

Collaborative Design of Controlled Experiments in the Presence of Subject Covariates

William Fisher¹, Qiong Zhang¹, Lulu Kang², and Xinwei Deng³

¹School of Mathematical and Statistical Sciences, Clemson University

²Department of Mathematics and Statistics, University of Massachusetts Amherst

³Department of Statistics, Virginia Tech

Abstract

We consider the optimal experimental design problem of allocating subjects to treatment or control when subjects participate in multiple, separate controlled experiments within a short time-frame and subject covariate information is available. Here, in addition to subject covariates, we consider the dependence among the responses coming from the subject's random effect across experiments. In this setting, the goal of the allocation is to provide precise estimates of treatment effects for each experiment. Deriving the precision matrix of the treatment effects and using *D-optimality* as our allocation criterion, we demonstrate the advantage of *collaboratively* designing and analyzing multiple experiments over traditional *independent* design and analysis, and propose two randomized algorithms to provide solutions to the D-optimality problem for collaborative design. The first algorithm decomposes the D-optimality problem into a sequence of subproblems, where each subproblem is a quadratic binary program that can be solved through a semi-definite relaxation based randomized algorithm with performance guarantees. The second algorithm involves solving a single semi-definite program, and randomly generating allocations for each experiment from the solution of this program. We showcase the performance of these algorithms through a simulation study, finding that our algorithms outperform covariate-agnostic methods when there are a large number of covariates.

Keywords: D-optimality; Greedy Algorithm; Mixed Effects Model; Semi-definite Programming

1 Introduction

Controlled experiments are a form of experiment that allows one to analyze a proposed treatment by comparing responses between a treatment group and control group. For example, a pharmaceutical company may design a new drug to decrease blood pressure. They would begin by gathering a group of subjects and randomly allocating one part of the group to receive the new drug (treatment), whereas the other part of the group does not receive the drug (control). Blood pressure would then be recorded and compared between the two groups and analyzed using a statistical test to decide if further investigation needed. More broadly, controlled experiments facilitate analysis and decision making in a wide range of areas such as healthcare (Lyngbakken et al., 2020), transportation (Skippon et al., 2016), and business (Koning et al., 2022). Research groups or organizations may run multiple, separate controlled experiments with subjects participating in more than one experiment (Xu et al., 2015; Ostrow et al., 2016). Having subjects participate in multiple experiments may occur when the subject pool is limited and researchers decide against partitioning the subject pool into separate experiments due to concerns about smaller sample sizes in each experiment or when subjects are on a platform where potentially hundreds of different experiments are being ran within a short time frame (Kohavi et al., 2013). Due to each subject participating in multiple experiments, there is dependence among the responses. In addition, there are often certain subject covariates (such as age, height, income, etc.) which may influence the subject’s response. These two sources of information, across-experiment response-dependence and subject covariates, should be taken into account when analyzing results across multiple experiments. Consequently, this information should also be utilized in the experiment design phase where subjects are allocated to treatment or control within each experiment in order to provide more precise estimates of treatment effects for each experiment.

Optimal design of experiments (Pukelsheim, 2006) offers a framework to design these separate experiments so that there is more precision in estimated treatment effects when the experiments are analyzed together. One commonly used criterion for constructing experimental designs is *D-efficiency* (Pukelsheim, 2006), which is equivalent to the K th root of the determinant of the estimated treatment effects’ precision matrix, assuming there are K separate experiments. This quantity is inversely related to the volume of the confidence region of the treatment effects. Thus, finding experimental designs with high D-efficiency leads to a resulting confidence region with lower volume and consequently more precise treatment effect estimates. This problem is known as the *D-optimality* problem. By taking into consideration the dependence between subject responses across experiments, we may model the separate controlled experiments jointly and derive the precision matrix of the estimated treatment effects. This precision matrix is a function of the allocations for each of the K experiments which characterizes the relationship between allocation in each experiment,

across-experiment response-dependence, subject covariates, and estimated treatment effect precision. Solving the D-optimality problem will then determine the manner in which we allocate subjects to treatment or control for each of the experiments so as to strike a balance between covariate balancing (Li et al., 2018) within experiments and orthogonality of allocations across experiments to achieve maximal precision.

Other works consider the problem of designing controlled experiments in the presence of subject covariates and dependence structures. Bertsimas et al. (2015) consider the problem of designing a single controlled experiment in the presence of subject covariates and propose a parameteric mixed integer linear program to balance covariates across treatment and control by minimizing discrepancy in the first and second moments of the subject covariates in treatment and control. Bhat et al. (2020) consider both offline and online allocation of subjects to treatment or control for a single experiment in order to maximize precision of the treatment effect, proposing the use of a well known semi-definite program (SDP) relaxation based randomized algorithm for the offline problem and a dynamic programming approach for the online problem. Zhang et al. (2022) study optimal allocation of subjects to treatment and control for two-armed trials in the presence of covariate information with the goal of providing personalized decisions in precision medicine. Their problem is more challenging than the offline problem of Bhat et al. (2020) due to interaction between treatment and subject covariates in their setting. They propose approximating their problem with a surrogate problem and optimizing over the surrogate problem to allocate subjects to treatment or control. Li et al. (2023) consider the generalized problem studied in Zhang et al. (2022) where there are multiple treatments composed of binary factors interacting with subject covariates. They utilize a mixed binary SDP to solve the E-optimality problem (Boyd and Vandenberghe, 2004) in order to allocate subjects to different treatments. Zhang and Kang (2022) consider the problem of optimal allocation in *network* A/B testing, where there is a dependence among subject responses coming from an underlying social network. Due to the presence of an unknown network parameter in their optimization criterion, they propose a locally optimal design that achieves covariate balance and network connection balance in the allocation of subjects to treatment and control. Rerandomization (Morgan and Rubin, 2012) and matching/weighting methods (Imai and Ratkovic, 2014) are other commonly used techniques to achieve covariate balance in controlled experiments. Lastly, although they did not consider the design problem, the work which is most similar to our setting is Zhang et al. (2024), which investigated the case when there are two experiments having subjects involved in both experiments, but without subject covariates. They proposed a collaborative analysis framework to efficiently analyze the treatment effects in such paired experiments, and showed that their framework provides more precise estimates of treatment effects than analyzing the experiments separately. They stated that the problem of collaborative experimental design of multiple experiments in the presence of subject covariates is a problem of interest. Our work here is the first to address this problem.

Our contributions to experimental design in the presence of subject covariates are as follows: First, we consider the problem of designing multiple experiments simultaneously, taking into consideration not only subject covariates but also the dependence between observations due to subjects having multiple responses across experiments. This problem is in the same spirit as problems such as design for network A/B testing (Zhang and Kang, 2022) and design of experiments under spatial correlation (Martin, 1986), where there is a dependence structure among responses that should be accounted for in the experiment design process. Second, we show that if multiple, separate experiments are to be conducted on the same subject pool, then in the best case scenario more precise estimates of treatment effects in each experiment can be attained by collaboratively designing the experiments compared to if we designed and analyzed the experiments as though they were independent. We also demonstrate the importance of both covariate balancing and orthogonality in the design problem, as designs which do not have the latter property will be less D-efficient. Furthermore, in the setting where orthogonality is completely ignored, we show that the variances of treatment effects under collaborative analysis is equal to the variances of treatment effects if one were to analyze the experiments independently. Thus we emphasize the need for collaborative design if one decides to collaboratively analyze experiments. Third, we propose two algorithms for solving the D-optimality problem in our setting. The first is a greedy algorithm where each subproblem in the greedy algorithm can be solved through a well known SDP relaxation based randomized algorithm (Ben-Tal and Nemirovski, 2001) with guarantees on the quality of the solution. Solving each subproblem using the SDP relaxation based randomized algorithm, we are able to randomly allocate subjects to treatment or control in a manner that is guided by our design objective of D-efficiency. The second algorithm involves solving a single SDP which is the same SDP as the first subproblem in our greedy algorithm, and randomly generating allocations for all experiments using the solution to this one SDP. This second algorithm is computationally more efficient than the first algorithm, and its use is justified by the insight that the gap in precision attained by designing separately and designing collaboratively tends to zero as the number of experiments increases.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows: In Section 2 we introduce a mixed-effects model (Dobson and Barnett, 2018), which contains treatment/control-specific fixed effects, subject covariates, and subject-specific random effects, to facilitate joint modeling of the separate experiments. We derive the precision matrix of the treatment effects under this mixed-effects model, and analyze the effects of designing and analyzing the experiments independently or collaboratively on the precision. Section 3 introduces two randomized algorithms for constructing D-efficient experimental designs in the collaborative design and analysis framework. In Section 4, we demonstrate the performance of our algorithms in constructing D-efficient designs and reducing the variance of individual treatment effect estimates in a simulation study where we vary the number of experiments, the level of noise in the subject-specific random effects, and the

number of covariates. Lastly, Section 5 provides concluding remarks and future directions.

2 Collaborative Design of Multiple Controlled Experiments

2.1 Precision Matrix and Optimality Criteria

Mixed-effects modeling (Dobson and Barnett, 2018) is a form of statistical modeling that, among many other use cases, allows one to model dependence between responses by incorporating random effects in addition to fixed effects into the statistical model. In our setting, we model dependence between responses in different experiments coming from the same subject by using a subject-specific random effect. In addition to modeling dependence, this random effect also captures any subject-specific effect on the response that was not accounted for by the subject covariate effects. We further assume that there are no interactions between treatment and subject covariates within experiments, and no interactions between treatments across experiments. In addition, responses have the same unit of measurement across experiments. Lastly, we assume that all subjects participate in each experiment.

