

# Class flipping for uplift modeling and Heterogeneous Treatment Effect estimation on imbalanced RCT data

Krzysztof Rudaś <sup>1,2\*†</sup> and Szymon Jaroszewicz <sup>1,2†</sup>

<sup>1\*</sup>Institute of Computer Science, Polish Academy of Sciences, ul. Jana Kazimierza 5, Warsaw, 01-248, Poland.

<sup>2</sup>Faculty of Mathematics and Information Science, Warsaw University of Technology, ul. Koszykowa 75, Warsaw, 00-662, Poland.

\*Corresponding author(s). E-mail(s): [krzysztof.rudas@ipipan.waw.pl](mailto:krzysztof.rudas@ipipan.waw.pl);

Contributing authors: [szymon.jaroszewicz@ipipan.waw.pl](mailto:szymon.jaroszewicz@ipipan.waw.pl);

†These authors contributed equally to this work.

## Abstract

Uplift modeling and Heterogeneous Treatment Effect (HTE) estimation aim at predicting the causal effect of an action, such as a medical treatment or a marketing campaign on a specific individual. In this paper, we focus on data from Randomized Controlled Experiments which guarantee causal interpretation of the outcomes. Class and treatment imbalance are important problems in uplift modeling/HTE, but classical undersampling or oversampling based approaches are hard to apply in this case since they distort the predicted effect. Calibration methods have been proposed in the past, however, they do not guarantee correct predictions. In this work, we propose an approach alternative to undersampling, based on flipping the class value of selected records. We show that the proposed approach does not distort the predicted effect and does not require calibration. The method is especially useful for models based on class variable transformation (modified outcome models). We address those models separately, designing a transformation scheme which guarantees correct predictions and addresses also the problem of treatment imbalance which is especially important for those models. Experiments fully confirm our theoretical results. Additionally, we demonstrate that our method is a viable alternative also for standard classification problems.

**Keywords:** Class flipping, Heterogenous Treatment effect, Uplift modeling, Class imbalance

# 1 Introduction

Selecting observations that should be targets of an action such as a marketing campaign or a medical treatment is becoming an important problem in machine learning. Noncausal approaches focus on predicting response on a treated group of observations, e.g. customers who received an offer. A new observation is assigned as suitable for action if the predicted outcome is positive (i.e. customer made a purchase). Unfortunately, such approaches ignore the responses which would be observed had the action not been taken.

Randomized Controlled Trials (RCTs) offer a solution to this problem. The population is divided randomly into two parts. The first one, called the *treatment group*, consists of observations that will be targeted. Individuals in the second one, known as the *control group*, are not assigned to the action. Thanks to this we may construct a model calculating the true effect of an action on an individual.

There are two main lines of research on applying machine learning models to experimental data. The first is uplift modeling which is most popular in business applications [26, 28, 32] with the main focus on building best possible models on RCT data. Another line of research comes under the name Heterogeneous Treatment Effect (HTE) estimation [2, 19] and is mainly concerned with nonrandomized experiments, but the methods proposed there are also applicable to RCTs. Learning from nonrandomized data is attractive but relies on hard to verify assumptions such as ‘no unmeasured confounders’. In practice, only random treatment assignment guarantees that the true causal effect is correctly identified. The terms HTE estimation from RCT data and uplift modeling will be used interchangeably in the remaining part of this paper.

We address the problem of class imbalance in uplift modeling/HTE estimation which received very little attention in the literature.

## 1.1 Notation

Let us now introduce the notation used throughout the paper. Scalars and vectors will be denoted with lowercase letters  $x, y$ , and random variables with script letters  $\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}$ . Denote by  $\mathbb{P}$  the population distribution over  $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{W})$ , where  $\mathcal{X}$  is a  $p$ -dimensional vector of features,  $\mathcal{Y} \in \{0, 1\}$  a binary response, and  $\mathcal{W} \in \{C, T\}$  is a random variable, which denotes assignment to one of two groups: treatment ( $T$ ) or control ( $C$ ). Using this notation we may formally define the *conditional average treatment effect* (CATE) also known as *uplift* (i.e. the net effect of an action on an individual described by features  $x$ ) as:

$$\tau(x) = \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{Y} = 1|x, \mathcal{W} = T) - \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{Y} = 1|x, \mathcal{W} = C). \quad (1)$$

Our goal is to build a model predicting  $\tau(x)$  based on a training set  $\{(x_i, y_i, w_i)\}_{i=1}^n$  sampled at random from  $\mathbb{P}$ .

In this paper we assume the treatment assignment to be completely random, so we are guaranteed that assumptions such as strong ignorability [15] are satisfied and the model is causal in nature [12]. Moreover, we have  $\mathcal{X} \perp \mathcal{W}$ .

The paper is organized as follows. In the remaining part of Section 1 we present existing works on uplift modeling and HTE estimation, and position them in the wider context of causal discovery. We also review the works concerning class and treatment imbalance problems in uplift modeling. In Section 2 we introduce our class flipping method and compare it to undersampling in the standard classification setting, and in Section 3 extend it to uplift modeling/HTE estimation. In Section 4 we adapt these results to CVT models: an important class of uplift models very sensitive to class imbalance. In Section 5 we experimentally compare class flipping and undersampling methods. In Section 6 we conclude.

## 1.2 Related Work

Uplift modeling/HTE estimation are part of a broader problem of causal discovery which uses experimental data where an intervention has directly been applied to a subgroup of a population. This is the scenario considered in this paper.

Most papers on uplift modeling concentrate on the classification problem and most HTE estimation papers on regression. Many early methods were based on decision tree construction algorithms [2, 28, 32] which use modified splitting criteria to take into account the difference in responses between treatment groups. Later works extended these results to ensemble methods [11, 33, 35]. Linear models like logistic regression or Support Vector Machines have also been proposed [3, 14, 20, 29–31, 36, 37]. A learning to rank method for uplift modeling has been presented in [8].

A very important group of methods are so called metamodels which adapt standard classifiers to uplift modeling problem [16, 19, 23]. The most popular metamodel is the Two Model approach (called the T-learner in [19]) which builds separate classifiers on the treatment and control groups and subtracts their predictions. Despite criticisms [28] the method often produces excellent results [29].

Another important uplift metamodel is the class variable transformation (CVT) approach [10, 16, 17, 21]. The method is based on reversing the class variable in the control group and concatenating the resulting dataset with the treatment group. It can be shown [16] that any probabilistic classifier built on such a dataset will predict uplift directly. While appealing, the method may have high variance [29] and is very susceptible to class imbalance [25]. The CVT method will thus be addressed separately (Section 4.2) and in Section 5 we will confirm the results of [24] which suggest that the method becomes highly competitive if class imbalance is corrected.

A more complete overview of uplift modeling literature can be found e.g. in [7] and an overview of HTE literature in [22]. We now proceed to discuss literature on imbalanced uplift modeling.

### *Class and treatment imbalance problems.*

Consider a classification problem with two classes 0 and 1. The class imbalance problem occurs when one of the classes (typically class 1) is significantly less frequent than the other. The problem has received significant attention in machine learning literature, see [18] for a thorough overview. The most popular approach is undersampling the majority class such that the imbalance is decreased. Equivalent to undersampling is

assigning lower weights to records in the majority class which avoids data loss (an approach we use in this paper).

Very little work has been devoted to class imbalance in uplift modeling/HTE estimation. In uplift modeling the main research focus has been on treatment imbalance, where one of the treatments is underrepresented; much less attention has been paid to the class imbalance problem. We begin with the review of literature for treatment imbalance problem. In [4] the authors propose two metamodels for uplift modeling and suggest their use in treatment imbalanced scenarios. In our experiments we will use the Dependent Data Representation (DDR) method which is the two model approach where control model’s predictions are used as an additional variable for the treatment model. Olaya et al. [26] discuss the effect of imbalance in treatment group sizes on existing uplift modeling methods.

