

Distributional Difference-in-Differences Models with Multiple Time Periods: A Monte Carlo Analysis*

ANDREA CIACCIO[†]

August 1, 2024

Abstract

Researchers are often interested in evaluating the impact of a policy on the entire (or specific parts of the) distribution of the outcome of interest. In this paper, I provide a practical toolkit to recover the whole counterfactual distribution of the untreated potential outcome for the treated group in non-experimental settings with staggered treatment adoption by generalizing the existing quantile treatment effects on the treated (QTT) estimator proposed by [Callaway and Li \(2019\)](#). Besides the QTT, I consider different approaches that anonymously summarize the quantiles of the distribution of the outcome of interest (such as tests for stochastic dominance rankings) without relying on rank invariance assumptions. The finite-sample properties of the estimator proposed are analyzed via different Monte Carlo simulations. Despite being slightly biased for relatively small sample sizes, the proposed method's performance increases substantially when the sample size increases.

JEL codes: C14, C21, C23

Keywords: Quantile treatment effect on the treated, Difference in Differences, Copula, Variation in treatment timing, Treatment effect heterogeneity, Rank Invariance

Acknowledgments: I am grateful to Irene Mammi, Davide Raggi, Manuel Arellano, Dmitry Arkhangel-sky, Alexander Simon Mayer, Annalivia Polselli, and Francesco Chiochio for their precious advice, insights, and constructive suggestions. I also thank the CEMFI Econometrics Workshop audience for their helpful comments.

*This is a preliminary version of the paper where most of the comments and feedback received still need to be addressed. All the Monte Carlo simulations were run in STATA. The ado files of the command used for implementing the methodology presented in the paper, `qtt`, are available upon request at the time of writing.

[†]Department of Economics, Ca' Foscari University of Venice, Italy. E-mail: andrea.ciaccio@unive.it

1 Introduction

Often, in economics and, more generally, in social sciences, we are interested in assessing the impact of a policy on an outcome of interest in non-experimental settings. Since the treatment assignment is not random in these setups, the researcher faces a selection problem. For the same individual, she will observe either the treated or untreated potential outcome (Rubin, 1974). The researcher's main challenge will be to find an appropriate way to recover the counterfactual outcome - that is, the outcome one would observe had the policy not been implemented.

Different methods exist to estimate the counterfactual outcome that exploits Rubin (1974)'s potential outcome framework. One of the most popular methods is the *Difference-in-Differences (DiD)* method, which allows both observable and unobservable confounders to vary across treated groups. Under the assumption that had the policy not been implemented, the average evolution between treated and untreated units would have been parallel (also known as *common trends* or *parallel trends (PT)* assumption), it is possible to estimate the counterfactual outcome consistently and, therefore, the average treatment effects on the treated (ATT). The DiD's popularity is mainly due to its broad applicability to many research questions and the fact that, if we have many independent clusters, one can prove that we can consistently estimate the ATT using a two-way fixed effects (TWFE) regression.

While most studies employ causal inference methods - and, in particular, some variation of the DiD - to estimate the ATT, sometimes researchers might also be interested in evaluating the impact of a policy on the entire (or specific parts of the) distribution of the outcome of interest. For instance, think of two policies that aim at increasing wages but with the same average impact. Policymakers will prefer the policy that is more likely to lead to a more significant wage increase in the lower deciles of the income distribution than the one that should generate higher (expected) benefits for individuals "dwelling" in the middle-top deciles. The latter example was only one of the possible scenarios where looking at the distributional impact - rather than focusing on the average - may be desirable. Indeed, there are plenty of situations in economics where considering the entire distributional effect of a policy is more appropriate, especially when there are reasons to expect the impact to be heterogeneous across treated groups.

One way to examine the distributional effect of introducing a policy in a non-experimental setting is to consider the quantile treatment effect on the treated (QTT), which estimates the impact of a policy - for the treated group - on a specific quantile of the outcome of interest by simply comparing the treated group's distributions of treated and untreated potential outcomes. Different studies show how to retrieve a consistent estimator of the counterfactual distribution and, therefore, of the QTT in two-period two-group settings (Athey and Imbens, 2006; Bonhomme and Sauder, 2011; Fan and Yu, 2012; Callaway et al., 2018). When computing the QTT, however, the researcher implicitly invokes an additional assumption: rank invariance between treated and untreated groups. As all these studies exploit information observed in the untreated group to infer the counterfactual distribution for the treated group, the rank invariance assumption, in these settings, states that treated and untreated units occupying the same ranking are comparable. This implies that treated and untreated ranks refer to the same set of skills/endowments (Maasoumi and Wang, 2019). However, the fact that treated and untreated units have the same ranking does not necessarily mean that rank is preserved when, for instance, treated units are endowed with untreated units' abilities. Indeed, as Maasoumi and Wang (2019) show, the data often reject rank invariance and, therefore, is hard to justify in most empirical

applications.

Moreover, if, on one side, it is reasonable to assume that there are only two periods and two groups in experimental settings, most of the quasi-experimental designs often encountered in empirical applications depart from the (2×2) case. A strand of the literature on causal inference has recently focused on how departures from the canonical (2×2) scenario influence the estimation of the ATT. Different methods have been proposed to overcome the negative weight issue that arises when using a two-way fixed effect regression to estimate the ATT in the context of multiple periods with variation in treatment timing (Borusyak et al., 2021; Callaway and Sant’Anna, 2021; Sun and Abraham, 2021; Wooldridge, 2021; De Chaisemartin and d’Haultfoeuille, 2022).¹ While different estimators show how to retrieve a consistent estimator of the ATT in a context with a staggered policy rollout, little is known about how to estimate the distributional effect when there is a staggered treatment adoption and precisely how to recover the counterfactual distribution.

Therefore, this paper’s first main contribution is to provide a practical toolkit to recover the whole counterfactual distribution of the untreated potential outcome for the treated group in non-experimental settings with multiple periods with variation in treatment timing. To do so, exploiting the intuition lying behind the group-time average treatment effects estimator proposed by Callaway and Sant’Anna (2021), I show that identification and estimation of the entire counterfactual distribution can also be achieved in the presence of staggered treatment adoption by simply estimating, for each pair of treated cohorts and never-treated units, the method proposed by Callaway et al. (2018) and Callaway and Li (2019). Specifically, Callaway et al. (2018) and Callaway and Li (2019) achieve identification and estimation of the counterfactual distribution – and hence the QTT – under a distributional generalization of the PT trends assumption. The distributional parallel trends assumption requires the change in the untreated potential outcome to be independent of treatment assignment. The similarity of this assumption with the canonical (mean) PT assumption commonly employed in empirical practice to estimate the ATT makes this method very intuitive. Compared to the selection on observable assumption and strong ignorability assumptions invoked by Firpo (2007), the distributional parallel trends allow unobservable confounders to vary between treated and untreated cohorts. For instance, in the context analyzed by Bonhomme and Sauder (2011) of how selective and non-selective secondary education impact children’s test scores, selection on unobservables means that a child’s unobserved initial endowment can be (potentially) correlated with the type of education in which the pupil enrolls.

Despite the distributional PT assumption being more than sufficient to reach point identification of the ATT, Fan and Yu (2012) show that the distributional treatment effect on the treated is only partially identified. Partial identification arises from the fact that the dependence (or copula) between the change in untreated potential outcome and the pre-treatment level of untreated potential outcome is unknown to the researcher. To reach point identification, Callaway and Li (2019) propose to impose a copula stability assumption, which requires this (missing) dependence to be stable over time. Under the availability of (at least) two pre-treatment periods and the copula stability assumption, the researcher can recover the missing dependence using past (known) dependence in the previous periods. One disadvantage of this approach is that it requires the availability of panel data and two pre-treatment periods. To overcome this requirement, instead, following Callaway et al. (2018), I will impose a *copula invariance* assumption, which instead requires the dependence between the change in untreated

¹See, for instance, Roth et al. (2023) for a review.

potential outcome and the pre-treatment level of untreated potential outcome to be the same between treated cohorts and never-treated units. This means that if, for instance, among never-treated units, the most significant increase in earnings over time is faced by units "residing" in the lower deciles of the "pre-treatment" income distributions, the copula invariance assumption requires that, in the absence of the policy, the same would have happened for units in the treated cohort. Specifically, this assumption does not restrict the marginal distributions; it only restricts the dependence to be the same across treated and non-treated units. Furthermore, similarly to [Callaway and Li \(2019\)](#), I extend the results obtained to the case where the distributional PT and the copula invariance assumption may hold after conditioning on observable characteristics.

Once the entire counterfactual distribution is identified, the researcher can construct different causal estimands of interest. For instance, a generalization of the estimator proposed by [Callaway and Li \(2019\)](#) to the multi-periods and multiple groups set-up can be constructed. I call this estimator *cohort-time quantile treatment effect* in the spirit of the [Callaway and Sant'Anna \(2021\)](#)'s causal estimands. However, rank invariance must be assumed to compare quantiles. For this reason, in this paper, building on [Maasoumi and Wang \(2019\)](#), I also consider other causal estimands of interests that do not assume rank invariance. Specifically, I will show that once the entire counterfactual distribution is estimated, the researcher can also evaluate the impact of the policy using inequality measures – such as the Lorenz curve, Gini coefficient, etc. – that characterize the quantiles of the distribution of interest "anonymously" (that is, without specifying the identity of those who occupy a specific quantile). This approach overcomes the problem of rank invariance, as it is concerned with distributions of treated and untreated potential outcomes and not with units themselves. Since there is no universally accepted distribution evaluation function for conciseness in the main text, I will consider only *tests for stochastic dominance rankings* to evaluate the distributional treatment effect for the treated. In the appendix, I will also consider the Generalized Entropy Measures and show how to construct a *Generalized Entropy treatment effect on the treated*. Depending on the object of interest, I advocate for the most appropriate statistical test to conduct valid inference. For instance, when considering the QTT, the empirical bootstrap proposed by [Callaway and Li \(2019\)](#) will be considered. To the best of my knowledge, this is the first paper that combines the literature on causal inference with that on inequality measures.

Once the causal estimands of interest are built, one can aggregate these parameters using aggregation schemes identical to those proposed by [Callaway and Sant'Anna \(2021\)](#) to highlight heterogeneity along specific dimensions (such as how the treatment effects vary with the length of exposure to the treatment). This step is particularly crucial when there are many parameters to estimate, and the researcher wants to have a tool to aggregate and summarize results to highlight heterogeneity over time and/or by treatment cohorts and/or to gather information on the overall effects of the policy.

Based on the identification results presented above, estimating the entire counterfactual distribution is simple as it relies on non-parametric estimation of empirical distribution functions. When the distributional PT is likely to hold after conditioning on pre-treatment covariates, estimation of the counterfactual distribution is performed via a generalization of the Inverse Probability Weighting estimator first proposed by [Firpo \(2007\)](#) and then readapted by [Callaway and Li \(2019\)](#). In the case in which the copula invariance assumption holds conditionally, under the assumption that covariates are discrete, one can compute for each possible value of the covariates, the conditional counterfactual distribution, as suggested by [Callaway et al. \(2018\)](#). Via some Monte Carlo exercises, I show that, despite being slightly biased for relatively small sample sizes, the proposed method's performance increases

substantially when the sample size increases.

The proposed method is only one of the possible ways to construct the counterfactual distribution. As is well known in empirical practice, estimating the counterfactual outcome is often tricky. Different estimators exist, and each of them relies on different identifying assumptions.² Estimators that perform well in one context are not necessarily said to perform well in other settings. On this line of reasoning, I advocate that the researcher determine whether the proposed method can be plausible to address the research question under analysis. Other works that identify the untreated potential outcome's distribution for the treated group – that allows for unobserved characteristics to vary across treated groups – exist, and these can be easily extended to the staggered treatment adoption case using the same intuition presented in this paper. The first is the changes-in-changes (CIC) model proposed by [Athey and Imbens \(2006\)](#), which relates the outcome without intervention to the individual's group, time, and unobservable characteristics through a monotonic production function. While allowing for the selection on unobservables, the CIC model assumes that unobservable traits' distribution within a group is stable over time. [Bonhomme and Sauder \(2011\)](#) also provide an estimator of the distributional treatment effects by requiring that the production function mapping groups, time, and covariates into outcome is additive.

Unlike the paper from [Athey and Imbens \(2006\)](#) and [Bonhomme and Sauder \(2011\)](#), the proposed approach does not restrict the functional form that relates groups, time, and covariates. Moreover, contrary to [Bonhomme and Sauder \(2011\)](#), this method does not require the unobservable time-varying component to be independent of treatment assignment nor the time-varying unobservables to be independent of time-invariant unobservables (conditioning on treatment assignment). This method only requires that the evolution of the untreated potential outcome be (conditionally) independent of treatment assignment while still allowing for serial correlation in the error term and the time-varying unobservables to be correlated with the individual (unobserved) heterogeneity. In this sense, the estimator proposed is more generic than the other existing approaches, but this comes at the price of an additional assumption regarding the missing dependence (copula) between the change in untreated potential outcome and the pre-treatment level of untreated potential outcome. By contrast, the method proposed in this paper is not scale invariant as the CIC model and, differently from the method proposed by [Bonhomme and Sauder \(2011\)](#), returns to unobserved skills are not allowed to vary after the introduction of the policy.

