

Design-based causal inference in bipartite experiments

*Sizhu Lu[†] Lei Shi[‡] Yue Fang[§] Wenxin Zhang[¶] Peng Ding^{||}

January 20, 2025

Abstract

Bipartite experiments are widely used across various fields, yet existing methods often rely on strong assumptions about modeling the potential outcomes and exposure mapping. In this paper, we explore design-based causal inference in bipartite experiments, where treatments are randomized over one set of units, while outcomes are measured over a separate set of units. We first formulate the causal inference problem under a design-based framework that generalizes the classic assumption to account for bipartite interference. We then propose point and variance estimators for the total treatment effect, establish a central limit theorem for the estimator, and propose a conservative variance estimator. Additionally, we discuss a covariate adjustment strategy to enhance estimation efficiency.

Key Words: bipartite interference; finite population; covariate adjustment; randomization inference

1 Introduction

Bipartite experiments have gained increasing recognition for their utility in various fields, including digital experimentation (Harshaw et al., 2023; Shi et al., 2024) and environmental science (Zigler and Papadogeorgou, 2021). In bipartite experiments, the treatments are randomized over one set of units, called *treatment units*, while the outcomes are measured over a separate set of units, called the *outcome units*. This is different from the classic experiment settings where we randomly assign units to different treatment groups and measure their outcome of interest after the initiation of treatment. As illustrated in Figure 1, the treatment units and outcome units are connected through a known fixed bipartite graph, and causal dependencies are represented by the bipartite network, leading to what is known as *bipartite interference* (Zigler and Papadogeorgou, 2021).

There has been extensive research on bipartite experiments. A well-known special case is cluster randomization, which has been studied in theory and adopted in practice (Donner, 1998; Donner et al., 2000;

*The first two authors contributed equally to this work.

[†]Department of Statistics, University of California, Berkeley, CA 94720, USA. Email: sizhu_lu@berkeley.edu

[‡]Division of Biostatistics, University of California, Berkeley, CA 94720, USA. Email: leishi@berkeley.edu

[§]School of Management and Economics, The Chinese University of Hong Kong, Shenzhen, 518172 China. Email: fangyue@cuhk.edu.cn

[¶]Division of Biostatistics, University of California, Berkeley, CA 94720, USA. Email: wenxin_zhang@berkeley.edu

^{||}Department of Statistics, University of California, Berkeley, CA 94720, USA. Email: pengdingpku@berkeley.edu




Figure 1: Illustration of a bipartite experiment with $n = 4$ and $m = 5$

(Su and Ding, 2021). The cluster experiment setup corresponds to a situation where each outcome unit is connected to exactly one treatment unit. More recent works have focused on the general bipartite network, where each outcome unit may be connected to multiple treatment units, and vice versa. Zigler and Papadogeorgou (2021) formulated a set of causal estimands in bipartite experiments and proposed an inverse probability-weighted estimator for observational studies. Doudchenko et al. (2020) leveraged the generalized propensity score to obtain unbiased estimates of causal effects. Harshaw et al. (2023) explored the estimation and inference of the average total treatment effect under a linear exposure-response model. Shi et al. (2024) extended Harshaw et al. (2023) by studying covariate adjustment under a double linear model. Song and Papadogeorgou (2024) studied bipartite experiments in the time series and random network setting under exposure examined bipartite experiments in time series and random network settings using exposure mapping and matching estimators for observational studies. Several works have also addressed the design of experiments in the presence of bipartite interference. For example, Pouget-Abadie et al. (2019), Harshaw et al. (2023), and Brennan et al. (2022) investigated methods for constructing better experimental designs in such context.

In this work, we conduct a design-based analysis for bipartite experiments, where we define casual parameters based on fixed potential outcomes and derive properties of estimators for causal effects under the randomness of treatment assignment (Imbens and Rubin, 2015; Ding, 2024). Many existing approaches (e.g. Harshaw et al., 2023; Doudchenko et al., 2020; Lu et al., 2024) have touched such a perspective for bipartite experiments. However, these works typically rely on strong modeling assumptions on the potential outcomes. For example, Harshaw et al. (2023) adopted a linear exposure mapping (Aronow and Samii, 2017; Forastiere et al., 2021) with a linear outcome model. Doudchenko et al. (2020) used exposure mapping for estimation along with a linear model for variance estimation. Lu et al. (2024) applied a heterogeneous additive effect model on the potential outcomes. Estimation and inference using these model-based methods depend heavily on correct model specifications, and a more flexible design-based framework that requires fewer assumptions has not yet been rigorously discussed in the context of bipartite experiments. There

are several challenges to adopting such a framework in this context. For instance, how can we establish central limit theorems and construct valid variance estimators with strong dependencies across outcome units? Furthermore, if covariate information is available, how should we perform covariate adjustment in a model-agnostic fashion without relying on parametric assumptions on the outcomes and covariates, following the spirit of [Lin \(2013\)](#)?

Our contributions. First, we formulate the causal inference problem in bipartite experiments under the design-based framework. We generalize the stable unit treatment value assumption (SUTVA) to account for bipartite interference. This generalization is tailored to the bipartite network structure, enabling the identification of the total treatment effect as a function of observed data. Unlike model-based frameworks, our approach avoids the strong assumptions on modeling the potential outcomes or exposure mapping.

Second, we propose a Hájek estimator for the total treatment effect and prove its consistency and asymptotic normality under mild assumptions on the network structure. We also propose a conservative variance estimator that ensures valid inference by accounting for the complexity of the network.

Third, we present a model-agnostic covariate-adjusted estimator that is asymptotically no less efficient than the Hájek-type estimator while maintaining valid inference.

Organization of the paper. The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 introduces the design-based setup of the bipartite experiments. Section 3 discusses the estimation of the total treatment effect under bipartite interference. Section 4 presents a covariate adjustment strategy for constructing point and variance estimators and proves their asymptotic properties. Section 5 conducts many numerical experiments to validate the proposed methods and theoretical results. Section 6 concludes the paper and outlines future research directions. All proofs and technical details are in the Supplementary Material.

Notation. We will use the following notation. Let $\mathbb{1}\{\cdot\}$ denote the indicator function. Let plim denote the probability limit, $\text{avar}(\cdot)$ and $\text{acov}(\cdot, \cdot)$ denote the asymptotic variance and covariance, respectively, and \asymp denote asymptotically the same order as the sample size increases to infinity. For any positive integer K , denote $[K] = \{1, \dots, K\}$ as the set of all positive integers smaller than or equal to K . Write $b_n = O(a_n)$ if b_n/a_n is bounded and $b_n = o(a_n)$ if b_n/a_n converges to 0 as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Write $b_n = O_p(a_n)$ if b_n/a_n is bounded in probability and $b_n = o_p(a_n)$ if b_n/a_n converges to 0 in probability.

2 Setup

2.1 Motivating examples

We first present several motivating examples that highlight the applicability of bipartite experiments.

Example 1 (Power plant). *Zigler and Papadogeorgou (2021) studies the problem of evaluating how the installation of selective noncatalytic reduction system or not (treatment) in their upwind power plants (treatment units) causally affects the hospitalization rates in the neighborhoods (outcome units). In this case, a*

neighborhood can be affected by the treatments of multiple upwind power plants, while one power plant may affect a set of neighborhoods. We will revisit this example in Section 5.2.

Example 2 (Facebook Group). *Shi et al. (2024)* considers a bipartite experiment where treatments are randomized across Facebook Groups and outcomes are measured by user-level engagement. The outcome of each user is affected by interventions on a set of groups they belong to, while treatment in each group affects all users within that group.

Example 3 (Amazon market). *Harshaw et al. (2023)* simulates a bipartite experiment on the Amazon marketplace to evaluate the impact of new pricing mechanisms (treatments) randomized across items (treatment units) on the level of satisfaction (outcome) of the customers (outcome units). In this scenario, items with new pricing mechanisms may influence the group of customers who view them, while each customer may encounter a variety of items subject to different pricing strategies.

2.2 Setup of bipartite experiments

Consider a finite population with m treatment units and n outcome units. For simplicity, we abbreviate the terminology and call the treatment units “groups” and the outcome units “units”. The units and groups are connected through a bipartite network, summarized by a known $n \times m$ adjacency matrix \mathbf{W} , where W_{ik} equals 1 if unit i is in the group k , and 0 otherwise for $i = 1, \dots, n$ and $k = 1, \dots, m$. Let $\mathcal{S}_i \subset \{1, \dots, m\}$ denote the subset which includes indices of all groups unit i is in, i.e., $k \in \mathcal{S}_i$ if and only if $W_{ik} = 1$, and let $|\mathcal{S}_i| = \sum_{k=1}^m W_{ik}$ denote the total number of groups unit i belongs to and $\bar{S} = \max_i |\mathcal{S}_i|$ denote the maximum number of groups the units belong to.

As we have introduced in Section 1, in the bipartite experiment, the treatment assignment is randomly assigned at the group level, while the outcome of interest is measured on the unit side. On the group side, we randomly assign the m groups to treatment and control arms. Let Z_k denote the binary treatment status of group k , where Z_k equals 1 if group k is assigned to treatment, and 0 otherwise. Let $\mathcal{D}_k \subset \{1, \dots, n\}$ denote the subset which includes indices of all units that belong to group k , and $|\mathcal{D}_k| = \sum_{i=1}^n W_{ik}$ denote the number of units group k contains and $\bar{D} = \max_k |\mathcal{D}_k|$ denote the maximum number of units the groups contain.

For each unit i , there are 2^m potential outcomes $Y_i(\mathbf{z})$, where $\mathbf{z} = (z_1, \dots, z_m)$ and $z_k = 0, 1, k = 1, \dots, m$. The observed outcome $Y = Y(\mathbf{Z})$, where $\mathbf{Z} = (Z_1, \dots, Z_m)$. We make the following assumption:

Assumption 1. *The potential outcomes of unit i depend only on the treatment status of the groups to which it belongs. Formally, $Y_i(\mathbf{z}) = Y_i(\mathbf{z}_{\mathcal{S}_i})$, where $\mathbf{z}_{\mathcal{S}_i}$ denotes the subvector of \mathbf{z} corresponding to groups in \mathcal{S}_i .*

Here the potential outcome $Y_i(\mathbf{z})$ depends on the treatment vector $\mathbf{z}_{\mathcal{S}_i}$, whose dimension varies across units, unlike the classic setting. We focus on the total treatment effect

$$\tau = n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \{Y_i(\mathbf{1}) - Y_i(\mathbf{0})\},$$

which captures the difference in the average potential outcomes when all groups are treated versus when none are controlled. It is a widely studied estimand in settings with interference such as bipartite spatial experiments (Zigler and Papadogeorgou, 2021; Harshaw et al., 2023). Denote $\mu_1 = n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n Y_i(\mathbf{1})$ and $\mu_0 = n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n Y_i(\mathbf{0})$, we have $\tau = \mu_1 - \mu_0$.

3 Estimation and inference

3.1 Point estimator

Let $T_i = \mathbb{1}\{\sum_{k=1}^m W_{ik}(1 - Z_k) = 0\}$ and $C_i = \mathbb{1}\{\sum_{k=1}^m W_{ik}Z_k = 0\}$ denote the indicator that all groups which unit i belongs to were assigned to the treatment group and the control group, respectively. Across the paper, we focus on Bernoulli randomization as the treatment assignment mechanism on the group level, formally defined in the following assumption:

Assumption 2 (Bernoulli randomization). *Each group is randomly assigned to the treatment group with probability p and to the control group with probability $1 - p$, i.e., $Z_k \stackrel{iid}{\sim} \text{Bern}(p)$.*

Under Assumption 2, we have $E(T_i) = p^{|\mathcal{S}_i|}$ and $E(C_i) = (1 - p)^{|\mathcal{S}_i|}$. A natural Horvitz-Thompson-type estimator $n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n T_i Y_i / p^{|\mathcal{S}_i|} - n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n C_i Y_i / (1 - p)^{|\mathcal{S}_i|}$ is unbiased for τ . However, throughout this paper, we focus on the following Hájek-type weighting estimator $\hat{\tau} = \hat{\mu}_1 - \hat{\mu}_0$, where

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{\mu}_1 &= n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{T_i Y_i}{p^{|\mathcal{S}_i|}} / n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{T_i}{p^{|\mathcal{S}_i|}}, \\ \hat{\mu}_0 &= n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{C_i Y_i}{(1 - p)^{|\mathcal{S}_i|}} / n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{C_i}{(1 - p)^{|\mathcal{S}_i|}},\end{aligned}$$

because of its better finite-sample performance compared with the unbiased Horvitz-Thompson estimator.

3.2 Consistency of $\hat{\tau}$

In this subsection, we establish the consistency of $\hat{\tau}$. We need the following regularity conditions.

Assumption 3. $\bar{S} = O(1)$ and $\bar{D}/n = o(1)$.

Assumption 3 restricts the density of the bipartite graph as n increases. We restrict the maximum number of groups each unit belongs to bounded by a constant while allowing for the maximum number of units each group contains to increase with n but at a slower rate.

Assumption 4. *The potential outcomes and the covariates are bounded.*

We impose the boundedness of the potential outcomes and covariates in Assumption 4 to prove the limiting theorems. We can relax it to some moment conditions but keep the form of Assumption 4 to simplify the presentation.

We have the following consistency result for $\hat{\tau}$.

Theorem 3.1 (Consistency of $\hat{\tau}$). *Under Assumptions 1-4, $\hat{\tau}$ converges in probability to τ .*

3.3 Asymptotic distribution

In this section, we establish the asymptotic normality of the point estimator $\hat{\tau}$. For this purpose, we further assume the following condition on the density of the bipartite graph.

Assumption 5 (Sparse bipartite graph). *Define groups j_1 and j_2 are connected if there exists at least one unit belonging to both groups. Assume for any group k , the total number of groups that are connected to k is bounded by an absolute constant B :*

$$\sum_{j \in [m] \setminus \{k\}} \mathbb{1}\{j, k \text{ are connected}\} \leq B, \quad k = 1, \dots, m.$$

Assumption 5 imposes some sparsity conditions on the degree of the group network. Assuming a bounded degree simplifies the presentation of the theoretical results, though our theory allows B to grow in some polynomial order of n . This sparsity condition can be justified in many bipartite experiments. For instance, in Example 1, two power plants are defined as connected only if there is at least one neighborhood monitored within a certain distance of both power plants. If two power plants are far away from each other, they are not connected. Therefore, such a geographical network formation naturally restricts the sparsity of the network degrees. However, there are examples where this assumption is less likely to hold. In Example 3, the items are connected in a dense pattern because each customer may encounter a wide range of items while browsing the website, and the browsing lists from different customers can have many overlaps. We might need different estimation strategies and theoretical tools to analyze bipartite experiments with such dense network formations.