Under these assumptions, we model the experiments jointly using the mixed-effects model

$$y_{ij} = \beta_j x_{ij} + \mathbf{z}_i^\top \gamma_j + u_i + \epsilon_{ij}, \quad i = 1, \dots, N, \quad j = 1, \dots, K. \quad (1)$$

Here, N is the number of subjects and K is the number of experiments. y_{ij} is the response of subject i in experiment j , $x_{ij} \in \{-1, 1\}$ is the treatment/control assignment of subject i in experiment j , and \mathbf{z}_i is a p dimensional vector of covariates associated with subject i where the first component is equal to 1 for all subjects. The first component of \mathbf{z}_i acts as the intercept term in this linear mixed-effect model. β_j and γ_j are unknown parameters determining the effects of treatment/control and each of the covariates on the response in experiment j , respectively. For clarity, γ_j is a vector of parameters. Lastly, $u_i \sim N(0, \tau^2)$ and $\epsilon_{ij} \sim N(0, \sigma_j^2)$ are the random effect specific to subject i and the experimental error corresponding to the response of subject i in experiment j , both following normal distributions with mean 0 and variance τ^2 and σ_j^2 , respectively. All random effects and experimental errors are assumed to be independent.

This mixed-effects model facilitates modeling the dependence between a subjects responses across experiments as we can see that under the model assumption in (1) we have

$$\text{Cov}(y_{ij}, y_{ij'}) = \text{Cov}(u_i + \epsilon_{ij}, u_i + \epsilon_{ij'}) = \text{Var}(u_i) = \tau^2,$$

which holds for any subject i and two experiments j and j' . That is, the correlation between the responses of a subject across experiments is non-zero, and thus there is dependence between the responses.

As is often the case in experimental design in the presence of subject covariates, we are more interested in learning about the effects of the treatment on the response rather than the effects of the subject covariates on the response (Zhang and Kang, 2022), and thus we should design our experiment in such a manner that the precision of the treatment effect estimates is maximized. The problem of designing an experiment to maximize the precision of a subset of model parameter estimates is known as D_s -optimality (Lim and Studden, 1988). In our setting, the subset of parameters we are interested in designing for is $\boldsymbol{\beta}^\top = [\beta_1, \beta_2, \dots, \beta_K]$. Solving the D_s -optimality problem will then involve deriving the precision matrix of the estimated treatment effects $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^\top = [\hat{\beta}_1, \hat{\beta}_2, \dots, \hat{\beta}_K]$. Given that the covariance between any two responses can be calculated in (1) assuming τ^2 and σ_j^2 are known for every $j = 1, \dots, K$, it follows that the precision matrix of all parameter estimates in (1) (including $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ and $\hat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}} = [\hat{\gamma}_1^\top, \hat{\gamma}_2^\top, \dots, \hat{\gamma}_K^\top]$) can be easily found, assuming that we are using the generalized least squares estimates (Christensen, 2002). The GLS estimates of the treatment effects and covariate effects are given by

$$\begin{bmatrix} \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} \\ \hat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}} \end{bmatrix} = (X^\top V^{-1} X)^{-1} X^\top V^{-1} \mathbf{Y}, \quad (2)$$

where $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ and $\hat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}$ are the estimates of the treatment and covariate effects across experiments, and

$$X = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{x}_1 & \mathbf{0}_{N \times 1} & \dots & \mathbf{0}_{N \times 1} & Z & \mathbf{0}_{N \times p} & \dots & \mathbf{0}_{N \times p} \\ \mathbf{0}_{N \times 1} & \mathbf{x}_2 & \dots & \mathbf{0}_{N \times 1} & \mathbf{0}_{N \times p} & Z & \dots & \mathbf{0}_{N \times p} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \dots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \dots & \vdots \\ \mathbf{0}_{N \times 1} & \mathbf{0}_{N \times 1} & \dots & \mathbf{x}_K & \mathbf{0}_{N \times p} & \mathbf{0}_{N \times p} & \dots & Z \end{bmatrix}$$

is the design matrix, where \mathbf{x}_j is an $N \times 1$ vector of allocations x_{ij} for subjects $i = 1, \dots, N$ in experiment j , and Z is an $N \times p$ matrix with the i th row being \mathbf{z}_i^\top . In addition, we have that

$$V = \begin{bmatrix} (\sigma_1^2 + \tau^2)I_N & \tau^2 I_N & \dots & \tau^2 I_N \\ \tau^2 I_N & (\sigma_2^2 + \tau^2)I_N & \dots & \tau^2 I_N \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \tau^2 I_N & \tau^2 I_N & \dots & (\sigma_K^2 + \tau^2)I_N \end{bmatrix}$$

is the covariance matrix of the responses

$$\mathbf{Y} = [y_{1,1}, \dots, y_{N,1}, y_{1,2}, \dots, y_{N,2}, \dots, y_{1,K}, \dots, y_{N,K}]^\top.$$

The matrix $(X^\top V^{-1}X)$ in (2) is the precision matrix of $[\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^\top, \hat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}^\top]$. Block matrix inversion (Ogata, 2010) can then be directly applied to $(X^\top V^{-1}X)$ to find the covariance matrix of the treatment effect estimates, $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$, from which the precision matrix can be derived through inversion. The form of the precision matrix of $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ is given below in Proposition 1, with proof in the Appendix.

Proposition 1. *Let \mathbf{x}_j be the $N \times 1$ vector containing allocations $x_{ij} \in \{-1, 1\}$ for all subjects $i = 1, \dots, N$ in experiment j with $j = 1, \dots, K$. In addition, let Z be an full-rank $N \times p$ matrix where the i th row is given by \mathbf{z}_i^\top , the transposed vector of covariates of subject i (with the first component being equal to 1 for all subjects). Furthermore, let $P_{Z^\perp} = I - Z(Z^\top Z)^{-1}Z^\top$ be the projection matrix onto the orthogonal complement of the column space of Z . Lastly, let τ^2 be the variance of the subject-specific random effect u_i in (1) and let σ_j^2 be the variance of the experimental errors ϵ_{ij} in experiment j . Then, the precision of the treatment effect estimates $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} = \{\hat{\beta}_j : j = 1, \dots, K\}$, denoted by $P(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})$, is given by*

$$P(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) = \frac{1}{c} \begin{bmatrix} Q_1 \mathbf{x}_1^\top P_{Z^\perp} \mathbf{x}_1 & R_{1,2} \mathbf{x}_1^\top P_{Z^\perp} \mathbf{x}_2 & \dots & R_{1,K} \mathbf{x}_1^\top P_{Z^\perp} \mathbf{x}_K \\ R_{2,1} \mathbf{x}_2^\top P_{Z^\perp} \mathbf{x}_1 & Q_2 \mathbf{x}_2^\top P_{Z^\perp} \mathbf{x}_2 & \dots & R_{2,K} \mathbf{x}_2^\top P_{Z^\perp} \mathbf{x}_K \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ R_{K,1} \mathbf{x}_K^\top P_{Z^\perp} \mathbf{x}_1 & R_{K,2} \mathbf{x}_K^\top P_{Z^\perp} \mathbf{x}_2 & \dots & Q_K \mathbf{x}_K^\top P_{Z^\perp} \mathbf{x}_K \end{bmatrix},$$

where $c = 1 + \tau^2 \sum_{\ell=1}^K \sigma_\ell^{-2}$, $Q_j = \sigma_j^{-2}(c - \tau^2 \sigma_j^{-2})$, and $R_{j,j'} = -\tau^2 \sigma_j^{-2} \sigma_{j'}^{-2}$.

Note that although $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ is a function of both the allocations for each experiment and the responses in each experiment, $P(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})$ is a function of only the allocations for each experiment.

Given our precision matrix defined in Proposition 1, we may define the problem we must solve for selecting the allocations for each experiment. Assuming D-efficiency as our selection criterion, the problem we solve is given by

$$\max_{\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_K \in \{-1, 1\}^N} \det\left(P(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})\right)^{1/K}, \quad (3)$$

where $\det(\cdot)$ denotes the determinant of a matrix.

As can be seen from the form of the precision matrix in Proposition 1, allocations which provide covariate balancing within experiments and orthogonality across experiments will have higher D-efficiency, as covariate

balancing will result in having high values for $\frac{1}{c}Q_j\mathbf{x}_j^\top P_{Z^\perp}\mathbf{x}_j$ for each j , and having orthogonality across experiments (along with covariate balancing) will result in having low values for $\frac{1}{c}R_{j,j'}\mathbf{x}_j^\top P_{Z^\perp}\mathbf{x}_{j'}$ for all $j \neq j'$.

2.2 Precision under Collaborative and Independent Design and Analysis

Zhang et al. (2024) proposed the collaborative analysis framework to analyze data coming from multiple experiments conducted on a common pool of subjects. They showed that collaborative analysis is able to offer more precise estimates of treatment effects than analyzing the experiments separately. Due to the lack of covariates in their setting, the ideal allocations or experimental designs are those which are balanced and mutually orthogonal. In our setting where covariates are present, simple balancing is not ideal as under simple balancing some crucial covariates may be unbalanced and become confounded with the treatment. Ideal allocations are those which balance covariates within experiments and are orthogonal across experiments. By collaboratively designing the experiments, we may find allocations which achieve both covariate balancing and orthogonality, which will lead to more precise treatment effect estimates. In contrast, when analyzing experiments independently, we only need to achieve covariate balancing within each experiment, without regard to orthogonality across experiments. Thus, here we seek to demonstrate the difference in precision between designing and analyzing collaboratively and independently, and we show that collaborative design and analyse allows us to gain higher precision on treatment effect estimates.