In [6] the authors combine two estimators based on target variable transformations, such that the resulting estimator is less affected by treatment imbalance (the authors also discuss the case of non-randomized treatment assignment). In [38] a concept of Entire Space Neural Networks was introduced which address the problem of treatment imbalance by learning models for each treatment on the entire dataset. In [34] a method based on the SMOTE [5] algorithm has been combined with propensity score matching to address the problem of class imbalance in non-randomized experiments. The paper does not address the problems we describe in Section 3, so the predicted treatment effects may be distorted.

Most relevant to the current paper are works by Nyberg et al. [24, 25], which are the only works we are aware of addressing the problem of class imbalance in uplift modeling/HTE estimation. The authors were the first to notice an important problem undersampling based methods encounter when applied to uplift modeling.

More specifically, when undersampling is applied, the original class probabilities cannot easily be recovered. When applied to uplift modeling, treatment and control probabilities become inconsistent and the final uplift estimate will not be correct (more details are given in Section 3). In [24, 25] the authors note that in the special case of  $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{Y} = 1) \approx 0$  undersampling can be applied without the problem occurring. In other cases they suggest using cross-validation to select undersampling factors which balance the benefits of imbalance correction against the bias in estimating CATE.

In this work we propose an alternative class imbalance correction method based on class flipping which can be applied to uplift modeling directly.

## 2 Class flipping for standard classification

In this section we introduce the main contribution of this paper which is to correct class imbalance by flipping class values in the majority class. We will begin by showing this concept for ordinary classifiers. We will thus ignore the treatment indicator  $\mathcal{W}$ . Moreover, it will be more convenient to fix the predictors vector at  $x$  and work with the conditional distribution  $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{Y}|\mathcal{X} = x)$ .

## 2.1 Majority class undersampling

Under and oversampling are the most widely used methods for correcting the class imbalance in the classification problem [18]. Most commonly, cases in the majority are undersampled such that the disproportion between classes decreases.

A drawback of this method is that the relationship between the proportion of observations removed and the predicted class probabilities is not straightforward. For example, assume that the majority class is 0 (a typical case) and we randomly remove  $(1 - k) \cdot 100\%$  of observations from that class, where  $0 \leq k \leq 1$  is the undersampling factor (in other words,  $k$  is the proportion of majority class records kept). Denote by  $\mathbb{P}^*$  the distribution which would be obtained from the original distribution  $\mathbb{P}$  if undersampling was applied at the population level.

In the remaining part of the paper we will follow the convention that distributions obtained from  $\mathbb{P}$  through undersampling/record weighting will be denoted with  $\mathbb{P}^*$ .

Class probabilities before and after undersampling are related by the following formula [24]:

$$\mathbb{P}^*(\mathcal{Y} = 0|x) = \frac{k\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{Y} = 0|x)}{\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{Y} = 1|x) + k\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{Y} = 0|x)}. \quad (2)$$

Notice that the relationship is not linear and depends on the (unknown) conditional class probabilities.

Instead of actually undersampling the data one can assign weights  $q_i$  to data records with

$$q_i = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } y_i = 1, \\ k & \text{if } y_i = 0. \end{cases} \quad (3)$$

Weighting typically gives slightly better results, especially when data is scarce.

## 2.2 Class flipping

As an alternative to undersampling, we propose a class flipping based method where, instead of removing samples, their classes are reversed. Suppose that we randomly select  $(1 - k) \cdot 100\%$  observations from class 0 and change their response to 1. At the population level this results in a modified response variable:

$$\check{\mathcal{Y}} = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } \mathcal{Y} = 0 \text{ and } \mathcal{U} \leq k, \\ 1 & \text{if } \mathcal{Y} = 0 \text{ and } \mathcal{U} > k, \\ 1 & \text{if } \mathcal{Y} = 1, \end{cases}$$

where  $\mathcal{U}$  is a random variable uniformly distributed on the interval  $[0, 1]$  independent of  $\mathcal{Y}$  and  $\mathcal{X}$ . Then:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\check{\mathcal{Y}} = 0|x) &= \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{Y} = 0, \mathcal{U} \leq k|x) = \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{Y} = 0|x)\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{U} \leq k) \\ &= k\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{Y} = 0|x). \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

We can see that after flipping, the probability of class 0 changes by the factor  $k$  regardless of its original value so, unlike in the case of undersampling, we have a *simple linear relationship* between the proportion of flipped observations and the change in the probability of class 0. The relationship holds for both conditional and unconditional probabilities.

It can thus be seen that flipping offers an alternative to undersampling for handling class imbalance, with the advantage of easier recovery of original probabilities (Equation 4 vs. Equation 2). In the next section we will see that the advantage becomes much more important in the case of uplift modeling/CATE estimation, where it allows for achieving model identifiability.

***Additional notation.***

In the following sections we will need to flip both classes (0 and 1) and we will now introduce such possibility. The two classes will be flipped using coefficients  $k_0$  and  $k_1$  respectively, and  $\mathcal{Y}$  becomes

$$\check{\mathcal{Y}} = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } \mathcal{Y} = 0 \text{ and } \mathcal{U} \leq k_0, \\ 1 & \text{if } \mathcal{Y} = 0 \text{ and } \mathcal{U} > k_0, \\ 0 & \text{if } \mathcal{Y} = 1 \text{ and } \mathcal{U} > k_1, \\ 1 & \text{if } \mathcal{Y} = 1 \text{ and } \mathcal{U} \leq k_1, \end{cases} \quad (5)$$

where  $k_0, k_1 \in [0, 1]$ . Additionally we require that at least one of  $k_0, k_1$  be equal to one, i.e. we flip cases in only one of the classes.<sup>1</sup> In the remaining part of the article we will clearly state which class is flipped, i.e. whether  $k_0 < 1$  or  $k_1 < 1$ .

***Weighting.***

Recall (Equation 3) that the effects of undersampling can be achieved by record weighting. We now show that the effect of random class flips can be also be obtained by appropriate weighting and duplicating of records. Assume that we are flipping class 0 with factor  $k_0$ . Take the following conditional expectation of some function  $f(x, \check{\mathcal{Y}})$  (e.g. a loss function):

$$\begin{aligned} E_{\check{\mathcal{Y}}}[f(x, \check{\mathcal{Y}})|x] &= f(x, 1)\mathbb{P}(\check{\mathcal{Y}} = 1|x) + f(x, 0)\mathbb{P}(\check{\mathcal{Y}} = 0|x) \\ &= f(x, 1)(1 - k_0\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{Y} = 0|x)) + f(x, 0)k_0\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{Y} = 0|x). \end{aligned}$$

The equation suggests the following scheme: each class 0 record  $(x_i, 0)$  is replaced with two records  $(x_i, 0)$  and  $(x_i, 1)$  with weights respectively  $k_0$  and  $1 - k_0$ . Records in class 1 are unchanged and all get weights equal to 1.

---

<sup>1</sup>In full generality the method could simultaneously flip classes 0 and 1 in different proportions, however it is easy to see that the desired relationship in Equation 4 would no longer hold.

Let us illustrate the procedure on a simple example with two data records:

$$\begin{array}{l} (x_1, y = 1) \\ (x_2, y = 0) \end{array} \quad \text{become} \quad \begin{array}{l} (x_1, y = 1), q_1 = 1 \\ (x_2, y = 0), q_2 = k_0 \\ (x_2, y = 1), q'_2 = 1 - k_0, \end{array}$$

where  $q_i$ 's denote record weights.