We introduce some additional notation for the potential outcomes. Let $\mathbf{Y}(\mathbf{z}) = (Y_1(\mathbf{z}), \dots, Y_n(\mathbf{z}))$ denote the vector consisting all potential outcomes under treatment assignment \mathbf{z} , and $\tilde{\mathbf{Y}}(\mathbf{z}) = \mathbf{Y}(\mathbf{z}) - n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n Y_i(\mathbf{z})$ denote the centered potential outcome vector. Moreover, for $i, j = 1, \dots, n$, define the following matrices:

$$(\Lambda_1)_{i,j} = p^{-|\mathcal{S}_i \cap \mathcal{S}_j|} - 1, \quad (\Lambda_0)_{i,j} = (1-p)^{-|\mathcal{S}_i \cap \mathcal{S}_j|} - 1, \quad (\Lambda_\tau)_{i,j} = \mathbb{1}\{\mathcal{S}_i \cap \mathcal{S}_j \neq \emptyset\}.$$

The following theorem formally establishes the asymptotic normality of $\hat{\tau}$:

Theorem 3.2 (Asymptotic normality of $\hat{\tau}$). *Under Assumptions 1–5, we have*

$$v_n^{-1/2}(\hat{\tau} - \tau) \rightarrow \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$$

if the asymptotic variance v_n is nondegenerate in the sense that:

$$\frac{v_n}{\sqrt{m} \cdot (D/n)^2} \rightarrow \infty, \tag{1}$$

where v_n has the following expression:

$$v_n = n^{-2} \left\{ \tilde{\mathbf{Y}}(\mathbf{1})^\top \Lambda_1 \tilde{\mathbf{Y}}(\mathbf{1}) + \tilde{\mathbf{Y}}(\mathbf{0})^\top \Lambda_0 \tilde{\mathbf{Y}}(\mathbf{0}) + 2\tilde{\mathbf{Y}}(\mathbf{1})^\top \Lambda_\tau \tilde{\mathbf{Y}}(\mathbf{0}) \right\}. \tag{2}$$

Remark 3.1 (Non-degeneracy of v_n). *In Theorem 3.2, we impose the non-degeneracy condition (1) to rule out the cases where the asymptotic variance (2) is too small in order. The rate is motivated by our central limit theorem established in Theorem A.1 in the supplementary material. Naturally, it requires the potential outcomes to have a non-degenerate covariance structure. In the classic Bernoulli randomized experiments setting, $\bar{D} = 1$ and $n = m$, and (2) requires v_n to have a larger order than $n^{-3/2}$. This is automatically satisfied according to the standard results in the literature (e.g. Li and Ding, 2017) which typically gives the rate of $v_n = O(n^{-1})$ under mild assumptions on the potential outcomes.*

As an additional sanity check, we justify the nondegeneracy condition in some random data examples. Consider a network where \bar{D} and \bar{S} are both finite. Then $m \asymp n$. If the potential outcomes $(Y_i(\mathbf{1}), Y_i(\mathbf{0}))$ are generated independently from a bivariate normal distribution $\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}_2, \sigma_i^2 \mathbf{I}_2)$, then the quantities in v_n has the following order:

$$\begin{aligned} n^{-2} \tilde{\mathbf{Y}}(\mathbf{1})^\top \Lambda_1 \tilde{\mathbf{Y}}(\mathbf{1}) &= n^{-2} \sum_{i=1}^n (p^{-|\mathcal{S}_i|} - 1) \sigma_i^2 + o_p(n^{-1}), \\ n^{-2} \tilde{\mathbf{Y}}(\mathbf{0})^\top \Lambda_0 \tilde{\mathbf{Y}}(\mathbf{0}) &= n^{-2} \sum_{i=1}^n (p^{-|\mathcal{S}_i|} - 1) \sigma_i^2 + o_p(n^{-1}), \\ n^{-2} \tilde{\mathbf{Y}}(\mathbf{1})^\top \Lambda_\tau \tilde{\mathbf{Y}}(\mathbf{0}) &= o_p(n^{-1}), \end{aligned}$$

which ensure that

$$v_n = 2n^{-2} \sum_{i=1}^n (p^{-|\mathcal{S}_i|} - 1) \sigma_i^2 + o_p(n^{-1}),$$

thus Condition (2) is satisfied.

Below we use classic Bernoulli randomization and cluster randomization as examples to illustrate the variance formula in Theorem 3.2. Our Theorem 3.2 recovers the existing results.

Example 4 (Classic Bernoulli randomized experiment). *In classic Bernoulli randomization where the randomization units are identical to the outcome units,*

$$\mathcal{S}_i \cap \mathcal{S}_j = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } i = j, \\ 0, & \text{if } i \neq j. \end{cases}$$

Thus the asymptotic variance in equation (2) reduces to

$$v_n = n^{-2} p(1-p) \sum_{i=1}^n \left\{ \frac{\tilde{Y}_i(\mathbf{1})}{p} - \frac{\tilde{Y}_i(\mathbf{0})}{1-p} \right\}^2,$$

which recovers the classic result of Bernoulli randomization in Miratrix et al. (2012, Theorem 1).

Example 5 (Cluster randomization). *In a cluster randomization setting with m clusters and the treatment*

assignment $Z_k \stackrel{iid}{\sim} \text{Bern}(p)$ for $k = 1, \dots, m$, we have

$$\mathcal{S}_i \cap \mathcal{S}_j = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } i, j \text{ belong to the same group,} \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

If we order the units according to the cluster they belong to, then

$$\Lambda_\tau = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{1}_{n_1} & \mathbf{0} & \cdots & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{1}_{n_2} & \cdots & \mathbf{0} \\ \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \cdots & \mathbf{1}_{n_m} \end{pmatrix}, \quad \Lambda_1 = \frac{1-p}{p} \Lambda_\tau, \quad \Lambda_0 = \frac{p}{1-p} \Lambda_\tau,$$

where $\mathbf{1}_{n_k}$ is an $n_k \times n_k$ -dimensional matrix with all entries equal to 1 and n_k is the total number of units in cluster k for $k = 1, \dots, m$. Therefore, the asymptotic variance in equation (2) reduces to

$$v_n = n^{-2} p(1-p) \sum_{k=1}^m \left[\sum_{i \in \mathcal{D}_k} \left\{ \frac{\tilde{Y}_i(1)}{p} - \frac{\tilde{Y}_i(0)}{1-p} \right\} \right]^2.$$

3.4 Variance estimation

To conduct Wald-type inference based on the central limit theorem in Theorem 3.2, we need to estimate the asymptotic variance v_n . We propose the following variance estimator

$$\hat{v} = \left[\left\{ n^{-2} \sum_{i,j} \frac{T_i T_j (Y_i - \hat{\mu}_1)(Y_j - \hat{\mu}_1)(\Lambda_1)_{i,j}}{p^{|S_i \cup S_j|}} \right\}^{1/2} + \left\{ n^{-2} \sum_{i,j} \frac{C_i C_j (Y_i - \hat{\mu}_0)(Y_j - \hat{\mu}_0)(\Lambda_0)_{i,j}}{(1-p)^{|S_i \cup S_j|}} \right\}^{1/2} \right]^2 \quad (3)$$

The variance formula in (3) involves double summations over units i and j , where the two parts inside brackets are sample analogs of $n^{-2} \tilde{\mathbf{Y}}(\mathbf{1})^\top \Lambda_1 \tilde{\mathbf{Y}}(\mathbf{1})$ and $n^{-2} \tilde{\mathbf{Y}}(\mathbf{0})^\top \Lambda_0 \tilde{\mathbf{Y}}(\mathbf{0})$, respectively.

The following Theorem 3.3 shows that \hat{v} converges in probability and is conservative to the true asymptotic variance $\text{avar}(\hat{\tau})$. Therefore, we can construct the Wald-type large-sample confidence interval: $[\hat{\tau} - q_{\alpha/2} \hat{v}^{1/2}, \hat{\tau} + q_{\alpha/2} \hat{v}^{1/2}]$ that ensures valid Type I error control in a large sample, where $q_{\alpha/2}$ denotes the upper $\alpha/2$ quantile of a standard Gaussian distribution.

Theorem 3.3 (Conservative variance estimator for $\hat{\tau}$). *Under Assumptions 1–5,*

(a) $\hat{v}/\text{plim}(\hat{v})$ converges in probability to 1, where

$$\text{plim}(\hat{v}) = \left[\left\{ n^{-2} \tilde{\mathbf{Y}}(\mathbf{1})^\top \Lambda_1 \tilde{\mathbf{Y}}(\mathbf{1}) \right\}^{1/2} + \left\{ n^{-2} \tilde{\mathbf{Y}}(\mathbf{0})^\top \Lambda_0 \tilde{\mathbf{Y}}(\mathbf{0}) \right\}^{1/2} \right]^2.$$

(b) $\text{plim}(\hat{v}) \geq \text{avar}(\hat{\tau})$, where the equality holds if and only if

$$\tilde{\mathbf{Y}}(\mathbf{1})^\top \Lambda_\tau \tilde{\mathbf{Y}}(\mathbf{0}) = \left\{ \tilde{\mathbf{Y}}(\mathbf{1})^\top \Lambda_1 \tilde{\mathbf{Y}}(\mathbf{1}) \right\}^{1/2} \left\{ \tilde{\mathbf{Y}}(\mathbf{0})^\top \Lambda_0 \tilde{\mathbf{Y}}(\mathbf{0}) \right\}^{1/2}. \quad (4)$$

Condition (4) quantifies the requirement to achieve consistent variance estimation, which is derived based on the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality. It depends on both the values of the potential outcomes and the structure of the networks. We revisit the two Examples 4 and 5 to provide more intuition of the equality condition in special cases.

Continuance of Example 4 (Classic Bernoulli randomized experiment). *In the classic Bernoulli randomized experiment setting, condition (4) reduces to*

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \tilde{Y}_i(1)\tilde{Y}_i(0) = \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^n \tilde{Y}_i(1)^2 \sum_{i=1}^n \tilde{Y}_i(0)^2 \right\}^{1/2},$$

which is equivalent to $\tilde{Y}_i(1) = \zeta_1 \tilde{Y}_i(0)$ for any $i = 1, \dots, n$ and $\zeta_1 > 0$ is a positive constant. A special case that satisfies this condition is the constant treatment effect case with $Y_i(1) - Y_i(0) = \tau$ for all units $i = 1, \dots, n$.

Continuance of Example 5 (Cluster randomization). *In the cluster experiment setting, condition (4) reduces to*

$$\sum_{k=1}^m \left\{ \sum_{i \in \mathcal{D}_k} \tilde{Y}_i(1) \right\} \left\{ \sum_{i \in \mathcal{D}_k} \tilde{Y}_i(0) \right\} = \left[\sum_{k=1}^m \left\{ \sum_{i \in \mathcal{D}_k} \tilde{Y}_i(1) \right\}^2 \sum_{k=1}^m \left\{ \sum_{i \in \mathcal{D}_k} \tilde{Y}_i(0) \right\}^2 \right]^{1/2},$$

which is equivalent to $\sum_{i \in \mathcal{D}_k} \tilde{Y}_i(1) = \zeta_2 \sum_{i \in \mathcal{D}_k} \tilde{Y}_i(0)$ for any $k = 1, \dots, m$ and $\zeta_2 > 0$ is a positive constant. A special case that satisfies this condition is when the cluster-specific average treatment effect on each cluster is a constant, i.e., $|\mathcal{D}_k|^{-1} \{ \sum_{i \in \mathcal{D}_k} Y_i(1) - \sum_{i \in \mathcal{D}_k} Y_i(0) \} = \tau$ for all clusters $k = 1, \dots, m$.

4 Covariate adjustment

4.1 Methodology

In this section, we propose a covariate adjustment strategy to improve efficiency in bipartite experiments. Covariate adjustment is a classic topic in randomized experiments. For completely randomized experiments, Fisher (1925) proposed to use the analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) to improve estimation efficiency. Freedman (2008a,b) later reanalyzed the ANCOVA and found that it does not guarantee efficiency improvement in completely randomized experiments. In respond to the critics, Lin (2013) proposed another covariate adjustment strategy that guarantees asymptotic efficiency gains, and the resulting estimator is usually called the Lin’s estimator in the literature. Ding (2024, Chapter 6) reviewed the intuition of Lin (2013) from different points of view. We will generalize the idea of Lin (2013) to obtain a covariate adjustment strategy in the current setting.

Let \tilde{X}_i denote the centered covariates, i.e., $\tilde{X}_i = X_i - n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n X_i$. Consider a class of linearly adjusted estimators indexed by (β_1, β_0) :

$$\hat{\tau}(\beta_1, \beta_0) = n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{T_i(Y_i - \beta_1^T \tilde{X}_i)}{p^{|\mathcal{S}_i|}} / n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{T_i}{p^{|\mathcal{S}_i|}} - n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{C_i(Y_i - \beta_0^T \tilde{X}_i)}{(1-p)^{|\mathcal{S}_i|}} / n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{C_i}{(1-p)^{|\mathcal{S}_i|}},$$

where we replace Y_i in the naive estimator $\hat{\tau}$ with linearly adjusted residuals. Further denote $\tilde{\mathbf{X}} = (\tilde{X}_1, \dots, \tilde{X}_n)^\top$ the centered covariate matrix including all n units. The covariate adjustment estimator $\hat{\tau}(\beta_1, \beta_0)$ has the following properties for fixed (β_1, β_0) .

Proposition 4.1 (Consistency and asymptotic distribution of $\hat{\tau}(\beta_1, \beta_0)$). *Under Assumptions 1–4, for any fixed (β_1, β_0) , $\hat{\tau}(\beta_1, \beta_0)$ converges in probability to τ . Further suppose Assumption 5 holds, the variance of $\hat{\tau}(\beta_1, \beta_0)$ has the order $\text{var}\{\hat{\tau}(\beta_1, \beta_0)\}/v_n(\beta_1, \beta_0) = 1 + o(1)$, where*

$$\begin{aligned} v_n(\beta_1, \beta_0) &= n^{-2} \left[\{\tilde{\mathbf{Y}}(\mathbf{1}) - \tilde{\mathbf{X}}\beta_1\}^\top \Lambda_1 \{\tilde{\mathbf{Y}}(\mathbf{1}) - \tilde{\mathbf{X}}\beta_1\} + \{\tilde{\mathbf{Y}}(\mathbf{0}) - \tilde{\mathbf{X}}\beta_0\}^\top \Lambda_0 \{\tilde{\mathbf{Y}}(\mathbf{0}) - \tilde{\mathbf{X}}\beta_0\} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + 2\{\tilde{\mathbf{Y}}(\mathbf{1}) - \tilde{\mathbf{X}}\beta_1\}^\top \Lambda_\tau \{\tilde{\mathbf{Y}}(\mathbf{0}) - \tilde{\mathbf{X}}\beta_0\} \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

Further assuming the non-degeneracy of $v_n(\beta_1, \beta_0)$, i.e., $v_n(\beta_1, \beta_0) \asymp \bar{D}/n$, we have

$$v_n(\beta_1, \beta_0)^{-1/2} \{\hat{\tau}(\beta_1, \beta_0) - \tau(\beta_1, \beta_0)\} \rightarrow \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$$

in distribution.