Because I focus on non-parametric estimation of distributional treatment effect in a context with multiple time periods with variation in treatment timing, this paper is linked to different strands of literature. First, as pointed out in [Callaway and Li \(2019\)](#), it contributes to the literature on non-separable panel data methods (see, for instance, [Chernozhukov et al. \(2013\)](#)). Second, it is related to two strands of the literature in causal inference: the one which focuses on the estimation of distributional treatment effects while still allowing for selection on unobservables ([Athey and Imbens, 2006](#); [Bonhomme and Sauder, 2011](#); [Callaway et al., 2018](#); [Callaway and Li, 2019](#)); as well as the one on staggered treatment adoption ([Borusyak et al., 2021](#); [Callaway and Sant'Anna, 2021](#); [Sun and Abraham, 2021](#); [Wooldridge, 2021](#); [De Chaisemartin and d'Haultfoeuille, 2022](#)). Moreover, since I also consider causal estimands that do not require rank invariance assumption to hold (such as Generalized Entropy measures and tests of stochastic dominance), this paper contributes to the ongoing debate on inequality

²See [Imbens and Wooldridge \(2009\)](#) for a review of the most common assumptions used in the causal inference literature to estimate the counterfactual outcome.

measures (see, for instance, [Maasoumi and Wang \(2019\)](#)).

This paper is organized as follows. Section 2 presents the main identification results of this paper and how to build different aggregation schemes to highlight heterogeneity along specific dimensions. Section 3 reports the estimation and inference procedures. Section 4 assesses the finite-sample properties of the estimators proposed via different Monte Carlo exercises. Lastly, 5 concludes. All proofs are reported in the [Appendix A](#).

2 Identification

2.1 Setup

I will now introduce the notation that I will use throughout the article. Let us consider the case where there are available T periods, and let us denote a generic period with $t = 1, \dots, T$. Let $D_{i,t}$ denote the treatment dummy taking value 1 if unit i is treated in period t , where $i = 1, \dots, N$. In the classic (2×2) scenario, $T = 2$ and no units are treated in $t = 1$. However, in the context considered in the rest of this paper, I will allow $T > 2$, and, in particular, I will assume that, starting from period $q \geq 2$, a policy is implemented staggered across units. Then, one should make the following assumption about the treatment process:

Assumption 1 (*Irreversibility of Treatment*). $D_j = 0$ for all $j = 1, \dots, (q - 1)$ almost surely (a.s.). For $t = q, \dots, T$, $D_{t-1} = 1$ implies that $D_t = 1$ a.s.

[Assumption 1](#) states that no unit is treated before period q , the first period in which the policy occurs, and that once a unit receives the treatment, it will remain treated for the remainder of the (observed) periods. This assumption is often referred to in the causal-inference literature as *staggered treatment adoption*. Following [Callaway and Sant'Anna \(2021\)](#) and [Sun and Abraham \(2021\)](#), I will interpret this assumption as units changing their behavior "forever" once they become treated.³

Another implication of [Assumption 1](#) is that it automatically defines the "cohort" to which unit i belongs. Assuming a never-treated group exists, one can define $T - q + 2$ mutually exclusive cohort dummies, d_r with $r = q, \dots, T$, denoting the period in which unit i first receives the treatment. C will, on the other hand, be a dummy taking value 1 if a group is never treated. Lastly, $\bar{d} = \max_{i=1, \dots, N} d_{i,r}$ denotes the maximum period in the dataset where a unit may become treated.

Next, let us assume that a complete set of pre-treatment covariates exists X with support denoted by $\chi = \text{supp}(X) \subseteq R^K$ and dimensionality equal to $\dim(X) = k$. One can then define the generalized propensity score as $\mathbb{P}_{r,t}(X) = \mathbb{P}(d_r = 1 | X, d_r + C = 1)$, denoting the probability of being first treated at period r conditional on observable pre-treatment characteristics and on either being part of cohort r or being never-treated.

We can set up a potential outcome framework by combining the dynamic potential outcome framework ([Robins, 1986, 1987](#)) with the dynamic treatment adoption setting discussed in [Heckman et al. \(2016\)](#). For $r = q, \dots, T$, let $y_{i,t}(r)$ represent the potential outcome for unit i at time t had the policy been introduced by period r (i.e., $d_{i,r} = 1$), whereas $y_{i,t}(0)$ will denote the analogous in period t had

³If always-treated units exist, these will be dropped from the analysis, as there is no pre-treatment period for these units. For an analysis of the case where the treatment is binary, the causal estimand of interest is the ATT, and the treatment turns on and off at different points in time, please refer to [De Chaisemartin and d'Haultfoeuille \(2022\)](#).

the treatment not been received (that is, had the unit never been treated). Then, one can rewrite the observed outcome for a generic unit as follows

$$y_{i,t} = y_{i,t}(0) + \sum_{r=q}^T d_{i,r} \cdot (y_{i,t}(r) - y_{i,t}(0))$$

That is, we will observe only one of the two mutually exclusive potential outcomes for each unit, and the realization of what we will observe will depend on whether unit i is receiving the treatment or not. Specifically, for units that never participate in the treatment, the observed y will be the untreated potential outcome (this is true for all $t = 1, \dots, T$). On the other hand, for units that, starting from period $r = q, \dots, T$ will receive the treatment, then the observed outcome will be equal $y(0)$ for all $t = 1, \dots, r - 1$, whereas y will be equal to $y(r)$ for all $t \geq r$. The fact that data will reveal only one of the two mutually exclusive quantities (either $y(r)$ or $y(0)$) constitutes a selection problem. This selection problem represents the *fundamental problem of causal inference* (Holland, 1986).

I will also make the following assumption for the remainder of the paper:

Assumption 2 (*Random Sampling*). $\{Y_{i,1}, Y_{i,2}, \dots, Y_{i,T}, X_i, D_{i,1}, D_{i,2}, \dots, D_{i,T}\}_{i=1}^n$ is independent and identically distributed.

This assumption requires that panel data be available.⁴ Assumption 2 is a common assumption in the Diff-in-Diff literature (see, for instance, Roth et al. (2023) for a review), and allows to introduce uncertainty in our setting and consider potential outcomes as random variables. Specifically, Assumption 2 implies that any unit i is the realization from a super-population of interest. Please note that, however, Assumption 2 neither rules out any time series dependence nor imposes any restriction between the relation between $D_{i,t}$ and $(y(0), y(r))$.

Before introducing the assumptions needed for identification, since we are interested in understanding the impact of the policy along with the distribution of our outcome of interest, I will now introduce the notation both for the quantile and the tests of stochastic dominance ranking. Specifically, for $\tau \in [0, 1]$ the τ^{th} quantile q_τ of a generic random variable T is defined as:

$$\mathbb{P}(T \leq q_\tau) = F_T(q_\tau) = \tau$$

or analogously as $q_\tau = F_T^{-1}(\tau) := \inf\{t : F_T(t) \geq \tau\}$. Where, for instance, $\tau = .25$ represents the 25th percentile.

However, summarizing the distributional treatment effects on the treated by comparing quantiles via a quantile-by-quantile approach relies implicitly on the rank invariance assumption. That is, treated and never-treated units with the same rank also have the same unobserved characteristics. As Maasoumi and Wang (2019) show, empirical evidence usually dismisses this assumption. To overcome this issue, I advocate the reader to undertake another approach that, rather than computing quantile-by-quantile and then taking the difference between the quantile for the treated potential outcome and the counterfactual (untreated) potential outcome, first summarizes the impact by an appropriate evaluation function and then take the difference between the two evaluation functions, as suggested by

⁴One can extend the setting considered in this paper to the case where repeated cross-sections, rather than panel data, are available. To do so, one should impose stronger assumptions than those presented below. For a reference, please refer to Callaway et al. (2018) and Callaway and Sant'Anna (2021).

Maasoumi and Wang (2019). Since there is no unique definition of distribution's evaluation function - "averages, inequality measures, and entropies are all well-known functions of distributions that summarize its quantiles anonymously, without regard to the identity of those who occupy a given quantile. Each function attributes its own weights to different wage levels." (Maasoumi and Wang, 2019, p. 2439) - and there are many valid alternatives whose choice often relies on a decision-theoretic framework, I adapt to the framework under analysis in this paper the statistical tests for stochastic dominance rankings proposed in Maasoumi and Wang (2019). In the appendix, I also provide an extension to the case where, rather than considering quantiles or tests of stochastic dominance rankings, the researcher may be interested in evaluating the impact of the policy using inequality measures such as generalized entropy measures.

Considering partial orderings between random variables comes with two main advantages besides not relying on rank invariance. First, there is no reason to prefer one inequality measure over another; often, choosing one over the other hinges upon a decision-theoretic framework. Tests for stochastic dominance rankings overcome this problem as they tell which of the two distributions dominates, irrespective of a specific weighting scheme. Second, when the distributions for treated and untreated potential outcomes intertwine, the researcher may end up with different conclusions depending on the inequality measure considered, as the ranking of these will differ depending on the underlying evaluation functions. This is particularly crucial, even when rank invariance holds. When the two distributions intersect, the treatment effect changes sign, and so the conclusion drawn by the researcher will strongly rely on the measure considered. Also, in this case, stochastic dominance tests provide a more robust approach to carrying out policy evaluation, as they assess whether distributions can be consistently ranked across a broad range of evaluation functions with a certain level of statistical confidence.

Let us now define what are tests of stochastic dominance rankings. I will use the notation used by Maasoumi and Wang (2019). Let U_1 be the class of von Neumann-Morgenstern utility functions u that are increasing in the (treated or untreated) potential outcome of interest $y(0)$ (i.e., $u' \geq 0$) and let U_2 the class of utility function in U_1 such that the utility function is concave ($u'' \leq 0$).

First-order Stochastic Dominance – The treated potential outcome, $y_t(r)|d_r = 1$, first-order stochastically dominates (denoted by $y_t(r)|d_r = 1$ FSD $y_t(0)|d_r = 1$) the untreated potential outcome for the treated, $y_t(0)|d_r = 1$, if and only if

1. $\mathbb{E}u(y_t(r)|d_r = 1) \geq \mathbb{E}u(y_t(0)|d_r = 1)$ for all $u \in U_1$ with the inequality being strict for some u
or
2. $F_{y_t(r)|d_r=1}(y) \leq F_{y_t(0)|d_r=1}(y)$ for all y with strict inequality for some values of y , or
3. $y_t(r)|d_r = 1 \geq y_t(0)|d_r = 1$ for all points in the support of y .

Second-order Stochastic Dominance – The treated potential outcome, $y_t(r)|d_r = 1$, second-order stochastically dominates (denoted by $y_t(r)|d_r = 1$ SSD $y_t(0)|d_r = 1$) the untreated potential outcome for the treated, $y_t(0)|d_r = 1$, if and only if

1. $\mathbb{E}u(y_t(r)|d_r = 1) \geq \mathbb{E}u(y_t(0)|d_r = 1)$ for all $u \in U_2$ with the inequality being strict for some u
or

2. $\int_{-\infty}^y F_{y_t(r)|d_r=1}(z)dz \leq \int_{-\infty}^y F_{y_t(0)|d_r=1}(z)dz$ for all y with strict inequality for some values of y , or
3. $\int_{-\infty}^z y_t(r)|d_r = 1 \geq \int_{-\infty}^z y_t(0)|d_r = 1$ for all points in the support of y .

If, for instance, $y_t(r)|d_r = 1$ FSD $y_t(0)|d_r = 1$, then it is also true that $y_t(r)|d_r = 1$ SSD $y_t(0)|d_r = 1$, as first-order stochastic dominance implies second-order stochastic dominance.

2.2 The cohort-time distributional treatment effect on the treated

Most of the time, we are interested in evaluating the impact of the policy in non-experimental settings. Since the treatment assignment is not random in these setups, as [Manski and Pepper \(2013\)](#) notice, data will reveal only one of the two mutually exclusive quantities: $y_{i,t}(r)$ or $y_{i,t}(0)$. The researcher’s main challenge will be to find an appropriate way to recover the counterfactual outcome - that is, the outcome one would observe had the policy not been implemented. For this reason, researchers often employ different strategies to evaluate the causal effect of a given policy. Specifically, in these cases, we cannot say anything regarding the whole population, but we can still say something about the impact of the policy on the treated subpopulation. For instance, suppose we are interested in estimating the average impact of a given policy on the treated group. The Average Treatment Effect on the Treated (ATT) is given by: $ATT = \mathbb{E}(y(1) - y(0)|d = 1)$ (where $y(1)$ represents the treated potential outcome and $y(0)$ is the untreated potential outcome). Since, for treated units, we do not observe the counterfactual outcome, researchers commonly use different assumptions in the causal inference literature to retrieve a consistent estimator of $y(0)$.⁵ One of the most commonly used assumptions is the Parallel Trends (PT) assumption ([Heckman et al., 1998](#)). The PT assumption requires that had the policy not been implemented, the average outcome evolution for the treated and untreated units would have remained stable over time (i.e., $\mathbb{E}(y(1) - y(0)|d = 1) = \mathbb{E}(y(1) - y(0)|d = 0)$). Different studies have generalized this assumption to cases where multiple periods and multiple time groups are available ([Borusyak et al., 2021](#); [Callaway and Sant’Anna, 2021](#); [Sun and Abraham, 2021](#); [Wooldridge, 2021](#); [De Chaisemartin and d’Haultfoeuille, 2022](#)).

Sometimes, however, policymakers may be concerned with analyzing the impact of a specific policy on specific parts of the distribution of the outcomes considered besides the average effect. When the treatment is likely to be heterogeneous along the distribution of our outcome of interest, considering the ATT alone might be misleading. In such cases, it becomes essential to analyze the distributional impact of the policy for a sound policy evaluation. In these cases, researchers commonly compare distributions of treated and untreated potential outcomes (e.g., see [Carneiro et al. \(2003\)](#)).