2.2.1 Collaborative Design and Analysis

We will analyze the precision of treatment effect estimates under collaborative design and analysis. As is well known in the case of independent analysis, when covariates are present it is best to assign subjects to treatment or control in a way which balances covariates so that the treatment effect is not confounded with any of the covariates, and covariate balanced designs typically lead to more precise treatment effect estimates. The design property of covariate balancing is also important in the collaborative design and analysis setting. Thus, in our analysis of the precision of treatment effect estimates under collaborative design and analysis, we will restrict the designs we investigate to those which are covariate balancing within each experiment. That is, the allocations \mathbf{x}_j for each experiment j satisfy

$$Z^\top \mathbf{x}_j = \mathbf{0}.$$

Under the assumption of covariate balancing, the other design property we must consider is orthogonality between experiments. We will consider both the best case and worst case scenario for covariate balanced

designs, where best and worst are measured in terms of D-efficiency. The best case scenario corresponds to those designs which achieve orthogonality between every pair of experiments. That is, the best case scenario satisfies

$$\mathbf{x}_j^\top \mathbf{x}_{j'} = \mathbf{0} \quad \forall j \neq j'; j, j' \in \{1, \dots, K\},$$

in addition to covariate balancing within each experiment. The worst case scenario corresponds to the case where the same covariate balancing allocation is used across experiments. That is, where $\mathbf{x}_1 = \mathbf{x}_2 = \dots = \mathbf{x}_K = \mathbf{x}$. A proof that this is the worst case scenario among covariate balancing designs is given in Appendix B.

For convenience, we assume that $\sigma_1^2 = \sigma_2^2 = \dots = \sigma_K^2 = \sigma^2$ and that $\tau^2 = b\sigma^2$ for some $b > 0$. Under our assumptions, we have that $\frac{Q_j}{c} = \frac{1}{\sigma^2} \frac{1+b(K-1)}{1+bK}$, $\frac{R_{j,j'}}{c} = -\frac{1}{\sigma^2} \frac{b}{1+bK}$, and $\mathbf{x}_j^\top P_{Z^\perp} \mathbf{x}_j = N$ for $j, j' \in \{1, \dots, K\}$ with $j \neq j'$. In the worst case scenario where we use the same allocation across experiments, we have that

$$P(\hat{\beta}^s) = \frac{N}{\sigma^2(1+bK)} \begin{bmatrix} 1+b(K-1) & -b & \dots & -b \\ -b & 1+b(K-1) & \dots & -b \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ -b & -b & \dots & 1+b(K-1) \end{bmatrix}. \quad (4)$$

Here, $\hat{\beta}^s$ denotes the treatment effect estimates under the worst design scenario. By writing (4) as $P(\hat{\beta}^s) = \frac{N}{\sigma^2} I_K - \frac{N}{\sigma^2(1+bK)} \bar{b} \bar{b}^\top$ where $\bar{b} = \sqrt{b} \mathbf{1}_K$ is a $K \times 1$ vector whose entries are all \sqrt{b} and applying the matrix determinant lemma, we can show that

$$\det(P(\hat{\beta}^s))^{1/K} = \frac{N}{\sigma^2} \left(\frac{1}{1+bK} \right)^{1/K}. \quad (5)$$

Furthermore, in this scenario we can show that

$$P(\hat{\beta}^s)^{-1} = \frac{\sigma^2}{N} \left(I_k + \bar{b} \bar{b}^\top \right),$$

which implies that the variance of individual treatment effects $\hat{\beta}_j^s$ are given by

$$\text{Var}(\hat{\beta}_j^s) = \frac{\sigma^2}{N} (1+b) \quad \forall j \in \{1, \dots, K\}. \quad (6)$$

In Section 2.2.2 we will see that this is the same variance achieved under the optimal design for independent

analysis.

In the best case scenario where, in addition to covariate balancing we also have orthogonality, it follows that $\mathbf{x}_j^\top P_{Z^\perp} \mathbf{x}_{j'} = 0$ for $j, j' \in \{1, \dots, K\}$ with $j \neq j'$. Thus, in this setting the precision matrix becomes

$$P(\hat{\beta}^c) = \frac{N}{\sigma^2(1+bK)} \begin{bmatrix} 1+b(K-1) & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ 0 & 1+b(K-1) & \dots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \dots & 1+b(K-1) \end{bmatrix} = \frac{N(1+b(K-1))}{\sigma^2(1+bK)} I_K. \quad (7)$$

Here, $\hat{\beta}^c$ denotes the treatment effect estimates in the best design scenario. In this setting, we can easily see that

$$\det(P(\hat{\beta}^c))^{1/K} = \frac{N}{\sigma^2} \frac{1+b(K-1)}{1+bK}. \quad (8)$$

Fixing the number of experiments, K , we note that for large values of b , (8) approaches $\frac{N}{\sigma^2} \frac{K-1}{K}$. In contrast, we have that (5) approaches 0 for large values of b . In addition, we have that the variance of individual treatment effects $\hat{\beta}_j^c$ is given by

$$\text{Var}(\hat{\beta}_j^c) = \frac{\sigma^2}{N} \left(\frac{1+bK}{1+b(K-1)} \right) = \frac{\sigma^2}{N} \left(1 + \frac{b}{1+b(K-1)} \right) \quad \forall j \in \{1, \dots, K\}. \quad (9)$$

Clearly, we have that $\text{Var}(\hat{\beta}_j^c) < \text{Var}(\hat{\beta}_j^s)$ for $b > 0$ and $K > 1$, and the variance of the individual treatment effects under the best case scenario decreases as the number of experiments increases. In contrast, the variance of the individual treatment effects under the worst case scenario remains constant with the number of experiments. This suggests that when designing experiments for collaborative analysis we must focus on finding designs which not only achieve covariate balancing within experiments, but also achieve orthogonality across experiments.

2.2.2 Independent Design and Analysis

To highlight the benefits of collaboratively analyzing experiments when subjects participate in multiple experiments, we will discuss the case of independent analysis. By independent analysis, we refer to the experimenter treating the K experiments as though they are completely separate, not taking into account that subjects are participating in more than one experiment. Similar to the previous section, we assume

$\sigma_1^2 = \sigma_2^2 = \dots = \sigma_K^2 = \sigma^2$ and $\tau^2 = b\sigma^2$. In this setting, the model becomes

$$y_{ij} = \beta_j x_{ij} + \mathbf{z}_i^\top \boldsymbol{\gamma}_j + \tilde{\epsilon}_{ij}, \quad (10)$$

where $\tilde{\epsilon}_{ij} \sim N(0, (1+b)\sigma^2)$. The difference between (10) and (1) lies in the error component. In (1), we model experimental error and subject-specific error separately and we are able to do so because we model the K experiments jointly. In contrast, in (10) we fail to take into account that subjects are participating in multiple experiments, and thus are not able to separate experimental error and subject-specific error, which inflates the variance of the experimental error term in (10).

Under independent analysis, the optimal experimental design is that which balances covariates within each experiment. Thus, in the best case scenario the precision of a single treatment effect estimate $\hat{\beta}_j$ is

$$P(\hat{\beta}_j) = \frac{N}{(1+b)\sigma^2}$$

To fairly compare the precision of independent analysis and collaborative analysis, we may form a precision matrix of the treatment effect estimates under independent analysis. Due to the assumption that we are analyzing the experiments separately, the treatment effect estimates will naturally be uncorrelated. Then, the precision matrix is simply $\frac{N}{(1+b)\sigma^2} I_K$, and thus the D-efficiency in this case is $\frac{N}{(1+b)\sigma^2}$.

Figure 1 shows the normalized D-efficiencies (by normalized, we mean ignoring the term $\frac{N}{\sigma^2}$) achieved by the ideal design for independent analysis, the worst covariate balancing design for collaborative analysis, and the best covariate balancing design for collaborative analysis. The left column fixes the values of K at 2, 5, and 10 and shows the D-efficiency as a function of b , while the right column fixes the values of b at 0.5, 1, and 2 and shows D-efficiency as a function of K . We see that collaborative design and analysis uniformly provides the highest D-efficiency in each scenario, suggesting that not only should we analyze experiments collaboratively when subjects participate in multiple experiments, but we should also design the experiments collaboratively.

In addition, Figure 2 shows the log-transformed normalized variance of individual treatment effect estimate $\hat{\beta}_j$ for the best case of collaborative design and analysis and the best case of independent design and analysis. We don't include the worst case for covariate balanced designs in collaborative analysis as the variance achieved there is the same as the variance achieved in the best case for independent design. Once again, normalized here refers to ignoring the term $\frac{\sigma^2}{N}$. From this we can see that using D-efficiency as the design criterion also leads to a reduction in variance of the individual treatment effects.




Figure 1: Normalized D-efficiencies as functions of K (number of experiments) and b (recall that we assume $\tau^2 = b\sigma^2$) achieved under ideal designs for the cases of independent design and analysis, and the best and worst cases of covariate balanced designs for collaborative design and analysis




Figure 2: Log-transformed normalized variances as functions of K (number of experiments) and b (recall that we assume $\tau^2 = b\sigma^2$) achieved under ideal designs for the cases of independent design and analysis and collaborative design and analysis.

3 Randomized Algorithms for Constructing Efficient Designs

3.1 Randomized Greedy Algorithm

Here we propose a randomized greedy algorithm for constructing designs for multiple controlled experiments. The main idea is straightforward: we decompose (3) into a sequence of K subproblems, where K is the number of experiments. In each subproblem j , we provide an allocation for experiment j by solving a binary quadratic program which is derived from the formula for calculating the determinant of a block matrix (Abadir and Magnus, 2005) and incorporates information from the $j - 1$ previous allocations. Randomized allocation of subjects to treatment/control in experiment j is facilitated through the use of an SDP relaxation based randomized algorithm (Ben-Tal and Nemirovski, 2001) to solve the binary quadratic program mentioned above, with the expected value of the solution coming from this randomized algorithm having a performance guarantee of being at least $2/\pi$ the value of the true optimal allocation. While the binary quadratic program for allocation in experiment j can be solved to optimality through deterministic integer programming techniques available in commercial optimization solvers such as Gurobi (Gurobi Optimization, LLC, 2023), this approach leads to non-random allocation of subjects to treatment and control. Using the SDP relaxation based randomized algorithm thus strikes a balance between providing randomized allocation, which is a necessary component of experimental design and analysis (Ehrenfeld and Zacks, 1961; Youden, 1972), and attaining precise treatment effect estimates.