Proposition 4.1 states the analogous results to Theorem 3.2 on the asymptotic distribution of the class of covariate-adjusted estimators. The results follow directly when we treat the linearly adjusted residuals of the potential outcomes, $Y_i(1) - \beta_1^\top \tilde{X}_i$ and $Y_i(0) - \beta_0^\top \tilde{X}_i$, as “pseudo potential outcomes” and apply Theorem 3.2. Similarly, we can construct a conservative variance estimator for $\hat{\tau}(\beta_1, \beta_0)$. Denote the upper bound of $v_n(\beta_1, \beta_0)$ as

$$v_{n,\text{UB}}(\beta_1, \beta_0) = \left(\left[n^{-2} \{\tilde{\mathbf{Y}}(\mathbf{1}) - \tilde{\mathbf{X}}\beta_1\}^\top \Lambda_1 \{\tilde{\mathbf{Y}}(\mathbf{1}) - \tilde{\mathbf{X}}\beta_1\} \right]^{1/2} + \left[n^{-2} \{\tilde{\mathbf{Y}}(\mathbf{0}) - \tilde{\mathbf{X}}\beta_0\}^\top \Lambda_0 \{\tilde{\mathbf{Y}}(\mathbf{0}) - \tilde{\mathbf{X}}\beta_0\} \right]^{1/2} \right)^2$$

and the corresponding consistent estimator of the upper bound as

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{v}_{n,\text{UB}}(\beta_1, \beta_0) &= \left[\left\{ n^{-2} \sum_{i,j} \frac{T_i T_j (Y_i - \hat{\mu}_1 - \beta_1^\top \tilde{X}_i)(Y_j - \hat{\mu}_1 - \beta_1^\top \tilde{X}_j)(\Lambda_1)_{i,j}}{p^{|S_i \cup S_j|}} \right\}^{1/2} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \left\{ n^{-2} \sum_{i,j} \frac{C_i C_j (Y_i - \hat{\mu}_0 - \beta_0^\top \tilde{X}_i)(Y_j - \hat{\mu}_0 - \beta_0^\top \tilde{X}_j)(\Lambda_0)_{i,j}}{(1-p)^{|S_i \cup S_j|}} \right\}^{1/2} \right]^2. \end{aligned}$$

To gain the best asymptotic efficiency by using covariate adjustment estimators, ideally, we want to minimize the asymptotic variance in (5) over (β_1, β_0) . However, the third term in (5) is not estimable because it depends on the joint distribution of the potential outcomes. Instead, the improvement in the asymptotic variance of the covariate-adjusted estimator, $\hat{\tau}(\beta_1, \beta_0)$, compared with that of the naive estimator $\hat{\tau}$, is estimable. Denote

$$L(\beta_1, \beta_0) = n^{-2} \begin{pmatrix} \beta_1 \\ \beta_0 \end{pmatrix}^\top \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{\mathbf{X}}^\top \Lambda_1 \tilde{\mathbf{X}} & \tilde{\mathbf{X}}^\top \Lambda_\tau \tilde{\mathbf{X}} \\ \tilde{\mathbf{X}}^\top \Lambda_\tau \tilde{\mathbf{X}} & \tilde{\mathbf{X}}^\top \Lambda_0 \tilde{\mathbf{X}} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \beta_1 \\ \beta_0 \end{pmatrix} - 2n^{-2} \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{\mathbf{X}}^\top \Lambda_1 \tilde{\mathbf{Y}}(\mathbf{1}) + \tilde{\mathbf{X}}^\top \Lambda_\tau \tilde{\mathbf{Y}}(\mathbf{0}) \\ \tilde{\mathbf{X}}^\top \Lambda_0 \tilde{\mathbf{Y}}(\mathbf{0}) + \tilde{\mathbf{X}}^\top \Lambda_\tau \tilde{\mathbf{Y}}(\mathbf{1}) \end{pmatrix}^\top \begin{pmatrix} \beta_1 \\ \beta_0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

We can verify that $L(\beta_1, \beta_0)$ is the difference between the two asymptotic variances $v_n(\beta_1, \beta_0)$ and $v_n(0, 0)$ thus measures the efficiency gain of $\hat{\tau}(\beta_1, \beta_0)$ compared with $\hat{\tau}$. We formalize it in Lemma 4.1.

Lemma 4.1. *We have $L(\beta_1, \beta_0) = v_n(\beta_1, \beta_0) - v_n(0, 0)$.*

Define the optimization problem and its solution as

$$\left(\tilde{\beta}_1, \tilde{\beta}_0\right) = \arg \min_{\beta_1, \beta_0} L(\beta_1, \beta_0). \quad (6)$$

By construction, the improvement in asymptotic variance is guaranteed. We formalize this result in the following proposition.

Proposition 4.2 (Improvement in asymptotic variance). *The covariate adjustment estimator $\hat{\tau}(\tilde{\beta}_1, \tilde{\beta}_0)$ has an asymptotic variance no larger than that of $\hat{\tau}$, i.e., $v_n(\tilde{\beta}_1, \tilde{\beta}_0) \leq v_n$.*

4.2 Estimation and inference based on covariate adjustment

The optimization in (6) is a population-level convex problem which has a closed-form global optimal solution $(\tilde{\beta}_1, \tilde{\beta}_0)$,

$$\begin{pmatrix} \tilde{\beta}_1 \\ \tilde{\beta}_0 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{\mathbf{X}}^\top \Lambda_1 \tilde{\mathbf{X}} & \tilde{\mathbf{X}}^\top \Lambda_\tau \tilde{\mathbf{X}} \\ \tilde{\mathbf{X}}^\top \Lambda_\tau \tilde{\mathbf{X}} & \tilde{\mathbf{X}}^\top \Lambda_0 \tilde{\mathbf{X}} \end{pmatrix}^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{\mathbf{X}}^\top \Lambda_1 \tilde{\mathbf{Y}}(\mathbf{1}) + \tilde{\mathbf{X}}^\top \Lambda_\tau \tilde{\mathbf{Y}}(\mathbf{0}) \\ \tilde{\mathbf{X}}^\top \Lambda_0 \tilde{\mathbf{Y}}(\mathbf{0}) + \tilde{\mathbf{X}}^\top \Lambda_\tau \tilde{\mathbf{Y}}(\mathbf{1}) \end{pmatrix}.$$

We propose to estimate the vector which includes unobserved potential outcomes using the sample analog by inverse probability weighting, similar to the trick used for variance estimation in Section 3.4. We construct the following estimator of $(\tilde{\beta}_1, \tilde{\beta}_0)$,

$$\begin{pmatrix} \hat{\beta}_1 \\ \hat{\beta}_0 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{\mathbf{X}}^\top \Lambda_1 \tilde{\mathbf{X}} & \tilde{\mathbf{X}}^\top \Lambda_\tau \tilde{\mathbf{X}} \\ \tilde{\mathbf{X}}^\top \Lambda_\tau \tilde{\mathbf{X}} & \tilde{\mathbf{X}}^\top \Lambda_0 \tilde{\mathbf{X}} \end{pmatrix}^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} \sum_{i,j} \frac{T_i T_j \tilde{X}_i (Y_j - \hat{\mu}_1) (\Lambda_1)_{i,j}}{p^{|S_i \cup S_j|}} + \sum_{i,j} \frac{C_i C_j \tilde{X}_i (Y_j - \hat{\mu}_0) (\Lambda_\tau)_{i,j}}{(1-p)^{|S_i \cup S_j|}} \\ \sum_{i,j} \frac{T_i T_j \tilde{X}_i (Y_j - \hat{\mu}_1) (\Lambda_\tau)_{i,j}}{p^{|S_i \cup S_j|}} + \sum_{i,j} \frac{C_i C_j \tilde{X}_i (Y_j - \hat{\mu}_0) (\Lambda_0)_{i,j}}{(1-p)^{|S_i \cup S_j|}} \end{pmatrix}.$$

We next establish the asymptotic properties of the covariate-adjusted estimator $\hat{\tau}(\hat{\beta}_1, \hat{\beta}_0)$. To simplify the discussion, we introduce the following assumption that imposes the limits for several population quantities.

Assumption 6 (Existence of limiting values). *Assume that*

$$\begin{aligned} (\bar{D}/n) \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{\mathbf{Y}}(\mathbf{1}) & \tilde{\mathbf{X}} \end{pmatrix}^\top \Lambda_1 \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{\mathbf{Y}}(\mathbf{1}) & \tilde{\mathbf{X}} \end{pmatrix} &\rightarrow \begin{pmatrix} \Omega_{yy,11} & \Omega_{yx,11} \\ \Omega_{yx,11}^\top & \Omega_{xx,11} \end{pmatrix} =: \Omega_{11}, \\ (\bar{D}/n) \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{\mathbf{Y}}(\mathbf{0}) & \tilde{\mathbf{X}} \end{pmatrix}^\top \Lambda_0 \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{\mathbf{Y}}(\mathbf{0}) & \tilde{\mathbf{X}} \end{pmatrix} &\rightarrow \begin{pmatrix} \Omega_{yy,00} & \Omega_{yx,00} \\ \Omega_{yx,00}^\top & \Omega_{xx,00} \end{pmatrix} =: \Omega_{00}, \\ (\bar{D}/n) \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{\mathbf{Y}}(\mathbf{1}) & \tilde{\mathbf{X}} \end{pmatrix}^\top \Lambda_\tau \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{\mathbf{Y}}(\mathbf{0}) & \tilde{\mathbf{X}} \end{pmatrix} &\rightarrow \begin{pmatrix} \Omega_{yy,10} & \Omega_{yx,10} \\ \Omega_{yx,01}^\top & \Omega_{xx,10} \end{pmatrix} =: \Omega_{10}. \end{aligned}$$

Assumption 6 requires the weighted covariance matrices of potential outcomes and covariates to have limiting values not depending on n as $n \rightarrow \infty$. In the special case of complete randomized experiments without interference, it reduces to the assumption in Theorem 5 in Li and Ding (2017).

The following theorem shows the consistency and asymptotic distribution of $\hat{\tau}(\hat{\beta}_1, \hat{\beta}_0)$.

Theorem 4.1 (Consistency and asymptotic distribution of $\hat{\tau}(\hat{\beta}_1, \hat{\beta}_0)$). *Under Assumptions 1–4 and 6, $\hat{\tau}(\hat{\beta}_1, \hat{\beta}_0)$ converges in probability to τ . Further suppose Assumption 5 holds,*

$$\left[\text{avar}\{\hat{\tau}(\hat{\beta}_1, \hat{\beta}_0)\} \right]^{-1/2} \left\{ \hat{\tau}(\hat{\beta}_1, \hat{\beta}_0) - \tau \right\} \rightarrow \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$$

in distribution.

Combined with Proposition 4.2, Theorem 4.1 suggests the covariate-adjusted estimator can reduce the asymptotic variance compared with the unadjusted estimator.

Now following our discussion in Section 4.1, we can use the variance estimator $\hat{v}_{n,\text{UB}}(\hat{\beta}_1, \hat{\beta}_0)$ by plugging in the estimated coefficients. The following theorem establishes the convergence and conservativeness of this variance estimator.

Theorem 4.2 (Conservative variance estimator for $\hat{\tau}^{\text{adj}}$). *Under Assumption 1–6, the variance estimator $\hat{v}_{n,\text{UB}}(\hat{\beta}_1, \hat{\beta}_0)$ is a conservative variance estimator following the facts that $\hat{v}_{n,\text{UB}}(\hat{\beta}_1, \hat{\beta}_0)/v_{n,\text{UB}}(\tilde{\beta}_1, \tilde{\beta}_0)$ converges in probability to 1 and that $v_{n,\text{UB}}(\tilde{\beta}_1, \tilde{\beta}_0) \geq \text{avar}\{\hat{\tau}(\tilde{\beta}_1, \tilde{\beta}_0)\}$.*

Theorem 4.2 proves the conservativeness of the variance estimator, which directly motivates a valid confidence interval: $[\hat{\tau}(\hat{\beta}_1, \hat{\beta}_0) - q_{\alpha/2} \hat{v}_{n,\text{UB}}^{1/2}, \hat{\tau}(\hat{\beta}_1, \hat{\beta}_0) + q_{\alpha/2} \hat{v}_{n,\text{UB}}^{1/2}]$.

5 Simulation and application

5.1 Simulated bipartite graph

We conduct simulation studies to evaluate the finite-sample performance of our proposed estimators in this subsection. In the simulation, we start by creating two types of nodes: individual nodes and group nodes. We generate the degree of each individual node $|\mathcal{S}_i|$ sampling from a Gaussian distribution $\mathcal{N}((\bar{S}+1)/2, (\bar{S}-1)/6)$ and rounding the sampled value to the nearest integer. We choose this distribution with the specified mean and standard deviation to ensure that the sampled degrees predominantly fall within the range of 1 and \bar{S} , minimizing the need for truncation or clipping. Next, we randomly connect individual nodes i to $|\mathcal{S}_i|$ different groups from the set of group nodes. Moreover, we make the following adjustments to ensure the graph satisfies the sparsity condition in Assumption 5. For each degree s , we examine the number of connected group sets through individuals with degree s . If the count surpasses a predefined upper limit, we break a random subset of the connections. Specifically, we break links between individuals and groups that are part of the same overly connected set. We then randomly establish new connections with other group sets that were not previously overly connected, ensuring that the total degree of each individual is unchanged. We keep the bipartite graph fixed after building it up.

We consider three different regimes of data generating process. For each regime, we generate covariates $X_i = (X_{1i}, X_{2i}) \sim (U[0, 1])^2$ and the potential outcomes $Y_i(\mathbf{1})$ and $Y_i(\mathbf{0})$ from the following conditional distributions summarized in Table 1, with $\gamma = (1, 1)^\top$ and $\alpha_i \sim U[0, 0.5]$. The treatment indicator $Z_k \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} \text{Bern}(p)$ with $p = 0.5$.