### 3 Class flipping for uplift modeling/CATE estimation

Now we return to the main setting of the paper (see Section 1), where the population is randomly divided into treatment and control groups. Recall that the random variable  $\mathcal{W} \in \{C, T\}$  denotes the group an individual was assigned to and our aim is estimating uplift or CATE as defined in Equation 1. We will again fix the predictors vector at  $x$ , and work with triples  $(x, \mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{W})$ , where  $(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{W}) \sim \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{W}|x)$ .

Dealing with class imbalance in uplift modeling is more complicated than in standard classification since the imbalance may need to be corrected differently in the treatment and control groups, i.e. coefficients used in Equation 5 will differ across groups. We denote coefficients used for controls with  $k_0^C, k_1^C$ , and for treatment cases with  $k_0^T, k_1^T$ .

Let us first notice that undersampling generally results in a loss of model identifiability<sup>2</sup>. Indeed, if class 0 is undersampled, applying Equation 2 to the definition of CATE (reusing coefficient naming introduced for flipping) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}^*(\mathcal{Y} = 1|x, \mathcal{W} = T) - \mathbb{P}^*(\mathcal{Y} = 1|x, \mathcal{W} = C) \\ &= \frac{\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{Y} = 1|x, \mathcal{W} = T)}{\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{Y} = 1|x, \mathcal{W} = T) + k_0^T \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{Y} = 0|x, \mathcal{W} = T)} \\ & \quad - \frac{\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{Y} = 1|x, \mathcal{W} = C)}{\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{Y} = 1|x, \mathcal{W} = C) + k_0^C \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{Y} = 0|x, \mathcal{W} = C)}, \end{aligned}$$

from which the original CATE,  $\tau(x)$  cannot be recovered even when  $k_0^T = k_0^C$  since it depends on the unknown response probabilities. More details can be found in [24], where it is also shown that the estimation becomes correct only for  $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{Y} = 1|x) \approx 0$ .

We will now demonstrate that class flipping is free from the above problem and true uplift/CATE,  $\tau(x)$  can be recovered from predictions of an uplift model trained on the flipped class variable  $\check{\mathcal{Y}}$ . Instead of the original  $\tau(x)$  such a model predicts  $\check{\tau}(x)$  given by

$$\check{\tau}(x) = \mathbb{P}(\check{\mathcal{Y}} = 1|x, \mathcal{W} = T) - \mathbb{P}(\check{\mathcal{Y}} = 1|x, \mathcal{W} = C). \quad (6)$$

The first case we consider is when class 0 is the majority class in both groups. Assume  $k_1^C = k_1^T = 1$ ,  $k_0^C = k_0^T = k < 1$ , that is we flip randomly cases from class 0 into class 1 in both groups with equal probabilities. Substituting Equation 4 into Equation 6 we

---

<sup>2</sup>i.e. CATE will not be predicted correctly even when sample size tends to infinity

get

$$\begin{aligned}
\check{\tau}(x) &= 1 - \mathbb{P}(\check{\mathcal{Y}} = 0|x, \mathcal{W} = T) - 1 + \mathbb{P}(\check{\mathcal{Y}} = 0|x, \mathcal{W} = C) \\
&= k_0^C \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{Y} = 0|x, \mathcal{W} = C) - k_0^T \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{Y} = 0|x, \mathcal{W} = T) \\
&= k(1 - \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{Y} = 1|x, \mathcal{W} = C) - 1 + \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{Y} = 1|x, \mathcal{W} = T)) \\
&= k\tau(x).
\end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

The correct  $\tau(x)$  can be recovered after multiplying  $\check{\tau}$  by  $\frac{1}{k}$ . An analogous result easily follows for the case when 1 is the majority class in both groups and  $k_0^C = k_0^T = 1$ ,  $k_1^C = k_1^T = k < 1$ .

For completeness let us consider an unusual situation with different majority classes in treatment and control groups. Without loss of generality consider the case when we flip class 1 observations in the treatment group and class 0 in controls, i.e.  $k_0^T = k_1^C = 1$  and  $k_1^T = k_0^C = k < 1$ . We have

$$\begin{aligned}
\check{\tau}(x) &= \mathbb{P}(\check{\mathcal{Y}} = 1|x, \mathcal{W} = T) - \mathbb{P}(\check{\mathcal{Y}} = 1|x, \mathcal{W} = C) \\
&= \mathbb{P}(\check{\mathcal{Y}} = 1|x, \mathcal{W} = T) - 1 + \mathbb{P}(\check{\mathcal{Y}} = 0|x, \mathcal{W} = C) \\
&= k_1^T \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{Y} = 1|x, \mathcal{W} = T) - 1 + k_0^C \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{Y} = 0|x, \mathcal{W} = C) \\
&= k\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{Y} = 1|x, \mathcal{W} = T) - 1 + k - k\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{Y} = 1|x, \mathcal{W} = C) \\
&= k\tau(x) + k - 1.
\end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

Here  $\tau(x)$  can again be recovered from model predictions using a simple linear transformation.

One remaining question is how to select the factor  $k$ . A simple strategy is to bring class probabilities in both groups as close as possible to  $\frac{1}{2}$ . For ordinary classification the factor  $k = \frac{1}{2\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{Y}=1)}$  achieves this (see Equation 4). In uplift modeling/HTE estimation class probabilities are different in both groups, and we will choose the simplest solution: compute the flipping factor  $k$  based on the average of probabilities of majority classes in both groups:

$$\begin{aligned}
k &= \frac{1}{2 \frac{\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{Y}=m^C|\mathcal{W}=C) + \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{Y}=m^T|\mathcal{W}=T)}{2}} \\
&= \frac{1}{\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{Y} = m^C|\mathcal{W} = C) + \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{Y} = m^T|\mathcal{W} = T)},
\end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

where  $m^C, m^T \in \{0, 1\}$  are the majority classes in, respectively, treatment and control groups.

## 4 Class flipping for the CVT uplift model

In this section we present a class flipping scheme designed specifically for the Class Variable Transformation (CVT) model [16]. Its advantage is that it allows for converting an arbitrary classifier into an uplift model which is trained once on a modified dataset. It is thus simpler than other metamodells, e.g. those found in [19].

The model is addressed separately since it is especially susceptible to class imbalance [24], and has a specific form requiring additional factors to be taken into account. We begin with a short overview of the model, details can be found in [16].

### 4.1 The CVT model and its properties

The CVT model is obtained by flipping the class in the control group, concatenating it with the treatment group and building a single classifier on the combined dataset. It is equivalent to fitting a classifier on a modified class variable defined as

$$\tilde{\mathcal{Y}} = \begin{cases} \mathcal{Y}, & \text{if } \mathcal{W} = T, \\ 1 - \mathcal{Y}, & \text{if } \mathcal{W} = C. \end{cases} \quad (10)$$

To justify the model, assume first that  $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{W} = T) = \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{W} = C) = \frac{1}{2}$ , i.e. treatment and control groups have equal sizes. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\tilde{\mathcal{Y}} = 1|x) &= \mathbb{P}(\tilde{\mathcal{Y}} = 1|x, \mathcal{W} = T)\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{W} = T) + \mathbb{P}(\tilde{\mathcal{Y}} = 1|x, \mathcal{W} = C)\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{W} = C) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} (\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{Y} = 1|x, \mathcal{W} = T) + 1 - \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{Y} = 1|x, \mathcal{W} = C)) = \frac{\tau(x) + 1}{2}, \end{aligned}$$

and  $\tau(x)$  can be recovered from model predictions  $\mathbb{P}(\tilde{\mathcal{Y}} = 1|x)$  using a linear transformation.

