stochastic systems that can be analyzed separately. In other words, users in the treatment group do not affect users in the control group, and vice versa. However, users in the treatment group do affect each other.

In the notation of the queueing system defined in §3.2, the treatment group evolves according to Q_{M_1, N_1} , where the steady state distribution of the number of users in the queue is captured by π_{M_1, N_1} , and the steady state proportion of time each user spends in the undesirable state is $\mathbb{E}_{\pi_{M_1, N_1}}[x_{M_1, N_1}(u, t)]$. Each of these expressions depends on M_1 and N_1 .

In contrast, users in the control group move from the undesired state to the desired state according to the dynamics given in Figure 1, without any service from system. We can express the evolution of the control group with the transition rate matrix Q_{0, N_0} with steady state distribution π_{0, N_0} or, equivalently, as N_0 separate systems, each consisting of a single individual evolving according to $Q_{0, 1}$ and with steady state distribution $\pi_{0, 1}$. The steady state proportion of time that each user spends in the undesirable state is then $\mathbb{E}_{\pi_{0, 1}}[x_{0, 1}(u, t)]$, which does not depend on N_0 .

3.4.3. Treatment effect and estimators. We define a class of treatment effects that measure the long term effect of the intervention on the time users spend in the desirable state, the metric of interest defined in 3.3. Importantly, in the context of service interventions, this effect depends on the number of users N_1 and servers M_1 .

Given an experiment with M_1, N_1, N_0 , we define the *steady state treatment effect* $\theta^{ss}(M_1, N_1)$ as the difference between the treatment and control group in the proportion of time spent in the desirable state.

$$\begin{aligned} \theta^{ss}(M_1, N_1) &= \left[1 - \mathbb{E}_{\pi_{M_1, N_1}}[x_{M_1, N_1}(u, t)]\right] - \left[1 - \mathbb{E}_{\pi_{0, N_0}}[x_{0, N_0}(u, t)]\right] \\ &= \left[1 - \bar{K}_{M_1, N_1}/N_1\right] - \mathbb{E}_{\pi_{0, 1}}[x_{0, 1}(u, t)]. \end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

Note that this treatment effect depends on M_1 and N_1 , but not N_0 .

A natural estimator for the treatment effect is the difference in means estimator that compares the empirical group mean verification of the treatment and control group. Given an experiment with M_1 servers for the treatment group, N_1 users in treatment, N_0 users in control, and a time horizon of length T , the *time average estimator* $\hat{\theta}(M_1, N_1, N_0, T)$ is

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{\theta}(M_1, N_1, N_0, T) &= \left[\frac{\sum_{u:Z_u=1} 1 - Y_{M_1, N_1}(u, T)}{N_1} \right] - \left[\frac{\sum_{u:Z_u=0} 1 - Y_{0, N_0}(u, T)}{N_0} \right] \\ &= \left[1 - \frac{\frac{1}{T} \cdot \int_{t=0}^T X_{M_1, N_1}(t) dt}{N_1} \right] - \left[1 - \frac{\frac{1}{T} \cdot \int_{t=0}^T X_{0, N_0}(t) dt}{N_0} \right].\end{aligned}\tag{9}$$

Equation (9) shows two ways of expressing the estimator. The first line expresses the estimator as the difference between averages of individual outcomes. The second line expresses the estimator as a queueing system metric, with respect to the queue length for the treatment and control systems, $X_{M_1, N_1}(t)$ and $X_{0, N_0}(t)$, using Lemma 1.

3.4.4. Hypothesis testing and power. The experimenter conducts a standard hypothesis test to determine whether observed differences between the treatment and control group are statistically significant. Let $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ denote the significance level of the test.

The experimenter then conducts a test with null hypothesis $H_0 : \theta^{ss}(M_1, N_1) = 0$ and alternative hypothesis $\theta^{ss}(M_1, N_1) > 0$. If we assume that the variance of the estimator is known, then the test statistic under the null hypothesis is

$$Z(M_1, N_1, N_0, T) = \frac{\hat{\theta}(M_1, N_1, N_0, T) - 0}{\sqrt{\text{Var}(\hat{\theta}(M_1, N_1, N_0, T))}}.\tag{10}$$

The experimenter rejects the null if the probability of observing $Z(M_1, N_1, N_0, T)$ under the null hypothesis is less than α . Let MDE denote a minimum detectable effect threshold and $\beta \in (0, 1)$ be the desired power. If the true effect $\theta^{ss}(M_1, N_1)$ is at least as large as the MDE , then the experimenter wants to reject the null hypothesis with probability β . We will develop approximations for the two components of (10) in §4.

3.4.5. Trial design decisions. When planning a trial, experimenter must choose the number of servers M_1 and the number of subjects N_1 and N_0 to ensure a high powered test at the specified MDE , or equivalently, a high enough ratio in Equation (10).

In trials without interference, the problem is simple, since the variance in (10) decreases linearly in the number of subjects, and boils down to minimizing the number of subjects $N_1 + N_0$ while meeting the power criterion. For service interventions, the decision is more complicated as the experimenter must jointly decide on N_1 , N_0 and M_1 . In §6 we will contrast two naive approaches for power analysis with a queueing-informed approach, demonstrating that obtaining accurate power estimates relies on understanding the level of congestion interference.

For service interventions, the decision is more complicated as the experimenter must jointly decide on N_1 , N_0 and M_1 . In §6 we will contrast two naive approaches for power analysis with a queueing-informed approach, demonstrating that obtaining accurate power estimates relies on understanding the level of congestion interference.

4. Analysis of system

This section provides the mathematical foundations to analyze these experiments; later §5 and §6 use these expressions to characterize the implications for service intervention RCTs. To study the quantities defined in §3.4, we need to characterize both the expected value of the estimator and its variance. By Lemma 1, this problem reduces to characterizing the time average of the queue length and the associated variance, for both the treatment and control groups.

Here, we first use prior results from the literature to establish a Central Limit Theorem for the two groups and the estimator as $T \rightarrow \infty$ (§4.1). However, due to the dependencies between individuals in the treatment group, the expressions for the average queue length and its variance are complex even in the large T limit (see Equations (11)-(12)). Therefore, to obtain analytical insights on the behavior of these two quantities, we subsequently develop a fluid limit to approximate the average queue length in large systems with many users and many servers (§4.2). In particular, we illustrate how to apply these approximations to study experiment outcomes (§4.2.1).

4.1. Central Limit Theorem for estimator in finite system

Recall that the estimator $\hat{\theta}(M_1, N_1, N_0, T)$, defined in Equation (9) as

$$\hat{\theta}(M_1, N_1, N_0, T) = \left[\frac{\sum_{u:Z_u=1} 1 - Y_{M_1, N_1}(u, T)}{N_1} \right] - \left[\frac{\sum_{u:Z_u=0} 1 - Y_{0, N_0}(u, T)}{N_0} \right],$$

compares the average time spent in the desirable state across groups, where the first term corresponds to the average over the users in the treatment group and the second term corresponds to the average over users in the control group.

We derive a Central Limit Theorem (CLT) for the estimator $\hat{\theta}(M_1, N_1, N_0, T)$ by first deriving a CLT for each of the treatment and control terms separately. Since the treatment and control groups are independent from each other, the CLT for the estimator then immediately follows.

We first remind the reader of the challenges in deriving a CLT for this system. The term corresponding to the treatment group is a sum of *dependent* random variables $Y_{M_1, N_1}(u, T)$, since the length of time that a user remains in the undesirable state can depend on whether other users are waiting for service. In contrast, the term corresponding to the control group is a sum of independent random variables $Y_{0, N_0}(u, T)$ since the users' states evolve independently from each other in the control group. However, in both groups, there is a dependency across time for each user u . That is, the state of user u at time t affects the distribution of their state at some later time t' . Each random variable $Y_{M, N}(u, T)$ is an integral over time and so we must characterize the dependency across time for both groups. Thus, we do not have independent and identically distributed samples, a condition typically assumed to guarantee the existence of a CLT. Nevertheless, we are able leverage existing results from Whitt (1992) in queueing theory to establish a CLT.

THEOREM 1 (Central Limit Theorem). Let $A(M_1, N_1, T) = \sum_{u:Z_u=1} 1 - Y_{M_1, N_1}(u, T)/N_1$ and $B(N_0, T) = \sum_{u:Z_u=0} 1 - Y_{0, N_0}(u, T)/N_0$ denote the treatment and control terms of Equation (9), so that $\hat{\theta}(M_1, N_1, N_0, T) = A(M_1, N_1, T) - B(N_0, T)$.