We will now discuss the technical details of our randomized greedy algorithm in more detail. Let $P(\hat{\beta})_{1:j-1}^{1:j-1}$ denote the submatrix of $P(\hat{\beta})$ formed from the first $j - 1$ rows and first $j - 1$ columns of $P(\hat{\beta})$. That is,

$$P(\hat{\beta})_{1:j-1}^{1:j-1} = \frac{1}{c} \begin{bmatrix} Q_1 \mathbf{x}_1^\top P_{Z^\perp} \mathbf{x}_1 & R_{1,2} \mathbf{x}_1^\top P_{Z^\perp} \mathbf{x}_2 & \dots & R_{1,j-1} \mathbf{x}_1^\top P_{Z^\perp} \mathbf{x}_{j-1} \\ R_{2,1} \mathbf{x}_2^\top P_{Z^\perp} \mathbf{x}_1 & Q_2 \mathbf{x}_2^\top P_{Z^\perp} \mathbf{x}_2 & \dots & R_{2,j-1} \mathbf{x}_2^\top P_{Z^\perp} \mathbf{x}_{j-1} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ R_{j-1,1} \mathbf{x}_{j-1}^\top P_{Z^\perp} \mathbf{x}_1 & R_{j-1,2} \mathbf{x}_{j-1}^\top P_{Z^\perp} \mathbf{x}_2 & \dots & Q_{j-1} \mathbf{x}_{j-1}^\top P_{Z^\perp} \mathbf{x}_{j-1} \end{bmatrix} \quad (11)$$

Next, let $P(\hat{\beta})_{1:j-1}^j$ denote a vector formed by the first $j - 1$ rows and the j th column of $P(\hat{\beta})$. That is,

$$P(\hat{\beta})_{1:j-1}^j = \frac{1}{c} [R_{1,j} \mathbf{x}_1^\top P_{Z^\perp} \mathbf{x}_j, R_{2,j} \mathbf{x}_2^\top P_{Z^\perp} \mathbf{x}_j, \dots, R_{j-1,j} \mathbf{x}_{j-1}^\top P_{Z^\perp} \mathbf{x}_j]^\top. \quad (12)$$

Lastly, let $P(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})_j^j$ simply be the entry in the j th row and j th column of $P(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})$. That is,

$$P(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})_j^j = \frac{1}{c} Q_j \mathbf{x}_j^\top P_{Z^\perp} \mathbf{x}_j. \quad (13)$$

Then, assuming that $P(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})_{1:j-1}^{1:j-1}$ is invertible, and using the forms for $P(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})_{1:j-1}^{1:j-1}$, $P(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})_{1:j-1}^j$, and $P(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})_j^j$ in (11), (12), and (13), it follows from the formula for calculating the determinant of a block matrix that

$$\det\left(P(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})_{1:j}^{1:j}\right) = \det\left(P(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})_{1:j-1}^{1:j-1}\right) \left(P(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})_j^j - (P(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})_{1:j-1}^j)^\top (P(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})_{1:j-1}^{1:j-1})^{-1} P(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})_{1:j-1}^j\right) \quad (14)$$

Now, given allocations to the first $j - 1$ experiments, denoted by $\mathbf{x}_1^*, \mathbf{x}_2^*, \dots, \mathbf{x}_{j-1}^*$, it follows that the quantity $\det\left(P(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})_{1:j-1}^{1:j-1}\right)$ is constant and $\left(P(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})_j^j - (P(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})_{1:j-1}^j)^\top (P(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})_{1:j-1}^{1:j-1})^{-1} P(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})_{1:j-1}^j\right)$ can be written as a quadratic form in terms of \mathbf{x}_j . This quadratic form is given by

$$q_j(\mathbf{x}_j) = \mathbf{x}_j^\top \left(\frac{1}{c} Q_j P_{Z^\perp} - B_{1:j-1} (P^*(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})_{1:j-1}^{1:j-1})^{-1} B_{1:j-1}^\top \right) \mathbf{x}_j, \quad (15)$$

where $B_{1:j-1} = \frac{1}{c} [R_{1,j} P_{Z^\perp} \mathbf{x}_1^* \ R_{2,j} P_{Z^\perp} \mathbf{x}_2^* \ \dots \ R_{j-1,j} P_{Z^\perp} \mathbf{x}_{j-1}^*]$ is an $N \times (j - 1)$ matrix and $P^*(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})_{1:j-1}^{1:j-1}$ is equivalent to $P(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})_{1:j-1}^{1:j-1}$ but evaluated at previously selected allocations $\mathbf{x}_1^*, \mathbf{x}_2^*, \dots, \mathbf{x}_{j-1}^*$. It then follows that the problem of picking the allocation \mathbf{x}_j which leads to the largest marginal improvement in (14) given $\mathbf{x}_1^*, \mathbf{x}_2^*, \dots, \mathbf{x}_{j-1}^*$ is equivalent to picking \mathbf{x}_j which maximizes $q_j(\mathbf{x}_j)$ in (15). Finding an allocation for experiment j which maximizes (15) involves striking a balance between covariate balancing in the j th experiment, which corresponds to the term $\mathbf{x}_j^\top \left(\frac{1}{c} Q_j P_{Z^\perp} \right) \mathbf{x}_j$, and a form of orthogonality of experiment j with pre-allocated experiments $1, \dots, j - 1$ which corresponds to the term $-\mathbf{x}_j^\top \left(B_{1:j-1} (P^*(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})_{1:j-1}^{1:j-1})^{-1} B_{1:j-1}^\top \right) \mathbf{x}_j$. The allocation for the first experiment, \mathbf{x}_1 , is selected by maximizing $q_1(\mathbf{x}_1) = \frac{1}{c} Q_1 \mathbf{x}_1^\top P_{Z^\perp} \mathbf{x}_1$.

Next, we briefly introduce the SPD relaxation based randomization algorithm for providing a randomized solution to (15) with quality guarantee. This algorithm was originally proposed by Goemans and Williamson (1995) to solve the MAXCUT problem (Commander, 2009), and later generalized to provide solutions to the maximization of general binary quadratic programs (Ben-Tal and Nemirovski, 2001), with the expected value of the solution having a performance guarantee of being $2/\pi$ of the value of the optimal solution. Bhat et al. (2020) proposed the use of this randomized algorithm in their offline setting for designing a single experiment, citing its ability to provide a solution in polynomial time as one of its key advantages over directly solving their original problem, which is NP-hard. We reiterate that the reason for our use of this algorithm is in its ability to provide efficient allocations while ensuring an element of randomness in the allocation, which is required for valid statistical inference.

In our setting, the SDP relaxation based randomized algorithm for finding an allocation for experiment

j works as follows: we first rewrite the objective in (15) and formulate the optimization problem as

$$\max_{\mathbf{x}_j \in \{-1,1\}^N} \text{Tr} \left(\left(\frac{1}{c} Q_j P_{Z^\perp} - B_{1:j-1} (P^*(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})_{1:j-1}^{1:j-1})^{-1} B_{1:j-1}^\top \right) \mathbf{x}_j \mathbf{x}_j^\top \right), \quad (16)$$

where $\text{Tr}(\cdot)$ denotes the trace of a matrix. The equivalence of the objectives in (15) and (16) follows from the cyclic property of the trace function. It is further clear that the matrix $\mathbf{x}_j \mathbf{x}_j^\top$ is positive semi-definite, with diagonal elements being all equal to 1. Lastly, that the matrix $\frac{1}{c} Q_j P_{Z^\perp} - B_{1:j-1} (P^*(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})_{1:j-1}^{1:j-1})^{-1} B_{1:j-1}^\top$ is positive semi-definite is a consequence of Sylvester's criterion for positive semi-definite matrices (Prussing, 1986), which states that all possible principal minors of a positive semi-definite matrix are positive semi-definite. In detail, $P(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})$ is positive semi-definite since it is a precision matrix. Thus, by Sylvester's criterion $P(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})_{1:j}^{1:j}$ and $P(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})_{1:j-1}^{1:j-1}$ are positive semi-definite. Then, the relation in (14) forces the quantity $P(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})_j^j - (P(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})_{1:j-1}^j)^\top (P(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})_{1:j-1}^{1:j-1})^{-1} P(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})_{1:j-1}^j$ to be non-negative ($\det(P(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})_{1:j-1}^{1:j-1})$ is positive by assumption of invertibility and positive semi-definiteness of $P(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})_{1:j-1}^{1:j-1}$), and hence $\frac{1}{c} Q_j P_{Z^\perp} - B_{1:j-1} (P^*(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})_{1:j-1}^{1:j-1})^{-1} B_{1:j-1}^\top$ is positive semi-definite. We mention that this matrix is positive semi-definite because the performance guarantee of the solution coming from the SDP relaxation based randomized algorithm requires the constant matrix to be positive semi-definite (Bhat et al., 2020).

Following this, a natural SDP relaxation of (16) is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{W_j} \text{Tr} \left(\left(\frac{1}{c} Q_j P_{Z^\perp} - B_{1:j-1} (P^*(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})_{1:j-1}^{1:j-1})^{-1} B_{1:j-1}^\top \right) W_j \right) & \quad (17) \\ \text{s.t.} & \\ (W_j)_{ii} = 1, \quad i = 1, \dots, N & \\ W_j \succeq \mathbf{0}_{N \times N}. & \end{aligned}$$

The constraint $(W_j)_{ii} = 1$ enforces the diagonals of W_j to be 1 and $W_j \succeq \mathbf{0}_{N \times N}$ enforces W_j to be positive semi-definite. This SDP can be solved conveniently in commercial optimization solvers such as MOSEK (ApS, 2024).