Similar to what researchers do to evaluate the average causal impact of a policy, in the case where the effect is likely to be heterogeneous, the ATT’s analogous (distributional) causal estimand of interest is the Quantile Treatment Effect on the Treated. While extensive literature exists on how to retrieve an estimator of the ATT – also in non-standard Difference-in-difference settings – only a few papers tackle the issue of how to retrieve an estimator of the quantile treatment effects ([Athey and Imbens, 2006](#); [Bonhomme and Sauder, 2011](#); [Callaway et al., 2018](#); [Callaway and Li, 2019](#)). Specifically, to the best of my knowledge, no estimators exist to estimate the distributional impact of a policy in a context with staggered treatment adoption. However, as said in the previous section, comparing quantiles

⁵Please refer to [Imbens and Wooldridge \(2009\)](#) for a review of these assumptions.

hinges upon the implicit assumption of rank invariance. For this reason, it is preferable to consider other approaches to summarize the distributional treatment effects of a program that do not require specifying which units occupy specific quantiles.

The aim of this paper is, therefore, to provide a practical toolkit to recover the whole counterfactual distribution of untreated potential outcomes for the treated group in a context with multiple groups and periods with variations in treatment timing by generalizing the estimator proposed in [Callaway and Li \(2019\)](#). To do so, I will build on the idea behind the group-time average treatment effect proposed by [Callaway and Sant’Anna \(2021\)](#). Once the entire counterfactual distribution is obtained, the researcher can choose whether to summarize the impact of the policy along the distribution of the outcome of interest by exploiting a quantile-by-quantile approach or first summarizing it by an appropriate evaluation function and then take the difference between the two evaluation functions, as suggested by [Maasoumi and Wang \(2019\)](#). For completeness, I will provide both an estimator of the quantile treatment effects on the treated and an estimator of the distributional treatment effects on the treated based on tests of stochastic dominance rankings. Borrowing the name from [Callaway and Sant’Anna \(2021\)](#), I call these causal parameters as *cohort-time distributional treatment effects on the treated*.

Specifically, if we denote with $F_{y_t(r)|d_r=1}$ and $F_{y_t(0)|d_r=1}$ the distribution of treated and untreated potential outcomes for units that first receives the treatment in period r , then the QTT parameter for units first treated in group r evaluated at any given time period $t \geq r$ can be defined as follows:

$$QTT_{r,t}(\tau) = F_{y_t(r)|d_r=1}^{-1}(\tau) - F_{y_t(0)|d_r=1}^{-1}(\tau) \quad \tau \in [0, 1], r = q, \dots, T, \text{ and } t \geq r, \quad (1)$$

Besides allowing heterogeneity of the treatment effect along with the distribution of y , the parameter $QTT_{r,t}(\tau)$ allows additional heterogeneity across treated cohorts (note that, for example, even keeping t and τ fixed, the QTT experienced by cohort r may be different from that experienced by cohort r') and over time. Moreover, the researcher can employ the *cohort-time quantile treatment effects* to learn about the overall impact of the policy by constructing an overall quantile treatment effect or to highlight heterogeneity along specific dimensions (such as, how does the QTT vary with the length of exposure to the treatment) as will be discussed in the following sections.

As far as the distributional treatment effect based on tests of stochastic dominance rankings is concerned, using the definition of stochastic dominance, one can check for each post-treatment period t and each treated cohort r whether $y_t(r)|d_r = 1$ FSD $y_t(0)|d_r = 1$ or $y_t(r)|d_r = 1$ SSD $y_t(0)|d_r = 1$. As pointed out in the previous subsection, comparing distributions rather than units – besides overcoming the issue of assuming rank invariance – allows the researcher to have a clearer picture of the overall effect of the policy along the distribution of y . This is particularly true when treated and untreated potential outcome distributions for the treated group cross, making policy evaluation based on a quantile-by-quantile approach extremely sensitive to the quantile considered.

2.3 Identifying assumptions

If the Parallel Trends assumption was enough to retrieve a consistent estimator of the ATT in the simple (2×2) scenario – and under a generalization of this assumption to the multi-period setting, numerous studies proved to lead to the identification of ATT even in much more complicated setting (see [Roth et al. \(2023\)](#) for a review) – identification of the distributional treatment effects is more challenging. A simple distributional generalization of the PT will no longer be sufficient ([Fan and Yu, 2012](#)).

Since $F_{y_t(r)|d_r=1}$ is identified from the data, to reach point-identification of the distributional treatment effect in a setting with staggered treatment adoption, we need to identify the distribution of untreated potential outcome for units treated in cohort r , $F_{y_t(0)|d_r=1}$. To do so, let us make the following assumptions:

Assumption 3 (*Limited Treatment Anticipation*). *There is a known $\delta \geq 0$ such that $\mathbb{P}\{Y_t(r) \leq y|X, d_r = 1\} = \mathbb{P}\{Y_t(0) \leq y|X, d_r = 1\}$ a.s. for all $r = q, \dots, T$ and $t = 1, \dots, T$ such that $t < r - \delta$.*

[Assumption 3](#) is a generalization of the Limited Treatment Anticipation assumption made in DiD settings with multiple time periods with variation in treatment timing (see, for instance, [Callaway and Sant'Anna \(2021\)](#)) from the mean to the entire distribution. It states that, before the treatment occurs, the treated and untreated potential outcome for "eventually" treated units is the same in the pre-treatment period. In other words, this means that units cannot anticipate the treatment (i.e., $\delta = 0$), or if they can expect it, the time span in which there are possible anticipatory behaviors is known and limited (i.e., $\delta > 0$, and it is such that $t < r - \delta$). Specifically, when $\delta = 0$, it imposes a No Anticipation assumption. Please note that [Assumption 3](#) implies that the distributional treatment effect is 0 for all $t < r - \delta$. [Assumption 3](#) is likely to hold in empirical practice when units do not expect the implementation of the policy and/or units cannot "decide" whether to be treated or not.

Next, the following assumption provides a distributional generalization of the classic Parallel Trends assumption when there is a staggered treatment adoption.

Assumption 4 (*Conditional Distributional PT based on a "Never-treated" Group*). *Let δ be defined as in [Assumption 3](#). For each $r, t \in \{q, \dots, T\}$ such that $t \geq q - \delta$,*

$$\mathbb{P}(\Delta Y_t(0) \leq \Delta Y|X, d_r = 1) = \mathbb{P}(\Delta Y_t(0) \leq \Delta Y|X, C = 1) \quad a.s.$$

where $\Delta Y_t = Y_t - Y_{t-1}$. [Assumption 4](#) states that the sequence of changes in untreated potential outcomes is – conditionally on observable pre-treatment characteristics – independent of treatment assignment. The [Distributional PT assumption](#) is commonly used in the existing literature to retrieve the counterfactual distribution ([Fan and Yu, 2012](#); [Callaway and Li, 2019](#); [Miller, 2023](#)), and it extends the idea of the common trends assumption from the average to the entire distribution of untreated potential outcomes.

Unlike selection-on-observables used by [Firpo \(2007\)](#) – where $Y(0)$ and $Y(1)$ are required to be independent of treatment assignment, once controlling for a complete set of pre-treatment characteristics) – the distributional parallel trends allow unobservable confounders to vary between treated and untreated cohorts, making [Assumption 4](#) weaker. [Assumption 4](#) is also weaker than Assumptions 1 and 2 in [Bonhomme and Sauder \(2011\)](#), which require the unobserved time-varying shock in the pre-treatment period and the time-varying unobserved component in the equation for the untreated potential outcome in the post-treatment period to be independent of treatment assignment and independent of unobservable confounders (once controlling for D_i). As [Callaway et al. \(2018\)](#) point out, if the pre-treatment period is large, then this assumption is testable under the assumption of strict stationarity of the time series of changes in untreated potential outcomes.

Despite being stronger than the mean PT assumption and more than sufficient to reach point identification of the ATT,⁶ exploiting results on the distribution of the sum of two random variables,

⁶Once estimated the counterfactual distribution, one can compute the average counterfactual distribution for the treated

Fan and Yu (2012) show that the [Distributional PT assumption](#) is no longer sufficient to point-identify the counterfactual distribution for the treated group, hence making more challenging identification of the distributional treatment effect. Without additional assumptions, the distribution of untreated potential outcome for the treated group, $F_{y(0)|d_r=1}$, can only be partially identified, with these bounds being very wide, as shown by [Callaway and Li \(2019\)](#).

The reason why [Assumption 4](#) is no longer sufficient to reach point identification of the distributional treatment effect is that different distributions of untreated potential outcomes in period t , $F_{y_t(0)|d_r=1}$, are equivalent from an observational point of view, as [Callaway et al. \(2018\)](#) highlight. This is the reason why an additional assumption on the dependence between $y_{t-1}(0)$ and $\Delta y_t(0)$ (or copula) is then needed. Even if one can identify the marginals $F_{y_{t-1}(0)|d_r=1}$ (from the data) and $F_{\Delta y_t(0)|d_r=1}$ (via [Assumption 4](#)), since "observations are observed separately for untreated and treated individuals, . . . , the joint distribution is not identified" ([Callaway and Li, 2019](#), p.1585). To retrieve the joint distribution of $y_{t-1}(0)$ and $\Delta y_t(0)$, following [Callaway and Li \(2019\)](#), I will resort to Sklar's theorem ([Sklar \(1959\)](#)) which states that the joint distribution can be expressed as the relation (or *copula*) of two marginals with uniform cdf. For example, given any two random variables T and W , Sklar's theorem says that the joint distribution, $F_{T,W}$, is equal to:

$$F_{T,W} = C_{T,W}(F_T(t), F_W(w))$$

where $C_{T,W}(\cdot, \cdot)$ represents the copula.⁷ Copulas are frequently used in nonparametric statistics as they allow the researcher to model the dependence between two random variables even when this is unknown from their marginals. Moreover, "much of the usefulness of copulas in the study of non-parametric statistics derives from the fact that for strictly monotone transformations of the random variables, copulas are either invariant or change in predictable ways" ([Nelsen, 2006](#), p. 25).

At this point, the last missing piece is to define the copula function in this setting. In particular, I will follow [Callaway et al. \(2018\)](#) and impose the assumption that the missing dependence is the same between treated units in cohort r and never-treated units, rather than imposing that the copula between $y_{t-1}(0)$ and $\Delta y_t(0)$ is stable over time as in [Callaway and Li \(2019\)](#):

Assumption 5 (*Conditional Copula Invariance based on a "Never-treated" Group*). For all $x \in \chi$ and for all $(u, v) \in [0, 1]^2$

$$C_{\Delta y_t(0), y_{t-1}(0)|X, d_r=1}(u, v) = C_{\Delta y_t(0), y_{t-1}(0)|X, C=1}(u, v)$$

The reason to prefer a [Conditional Copula Invariance](#) compared to a [Conditional Copula Stability](#) (which instead requires the dependence to be stable over time) as in [Callaway and Li \(2019\)](#) is that there is no requirement to have access to a panel data with (at least) two pre-treatment periods, thus allowing to use repeated cross-section (see [Callaway et al. \(2018\)](#) for a reference).

Specifically, what [Assumption 5](#) does is to recover the missing dependence between $y_{t-1}(0)$ and $\Delta y_t(0)$ needed to reach point-identification of $F_{y(0)|d_r=1}$ – rather than determining bounds, as in [Fan and Yu \(2012\)](#) – by replacing the unknown $C_{\Delta y_t(0), y_{t-1}(0)|X, d_r=1}(\cdot, \cdot)$ with the "observed" depen-

cohort as $\mathbb{E}(y(0)|d_r = 1) = \int_0^1 F_{y(0)|d_r=1}^{-1}(\tau) d\tau$. Then, it is straightforward to retrieve the *ATT*.

⁷Please note that the copula contains all the information on the relationship between two random variables; however, it does not contain any information on the respective marginal distributions. For a discussion on copulas, see, for example, [Nelsen \(2006\)](#).

dence for the never-treated group. Intuitively, this means that if, for instance, among never-treated units, the most significant increase in earnings over time is faced by units "residing" in the lower deciles of the "pre-treatment" income distributions, [Assumption 5](#) requires that, in the absence of the policy, the same would have happened for units first treated in cohort r . In particular, [Assumption 5](#) does not put any restrictions on the marginal distributions; it only restricts the joint distribution (the initial distributions can indeed be different between treated and never-treated groups). Moreover, also as [Callaway et al. \(2018\)](#) and [Callaway and Li \(2019\)](#) notice, please note that [Assumption 4](#) does not imply [Assumption 5](#), nor the vice-versa is true. The fact that the two assumptions are not reciprocally implied by one another is because, while [Assumption 4](#) restricts only the marginals of change in untreated potential outcomes, [Assumption 5](#), on the other hand, restricts the dependence between $y_{t-1}(0)$ and $\Delta y_t(0)$. To see this point, suppose $y_{t-1}(0)$ and $\Delta y_t(0)$ are jointly normally distributed with means μ_1 and μ_2 respectively. Analogously, suppose they have variances equal to σ_1^2 and σ_2^2 , respectively. If we denote the correlation between $y_{t-1}(0)$ and $\Delta y_t(0)$ with ρ_t , then with [Assumption 5](#) we are requiring the ρ_t to be independent of treatment assignment, conditionally on X and being either treated in cohort r or being never-treated. We are not restricting the means or variances of the two random variables.