Then the following quantities converge in distribution

$$\begin{aligned} T^{1/2} \cdot (A(M_1, N_1, T) - \mu_1) &\implies N(0, \tilde{\sigma}_1^2) \\ T^{1/2} \cdot (B(N_0, T) - \mu_0) &\implies N(0, \tilde{\sigma}_0^2) \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_1 = \mu_1(M_1, N_1) &= 1 - \bar{K}_{M_1, N_1}/N_1, \quad \mu_0 = \frac{\tau}{\lambda + \tau} \\ \tilde{\sigma}_1^2 = \tilde{\sigma}_1^2(M_1, N_1) &= \frac{2}{N_1^2} \sum_{j=0}^{N_1-1} \frac{1}{(N_1 - j)\pi_{M_1, N_1}(j)} \left[\sum_{i=0}^j (i - \bar{K}_{M_1, N_1})\pi_{M_1, N_1}(i) \right]^2 \\ \tilde{\sigma}_0^2 = \tilde{\sigma}_0^2(N_0) &= \frac{1}{N_0} \cdot \frac{2\lambda\tau}{(\lambda + \tau)^3} \end{aligned}$$

Then the scaled estimator converges

$$T^{1/2} \cdot \left(\hat{\theta}(M_1, N_1, N_0, T) - (\mu_1 - \mu_0) \right) \implies N(0, \tilde{\sigma}_1^2 + \tilde{\sigma}_0^2).$$

The convergence to the time average of each group to its mean follows directly from the system being an ergodic Markov chain. The formula for variance follows from a result for Markov processes in Whitt (1992). The proof for this result is in Appendix B.

A corollary of Theorem 1 is that $\hat{\theta}(M_1, N_1, N_0, T)$ is a consistent estimator for the long term treatment effect $\theta^{ss}(M, N)$, when $M = M_1$ and $N = N_1$. That is, the estimator recovers the true treatment effect if the experiment is run for long enough. As we discuss later, this result does not hold for general $M \neq M_1$ and $N \neq N_1$.

COROLLARY 1 (Consistency). For any $N_0 > 1$,

$$\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \hat{\theta}(M_1, N_1, N_0, T) \xrightarrow{p} \theta^{ss}(M_1, N_1)$$

where p denotes convergence in probability.

Motivated by Theorem 1, we use the following approximation for the mean of the estimator:

$$\hat{\theta}(M_1, N_1, N_0, T) \approx \left[1 - \bar{K}_{M_1, N_1}/N_1 \right] - \frac{\tau}{\lambda + \tau}. \quad (11)$$

Similarly, we use the following approximation for the variance of the estimator for finite T :

$$\text{Var} \left(\hat{\theta}(M_1, N_1, N_0, T) \right) \approx \tilde{\sigma}^2/T. \quad (12)$$

The simulations in Appendix D for the system at finite time horizons show that these simulation quantities align closely with the approximations suggested by the CLT for large enough T .

4.2. Approximating the average queue length using a fluid limit

To capture the implications of congestion arising from capacity constrained interventions, we must characterize how the size of the treatment effect defined in Equation (8) changes with the number of servers and users. In other words, we need to characterize how the mean of the limiting distribution in Theorem 1 depends on N_1 and M_1 . To obtain analytical insights, instead of directly analyzing the expression in Equation (11), we utilize a *fluid limit* to approximate this quantity in large systems. This approach is a method from queueing theory that allows us to simplify the expression for queue length (see Whitt (2002) for the general method and De Véricourt and Jennings (2008) for an example in a closed queueing system).

We first present the fluid limit of the queueing system with M servers and N users. In the next section (§ 4.2.1), we describe how to use this limit to approximate experiment quantities described above.

We scale up both the number of servers M and number of users N proportionally (such that M/N approaches a constant) and consider the *average* behavior of the system, which becomes deterministic even for finite T . Formally, suppose that the number of servers is a function of N , denoted $M^{(N)}$. Further assume that we choose a staffing rule such that $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} M^{(N)}/N = \bar{M}$. We define the following fluid limit, designed to represent the behavior of the system as $N \rightarrow \infty$. Let $z(t)$ denote the fraction of users in the undesirable state at time t such that $z(t)$ obeys the following ordinary differential equation:

$$\frac{dz(t)}{dt} = \begin{cases} \lambda(1-z) - z\mu p - z\tau, & \text{for } z < \bar{M}, \\ \lambda(1-z) - \bar{M}\mu p - z\tau, & \text{for } z \geq \bar{M}. \end{cases} \quad (13a)$$

$$(13b)$$

The two equations show that the evolution of this system depends on whether the fraction of users in the undesirable state $z(t)$ is greater than or less than the the ratio of servers to users \bar{M} . When $z(t) < \bar{M}$, the rate at which users receive service undesirable state is limited by $z(t)$. Conversely, when $z(t) > \bar{M}$, the rate at which users receive service is limited by \bar{M} .

Analogous to the finite system steady state quantity $\bar{K}_{M,N}/N$, we can define the steady state proportion of users in the system (undesirable state) in the fluid limit, defined to be the value at which $dz/dt = 0$, which we denote $z^*_{\bar{M}}$. The following result characterizes the steady state behavior, as a function of model parameters. The proof is in Appendix B.

PROPOSITION 1 (**Fluid limit steady state**). For a given value of \bar{M} , the ODE system given by equations (13a) – (13b) has the following steady state solution:

$$z_{\bar{M}}^* = \begin{cases} \frac{\lambda - \bar{M}\mu p}{\lambda + \tau}, & \text{for } \bar{M} \leq r, \\ \frac{\lambda}{\lambda + \tau + \mu p}, & \text{for } \bar{M} > r. \end{cases} \quad (14)$$

In particular, note that this expression directly shows how increasing the ratio of servers \bar{M} to users affects the fraction of people in the undesirable state, unlike the expression for queue length in Equation (3) for finite settings.

For a finite system with large enough values of M and N , we can use the behavior of the fluid limit to approximate the average queue length in the finite system as follows:

$$\bar{K}_{M,N} \approx N \cdot z_{M/N}^*.$$

Indeed, we observe that the the steady state distribution of the finite system converges to the steady state of the fluid limit as M and N increase. See Appendix D for comparisons of simulations of the finite system and the fluid limit.

4.2.1. Fluid limit approximations for experiment quantities For a system with finite M and N , we can approximate the finite system behavior using the fluid limit with limiting server-to-user ratio M/N . Applying this to the experiment context with M_1 servers, N_1 users in the treatment group, and N_0 users in the control group, we define the *fluid limit treatment effect* θ^* , analogous to the finite system steady state treatment effect θ^{ss} as

$$\theta^*(M_1/N_1) := [1 - z_{M_1/N_1}^*] - [1 - z_0^*]. \quad (16)$$

and use the fluid limit treatment effect to approximate $\theta^{ss}(M_1, N_1)$

$$\theta^{ss}(M_1, N_1) \approx \theta^*(M_1/N_1).$$

We use this approximation in Section 5.1 to highlight how the steady state treatment effect $\theta^{ss}(M_1, N_1)$ changes with M_1 and N_1 . However, we note that this fluid limit is deterministic and thus, when we study the variance of the estimator and the statistical power of the experiment, we use the finite system quantities in Theorem 1.

5. Insights for Experimental Design

In this section, we highlight the impact that congestion has on the magnitude of the treatment effect and the resulting statistical power of the RCT. Note that there are four experiment parameters that the experimenter decides in the design phase: the number of service providers M_1 , the number of treatment and control users N_1 and N_0 , as well as the time horizon T . We focus on the choices of M_1 , N_1 , and N_0 , to highlight the capacity constrained dimension of these interventions.




Figure 2 Visualizations of the treatment effect size for various M_1 and N_1 combinations, where $N_1 = N_0 = N/2$. Dashed grey lines represent quantity if queue had infinite capacity ($M_1 \rightarrow \infty$). Solid lines show approximations given by the CLT in Theorem 1. Dashed lines show fluid limit approximation in Equation (16).

Parameters: $\lambda = 0.4, \tau = 0.35, \mu = 3, p = 0.1, T = 10$.

5.1. Non-linear effect of user load on effect size

Intuitively, in a service intervention, if we fix the number of servers but increase the number of users, then users will likely need to wait longer to be served and hence, will spend more time in the undesirable state. In this situation, we expect the treatment effect of the intervention to decrease. However, we can show using the fluid limit that this impact of the user load on effect size is non-linear. When the user load is small, the treatment effect is in fact constant in the user load. Only when the user load is large enough does the treatment effect decrease in user load, following the intuition above. Later §5.3 and §6 show how to use this non-linearity to increase the statistical power of an experiment.

PROPOSITION 2 (Fluid limit treatment effect). Fix a limiting server-to-user ratio $\bar{M} = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} M_1^{(N)}/N_1$. The fluid limit treatment effect is

$$\theta^*(\bar{M}) = \begin{cases} \frac{\bar{M} \cdot \mu p}{\lambda + \tau} & \text{for } \bar{M} \leq r \\ \frac{\lambda \mu p}{(\lambda + \tau)(\lambda + \tau + \mu p)} & \text{for } \bar{M} \geq r. \end{cases}$$

where r is the critical ratio.