A random allocation for experiment j which approximately solves (15) is constructed as follows: we solve (17) to optimality and retrieve a solution W_j^* . We then find a matrix $(W_j^*)^{1/2}$ which satisfies $W_j^* = ((W_j^*)^{1/2})^\top (W_j^*)^{1/2}$. This may be achieved through eigenvalue decomposition or Cholesky factorization of a diagonally perturbed version of W_j^* (Trefethen and Bau, 2022). We then randomly generate a vector v_j from the uniform distribution on the unit N -sphere, which may be achieved by randomly generating a vector v_j' from $N(\mathbf{0}_{N \times 1}, I_N)$ and normalizing it by the L_2 norm of v_j' (Muller, 1959). Allocation of subject i to

treatment or control in experiment j is then achieved by using the following procedure for $i = 1, \dots, N$:

$$x_{ij} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } v_j^\top ((W_j^*)^{1/2})_{1:N}^i \geq 0 \\ -1 & \text{if } v_j^\top ((W_j^*)^{1/2})_{1:N}^i < 0 \end{cases}, \quad (18)$$

where $((W_j^*)^{1/2})_{1:N}^i$ is the i th column of $(W_j^*)^{1/2}$. Here, the v_j are generated independently of one another. In this work, we consider treatment to be equal to 1 and control to be equal to -1.

3.2 Large-Scale Design based on Randomized Algorithm

The randomized greedy algorithm that we proposed in Section 3.1 requires solving an SDP of the form given in (17) for each experiment j . If the number of experiments and number of subjects are both large, such as common with some e-commerce organizations which run hundreds of controlled experiments daily (Larsen et al., 2024), then the optimal allocations provided by the randomized greedy algorithm may require a prohibitive time to compute. We address this problem with the algorithm proposed in this section, which we call the Single Design based Randomized algorithm (SDR). SDR involves solving only a single SDP with N^2 decision variables, and then employs a certain randomization scheme to provide allocations to each experiment. The SDP addresses covariate balancing within experiments, while the randomization scheme addresses orthogonality across experiments. This is in contrast to the randomized greedy algorithm of Section 3.1, which addresses both covariate balancing within experiments and orthogonality across experiments in the sequence of SDPs.

SDR is motivated by the fact that, when considered separately, the optimal allocation for each individual experiment is the same due to the fact that the precision of each individual experiment is represented by the same quadratic form, disregarding constant multiplicative factors. For clarity and to see the underlying reasoning, the precisions of experiments j and j' are given by $\frac{1}{c} Q_j \mathbf{x}_j^\top P_{Z^\perp} \mathbf{x}_j$ and $\frac{1}{c} Q_{j'} \mathbf{x}_{j'}^\top P_{Z^\perp} \mathbf{x}_{j'}$, respectively, and the maximization of these two quadratic forms are equivalent as optimization problems. Thus, solving the problem

$$\max_{\mathbf{x} \in \{-1, 1\}^N} \mathbf{x}^\top P_{Z^\perp} \mathbf{x} \quad (19)$$

will provide an allocation \mathbf{x} that can be used in each experiment which provides covariate balancing within experiments. However, using the same allocation \mathbf{x} in each experiment will result in a loss of orthogonality across experiments, and thus result in lower D-efficiency. We address this issue by solving an SDP relaxation of (19), and then using a randomly generated set of K orthogonal vectors from the unit N -sphere to provide

allocation for each experiment. We generate these K orthogonal vectors by first generating a single vector uniformly from the N -sphere, using QR factorization (Trefethen and Bau, 2022) on this uniformly generated vector to generate a set (of cardinality N) of mutually orthogonal vectors of unit length, and then uniformly select K vectors from among these N vectors.

4 Simulation Study

In this section we investigate the D-efficiency of our proposed design methods as well as the variances of the estimators associated with the first and last experiments across different scenarios in a simulation study, where D-efficiency is defined as the objective of (3) in Section 2.1, and the variances of the first and last experiments are found by inverting the precision matrix and recording the entry in the first row and first column, and the last row and last column, respectively. Our investigation of the variances of the first and last experiments serve two purposes: (1) To demonstrate that our methods not only improve D-efficiency, which is a global measure of efficiency taking into consideration the entire collection of experiments, but that our methods also improve the individual variances of the experiments, which are local measures of efficiency and (2) to investigate whether there is an order effect on the resulting variances when using our greedy methods, as our greedy methods consider only one experiment at a time. The scenarios we investigate will be comprised of combinations of various factors, including: the number of controlled experiments being conducted, amount of noise in the subject-specific error term, and number of covariates.

4.1 Simulation Setup

Here we describe in detail the setup of our simulation, and begin by describing the factors. First, the two settings for the number of controlled experiments being conducted that we consider will be 4 and 8. Next, we will have a low and high setting for the amount of noise in the subject-specific error term. For the low setting we will have $\tau = 0.25$ and for the high setting we will have $\tau = 2$. Across all simulation scenarios, we assume that the variances of the experimental errors are all equal to 1, that is $\sigma_1 = \sigma_2 = \dots = \sigma_K = 1$ for $K = 4$ and $K = 8$ across all simulation scenarios. Lastly, we will fix the number of subjects to be 96, and the number of covariates will either be 10 or 70. Although having 70 covariates may be unrealistic in some applications, we investigate this extreme setting due to observations in Bhat et al. (2020) and Bertsimas et al. (2015) that optimal allocation methods perform better than fully random allocation methods when the number of covariates is close to the number of subjects.

Next, we introduce the design construction methods that we will compare. We compare five methods in our simulation study. They are listed below:

1. (**RAND**): Fully random allocation .
2. (**PB**): Plackett-Burman design.
3. (**SDR**): Single design based randomized algorithm with orthogonal vectors (see Section 3.2).
4. (**GREED-SDP**): Greedy algorithm with each subproblem solved via SDP (see Section 3.1).
5. (**GREED-BP**): Greedy algorithm with each subproblem solved via deterministic binary programming (see Section 3.1).

We will clarify the methods RAND and PB since they have not been introduced yet. RAND independently assigns each subject to treatment or control in each experiment with probability $1/2$. On average, RAND will provide balanced allocations for each experiment. It can also be mathematically checked that the allocations across experiments will be orthogonal, on average. In contrast, PB forces balance within experiments and orthogonality across experiments. This is a property of Plackett-Burman designs (Plackett and Burman, 1946), which are fractional factorial designs that are used when interactions between factors are considered negligible. We create a Plackett-Burman design for each of the two settings for the number of experiments. For the case of four controlled experiments, we create a Plackett-Burman design which has four columns. The generated Plackett-Burman design has eight rows, and thus we stack this design on itself 12 times to accommodate the 96 subjects. Similarly, for the case of eight controlled experiments, we create a Plackett-Burman design which has eight columns. The generated Plackett-Burman design has 12 rows, and thus we stack this design on itself eight times to accommodate 96 subjects. Subjects are then randomly allocated to the rows of the stacked design so that each row is given one subject. Within-experiment balance and across-experiment orthogonality are preserved by this stacking process. Each column of the stacked Plackett-Burman designs corresponds to the allocation vector for the 96 subjects of one of the controlled experiments and each row corresponds to a specific allocation for each of the (4 or 8) controlled experiments. In other words, column j represents the within-experiment allocation of subjects to treatment or control in experiment j and row i represents the across-experiment allocation of subject i to treatment or control within each experiment $j = 1, \dots, K$.

Having explained the factorial structure and methods we will compare, we now discuss the replication structure of the simulation study. Given a specification of the number of covariates $p = 10$ or $p = 70$, we randomly generate five $96 \times p$ covariate matrices Z_1, Z_2, \dots, Z_5 where the first column is all 1s and each row (apart from the fixed entry in the first column) is independently generated from a $p - 1$ dimensional multivariate normal distribution with mean 0 and covariance matrix equal to the identity matrix. These covariate matrices will be used across all scenarios having $p = 10$ or $p = 70$ covariates. We generate

these different covariate matrices to see if the performance of the various methods is stable across different specifications of the covariate values. Next, we specify the number of controlled experiments and level of noise in the subject-specific error. Then, for each pre-generated covariate matrix Z_ℓ , we replicate the methods RAND, PB, SDR, and GREED-SDP each 100 times to construct designs since each of these methods have a random component. We run the method GREED-BP only once since it is deterministic. Solution times for methods using SDPs or binary programming will be capped at 50 seconds. For each method and each replication we will record the D-efficiency of the generated design, where D-efficiency is measured using the objective function in (3). We also record the variances of the first and last experiments, which is achieved by inverting the precision matrix and recording the entry in the first row, first column and last row, last column, respectively.