When  $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{W} = T) \neq \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{W} = C)$  the authors of [16] suggest, without formal justification, undersampling the more frequent group such that the equality is satisfied. Of course a weighting scheme from Equation 3 can be used instead. We now justify the use of this procedure. Denote by  $\mathbb{P}^*$  the distribution which would be obtained from the original distribution  $\mathbb{P}$  if undersampling (or reweighting) was applied at the population level such that  $\mathbb{P}^*(\mathcal{W} = T) = \mathbb{P}^*(\mathcal{W} = C) = \frac{1}{2}$ . We can repeat the above reasoning to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}^*(\tilde{\mathcal{Y}} = 1|x) &= \frac{1}{2} (\mathbb{P}^*(\mathcal{Y} = 1|x, \mathcal{W} = T) + 1 - \mathbb{P}^*(\mathcal{Y} = 1|x, \mathcal{W} = C)) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} (\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{Y} = 1|x, \mathcal{W} = T) + 1 - \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{Y} = 1|x, \mathcal{W} = C)) = \frac{\tau(x) + 1}{2}, \quad (11) \end{aligned}$$

where equalities  $\mathbb{P}^*(\mathcal{Y} = 1|x, \mathcal{W} = T) = \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{Y} = 1|x, \mathcal{W} = T)$  and  $\mathbb{P}^*(\mathcal{Y} = 1|x, \mathcal{W} = C) = \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{Y} = 1|x, \mathcal{W} = C)$  follow from the fact that undersampling is applied uniformly and independently of  $\mathcal{X}$  and  $\mathcal{Y}$  within each group.

Let us conclude by providing the undersampling proportion  $l$  for the more frequent group. Assume that we have more treatment observations and we randomly remove

$(1 - l)$  proportion of them to balance the groups. Using Equation 2 we get

$$\mathbb{P}^*(\mathcal{W} = T) = \frac{l\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{W} = T)}{l\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{W} = T) + \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{W} = C)}, \quad (12)$$

and solving  $\mathbb{P}^*(\mathcal{W} = T) = \frac{1}{2}$  for  $l$  we get  $l = \frac{\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{W}=C)}{\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{W}=T)}$ . If the size of the control group is higher, we need to resample it with  $l = \frac{\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{W}=T)}{\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{W}=C)}$ .

## 4.2 Correcting class imbalance in the CVT model

Let us first explain why the CVT model is so sensitive to class imbalance [24]. Assume that we have only a small number of class 1 observations in the treatment and control groups. Then the transformed response  $\tilde{\mathcal{Y}}$  is equal to 0 for most observations in the treatment group and equal to 1 for most observations in the control group. This causes  $\tilde{\mathcal{Y}}$  to become highly correlated with  $\mathcal{W}$ , and creates a strong incentive for the classifier built on the combined dataset to focus on random differences between treatment and control groups, not on predicting the true causal effect.

Correcting class imbalance in the CVT model should thus be done in a way which leads to independence between  $\tilde{\mathcal{Y}}$  and  $\mathcal{W}$ , and also balances  $\tilde{\mathcal{Y}}$  as much as possible.

First, class flipping will be applied to correct for class imbalance, transforming the original response  $\mathcal{Y}$  into  $\check{\mathcal{Y}}$  (Equation 5), then Equation 10 is applied to  $\check{\mathcal{Y}}$  resulting in a doubly-transformed class variable which we denote  $\tilde{\check{\mathcal{Y}}}$  (the flipped, transformed response). Moreover, the more frequent group (treatment or control) is undersampled (or weighted) according to Equation 12 so all probabilities will be computed in a modified distribution  $\mathbb{P}^*$ .

Now we will find class flipping factors  $k_0^C, k_1^C, k_0^T, k_1^T$  leading to independence between  $\tilde{\check{\mathcal{Y}}}$  and  $\mathcal{W}$ , which is equivalent to


$$\mathbb{P}^*(\tilde{\check{\mathcal{Y}}} = 1|\mathcal{W} = T) = \mathbb{P}^*(\tilde{\check{\mathcal{Y}}} = 1|\mathcal{W} = C),$$

and (Equation 10) to

$$\mathbb{P}^*(\tilde{\check{\mathcal{Y}}} = 1|\mathcal{W} = T) = \mathbb{P}^*(\tilde{\check{\mathcal{Y}}} = 0|\mathcal{W} = C). \quad (13)$$

The first case we consider is when class 0 is the majority class in both groups:  $k_1^C = k_1^T = 1$ ,  $k_0^C = k_0^T = k < 1$ . This set of coefficients guarantees model identifiability based on Equations 11 and 7:  $\tau(x)$  can be recovered by multiplying model predictions by  $\frac{1}{k}$ . Applying Equation 4 we transform Equation 13 as follows

$$\begin{aligned} 1 - \mathbb{P}^*(\tilde{\check{\mathcal{Y}}} = 0|\mathcal{W} = T) &= \mathbb{P}^*(\tilde{\check{\mathcal{Y}}} = 0|\mathcal{W} = C), \\ 1 - k\mathbb{P}^*(\mathcal{Y} = 0|\mathcal{W} = T) &= k\mathbb{P}^*(\mathcal{Y} = 0|\mathcal{W} = C). \end{aligned}$$



**Fig. 1** Uplift curves and mAUUC for different uplift algorithms on Hillstrom dataset for logistic regression, decision tree and random forest used as base learners

Solving for  $k$  we obtain

$$k = \frac{1}{\mathbb{P}^*(\mathcal{Y} = 0 | \mathcal{W} = T) + \mathbb{P}^*(\mathcal{Y} = 0 | \mathcal{W} = C)}.$$

Notice that this is the same formula as the one given in Equation 9.

When class 1 is the majority class in both groups then analogous reasoning leads to  $k_0^C = k_0^T = 1$ ,  $k_1^C = k_1^T = k < 1$ ,  $k = \frac{1}{\mathbb{P}^*(\mathcal{Y}=1 | \mathcal{W}=T) + \mathbb{P}^*(\mathcal{Y}=1 | \mathcal{W}=C)}$ .


The unusual situation with different majority classes in treatment and control groups is described in Section A in the Appendix.

## 5 Experiments

In this section we will demonstrate the effectiveness of the proposed class flipping method on real data.

### *Datasets.*


Unfortunately, despite numerous applications of RCTs, there are very few publicly available datasets.



**Fig. 2** Uplift curves and mAUUC for different uplift algorithms on Criteo dataset for logistic regression, decision tree and random forest used as base learners

We use three popular benchmark dataset for uplift modeling. The first is the Hillstrom dataset [13], which contains the results of an e-mail campaign for an Internet retailer. The dataset contains information about 64,000 customers who have been randomly split into three groups: the first received an e-mail campaign advertising men’s merchandise, the second a campaign advertising women’s merchandise, and the third was kept as a control. Two target variables are available: visit (whether a person visited the website) and conversion (whether a purchase was made). The first target is moderately imbalanced ( $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{Y} = 1) \approx 0.147$ ), the second is highly imbalanced ( $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{Y} = 1) \approx 0.009$ ). In this paper we use women’s campaign and conversion as a response variable, because of its high class imbalance.

The second dataset used in this work is a large dataset of online advertisements shown to randomly targeted subgroup of users [9], which is rapidly becoming the standard dataset for uplift modeling. We use the second, corrected version of the dataset. The dataset contains 25 million records and 12 features. We use the ‘visit’ target variable which indicates whether the ad was clicked. The minority class 1 constitutes 4.7% of cases. The dataset also features treatment imbalance with control cases constituting only about 15% of the dataset.



**Fig. 3** Uplift curves and mAUUC for different uplift algorithms on the Starbucks dataset for logistic regression, decision tree and random forest used as base learners

The third dataset is simulated data provided by Starbucks which mimics customer behavior during a real rewards campaign.<sup>3</sup> The dataset contains 84534 records and 7 predictors. About 1.2% of responses are positive, making the dataset highly imbalanced.