Table 1: Three regimes of data generating process

Regime	$Y_i(\mathbf{1})$	$Y_i(\mathbf{0})$
R1	$\mathcal{N}(0.25 + \gamma^\top X_i, 1)$	$\mathcal{N}(\gamma^\top X_i, 1)$
R2	$\mathcal{N}(\alpha_i + \gamma^\top X_i, 1)$	$\mathcal{N}(\gamma^\top X_i, 1)$
R3	$\mathcal{N}(0.1 \mathcal{S}_i + 1.1\gamma^\top X_i, 1.5)$	$\mathcal{N}(\gamma^\top X_i, 1.5)$

Table 2 reports the finite-sample performance of the two estimators $\hat{\tau}$ and $\hat{\tau}^{\text{adj}}$ with $n = 5000$, $m = 1500$, and $\bar{S} = 5$ based on 1000 Monte Carlo replications. In all three regimes, the two estimators both have small finite sample bias, and the proposed variance estimators are conservative, leading to valid inference with coverage rates larger than 95%. Compared with the naive estimator $\hat{\tau}$, the covariate-adjusted estimator has a smaller standard error and higher power under all regimes. Although our theory guarantees efficiency improvement only in asymptotic variance, in the numerical studies, we also observe smaller variance estimators and thus shorter constructed confidence intervals under all three regimes.

Table 2: Finite sample performance of estimators $\hat{\tau}$ and $\hat{\tau}^{\text{adj}}$.

Regime	τ	naive estimator					covariate adjustment				
		$\hat{\tau}$	$\text{SE}(\hat{\tau})$	$\hat{\text{SE}}(\hat{\tau})$	coverage	power	$\hat{\tau}^{\text{adj}}$	$\text{SE}(\hat{\tau}^{\text{adj}})$	$\hat{\text{SE}}(\hat{\tau}^{\text{adj}})$	coverage	power
R1	0.221	0.223	0.059	0.086	99.7%	82.3%	0.223	0.055	0.080	99.5%	89.3%
R2	0.256	0.255	0.062	0.085	98.8%	92.8%	0.254	0.058	0.079	98.8%	96.0%
R3	0.355	0.358	0.085	0.124	99.6%	90.6%	0.358	0.082	0.119	99.5%	93.4%

Note: For each regime of data generating process, we report the true total treatment effect τ , the two point estimators, their standard error $\text{SE}(\cdot)$, standard error estimator $\hat{\text{SE}}(\cdot)$, the coverage rate of the 95% confidence interval constructed using the conservative variance estimator, and their power.

5.2 Data analysis based on real-world bipartite graph

In this subsection, we apply our estimators to analyze a real-world bipartite graph. We revisit the application discussed in Zigler and Papadogeorgou (2021) and Papadogeorgou et al. (2019), which studies the causal effect of the installation of selective non-catalytic reduction system at a power plant on the air pollution level in the nearby areas. The intervention is at the power plant level, i.e., each power plant may be assigned to the implementation of the new system ($Z_k = 1$) or not ($Z_k = 0$). Since multiple power plants simultaneously influence a given area, and each power plant can potentially affect multiple areas, it forms a natural bipartite graph. To model the scenario, we simulate a bipartite randomized experiment based on the real-world bipartite structure between power plants and nearby areas. We take power plants as treatment

units and air pollution monitors as outcome units.

We construct our dataset using the power plant dataset from [Papadogeorgou et al. \(2019\)](#) and 2004 air pollution data at the monitor level from the United States Environmental Protection Agency’s website. Additionally, we incorporate population information for the counties where the monitors are located. The initial dataset of outcome units includes 95,762 air quality monitors, and the treatment units correspond to 473 coal or natural gas-burning power plants operating in the continental U.S. during the summer of 2004. To prepare the dataset, we remove outcome units with an “Arithmetic Mean” above the 90th percentile among all observations, and we also exclude outcome units with an “Arithmetic Mean” around 0 (we choose 2 as the threshold in this application), and outcome units with a population size exceeding 10^6 . To address computational constraints, we randomly select 10% of the remaining monitors. We calculate the distances between monitors and power plants using their longitude and latitude coordinates. A bipartite graph is then constructed by connecting monitors to power plants located within 15 km. Finally, we remove monitors and power plants that are not connected to any other units, resulting in a dataset comprising 795 outcome units and 228 treatment units. The maximum degree of outcome units is restricted to be 2.

We assume the potential outcomes to be $Y_i(\mathbf{1}) = \gamma_1^T X_i + \varepsilon_1$ and $Y_i(\mathbf{0}) = \gamma_0^T X_i + \varepsilon_0$, where $\gamma_1 = (2, -2, -2)^T$, $\gamma_0 = (1, -1, -1)^T$, and $\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_0 \sim U[0, 15]$. This data generation process is designed to simulate the distribution of the observed ‘Arithmetic Mean’ in the pollution dataset. To standardize the covariates and ensure numerical stability, we scale the population size of the county where the monitor i is located by dividing it by 10^6 (X_{1i}), and the distance between monitor i and its closest power plant by dividing it by 30 (X_{2i}). The third covariate, X_{3i} , represents the number of power plants connected to monitor i . We consider 1000 Monte Carlo replications. In each replication, treatment units are randomly assigned to treatment with a probability of $p = 0.5$. When applying the covariate adjustment estimator, we include the scaled covariates X_{1i} , X_{2i} , and X_{3i} in the model. The true total treatment effect is -1.266 .

Table 3 reports the simulation results based on the real-world bipartite graph. We can see that both the naive estimator and the covariate-adjusted estimator have small biases for estimating the true treatment effect, and both strategies lead to valid yet slightly conservative confidence intervals. Nevertheless, by applying the covariate adjustment strategy we introduced in Section 4, we can witness a reduction in both the standard deviation of the point estimator and the estimated variance, which leads to a great improvement in the power.

Table 3: Simulation results based on real bipartite graph in the power plant application

estimator	point estimator	SE	\hat{SE}	coverage	power
naive estimator $\hat{\tau}$	-1.251	0.136	0.227	98.2%	80.6%
covariate adjustment $\hat{\tau}^{\text{adj}}$	-1.202	0.116	0.170	97.7%	86.3%

Note: we report two point estimators (with and without covariate adjustment), their standard error SE, standard error estimator \hat{SE} , the coverage rate of the 95% confidence interval constructed using the conservative variance estimator, and their power.

6 Discussion

We propose a design-based causal inference framework for bipartite experiments. We generalize the classic SUTVA to the bipartite experiment setting and provide point and variance estimators for estimating the total treatment effect. These estimators are based on theoretical results that guarantee the consistency and asymptotic normality of the point estimator and the conservativeness of the variance estimator. We also propose covariate adjustment strategies that improve the efficiency of the point estimator. This framework extends the design-based causal inference frameworks for completely randomized experiments and cluster randomized experiments.

While this framework is useful for estimating causal effects in many general scenarios involving bipartite experiments, there are several directions for further investigation. First, we focus on the total average treatment effect which compares all versus nothing treatment regimes. There are more general causal parameters of interest that we can explore. Second, we only discuss the Bernoulli randomization treatment regime, leaving other more complex bipartite intervention strategies undeveloped. Third, we mainly focus on the outcome unit-level covariates for the covariate adjustment strategy. When treatment unit-level covariates are also available, as an ad-hoc strategy, we can incorporate them by using a summary at the outcome-unit level, for instance, taking the average or sum of the covariate values for the groups that each unit is connected to. However, a more rigorous and systematic way of incorporating treatment-unit level covariates is unclear. We leave them for future research.

References

- Aronow, P. M. and Samii, C. (2017). Estimating average causal effects under general interference, with application to a social network experiment. *Annals of Applied Statistics*, 11(4):1912–1947.
- Brennan, J., Mirrokni, V., and Pouget-Abadie, J. (2022). Cluster randomized designs for one-sided bipartite experiments. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:37962–37974.
- Ding, P. (2024). *A first course in causal inference*. CRC Press.
- Donner, A. (1998). Some aspects of the design and analysis of cluster randomization trials. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series C (Applied Statistics)*, 47(1):95–113.
- Donner, A., Klar, N., and Klar, N. S. (2000). *Design and analysis of cluster randomization trials in health research*, volume 27. Arnold Publishers: London.
- Doudchenko, N., Zhang, M., Drynkin, E., Airoldi, E., Mirrokni, V., and Pouget-Abadie, J. (2020). Causal inference with bipartite designs. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.02108*.
- Fisher, R. A. (1925). *Statistical Methods for Research Workers*. Oliver and Boyd, Edinburgh, 1st edition.
- Forastiere, L., Airoldi, E. M., and Mealli, F. (2021). Identification and estimation of treatment and interference effects in observational studies on networks. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 116(534):901–918.

- Freedman, D. A. (2008a). On regression adjustments in experiments with several treatments.
- Freedman, D. A. (2008b). On regression adjustments to experimental data. *Advances in Applied Mathematics*, 40(2):180–193.
- Hall, P. and Heyde, C. C. (2014). *Martingale limit theory and its application*. Academic Press.
- Harshaw, C., Sävje, F., Eisenstat, D., Mirrokni, V., and Pouget-Abadie, J. (2023). Design and analysis of bipartite experiments under a linear exposure-response model. *Electronic Journal of Statistics*, 17(1):464–518.
- Imbens, G. W. and Rubin, D. B. (2015). *Causal inference in statistics, social, and biomedical sciences*. Cambridge University Press.
- Li, X. and Ding, P. (2017). General forms of finite population central limit theorems with applications to causal inference. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 112(520):1759–1769.
- Lin, W. (2013). Agnostic notes on regression adjustments to experimental data: Reexamining freedman’s critique. *The Annals of Applied Statistics*, 7(1):295–318.
- Lu, X., Li, H., and Liu, H. (2024). Estimation and inference of average treatment effects under heterogeneous additive treatment effect model. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.17205*.
- Miratrix, L. W., Sekhon, J. S., and Yu, B. (2012). Adjusting treatment effect estimates by post-stratification in randomized experiments. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B: Statistical Methodology*, 75(2):369–396.
- Papadogeorgou, G., Choirat, C., and Zigler, C. M. (2019). Adjusting for unmeasured spatial confounding with distance adjusted propensity score matching. *Biostatistics*, 20(2):256–272.
- Pouget-Abadie, J., Aydin, K., Schudy, W., Brodersen, K., and Mirrokni, V. (2019). Variance reduction in bipartite experiments through correlation clustering. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 32.
- Shi, L., Bakhitov, E., Hung, K., Karrer, B., Walker, C., Bhole, M., and Schrijvers, O. (2024). Scalable analysis of bipartite experiments. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.11070*.
- Song, Z. and Papadogeorgou, G. (2024). Bipartite causal inference with interference, time series data, and a random network. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.04775*.
- Su, F. and Ding, P. (2021). Model-assisted analyses of cluster-randomized experiments. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B: Statistical Methodology*, 83(5):994–1015.
- Zigler, C. M. and Papadogeorgou, G. (2021). Bipartite causal inference with interference. *Statistical Science*, 36(1):109 – 123.

Supplementary Material

Section A provides a general theory of establishing central limit theorems for bipartite experiments under Bernoulli randomization.

Section B provides proofs of all theorems in the main text.

A A useful central limit theorem

To prove the central limit theorem for $\hat{\tau}$, we first prove a central limit theorem for a general statistic defined as follows:

$$\Gamma = \sum_{k_1} a_{k_1} \tilde{Z}_{k_1} + \sum_{k_1 < k_2} a_{k_1 k_2} \tilde{Z}_{k_1} \tilde{Z}_{k_2} + \cdots + \sum_{k_1 < \cdots < k_s} a_{k_1 \dots k_s} \tilde{Z}_{k_1} \cdots \tilde{Z}_{k_s}. \quad (\text{A.1})$$

Here $\{a_{k_1 \dots k_s} : k_1, \dots, k_s \in [m], k_1 \neq \dots \neq k_s\}$ is an s -dimensional array that are symmetric in its indices, i.e.,

$$a_{k_1 \dots k_s} = a_{k'_1 \dots k'_s} \quad \text{if} \quad \{k_1, \dots, k_s\} = \{k'_1, \dots, k'_s\}.$$

As a convention, we use $(k_1 \dots k_s)$ to denote an unordered s -tuple with $k_1 \neq \dots \neq k_s$. Moreover, \tilde{Z}_k 's are i.i.d. copies of a random variable \tilde{Z} with mean zero, variance σ^2 and fourth moments bounded by $E\tilde{Z}^4 \leq \nu_4^4$. Note that here we do not require \tilde{Z} to be a centered Bernoulli variable.

For the statistic in (A.1), we have $E(\Gamma) = 0$ and

$$v_\Gamma = \text{var}(\Gamma) = \sum_{k_1} a_{k_1}^2 \sigma^2 + \sum_{k_1 < k_2} a_{k_1 k_2}^2 \sigma^4 + \cdots + \sum_{k_1 < \cdots < k_s} a_{k_1 \dots k_s}^2 \sigma^{2s}.$$

We have the following central limit theorem for Γ :

Theorem A.1. *Assume that*

1. *the elements of the array a 's are bounded by some constant \bar{a}_m that possibly depends on m ;*
2. *there exists a universal constant B such that for all $k \in [m]$ and $s \in [\bar{S}]$,*

$$\sum_{(k_1, \dots, k_s) \subset [m] \setminus \{k\}} \mathbb{1}\{|a_{k k_1 \dots k_s}| \neq 0\} \leq B;$$

3. *the variance is nondegenerate: $v_\Gamma / (m^{1/2} \bar{a}_m^2)$ goes to ∞ .*

We have $v_\Gamma^{-1/2} \Gamma \rightarrow \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ in distribution.

We will use the martingale central limit theorem in [Hall and Heyde \(2014\)](#) to prove [Theorem A.1](#). For completeness of our proof, we first review the martingale central limit theorem as the following [Proposition A.1](#).

Proposition A.1 (Theorem 3.2 of [Hall and Heyde \(2014\)](#)). Let $\{S_{ni}, \mathcal{F}_{ni}, 1 \leq i \leq k_n, n \geq 1\}$ be a zero-mean, square-integrable martingale array with differences Δ_{ni} , and let η^2 be an almost surely finite random variable. Suppose the following conditions hold:

1. Squared sum convergence:

$$\sum_i E(\Delta_{ni}^2 \mid \mathcal{F}_{n,i-1}) \rightarrow \eta^2 \quad (\text{A.2})$$

in probability,

2. Lindeberg condition:

$$\text{for all } \varepsilon > 0, \quad \sum_i E(\Delta_{ni}^2 \mathbb{1}\{|\Delta_{ni}| > \varepsilon\} \mid \mathcal{F}_{n,i-1}) \rightarrow 0 \quad (\text{A.3})$$

in probability,

and the σ -fields are nested: $\mathcal{F}_{n,i} \subseteq \mathcal{F}_{n+1,i}$, for $1 \leq i \leq k_n$, $n \geq 1$. Then $S_{nk_n} = \sum_i \Delta_{ni}$ converges in distribution (stably) to some random variable with characteristics function $E\{\exp(-\frac{1}{2}\eta^2 t^2)\}$.