In particular, as the server-to-user ratio decreases to 0, we have

$$\lim_{\bar{M} \rightarrow 0} \theta^*(\bar{M}) = 0,$$

The proof follows immediately by applying the fluid limit steady state characterization in Proposition 1 to the treatment and control systems. Using the mean field limit, Proposition 2 confirms the intuition that there is not a single treatment effect for a service intervention, but rather a set of different treatment effects corresponding to different server-to-user ratios \bar{M} . Figure 2 shows these

fluid approximations for the treatment effect, along with the finite system quantities in Equation (8).

We note that the outcome of the control group does not depend on \bar{M} and that changes in the treatment effect stem only from changes in the outcomes of the treatment group. When \bar{M} decreases, there are fewer servers for the treatment group and on average treatment users will wait longer to be served. In the limit, when $\bar{M} \rightarrow 0$ (as is the case when holding M fixed and increasing $N \rightarrow \infty$), users will not be served and the treatment effect diminishes. On the other hand, when increasing \bar{M} , users will experience shorter wait times before being served and as $\bar{M} \rightarrow \infty$, users will be served immediately after entering the undesirable state.

The dependence of the treatment effect is not linear in \bar{M} . For small $\bar{M} < r$, increasing the ratio of servers to users increases the treatment effect but when $\bar{M} > r$ is large, increasing \bar{M} does not increase the treatment effect. This result is due to the underlying queueing structure of the service intervention. Recall the queueing regimes defined in Section 3.2.1. The $\bar{M} < r$ case corresponds to the Efficiency-Driven regimes where, on average, users who enter the undesirable state will need to wait to be served. In this setting, increasing the number of servers decreases how long users must wait before receiving the intervention and increases the treatment effect. The $\bar{M} > r$ case corresponds to the Quality-Driven regime, where the system maintains a buffer of unused servers and the probability that a user needs to wait to be served is low (tending to 0). In this setting, most users are served immediately and increasing the number of servers will not increase the treatment effect.

Proposition 2 also implies that the experiment estimator may be biased if the experiment does not the same number of servers or users as the intended intervention when scaled up. Consider the setting where an experimenter runs a study with M_1 servers, N_1 users in treatment, and $N_0 \geq 1$ users in control and obtains the estimate $\hat{\theta}(M_1, N_1, N_0) \approx \theta^*(M_1/N_1)$. If they choose to scale up the platform to $N > N_1$ users without increasing the number of servers M_1 , then they will obtain an unbiased estimate of the treatment effect if and only if both $M_1/N \geq r$ and $M_1/N_1 \geq r$; otherwise the experimenter will overestimate the true effect. See Proposition 4 in Appendix C for a complete characterization of the bias for all ratios of M/N and M_1/N_1 .

5.2. Estimation of variance

In general, the variance of the sampling distribution $\hat{\theta}$ is unknown and the experimenter must estimate the variance using observed data. In settings where individual outcomes $Y_{M,N}(u, T)$ are independent across u , there exists a constant $\sigma^2 = \text{Var}(Y_{M,N}(u, T))$ and the variance of the sample mean is given by $\text{Var}(\sum_{u=1}^N Y_{M,N}(u, T)/N) = \sigma^2/N$. The standard approach is to estimate the sample variance s^2 across observations and estimate the variance of the sample mean with s^2/N .

However, with a capacity constrained intervention, the users in the treatment group are dependent and there are correlations in $Y_{M,N}(u, T)$ across users that the naive variance estimation procedure ignores. In particular, as seen in Theorem 1, the asymptotic variance for the treatment group average

$$\tilde{\sigma}_1^2 = \tilde{\sigma}^2(M, N_1, N_0) = \frac{2}{N_1^2} \sum_{j=0}^{N_1-1} \frac{1}{(N_1 - j)\pi_{M,N_1}(j)} \left[\sum_{i=0}^j (i - \bar{K}_{M,N_1}) \pi_{M,N_1}(i) \right]^2$$

does not decompose into the form σ^2/N_1 .

We leave this problem of variance estimation for future work and, for the rest of this paper, assume that the experimenter has the simpler task of running an experiment when the true variance is known. We show that even in this setting, where variance estimation is not an issue, the capacity constraints on the intervention will invalidate statistical guarantees in naive experiments.

5.3. Power is not monotonic in number of patients

We now consider the statistical power of the hypothesis test, which is the probability of finding a statistically significant result given that the true effect size is at least some threshold. Let M_1 denote the number of providers for the treatment group and N_1 and N_0 denote the number of users in treatment and control. We assume for simplicity that $N_1 = N_0$.

Let the null hypotheses be $H_0: \mu_r = \mu_c$ and suppose we are conducting a one-tailed test such that the alternative hypothesis is $H_a: \mu_r > \mu_c$. Let α be the significance level (e.g., $\alpha = 0.05$), β be the desired power (e.g., $\beta = 0.80$), and $MDE > 0$ denote the a Minimum Detectable Effect threshold. Fix $T > 0$.

The test statistic under the null hypothesis is

$$Z(M_1, N_1, N_0, T) = \frac{\hat{\theta}(M_1, N_1, N_0, T) - 0}{\sqrt{\tilde{\sigma}_r^2(M_1, N_1)/T + \tilde{\sigma}_0^2(N_0)/T}}.$$

Recall that if T is large enough, Theorem 1 shows that the estimator $\hat{\theta}(M_1, N_1, N_0, T)$ is *approximately* normally distributed. For tractability, we assume that the estimator is indeed normally distributed, although we expect that the results hold without this assumption. If we make the assumption that the estimator $\hat{\theta}(M_1, N_1, N_0, T)$ is normally distributed, then we can run a z -test. The power of this test at a fixed MDE is

$$1 - \Phi \left(\Phi^{-1}(1 - \alpha) - \frac{MDE}{\sqrt{\tilde{\sigma}_1^2(M_1, N_1)/T + \tilde{\sigma}_0^2(N_0)/T}} \right). \quad (17)$$

See Equation (23) in Appendix A for the derivation.

The experimenter generally fixes a static MDE and wishes to ensure a probability β of detecting a true effect $\theta^{ss}(M_1, N_1, N_0)$ at least as large as MDE . As we have seen, however, in service




Figure 3 Visualizations of the variance, normalized effect size, and power for various M_1 and N_1 combinations, where $N_1 = N_0 = N/2$. Dashed grey lines represent quantity if queue had infinite capacity ($M_1 \rightarrow \infty$). All plots show approximations given by the CLT in Theorem 1. The variance figure shows the variance of the treatment and control group averages separately. Parameters: $\lambda = 0.4, \tau = 0.35, \mu = 3, p = 0.1, T = 10$.

interventions this true effect size depends on M_1 and N_1 . To capture this phenomenon, for an experiment run with M_1 providers, N_1 treatment users, and N_0 control users, we consider the power to detect an effect at least as large as the *true* effect of the experiment; that is, we fix the $MDE = \theta^{ss}(M_1, N_1)$ to obtain:

$$1 - \Phi \left(\Phi^{-1}(1 - \alpha) - \frac{\theta^{ss}(M_1, N_1)}{\sqrt{\tilde{\sigma}_1^2(M_1, N_1)/T + \tilde{\sigma}_0^2(N_0)/T}} \right). \quad (18)$$

This quantity, of course, is not known to the experimenter when running the experiment. However, we can use this quantity to evaluate different experiment designs.

Now we consider the implications of Equation (18). First, note that power increases when $\theta^{ss}(M_1, N_1, N_0)$ increases, since Φ is a monotonically increasing function. Further, power increases when the variance term $\tilde{\sigma}_r^2(M_1, N_1) + \tilde{\sigma}_0^2(N_0)$ decreases.

First consider the setting where SUTVA holds and all treatment and control users are independent. Then, the numerator $\theta^{ss}(M_1, N_1)$ is constant in M_1, N_1 and N_0 . For the variance term, there exist constants $\tilde{\sigma}_0^2$ and $\tilde{\sigma}_1^2$ such that $\tilde{\sigma}_1^2(M_1, N_1) = \tilde{\sigma}_1^2/N_1$ and $\tilde{\sigma}_0^2(N_0) = \tilde{\sigma}_0^2/N_0$; in other words, the variance term for each of the treatment and control group averages decrease linearly with $1/N_1$ and $1/N_0$, respectively. Thus, increasing N_1 and N_0 increases the power of the hypothesis test.

For service interventions, SUTVA does not hold and we find that power is *not* monotonic in the number of patients. Figure 3 plots the statistical power at different M_1 and N , where $N_1 = N_0 = N/2$, using approximations in Equations (11)-(12). For each number of providers M_1 , we see that power is increasing in the number of patients N until a threshold (depending on M), after which power is decreasing in N .