### *Algorithms.*

All uplift modeling algorithms we use are metamodels, i.e. approaches based on converting standard probabilistic classifiers into uplift models [16, 19].

We focused primarily on the CVT algorithm (see Section 4) as it was most extensively studied by us. We use the version which corrects for imbalance between treatment group sizes, as suggested in [16] and described in Section 4.1.

A second variant of the CVT method (FlippedCVT) is the approach proposed in Section 4.2, which corrects the dependence between target variable and treatment assignment, and is one of the main contributions of the paper.

The most relevant competing method is Stratified Undersampling proposed in [24]. The method applies the same oversampling factor  $k$  in both treatment and control groups. We use a weighting based version of the method. Since undersampling distorts the predicted uplift, [24] suggested using cross-validation to select an optimal factor

---

<sup>3</sup>There are many versions of the dataset, we use a pre-aggregated one from <https://github.com/01KAT1/Marketing-Promotion-Campaign-Uplift-Modelling-Starbucks-Dataset>

*k*. We found this method to perform poorly and select the undersampling factor using Equation 9 instead.

In order to compare with methods designed for treatment imbalance we included the Data Dependent Representation (DDR) method from [4].

### ***Base classifiers.***

Since all uplift models we use are metamodels, they can be applied together with different base classifiers. As base classifiers we use logistic regression, decision trees and random forests. We use implementations from the `scikit-learn` package [27] using default parameters with the following exceptions: logistic regression uses a variable standardization preprocessing step, decision trees and random forests use maximum tree depth of 100. We found that the performance of decision trees and random forests depends heavily on good probability estimates in the leaves. We therefore experimented with different values (0.001, 0.01, 0.05, and 0.1) for the ‘minimum summary weight of records falling into a leaf’ parameter to ensure meaningful probability estimates. The best results were obtained for 0.01 and 0.05 and those values are used most frequently in our experiments (full experimental results can be found in the Appendix). Additionally, bootstrap sampling was disabled for random forests (randomized feature selection was still used) since we found it to significantly degrade performance of all uplift metamodels used. The reason was traced to the fact that bootstrapping can remove a high proportion of records from the minority class.

Different random forest based models will be named `RF_n_α`, where *n* stands for the number of trees in the ensemble and *α* for the minimum leaf weight. For example `RF_10_0.01` denotes a random forest model with 10 trees and each leaf containing at least 1% of data points. Decision trees are named analogously with `DT_α`.

## **5.1 Standard classification problems**

While the main topic of the paper is imbalance in uplift modeling/HTE estimation, the proposed class flipping method is also applicable to standard classification, and, for the sake of completeness, we compared it experimentally to undersampling based approach. Overall, class flipping slightly outperformed undersampling, proving that it is a viable alternative also for classification problems.

While the main topic of the paper is imbalance in uplift modeling/HTE estimation setting, the proposed class flipping method is also applicable to standard classification, and, for the sake of completeness, in this section we compare it experimentally to undersampling the majority class.

We conjecture that flipping will have different properties than undersampling. On the one hand, if the data is linearly separable, flipping will destroy this property; on the other, undersampling changes the overall distribution of predictors (since only once class is sampled and predictor distributions in both classes differ) and flipping does not. Moreover flipping requires a much simpler correction to restore predicted probabilities.

Both flipping and majority undersampling were implemented by reweighting (see Equation 3 and Section 2) the data records, and the correction rate was chosen to completely balance the classes.

Dataset	# minority records	# all records	sampling rate
Artificial	20	1000	—
Breast cancer	5	217	0.015
Diabetes	5	505	0.02
Oil	8	904	0.2
Mammography	26	10949	0.1
Abalone	6	695	0.15
Vowel	9	909	0.1
Vehicle	10	657	0.05
Ionosphere	10	235	0.08

**Table 1** Datasets used for imbalanced classification experiment

The classifiers used are the same as base learners for uplift metamodells described above.

We used several standard benchmark datasets and an artificial dataset generated using `scikit-learn` generator with class separation parameter equal to 1 making the problem moderately difficult. We additionally downsampled the minority class in the benchmark datasets to make them more imbalanced. Table 1 lists all the datasets together with the numbers of all records and records in the minority class. The undersampling rate for the minority class is shown in the last column.

All classifiers were evaluated using 5-fold stratified cross-validation. The procedure has been repeated 1000 times for stability. Table B1 presents the results. For each algorithm and imbalance correction method we give average test set AUROC together with standard deviation. Performance without class imbalance correction is also included.

For a quick summary, the table below gives the number of times (over all datasets/models/model parameters) each undersampling correction method was best.

Method	Num. of wins
None	28
Flipping	58
Undersampling	37

It can be seen that the proposed class flipping was overall the best method and we believe its a viable alternative to undersampling also for standard classification.

Full experimental results can be found in Table B1 in Appendix B.

## 5.2 Evaluation measures

Evaluating uplift models is more challenging than evaluating classifiers due to the Fundamental Problem of Causal Inference: for single records we do not know whether the treatment was really effective. As a result, comparisons can only be made at the level of groups of records. A typical approach to visualize uplift model performance are *uplift curves*. The  $x$  axis of the curve corresponds to the percentage of the population assigned the treatment based on model predictions, and the  $y$  axis to the corresponding estimated net gain per individual in the treated group. Details can be found in [8, 28, 32].

To numerically compare models area under the uplift curve (AUUC) can be used. To make results easier to compare we subtract the area under the diagonal and multiply the result by 1000. This measure was proposed in [24] and called mAUUC.

### 5.3 Uplift/HTE estimation

Now we will show the experiments on class imbalance in uplift modeling/HTE estimation, which are the main topics of this paper.

Figures 1, 2, and 3 show uplift curves for the three benchmark datasets used. For each of the three datasets we used all three types of base learners and five different metamodels: the original CVT model (CVT), the CVT model with class flipping (Flipped CVT), the CVT model with stratified imbalance correction of [24] (Stratified CVT), and the DDR model. Additionally the two model (T-learner) approach is included since it is the most popular uplift modeling technique which often performs very well [29].

The figures presented in this section show results with one parameter setting for decision trees and two parameter settings for random forests (naming conventions are described in the Base Classifiers section above). Experiments with more parameter settings can be found in Section C in the Appendix.

Each curve was computed by splitting the data into training (70%) and test sets (30%) on which the curve was computed. For stability the process was repeated 100 times and the curves averaged (due to performance only 20 iterations were performed on the Criteo dataset). The legends show the average mAUUC for each model.

Based on the figures, we may conclude that the (Flipped CVT) method introduced in this paper performs very well. It always outperforms the Stratified Undersampling based correction of CVT which in turn always outperforms the original CVT model. The two model approach remains a strong contender in many situations, but is often outperformed by Flipped CVT. Specifically, it is never the top performer on the Criteo dataset. The DDR model performs erratically, sometimes giving very good and sometimes poor results.

## 6 Conclusions

This paper introduces a novel class imbalance correction method for uplift modeling/HTE estimation based on flipping the class label in the majority class. The approach has the advantage that conditional class probabilities can be recovered through linear transformations which guarantees causal model identifiability. We separately address the CVT uplift algorithm where class flipping leads to great improvements in performance, and allows the CVT approach to compete with other metamodels.