In particular, a sufficient condition for the Lindeberg condition (A.3) is given by the following Lyapunov condition:

$$\text{For some } \delta > 0, \quad \sum_{i=1}^n E\{|\Delta_{ni}|^{2+\delta}\} \rightarrow 0. \quad (\text{A.4})$$

Proof of Theorem A.1. We prove Theorem A.1 following three steps. We first construct a martingale difference sequence based on Γ . Next, we check the convergence of the summation of the conditional squared differences in equation (A.2). Finally, we check the Lyapunov condition in equation (A.4).

Step 1. Construct a martingale difference sequence based on Γ . Let $\mathcal{F}_{m,k}$ be the σ -algebra generated by $\tilde{Z}_1, \dots, \tilde{Z}_k$, i.e. $\mathcal{F}_{m,k} = \sigma\{\tilde{Z}_1, \dots, \tilde{Z}_k\}$. For ease of notation, for any $k_1, \dots, k_\ell \in [m]$, we denote $\tilde{Z}_{k_1 \dots k_\ell} = \tilde{Z}_{k_1} \cdots \tilde{Z}_{k_\ell}$. Let

$$\Delta_{mk} = v_\Gamma^{-1/2} \sum_{s=1}^{\bar{S} \wedge k} \sum_{(k_1 \dots k_{s-1}) \subset [k-1]} a_{k_1 \dots k_{s-1} k} \tilde{Z}_{k_1 \dots k_{s-1} k},$$

with $a_{\emptyset k} = a_k$ and $\tilde{Z}_\emptyset = 1$. Then $\{\Delta_{mk}, \mathcal{F}_{m,k}\}_{k=1}^m$ forms a martingale difference sequence and

$$\Gamma = \sum_{k=1}^m \Delta_{mk}.$$

Step 2. Check the convergence of the summation of the conditional squared differences in equation (A.2). We show equation (A.2) by computing the variance of its LHS,

$$\text{var} \left\{ \sum_k E(\Delta_{mk}^2 \mid \mathcal{F}_{m,k-1}) \right\}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \frac{\sigma^4}{v_\Gamma^2} \text{var} \left(\sum_k \sum_{s,r}^{\bar{S} \wedge k} \sum_{\substack{(k_1 \dots k_s) \subset [k-1] \\ (k'_1 \dots k'_r) \subset [k-1]}} a_{k_1 \dots k_s k} a_{k'_1 \dots k'_r k} \tilde{Z}_{k_1 \dots k_s} \tilde{Z}_{k'_1 \dots k'_r} \right) \\
&= \frac{\sigma^4}{v_\Gamma^2} \left\{ \sum_{k,\ell} \sum_{s,r}^{\bar{S} \wedge k} \sum_{t,u}^{\bar{S} \wedge \ell} \sum_{\substack{(k_1 \dots k_s) \subset [k-1] \\ (k'_1 \dots k'_r) \subset [k-1] \\ (\ell'_1 \dots \ell'_t) \subset [\ell-1] \\ (\ell'_1 \dots \ell'_u) \subset [\ell-1]}} a_{k_1 \dots k_s k} a_{k'_1 \dots k'_r k} a_{\ell_1 \dots \ell_t \ell} a_{\ell'_1 \dots \ell'_u \ell} \text{cov}(\tilde{Z}_{k_1 \dots k_s} \tilde{Z}_{k'_1 \dots k'_r}, \tilde{Z}_{\ell_1 \dots \ell_t} \tilde{Z}_{\ell'_1 \dots \ell'_u}) \right\} \quad (\text{A.5})
\end{aligned}$$

Note that $\text{cov}(\tilde{Z}_{k_1 \dots k_s} \tilde{Z}_{k'_1 \dots k'_r}, \tilde{Z}_{\ell_1 \dots \ell_t} \tilde{Z}_{\ell'_1 \dots \ell'_u}) \neq 0$ only if

$$\{(k_1 \dots k_s) \cup (k'_1 \dots k'_r)\} \cap \{(\ell_1 \dots \ell_t) \cup (\ell'_1 \dots \ell'_u)\} \neq \emptyset.$$

For the nonzero covariance, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left| \text{cov}(\tilde{Z}_{k_1 \dots k_s} \tilde{Z}_{k'_1 \dots k'_r}, \tilde{Z}_{\ell_1 \dots \ell_t} \tilde{Z}_{\ell'_1 \dots \ell'_u}) \right| \\
& \leq \left\{ \text{var}(\tilde{Z}_{k_1 \dots k_s} \tilde{Z}_{k'_1 \dots k'_r}) \text{var}(\tilde{Z}_{\ell_1 \dots \ell_t} \tilde{Z}_{\ell'_1 \dots \ell'_u}) \right\}^{1/2} \\
& \leq \left\{ E(Z_{k_1 \dots k_s}^2 Z_{k'_1 \dots k'_r}^2) E(Z_{\ell_1 \dots \ell_t}^2 Z_{\ell'_1 \dots \ell'_u}^2) \right\}^{1/2} \\
& \leq E(\tilde{Z}_{k_1 \dots k_s}^4)^{1/4} E(\tilde{Z}_{k'_1 \dots k'_r}^4)^{1/4} E(\tilde{Z}_{\ell_1 \dots \ell_t}^4)^{1/4} E(\tilde{Z}_{\ell'_1 \dots \ell'_u}^4)^{1/4} \\
& \leq \nu_4^{s+r+t+u} \leq \nu_4^{4(\bar{S}-1)}.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we can further bound (A.5) as

$$\begin{aligned}
& \text{var} \left\{ \sum_k E(\Delta_{mk}^2 \mid \mathcal{F}_{m,k-1}) \right\} \\
& \leq \frac{\sigma^4 \nu_4^{4(\bar{S}-1)} \bar{a}_m^{-4}}{v_\Gamma^2} \left(\sum_{\substack{G_1, G_2, G_3, G_4 \subset [\bar{S}]: \\ G_1 \cap G_2 \neq \emptyset, \\ G_2 \cap G_3 \neq \emptyset, \\ G_3 \cap G_4 \neq \emptyset}} \mathbb{1}\{|a_{G_1}| \neq 0\} \mathbb{1}\{|a_{G_2}| \neq 0\} \mathbb{1}\{|a_{G_3}| \neq 0\} \mathbb{1}\{|a_{G_4}| \neq 0\} \right) \\
& \leq \frac{\sigma^4 \nu_4^{4(\bar{S}-1)} \bar{a}_m^{-4} (B \bar{S}^2)}{v_\Gamma^2} \left(\sum_{\substack{G_1, G_2, G_3 \subset [\bar{S}]: \\ G_1 \cap G_2 \neq \emptyset, \\ G_2 \cap G_3 \neq \emptyset}} \mathbb{1}\{|a_{G_1}| \neq 0\} \mathbb{1}\{|a_{G_2}| \neq 0\} \mathbb{1}\{|a_{G_3}| \neq 0\} \right) \\
& \leq \frac{\sigma^4 \nu_4^{4(\bar{S}-1)} \bar{a}_m^{-4} (B^2 \bar{S}^4)}{v_\Gamma^2} \left\{ \sum_{\substack{G_1, G_2 \subset [\bar{S}]: \\ G_1 \cap G_2 \neq \emptyset}} \mathbb{1}\{|a_{G_1}| \neq 0\} \mathbb{1}\{|a_{G_2}| \neq 0\} \right\}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq \frac{\sigma^4 \nu_4^{4(\bar{S}-1)} \bar{a}_m^4 (B^4 \bar{S}^6) m}{v_\Gamma^2} \\
&= o(1),
\end{aligned}$$

under the third assumed condition.

Also, we have

$$E \left\{ \sum_k E(\Delta_{mk}^2 \mid \mathcal{F}_{m,k-1}) \right\} = 1.$$

Therefore, by Chebyshev's inequality,

$$\sum_k E(\Delta_{mk}^2 \mid \mathcal{F}_{m,k-1}) \rightarrow 1$$

in probability.

Step 3. Check the Lyapunov condition in equation (A.4). We have

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{k=1}^m E(\Delta_{mk}^4) &= \frac{1}{v_\Gamma^2} \left\{ \sum_{s,r,t,u}^{\bar{S} \wedge k} \sum_{\substack{(k_1 \dots k_s) \subset [k-1] \\ (k'_1 \dots k'_r) \subset [k-1] \\ (k''_1 \dots k''_t) \subset [k-1] \\ (k'''_1 \dots k'''_u) \subset [k-1]}} a_{k_1 \dots k_s k} a_{k'_1 \dots k'_r k} a_{k''_1 \dots k''_t k} a_{k'''_1 \dots k'''_u k} E(\tilde{Z}_{k_1 \dots k_s} \tilde{Z}_{k'_1 \dots k'_r} \tilde{Z}_{k''_1 \dots k''_t} \tilde{Z}_{k'''_1 \dots k'''_u}) \right\} \\
&\leq \frac{\nu_4^{4\bar{S}}}{v_\Gamma^2} \left(\sum_{s,r,t,u}^{\bar{S} \wedge k} \sum_{\substack{(k_1 \dots k_s) \subset [k-1] \\ (k'_1 \dots k'_r) \subset [k-1] \\ (k''_1 \dots k''_t) \subset [k-1] \\ (k'''_1 \dots k'''_u) \subset [k-1]}} |a_{k_1 \dots k_s k}| |a_{k'_1 \dots k'_r k}| |a_{k''_1 \dots k''_t k}| |a_{k'''_1 \dots k'''_u k}| \right) \\
&\leq \frac{\nu_4^{4\bar{S}} \bar{a}^4}{v_\Gamma^2} \left(\sum_{\substack{G_1, G_2, G_3, G_4 \subset [\bar{S}]: \\ G_1 \cap G_2 \cap G_3 \cap G_4 \neq \emptyset}} \mathbb{1}\{|a_{G_1}| \neq 0\} \mathbb{1}\{|a_{G_2}| \neq 0\} \mathbb{1}\{|a_{G_3}| \neq 0\} \mathbb{1}\{|a_{G_4}| \neq 0\} \right) \\
&\leq \frac{\nu_4^{4\bar{S}} \bar{a}_m^4 (B\bar{S})^4 m}{v_\Gamma^2} = o(1).
\end{aligned}$$

Combining results in Steps 1–3 and Proposition A.1, we prove the results in Theorem A.1. \square

B Proofs

B.1 Lemmas

We first introduce two lemmas in order to simplify the proofs for the main theorems across the paper.

Lemma B.1. For any two arrays $\{a_i\}_{i=1}^n$ and $\{b_i\}_{i=1}^n$, we have

$$n^{-2} \sum_{i,j} a_i b_j (p^{-|\mathcal{S}_i \cap \mathcal{S}_j|} - 1) \leq n^{-1} (p^{-\bar{S}} - 1) (\max_i a_i) (\max_i b_i) \bar{S} \bar{D}.$$

Proof of Lemma B.1. $p^{-|\mathcal{S}_i \cap \mathcal{S}_j|} - 1$ is nonzero if and only if $\mathcal{S}_i \cap \mathcal{S}_j \neq \emptyset$. For each unit i , the number of groups i belongs to is no larger than \bar{S} , and there are at most \bar{D} units in each group. Therefore, for each i ,

$$\left| \sum_j b_j (p^{-|\mathcal{S}_i \cap \mathcal{S}_j|} - 1) \right| \leq (p^{-\bar{S}} - 1) (\max_i b_i) \bar{S} \bar{D},$$

thus

$$\left| \sum_{i,j} a_i b_j (p^{-|\mathcal{S}_i \cap \mathcal{S}_j|} - 1) \right| \leq n (p^{-\bar{S}} - 1) (\max_i a_i) (\max_i b_i) \bar{S} \bar{D}.$$

□

Lemma B.2. Recall $T_i = \mathbb{1}\{\sum_{k=1}^m W_{ik}(1 - Z_k) = 0\}$ and $C_i = \mathbb{1}\{\sum_{k=1}^m W_{ik}Z_k = 0\}$ denote the indicator that all groups which unit i belongs to were assigned to the treatment group and the control group, respectively, as introduced in the beginning of Section 3.1. We have

$$\left| E \left\{ n^{-2} \sum_{i,j} \frac{T_i T_j a_i b_j (p^{-|\mathcal{S}_i \cap \mathcal{S}_j|} - 1)}{p^{|\mathcal{S}_i \cup \mathcal{S}_j|}} \right\} \right| \leq n^{-1} (p^{-\bar{S}} - 1) (\max_i a_i) (\max_i b_i) \bar{S} \bar{D}, \quad (\text{B.6})$$

$$\text{var} \left\{ n^{-2} \sum_{i,j} \frac{T_i T_j a_i b_j (p^{-|\mathcal{S}_i \cap \mathcal{S}_j|} - 1)}{p^{|\mathcal{S}_i \cup \mathcal{S}_j|}} \right\} \leq n^{-3} p^{-4\bar{S}} (\max_i a_i^2) (\max_i b_i^2) \bar{S}^3 \bar{D}^3 (p^{-\bar{S}} - 1)^2. \quad (\text{B.7})$$

Similar results also holds for the the quantites defined by C_i 's.

Proof of Lemma B.2. By the fact that $E(T_i T_j) = p^{|\mathcal{S}_i \cup \mathcal{S}_j|}$, we have

$$E \left\{ n^{-2} \sum_{i,j} \frac{T_i T_j a_i b_j (p^{-|\mathcal{S}_i \cap \mathcal{S}_j|} - 1)}{p^{|\mathcal{S}_i \cup \mathcal{S}_j|}} \right\} = n^{-2} \sum_{i,j} a_i b_j (p^{-|\mathcal{S}_i \cap \mathcal{S}_j|} - 1).$$

Equation (B.6) holds by Lemma B.1.