The expression for power in Equation (18) highlights two factors leading to in power: (a) the treatment effect $\theta^{ss}(M_1, N_1, N_0)$ decreases in N (Figure 2) and (b) the treatment group variance term $\tilde{\sigma}_r^2(M_1, N_1)$ (given in Theorem 1) does not necessarily decrease with $1/N$ (Figure 3). (The




Figure 4 The change in the optimal number of users N as parameters vary, with $N_1 = N_0 = N/2$ and $T = 10$ in all plots. Base parameters are $\lambda = 0.3, \tau = 0.3, \mu = 3, p = 0.5$. Each plot varies one of the parameters, holding the other three fixed at the base parameter value.

control group samples are independent and we indeed have $\tilde{\sigma}_0^2(N_0) = \tilde{\sigma}_0^2(1)/N_0$.) Qualitatively, we observe that (a) the difference in the treatment effect plays a larger role than (b) the deviation in variance. For (a), the top left figure shows a sharp decrease in the treatment effect size in N . For (b), the top right figure shows that the control group variance decreases with $1/N$ but the treatment group variance deviates slightly in the small N regime.

A comparison of the plots for the treatment effect (Figure 2) and the variance in (Figure 3) provides intuition on how to maximize power, for a given M . As discussed in Section 5.1, treatment effect is constant for small N (the Quality Driven regime) up until a quantity that depends on M and then decreases for larger N (the Efficiency Driven regime). On the other hand, the variance is largely decreasing in N , and, in particular, is decreasing quickly for small N . Thus, for the small N interval of the Quality Driven regime, we can see that power is increasing in N , since power is a function of the ratio between the treatment effect and the standard error. For large N in the Efficiency Driven regime, the treatment effect appears to be decreasing more quickly than the variance, and so power is decreasing in N . Thus one might expect that the optimal N is one in the “middle” between these two regimes, what is known in queueing theory as the Quality Efficiency Driven regime. Indeed, we use this observation in the §6 to suggest a policy for experiment planning.

5.4. Numerical experiments: Optimal N varying parameter values

Figure 4 explores how the optimal number of users N changes as system parameters vary. We set the base parameters to be $\lambda = 0.3, \tau = 0.3, \mu = 3, p = 0.5$, and each plot varies a single parameter.

We focus on arrival rates $\lambda \in [0, 0.5]$ and abandon rates $\tau \in [0, 0.5]$ to reflect that states are “sticky”, i.e., a user is more likely to stay in the same state they were in yesterday, in the absence of intervention.

Figure 4 shows that the optimal N is decreasing in the arrival rate λ , increasing in abandon rate τ , increasing in service rate μ , and increasing in the probability of effect p . The directional effects intuitively reflect how the number of users in the queue change with respect to the parameters, e.g., as the arrival rate increases, more users will be entering the queue and so a larger number of servers M is needed. On the other hand, as the abandon rate increases, more users leave the queue and thus a fixed M will be able to serve more users.

In summary, Figure 4 implies that, for each M_1 , the power optimal N depends on the system parameters. We explore this direction in the next section and propose a heuristic Square Root Staffing policy, informed by queueing theory, to increase power by leveraging information about the underlying system structure.

6. Comparison of power analysis approaches

A main objective of this work is to help experimenters avoid the mistake of concluding an intervention is ineffective following RCT experimentation, simply because operational (capacity) constraints led to smaller effect sizes and, thus, an underpowered experiment. This goal is especially relevant for an efficacy trial, which aims to evaluate the impact of an intervention under ideal conditions. If the intervention seems promising in the efficacy trial, then there may be what is known as an effectiveness trial, designed to estimate the effect of the intervention under *realistic* conditions (Flay 1986). In our setting, an effectiveness trial might staff the experiment with a similar number of servers and users as what may be realistically deployed to the intended user-base.

A standard procedure in experiment design to ensure that an experiment is well powered is to first run a small scale *pilot study* and then conduct a *power analysis*, using the outcomes from the pilot study, to decide how many users to include in the full study.

In the remainder of the section, we consider two naive power analysis approaches that do not account for the capacity constrained structure intervention that we show may either be underpowered or be costly to run (requiring high M_1 , N_1 , or N_0). We then define a queueing-informed policy that leverages the intervention structure to ensure high power and with fewer resources (requiring lower M_1 , N_1 , and N_0).

6.1. Setup and naive power analysis policies

Consider a small scale *pilot study*, with M_1^p servers and N^p in the experiment, with N_0^p in control and N_1^p in treatment. Fix some $T > 0$. After running the pilot study, the experimenter obtains an estimate of the treatment effect $\hat{\theta}(M_1^p, N_1^p, N_0^p, T)$ and an estimate for the variance

$\widehat{Var}(\hat{\theta}(M_1^p, N_1^p, N_0^p, T))$. Based on the estimates from the pilot study and a specified Minimum Detectable Effect (*MDE*), the experimenter decides how to set the number of users and servers in the full experiment.

A power analysis policy thus specifies an (M_1, N_1, N_0) pair. We focus on policies with an equal number of users in treatment and control $N_1 = N_0$, although the observations can be extended for any constant treatment proportion.

6.1.1. Naive Policy 1: No M_1 Scale-up. Recall that the long-term treatment effect is $\theta^{ss}(M_1, N_1, N_0)$ and the variance $Var(\hat{\theta}(M_1, N_1, N_0, T)) \approx 1/T \cdot (\tilde{\sigma}_1^2(M_1, N_1, T) + \tilde{\sigma}_0^2(N_0, T))$.

For this first naive policy, the experimenter is not aware of those dependencies and makes two (incorrect) assumptions about the experiment:

1. They wrongly assume that the treatment effect $\theta^{ss}(M_1, N_1)$ does not depend on M_1 nor N_1 .
2. They wrongly assume that there exist constants $\tilde{\sigma}_0^2$ and $\tilde{\sigma}_1^2$ such that $\tilde{\sigma}_1^2(M_1, N_1) = \tilde{\sigma}_1^2/N_1$ and $\tilde{\sigma}_0^2(N_0) = \tilde{\sigma}_0^2/N_0$.

Due to assumption (1), they believe that there is a constant treatment effect for any M_1 , N_1 , and N_0 . An implication is that all experiment designs will lead to the same treatment effect as the pilot study. Thus, if the experimenter knew the treatment effect of the pilot study, they would set $MDE = \theta^{ss}(M_1^p, N_1^p)$. Further, an experimenter who is not aware of the impact of congestion does not increase the number of servers beyond M_1^p .

Of course, the experimenter does not know $\theta^{ss}(M^p, N_1^p)$ and only obtains an estimate $\hat{\theta}(M_1^p, N_1^p, N_0^p, T)$. Further, as Section 5.2 discusses, it is unclear how to estimate the variance of the estimator $\hat{\theta}(M^p, N_1^p, N_0^p, T)$. To simplify matters, we assume that the experimenter knows three additional pieces of information after the pilot study: they have oracle access to $\theta^{ss}(M_1^p, N_1^p, N_0^p)$, $\tilde{\sigma}_1^2(M_1^p, N_1^p)/T$, and $\tilde{\sigma}_0^2(N_0^p)/T$. We note that oracle access to these quantities makes the naive experimenter's task easier, and we will still show that the naive policy underperforms with respect to the queueing-informed policy. In other words, the experimenter has perfect knowledge of the sampling distribution of the estimator in the pilot study, but is not given additional information about the sampling distribution at other M_1 , N_1 , or N_0 .

Under this oracle knowledge and Assumption (2), the naive experimenter (incorrectly) assumes that the treatment group variance term scales with N_1 and so the variance at $N_1 \neq N_1^p$ is $\tilde{\sigma}_1^2(M_1^p, N_1^p)/T \cdot N_1^p/N_1$. Likewise, the experimenter (correctly) assumes that the control group variance term scales with N_0 and so the variance at $N_0 \neq N_0^p$ is $\tilde{\sigma}_0^2(N_0^p)/T \cdot N_0^p/N_0$.

Given these assumptions, the naive experimenter chooses N_1 by solving the following optimization problem.

$$\begin{aligned}
& \text{minimize} && N_1 \\
& \text{subject to} && 1 - \Phi \left(\Phi^{-1}(1 - \alpha) - \frac{MDE}{\sqrt{f(N_1) + g(N_0)}} \right) \geq \beta \\
& && MDE = \theta^{ss}(M_1^p, N_1^p) \tag{19a} \\
& && M_1 = M_1^p \tag{19b} \\
& && f(N_1) = \frac{N_1^p}{N_1 T} \cdot \tilde{\sigma}_1^2(M_1^p, N_1^p) \tag{19c} \\
& && g(N_0) = \frac{N_0^p}{N_0 T} \cdot \tilde{\sigma}_1^2(N_0^p) \tag{19d} \\
& && N_1 = N_0 \\
& && N_1 \in \mathbb{Z}_+^n
\end{aligned}$$

Note that (19a)-(19b) reflect Assumption (1) and (19c)-(19d) reflect Assumption (2). Let N_1^{naive} denote the solution to the naive optimization problem. Then the first Naive Policy of not scaling M_1 would recommend

$$(M_1^p, N_1^{Naive}, N_1^{Naive})$$

for the full experiment.