## References

- [1] Agresti A (1990) Categorical data analysis. Wiley, New York

- [2] Athey S, Imbens G (2016) Recursive partitioning for heterogeneous causal effects. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 113(27):7353–7360
- [3] Belloni A, Chernozhukov V, Hansen C (2014) High-dimensional methods and inference on structural and treatment effects. *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 28(2):1–23
- [4] Betlei A, Diemert E, Amini MR (2018) Uplift prediction with dependent feature representation in imbalanced treatment and control conditions. In: *Proc. of the 25th Conf. on Neural Information Processing (ICONIP'18)*. Springer International Publishing, Heidelberg, pp 47–57
- [5] Chawla NV, Bowyer KW, O'Hall L, et al (2002) SMOTE: synthetic minority over-sampling technique. *Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research* pp 321–357
- [6] Chen X, Liu Z, Yu L, et al (2022) Imbalance-aware uplift modeling for observational data. *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence* 36(6):6313–6321
- [7] Devriendt F, Moldovan D, Verbeke W (2018) A literature survey and experimental evaluation of the state-of-the-art in uplift modeling: A stepping stone toward the development of prescriptive analytics. *Big Data* 6(1):13–41
- [8] Devriendt F, Van Belle J, Guns T, et al (2020) Learning to rank for uplift modeling. *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering* Early access
- [9] Diemert E, Betlei A, Renaudin C, et al (2018) A large scale benchmark for uplift modeling. In: *Proceedings of the AdKDD and TargetAd Workshop, KDD, London, United Kingdom, August, 20, 2018*. ACM, New York
- [10] Gubela RM, Lessmann S, Jaroszewicz S (2020) Response transformation and profit decomposition for revenue uplift modeling. *European Journal of Operational Research* 283(2):647–661
- [11] Guelman L, Guillén M, Pérez-Marín A (2012) Random forests for uplift modeling: An insurance customer retention case. In: *Modeling and Simulation in Engineering, Economics and Management, Lecture Notes in Business Information Processing (LNBIP)*, vol 115. Springer, Heidelberg, p 123–133
- [12] Hernán M, Robins J (2025) *Causal Inference: What If*. Boca Raton: Chapman & Hall/CRC, Boca Raton, forthcoming
- [13] Hillstrom K (2008) The MineThatData e-mail analytics and data mining challenge. MineThatData blog, <http://blog.minethatdata.com/2008/03/minethatdata-e-mail-analytics-and-data.html>, retrieved on 12.12.2024

- [14] Imai K, Ratkovic M (2013) The annals of applied statistics. Estimating treatment effect heterogeneity in randomized program evaluation 7:443–470
- [15] Imbens G, Rubin D (2015) Causal Inference for Statistics, Social, and Biomedical Sciences: An Introduction. Cambridge University Press, New York, NY, USA
- [16] Jaśkowski M, Jaroszewicz S (2012) Uplift modeling for clinical trial data. In: ICML 2012 Workshop on Machine Learning for Clinical Data Analysis, Edinburgh
- [17] Kane K, Lo VSY, Zheng J (2014) Mining for the truly responsive customers and prospects using true-lift modeling: Comparison of new and existing methods. *Journal of Marketing Analytics* 2(4):218–238
- [18] Kaur H, Pannu HS, Malhi AK (2019) A systematic review on imbalanced data challenges in machine learning: Applications and solutions. *ACM Computing Surveys (CSUR)* 52(4):1–36
- [19] Künzel SR, Sekhon JS, Bickel PJ, et al (2019) Metalearners for estimating heterogeneous treatment effects using machine learning. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 116(10):4156–4165. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1804597116>
- [20] Kuusisto F, Santos Costa V, Nassif H, et al (2014) Support vector machines for differential prediction. In: ECML-PKDD
- [21] Lai LYT (2006) Influential marketing: A new direct marketing strategy addressing the existence of voluntary buyers. Master’s thesis, Simon Fraser University
- [22] Lipkovich I, Svensson D, Ratitch B, et al (2024) Modern approaches for evaluating treatment effect heterogeneity from clinical trials and observational data. *Stat Med*
- [23] Nie X, Wager S (2020) Quasi-oracle estimation of heterogeneous treatment effects. *Biometrika* 108(2):299–319
- [24] Nyberg O, Klami A (2023) Exploring uplift modeling with high class imbalance. *Data Min Knowl Disc* pp 736–766
- [25] Nyberg O, Kuśmierczyk T, Klami A (2021) Uplift modeling with high class imbalance. In: *Proceedings of the 13th Asian conference on machine learning*, Bangkok, pp 315–330
- [26] Olaya D, Coussement K, Verbeke W (2020) A survey and benchmarking study of multitreatment uplift modeling. *Data Mining and Knowledge Discovery* 34:273–308
- [27] Pedregosa F, Varoquaux G, Gramfort A, et al (2011) Scikit-learn: Machine learning in Python. *Journal of Machine Learning Research* 12:2825–2830

- [28] Radcliffe NJ, Surry PD (2011) Real-world uplift modelling with significance-based uplift trees. Portrait Technical Report TR-2011-1, Stochastic Solutions
- [29] Rudas K, Jaroszewicz S (2018) Linear regression for uplift modeling. *Data Mining and Knowledge Discovery* 32(5):1275–1305
- [30] Rudas K, Jaroszewicz S (2019) Shrinkage estimators for uplift regression. In: *European Conference on Machine Learning and Principles and Practice of Knowledge Discovery in Databases (ECML/PKDD’19)*, Würzburg, Germany
- [31] Rudas K, Jaroszewicz S (2023) Regularization for uplift regression. In: *European Conference on Machine Learning and Principles and Practice of Knowledge Discovery in Databases (ECML/PKDD’23)*, Torino, Italy
- [32] Rzepakowski P, Jaroszewicz S (2011) Decision trees for uplift modeling with single and multiple treatments. *Knowledge and Information Systems*
- [33] Soltys M, Jaroszewicz S, Rzepakowski P (2015) Ensemble methods for uplift modeling. *Data Mining and Knowledge Discovery* 29(6):1531–1559
- [34] Vairetti C, Marfán MJ, Maldonado S (2024) Dealing with class imbalance in uplift modeling - efficient data preprocessing via oversampling and matching. *IEEE Access*
- [35] Wager S, Athey S (2018) Estimation and inference of heterogeneous treatment effects using random forests. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 113(523):1228–1242
- [36] Zaniewicz L, Jaroszewicz S (2013) Support vector machines for uplift modeling. In: *The First IEEE ICDM Workshop on Causal Discovery (CD 2013)*, Dallas
- [37] Zaniewicz L, Jaroszewicz S (2017)  $l_p$ -support vector machines for uplift modeling. *Knowledge and Information Systems* 53(1):269–296
- [38] Zhong K, Xiao F, Ren Y, et al (2022) DESCN: Deep entire space cross networks for individual treatment effect estimation. In: *Proceedings of the 28th ACM SIGKDD Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining (KDD’22)*, New York, NY, USA, pp 4612–4620

## Appendix A Class flipping to the CVT model for different treatment/control majority classes

We now examine to possibility of achieving independence between  $\tilde{\mathcal{Y}}$  and  $\mathcal{W}$  in the CVT model in the unusual case when the majority classes in treatment and control groups differ. Suppose we flip class 1 observations in the treatment group and class 0

in controls, i.e.  $k_0^T = k_1^C = 1$  and  $k_1^T = k_0^C = k < 1$ . The last equality is necessary for model identifiability, see Equation 8. Equation 13 becomes

$$k\mathbb{P}^*(\mathcal{Y} = 1|\mathcal{W} = T) = k\mathbb{P}^*(\mathcal{Y} = 0|\mathcal{W} = C),$$

which is satisfiable only in the special case when  $\mathbb{P}^*(\mathcal{Y} = 1|\mathcal{W} = T) = \mathbb{P}^*(\mathcal{Y} = 0|\mathcal{W} = C)$ , which means that independence of  $\tilde{\mathcal{Y}}$  and  $\mathcal{W}$  cannot, in general, be achieved.