Next, we prove equation (B.7). Recall that we denote $(\Lambda_1)_{i,j} = p^{-|\mathcal{S}_i \cap \mathcal{S}_j|} - 1$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{var} \left\{ n^{-2} \sum_{i,j} \frac{T_i T_j a_i b_j (p^{-|\mathcal{S}_i \cap \mathcal{S}_j|} - 1)}{p^{|\mathcal{S}_i \cup \mathcal{S}_j|}} \right\} &= n^{-4} \sum_{i,j,u,v} \frac{\text{cov}(T_i T_j, T_u T_v) a_i b_j a_u b_v (\Lambda_1)_{i,j} (\Lambda_1)_{u,v}}{p^{|\mathcal{S}_i \cup \mathcal{S}_j| + |\mathcal{S}_u \cup \mathcal{S}_v|}} \\ &\leq n^{-4} p^{-4\bar{S}} \sum_{i,j,u,v} |\text{cov}(T_i T_j, T_u T_v) a_i b_j a_u b_v (\Lambda_1)_{i,j} (\Lambda_1)_{u,v}| \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.8})$$

(B.9)

If $(\mathcal{S}_i \cup \mathcal{S}_j) \cap (\mathcal{S}_u \cup \mathcal{S}_v) = \emptyset$, then $T_i T_j$ and $T_u T_v$ are independent, thus $\text{cov}(T_i T_j, T_u T_v) = 0$. Therefore, $\text{cov}(T_i T_j, T_u T_v) (\Lambda_1)_{i,j} (\Lambda_1)_{u,v}$ is nonzero if and only if $\mathcal{S}_i \cup \mathcal{S}_j \neq \emptyset$, $\mathcal{S}_u \cup \mathcal{S}_v \neq \emptyset$, and $(\mathcal{S}_i \cup \mathcal{S}_j) \cap (\mathcal{S}_u \cup \mathcal{S}_v) \neq \emptyset$.

Without loss of generality, assume that $(\mathcal{S}_i \cup \mathcal{S}_j) \cap \mathcal{S}_u \neq \emptyset$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{i,j,u,v} |\text{cov}(T_i T_j, T_u T_v) a_i b_j a_u b_v (\Lambda_1)_{i,j} (\Lambda_1)_{u,v}| \\
& \leq \sum_{i,j} |a_i b_j| (\Lambda_1)_{i,j} \sum_{u,v} |\text{cov}(T_i T_j, T_u T_v) a_u b_v (\Lambda_1)_{u,v}| \\
& \leq \sum_{i,j} |a_i b_j| (\Lambda_1)_{i,j} \sum_u |a_u| \sum_v |\text{cov}(T_i T_j, T_u T_v) b_v (\Lambda_1)_{u,v}| \\
& \leq \sum_{i,j} |a_i b_j| (\Lambda_1)_{i,j} \sum_u |a_u| (p^{-\bar{S}} - 1) (\max_v b_v) \bar{S} \bar{D} \mathbb{1}\{(\mathcal{S}_i \cup \mathcal{S}_j) \cap \mathcal{S}_u \neq \emptyset\} \\
& \leq \sum_{i,j} |a_i b_j| (\Lambda_1)_{i,j} (p^{-\bar{S}} - 1) (\max_u a_u) (\max_v b_v) \bar{S}^2 \bar{D}^2 \\
& \leq n (p^{-\bar{S}} - 1)^2 (\max_u a_u^2) (\max_v b_v^2) \bar{S}^3 \bar{D}^3,
\end{aligned}$$

where the third inequality follows from $(\mathcal{S}_i \cup \mathcal{S}_j) \cap \mathcal{S}_u \neq \emptyset$ and a similar argument in the proof of Lemma B.1 that for each u , $|\sum_v b_v (\Lambda_1)_{u,v}| \leq (p^{-\bar{S}} - 1) (\max_v b_v) \bar{S} \bar{D}$, the fourth inequality follows from the fact that u has to be connected to either i or j , and the total number of u such that $\mathbb{1}\{(\mathcal{S}_i \cup \mathcal{S}_j) \cap \mathcal{S}_u \neq \emptyset\}$ is nonzero is no larger than $\bar{S} \bar{D}$, and the last equality follows from Lemma B.1. Plugging in back to equation (B.8) gives the second inequality in Lemma B.2. \square

B.2 Proof of Theorem 3.1

We first show $\hat{\mu}_1$ is consistent to μ_1 by showing the numerator of $\hat{\mu}_1 - \mu_1$ converges in probability to 0 and the denominator converges in probability to 1. The numerator of $\hat{\mu}_1 - \mu_1$ has mean zero and variance equal to

$$\begin{aligned}
& \text{var} \left\{ n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{T_i (Y_i - \mu_1)}{p^{|\mathcal{S}_i|}} \right\} \\
& = E \left(\left[n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\{Y_i(\mathbf{1}) - \mu_1\} \mathbb{1}\{\sum_{k=1}^m W_{ik}(1 - Z_k) = 0\}}{p^{|\mathcal{S}_i|}} \right]^2 \right) \\
& = n^{-2} \sum_{i,j} \frac{1}{p^{|\mathcal{S}_i| + |\mathcal{S}_j|}} E \left[\{Y_i(\mathbf{1}) - \mu_1\} \{Y_j(\mathbf{1}) - \mu_1\} \mathbb{1}\left\{ \sum_{k=1}^m W_{ik}(1 - Z_k) = 0 \right\} \mathbb{1}\left\{ \sum_{k=1}^m W_{jk}(1 - Z_k) = 0 \right\} \right] \\
& = n^{-2} \sum_{i,j} \frac{\{Y_i(\mathbf{1}) - \mu_1\} \{Y_j(\mathbf{1}) - \mu_1\} p^{|\mathcal{S}_i \cup \mathcal{S}_j|}}{p^{|\mathcal{S}_i| + |\mathcal{S}_j|}} \\
& = n^{-2} \sum_{i,j} \{Y_i(\mathbf{1}) - \mu_1\} \{Y_j(\mathbf{1}) - \mu_1\} p^{-|\mathcal{S}_i \cap \mathcal{S}_j|} \\
& = n^{-2} \sum_{i,j} \{Y_i(\mathbf{1}) - \mu_1\} \{Y_j(\mathbf{1}) - \mu_1\} (p^{-|\mathcal{S}_i \cap \mathcal{S}_j|} - 1) \\
& \leq n^{-1} (p^{-\bar{S}} - 1) (\max_i a_i) (\max_i b_i) \bar{S} \bar{D},
\end{aligned}$$

where the second-to-last equality follows from the fact that $\sum_{i,j} \{Y_i(\mathbf{1}) - \mu_1\} \{Y_j(\mathbf{1}) - \mu_1\} = 0$, and the last inequality follows from Lemma B.1. Therefore, the numerator of $\hat{\mu}_1 - \mu_1$ converges in probability to 0

by Chebyshev's inequality. Similarly, the denominator of $\hat{\mu}_1 - \mu_1$ has mean 1 and variance converging in probability to 0. This concludes the proof of $\hat{\mu}_1$ converges in probability to μ_1 . Analogously, $\hat{\mu}_0$ converges in probability to μ_0 , which concludes the proof of Theorem 3.1.

B.3 Proof of Theorem 3.2

We first compute the asymptotic variance of the proposed estimators $\hat{\mu}_1$. The denominator of $\hat{\mu}_1$ converges in probability to 1. By Slutsky's theorem, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{avar}(\hat{\mu}_1) &= \text{var} \left[n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\{Y_i(\mathbf{1}) - \mu_1\} \mathbb{1} \left\{ \sum_{k=1}^m W_{ik}(1 - Z_k) = 0 \right\}}{p^{|\mathcal{S}_i|}} \right] \\
&= E \left(\left[n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\{Y_i(\mathbf{1}) - \mu_1\} \mathbb{1} \left\{ \sum_{k=1}^m W_{ik}(1 - Z_k) = 0 \right\}}{p^{|\mathcal{S}_i|}} \right]^2 \right) \\
&= n^{-2} \sum_{i,j} \frac{1}{p^{|\mathcal{S}_i|+|\mathcal{S}_j|}} E \left[\{Y_i(\mathbf{1}) - \mu_1\} \{Y_j(\mathbf{1}) - \mu_1\} \mathbb{1} \left\{ \sum_{k=1}^m W_{ik}(1 - Z_k) = 0 \right\} \mathbb{1} \left\{ \sum_{k=1}^m W_{jk}(1 - Z_k) = 0 \right\} \right] \\
&= n^{-2} \sum_{i,j} \frac{\{Y_i(\mathbf{1}) - \mu_1\} \{Y_j(\mathbf{1}) - \mu_1\} p^{|\mathcal{S}_i \cup \mathcal{S}_j|}}{p^{|\mathcal{S}_i|+|\mathcal{S}_j|}} \\
&= n^{-2} \sum_{i,j} \{Y_i(\mathbf{1}) - \mu_1\} \{Y_j(\mathbf{1}) - \mu_1\} p^{-|\mathcal{S}_i \cap \mathcal{S}_j|} \\
&= n^{-2} \sum_{i,j} \{Y_i(\mathbf{1}) - \mu_1\} \{Y_j(\mathbf{1}) - \mu_1\} (\Lambda_1)_{i,j}.
\end{aligned}$$

By symmetry, we have

$$\text{avar}(\hat{\mu}_0) = n^{-2} \sum_{i,j} \{Y_i(\mathbf{0}) - \mu_0\} \{Y_j(\mathbf{0}) - \mu_0\} (\Lambda_0)_{i,j}.$$

Next, we compute the asymptotic covariance between $\hat{\mu}_1$ and $\hat{\mu}_0$:

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{acov}(\hat{\mu}_1, \hat{\mu}_0) &= n^{-2} E \left[\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\{Y_i(\mathbf{1}) - \mu_1\} \mathbb{1} \left\{ \sum_{k=1}^m W_{ik}(1 - Z_k) = 0 \right\}}{p^{|\mathcal{S}_i|}}, \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\{Y_i(\mathbf{0}) - \mu_0\} \mathbb{1} \left\{ \sum_{k=1}^m W_{ik} Z_k = 0 \right\}}{(1-p)^{|\mathcal{S}_i|}} \right] \\
&= n^{-2} \sum_{i,j} E \left[\frac{\{Y_i(\mathbf{1}) - \mu_1\} \{Y_j(\mathbf{0}) - \mu_0\} \mathbb{1} \left\{ \sum_{k=1}^m W_{ik}(1 - Z_k) = 0 \right\} \mathbb{1} \left\{ \sum_{k=1}^m W_{jk} Z_k = 0 \right\}}{p^{|\mathcal{S}_i|} (1-p)^{|\mathcal{S}_j|}} \right] \\
&= n^{-2} \sum_{i,j} \{Y_i(\mathbf{1}) - \mu_1\} \{Y_j(\mathbf{0}) - \mu_0\} \mathbb{1} \{ \mathcal{S}_i \cap \mathcal{S}_j = \emptyset \} \\
&= -n^{-2} \sum_{i,j} \{Y_i(\mathbf{1}) - \mu_1\} \{Y_j(\mathbf{0}) - \mu_0\} \mathbb{1} \{ \mathcal{S}_i \cap \mathcal{S}_j \neq \emptyset \}.
\end{aligned}$$

Combining the results, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{avar}(\hat{\tau}) &= \text{avar}(\hat{\mu}_1) + \text{avar}(\hat{\mu}_2) - 2\text{acov}(\hat{\mu}_1, \hat{\mu}_2) \\
&= n^{-2} \sum_{i,j} \{Y_i(\mathbf{1}) - \mu_1\} \{Y_j(\mathbf{1}) - \mu_1\} (\Lambda_1)_{i,j} + n^{-2} \sum_{i,j} \{Y_i(\mathbf{0}) - \mu_0\} \{Y_j(\mathbf{0}) - \mu_0\} (\Lambda_0)_{i,j}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + 2n^{-2} \sum_{i,j} \{Y_i(\mathbf{1}) - \mu_1\} \{Y_j(\mathbf{0}) - \mu_0\} (\Lambda_\tau)_{i,j} \\
& = n^{-2} \left\{ \tilde{\mathbf{Y}}(\mathbf{1})^\top \Lambda_1 \tilde{\mathbf{Y}}(\mathbf{1}) + \tilde{\mathbf{Y}}(\mathbf{0})^\top \Lambda_0 \tilde{\mathbf{Y}}(\mathbf{0}) + 2\tilde{\mathbf{Y}}(\mathbf{1})^\top \Lambda_\tau \tilde{\mathbf{Y}}(\mathbf{0}) \right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

We then apply Theorem A.1 following two steps.

Step 1. We first give an alternative representation of the numerator of $\hat{\mu}_1 - \mu_1$, which is equal to

$$\begin{aligned}
& n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\mathbb{1}\{\sum_{k=1}^m W_{ik}(1 - Z_{ik}) = 0\} \{Y_i(\mathbf{1}) - \mu_1\}}{p^{|\mathcal{S}_i|}} \\
& = \sum_{k_1} \frac{Z_{k_1}}{np} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{1}\{|\mathcal{S}_i| = 1\} W_{ik_1} \{Y_i(\mathbf{1}) - \mu_1\} \\
& \quad + \sum_{k_1 < k_2} \frac{Z_{k_1} Z_{k_2}}{np^2} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{1}\{|\mathcal{S}_i| = 2\} W_{ik_1} W_{ik_2} \{Y_i(\mathbf{1}) - \mu_1\} \\
& \quad + \dots \\
& \quad + \sum_{k_1 < \dots < k_s} \frac{Z_{k_1} \dots Z_{k_s}}{np^s} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{1}\{|\mathcal{S}_i| = \bar{S}\} W_{ik_1} \dots W_{ik_s} \{Y_i(\mathbf{1}) - \mu_1\} \\
& = \sum_{k_1} \frac{\tilde{Z}_{k_1} + p}{np} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{1}\{|\mathcal{S}_i| = 1\} W_{ik_1} \{Y_i(\mathbf{1}) - \mu_1\} \\
& \quad + \sum_{k_1 < k_2} \frac{(\tilde{Z}_{k_1} + p)(\tilde{Z}_{k_2} + p)}{np^2} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{1}\{|\mathcal{S}_i| = 2\} W_{ik_1} W_{ik_2} \{Y_i(\mathbf{1}) - \mu_1\} \\
& \quad + \dots \\
& \quad + \sum_{k_1 < \dots < k_s} \frac{(\tilde{Z}_{k_1} + p) \dots (\tilde{Z}_{k_s} + p)}{np^s} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{1}\{|\mathcal{S}_i| = \bar{S}\} W_{ik_1} \dots W_{ik_s} \{Y_i(\mathbf{1}) - \mu_1\}. \tag{B.10}
\end{aligned}$$