Lastly, we also need to quantify the various methods' performances in terms of D-efficiency on an absolute scale, as we do not know the proximity of the methods' solutions to the optimal solution of (3). However, since we do not know the optimal solution, we instead propose measuring the gap between the D-efficiency of the methods' solutions and an upper-bound on the value of the optimal solution. Given a specification of the number of experiments and values of τ and $\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \dots, \sigma_K$, this upper bound, which is based on the hadamard inequality for positive semi-definite matrices (Rózański et al., 2017) will be covariate-independent. In detail, the Hadamard inequality for positive semi-definite matrices states that for a positive semi-definite $K \times K$ matrix H with diagonal entries h_{ii} ,

$$\det(H) \leq \prod_{i=1}^K h_{ii},$$

and equality is achieved if and only if the matrix H is diagonal. Thus, a natural upper-bound for (3) is $((1/c)^K \prod_{i=1}^K Q_i \mathbf{x}_i P_{Z^\perp} \mathbf{x}_i)^{1/K}$. If this upper-bound is achieved, that means that we have perfect orthogonality of the experiments under P_{Z^\perp} . However, this upper-bound still depends on Z . Further extending this upper-bound to remove dependency on Z , we may assume that $\mathbf{x}_i Z (Z^\top Z)^{-1} Z^\top \mathbf{x}_i = 0$ for each i , which is achieved when covariates are perfectly balanced in each experiment. This results in an upper-bound of $((n/c)^K \prod_{i=1}^K Q_i)^{1/K}$. This upper-bound represents an ideal value of the optimal solution if perfect orthogonality and perfect covariate balancing can be achieved (see Section 2.2.1 for discussion on characteristics of the ideal design for collaborative analysis). Since in our experiments we assumed that $\sigma_1 = \dots = \sigma_K = 1$, this means that the upper bound for the D-efficiencies is equal to $\frac{96 \cdot (1 + \tau^2 (K-1))}{1 + \tau^2 K}$ for $\tau = 0.25, 2$ and $K = 4, 8$. It is this value against which we will compare the D-efficiencies of the various methods to get an idea of the effectiveness of the methods. Similarly for the variances, we compare them against a theoretical lower bound which comes from the variances achieved by the ideal design for collaborative analysis (see (9) in

Section 2.2.1). Since $\sigma_1 = \dots = \sigma_K = 1$, this means that the lower bound for the variances is equal to $\frac{1}{96} \left(1 + \frac{\tau^2}{1 + \tau^2(K-1)} \right)$ for $\tau = 0.25, 2$ and $K = 4, 8$.

4.2 Numerical Results

From our simulation study, we found that the most important factor which leads to a difference in the performance of the methods is the number of covariates. As the number of covariates increases from 10 to 70, we see that the D-efficiency of covariate-agnostic methods such as RAND and PB decreases, as seen in Figure 3. This is in agreement with results on the performance of random, covariate-agnostic allocation in the presence of a large number of covariates discussed in Bhat et al. (2020). However, when the number of covariates is small we find that covariate-agnostic methods may outperform our proposed SDR method. In addition, we found that the results for each of the experiment settings were similar for Z_1, Z_2, Z_3, Z_4 , and Z_5 , suggesting that the methods have stable performance in terms of D-efficiency when dealing with different covariates. The greedy methods GREED-SDP and GREED-BP typically perform the best, with GREED-SDP performing on par with SDR in some cases of the 70 covariate regime and GREED-BP always outperforming the other methods. We reiterate that although GREED-BP provides the highest D-efficiency, it does not provide any form of randomized assignment to reduce bias coming from unmeasured covariate effects.

In terms of performance on an absolute scale, our GREED-BP method was able to nearly achieve the Hadamard-based upper bound for D-efficiency in all cases where the number of covariates were equal to 10, suggesting that the greedy method performs well in providing covariate balanced and orthogonal treatment allocations when the number of covariates is relatively small compared to the number of subjects. We notice that in the cases where there are 70 covariates, the gap between GREED-BP and the Hadamard-based upper bound is non-negligible. While there is uncertainty whether this gap is due to a degradation of our methods' performance when the number of covariates is large or it is due to perfect covariate balancing and orthogonality being unachievable in these cases, this gap nonetheless gives us an upper bound on the gap between the D-efficiency attained by our methods' solutions and the D-efficiency of the true optimal solution.

In terms of our methods' performance in reducing the variance of treatment effect estimates in individual experiments, we find that there is typically not a large difference in the variances of treatment effect estimates in the first and last experiments, as shown in Figure 4. Similar to the case of D-efficiency, we see that our proposed methods outperform covariate-agnostic methods when the number of covariates is large. Lastly, one point of interest is that while our GREED-BP method was unable to achieve the theoretical upper bound for D-efficiency, it was able to get close to the theoretical lower bound for the variance in the first and last




Figure 3: D-efficiencies of the methods RAND, PB, SDR, GREED-SDP, and GREED-BP across different experimental settings for covariate matrix Z_1 . The purple dotted line is the Hadamard-based upper bound.




Figure 4: Variances of the first and last experiments of the methods RAND, PB, SDR, GREED-SDP, and GREED-BP across different experimental settings for covariate matrix Z_1 . The purple dotted line is a theoretical lower bound of the variances.

experiment.

5 Conclusion

In this work we considered the problem of collaboratively designing a set of controlled experiments when subjects participate in each experiment and subject covariate information is available, with the goal being to allocate subjects to treatment and control in each experiment in such a manner that maximizes precision of treatment effect estimates. We demonstrated that collaborative design and analysis are able to provide more precise estimates of treatment effects than the traditional method of individually designing and analyzing the experiments, which is achieved by modelling the dependence between the responses across experiments coming from a single subject through the use of subject-specific random effects. We then proposed two algorithms for collaborative design. One algorithm is a greedy algorithm whose subproblems can be solved either through a semi-definite programming based randomized algorithm or through integer programming techniques. The other algorithm involves solving a single semi-definite program to achieve covariate-balancing within experiments, and then relies on randomization to promote orthogonality across experiments. We then demonstrated the quality of our proposed design methods in a simulation study, where we found that our methods outperform covariate-agnostic methods when there are a large number of covariates.

Some future directions for this work are as follows: 1) In this work we focused on optimal experimental design in the presence of subject covariates for the generalized least squares estimates of treatment effects. It would be of interest to consider the problem of optimal experimental design in the presence of subject covariates for the *collaborative estimators* of treatment effects proposed in Zhang et al. (2024). 2) Generalizing this work to the case where there are multiple treatments within each experiment or to the case where there are interactions between the separate experiments. 3) Considering the problem where not all subjects participate in each experiment. This would be of practical importance, as perhaps some subjects may not be willing to participate in each of the experiments or some other constraint may make it so that certain subjects cannot participate in a certain experiment. Lastly, 4) considering the online version of this problem would be of interest, as in this work we consider the offline problem where we assume that we have all subjects' covariate information available before allocation begins.

References

Karim M Abadir and Jan R Magnus. *Matrix algebra*, volume 1. Cambridge University Press, 2005.

- MOSEK ApS. *MOSEK Optimizer API for Python 10.1.31*, 2024. URL <https://docs.mosek.com/latest/pythonapi/index.html>.
- Aharon Ben-Tal and Arkadi Nemirovski. *Lectures on modern convex optimization: analysis, algorithms, and engineering applications*. SIAM, 2001.
- Dimitris Bertsimas, Mac Johnson, and Nathan Kallus. The power of optimization over randomization in designing experiments involving small samples. *Operations Research*, 63(4):868–876, 2015.
- Nikhil Bhat, Vivek F Farias, Ciamac C Moallemi, and Deeksha Sinha. Near-optimal ab testing. *Management Science*, 66(10):4477–4495, 2020.
- Stephen P Boyd and Lieven Vandenberghe. *Convex optimization*. Cambridge university press, 2004.
- Richard P Brent, H Osborn Judy-anne, and Warren D Smith. Note on best possible bounds for determinants of matrices close to the identity matrix. *Linear Algebra and its Applications*, 466:21–26, 2015.
- Ronald Christensen. *Plane answers to complex questions: the theory of linear models*. Springer, 2002.
- Clayton W Commander. Maximum cut problem, max-cut. *Encyclopedia of Optimization*, 2, 2009.
- Annette J Dobson and Adrian G Barnett. *An introduction to generalized linear models*. Chapman and Hall/CRC, 2018.
- S Ehrenfeld and So Zacks. Randomization and factorial experiments. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, 32(1):270–297, 1961.
- Michel X Goemans and David P Williamson. Improved approximation algorithms for maximum cut and satisfiability problems using semidefinite programming. *Journal of the ACM (JACM)*, 42(6):1115–1145, 1995.
- Gurobi Optimization, LLC. Gurobi Optimizer Reference Manual, 2023. URL <https://www.gurobi.com>.
- Nicholas J Higham. *Accuracy and stability of numerical algorithms*. SIAM, 2002.
- Kosuke Imai and Marc Ratkovic. Covariate balancing propensity score. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B: Statistical Methodology*, 76(1):243–263, 2014.
- Ron Kohavi, Alex Deng, Brian Frasca, Toby Walker, Ya Xu, and Nils Pohlmann. Online controlled experiments at large scale. In *Proceedings of the 19th ACM SIGKDD international conference on Knowledge discovery and data mining*, pages 1168–1176, 2013.

- Rembrand Koning, Sharique Hasan, and Aaron Chatterji. Experimentation and start-up performance: Evidence from a/b testing. *Management Science*, 68(9):6434–6453, 2022.
- Nicholas Larsen, Jonathan Stallrich, Srijan Sengupta, Alex Deng, Ron Kohavi, and Nathaniel T Stevens. Statistical challenges in online controlled experiments: A review of a/b testing methodology. *The American Statistician*, 78(2):135–149, 2024.
- Fan Li, Kari Lock Morgan, and Alan M Zaslavsky. Balancing covariates via propensity score weighting. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 113(521):390–400, 2018.
- Yezhuo Li, Qiong Zhang, Amin Khademi, and Boshi Yang. Optimal design of controlled experiments for personalized decision making in the presence of observational covariates. *The New England Journal of Statistics in Data Science*, 2023.
- Yong B Lim and WJ Studden. Efficient d_s -optimal designs for multivariate polynomial regression on the q -cube. *The Annals of Statistics*, 16(3):1225–1240, 1988.
- Magnus Nakrem Lyngbakken, Jan-Erik Berdal, Arne Eskesen, Dag Kvale, Inge Christoffer Olsen, Corina Silvia Rueegg, Anbjørg Rangberg, Christine Monceyron Jonassen, Torbjørn Omland, Helge Røsjø, et al. A pragmatic randomized controlled trial reports lack of efficacy of hydroxychloroquine on coronavirus disease 2019 viral kinetics. *Nature communications*, 11(1):5284, 2020.
- RJ Martin. On the design of experiments under spatial correlation. *Biometrika*, 73(2):247–277, 1986.
- Kari Lock Morgan and Donald B Rubin. Rerandomization to improve covariate balance in experiments. *The Annals of Statistics*, 2012.
- Mervin E Muller. A note on a method for generating points uniformly on n -dimensional spheres. *Communications of the ACM*, 2(4):19–20, 1959.
- Katsuhiko Ogata. *Modern Control Engineering*. Prentice Hall, 2010.
- Korinn S Ostrow, Doug Selent, Yan Wang, Eric G Van Inwegen, Neil T Heffernan, and Joseph Jay Williams. The assessment of learning infrastructure (ali) the theory, practice, and scalability of automated assessment. In *Proceedings of the sixth international conference on learning analytics & knowledge*, pages 279–288, 2016.
- Alexander M Ostrowski. *Sur l’approximation du déterminant de Fredholm par les déterminants des systèmes d’équations linéaires*. Almqvist & Wiksell, 1938.