6.1.2. Naive Policy 2: Proportional M_1 Scale-up. We consider a (less naive) second policy where the experimenter makes Assumption (2) but not Assumption (1). This experimenter knows that $\theta^{ss}(M_1, N_1)$ depends on both M_1 and N_1 , but does not necessarily know how. In this setting, experimenter similarly sets $MDE = \theta(M_1^p, N_1^p)$ and prescribes the same N^{naive} as above, but takes the natural step of scaling M_1 proportionally with N_1 , so that

$$M_1 = \left\lceil M_1^p \cdot \frac{N^{naive}}{N_1^p} \right\rceil. \tag{20}$$

The Naive Policy (Proportion M_1 Scale-up) recommends $(\lceil M_1^p \cdot \frac{N^{naive}}{N_1^p} \rceil, N_1^{Naive}, N_1^{Naive})$ for the full experiment.

6.2. Queueing Informed Square Root Staffing Policy.

We now consider a policy informed by queueing theory, which utilizes the square root staffing rule, a common heuristic to balance efficiency and quality of service. This experimenter intelligently corrects for both Assumption (1) and Assumption (2).

As observed in Section 5.3, power is monotonically increasing for small N (the Quality Driven regime) and decreasing for large N (the Efficiency Driven regime). Motivated by these observations, we aim to set the number of servers M and users N such that the queueing system is operating

in the intermediate Quality Efficiency Driven regime. We utilize the Square Root Staffing rule to set staffing levels in this regime. Introduced in Halfin and Whitt (1981), this heuristic calculates for each number of users N the number of servers M required to maintain an approximately fixed probability of delay.

We first describe the square root staffing rule, which we later incorporate into a power analysis policy. Fix a constant $\gamma > 0$. In this work, we take $\gamma = 0.5$, although the choice of γ should depend on the parameters of the queueing system Shortle et al. (2018). We expect the dependence on γ to diminish in larger instances. We leave further optimization of γ in the context of experiment design to future work. Recall that $r = \lambda/(\lambda + \tau + \mu p)$ is the critical ratio, as defined in Equation (4), and rN_1 is offered load, or the average load on the system if there were always an available server when a patient entered the undesirable state. For each $N_1 > 0$, the square root staffing rule computes the required number of servers $M^*(N_1)$ where

$$M_1^*(N_1) := \left\lceil rN_1 + \gamma\sqrt{N_1} \right\rceil, \quad (21)$$

The number of servers M_1 is chosen to match the offered load on the system rN_1 , but adds a buffer $\gamma\sqrt{N_1}$ to account for variability in arrival and service times. In other words, to maintain a fixed level of service when increasing N , the chosen M should not be linear in N but rather needs to account for variability in the system and incorporate this $\sqrt{N_1}$ term.

Equation (21) implies that as the number of users N_1 increases, then the ratio of servers to users $M_1^*(N_1)/N_1 \rightarrow r$. Indeed, this limiting ratio r coincides with the threshold in Proposition 2, which shows that in the (large system) mean field limit, the treatment effect is increasing in the limiting server to user ratio \bar{M} when $\bar{M} < r$ and increasing in \bar{M} when $\bar{M} > r$. Intuitively, this staffing policy chooses the smallest M to maintain a high level of service and, thus, a large treatment effect.

Now we combine the square root staffing rule into an experiment design approach. For a fixed N_1 , the square root staffing rule outputs an $M_1^*(N_1)$, but the experimenter must still choose N_1 .

The queueing informed experimenter solves the following optimization problem

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{minimize} && N_1 \\ & \text{subject to} && 1 - \Phi \left(\Phi^{-1}(1 - \alpha) - \frac{MDE}{\sqrt{f(N_1) + g(N_0)}} \right) \geq \beta \\ & && MDE = \theta^{ss}(M_1, N_1) \end{aligned} \quad (22a)$$

$$M_1 = \left\lceil rN_1 + \gamma\sqrt{N_1} \right\rceil \quad (22b)$$

$$f(N_1) = \tilde{\sigma}_1^2(M_1, N_1)/T \quad (22c)$$

$$g(N_0) = \tilde{\sigma}_1^2(N_0)/T \quad (22d)$$

$$N_1 = N_0$$

$$N_1 \in \mathbb{Z}_+^n$$

Let N_1^{sqr} denote the solution N_1 to the above problem. Compared to the naive optimization problem, the queueing informed optimization problem corrects for Assumption (1) in (22a), implements the square root staffing rule in (22b), and uses the variance approximation from Theorem 1 in (22c)-(22d).

The queueing informed Square Root Staffing Policy then proposes

$$\left(\left\lceil rN_1 + \gamma\sqrt{N_1} \right\rceil, N_1^{sqr}, N_1^{sqr} \right)$$

for the full experiment.

Note, however, that both calculating the expressions in (22a)-(22d) requires knowing λ , τ , μ , and p . In practice, these parameters are unknown and experimenter would need to obtain estimates $\hat{\lambda}$, $\hat{\tau}$, $\hat{\mu}$, and \hat{p} from the pilot study, and then use these estimates to compute (22a)-(22d). Similar to the discussion of variance estimation for the naive policy, in order to isolate the issue of scaling up M_1 and N_1 , we assume that the experimenter has oracle access to the true quantities and leave the issue of estimation of queueing quantities to future work.

6.3. Numerical experiment setup

We consider a setting with $\lambda = 0.4$, $\tau = 0.35$, $\mu = 3$, $p = 0.1$, and $T = 10$. We focus on a setting with $\lambda < 0.5$ and $\tau < 0.5$ to capture the effect where states are “sticky”, i.e., without intervention, the user is more likely to remain in the state they were in yesterday. We then consider two scenarios for a pilot study: Scenario 1 with $M_1^p = 5$ and $N_1^p = N_0^p = 10$ and Scenario 2 with the same number of servers $M_1^p = 5$ but more users $N_1^p = N_0^p = 25$.

We suppose that the experimenter wants to run an experiment at significance level $\alpha = 0.05$ and desired power $\beta = 0.80$. We compare the power at each of the three power analysis policies: Naive Policy 1 (No M_1 Scale-up), Naive Policy 2 (Proportional M_1 Scale-up), and the Queueing Informed Square Root Staffing Policy.

Using Equation (18), we evaluate the statistical power of the experiment with (M_1, N_1, N_0) to detect a treatment effect at least as large as the true treatment effect $\theta^{ss}(M_1, N_1)$ of the experiment, where we approximate estimator mean and variance using Equations (11) and (12).

6.4. Comparison of power analysis policies

Figure 5 shows the performance of the three policies, for two difference instances of M_p^1 and N_p^1 . Since these initial pilot study parameters M_p^1 and N_p^1 are typically chosen for feasibility reasons and not optimized, a power analysis policy would ideally perform well given any instance of M_p^1 and N_p^1 . While the queueing informed Square Root Staffing Policy can give the desired power β for both scenarios, Naive Policy 1 (No M_1 Scale-up) does not achieve the desired power in either scenario, and Naive Policy 2 (Proportional M_1 Scale-up) achieves the desired policy but, depending




Figure 5 Power at different power analysis policies: each marker corresponds to a policy (M_1, N_1) . Naive (No M_1 Scale-up) policy scales up N_1 naively and does not scale up M_1 . Naive (Proportional) scales up N_1 naively and scales up M_1 proportionally. Square Root Policy chooses M_1 according square root staffing rule. Left figure considers a pilot study in the Quality Driven (Small N_1^p) regime; right figure considers a pilot study in the Efficiency Driven (Large N_1^p) regime. Parameters: $\lambda = 0.4, \tau = 0.35, \mu = 3, p = 0.1, N_1 = N_0, T = 10$.

on the initial pilot study conditions, may require significantly more resources than the Square Root Staffing Policy.

Under these parameters, the critical ratio is $r = 0.38$ and Scenario 1 (with $M_1^p/N_1^p = 0.5$) corresponds to the small N_1 (Quality-Driven) regime whereas Scenario 2 (with $M_1^p/N_1^p = 0.2$) corresponds to the large N_1 (Efficiency-Driven) regime. Importantly, the treatment effect is larger for $M^p = 5$ and $N^p = 20$ than it is for $M^p = 5$ and more users $N^p = 50$. (See Figure 2 for an illustration of effect size.)