Under [Assumption 4](#) and [Assumption 5](#) we can point-identify $F_{y(0)|d_r=1}$. However, since the copula representation is not unique unless the random variables are continuous ([Joe, 1997](#); [Nelsen, 2006](#)), following [Callaway et al. \(2018\)](#) and [Callaway and Li \(2019\)](#), I will impose the following additional assumption for mathematical convenience:

Assumption 6 (Continuity). *The random variables $Y_{t-1}(0)$ and $\Delta Y_t(0)$ have continuous distribution conditional on either being part of the treated cohort r (i.e., $d_r = 1$) or being never-treated (i.e., $C = 1$), and $Y_t(r)|d_r = 1$ is also continuously distributed on its support. Moreover, each of these distributions has a compact support with marginal distributions, which are (uniformly) bounded away from 0 and 0 over their respective support.*

Lastly, the following assumption will be required only to recover $F_{y(0)|d_r=1}$ when conditioning on observable pre-treatment covariates:

Assumption 7 (Overlap). *For each $r, t \in \{q, \dots, T\}$, there exists some $\varepsilon > 0$ s.t. $\mathbb{P}(d_r = 1) > \varepsilon$ and $\mathbb{P}_{r,t}(X) < 1 - \varepsilon$ a.s.*

where $\mathbb{P}(d_r = 1)$ denotes the probability of being treated in cohort r . [Assumption 7](#) is the common overlap condition and generalizes the assumptions done in [Firpo \(2007\)](#); [Callaway et al. \(2018\)](#); [Callaway and Li \(2019\)](#) to the multiple periods and multiple groups setting. In words, the first part of [Assumption 7](#) states that there is a positive probability of being treated in cohort r (compared to being always never-treated). The second part, instead, says that, for all the combinations of (r, t) , the propensity score is bounded away from 1.

2.4 Non-parametric identification of the distribution of untreated potential outcome

In this subsection, I will show that, under the identifying assumptions done in the previous subsections, the full counterfactual distribution for the treated group, $F_{y(0)|d_r=1}$, can be non-parametrically point-identified in Difference-in-Differences models with multiple periods and multiple groups.

Suppose absurdly that pre-treatment covariates play no role in the identification. The following theorem shows that under Assumptions 1, 2, 6 and an unconditional version of Assumptions 3–5, we can point identify the counterfactual distribution for the treated group.

Theorem 1. *Suppose Assumptions 1, 2, 6, and unconditional version of Assumptions 3-5 hold. Then $F_{y_t(0)|d_r=1}(\tau)$ is identified:*

$$\begin{aligned} F_{y_t(0)|d_r=1} &= \mathbb{P}(y_t(0) \leq y | d_r = 1) \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{1} \left(\Delta_{[r-\delta-1, t]} y(0) \right) \leq y - \right. \\ &\quad \left. F_{y_{r-\delta-1}(0)|d_r=1}^{-1} \left(F_{y_{r-\delta-1}(0)|C=1} (y_{r-\delta-1}(0)) \right) \right] | C = 1 \end{aligned}$$

where $\Delta_{[r-\delta-1, t]} y(0) = y_t(0) - y_{r-\delta-1}(0)$. [Theorem 1](#) is the main result of this paper. It shows that, under the classical assumptions done in the staggered Diff-in-Diff literature, a generalization of the common PT assumption to the entire distribution of change in untreated potential outcomes and a "new" assumption regarding the joint distribution of $Y_{t-1}(0)$ and $\Delta Y_t(0)$, one can point reach point-identification of $F_{y_t(0)|d_r=1}(\tau)$, and hence also $F_{y_t(0)|d_r=1}^{-1}(\tau)$. [Theorem 1](#) implies that units belonging to treated cohort r must be similarly distributed to never-treated units in terms of both marginals distributions of $y(0)_{t-1}$ and $\Delta y(0)_t$, but also in terms of the dependence between these marginals. Note that this is guaranteed by Assumptions 4 and 5.⁸

The intuition lying behind the results in [Theorem 1](#) is the following and is almost identical to that given by [Callaway and Li \(2019\)](#) for their main identification results. Note that $\mathbb{P}(y_t(0) \leq y | d_r = 1) = \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{1}(y_t(0) - y_{r-\delta-1}(0) + y_{r-\delta-1}(0)) \leq y]$ is an integral (remember that Y is continuous) over the joint distribution between the pre-treatment level in untreated potential outcome, $y_{r-\delta-1}$, and the change in untreated potential outcome. This joint distribution can be identified under [Assumption 5](#), which allows recovering the missing dependence by replacing the unknown distribution for the treated with that observed for the never-treated. However, since $y_t(0) - y_{r-\delta-1}(0)$ is not observed for the treated group r , we need [Assumption 4](#) to replace $F_{y_t(0)-y_{r-\delta-1}(0)|d_r=1}^{-1}(\cdot)$ with $F_{y_t(0)-y_{r-\delta-1}(0)|C=1}^{-1}(\cdot)$. For the entire proof, please refer to [Appendix A](#).

The following example shows the conditions for a classic two-way fixed effects regression to satisfy the assumptions needed to identify the group-time average treatment effects proposed by [Callaway and Sant'Anna \(2021\)](#) and the distribution of the untreated potential outcome presented in this paper.

Example 1. Consider the following two-way fixed effect regression for the untreated potential outcome:

$$y_{it}(0) = \alpha_t + \eta_i + u_{it}$$

Where α_t represents the time-fixed effects, η_i is the unobserved heterogeneity – which may be distributed differently between treated cohorts and never-treated units –, and u_{it} represents the time-varying unobservable shock. Suppose we have access to panel data and assume, for simplicity, there is no treatment anticipation (i.e., $\delta = 0$). For the estimator of the *ATT* presented in [Callaway and Sant'Anna \(2021\)](#) a sufficient condition for the mean version of [Assumption 4](#) to hold would be that $\mathbb{E}(\Delta u_{it} | d_r = 1) = \mathbb{E}(\Delta u_{it} | C = 1)$. Instead, for the above DGP to satisfy the assumptions of the method presented in this paper, then two sufficient conditions are i) $\Delta u_{it} \perp\!\!\!\perp D$, ii) $C_{\Delta u_t, u_{t-1} | d_r=1} = C_{\Delta u_t, u_{t-1} | C=1}$. Note

⁸Please note that, under Assumptions 1-4, it is also possible to identify the ATT in a context with multiple periods and groups with staggered treatment adoption.

that condition ii) allows for the distribution of the time-varying shock to vary over time – thus allowing for serial correlation – as well as allows for the distribution of u_{it} to be potentially correlated with η_i , in contrast to [Bonhomme and Sauder \(2011\)](#).

The validity of the claims in Example 1 follows the same logic as the proof provided in Appendix A for Example 1 in [Callaway and Li \(2019\)](#). The only difference is that I rely on a copula invariance assumption, while [Callaway and Li \(2019\)](#) rely on a copula stability assumption. Furthermore, note that, for the method presented in this paper to work, it is sufficient only to impose restrictions on how the distribution of untreated potential outcomes is generated. Nothing is said about how the treated potential outcome is generated.

However, it is highly unlikely that any of Assumptions 3-5 hold unconditionally. There is a wide literature that shows that, in most applications, these assumptions hold only after having conditioned on pre-treatment observable characteristics (see, for instance, [Heckman et al. \(1998\)](#) or [Abadie \(2005\)](#) for a discussion). In the remainder of this section I, therefore, consider the case where I require Assumptions 3– 4 to hold conditioning on covariates. Specifically, I will distinguish among two scenarios:

1. Assumptions 3 and 4 hold after conditioning on covariates, whereas Assumption 5 hold unconditionally;
2. Assumptions 3– 5 hold after conditioning on covariates.

Let us consider the first scenario (1). Then, the only part of [Theorem 1](#) we need to modify to reach identification of the counterfactual distribution is the identification of $F_{\Delta y(0)|d_r=1}$, once having accounted for pre-treatment observable characteristics. Rather than obtaining a conditional version of this distribution function, following [Callaway and Li \(2019\)](#), I will generalize the propensity score method proposed by [Firpo \(2007\)](#) to the staggered treatment adoption scenario. Despite requiring a parametric specification for $\mathbb{P}_{r,t}(X)$ comes at the additional cost of imposing a distributional form for which there is no guarantee to be correct, this is a commonly used technique that is easy to implement ([Abadie, 2005](#)): in the first step one obtains an estimator of the propensity score; in a second stage, one plugs the estimated propensity score in the sample counterparts of $F_{y(0)|d_r=1}$.⁹ Please note that the remaining part of [Theorem 1](#) will continue to be valid thanks to [Assumption 5](#) holding unconditionally.

Proposition 1. *Under Assumptions 1-4, 6, 7, and unconditional version of Assumptions 5 hold. Then $F_{y_t(0)|d_r=1}(\tau)$ is identified:*

$$\begin{aligned} F_{y_t(0)|d_r=1} &= \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{1} \left[F_{(y_t(0)-y_{r-\delta-1}(0))|d_r=1}^{p,-1} \left(F_{(y_t(0)-y_{r-\delta-1}(0))|C=1} (y_t(0) - y_{r-\delta-1}(0)) \right) \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. \leq y - F_{y_{r-\delta-1}(0)|d_r=1}^{-1} \left(F_{y_{r-\delta-1}(0)|C=1} (y_{r-\delta-1}(0)) \right) \right] | C = 1 \right] \end{aligned}$$

where

$$F_{\Delta r-\delta-1,t(0)|d_r=1}^p(\delta) = \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{C}{p_r} \frac{p_r(x)}{1 - p_r(x)} \mathbb{1}\{y_t - y_{r-\delta-1} \leq \delta\} \right] \quad (2)$$

which is identified.

⁹A way to overcome the fact that this method strongly relies on the correct specification of the functional form of $\mathbb{P}_{r,t}(X)$ would be to use a doubly robust estimator for the $F_{y(0)|d_r=1}$ as the one proposed by [Müller \(2023\)](#). However, this goes beyond the scope of this paper, whose aim is to generalize the method proposed by [Callaway and Li \(2019\)](#) to the multi-period setup.

Again, the result just obtained is almost identical to the one derived in [Theorem 1](#). The only part that changes is that now $F_{\Delta y(0)|d_r=1}$ is identified by the reweighted distribution – given by [Eq. \(2\)](#) – of change in the untreated potential outcome that occurs for never-treated units. This reweighting procedure is almost identical to the one proposed by [Abadie \(2005\)](#) and [Firpo \(2007\)](#) with some minor changes. For a sketch of the proof of why the result obtained in [Theorem 1](#) is still valid, please refer to [Appendix A](#).

The following example shows the importance of [Assumption 3](#) and [Assumption 4](#) holding conditionally in the empirical application.

Example 2. Consider the following two-way fixed effect regression for the untreated potential outcome:

$$y_{it}(0) = \alpha_t + \eta_i + x'_{it}\beta + u_{it}$$

Where X is a full set of covariates, which can be distributed differently between treated and never-treated units; $u_{it} = \rho u_{i,t-1} + \varepsilon_{it}$, with $\varepsilon \sim WNN$ process and $|\rho| < 1$. For this DGP to satisfy the assumption of this model presented in this paper, then two sufficient conditions are i) $\Delta u_{it} \perp\!\!\!\perp D|X$, ii) $C_{\Delta u_t, u_{t-1}|d_r=1} = C_{\Delta u_t, u_{t-1}|C=1}$.

The last scenario I consider in this subsection is the case where [Assumption 5](#) holds after conditioning on covariates (scenario (ii)). Specifically, the following proposition shows that it is still possible to identify the QTT, by now requiring [Assumptions 3-5](#) holding after conditioning on pre-treatment characteristics:

Proposition 2. *Suppose that the random variables $Y_{t-1}(0)$ and $\Delta Y_t(0)$ are continuously distributed conditionally on x , and that this is true for all $x \in \chi$ and both groups r or the never-treated. Then, under [Assumptions 1-7](#), $F_{y_t(0)|d_r=1}(\tau)$ is identified:*

$$\mathbb{P}(y_t(0) \leq y | X = x, d_r = 1) = \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{1} \left[F_{\Delta_{r-\delta-1,t}y(0)|X,C=1}^{-1} \left(F_{\Delta_{r-\delta-1,t}y(0)|X,C=1}(\Delta y_{t,r-\delta-1}(0)) | X \right) \leq y - F_{y_{r-\delta-1}(0)|X,d_r=1}^{-1} \left(F_{y_{r-\delta-1}(0)|X,C=1}(y_{r-\delta-1}(0)) | X \right) \right] | X = x, C = 1 \right]$$

and

$$\mathbb{P}(y_t(0) \leq y | d_r = 1) = \int_{\chi} \mathbb{P}(y_t(0) \leq y | X = x, d_r = 1) dF_{X|d_r=1}(x)$$

The result obtained in [Proposition 2](#) is very close to that obtained above in [Theorem 1](#). The only difference compared to [Theorem 1](#) is that one needs to compute first conditional distributions of untreated potential outcomes. Next, to obtain the unconditional distribution of untreated potential outcome, the researcher has to first integrate out covariates from $\mathbb{P}(y_t(0) \leq y | X = x, d_r = 1)$ to obtain $\mathbb{P}(y_t(0) \leq y | d_r = 1)$.