- Robin L Plackett and J Peter Burman. The design of optimum multifactorial experiments. *Biometrika*, 33(4):305–325, 1946.
- John E Prussing. The principal minor test for semidefinite matrices. *Journal of Guidance, Control, and Dynamics*, 9(1):121–122, 1986.
- Friedrich Pukelsheim. *Optimal design of experiments*. SIAM, 2006.
- Michał Róžański, Roman Wituła, and Edyta Hetmaniok. More subtle versions of the hadamard inequality. *Linear Algebra and its Applications*, 532:500–511, 2017.
- Stephen M Skippon, Neale Kinnear, Louise Lloyd, and Jenny Stannard. How experience of use influences mass-market drivers’ willingness to consider a battery electric vehicle: A randomised controlled trial. *Transportation Research Part A: Policy and Practice*, 92:26–42, 2016.
- Lloyd N Trefethen and David Bau. *Numerical linear algebra*. SIAM, 2022.
- Ya Xu, Nanyu Chen, Addrian Fernandez, Omar Sinno, and Anmol Bhasin. From infrastructure to culture: A/b testing challenges in large scale social networks. In *Proceedings of the 21th ACM SIGKDD international conference on knowledge discovery and data mining*, pages 2227–2236, 2015.
- WJ Youden. Randomization and experimentation. *Technometrics*, 14(1):13–22, 1972.
- Qiong Zhang and Lulu Kang. Locally optimal design for a/b tests in the presence of covariates and network dependence. *Technometrics*, 64(3):358–369, 2022.
- Qiong Zhang, Amin Khademi, and Yongjia Song. Min-max optimal design of two-armed trials with side information. *INFORMS Journal on Computing*, 34(1):165–182, 2022.
- Qiong Zhang, Lulu Kang, and Xinwei Deng. Collaborative analysis for paired a/b testing experiments. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.05400*, 2024.

A Proof of Proposition 1

Proof. We will begin by directly calculating $X^\top V^{-1} X$. First, note that

$$V = \begin{bmatrix} \sigma_1^2 I_N & \mathbf{0}_{N \times N} & \dots & \mathbf{0}_{N \times N} \\ \mathbf{0}_{N \times N} & \sigma_2^2 I_N & \dots & \mathbf{0}_{N \times N} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \mathbf{0}_{N \times N} & \mathbf{0}_{N \times N} & \dots & \sigma_K^2 I_N \end{bmatrix} + \tau^2 \begin{bmatrix} I_N \\ \vdots \\ I_N \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} I_N & \dots & I_N \end{bmatrix}.$$

By applying the Woodbury formula (Higham, 2002), we can see that

$$V^{-1} = \begin{bmatrix} \sigma_1^{-2} I_N & \mathbf{0}_{N \times N} & \dots & \mathbf{0}_{N \times N} \\ \mathbf{0}_{N \times N} & \sigma_2^{-2} I_N & \dots & \mathbf{0}_{N \times N} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \mathbf{0}_{N \times N} & \mathbf{0}_{N \times N} & \dots & \sigma_K^{-2} I_N \end{bmatrix} - \left(\tau^{-2} + \sum_{\ell=1}^K \sigma_\ell^{-2} \right)^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} \sigma_1^{-2} I_N \\ \vdots \\ \sigma_K^{-2} I_N \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \sigma_1^{-2} I_N & \dots & \sigma_K^{-2} I_N \end{bmatrix}.$$

So then direct computation of $X^\top V^{-1} X$ yields

$$X^\top V^{-1} X = G - \left(\tau^{-2} + \sum_{\ell=1}^K \sigma_\ell^{-2} \right)^{-1} H$$

where

$$G = \begin{bmatrix} \sigma_1^{-2} \mathbf{x}_1^\top \mathbf{x}_1 & 0 & \dots & 0 & \sigma_1^{-2} \mathbf{x}_1^\top Z & \mathbf{0}_{1 \times p} & \dots & \mathbf{0}_{1 \times p} \\ 0 & \sigma_2^{-2} \mathbf{x}_2^\top \mathbf{x}_2 & \dots & 0 & \mathbf{0}_{1 \times p} & \sigma_2^{-2} \mathbf{x}_2^\top Z & \dots & \mathbf{0}_{1 \times p} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \dots & \sigma_K^{-2} \mathbf{x}_K^\top \mathbf{x}_K & \mathbf{0}_{1 \times p} & \mathbf{0}_{1 \times p} & \dots & \sigma_K^{-2} \mathbf{x}_K^\top Z \\ \sigma_1^{-2} Z^\top \mathbf{x}_1 & \mathbf{0}_{p \times 1} & \dots & \mathbf{0}_{p \times 1} & \sigma_1^{-2} Z^\top Z & \mathbf{0}_p & \dots & \mathbf{0}_p \\ \mathbf{0}_{p \times 1} & \sigma_2^{-2} Z^\top \mathbf{x}_2 & \dots & \mathbf{0}_{p \times 1} & \mathbf{0}_p & \sigma_2^{-2} Z^\top Z & \dots & \mathbf{0}_p \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \mathbf{0}_{p \times 1} & \mathbf{0}_{p \times 1} & \dots & \sigma_K^{-2} Z^\top \mathbf{x}_K & \mathbf{0}_p & \mathbf{0}_p & \dots & \sigma_K^{-2} Z^\top Z \end{bmatrix}$$

and

$$H = \begin{bmatrix} \sigma_1^{-2} \sigma_1^{-2} \mathbf{x}_1^\top \mathbf{x}_1 & \sigma_1^{-2} \sigma_2^{-2} \mathbf{x}_1^\top \mathbf{x}_2 & \dots & \sigma_1^{-2} \sigma_K^{-2} \mathbf{x}_1^\top \mathbf{x}_K & \sigma_1^{-2} \sigma_1^{-2} \mathbf{x}_1^\top Z & \sigma_1^{-2} \sigma_2^{-2} \mathbf{x}_2^\top Z & \dots & \sigma_1^{-2} \sigma_K^{-2} \mathbf{x}_1^\top Z \\ \sigma_2^{-2} \sigma_1^{-2} \mathbf{x}_2^\top \mathbf{x}_1 & \sigma_2^{-2} \sigma_2^{-2} \mathbf{x}_2^\top \mathbf{x}_2 & \dots & \sigma_2^{-2} \sigma_K^{-2} \mathbf{x}_2^\top \mathbf{x}_K & \sigma_2^{-2} \sigma_1^{-2} \mathbf{x}_2^\top Z & \sigma_2^{-2} \sigma_2^{-2} \mathbf{x}_2^\top Z & \dots & \sigma_2^{-2} \sigma_K^{-2} \mathbf{x}_2^\top Z \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \sigma_K^{-2} \sigma_1^{-2} \mathbf{x}_K^\top \mathbf{x}_1 & \sigma_K^{-2} \sigma_2^{-2} \mathbf{x}_K^\top \mathbf{x}_2 & \dots & \sigma_K^{-2} \sigma_K^{-2} \mathbf{x}_K^\top \mathbf{x}_K & \sigma_K^{-2} \sigma_1^{-2} \mathbf{x}_K^\top Z & \sigma_K^{-2} \sigma_2^{-2} \mathbf{x}_K^\top Z & \dots & \sigma_K^{-2} \sigma_K^{-2} \mathbf{x}_K^\top Z \\ \sigma_1^{-2} \sigma_1^{-2} Z^\top \mathbf{x}_1 & \sigma_1^{-2} \sigma_2^{-2} Z^\top \mathbf{x}_2 & \dots & \sigma_1^{-2} \sigma_K^{-2} Z^\top \mathbf{x}_K & \sigma_1^{-2} \sigma_1^{-2} Z^\top Z & \sigma_1^{-2} \sigma_2^{-2} Z^\top Z & \dots & \sigma_1^{-2} \sigma_K^{-2} Z^\top Z \\ \sigma_2^{-2} \sigma_1^{-2} Z^\top \mathbf{x}_1 & \sigma_2^{-2} \sigma_2^{-2} Z^\top \mathbf{x}_2 & \dots & \sigma_2^{-2} \sigma_K^{-2} Z^\top \mathbf{x}_K & \sigma_2^{-2} \sigma_1^{-2} Z^\top Z & \sigma_2^{-2} \sigma_2^{-2} Z^\top Z & \dots & \sigma_2^{-2} \sigma_K^{-2} Z^\top Z \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \sigma_K^{-2} \sigma_1^{-2} Z^\top \mathbf{x}_1 & \sigma_K^{-2} \sigma_2^{-2} Z^\top \mathbf{x}_2 & \dots & \sigma_K^{-2} \sigma_K^{-2} Z^\top \mathbf{x}_K & \sigma_K^{-2} \sigma_1^{-2} Z^\top Z & \sigma_K^{-2} \sigma_2^{-2} Z^\top Z & \dots & \sigma_K^{-2} \sigma_K^{-2} Z^\top Z \end{bmatrix}.$$