In Scenario 1 (small N_1^p pilot), the treatment effect in the pilot study is $\theta^{ss}(5, 10) = 0.14$. Naive Policy 1 (No- M_1 Scale-up) chooses $(M_1, N_1, N_0) = (5, 35, 35)$, Naive Policy 2 (Proportional M_1 Scale-up) chooses $(M_1, N_1, N_0) = (18, 35, 35)$, and the Square Root Staffing Policy chooses $(M_1, N_1, N_0) = (16, 34, 34)$. We can see that Naive Policy 1 (No M_1 Scale-up) does not achieve the desired power, and actually has less power than the initial pilot experiment, due to the decreased effect size when increasing N_1 but not increasing M_1 . Both the Naive Policy 2 (Proportional M_1 Scale-up) and the Square Root Staffing Policy achieve 80% power. However, the Square Root Staffing Policy is able to achieve this power with slightly fewer users *and* servers, which reduces costs for running the experiment.

In Scenario 2 (large N_1^p pilot), the treatment effect in the pilot study is $\theta^{ss}(5, 25) = 0.07$, which is lower than the treatment effect in Scenario 1, due to the higher user load. We observe a similar pattern where the Naive Policy 1 (No M_1 Scale-up) is underpowered but both Naive Policy 2 (Proportional M_1 Scale-up) and Square Root Staffing policies achieve 80% power. Naive Policy 1 (No- M_1 Scale-up) chooses $(M_1, N_1, N_0) = (5, 140, 140)$, Naive Policy 2 (Proportional M_1 Scale-up) chooses $(M_1, N_1, N_0) = (28, 140, 140)$, and the Square Root Staffing Policy chooses $(M_1, N_1, N_0) = (16, 33, 33)$. In this setting, the Square Root Policy is able to achieve the same power as Naive

Policy 2, but with 42% fewer servers and 76% fewer users, requiring far fewer resources for the same power. Both naive policies choose a large number of users because they fail to realize that the small treatment effect size in the pilot study is due to a high user load on the system. Both naive policies attempt to increase the number of users in order to detect an effect as small as the pilot study observed effect size. The Queueing Informed Square Root Staffing rule recognizes that the treatment effect can be larger if there are more servers and thus requires fewer users in the experiment to detect this effect.

7. Conclusion

Our study provides insights into the challenges of experimentation with capacity constrained service interventions and also illustrates how we can run better experiments (with larger power and lower costs) by incorporating knowledge of the underlying queueing structure. With service interventions, it is possible that an intervention is beneficial and has a large effect size under ideal conditions (high enough capacity relative to the number of users) but unless the capacity is carefully chosen, an experiment may be underpowered to detect the effect.

This work serves to highlight the importance and the magnitude of such effects and provides a springboard for directions of future research. One direction is to develop the variance estimation and queue parameter estimation problems needed for both the naive and the queueing informed power analysis policies. Another direction is to study how to extrapolate from a single experiment with a given (M, N) and estimate how the experiment would have performed if a different M were used. Finally, one may want to consider heterogeneous models for users, servers, and treatment effects and also consider interventions with different priority queues, in addition to the first come first serve queue we consider here.

References

- Ancker Jr C, Gafarian AV (1963) Some queueing problems with balking and reneging. i. *Operations Research* 11(1):88–100.
- Baek J, Boutilier JJ, Farias VF, Jonasson JO, Yoeli E (2023) Policy optimization for personalized interventions in behavioral health. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.12206* .
- Blake T, Coey D (2014) Why marketplace experimentation is harder than it seems: The role of test-control interference. *Proceedings of the fifteenth ACM conference on Economics and computation*, 567–582.
- Boutilier J, JO J, Yoeli E (2022a) Improving tuberculosis treatment adherence support: The case for targeted behavioral interventions 24, ISSN 1523-4614, 1526-5498, URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1287/msom.2021.1046>.
- Boutilier JJ, Yoeli E, Rathausser J, Owiti P, Subbaraman R, Jónasson JO (2022b) Can digital adherence technologies reduce inequity in tuberculosis treatment success? evidence from a randomised controlled trial. *BMJ global health* 7(12):e010512.

-
- Bright I, Delarue A, Lobel I (2022) Reducing marketplace interference bias via shadow prices. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.02274* .
- Burman D (1980) A functional central limit theorem for birth and death processes, talk at the ORSA/TIMS Conference in Washington D.C.
- Cho SMJ, Lee JH, Shim JS, Yeom H, Lee SJ, Jeon YW, Kim HC (2020) Effect of smartphone-based lifestyle coaching app on community-dwelling population with moderate metabolic abnormalities: randomized controlled trial. *Journal of medical Internet research* 22(10):e17435.
- De Véricourt F, Jennings OB (2008) Dimensioning large-scale membership services. *Operations Research* 56(1):173–187.
- Dhaouadi W, Johari R, Weintraub GY (2023) Price experimentation and interference in online platforms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.17165* .
- Eckles D, Karrer B, Ugander J (2016) Design and analysis of experiments in networks: Reducing bias from interference. *Journal of Causal Inference* 5(1):20150021.
- Flay BR (1986) Efficacy and effectiveness trials (and other phases of research) in the development of health promotion programs. *Preventive medicine* 15(5):451–474.
- Halfin S, Whitt W (1981) Heavy-traffic limits for queues with many exponential servers. *Operations research* 29(3):567–588.
- Haque L, Armstrong MJ (2007) A survey of the machine interference problem. *European Journal of Operational Research* 179(2):469–482.
- Holtz D, Lobel R, Liskovich I, Aral S (2020) Reducing interference bias in online marketplace pricing experiments. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2004.12489* .
- Imbens GW, Rubin DB (2010) Rubin causal model. *Microeconomics*, 229–241 (Springer).
- Johari R, Li H, Liskovich I, Weintraub GY (2022) Experimental design in two-sided platforms: An analysis of bias. *Management Science* 68(10):7069–7089.
- Keum J, Chung MJ, Kim Y, Ko H, Sung MJ, Jo JH, Park JY, Bang S, Park SW, Song SY, et al. (2021) Usefulness of smartphone apps for improving nutritional status of pancreatic cancer patients: randomized controlled trial. *JMIR mHealth and uHealth* 9(8):e21088.
- Lekwijit S, Terwiesch C, Asch DA, Volpp KG (2023) Evaluating the efficacy of connected healthcare: An empirical examination of patient engagement approaches and their impact on readmission. *Management Science* .
- Li H, Zhao G, Johari R, Weintraub GY (2022) Interference, bias, and variance in two-sided marketplace experimentation: Guidance for platforms. *Proceedings of the ACM Web Conference 2022*, 182–192.
- Li S, Johari R, Wager S, Xu K (2023) Experimenting under stochastic congestion. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.12093* .

- Liu Y, Zhang Y (2015) Central limit theorems for ergodic continuous-time markov chains with applications to single birth processes. *Frontiers of Mathematics in China* 10:933–947.
- Meyn SP, Tweedie RL (2012) *Markov chains and stochastic stability* (Springer Science & Business Media).
- Munro E, Wager S, Xu K (2021) Treatment effects in market equilibrium. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2109.11647*.
- Shortle JF, Thompson JM, Gross D, Harris CM (2018) *Fundamentals of queueing theory*, volume 399 (John Wiley & Sons).
- Toro-Ramos T, Michaelides A, Anton M, Karim Z, Kang-Oh L, Argyrou C, Loukaidou E, Charitou MM, Sze W, Miller JD (2020) Mobile delivery of the diabetes prevention program in people with prediabetes: randomized controlled trial. *JMIR mHealth and uHealth* 8(7):e17842.
- Tweedie RL (1981) Criteria for ergodicity, exponential ergodicity and strong ergodicity of markov processes. *Journal of Applied Probability* 18(1):122–130.
- Véricourt Fd, Jennings OB (2011) Nurse staffing in medical units: A queueing perspective. *Operations research* 59(6):1320–1331.
- Volpp KG, Troxel AB, Mehta SJ, Norton L, Zhu J, Lim R, Wang W, Marcus N, Terwiesch C, Caldarella K, et al. (2017) Effect of electronic reminders, financial incentives, and social support on outcomes after myocardial infarction: the heartstrong randomized clinical trial. *JAMA Internal Medicine* 177(8):1093–1101.
- Wager S, Xu K (2021) Experimenting in equilibrium. *Management Science* 67(11):6694–6715.
- Whitt W (1992) Asymptotic formulas for markov processes with applications to simulation. *Operations Research* 40(2):279–291.
- Whitt W (2002) Stochastic-process limits: an introduction to stochastic-process limits and their application to queues. *Space* 500:391–426.
- Yoeli E (2019) Delivering community-based interventions and disease management tools across a digital platform in order to increase tb treatment adherence in Imics (NCT03135366), URL <https://clinicaltrials.gov/study/NCT03135366>.
- Yoeli E, Rathauer J, Bhanot SP, Kimenye MK, Mailu E, Masini E, Owiti P, Rand D (2019) Digital health support in treatment for tuberculosis. *New England Journal of Medicine* 381(10):986–987, ISSN 0028-4793, URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1056/NEJMc1806550>.

Appendix A: Expressions for power

Hypothesis testing.