2.4.1 The cohort-time quantile treatment effect

We can construct different causal estimands once we have identified $F_{y(0)|d_r=1}$. Suppose rank invariance holds, then it is possible to show that, under the same assumptions required for the results obtained in [Theorem 1](#) or in [Proposition 1](#) to be valid, one can obtain the inverse of $F_{y(0)|d_r=1}$, that is $F_{y(0)|d_r=1}^{-1}(\tau)$ for each $\tau \in (0, 1)$. At this point, the *cohort-time quantile treatment effects* are also identified:

$$QTT_{r,t,\delta}(\tau) = F_{y_t(r)|d_r=1}^{-1}(\tau) - F_{y_t(\infty)|d_r=1}^{-1}(\tau) \quad \forall r, t \in \{q, \dots, T\}, t \geq r - \delta.$$

If, instead, one relies on the result obtained in [Proposition 2](#). After $\mathbb{P}(y_t(0) \leq y | X = x, d_r = 1)$ is identified, one can invert it, and the conditional cohort-time quantile treatment effects are identified:

$$QTT_{r,t,\delta}(\tau; x) = F_{y_t(r)|X,d_r=1}^{-1}(\tau|x) - F_{y_t(0)|X,d_r=1}^{-1}(\tau|x) \quad \forall r, t \in \{q, \dots, T\} \text{ and } t \geq r - \delta$$

Or one can integrate out covariate from $\mathbb{P}(y_t(0) \leq y | X = x, d_r = 1)$, obtain $\mathbb{P}(y_t(0) \leq y | d_r = 1)$, invert it and then get:

$$QTT_{r,t,\delta}(\tau) = F_{y_t(r)|d_r=1}^{-1}(\tau) - F_{y_t(0)|d_r=1}^{-1}(\tau) \quad \forall r, t \in \{q, \dots, T\} \text{ and } t \geq r - \delta$$

Which is identified.

Once the cohort-time quantile treatment effects are identified, one can aggregate these parameters to highlight heterogeneity along specific dimensions (such as how the treatment effects vary with the length of exposure to the treatment) or to summarize in one unique parameter the overall treatment effect. Specifically, I advocate the researcher to use aggregations schemes of the cohort-time quantile treatment effects, similar to those suggested by [Callaway and Sant'Anna \(2021\)](#).

Aggregation schemes are particularly crucial when there are many parameters to estimate, and the researcher wants to have a quick tool to aggregate and summarize results to highlight heterogeneity over time or by treatment cohorts. Note, however, that while in the scenario considered in [Callaway and Sant'Anna \(2021\)](#), it made sense to propose a simple weighted average of these parameters to summarize the effect of the policy, in principle, in this scenario, one might think of more complicated ways to aggregate to highlight heterogeneity also along the distribution of y . For instance, the researcher might be interested in the policy's overall cumulative effect on the lower tail of the distribution (e.g., evaluate the impact of the introduction of minimum wages on those units that reside in the first two deciles of the income distribution). However, to keep things simple and to avoid including an additional dimension of heterogeneity, I will limit myself to generalizing the discussion in [Callaway and Sant'Anna \(2021\)](#) to the QTT case.

Specifically, in the previous section, we focused on stating under which conditions one can identify the QTT parameters. It may be relevant for a policymaker to understand, for instance, the long-run effects of the policy or to understand whether there exist different patterns according to when a unit first receives the treatment. Following [Callaway and Sant'Anna \(2021\)](#), I will propose aggregation schemes of the following form:

$$\theta(\tau) = \sum_{t=q}^T \sum_{r=q}^T w(r, t) \cdot QTT_{r,t}(\tau) \quad r \in \{q, \dots, T\} \quad (3)$$

Where $w(r, t)$ are the researcher's weighting functions at her disposal. One can address multiple policy-relevant questions by changing $w(r, t)$, such as: 'How does the QTT vary across groups?'; 'How does the QTT vary with the length of exposure to the treatment?'; 'What is the cumulative average Treatment effect of the policy across all groups until time t ?'; or 'What is the overall impact of the policy'. For instance, if the researcher is interested in understanding how the QTT varies with the length of ex-

posure to the treatment, by denoting with $e = t - r$ the event time (i.e., the time elapsed since the unit first received the treatment), one possible aggregation scheme to highlight the heterogeneity of the QTT with respect to the event time is:

$$\theta_{exp}^e(\tau) = \sum_{r=q}^T \mathbb{1}\{r + e \leq T\} \mathbb{P}(d_r = 1 | r + e \leq T) QTT_{r,r+e,\delta}(\tau) \quad r \in \{q, \dots, T\}$$

$\theta_{exp}^e(\tau)$ represents the effect – for units belonging to the τ^{th} quantile of the distribution of y – of participating in the treatment for e periods after treatment implementation. $\theta_{exp}^e(\tau)$ is computed across all units, which are exactly e periods away from when the policy was first implemented. $\theta_{exp}^e(\tau)$ is a common parameter of interest in event studies where the researcher is interested in understanding the dynamic impact of the policy (e.g., see [Sun and Abraham \(2021\)](#); [De Chaisemartin and d’Haultfoeuille \(2022\)](#)).

If, on the other side, the researcher is interested in evaluating the overall impact of the policy on those units that belong to the τ^{th} quantile, then a straightforward way to obtain an overall effect parameter is the following:

$$\theta_{weight}^o(\tau) = \frac{1}{\kappa} \sum_{t=q}^T \sum_{r=q}^T \mathbb{1}\{t \geq r\} \mathbb{P}(d_r = 1 | r \leq T) QTT_{r,t,\delta}(\tau) \quad r \in \{q, \dots, T\}$$

where $\kappa = \sum_{t=q}^T \sum_{r=q}^T \mathbb{1}\{t \geq r\} \mathbb{P}(d_r = 1 | r \leq T)$. $\theta_{weight}^o(\tau)$ is a weighted average of QTTs putting more weight on those QTTs whose size is larger. However, one drawback of $\theta_{weight}^o(\tau)$, as also [Callaway and Sant’Anna \(2021\)](#) note, is that it systematically weights those groups that participate for a longer period in the treatment.

2.4.2 Tests of stochastic dominance rankings

If, instead, rank invariance is unlikely to hold in the context analyzed or the two distributions cross – the $QTT_{r,t,\delta}(\tau)$ changes sign when going from $\tau = 0$ to $\tau = 1$, thus making policy implications based on these results sensitive to the choice of the quantiles considered – one can perform statistical tests of stochastic dominance rankings or use inequality measures, which anonymously summarize the quantile of the distribution without requiring to know which units occupy a given quantile, such as the Gini Coefficient or Generalized Entropy measures, as [Maasoumi and Wang \(2019\)](#) point out.

For the remainder of this paper, I will consider only tests of stochastic dominance rankings. I will show how to retrieve Generalized Entropy measures in the appendix. Once we have identified the counterfactual distribution, one can construct tests of stochastic dominance rankings for the treated group r by comparing the distribution of the treated and untreated potential outcomes for the treated groups (i.e., $F_{y_t(r)|d_r=1}$ and $F_{y_t(0)|d_r=1}$). Specifically, once the entire counterfactual distribution is identified, the researcher can invert it and obtain all the possible values of $y_t(0)|d_r = 1$ to compute tests of this type. For instance, when considering first-order stochastic dominance, we will say that the treated potential outcome, $y_t(r)|d_r = 1$, first-order stochastically dominates the untreated potential outcome for the treated, $y_t(0)|d_r = 1$, if and only if

1. $\mathbb{E}u(y_t(r)|d_r = 1) \geq \mathbb{E}u(y_t(0)|d_r = 1)$ for all $u \in U_1$ with the inequality being strict for some u
- or

2. $F_{y_t(r)|d_r=1}(y) \leq F_{y_t(0)|d_r=1}(y)$ for all y with strict inequality for some values of y , or
3. $y_t(r)|d_r = 1 \geq y_t(0)|d_r = 1$ for all points in the support of y .

Again, this is possible as we have identified the entire counterfactual distribution.

3 Estimation and Inference

In the previous sections, we have focused on identifying the counterfactual distribution of the untreated potential outcome for the treated group. Once identified, we showed that one can build different causal estimands of interests. Moreover, when considering the QTT case, the aggregations schemes suggested by [Callaway and Sant'Anna \(2021\)](#) can be easily generalized to this setting. In this section, I will propose a way to estimate these parameters and different ways to conduct valid inference according to the type of causal estimand considered.

Suppose one is interested in the parameters presented in [Eq. 1](#), using the analogy principle ([Manski, 1994](#)), one straightforward way to construct an estimator of the parameters presented in [Eq. 1](#), is to use empirical distribution functions, as [Callaway and Li \(2019\)](#) do.¹⁰ In the case in which covariates play no role (the case analyzed in [Theorem 1](#)), we can estimate the cohort-time quantile treatment effects by:

$$\widehat{QTT}_{r,t,\delta}(\tau) = \widehat{F}_{y_t(r)|d_r=1}^{-1}(\tau) - \widehat{F}_{y_t(0)|d_r=1}^{-1}(\tau)$$

where $\widehat{F}_{y_t(r)|d_r=1}^{-1}(\tau)$ is directly estimated from the data. Specifically, the researcher first estimates $\widehat{F}_{y_t(r)|d_r=1}(y)$, and then obtains the quantile function for the required quantile of interest by simply inverting $\widehat{F}_{y_t(r)|d_r=1}(y)$. That is:

$$\widehat{F}_{y_t(r)|d_r=1}^{-1}(\tau) = \text{inf}\{y : \widehat{F}_{y_t(r)|d_r=1}(y) \geq \tau\}$$

Whereas we can estimate the counterfactual quantile exploiting the results obtained in [Theorem 1](#), where EDF and quantile functions will be estimated by their sample analogs:

$$\widehat{F}_{y_t(0)|d_r=1}^{-1}(\tau) = \text{inf}\{y : \widehat{F}_{y_t(0)|d_r=1}(y) \geq \tau\}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{F}_{y_t(0)|d_r=1}(y) &= \frac{1}{n_0} \sum_{i=0} \mathbb{1} \left[\widehat{F}_{\Delta_{[r-\delta-1,t]}|C=1}^{-1} \left(\widehat{F}_{\Delta_{[r-\delta-1,t]}|C=1} \left(\Delta_{[r-\delta-1,t]} y \right) \right) \right] \\ &\leq y - \widehat{F}_{y_{r-\delta-1}|d_r=1}^{-1} \left(\widehat{F}_{y_{r-\delta-1}|C=1} \left(y_{r-\delta-1} \right) \right) \end{aligned}$$

where n_0 represents the number of never treated units in periods $r - \delta - 1$ and t .

Regarding statistical inference, depending on the context under analysis, I advocate for the researcher to use the most appropriate procedure to carry out valid inference. For instance, in the case where there is no serial correlation or where it is unlikely to have clustered dependence of any sort, one

¹⁰Under the assumptions required in [Theorem 1](#) and the additional assumption that the support of $y(j)$ with $j \in \{r, 0\}$, [Callaway and Li \(2019\)](#) show that this estimator is consistent. Moreover, using a functional central limit theorem, they also show that their estimator converges uniformly to a Gaussian process. Their results can be easily extended to this context, as what changes is only how we construct the benchmark but not the estimator itself.

can use the empirical bootstrap proposed in [Callaway and Li \(2019\)](#), which the authors prove to lead uniform confidence bands that cover the $QTT(\tau)$ with fixed probability for all $\tau \in [\varepsilon, 1 - \varepsilon] \subset (0, 1)$ for some small, positive ε .

Specifically, let $\widehat{QTT}^*(\tau)$ denote an estimate of the QTT using a bootstrapped sample (the steps are identical to those presented above; the only thing that changes is the sample used to form these $\widehat{QTT}^*(\tau)$) and let B be the number of bootstrap iterations and for $b = 1, \dots, B$. For each iteration, then one needs to compute:

$$I^b = \text{sup}_{\tau \in \mathbb{T}} \widehat{\Sigma}(\tau)^{-1/2} \left| \sqrt{n} \left(\widehat{QTT}^b(\tau) - \widehat{QTT}(\tau) \right) \right|$$

Where $\widehat{\Sigma}(\tau)^{1/2} = (q_{0.75}(\tau) - q_{0.25}(\tau)) / (z_{0.75}(\tau) - z_{0.25}(\tau))$ represents the interquartile range obtained via bootstrap, divided by the interquartile range of a standard normal random variable. Then one can obtain the $(1 - \alpha)$ confidence interval as follows:

$$\widehat{C}_{QTT(\tau)} = \widehat{QTT}^*(\tau) \pm c_{1-\alpha}^B \widehat{\Sigma}(\tau)^{1/2} / \sqrt{n}$$

Where $c_{1-\alpha}^B$ is the $(1 - \alpha)$ quantile of $\{I^b\}_{b=1}^B$.¹¹ If clustered dependence is likely in the context under analysis, depending on the number of treated clusters, the researcher can adapt the wild cluster bootstrap (or subcluster wild bootstrap ([MacKinnon and Webb, 2018](#))) to the QTT case, with minor adaptations. See [Cameron and Miller \(2015\)](#) and [MacKinnon et al. \(2023\)](#) for a review.

As far as the case considered in [Proposition 1](#), as shown in [Appendix A](#), the only additional term that needs to be estimated is $F_{\Delta_{[r-\delta-1, t]y(0)}|d_r=1}^{p, -1}(\delta)$. One can compute it by estimating the following generalization of the estimator proposed by [Firpo \(2007\)](#) and [Callaway and Li \(2019\)](#):

$$\mathbb{F}_{\Delta_{y_{t, r-\delta-1}(0)}|d_r=1}^p(\delta) = \frac{1}{n_{r,t}} \sum_{i \in r} \frac{d_{i0}}{p_r} \frac{\hat{p}_r(x_i)}{1 - \hat{p}_r(x_i)} \mathbb{1}\{\Delta_{y_{t, r-\delta-1}} \leq \delta\} \Bigg/ \frac{1}{n_{r,t}} \sum_{i \in r} \frac{d_{i0}}{p_r} \frac{\hat{p}_r(x_i)}{1 - \hat{p}_r(x_i)}$$

Where $n_{r,t}$ is the number of units used to compute $\widehat{QTT}_{r,t,\delta}(\tau)$, $\hat{p}(X)$ represents an estimator of the propensity score and the last term in the denominator normalizes the weights to sum to 1 in finite samples (ensuring that $\mathbb{F}^p(\cdot)$ is indeed a distribution function). Please note that, as both [Firpo \(2007\)](#) and [Callaway and Li \(2019\)](#) show, one can estimate the propensity score both parametrically and non-parametrically.