By binomial expansion, for any $s \in [\bar{S}]$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{k_1 < \dots < k_s} \frac{(\tilde{Z}_{k_1} + p) \dots (\tilde{Z}_{k_s} + p)}{np^s} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{1}\{|\mathcal{S}_i| = s\} W_{ik_1} \dots W_{ik_s} \{Y_i(\mathbf{1}) - \mu_1\} \\
& = \frac{1}{s!} \sum_{k_1 \neq \dots \neq k_s} \frac{(\tilde{Z}_{k_1} + p) \dots (\tilde{Z}_{k_s} + p)}{np^s} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{1}\{|\mathcal{S}_i| = s\} W_{ik_1} \dots W_{ik_s} \{Y_i(\mathbf{1}) - \mu_1\} \\
& = \frac{1}{s!} \binom{s}{1} \sum_{k_1} \frac{\tilde{Z}_{k_1}}{np} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{1}\{|\mathcal{S}_i| = s\} W_{ik_1} \{Y_i(\mathbf{1}) - \mu_1\} \sum_{\substack{k_2 \neq \dots \neq k_s, \\ k_u \neq k_1, \forall 1 < u \leq s}} W_{ik_2} \dots W_{ik_s} \\
& \quad + \dots \\
& \quad + \frac{1}{s!} \binom{s}{\ell} \sum_{k_1 \neq \dots \neq k_\ell} \frac{\tilde{Z}_{k_1} \dots \tilde{Z}_{k_\ell}}{np^\ell} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{1}\{|\mathcal{S}_i| = s\} W_{ik_1} \dots W_{ik_\ell} \{Y_i(\mathbf{1}) - \mu_1\} \sum_{\substack{k_{\ell+1} \neq \dots \neq k_s, \\ k_u \neq k_1, \dots, k_\ell, \forall \ell < u \leq s}} W_{ik_{\ell+1}} \dots W_{ik_s} \\
& \quad + \dots \\
& \quad + \frac{1}{s!} \binom{s}{s-1} \sum_{k_1 \neq \dots \neq k_{s-1}} \frac{\tilde{Z}_{k_1} \dots \tilde{Z}_{k_{s-1}}}{np^{s-1}} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{1}\{|\mathcal{S}_i| = s\} W_{ik_1} \dots W_{ik_{s-1}} \{Y_i(\mathbf{1}) - \mu_1\} \sum_{\substack{k_s, \\ k_s \neq k_1, \dots, k_{s-1}}} W_{ik_s} \\
& \quad + \frac{1}{s!} \sum_{k_1 \neq \dots \neq k_s} \frac{\tilde{Z}_{k_1} \dots \tilde{Z}_{k_s}}{np^s} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{1}\{|\mathcal{S}_i| = s\} W_{ik_1} \dots W_{ik_s} \{Y_i(\mathbf{1}) - \mu_1\}. \tag{B.11}
\end{aligned}$$

For the ℓ -th term, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{s!} \binom{s}{\ell} \sum_{k_1 \neq \dots \neq k_\ell} \frac{\tilde{Z}_{k_1} \cdots \tilde{Z}_{k_\ell}}{np^\ell} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{1}\{|\mathcal{S}_i| = s\} W_{ik_1} \cdots W_{ik_\ell} \{Y_i(\mathbf{1}) - \mu_1\} \sum_{\substack{k_{\ell+1} \neq \dots \neq k_s, \\ k_u \neq k_1, \dots, k_\ell, \forall \ell < u \leq s}} W_{ik_{\ell+1}} \cdots W_{ik_s} \\
&= \frac{1}{s!} \binom{s}{\ell} \sum_{k_1 \neq \dots \neq k_\ell} \frac{\tilde{Z}_{k_1} \cdots \tilde{Z}_{k_\ell}}{np^\ell} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{1}\{|\mathcal{S}_i| = s\} W_{ik_1} \cdots W_{ik_\ell} \{Y_i(\mathbf{1}) - \mu_1\} (s - \ell)! \\
&= \frac{1}{s!} \binom{s}{\ell} (s - \ell)! \sum_{k_1 < \dots < k_\ell} \frac{\tilde{Z}_{k_1} \cdots \tilde{Z}_{k_\ell}}{np^\ell} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{1}\{|\mathcal{S}_i| = s\} W_{ik_1} \cdots W_{ik_\ell} \{Y_i(\mathbf{1}) - \mu_1\} \\
&= \sum_{k_1 < \dots < k_\ell} \frac{\tilde{Z}_{k_1} \cdots \tilde{Z}_{k_\ell}}{np^\ell} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{1}\{|\mathcal{S}_i| = s\} W_{ik_1} \cdots W_{ik_\ell} \{Y_i(\mathbf{1}) - \mu_1\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Plugging back to equation (B.11), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{k_1 < \dots < k_s} \frac{(\tilde{Z}_{k_1} + p) \cdots (\tilde{Z}_{k_s} + p)}{np^s} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{1}\{|\mathcal{S}_i| = s\} W_{ik_1} \cdots W_{ik_s} \{Y_i(\mathbf{1}) - \mu_1\} \\
&= \sum_{\ell=1}^s \sum_{k_1 < \dots < k_\ell} \frac{\tilde{Z}_{k_1} \cdots \tilde{Z}_{k_\ell}}{np^\ell} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{1}\{|\mathcal{S}_i| = s\} W_{ik_1} \cdots W_{ik_\ell} \{Y_i(\mathbf{1}) - \mu_1\},
\end{aligned}$$

thus, the summation in (B.10) is equal to

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{k_1} \frac{\tilde{Z}_{k_1}}{np} \sum_{i=1}^n W_{ik_1} \{Y_i(\mathbf{1}) - \mu_1\} \sum_{s=1}^{\bar{S}} \mathbb{1}\{|\mathcal{S}_i| = s\} \\
&+ \sum_{k_1 < k_2} \frac{\tilde{Z}_{k_1} \tilde{Z}_{k_2}}{np^2} \sum_{i=1}^n W_{ik_1} W_{ik_2} \{Y_i(\mathbf{1}) - \mu_1\} \sum_{s=2}^{\bar{S}} \mathbb{1}\{|\mathcal{S}_i| = s\} \\
&+ \cdots \\
&+ \sum_{k_1 < \dots < k_{\bar{S}}} \frac{\tilde{Z}_{k_1} \cdots \tilde{Z}_{k_{\bar{S}}}}{np^{\bar{S}}} \sum_{i=1}^n W_{ik_1} \cdots W_{ik_{\bar{S}}} \{Y_i(\mathbf{1}) - \mu_1\} \sum_{s=\bar{S}}^{\bar{S}} \mathbb{1}\{|\mathcal{S}_i| = s\}.
\end{aligned}$$

By symmetry, the numerator of $\hat{\mu}_0 - \mu_0$ equals

$$\begin{aligned}
& n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\mathbb{1}\{\sum_{k=1}^m W_{ik} Z_{ik} = 0\} \{Y_i(\mathbf{0}) - \mu_0\}}{n(1-p)^{|\mathcal{S}_i|}} \\
&= \sum_{k_1} -\frac{\tilde{Z}_{k_1}}{n(1-p)} \sum_{i=1}^n W_{ik_1} \{Y_i(\mathbf{0}) - \mu_0\} \sum_{s=1}^{\bar{S}} \mathbb{1}\{|\mathcal{S}_i| = s\} \\
&+ \sum_{k_1 < k_2} (-1)^2 \frac{\tilde{Z}_{k_1} \tilde{Z}_{k_2}}{n(1-p)^2} \sum_{i=1}^n W_{ik_1} W_{ik_2} \{Y_i(\mathbf{0}) - \mu_0\} \sum_{s=2}^{\bar{S}} \mathbb{1}\{|\mathcal{S}_i| = s\} \\
&+ \cdots \\
&+ \sum_{k_1 < \dots < k_{\bar{S}}} (-1)^{\bar{S}} \frac{\tilde{Z}_{k_1} \cdots \tilde{Z}_{k_{\bar{S}}}}{n(1-p)^{\bar{S}}} \sum_{i=1}^n W_{ik_1} \cdots W_{ik_{\bar{S}}} \{Y_i(\mathbf{0}) - \mu_0\} \sum_{s=\bar{S}}^{\bar{S}} \mathbb{1}\{|\mathcal{S}_i| = s\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Define

$$\begin{aligned}
a_{1,k_1 \dots k_\ell} &= \frac{1}{np^\ell} \sum_{i=1}^n W_{ik_1} \cdots W_{ik_\ell} \{Y_i(\mathbf{1}) - \mu_1\} \sum_{s=\ell}^{\bar{S}} \mathbb{1}\{|\mathcal{S}_i| = s\}, \\
a_{0,k_1 \dots k_\ell} &= \frac{(-1)^\ell}{n(1-p)^\ell} \sum_{i=1}^n W_{ik_1} \cdots W_{ik_\ell} \{Y_i(\mathbf{0}) - \mu_0\} \sum_{s=\ell}^{\bar{S}} \mathbb{1}\{|\mathcal{S}_i| = s\}.
\end{aligned}$$

To summarize, we have shown that the numerator of $\hat{\mu}_z - \mu_z$ is equal to

$$\sum_{\ell=1}^{\bar{S}} \sum_{k_1 < \dots < k_\ell} a_{z,k_1 \dots k_\ell} \tilde{Z}_{k_1} \cdots \tilde{Z}_{k_\ell}$$

for $z = 1, 0$.

Step 2. We now consider any linear combination of the numerators of $\hat{\mu}_1 - \mu_1$ and $\hat{\mu}_0 - \mu_0$. We show it can be reformulated in the form of Γ defined in equation (A.1). Consider any c_1 and c_0 that has $c_1^2 + c_0^2 = 1$. Define

$$a_{k_1 \dots k_\ell} = c_1 a_{1,k_1 \dots k_\ell} + c_0 a_{0,k_1 \dots k_\ell}.$$

Then we can write

$$n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \left[\frac{c_1 T_i \{Y_i(\mathbf{1}) - \mu_1\}}{p^{|\mathcal{S}_i|}} + \frac{c_0 C_i \{Y_i(\mathbf{0}) - \mu_0\}}{(1-p)^{|\mathcal{S}_i|}} \right] = \sum_{\ell=1}^{\bar{S}} \sum_{k_1 < \dots < k_\ell} a_{k_1 \dots k_\ell} \tilde{Z}_{k_1} \cdots \tilde{Z}_{k_\ell}. \quad (\text{B.12})$$

We will apply Theorem A.1 to establish a central limit theorem for (B.12). We check the two conditions required in Theorem A.1.

We first show the boundedness of a 's. Note that

$$a_{k_1 \dots k_\ell} = \sum_{i=1}^n W_{ik_1} \cdots W_{ik_\ell} \left[\frac{c_1 \{Y_i(\mathbf{1}) - \mu_1\}}{np^\ell} + \frac{(-1)^\ell c_0 \{Y_i(\mathbf{0}) - \mu_0\}}{n(1-p)^\ell} \right] \sum_{s=\ell}^{\bar{S}} \mathbb{1}\{|\mathcal{S}_i| = s\}.$$

The summand indexed by i is nonzero only if unit i belongs to groups k_1, \dots, k_ℓ . By Assumption 3, for each k_1, \dots, k_ℓ , we have at most \bar{D} such units. Hence we obtain

$$|a_{k_1 \dots k_\ell}| \leq \frac{\bar{D} \max_i \{|Y_i(\mathbf{1}) - \mu_1|, |Y_i(\mathbf{0}) - \mu_0|\}}{n} \left\{ p^{-\bar{S}} + (1-p)^{-\bar{S}} \right\} := \bar{a}_m.$$

Second, we verify the limited overlapping condition $\sum_{(k_1 \dots k_s) \subset [m] \setminus \{k\}} \mathbb{1}\{|a_{kk_1 \dots k_s}| \neq 0\} \leq B$. For any $(k_1 \dots k_s) \subset [m]$ and k , we have $\mathbb{1}\{|a_{kk_1 \dots k_s}| \neq 0\} = \mathbb{1}\{\exists i, \text{ such that } W_{ik_1} \cdots W_{ik_s} W_{ik} = 1\}$, which is nonzero if and only if k_1, \dots, k_s are all connected to group k . Therefore,

$$\sum_{(k_1 \dots k_s) \subset [m] \setminus \{k\}} \mathbb{1}\{|a_{kk_1 \dots k_s}| \neq 0\} \leq \sum_{(k_1 \dots k_s) \subset [m] \setminus \{k\}} \mathbb{1}\{k_1, \dots, k_s \text{ are all connected to group } k\} \leq B^s,$$

where the last inequality holds because by Assumption 5, there are at most B groups connected to group k , thus the number of combinations (k_1, \dots, k_s) such that all of them are connected to k is upper bounded by $\binom{B}{s} \leq B^s$.

Therefore, by Step 2, we conclude that the numerators of $\hat{\mu}_1 - \mu_1$ and $\hat{\mu}_0 - \mu_0$ converge jointly to a bivariate standard normal distribution, after standardization via

$$\begin{pmatrix} n^{-2} \tilde{\mathbf{Y}}(\mathbf{1})^\top \Lambda_1 \tilde{\mathbf{Y}}(\mathbf{1}) & n^{-2} \tilde{\mathbf{Y}}(\mathbf{1})^\top \Lambda_\tau \tilde{\mathbf{Y}}(\mathbf{0}) \\ n^{-2} \tilde{\mathbf{Y}}(\mathbf{1})^\top \Lambda_\tau \tilde{\mathbf{Y}}(\mathbf{0}) & n^{-2} \tilde{\mathbf{Y}}(\mathbf{0})^\top \Lambda_0 \tilde{\mathbf{Y}}(\mathbf{0}) \end{pmatrix}.$$

Moreover, the denominators of $\hat{\mu}_1$ and $\hat{\mu}_0$ are converging in probability to 1, thus the asymptotic distribution in Theorem 3.2 holds by Slutsky's Theorem. □

B.4 Proof of Theorem 3.3

We first prove the convergence of $\hat{v}/\text{plim}(\hat{v})$. Denote

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{v}_1 &= n^{-2} \sum_{i,j} \frac{T_i T_j (Y_i - \hat{\mu}_1)(Y_j - \hat{\mu}_1)(\Lambda_1)_{i,j}}{p^{|S_i \cup S_j|}}, \\ \hat{v}_0 &= n^{-2} \sum_{i,j} \frac{C_i C_j (Y_i - \hat{\mu}_0)(Y_j - \hat{\mu}_0)(\Lambda_0)_{i,j}}{(1-p)^{|S_i \cup S_j|}}, \end{aligned}$$

then we have $\hat{v} = (\hat{v}_1^{1/2} + \hat{v}_0^{1/2})^2$. We prove the convergence of $\hat{v}/\text{plim}(\hat{v})$ by showing that $\hat{v}_1/\text{plim}(\hat{v}_1) = 1 + o_p(1)$ and $\hat{v}_0/\text{plim}(\hat{v}_0) = 1 + o_p(1)$, where

$$\begin{aligned} \text{plim}(\hat{v}_1) &= \text{avar}(\hat{\mu}_1) = n^{-2} \tilde{\mathbf{Y}}(\mathbf{1})^\top \Lambda_1 \tilde{\mathbf{Y}}(\mathbf{1}), \\ \text{plim}(\hat{v}_0) &= \text{avar}(\hat{\mu}_0) = n^{-2} \tilde{\mathbf{Y}}(\mathbf{0})^\top \Lambda_0 \tilde{\mathbf{Y}}(\mathbf{0}). \end{aligned}$$