The experimenter conducts a one-sided hypothesis test at the $\alpha = .05$ significance level with null hypotheses $H_0: \mu_r = \mu_c$ and $H_a: \mu_r > \mu_c$. The desired power is $\beta = 0.80$.

Fix $T > 0$ and let $\{r_1, \dots, r_{N_1}\}$ and $\{c_1, \dots, c_{N_0}\}$ be two sets of independent samples where $r_u = \frac{1}{T} \cdot \int_{t=0}^T x_{M_1, N_1}(u, t) dt$ and $c_u = \frac{1}{T} \cdot \int_{t=0}^T x_{0, N_0}(u, t) dt$. Let $\bar{r}(M_1, N_1) = \frac{\sum_{u: Z_u=1} \frac{1}{T} \cdot \int_{t=0}^T x_{M_1, N_1}(u, t) dt}{N_1}$ and $\bar{c}(N_0) = \frac{\sum_{u: Z_u=0} \frac{1}{T} \cdot \int_{t=0}^T x_{0, N_0}(u, t) dt}{N_0}$ be the sample means from the treatment and control group, respectively. Note that for large enough T , both quantities $\bar{r}(M_1, N_1)$ and $\bar{c}(N_0)$ are each approximately normally distributed, as suggested by Theorem 1.

For simplicity, we proceed with a normal approximation and assume that $\bar{r}(M_1, N_1) \sim N(\mu_r, \sigma_r^2)$ and $\bar{c}(N_0) \sim N(\mu_c, \sigma_c^2)$; we provide expressions for each of these quantities $\mu_r, \mu_c, \sigma_r^2, \sigma_c^2$ in the next section. We expect the main insights from our analysis to hold for the true distribution at finite T .

The test statistic under the null hypothesis is

$$Z(M_1, N_1, N_0) = \frac{(\bar{r}(M_1, N_1) - \bar{c}(N_0)) - 0}{\sqrt{\tilde{\sigma}_r^2(M_1, N_1) + \tilde{\sigma}_0^2(N_0)}}.$$

where $\tilde{\sigma}_r^2(M_1, N_1)$ and $\tilde{\sigma}_c^2(N_0)$ denote the variance of the treatment and control group sample means, respectively. Under the null hypothesis, $Z(M_1, N_1, N_0)$ is approximately distributed as $N(0, 1)$.

Note that if all treatment user outcomes r_u were independent, then $\mathbb{E}[\bar{r}(M_1, N_1) - \bar{c}(N_0)]$ is constant in M_1, N_1 , and N_0 , whereas this quantity depends on M_1 and N_1 in the setting with service interventions.

Power. Let $\Phi(z)$ denote the CDF of the standard normal distribution. For a fixed minimum detectable effect *MDE*,

$$\begin{aligned} & P(Z > \Phi^{-1}(1 - \alpha) | \mu_r - \mu_c = MDE) \\ &= 1 - P(Z \leq \Phi^{-1}(1 - \alpha) | \mu_r - \mu_c = MDE), \\ &= 1 - P\left(\frac{\bar{r} - \bar{c}}{\sqrt{\tilde{\sigma}_r^2(M_1, N_1) + \tilde{\sigma}_0^2(N_0)}} \leq \Phi^{-1}(1 - \alpha) | \mu_r - \mu_c = MDE\right), \\ &= 1 - P\left(\frac{\bar{r} - \bar{c} - MDE + MDE}{\sqrt{\tilde{\sigma}_r^2(M_1, N_1) + \tilde{\sigma}_0^2(N_0)}} \leq \Phi^{-1}(1 - \alpha) | \mu_r - \mu_c = MDE\right), \\ &= 1 - P\left(\frac{\bar{r} - \bar{c} - MDE}{\sqrt{\tilde{\sigma}_r^2(M_1, N_1) + \tilde{\sigma}_0^2(N_0)}} \leq \Phi^{-1}(1 - \alpha) - \frac{MDE}{\sqrt{\tilde{\sigma}_r^2(M_1, N_1) + \tilde{\sigma}_0^2(N_0)}} | \mu_r - \mu_c = MDE\right), \\ &\approx 1 - \Phi\left(\Phi^{-1}(1 - \alpha) - \frac{MDE}{\sqrt{\tilde{\sigma}_r^2(M_1, N_1) + \tilde{\sigma}_0^2(N_0)}}\right) \end{aligned} \tag{23}$$

where the approximation in the last line comes from the CLT in Theorem 1, which implies that $Z(M_1, N_1, N_0)$ is approximately normally distributed with mean θ and variance $\tilde{\sigma}_r^2(M_1, N_1) + \tilde{\sigma}_0^2(N_0)$.

Appendix B: Proofs

Proof of Theorem 1. The proof proceeds in three parts: 1) showing existence of a CLT exists for the estimator, 2) characterizing the mean of the limiting distribution, and 3) characterizing the variance of the limiting distribution.

Step 1: Existence of a CLT. We utilize Theorem 3.1 in Liu and Zhang (2015) on the existence of CLTs for continuous time Markov chains. This result shows for a positive recurrent CTMC X_t , with stationary distribution π , and real valued function f , a CLT holds for the sample mean $S(t) = 1/t \int_0^t f_{X_s} ds, t \geq 0$, a CLT of the form $t^{1/2} [S(t) - \pi(f)] \implies N(0, \sigma^2(f))$ when certain conditions are satisfied for X_t and f . We apply this theorem to our setting, letting X_t be the state of our CTMC and f be the identify function, i.e., $f(x) = x$ for any state x .

We need to check that the conditions X_t is strongly ergodic and $\mathbb{E}_\pi[f(x)^2] < \infty$ hold. First note that the Markov chain is ergodic, since it is possible to transition between any two states in finite time. Further, since the state space is finite, the expected hitting time of any state is finite and so ergodicity implies strong ergodicity (Tweedie 1981). The second condition $\mathbb{E}_\pi[f(x)^2] < \infty$ holds since the state space is finite. Thus a CLT exists.

Step 2: Characterizing the mean. We analyze the treatment patients and the control patients separately. We start with the treatment patients. Recall from Lemma 1 that

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{Y_{M,N}(u, T)}{T} = \frac{1}{NT} \int_{i=0}^T X_{M,N}(t) dt.$$

In other words, we can calculate the proportion of time non-verified $Y_{M,N}(u, T)$, averaged across users, as the time average of the queue length, normalized by the number of patients N . By the Ergodic theorem for Markov chains Meyn and Tweedie (2012), queue length time average converges to the expected length of the queue under the steady state distribution $\bar{K}_{M,N}$ and so the average proportion of time that users spend verified in the treatment group converges to $1 - \bar{K}_{M,N_1}/N_1$.

The control group consists of N_0 individuals that evolve independently. For any individual u , this individual switches between two states $x(u, t) = 0$ and $x(u, t) = 1$. By the Ergodic theorem, proportion of time that u spends verified on $[0, T]$ converges to the expectation in steady state that the user is in state $x(u, t) = 1$. Thus the proportion of time each user u spends verified converges to $\tau/(\lambda + \tau)$, and the average across all N_0 users is the same quantity.

Step 3: Characterizing the variance. Note that the set of treatment patients is independent from the set of control patients, so we can analyze the behavior of the two systems separately. For both systems, we first characterize the variance of the time average of the queue length and then relate this variance to the variance of the estimator.

We start with the treatment patients. For the treatment patients, the queuing system is a birth death chain. We use the following result from Whitt (1992), attributed to Burman (1980), for the asymptotic variance for a birth death process.

PROPOSITION 3 (Asymptotic Variance Whitt (1992), Burman (1980)). *Let $X(t)$ be a birth and death process on a subset of integers $\{0, \dots, n\}$ with birth and death rates λ_i and μ_i , respectively. Let $Y(t) = f(X(t))$ where f is a real-valued function on the state space of the BD process $X(t)$ and let $\bar{f} = \sum_{i=0}^n \pi_i f(i)$ be the steady state mean. Define the time average (sample mean) $(\bar{Y}(t) = t^{-1} \int_0^t Y(s) ds$ for $s > 0$ and define the asymptotic variance to be $\bar{\sigma}^2 = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} t \text{Var}(\bar{Y}(t))$.*

Then

$$\tilde{\sigma}^2 = 2 \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \frac{1}{\lambda_j \pi_j} \left[\sum_{i=1=0}^j (f(i) - \bar{f}) \pi_i \right]^2.$$

Note that the average number of jobs in the queue can be written in the above formulation as $f(i) = i$ and then we can directly use the formula in our setting.

Let $\tilde{\sigma}_{M,N}^2$ be the asymptotic variance of the time average queue length in a system with M servers and N users. Then

$$\tilde{\sigma}_{M,N}^2 = 2 \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} \frac{1}{(N-j)\pi_{M,N}(j)} \left[\sum_{i=0}^j (i - \bar{K}) \pi_{M,N}(i) \right]^2 \quad (24)$$

where \bar{K} itself is a function of $\pi_{M,N}$.