As far as the case considered in [Proposition 2](#) is concerned, it can be computationally demanding. Even if estimated non-parametrically, this would imply estimating five conditional distributions. This may be unfeasible in many empirical applications, especially with $\dim\{\mathbf{X}\}$ large and n small. To overcome this issue, one can either estimate the above quantities using quantile regressions as done by [Melly and Santangelo \(2015\)](#) – who exploit quantile regression to estimate the Change in Changes model proposed by [Athey and Imbens \(2006\)](#) in the context with covariates – or, if covariates are discrete, one can use the method proposed by [Callaway et al. \(2018\)](#). Precisely, in this latter scenario, one can estimate, for each possible value of x , $\widehat{F}_{y_t(r)|X, d_r=1}$ via its empirical distribution function and then invert it. Analogously, $\widehat{F}_{y_t(0)|X, d_r=1}$ can be estimated for each possible values of x exploiting the result in [Proposition 2](#). That is

¹¹For extreme quantile, one can use alternative inference procedures (see, [Chernozhukov, V., I. Fernandez-Val, and T. Kaji \(2018\)](#)).

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{F}_{y_t(0)|X=x, d_r=1}(y) &= \frac{1}{n_{0,x}} \sum_{i \in 0} \mathbb{1} \left[\left(\Delta_{[r-\delta-1, t]} y \right) \right. \\ &\quad \left. \leq y - \hat{F}_{y_{r-\delta-1}|X=x, d_r=1}^{-1} \left(\hat{F}_{y_{r-\delta-1}|X=x, C=1}(y_{r-\delta-1}) \right) \mid X = x \right]\end{aligned}$$

Again, one can use empirical distribution functions to estimate each of the quantities in the formula above. Once obtained an estimate of $\hat{F}_{y_t(r)|X, d_r=1}(\tau|x)$ and $\hat{F}_{y_t(0)|X, d_r=1}(\tau|x)$, one can obtain an estimator of the conditional QTT as:

$$QTT_{r,t,\delta}(\tau; x) = F_{y_t(r)|X, d_r=1}^{-1}(\tau|x) - F_{y_t(0)|X, d_r=1}^{-1}(\tau|x) \quad \forall r, t \in \{q, \dots, T\} \text{ and } t \geq r - \delta$$

for each $\tau \in (0, 1)$ and for each $x \in \mathcal{X}$.

Once an estimator for the QTT is obtained, if the researcher is interested in aggregating the $QTT_{r,t,\delta}(\tau)$ using the aggregation schemes proposed in the previous section, using the analogy principle (Manski, 1994), she can estimate the weighting functions by simply using their sample analogs.

If, on the other hand, the researcher is interested in performing tests of stochastic dominance (SD) rankings, following what Maasoumi and Wang (2019) suggest, one can perform stochastic dominance tests based on the generalized Kolmogorov-Smirnov statistics proposed by Linton et al. (2005). Once we obtain an estimator for $\hat{F}_{y_t(r)|d_r=1}$ and $\hat{F}_{y_t(0)|d_r=1}$ exploiting the results obtained in Theorem 1, Propositions 1 or 2 – depending on the context under analysis – tests for FSD or SSD can be obtained as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}d_{r,t,\delta} &= \sqrt{\frac{n_{r,t} \cdot n_{0,t}}{n_{r,t} + n_{0,t}}} \min \sup \left(\hat{F}_{y_t(r)|d_r=1}(y) - \hat{F}_{y_t(0)|d_r=1}(y) \right) \\ s_{r,t,\delta} &= \sqrt{\frac{n_{r,t} \cdot n_{0,t}}{n_{r,t} + n_{0,t}}} \min \sup \int_{-\infty}^y \left(\hat{F}_{y_t(r)|d_r=1}(z) - \hat{F}_{y_t(0)|d_r=1}(z) \right) dz\end{aligned}$$

where $n_{r,t}$ and $n_{0,t}$ represent the sample sizes used to estimate $\hat{F}_{y_t(r)|d_r=1}$ and $\hat{F}_{y_t(0)|d_r=1}$, respectively. Following Maasoumi and Wang (2019), one can construct a test for *iid* samples based on the pair bootstrap, which allows the researcher to obtain the probability of any of the two SD tests to fall in a specific interval, as well as the p -value. For instance, if $\mathbb{P}(d \leq 0)$ is large (e.g., above .90) and d is non-positive, then we can claim that $y_t(r)|d_r = 1$ FSD $y_t(0)|d_r = 1$ with a high degree of statistical confidence (Maasoumi and Wang, 2019).

More sophisticated tests can be built depending on the context under analysis (see Maasoumi (2003) for a survey on the possible tests that can be used with this approach). Again, depending on the context under analysis, I advocate using the most appropriate test to conduct statistical inference and decide whether the distribution of treated potential outcome at time t for the group first treated in period r stochastically dominates the counterfactual distribution. However, this is beyond the scope of this paper.

4 Monte-Carlo Simulations

In this section, I will analyze the finite-sample properties of the estimators of the distribution of the untreated potential outcome presented in the previous section. Because the results obtained in [Section 2](#) do not rely on the specific causal estimand of interest considered, for brevity, I will limit myself to analyzing the estimators' performance in the case in which the researcher is interested in recovering an estimator of the cohort-time quantile treatment effect. Specifically, since the identification results do not depend on specifying the outcome for the treated group, I will assess the finite-sample properties of the methods presented in generating $F_{y_t(0)|d_r=1}$. Lastly, please note that the rank invariance assumption can potentially hold in the following models considered, as nothing is said regarding $y_t(r)|d_r = 1$.

In contrast to what was usually done in earlier papers, I will assess the performance of the methods presented both in the case in which the data generating process (DGP) for the untreated potential outcome was a TWFE regression without covariates (as in [Callaway et al. \(2018\)](#); [Callaway and Li \(2019\)](#); [Miller \(2023\)](#)), but also in the case where the linear DGP includes covariates (as is the case in [Firpo \(2007\)](#); [Callaway and Sant'Anna \(2021\)](#)).

Throughout this section, without any loss of generality, I will assume there is no treatment anticipation (i.e., $\delta = 0$), that the policy is implemented starting from the second period onward, and that panel data are available. Let T denote the maximum number of available time periods, $q = 2$ the first time a policy is implemented, $r = \{2, \dots, T\}$ the first time a unit is treated, and n the sample size. I allow both n and T to vary in the following Monte Carlo exercises. I will compare the proposed estimators' performance in terms of average bias and root-mean-squared error (RMSE). For completeness, when considering the DGP in which covariates play a role, I also consider the unconditional QTT estimand, which can be obtained using the identification result in [Theorem 1](#), where the distributional parallel trends assumption is assumed to hold unconditionally.

The first DGP considered, *DGP 1*, is the following:

$$y_{it}(0) = \alpha_t + \eta_i + u_{it} \quad (4)$$

Where $y_{it}(0)$ denotes the untreated potential outcome, α_t are time fixed-effects, η_i represents the time-invariant unobserved heterogeneity, which can be distributed differently across treated cohorts and never-treated units (i.e., I allow for selection on unobservables), u_{it} represents the time-varying random shock (or unobservable component). Throughout this section, I will set $\alpha_t = t$, $\eta|r \sim N(r, 1)$ with $r = \{2, \dots, T\}$, and $u_t \sim N(0, 1)$ in all periods. Implicitly assumed is that $T = R$, where R represents the last time period in which a unit can undergo the policy (i.e., there is a positive probability of being treated in every period starting from the second period onward). Since covariates play no role in this DGP, it is assumed that the probability of being first treated in period r , $\mathbb{P}(d_r = 1)$, equals $1/T$. Then $y_{it}(0) \sim N(\alpha_t + r, 2)$. Exploiting the fact that for a generic random variable (R.V.) $X \sim N(\mu, \sigma^2)$, the τ -quantile is given by $F_X^{-1}(\tau) = \mu + \sigma\Phi^{-1}(\tau)$ (where $\Phi(\cdot)$ represents the standard normal cdf), then the τ^{th} quantile at time t for units belonging to cohort r is equal to $F_{y_t(\infty)|d_r=1}^{-1}(\tau) = (\alpha_t + r) + \sqrt{2}\Phi^{-1}(\tau)$.

The second DGP (*DGP 2*) mimics the TWFE regression with covariates used by [Callaway and Sant'Anna \(2021\)](#) to study the finite-sample properties of the estimators of the group-time average treatment effects. Specifically, in contrast to *DGP 1*, it also allows for the selection on observable characteristics. I

will consider the case where there is only one covariate $X \sim N(0, 1)$ for simplicity. Since in this DGP, selection on observable is allowed, as in Callaway and Sant’Anna (2021), I set the probability to belong to cohort r to be a function of observable pre-treatment characteristics:

$$\mathbb{P}(d_r = 1|X) = \frac{\exp(X'\gamma_r)}{\sum_r \exp(X'\gamma_r)}$$

where $\gamma_r = 0.5r/T$. The following model generates the untreated potential outcome:

$$y_{it}(0) = \alpha_t + \eta_i + X_{it} + u_{it} \quad (5)$$

Compared to *DGP 1*, the only difference lies in the fact that now I also allow selection on observable characteristics. In this case, since $y_{it}(0) \sim N(\alpha_t + r, 3)$, the population distribution of untreated potential outcome is equal to $F_{y_{it}(0)|d_r=1}^{-1}(\tau) = (\alpha_t + r) + \sqrt{3}\Phi^{-1}(\tau)$.

Both DGPs presented satisfy all the assumptions needed for identification.¹² Specifically, *DGP 1* requires the distributional parallel trends and the copula invariance assumptions to hold unconditionally. Whereas, *DGP 2* requires the distributional PT assumption to hold conditionally on X , but the copula assumption still holds unconditionally.¹³

In this section, I consider the following scenarios: i) $T = R = 4$ and ii) $T = R = 20$. In each setup, I allow the sample size to vary, $n = \{100, 1000\}$. All results are based on 2,000 Monte Carlo simulations, and I report the results for the .25, .50, and .75 quantiles. To save space, only results for $QTT_{2,2}(\tau)$ are shown in the main text. Whereas in Appendix B, results obtained for scenario i) for the estimators of all the QTT parameters when the quantile considered is .5 are presented. Based on the theoretical results obtained in Callaway and Li (2019) and Callaway and Sant’Anna (2021), the estimators are expected to perform well when n is large relative to R and T . What happens when T (and consequently R) grows is unclear, as the number of units in a given cohort can be very small.

Table 1 reports the simulation results for the estimators of $QTT_{2,2}(\tau)$ for scenario in which $T = R = 4$ (for both *DGP 1* and *DGP 2*). What emerges is that, as expected, when the number of units per cohort is small ($n = 100$), the performance of the method presented is poor (especially true for the .25 and .75 quantiles). As the number of units per cohort increases, the performance improves substantially both in terms of bias and RMSE. Moreover, in line with what the theory predicts, ignoring the role of covariates causes the estimator’s performance to be substantially poor, thus leading to unreliable inference.

Similar results are also found for the other cohort-time quantile treatment effects estimators. To save space, these results are omitted from the main text. Tables B1 and B2 in Appendix B, however, present the full set of results for the median – obtained when considering the scenario in which $T = 4$ – for *DGP 1* and *DGP 2*, respectively. All the other results are available upon request.

Regarding the scenario with $T = R = 10$, results are reported in Table 2. Again, also in this case, I report the results for the estimators of $QTT_{2,2}(\tau)$ for both *DGP 1* and *DGP 2*. As with $T = R = 4$, when the number of units per cohort is small, the method’s performance is poor, but as n increases,

¹²Sufficient conditions for the distributional PT assumption and the copula invariance assumption to hold in linear models is that the error term is *iid* in each period.

¹³The reason why the copula invariance still holds unconditionally is that none of the random variables in the right-hand side of the equation are normally distributed conditionally on X . As pointed out in the previous section, estimation may become demanding when the copula invariance holds conditionally.

Table 1: Monte Carlo Results for $QTT_{2,2,\delta=0}^{Nev}$. Setup with $T = R = 4$.

		0.25			0.50			0.75			
	n	$F_{y_t(0) d_r=1}^{-1}$	Bias	Root MSE	$F_{y_t(0) d_r=1}^{-1}$	Bias	Root MSE	$F_{y_t(0) d_r=1}^{-1}$	Bias	Root MSE	
DGP 1	Unc	100	3.046	0.112	0.525	4	0.097	0.489	4.954	0.122	0.509
DGP 2	Unc	100	2.832	0.331	0.695	4	0.341	0.684	5.168	0.391	0.714
	Cond	100	2.832	0.086	0.531	4	0.091	0.515	5.168	0.146	0.541
DGP 1	Unc	1000	3.046	0.011	0.152	4	0.007	0.15	4.954	0.013	0.157
DGP 2	Unc	1000	2.832	0.258	0.314	4	0.25	0.304	5.168	0.257	0.315
	Cond	1000	2.832	0.018	0.154	4	0.011	0.147	5.168	0.018	0.158

Notes: This table reports the Monte Carlo results for the estimator of the parameter $QTT_{2,2,\delta=0}^{Nev}$ in the setup with $T = R = 4$. Results are reported for the quantiles .25, .50, .75. Each Monte Carlo simulation uses 2,000 bootstrap replications. Rows labeled ‘DGP 1’ report the results obtained for the DGP in Eq. (4), whereas rows labeled ‘DGP 2’ present the results obtained for the DGP in Eq. (5). Rows labeled ‘UNC’ use the estimator based on the unconditional distributional PT assumption that ignores covariates. Finally, $F_{y_t(0)|d_r=1}^{-1}$ represents the true population parameter, whereas ‘Bias’ and ‘RMSE’ stand for average (simulated) bias, and root-mean-squared, respectively.