One may now ask which value of  $k$  minimizes the dependence according to some measure. We chose the absolute value of the log-odds-ratio [1] given by

$$L(k) = \left| \log \frac{\frac{\mathbb{P}^*(\tilde{\mathcal{Y}}=1|\mathcal{W}=T)}{\mathbb{P}^*(\tilde{\mathcal{Y}}=0|\mathcal{W}=T)}}{\frac{\mathbb{P}^*(\tilde{\mathcal{Y}}=1|\mathcal{W}=C)}{\mathbb{P}^*(\tilde{\mathcal{Y}}=0|\mathcal{W}=C)}} \right| = \left| \log \frac{\frac{\mathbb{P}^*(\tilde{\mathcal{Y}}=1|\mathcal{W}=T)}{\mathbb{P}^*(\tilde{\mathcal{Y}}=0|\mathcal{W}=T)}}{\frac{\mathbb{P}^*(\tilde{\mathcal{Y}}=0|\mathcal{W}=C)}{\mathbb{P}^*(\tilde{\mathcal{Y}}=1|\mathcal{W}=C)}} \right|,$$

which is equal to zero iff independence is achieved. We will now find the minimum of the function for  $0 < k < 1$ .

Recall that we assume  $k = k_1^T = k_0^C$ , and denote  $a = \mathbb{P}^*(\mathcal{Y} = 1|\mathcal{W} = T)$ ,  $b = \mathbb{P}^*(\mathcal{Y} = 0|\mathcal{W} = C)$ . Now

$$L(k) = \left| \log \frac{\frac{ka}{1-ka}}{\frac{kb}{1-kb}} \right| = \left| \log \left( \frac{a}{1-ka} \right) - \log \left( \frac{b}{1-kb} \right) \right|,$$

and its derivative:

$$\frac{d}{dk} L(k) = \text{sign} \left\{ \log \frac{\frac{a}{1-ka}}{\frac{b}{1-kb}} \right\} \left( \frac{a}{1-ka} - \frac{b}{1-kb} \right).$$

Notice that the signs of  $\frac{a}{1-ka} - \frac{b}{1-kb}$  and  $\log \frac{\frac{a}{1-ka}}{\frac{b}{1-kb}}$  are the same so  $\frac{d}{dk} L(k) > 0$  for  $k \in (0, 1)$ . The minimum is thus obtained when  $k \rightarrow 0$  which is not a usable solution since it would lead to instances of only one class being present.

As a result, class flipping should not be used with the CVT method when treatment and control majority classes differ. Luckily in real life these scenarios occur very rarely.

## Appendix B Experiments on standard classification problems

Table B1 gives results for the class flipping and majority undersampling for classification problems.

## Appendix C Additional experiments

In this part, we show the results of complete experiments for the uplift modeling problem which did not fit in the main text. We consider the same set of uplift algorithms