Since the time average proportion of time verified for the treatment group is simply the time average of the queue length normalized by N_1 , we get that the treatment group variance contribution is

$$\tilde{\sigma}^2 = \tilde{\sigma}^2(M, N_1, N_0) = \frac{2}{N_1^2} \sum_{j=0}^{N_1-1} \frac{1}{(N_1-j)\pi_{M,N_1}(j)} \left[\sum_{i=0}^j (i - \bar{K}_{M,N_1}) \pi_{M,N_1}(i) \right]^2.$$

For the control group, patients are independent from each other and so we can begin by analyzing a single patient. A single patient forms a birth death chain with only two states $\{0, 1\}$. Thus we can use Equation (24) to calculate the time average of the given patient's verification proportion. For this simple two state case, the resulting expression simplifies to

$$\frac{2\lambda\tau}{(\lambda + \tau)^3}.$$

All control users are independent and so the average across users has variance

$$\frac{1}{N_0} \cdot \frac{2\lambda\tau}{(\lambda + \tau)^3}.$$

Since the treatment and control groups are independent from each other, the asymptotic variance of the estimator is the sum of the respective asymptotic variance for the treatment and control groups. Thus completes the proof.

Proof of Proposition 1 Note that when Equation (13a) holds,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{dz}{dt} &< 0 \text{ when } \lambda/(\mu p + \lambda + \tau) < z \\ \frac{dz}{dt} &= 0 \text{ when } \lambda/(\mu p + \lambda + \tau) = z \\ \frac{dz}{dt} &> 0 \text{ when } \lambda/(\mu p + \lambda + \tau) > z. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, when Equation (13b) holds,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{dz}{dt} &< 0 \text{ when } (\lambda - \bar{M}\mu p)/(\lambda + \tau) < z \\ \frac{dz}{dt} &= 0 \text{ when } (\lambda - \bar{M}\mu p)/(\lambda + \tau) = z \\ \frac{dz}{dt} &> 0 \text{ when } (\lambda - \bar{M}\mu p)/(\lambda + \tau) > z. \end{aligned}$$

Now we consider three cases, Case (i) $r < \bar{M}$, Case (ii) $r = \bar{M}$, and Case (iii) $r > \bar{M}$.

We work out the steady state of the differential equation for Case (i). The other two cases can be proved similarly. If $z < r$, then Equation (13a) holds and $dz/dt < 0$. If $z = r$, Equation (13a) holds and $dz/dt = 0$. If $z > r$, then there are two cases: (a) $r < z < \bar{M}$ and (b) $r < \bar{M} < z$. Under scenario (a) $r < z < \bar{M}$, Equation (13a) holds and $dz/dt - \lambda(1-z) - \bar{M}\mu p - z\tau$. $dz/dt < 0 \iff z > (\lambda - \bar{M}\mu p)/(\lambda + \tau)$. One can verify through straightforward algebra that $\bar{M} > r$ implies that $r > (\lambda - \bar{M}\mu p)/(\lambda + \tau)$. Combining this expression with the fact that $z > r$ implies that $dz/dt < 0$ in this case. Thus when $r < \bar{M}$, the only steady state where $dz/dt = 0$ is when $z = r = \lambda/(\lambda + \tau + \mu p)$.

Appendix C: Additional results

Proposition 2 also implies that when the experiment is run with a different M or N_1 than the intended levels M' and N' when the intervention is scaled up, then it is possible that the estimator from the experiment $\hat{\theta}^*(M, N)$ does not recover the treatment effect at scale-up $\theta^*(M'/N')$ and the estimator is biased. We characterize the bias in the following result.

PROPOSITION 4 (Bias in estimator). *Fix an experiment design with M , N_1 , and N_0 . Suppose that the platform wants to estimate the treatment effect $\theta(M', N')$ of the intervention with M' providers and N' patients, with $M' \geq M$ and $N' \geq N_1$. The bias in the mean field estimator is given by*

$$\hat{\theta}^*(M/N_1) - \theta^*(M'/N') = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } M/N \leq r, M'/N' > r \\ \frac{\lambda}{\lambda + \tau + \mu p} - \frac{\lambda - (M'/N') \cdot \mu p}{\lambda + \tau} & \text{if } M/N > r, M'/N' < r \\ \frac{\lambda + \tau}{\lambda - (M/N) \cdot \mu p} - \frac{\lambda}{\lambda + \tau + \mu p} & \text{if } M/N < r, M'/N' > r \\ \frac{\lambda + \tau}{\lambda - (M/N) \cdot \mu p} - \frac{\lambda - (M'/N') \cdot \mu p}{\lambda + \tau} & \text{if } M/N < r, M'/N' < r. \end{cases} \quad (25)$$

An immediate result of Proposition 4 is that a platform that runs a study with M providers and N_1 users, obtains the estimate $\hat{\theta}^*(M, N_1)$ and naively wishes to scale up the platform to $N > N_1$ users without increasing the capacity M may be overestimating the effect $\theta^*(M, N)$.

The proof follows immediately from the mean field steady state expression in Equation (1).

Appendix D: Comparison of simulations with approximations

In Sections 5 and 6, we use the asymptotic approximations for the mean and variance of the estimator $\hat{\theta}(M, N_1, N_0, T)$ suggested by Theorem 1. We refer to these approximations as the CLT approximations. These approximations fix finite M, N_1, N_0 but consider the asymptotic behavior as $T \rightarrow \infty$. Additionally, in Section 5.1 Proposition 2 we use an additional large system mean field approximation in order to characterize how the effect size and estimator change with M and N . This approximation first scales up the size of the system such that $M \rightarrow \infty$ and $N \rightarrow \infty$, with $M/N \rightarrow \bar{M}$ for some constant \bar{M} . Then we consider the steady state of the mean field approximation as $T \rightarrow \infty$.

These approximations are convenient, as the the finite M, N_1, N_0 approximation motivated by Theorem 1 allows us to characterize the behavior at different M, N_1, N_0 without running computationally heavy simulations. The mean field approximation further allows us to prove the non-linearity in the decrease in the effect size in Proposition 2 when increasing the ratio of users to providers.

We now verify that these methods give us reasonable approximations of a system with finite M, N_1, N_0 and finite time horizon T . This boils down to confirming that the average queue length and the variance in the average queue length in simulations is similar to the quantities given by the approximations.




Figure 6 Comparison of sample mean average queue length in simulation runs with CLT approximation and mean field approximation.

We run simulations with system parameters $\lambda = 0.185, \mu = 7, \tau = 0.16, p = 0.085$ and time horizon $T = 150$. We N and M across simulation instances. For each simulation instance with server and user pair (M, N) , we run 500 simulation runs and compute. For each run i , we analyze the system at different time horizons T and compute the time average of the queue length on the interval $[0, T]$, which we denote $B_i(T)$. For each T , we then plot the sample mean and variance of $B_i(T)$ across simulation runs i , with bootstrapped 95% confidence intervals, and compare with the mean given by the mean field limit approximation and the mean and variance given by the CLT approximation.

Figure 6 compares the mean of the estimator across simulation runs with (a) the mean field approximation and (b) the mean given by the CLT approximation. The simulation mean coincides with the CLT approximation mean in all instances. The simulation mean coincides with the mean field approximation mean in all instances except $(M, N) = (20, 100)$ and $(M, N) = (40, 200)$. We attribute this difference the behavior of queues with finite M and N . We note that the ratio $M/N = 0.2$ in both of these instances is very close to the critical ratio of $r = 0.196$ for this combination of λ, τ, μ, p . In the limit as $M \rightarrow \infty$ and $N \rightarrow \infty$ and $M/N \rightarrow \bar{M} = 0.2$, the system is in the Quality Driven regime. However, recall that for finite M and N , the square root staffing rule suggests that $M = rN + \beta\sqrt{N}$, which implies that M/N must be larger than r plus some “buffer” in order to be in the Quality Driven regime. We conjecture that the finite systems with $(M, N) = (20, 100)$ and $(M, N) = (40, 200)$ are still operating in the Efficiency Driven regime, thus contributing to the difference between the mean field approximation and the simulation mean. We expect that this difference decreases for larger M and N .

Figure 2 also compares the treatment effect approximations given by the CLT and mean field limit and similarly shows that the two coincide except for small differences near the QED regime.




Figure 7 Comparison of sample variance of average queue length in simulation runs with CLT approximation.

Figure 7 compares the variance of the estimator value across simulation runs with the variance variance given by the CLT approximation. Note that the mean field limit is a deterministic system with no variance, and so we omit the mean field approximation from this comparison. In all instances shown, the mean of the simulation variance approaches the variance from the CLT approximation as T increases. For most instances, the 95 % confidence interval contains the CLT approximation for $T \geq 20$.