Table 2: Monte Carlo Results for $QTT_{2,2,\delta=0}^{Nev}$. Setup with $T = R = 10$.

		0.25			0.50			0.75			
	n	$F_{y_t(0) d_r=1}^{-1}$	Bias	Root MSE	$F_{y_t(0) d_r=1}^{-1}$	Bias	Root MSE	$F_{y_t(0) d_r=1}^{-1}$	Bias	Root MSE	
DGP 1	Unc	100	3.046	0.307	1.312	4	0.277	1.299	4.954	0.344	1.304
DGP 2	Unc	100	2.832	0.114	1.087	4	0.196	1.082	5.168	0.306	1.091
	Cond	100	2.832	-0.02	0.927	4	0.085	0.911	5.168	0.173	0.918
DGP 1	Unc	1000	3.046	0.059	0.37	4	0.066	0.361	4.954	0.066	0.374
DGP 2	Unc	1000	2.832	0.107	0.31	4	0.111	0.315	5.168	0.125	0.319
	Cond	1000	2.832	0.008	0.247	4	0.012	0.245	5.168	0.026	0.249

Notes: This table reports the Monte Carlo results for the estimator of the parameter $QTT_{2,2,\delta=0}^{Nev}$ in the setup with $T = R = 10$. Results are reported for the quantiles .25, .50, .75. Each Monte Carlo simulation uses 2,000 bootstrap replications. Rows labeled ‘DGP 1’ report the results obtained for the DGP in Eq. (4), whereas rows labeled ‘DGP 2’ present the results obtained for the DGP in Eq. (5). Rows labeled ‘UNC’ use the estimator based on the unconditional distributional PT assumption that ignores covariates. Finally, $F_{y_t(0)|d_r=1}^{-1}$ represents the true population parameter, whereas ‘Bias’ and ‘RMSE’ stand for average (simulated) bias, and root-mean-squared, respectively.

the method’s performance improves substantially. Moreover, as expected, the average bias for the estimators of parameters of *DGP 1* is always larger than those shown in [Table 1](#) (except for the median in the scenario with $n = 1,000$, where the magnitude remains almost unaltered). Interestingly, for the estimator of the parameters of *DGP 2*, the bias now appears smaller in magnitude in nearly every case. However, for almost all cases (both *DGP 1* and *2*), the RMSEs are larger than those shown in [Table 1](#), so the parameters are now estimated imprecisely. The fact that the RMSEs are larger than before is probably because the number of units per cohort is much smaller. Lastly, in the scenario with $T = R = 10$ and small n , the parameters of *DGP 2* could not be estimated in many simulations due to the low number of treated and/or never-treated units (results not shown). So, overall, the performance of the estimators of the parameters of *DGP 2* does not necessarily improve compared to the scenario in which $T = R = 4$.

All the results reported above are in line with what theory predicts and also in line with the simulation results obtained in [Callaway et al. \(2018\)](#); [Callaway and Li \(2019\)](#); [Callaway and Sant’Anna \(2021\)](#). The performance is relatively poor for small n but improves substantially as n increases. Lastly, in line with [Callaway et al. \(2018\)](#), I also found that, for both the two DGPs, the method’s power is relatively larger for the .50 quantile.

5 Conclusion

In this paper, I provide a practical toolkit to recover the whole counterfactual distribution of the untreated potential outcome for the treated group in non-experimental settings with staggered treatment adoption by generalizing the existing quantile treatment effects on the treated estimator proposed by [Callaway and Li \(2019\)](#). To do so, I build on the idea behind the group-time average treatment effect estimator proposed by [Callaway and Sant’Anna \(2021\)](#). Once the causal estimands of interest are built, one can aggregate these parameters using aggregation schemes identical to those suggested by [Callaway and Sant’Anna \(2021\)](#) to highlight heterogeneity along specific dimensions (such as how the treatment effects vary with the length of exposure to the treatment). I show that, once the entire counterfactual distribution is identified, besides the QTT – which relies on the assumption of rank invariance – different approaches that anonymously summarize the quantiles of the distribution of the outcome of interest (such as tests for stochastic dominance rankings) can be built within this framework, thus combining the literature on causal inference with that on inequality measures. Depending on the causal estimand of interest, I advocate that the researcher employ the most appropriate tests to perform statistical inference.

Identification is reached by generalizing the assumption of parallel trends, frequently invoked in empirical practice, to the entire distribution of the untreated potential outcome. Since this is no longer sufficient to reach point identification, as shown by [Fan and Yu \(2012\)](#), an additional assumption regarding the missing dependence (or copula) between the change in untreated potential outcome and its pre-treatment level is required. To go back to point identification, following [Callaway et al. \(2018\)](#); [Callaway and Li \(2019\)](#), I assume that the missing dependence is independent of the treatment assignment. I show that, under these assumptions, the proposed method’s performance is poor when the cohort size is small, but this improves substantially as n increases. These results are in line with what the theory developed by [Callaway et al. \(2018\)](#); [Callaway and Li \(2019\)](#); [Callaway and Sant’Anna \(2021\)](#) predicts.

References

- A. Abadie. Semiparametric Difference-in-Differences Estimators. *The Review of Economic Studies*, 72(1):1–19, 01 2005. ISSN 0034-6527. doi: 10.1111/0034-6527.00321. URL <https://doi.org/10.1111/0034-6527.00321>.
- S. Athey and G. W. Imbens. Identification and inference in nonlinear difference-in-differences models. *Econometrica*, 74(2):431–497, 2006. ISSN 00129682, 14680262. URL <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3598807>.
- S. Bonhomme and U. Sauder. Recovering distributions in difference-in-differences models: A comparison of selective and comprehensive schooling. *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, 93(2):479–494, 2011. URL <https://EconPapers.repec.org/RePEc:tpr:restat:v:93:y:2011:i:2:p:479-494>.
- K. Borusyak, X. Jaravel, and J. Spiess. Revisiting event study designs: Robust and efficient estimation. *arXiv preprint:2108.12419*, 2021.
- B. Callaway and T. Li. Quantile treatment effects in difference in differences models with panel data. *Quantitative Economics*, 10(4):1579–1618, 2019. doi: <https://doi.org/10.3982/QE935>. URL <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.3982/QE935>.
- B. Callaway and P. H. Sant’Anna. Difference-in-differences with multiple time periods. *Journal of Econometrics*, 225(2):200–230, 2021.
- B. Callaway, T. Li, and T. Oka. Quantile treatment effects in difference in differences models under dependence restrictions and with only two time periods. *Journal of Econometrics*, 206(2):395–413, 2018. ISSN 0304-4076. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeconom.2018.06.008>. URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0304407618301027>. Special issue on Advances in Econometric Theory: Essays in honor of Takeshi Amemiya.
- A. C. Cameron and D. L. Miller. A practitioner’s guide to cluster-robust inference. *Journal of human resources*, 50(2):317–372, 2015.
- P. Carneiro, K. T. Hansen, and J. Heckman. Estimating distributions of treatment effects with an application to the returns to schooling and measurement of the effects of uncertainty on college choice. IZA Discussion Papers 767, Institute of Labor Economics (IZA), 2003. URL <https://EconPapers.repec.org/RePEc:iza:izadps:dp767>.
- V. Chernozhukov, I. Fernandez-Val, and B. Melly. Inference on counterfactual distributions. *Econometrica*, 81(6):2205–2268, 2013. doi: <https://doi.org/10.3982/ECTA10582>. URL <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.3982/ECTA10582>.
- C. De Chaisemartin and X. d’Haultfoeuille. Difference-in-differences estimators of intertemporal treatment effects. Technical report, National Bureau of Economic Research, 2022.
- Y. Fan and Z. Yu. Partial identification of distributional and quantile treatment effects in difference-in-differences models. *Economics Letters*, 115(3):511–515, 2012. URL <https://EconPapers.repec.org/RePEc:eee:ecolet:v:115:y:2012:i:3:p:511-515>.

- S. Firpo. Efficient semiparametric estimation of quantile treatment effects. *Econometrica*, 75(1):259–276, 2007. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-0262.2007.00738.x>. URL <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/j.1468-0262.2007.00738.x>.
- J. Heckman, H. Ichimura, J. Smith, and P. Todd. Characterizing selection bias using experimental data. *Econometrica*, 66(5):1017–1098, 1998. ISSN 00129682, 14680262. URL <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2999630>.
- J. J. Heckman, J. E. Humphries, and G. Veramendi. Dynamic treatment effects. *Journal of Econometrics*, 191(2):276–292, 2016. ISSN 0304-4076. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeconom.2015.12.001>. URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0304407615002778>. Innovations in Measurement in Economics and Econometrics.
- P. W. Holland. Statistics and causal inference. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 81(396):945–960, 1986.
- G. W. Imbens and J. M. Wooldridge. Recent developments in the econometrics of program evaluation. *Journal of economic literature*, 47(1):5–86, 2009.
- H. Joe. *Multivariate models and multivariate dependence concepts*. CRC press, 1997.
- O. Linton, E. Maasoumi, and Y.-J. Whang. Consistent testing for stochastic dominance under general sampling schemes. *The Review of Economic Studies*, 72(3):735–765, 2005. URL <https://EconPapers.repec.org/RePEc:oup:restud:v:72:y:2005:i:3:p:735-765>.
- E. Maasoumi. *Parametric and Nonparametric Tests of Limited Domain and Ordered Hypotheses in Economics*, chapter 25, pages 538–556. John Wiley & Sons, Ltd, 2003. ISBN 9780470996249. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1002/9780470996249.ch26>. URL <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/9780470996249.ch26>.
- E. Maasoumi and L. Wang. The gender gap between earnings distributions. *Journal of Political Economy*, 127(5):2438–2504, 2019. doi: 10.1086/701788. URL <https://doi.org/10.1086/701788>.
- J. G. MacKinnon and M. D. Webb. The wild bootstrap for few (treated) clusters. *The Econometrics Journal*, 21(2):114–135, 2018.
- J. G. MacKinnon, M. Ø. Nielsen, and M. D. Webb. Cluster-robust inference: A guide to empirical practice. *Journal of Econometrics*, 232(2):272–299, 2023.
- C. F. Manski. Analog estimation of econometric models. *Handbook of econometrics*, 4:2559–2582, 1994.
- C. F. Manski and J. V. Pepper. Deterrence and the death penalty: Partial identification analysis using repeated cross sections. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*, 29:123–141, 2013.
- B. Melly and G. Santangelo. The changes-in-changes model with covariates. *W.P.*, 2015.
- B. I. Miller. Doubly-robust quantile treatment effect estimation. *W.P.*, 2023. URL <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/j.1468-0262.2007.00738.x>.

- R. Nelsen. *An Introduction to Copulas*. Springer, 01 2006. ISBN 978-0-387-28659-4. doi: 10.1007/0-387-28678-0.
- J. Robins. A new approach to causal inference in mortality studies with a sustained exposure period—application to control of the healthy worker survivor effect. *Mathematical Modelling*, 7(9):1393–1512, 1986. ISSN 0270-0255. doi: [https://doi.org/10.1016/0270-0255\(86\)90088-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/0270-0255(86)90088-6). URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/0270025586900886>.
- J. M. Robins. Addendum to “a new approach to causal inference in mortality studies with a sustained exposure period—application to control of the healthy worker survivor effect”. *Computers & Mathematics with Applications*, 14(9):923–945, 1987. doi: [https://doi.org/10.1016/0898-1221\(87\)90238-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/0898-1221(87)90238-0). URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/0898122187902380>.
- J. Roth, P. H. Sant’Anna, A. Bilinski, and J. Poe. What’s trending in difference-in-differences? A synthesis of the recent econometrics literature. *Journal of Econometrics*, 2023. ISSN 0304-4076. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeconom.2023.03.008>. URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0304407623001318>.
- D. B. Rubin. Estimating causal effects of treatments in randomized and nonrandomized studies. *Journal of educational Psychology*, 66(5):688, 1974.
- M. Sklar. Fonctions de repartition an dimensions et leurs marges. *Publ. inst. statist. univ. Paris*, 8: 229–231, 1959.
- L. Sun and S. Abraham. Estimating dynamic treatment effects in event studies with heterogeneous treatment effects. *Journal of Econometrics*, 225(2):175–199, 2021.
- J. M. Wooldridge. Two-Way Fixed Effects, the Two-Way Mundlak Regression, and Difference-in-Differences Estimators. *Available at SSRN 3906345*, 2021.

A Appendix A – Proofs

A.1 Identification

A.1.1 Identification without covariates

In this subsection, following [Callaway and Li \(2019\)](#) I will prove the result obtained in [Theorem 1](#). To prove this theorem, I will use two results of Sklar’s Theorem: Lemma A.1. and Lemma A.2. in Appendix A in [Callaway and Li \(2019\)](#). To save space, I refer the reader to their paper.