Model	Method	Artificial	Breast	Diabetes	Oil	Mammogr.	Abalone	Vowel	Vehicle	Ionosphere
Logistic	None	0.8465±0.11	0.9970±0.01	0.6693±0.26	0.9749±0.04	0.9464±0.06	0.5842±0.24	<b>0.9558±0.02</b>	0.9738±0.02	0.6849±0.24
	Flipping	<b>0.8704±0.10</b>	0.9936±0.01	0.6972±0.26	<b>0.9917±0.01</b>	0.9194±0.08	<b>0.7905±0.12</b>	0.9855±0.01	<b>0.9849±0.01</b>	<b>0.7158±0.28</b>
	Under	0.8347±0.10	<b>0.9989±0.00</b>	<b>0.7318±0.20</b>	0.9761±0.03	<b>0.9480±0.06</b>	0.5797±0.24	0.9664±0.02	0.9333±0.05	0.7005±0.24
RF n=10 n=0.001	None	<b>0.8804±0.09</b>	0.9775±0.09	0.5175±0.15	<b>0.7929±0.20</b>	0.8512±0.11	<b>0.5285±0.15</b>	0.9464±0.12	0.6262±0.16	<b>0.9436±0.10</b>
	Flipping	0.8786±0.11	<b>0.9891±0.05</b>	<b>0.5417±0.21</b>	0.7616±0.25	0.8404±0.13	0.5258±0.18	<b>0.9523±0.13</b>	<b>0.6503±0.17</b>	0.9434±0.11
	Under	0.8448±0.10	0.9108±0.19	0.5021±0.21	0.7851±0.21	<b>0.8611±0.11</b>	0.4840±0.07	0.8847±0.15	0.6276±0.17	0.9165±0.12
RF n=10 n=0.01	None	0.8775±0.10	0.9452±0.15	0.6301±0.25	0.9107±0.14	0.9210±0.08	0.5957±0.20	<b>0.9931±0.02</b>	0.7672±0.17	0.9431±0.10
	Flipping	<b>0.8782±0.10</b>	<b>0.9784±0.08</b>	<b>0.6909±0.27</b>	<b>0.9114±0.15</b>	<b>0.9294±0.07</b>	<b>0.6011±0.22</b>	0.9923±0.02	<b>0.7730±0.16</b>	<b>0.9510±0.10</b>
	Under	0.8677±0.10	0.9548±0.14	0.4973±0.19	0.8615±0.18	0.9140±0.08	0.4683±0.11	0.9814±0.05	0.7366±0.17	0.9320±0.11
RF n=10 n=0.05	None	0.8882±0.09	<b>0.9944±0.01</b>	0.8047±0.18	0.9387±0.05	0.9120±0.08	0.3997±0.22	0.9915±0.01	0.8688±0.11	0.9119±0.14
	Flipping	<b>0.8910±0.09</b>	<b>0.9944±0.01</b>	<b>0.8249±0.17</b>	<b>0.9369±0.05</b>	0.9168±0.08	0.4138±0.23	<b>0.9948±0.01</b>	<b>0.8717±0.10</b>	0.9163±0.13
	Under	0.8708±0.10	0.9917±0.02	0.7821±0.22	0.9402±0.08	<b>0.9275±0.08</b>	<b>0.4388±0.20</b>	0.9891±0.01	0.8220±0.16	<b>0.9231±0.12</b>
RF n=10 n=0.1	None	<b>0.8844±0.08</b>	0.9912±0.01	0.7522±0.18	0.9250±0.07	0.9153±0.09	0.3972±0.20	0.9790±0.02	0.8381±0.15	0.9197±0.11
	Flipping	0.8861±0.09	0.9913±0.01	0.7337±0.17	<b>0.9275±0.06</b>	0.9138±0.09	0.4044±0.19	0.9794±0.02	0.8361±0.15	0.9172±0.11
	Under	0.8669±0.09	<b>0.9920±0.02</b>	<b>0.7549±0.20</b>	0.9193±0.10	<b>0.9234±0.08</b>	<b>0.4260±0.21</b>	<b>0.9883±0.01</b>	<b>0.8503±0.12</b>	<b>0.9272±0.11</b>
RF n=100 n=0.001	None	0.8902±0.10	0.9948±0.01	0.6380±0.24	<b>0.9418±0.11</b>	0.9004±0.09	<b>0.5607±0.22</b>	<b>0.9976±0.01</b>	0.7809±0.16	0.9434±0.11
	Flipping	<b>0.8952±0.10</b>	<b>0.9950±0.01</b>	0.6274±0.25	0.9287±0.14	<b>0.9021±0.10</b>	0.5485±0.25	0.9955±0.03	<b>0.8061±0.15</b>	<b>0.9448±0.11</b>
	Under	0.8764±0.10	0.9803±0.08	<b>0.6689±0.26</b>	0.9390±0.12	0.8881±0.10	0.4879±0.15	0.9958±0.01	0.7589±0.17	0.9385±0.12
RF n=100 n=0.01	None	0.8765±0.11	0.9945±0.01	0.7891±0.22	0.9677±0.06	0.9267±0.08	0.5970±0.25	0.9928±0.01	<b>0.8522±0.11</b>	0.9437±0.11
	Flipping	<b>0.8806±0.10</b>	<b>0.9948±0.01</b>	<b>0.7955±0.19</b>	<b>0.9678±0.05</b>	<b>0.9306±0.07</b>	<b>0.5994±0.26</b>	0.9936±0.01	0.8517±0.10	<b>0.9486±0.11</b>
	Under	0.8787±0.10	0.9728±0.10	0.6786±0.27	0.9589±0.06	0.9272±0.08	0.4869±0.21	<b>0.9947±0.01</b>	0.8237±0.14	0.9339±0.13
RF n=100 n=0.05	None	0.8974±0.09	<b>0.9947±0.01</b>	0.7915±0.21	<b>0.9535±0.04</b>	0.9199±0.08	0.5332±0.22	0.9948±0.01	0.8714±0.10	0.9168±0.15
	Flipping	<b>0.8995±0.09</b>	<b>0.9947±0.01</b>	<b>0.8026±0.19</b>	0.9534±0.04	0.9212±0.08	<b>0.5447±0.22</b>	0.9951±0.01	<b>0.8735±0.10</b>	0.9176±0.14
	Under	0.8854±0.10	<b>0.9947±0.01</b>	0.7443±0.22	0.9462±0.06	<b>0.9255±0.08</b>	0.5005±0.24	<b>0.9952±0.01</b>	0.8675±0.09	<b>0.9183±0.16</b>
RF n=100 n=0.1	None	<b>0.8877±0.09</b>	0.9937±0.01	<b>0.7600±0.17</b>	0.9282±0.07	0.9206±0.09	0.4331±0.23	0.9820±0.02	0.8711±0.09	0.9110±0.13
	Flipping	0.8866±0.09	0.9940±0.01	0.7597±0.17	0.9278±0.07	0.9206±0.09	0.4350±0.24	0.9814±0.02	<b>0.8713±0.09</b>	0.9132±0.12
	Under	0.8822±0.09	<b>0.9947±0.01</b>	0.7272±0.24	<b>0.9299±0.07</b>	<b>0.9238±0.09</b>	<b>0.4414±0.23</b>	<b>0.9955±0.01</b>	0.8633±0.10	<b>0.9296±0.13</b>
DT n=100 n=0.001	None	<b>0.8315±0.10</b>	0.7386±0.25	0.4978±0.04	<b>0.6127±0.17</b>	0.6473±0.13	0.4950±0.01	<b>0.8030±0.18</b>	0.5256±0.08	0.7616±0.17
	Flipping	0.8269±0.11	<b>0.7931±0.24</b>	0.4948±0.07	0.5920±0.20	0.6193±0.17	0.4989±0.06	0.7875±0.21	<b>0.5293±0.09</b>	<b>0.7922±0.17</b>
	Under	0.6212±0.10	0.7426±0.25	<b>0.5006±0.05</b>	0.5693±0.14	<b>0.6811±0.14</b>	<b>0.5119±0.09</b>	0.7081±0.19	0.5118±0.07	0.6117±0.15
DT n=100 n=0.01	None	<b>0.8460±0.10</b>	0.7963±0.24	<b>0.5696±0.19</b>	0.7175±0.20	0.8362±0.11	0.4849±0.03	0.8238±0.17	0.5766±0.13	0.7686±0.18
	Flipping	<b>0.8460±0.10</b>	<b>0.8444±0.22</b>	0.5509±0.20	<b>0.7270±0.24</b>	0.8322±0.13	0.4887±0.07	<b>0.8268±0.20</b>	<b>0.5849±0.18</b>	<b>0.7925±0.15</b>
	Under	0.7966±0.11	0.8179±0.24	0.4964±0.05	0.6523±0.20	<b>0.8746±0.11</b>	<b>0.4895±0.03</b>	0.8182±0.19	0.5377±0.10	0.6602±0.15
DT n=100 n=0.05	None	0.8415±0.11	<b>0.8844±0.20</b>	0.7992±0.24	<b>0.8289±0.18</b>	0.8788±0.09	0.5370±0.20	<b>0.9617±0.07</b>	0.7053±0.16	0.8149±0.16
	Flipping	0.8489±0.11	0.8798±0.25	<b>0.8013±0.27</b>	0.8250±0.20	0.8798±0.09	<b>0.5499±0.27</b>	<b>0.9617±0.07</b>	<b>0.7224±0.19</b>	0.7774±0.18
	Under	<b>0.8556±0.10</b>	0.8179±0.24	0.4959±0.13	0.7609±0.21	<b>0.9030±0.09</b>	0.4692±0.02	0.9330±0.12	0.5834±0.12	<b>0.8477±0.16</b>
DT n=100 n=0.1	None	0.8603±0.08	0.9573±0.02	<b>0.7891±0.17</b>	<b>0.8781±0.15</b>	0.8641±0.09	<b>0.4749±0.18</b>	<b>0.9540±0.01</b>	0.8101±0.16	0.8662±0.15
	Flipping	<b>0.8710±0.08</b>	<b>0.9583±0.02</b>	0.7847±0.20	0.8748±0.17	0.8638±0.09	0.4735±0.24	<b>0.9540±0.01</b>	<b>0.8132±0.17</b>	0.8348±0.17
	Under	0.8667±0.10	0.8179±0.24	0.5503±0.22	0.8238±0.17	<b>0.9006±0.09</b>	0.4736±0.19	0.9338±0.12	0.7266±0.14	<b>0.8677±0.15</b>

**Table B1** Effects of different class imbalance corrections classifier performance. The Method column gives the methods used to correct class imbalance: undersampling, flipping or none. For random forests  $n$  denotes the number of trees in the ensemble. For forest and tree models the number below method name is the value of the ‘minimum summary weight of records falling into a leaf’ parameter controlling the number of records in tree leaves


and only change the parameters of base classifiers. Values of 'minimum summary weight of records falling into a leaf' in tree-based algorithms are chosen from a set 0.001, 0.01, 0.05, 0.1 (charts for 0.05 are in the main text) and the number of trees in the random forest is 10 or 100. Results are shown for all possible combinations of parameters for all datasets. The only exception is the Criteo dataset we do not consider random forest with 100 trees and 'minimum summary weight' parameter equal to 0.001 due to computational constraints.

In Figure C1 we show results for the Hillstrom dataset. We observe that the proposed **Flipped CVT** method outperforms other variants of the CVT model. We also note poor results for the smallest value of 'minimum summary weight' parameter. It is caused by the fact that the dataset has only 42693 and the decision trees have too few cases in the leaves to obtain meaningful probability estimates which leads to overfitting.


In Figure C2 we show analogous results for the Criteo dataset. We observe that the **Flipped CVT** algorithm always achieves the best performance. We no longer observe problems with too small a value of the 'minimum summary weight' parameter thanks to the huge size of the dataset.

For the Starbucks dataset (Figure C3) we note that **Flipped CVT** algorithm performs well for bigger values of 'minimum summary weight' parameter. Most of the algorithms achieve the best results for higher values of this parameter, but all of them have worse results than **Flipped CVT** method.


Overall, based on the experiments, we recommend the class flipping approach for uplift modeling with highly imbalanced datasets.



**Fig. C1** Uplift curves and mAUUC for different uplift algorithms on Hillstrom dataset for decision tree and random forest used as base learners



**Fig. C2** Uplift curves and mAUUC for different uplift algorithms on Criteo dataset for decision tree and random forest used as base learners



**Fig. C3** Uplift curves and mAUUC for different uplift algorithms on the Starbucks dataset for decision tree and random forest used as base learners