Letting $c = 1 + \tau^2 \sum_{\ell=1}^K \sigma_\ell^{-2}$, $Q_j = \sigma_j^{-2}(c - \tau^2 \sigma_j)$, and $R_{j,j'} = -\tau^2 \sigma_j \sigma_{j'}$ we then have that

$$X^\top V^{-1} X = \frac{1}{c} \begin{bmatrix} Q_1 \mathbf{x}_1^\top \mathbf{x}_1 & R_{1,2} \mathbf{x}_1^\top \mathbf{x}_2 & \dots & R_{1,K} \mathbf{x}_1^\top \mathbf{x}_K & Q_1 \mathbf{x}_1^\top Z & R_{1,2} \mathbf{x}_2^\top Z & \dots & R_{1,K} \mathbf{x}_1^\top Z \\ R_{2,1} \mathbf{x}_2^\top \mathbf{x}_1 & Q_2 \mathbf{x}_2^\top \mathbf{x}_2 & \dots & R_{2,K} \mathbf{x}_2^\top \mathbf{x}_K & R_{2,1} \mathbf{x}_2^\top Z & Q_2 \mathbf{x}_2^\top Z & \dots & R_{2,K} \mathbf{x}_2^\top Z \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ R_{K,1} \mathbf{x}_K^\top \mathbf{x}_1 & R_{K,2} \mathbf{x}_K^\top \mathbf{x}_2 & \dots & Q_K \mathbf{x}_K^\top \mathbf{x}_K & R_{K,1} \mathbf{x}_K^\top Z & R_{K,2} \mathbf{x}_K^\top Z & \dots & Q_K \mathbf{x}_K^\top Z \\ Q_1 Z^\top \mathbf{x}_1 & R_{1,2} Z^\top \mathbf{x}_2 & \dots & R_{1,K} Z^\top \mathbf{x}_K & Q_1 Z^\top Z & R_{1,2} Z^\top Z & \dots & R_{1,K} Z^\top Z \\ R_{2,1} Z^\top \mathbf{x}_1 & Q_2 Z^\top \mathbf{x}_2 & \dots & R_{2,K} Z^\top \mathbf{x}_K & R_{2,1} Z^\top Z & Q_2 Z^\top Z & \dots & R_{2,K} Z^\top Z \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ R_{K,1} Z^\top \mathbf{x}_1 & R_{K,2} Z^\top \mathbf{x}_2 & \dots & Q_K Z^\top \mathbf{x}_K & R_{K,1} Z^\top Z & R_{K,2} Z^\top Z & \dots & Q_K Z^\top Z \end{bmatrix}.$$

Note that $X^\top V^{-1} X$ can be partitioned into a 2×2 block matrix as

$$X^\top V^{-1} X = \frac{1}{c} \begin{bmatrix} M_1 & M_2 \\ M_2^\top & M_3 \end{bmatrix},$$

where M_1 corresponds to the $K \times K$ upper left submatrix of $X^\top V^{-1} X$ involving terms $\mathbf{x}_j^\top \mathbf{x}_{j'}$, M_2 is the upper right submatrix of $X^\top V^{-1} X$ involving terms $\mathbf{x}_j^\top Z$, and M_3 is the lower right submatrix of $X^\top V^{-1} X$ involving terms $Z^\top Z$.

Recalling that $X^\top V^{-1} X$ is the precision matrix of $[\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^\top, \hat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}^\top]^\top$, it follows that the covariance matrix of $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ is given by the upper left $K \times K$ submatrix of $(X^\top V^{-1} X)^\top$. It follows from block-matrix inversion that

$$\text{Cov}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) = c(M_1 - M_2 M_3^{-1} M_2^\top)^{-1}.$$

, and thus the precision of $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ is simply $\frac{1}{c}(M_1 - M_2 M_3^{-1} M_2^\top)$. Letting

$$S = \begin{bmatrix} Q_1 & R_{1,2} & \dots & R_{1,K} \\ R_{2,1} & Q_2 & \dots & R_{2,K} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ R_{K,1} & R_{K,2} & \dots & Q_K \end{bmatrix} \\ = c \begin{bmatrix} \sigma_1^{-2} & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ 0 & \sigma_2^{-2} & \dots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \dots & \sigma_K^{-2} \end{bmatrix} - \tau^2 \begin{bmatrix} \sigma_1^{-2} \\ \vdots \\ \sigma_K^{-2} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \sigma_1^{-2} & \dots & \sigma_K^{-2} \end{bmatrix},$$

we can easily see that $M_3 = S \otimes (Z^\top Z)$, where \otimes denotes the Kronecker product. Under our assumption that Z is full rank, and assuming that S is invertible (which it is when $\sigma_j \neq 0$ for all j), it follows that $M_3^{-1} = (S \otimes (Z^\top Z))^{-1} = S^{-1} \otimes (Z^\top Z)^{-1}$ from the inversion property of the Kronecker product. Through another use of the Woodbury formula, we can show that

$$S^{-1} = \frac{1}{c} \begin{bmatrix} (\sigma_1^2 + \tau^2) & \tau^2 & \dots & \tau^2 \\ \tau^2 & (\sigma_2^2 + \tau^2) & \dots & \tau^2 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \tau^2 & \tau^2 & \dots & (\sigma_K^2 + \tau^2) \end{bmatrix}.$$

Using this information, along with the observation that $(\sigma_j^2 + \tau^2)Q_j + \tau^2 \sum_{\ell \neq j} R_{\ell,j} = c$ and $\sigma_j^2 R_{j,j'} + \tau^2 Q_{j'} + \tau^2 \sum_{\ell \neq j'} R_{\ell,j'} = 0$, direct computation of $\frac{1}{c}(M_1 - M_2 M_3^{-1} M_2^\top)$ yields the precision matrix of $\hat{\beta}$. \square

B Lower Bound on D-efficiency in Covariate Balanced Design

Here we will derive a lower bound on the D-efficiency of covariate balanced designs. We will show that using the same covariate balancing allocation across all experiments leads to a design which reaches this lower bound, suggesting that such designs are the least efficient among all such covariate balancing designs.

Assume that $\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_K \in \{-1, 1\}^N$ are covariate balancing, i.e.

$$Z^\top \mathbf{x}_j = \mathbf{0} \text{ for all } j \in \{1, \dots, K\}.$$

Further assume that $\sigma_1^2 = \dots = \sigma_K^2 = \sigma^2$ and $\tau^2 = b\sigma^2$. Note that in such a case the precision matrix is given by

$$\begin{aligned} P(\hat{\beta}) &= \frac{1}{\sigma^2(1+bK)} \begin{bmatrix} (1+b(K-1))N & -b\mathbf{x}_1^\top \mathbf{x}_2 & \dots & -b\mathbf{x}_1^\top \mathbf{x}_K \\ -b\mathbf{x}_2^\top \mathbf{x}_1 & (1+b(K-1))N & \dots & -b\mathbf{x}_2^\top \mathbf{x}_K \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ -b\mathbf{x}_K^\top \mathbf{x}_1 & -b\mathbf{x}_K^\top \mathbf{x}_2 & \dots & (1+b(K-1))N \end{bmatrix} \\ &= \frac{1}{\sigma^2(1+bK)} \left((1+bK)NI_K - b \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{x}_1 & \dots & \mathbf{x}_K \end{bmatrix}^\top \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{x}_1 & \dots & \mathbf{x}_K \end{bmatrix} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Then, by the matrix-determinant lemma, we have that

$$\det(P(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})) = \left(\frac{N}{\sigma^2}\right)^K \det\left(I_N - \frac{b}{(1+bK)N} \sum_{j=1}^K \mathbf{x}_j \mathbf{x}_j^\top\right)$$

We will now calculate a lower bound on $\det\left(I_N - \frac{b}{(1+bK)N} \sum_{j=1}^K \mathbf{x}_j \mathbf{x}_j^\top\right)$. The calculation of this lower bound relies on a result given by Ostrowski (Ostrowski, 1938; Brent et al., 2015), which states that if $A = I_N - E$ is a matrix such that for each entry $e_{jj'}$ of E we have that $|e_{jj'}| \leq \epsilon$ where $N\epsilon < 1$, then we have that $\det(A) \geq 1 - N\epsilon$.

It is easy to show that each entry of $\frac{b}{(1+bK)N} \sum_{j=1}^K \mathbf{x}_j \mathbf{x}_j^\top$ is bounded in absolute value by $\epsilon = \frac{bK}{(1+bK)N}$. This is because the entries of each matrix $\mathbf{x}_j \mathbf{x}_j^\top$ consists of either -1 or 1, and we are summing K of these matrices together. Thus each entry of $\sum_{j=1}^K \mathbf{x}_j \mathbf{x}_j^\top$ is bounded in absolute value by K . Naturally, it follows that $N\epsilon = \frac{bK}{1+bK} < 1$. Thus, Ostrowski's lower bound applies in this setting and we have that

$$\det\left(I_N - \frac{b}{(1+bK)N} \sum_{j=1}^K \mathbf{x}_j \mathbf{x}_j^\top\right) \geq 1 - N \frac{bK}{(1+bK)N} = \frac{1}{1+bK}.$$

This lower bound holds for any choices of $\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_K$.

For the particular case where we use the same allocation across experiments, i.e. $\mathbf{x}_1 = \dots = \mathbf{x}_K = \mathbf{x}$, using the matrix-determinant lemma we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \det\left(I_N - \frac{b}{(1+bK)N} K \mathbf{x} \mathbf{x}^\top\right) &= \left(1 - \frac{bK}{(1+bK)N} \mathbf{x}^\top \mathbf{x}\right) \det(I_N) \\ &= 1 - \frac{bK}{1+bK} = \frac{1}{1+bK}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, using the same (covariate balancing) allocation across experiments results in the worst possible D-efficiency under collaborative analysis, if we restrict our choice of allocations to covariate balancing allocations.