Proof of Theorem 1. For notational convenience, I will assume that there is no treatment anticipation (i.e., $\delta = 0$) and abbreviate the joint pdf at time t of the change in untreated potential outcome and the pre-treatment untreated potential outcome for treated group r as $f_{t|d_r}(\cdot, \cdot) = 1 = f_{y_t(0)-y_{r-\delta-1}(0), y_{r-\delta-1}(0)|d_r=1}$. Similarly, this will be, instead, the same pdf for the never-treated $f_{t|C}(\cdot, \cdot) = 1 = f_{y_t(0)-y_{r-\delta-1}(0), y_{r-\delta-1}(0)|C=1}$. Further, I will denote the copula pdfs between the change in untreated potential outcome and the pre-treatment untreated potential outcome as $c_{t|d_g}(\cdot, \cdot) = 1 = c_{y_t(0)-y_{r-\delta-1}(0), y_{r-\delta-1}(0)|d_g=1}$ where $g = \{r, 0\}$. Assuming also that $\Delta_{[r-1, t]}y(0)$ has support in $\Delta\mathbb{Y}$ and $y_{t-1}(0)$ in \mathbb{Y} , then:

$$\begin{aligned}
F_{y_t(0)|d_r=1} &= \mathbb{P}(y_t(0) \leq y | d_r = 1) \\
&= P\left(\Delta_{[r-1, t]}y(0) + y_{r-1}(0) \leq y | d_r = 1\right) \\
&= \mathbb{E}\left[\mathbb{1}\left\{\Delta_{[r-1, t]}y(0) \leq y - y_{r-1}(0) | d_r = 1\right\}\right] \\
&= \int_y \int_{\Delta y} \mathbb{1}\{\delta \leq y - y'\} f_{t|d_r=1}(\delta, y') d\delta dy' \\
&= \int_y \int_{\Delta y} \mathbb{1}\{\delta \leq y - y'\} c_{t|d_r=1}\left(F_{\Delta_{[r-1, t]}y(0)|d_r=1}, F_{y_{r-1}(0)|d_r=1}\right) \\
&\quad \times f_{\Delta_{[r-1, t]}y(0)|d_r=1}(\delta) f_{y_{r-1}(0)|d_r=1}(y') d\delta dy' \quad (A.1) \\
&= \int_y \int_{\Delta y} \mathbb{1}\{\delta \leq y - y'\} c_{t|C=1}\left(F_{\Delta_{[r-1, t]}y(0)|d_r=1}, F_{y_{r-1}(0)|d_r=1}\right) \\
&\quad \times f_{\Delta_{[r-1, t]}y(0)|d_r=1}(\delta) f_{y_{r-1}(0)|d_r=1}(y') d\delta dy' \quad (A.2) \\
&= \int_y \int_{\Delta y} \mathbb{1}\{\delta \leq y - y'\} f_{t|C=1}\left(F_{\Delta_{[r-1, t]}y(0)|C=1}^{-1}\left(F_{\Delta_{[r-1, t]}y(0)|d_r=1}(\delta)\right), \right. \\
&\quad \left. F_{y_{r-1}(0)|C=1}^{-1}\left(F_{y_{r-1}(0)|d_r=1}(y')\right)\right) \\
&\quad \times \frac{f_{\Delta_{[r-1, t]}y(0)|d_r=1}(\delta)}{f_{\Delta_{[r-1, t]}y(0)|C=1}\left(F_{\Delta_{[r-1, t]}y(0)|d_r=1}(\delta)\right)} \\
&\quad \times \frac{f_{y_{r-1}(0)|d_r=1}(y')}{f_{y_{r-1}(0)|C=1}\left(F_{y_{r-1}(0)|C=1}^{-1}\left(F_{y_{r-1}(0)|d_r=1}(y')\right)\right)} d\delta dy' \quad (A.3)
\end{aligned}$$

Equation (A.1) exploits Lemma A.1 in [Callaway and Li \(2019\)](#) to write the joint distribution using a copula pdf. Equation (A.2) exploits [Assumption 5](#) to retrieve the missing dependence between the change in untreated potential outcome and the pre-treatment value of untreated potential outcome for treated group r . Lastly, equation (A.3) employs Lemma A.2 in [Callaway and Li \(2019\)](#) to rewrite the copula pdf as the joint distribution for the never-treated group.

Let us now make the following change of variables to simplify computations. Specifically, let us

denote with:

$$u = F_{\Delta_{[r-1,t]y(0)}|C=1}^{-1} \left(F_{\Delta_{[r-1,t]y(0)}|d_r=1}(\delta) \right), \quad v = F_{y_{r-1}(0)|C=1}^{-1} \left(F_{y_{r-1}(0)}|d_r=1(y') \right)$$

The above notation then implies the following equalities:

1. $\delta = F_{\Delta_{[r-1,t]y(0)}|d_r=1}^{-1} \left(F_{\Delta_{[r-1,t]y(0)}|C=1}(u) \right)$
2. $y' = F_{y_{r-1}(0)}|d_r=1}^{-1} \left(F_{y_{r-1}(0)}|C=1}(v) \right)$
3. $\frac{d\delta}{du} = \frac{f_{\Delta_{[r-1,t]y(0)}|C=1}(u)}{f_{\Delta_{[r-1,t]y(0)}|d_r=1} \left(F_{\Delta_{[r-1,t]y(0)}|d_r=1}^{-1} \left(F_{\Delta_{[r-1,t]y(0)}|C=1}(u) \right) \right)}$
4. $\frac{dy'}{dv} = \frac{f_{y_{r-1}(0)}|C=1}(v)}{f_{y_{r-1}(0)}|d_r=1} \left(F_{y_{r-1}(0)}|d_r=1}^{-1} \left(F_{y_{r-1}(0)}|C=1}(v) \right) \right)$

If we plug (1)-(4) in equation (A.3), we obtain the following equalities:

$$= \int_y \int_{\Delta y} \mathbb{1}(F_{\Delta_{[r-1,t]y(0)}|d_r=1}^{-1} \left(F_{\Delta_{[r-1,t]y(0)}|C=1}(u) \right) \leq y - F_{y_{r-1}(0)}|d_r=1}^{-1} \left(F_{y_{r-1}(0)}|C=1}(v) \right) \times f_{t|C=1}(u, v) dudv \quad (A.4)$$

$$= \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{1} \left(F_{\Delta_{[r-1,t]y(0)}|d_r=1}^{-1} \left(F_{\Delta_{[r-1,t]y(0)}|C=1} \left(\Delta_{[r-1,t]y(0)} \right) \right) \leq y - F_{y_{r-1}(0)}|d_r=1}^{-1} \left(F_{y_{r-1}(0)}|C=1}(y_{r-1}(0)) \right) \right) \mid C = 1 \right] \quad (A.5)$$

$$= \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{1} \left(F_{\Delta_{[r-1,t]y(0)}|C=1}^{-1} \left(F_{\Delta_{[r-1,t]y(0)}|C=1} \left(\Delta_{[r-1,t]y(0)} \right) \right) \leq y - F_{y_{r-1}(0)}|d_r=1}^{-1} \left(F_{y_{r-1}(0)}|C=1}(y_{r-1}(0)) \right) \right) \mid C = 1 \right] \quad (A.6)$$

$$= \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{1} \left(\Delta_{[r-1,t]y(0)} \leq y - F_{y_{r-1}(0)}|d_r=1}^{-1} \left(F_{y_{r-1}(0)}|C=1}(y_{r-1}(0)) \right) \right) \mid C = 1 \right] \quad (A.7)$$

Where equation (A.4) comes from substituting previous identities in equation (A.3); equation (A.5) comes from the definition of $\mathbb{E}(\cdot)$; equation (A.6) replaces the unknown distribution $F_{\Delta_{[r-1,t]y(0)}|d_r=1}^{-1}$ with the distribution of the change in untreated potential outcome for the never-treated group thanks to [Assumption 4](#) holding unconditionally, and lastly equation (A.7) proves the result as each of these distributions of untreated potential outcomes is identified by their sample counterparts. This proves identification of $F_{y_t(0)}|d_r=1$.

□

A.1.2 Identification with covariates

In the first part of this subsection I will prove the identification result shown [Proposition 1](#); in the second part of this subsection, instead, I will prove [Proposition 2](#).

Proof of Proposition 1. As pointed out in [Section 2](#), all the results obtained in [Theorem 1](#) are still valid. The only part that changes is equation (A.6), which used an unconditional version of [Assumption 4](#) to reach identification of $F_{\Delta y(0)}|d_r=1$. Now, this object is identified by the reweighted distribution in [Eq. \(2\)](#). To show that the results obtained in [Theorem 1](#) are still valid what we need to prove is that

$F_{\Delta y(0)|d_r=1} = F_{\Delta y(0)|d_r=1}^p$. To prove it, let us exploit the definition of $F_{\Delta y(0)|d_r=1}$:

$$\begin{aligned} F_{\Delta y(0)|d_r=1} &= \mathbb{P}(\Delta y_t(0) \leq \delta | d_r = 1) \\ &= \frac{\mathbb{P}(\Delta y_t(0) \leq \delta, d_r = 1)}{p_r} \quad (A.8) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &= \mathbb{E} \left(\frac{\mathbb{P}(\Delta y_t(0) \leq \delta, d_r = 1 | X)}{p_r} \right) \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left(\frac{P_r(X)}{p_r} \mathbb{P}(\Delta y_t(0) \leq \delta | d_r = 1, X) \right) \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left(\frac{P_r(X)}{p_r} \mathbb{P}(\Delta y_t(0) \leq \delta | X, C = 1) \right) \quad (A.9) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &= \mathbb{E} \left(\frac{P_r(X)}{p_r} \mathbb{E}[C \mathbb{1}\{\Delta y \leq \delta\} | X, C = 1] \right) \quad (A.10) \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left(\frac{P_r(X)}{p_r(1 - p_r(X))} \mathbb{E}[C \mathbb{1}\{\Delta y_t \leq \delta\} | X] \right) \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left(\frac{C p_r(X)}{p_r(1 - p_r(X))} \mathbb{1}\{\Delta y_t \leq \delta\} \right) \quad (A.11) \end{aligned}$$

where in Equation (A.8) I exploited the definition of conditional probability; Equation (A.9) holds since [Assumption 4](#) holds; in Equation (A.10) I exploited the definition of probability, and then I multiplied by C (this holds since $\mathbb{E}(\cdot)$ is conditionally on $C = 1$). Further, by conditioning on $C = 1$, we can rewrite the potential outcome as the observed outcome. The last equality exploits the Law of Iterated Expectations and concludes the proofs. □

Proof of Proposition 2. The proof of Proposition 2 follows directly from [Theorem 1](#), where now all the steps hold after conditioning on covariates. □

B Appendix B – Additional Results

Table B1: Monte Carlo Results, DGP 1, $\tau = .5$. Setup with $T = R = 4$.

		$n = 100$		$n = 1,000$		
	$F_{y_t(0) d_r=1}^{-1}$	Bias	Root MSE	Bias	Root MSE	
Unc	$QTT_{2,2}$	4	0.097	0.489	0.007	0.15
	$QTT_{2,3}$	5	0.089	0.491	0.009	0.148
	$QTT_{2,4}$	6	0.097	0.492	0.008	0.148
	$QTT_{3,3}$	6	0.087	0.451	0.013	0.133
	$QTT_{3,4}$	7	0.095	0.451	0.012	0.133
	$QTT_{4,4}$	8	0.101	0.416	0.015	0.126

Notes: This table reports the Monte Carlo results the DGP in Eq. (4) in the setup with $T = R = 4$ for the quantile $\tau = .5$. Each Monte Carlo simulation uses 2,000 bootstrap replications. Rows labeled 'UNC' use the estimator based on the unconditional distributional PT assumption that ignores covariates. Finally, $F_{y_t(0)|d_r=1}^{-1}$ represents the true population parameter, whereas 'Bias' and 'RMSE' stand for average (simulated) bias, and root-mean-squared, respectively.

Table B2: Monte Carlo Results, DGP 2, $\tau = .5$. Setup with $T = R = 4$.

		$n = 100$		$n = 1,000$		
	$F_{y_t(0) d_r=1}^{-1}$	Bias	Root MSE	Bias	Root MSE	
Unc	$QTT_{2,2}$	4	0.341	0.684	0.25	0.304
	$QTT_{2,3}$	5	0.344	0.686	0.248	0.303
	$QTT_{2,4}$	6	0.341	0.689	0.248	0.302
	$QTT_{3,3}$	6	0.469	0.723	0.371	0.41
	$QTT_{3,4}$	7	0.47	0.728	0.372	0.41
	$QTT_{4,4}$	8	0.571	0.794	0.479	0.509
Cond	$QTT_{2,2}$	4	0.091	0.515	0.011	0.147
	$QTT_{2,3}$	5	0.099	0.522	0.007	0.147
	$QTT_{2,4}$	6	0.091	0.519	0.005	0.145
	$QTT_{3,3}$	6	0.099	0.508	0.014	0.156
	$QTT_{3,4}$	7	0.098	0.515	0.012	0.151
	$QTT_{4,4}$	8	0.09	0.507	0.007	0.153

Notes: This table reports the Monte Carlo results for all the parameters of the DGP in Eq. (5) in the setup with $T = R = 4$ for the quantile $\tau = .5$. Each Monte Carlo simulation uses 2,000 bootstrap replications. Rows labeled 'UNC' use the estimator based on the unconditional distributional PT assumption that ignores covariates. Finally, $F_{y_t(0)|d_r=1}^{-1}$ represents the true population parameter, whereas 'Bias' and 'RMSE' stand for average (simulated) bias, and root-mean-squared, respectively.