Rewrite

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{v}_1 &= n^{-2} \sum_{i,j} \frac{T_i T_j \{Y_i - \mu_1 + (\mu_1 - \hat{\mu}_1)\} \{Y_j - \mu_1 + (\mu_1 - \hat{\mu}_1)\} (p^{-|S_i \cap S_j|} - 1)}{p^{|S_i \cup S_j|}} \\ &= n^{-2} \sum_{i,j} \frac{T_i T_j (Y_i - \mu_1)(Y_j - \mu_1)(p^{-|S_i \cap S_j|} - 1)}{p^{|S_i \cup S_j|}} \end{aligned} \tag{B.13}$$

$$+ 2(\mu_1 - \hat{\mu}_1) n^{-2} \sum_{i,j} \frac{T_i T_j (Y_i - \mu_1)(p^{-|S_i \cap S_j|} - 1)}{p^{|S_i \cup S_j|}} \tag{B.14}$$

$$+ (\mu_1 - \hat{\mu}_1)^2 n^{-2} \sum_{i,j} \frac{T_i T_j (p^{-|S_i \cap S_j|} - 1)}{p^{|S_i \cup S_j|}}, \tag{B.15}$$

and use $\mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{T}_2, \mathcal{T}_3$ to denote the three terms in (B.13)–(B.15), respectively. By the fact that $E(T_i T_j) = p^{|S_i \cup S_j|}$, we have $E(\mathcal{T}_1) = \text{plim}(\hat{v}_1)$. The variance of \mathcal{T}_1 ,

$$\text{var}(\mathcal{T}_1) \leq n^{-3} p^{-4\bar{S}} [\max_i \{Y_i(\mathbf{1}) - \mu_1\}^4] \bar{S}^3 \bar{D}^3 (p^{-\bar{S}} - 1)^2 = O_p(n^{-3} \bar{D}^3)$$

by Lemma B.2 when taking $a_i = b_i = Y_i(\mathbf{1}) - \mu_1$. Thus,

$$\mathcal{T}_1 = E(\mathcal{T}_1) + O_p\{\text{var}(\mathcal{T}_1)^{1/2}\} = \text{plim}(\hat{v}_1) + O_p(n^{-3/2} \bar{D}^{3/2}) = \text{plim}(\hat{v}_1) + o_p(n^{-1} \bar{D}).$$

Similarly, by Lemma B.2, we have

$$\begin{aligned} E \left\{ n^{-2} \sum_{i,j} \frac{T_i T_j (Y_i - \mu_1)(p^{-|S_i \cap S_j|} - 1)}{p^{|S_i \cup S_j|}} \right\} &= O_p(n^{-1} \bar{D}), \\ \text{var} \left\{ n^{-2} \sum_{i,j} \frac{T_i T_j (Y_i - \mu_1)(p^{-|S_i \cap S_j|} - 1)}{p^{|S_i \cup S_j|}} \right\} &= O_p(n^{-3} \bar{D}^3), \end{aligned}$$

by taking $a_i = Y_i(\mathbf{1}) - \mu_1$ and $b_i = 1$. By the proof of Theorem 3.2, we have $\hat{\mu}_1 - \mu_1 = O_p(n^{-1/2} \bar{D}^{1/2})$, and $\mathcal{T}_2 = E(\mathcal{T}_2) + O_p\{\text{var}(\mathcal{T}_2)^{1/2}\}$ gives us

$$\mathcal{T}_2 = O_p(n^{-1/2} \bar{D}^{1/2}) \cdot O_p(n^{-1} \bar{D}) + O_p[\{n^{-1} \bar{D} \cdot n^{-3} \bar{D}^3\}^{1/2}] = o_p(n^{-1} \bar{D}).$$

Also, we have

$$\begin{aligned} E \left\{ n^{-2} \sum_{i,j} \frac{T_i T_j (p^{-|S_i \cap S_j|} - 1)}{p^{|S_i \cup S_j|}} \right\} &= O_p(n^{-1} \bar{D}), \\ \text{var} \left\{ n^{-2} \sum_{i,j} \frac{T_i T_j (p^{-|S_i \cap S_j|} - 1)}{p^{|S_i \cup S_j|}} \right\} &= O_p(n^{-3} \bar{D}^3) \end{aligned}$$

by taking $(a_i, b_i) = (1, 1)$ in Lemma B.2. Again, we have

$$\mathcal{T}_3 = O_p(n^{-1} \bar{D}) \cdot O_p(n^{-1} \bar{D}) + O_p[\{n^{-2} \bar{D}^2 \cdot n^{-3} \bar{D}^3\}^{1/2}] = o_p(n^{-1} \bar{D}).$$

Combining the three terms \mathcal{T}_1 – \mathcal{T}_3 , we have

$$\hat{v}_1 = \text{plim}(\hat{v}_1) + o_p(n^{-1} \bar{D}).$$

Under the regularity condition that the weighted covariance matrix of the potential outcomes $Y_i(\mathbf{1})$ and $Y_i(\mathbf{0})$ are non-degenerated, $\text{plim}(\hat{v}_1) = O_p(n^{-1} \bar{D})$, thus $\hat{v}_1 / \text{plim}(\hat{v}_1) = 1 + o_p(1)$. Analogously, $\hat{v}_0 / \text{plim}(\hat{v}_0) = 1 + o_p(1)$. By the continuous mapping theorem, $\hat{v} / \text{plim}(\hat{v})$ converges in probability to 1.

Next, we prove that $\text{plim}(\hat{v}) \geq \text{avar}(\hat{\tau})$. Recall that $\text{plim}(\hat{v}) = \{\text{plim}(\hat{v}_1)^{1/2} + \text{plim}(\hat{v}_0)^{1/2}\}^2$, by Cauchy-

Schwarz inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{avar}(\hat{\tau}) &= \text{avar}(\hat{\mu}_1) + \text{avar}(\hat{\mu}_0) - 2\text{acov}(\hat{\mu}_1, \hat{\mu}_0) \\ &\leq \text{plim}(\hat{v}_1) + \text{plim}(\hat{v}_0) + 2\text{plim}(\hat{v}_1)^{1/2}\text{plim}(\hat{v}_0)^{1/2} = v. \end{aligned}$$

□

B.5 Proof of Proposition 4.1

The proof for the consistency and asymptotic normality of $\hat{\tau}(\beta_1, \beta_0)$ is analogous to that of Theorem 3.1 and 3.2. We only need to treat the $Y_i(1) - \tilde{X}_i^T \beta_1$ and $Y_i(0) - \tilde{X}_i^T \beta_0$ as pseudo potential outcomes. The remaining step is to check that the conditions in Theorems 3.1 and 3.2 still hold with the pseudo potential outcomes. Assumptions 1, 3 and 5 still hold because the network structure remains the same. To check Assumption 4, suppose $|Y_i(z)| \leq a_Y$ and $|X_{ik}| \leq a_X$, then we have $|Y_i - \beta^T \tilde{X}_i| \leq a_Y + \|\beta\|_1 a_X$ is also bounded. □

B.6 Proof of Lemma 4.1

We have

$$\begin{aligned} n^2 \{v_n(\beta_1, \beta_0) - v_n(0, 0)\} &= \{\tilde{\mathbf{Y}}(\mathbf{1}) - \tilde{\mathbf{X}}\beta_1\}^T \Lambda_1 \{\tilde{\mathbf{Y}}(\mathbf{1}) - \tilde{\mathbf{X}}\beta_1\} + \{\tilde{\mathbf{Y}}(\mathbf{0}) - \tilde{\mathbf{X}}\beta_0\}^T \Lambda_0 \{\tilde{\mathbf{Y}}(\mathbf{0}) - \tilde{\mathbf{X}}\beta_0\} \\ &\quad + 2\{\tilde{\mathbf{Y}}(\mathbf{1}) - \tilde{\mathbf{X}}\beta_1\}^T \Lambda_\tau \{\tilde{\mathbf{Y}}(\mathbf{0}) - \tilde{\mathbf{X}}\beta_0\} - v_n(0, 0) \\ &= \tilde{\mathbf{Y}}(\mathbf{1})^T \Lambda_1 \tilde{\mathbf{Y}}(\mathbf{1}) + \tilde{\mathbf{Y}}(\mathbf{0})^T \Lambda_0 \tilde{\mathbf{Y}}(\mathbf{0}) + 2\tilde{\mathbf{Y}}(\mathbf{1})^T \Lambda_\tau \tilde{\mathbf{Y}}(\mathbf{0}) \\ &\quad + \beta_1^T \tilde{\mathbf{X}}^T \Lambda_1 \tilde{\mathbf{X}}\beta_1 + \beta_0^T \tilde{\mathbf{X}}^T \Lambda_0 \tilde{\mathbf{X}}\beta_0 + 2\beta_1^T \tilde{\mathbf{X}}^T \Lambda_\tau \tilde{\mathbf{X}}\beta_0 \\ &\quad - \beta_1^T \tilde{\mathbf{X}}^T \{\Lambda_1 \tilde{\mathbf{Y}}(\mathbf{1}) + \Lambda_\tau \tilde{\mathbf{Y}}(\mathbf{0})\} + \beta_0^T \tilde{\mathbf{X}}^T \{\Lambda_0 \tilde{\mathbf{Y}}(\mathbf{0}) + \Lambda_\tau \tilde{\mathbf{Y}}(\mathbf{1})\} \\ &\quad - \beta_1^T \tilde{\mathbf{X}}^T \Lambda_1 \tilde{\mathbf{X}}\beta_1 + \beta_0^T \tilde{\mathbf{X}}^T \Lambda_0 \tilde{\mathbf{X}}\beta_0 + 2\beta_1^T \tilde{\mathbf{X}}^T \Lambda_\tau \tilde{\mathbf{X}}\beta_0 \\ &= n^2 L(\beta_1, \beta_0). \end{aligned}$$

□

B.7 Proof of Proposition 4.2

By the minimization step, $L(\tilde{\beta}_1, \tilde{\beta}_0) \leq L(0, 0) \leq 0$. By Lemma 4.1, it holds that

$$n^2 v_n(\tilde{\beta}_1, \tilde{\beta}_0) = n^2 \{v_n + L(\tilde{\beta}_1, \tilde{\beta}_0)\} \leq n^2 v_n$$

where the last inequality follows from the constraint in (6). □

B.8 Proof of Theorem 4.1

Convergence of the regression coefficients. Define the population limit counterpart for the closed-form solution $(\tilde{\beta}_1, \tilde{\beta}_0)$:

$$\begin{pmatrix} \beta_1^* \\ \beta_0^* \end{pmatrix} = \Omega_{xx}^{-1} \Omega_{yx}, \quad (\text{B.16})$$

where

$$\Omega_{xx} = \begin{pmatrix} \Omega_{xx,11} & \Omega_{xx,10} \\ \Omega_{xx,01} & \Omega_{xx,00} \end{pmatrix}, \quad \Omega_{yx} = \begin{pmatrix} \Omega_{yx,11} + \Omega_{yx,01} \\ \Omega_{yx,00} + \Omega_{yx,10} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (\text{B.17})$$

By Assumption 6, we have

$$\begin{pmatrix} \hat{\beta}_1 \\ \hat{\beta}_0 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{\mathbf{X}}^\top \Lambda_1 \tilde{\mathbf{X}} & \tilde{\mathbf{X}}^\top \Lambda_\tau \tilde{\mathbf{X}} \\ \tilde{\mathbf{X}}^\top \Lambda_\tau \tilde{\mathbf{X}} & \tilde{\mathbf{X}}^\top \Lambda_0 \tilde{\mathbf{X}} \end{pmatrix}^{-1} \rightarrow \Omega_{xx}.$$

By similar arguments as in Theorem 3.3, under Assumption 6, the following holds asymptotically in probability:

$$\begin{pmatrix} \sum_{i,j} \frac{T_i T_j \tilde{X}_i (Y_j - \hat{\mu}_1) (\Lambda_1)_{i,j}}{p^{|\mathcal{S}_i \cup \mathcal{S}_j|}} + \sum_{i,j} \frac{C_i C_j \tilde{X}_i (Y_j - \hat{\mu}_0) (\Lambda_\tau)_{i,j}}{(1-p)^{|\mathcal{S}_i \cup \mathcal{S}_j|}} \\ \sum_{i,j} \frac{T_i T_j \tilde{X}_i (Y_j - \hat{\mu}_1) (\Lambda_\tau)_{i,j}}{p^{|\mathcal{S}_i \cup \mathcal{S}_j|}} + \sum_{i,j} \frac{C_i C_j \tilde{X}_i (Y_j - \hat{\mu}_0) (\Lambda_0)_{i,j}}{(1-p)^{|\mathcal{S}_i \cup \mathcal{S}_j|}} \end{pmatrix}^\top \rightarrow \begin{pmatrix} \Omega_{yx,11} + \Omega_{yx,01} \\ \Omega_{yx,00} + \Omega_{yx,10} \end{pmatrix}.$$

Therefore, we conclude that

$$(\hat{\beta}_1, \hat{\beta}_0) - (\beta_1^*, \beta_0^*) = o_p(1). \quad (\text{B.18})$$

Consistency and asymptotic distribution of $\hat{\tau}(\hat{\beta}_1, \hat{\beta}_0)$. The difference between $\hat{\tau}(\hat{\beta}_1, \hat{\beta}_0)$ and $\hat{\tau}(\beta_1^*, \beta_0^*)$ is

$$\hat{\tau}(\hat{\beta}_1, \hat{\beta}_0) - \hat{\tau}(\beta_1^*, \beta_0^*) = n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{T_i (\hat{\beta}_1 - \beta_1^*)^\top \tilde{X}_i}{p^{|\mathcal{S}_i|}} / n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{T_i}{p^{|\mathcal{S}_i|}} - n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{C_i (\hat{\beta}_0 - \beta_0^*)^\top \tilde{X}_i}{(1-p)^{|\mathcal{S}_i|}} / n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{C_i}{(1-p)^{|\mathcal{S}_i|}}.$$

By the consistency of the optimization solutions

$$\hat{\beta}_1 - \beta_1^* = o_p(1), \quad \hat{\beta}_0 - \beta_0^* = o_p(1),$$

and the facts that

$$\begin{aligned} n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{T_i \tilde{X}_i}{p^{|\mathcal{S}_i|}} &= O_p(n^{-1/2} \bar{D}^{1/2}), & n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{C_i \tilde{X}_i}{(1-p)^{|\mathcal{S}_i|}} &= O_p(n^{-1/2} \bar{D}^{1/2}), \\ n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{T_i}{p^{|\mathcal{S}_i|}} &= 1 + O_p(n^{-1/2} \bar{D}^{1/2}), & n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{C_i}{(1-p)^{|\mathcal{S}_i|}} &= 1 + O_p(n^{-1/2} \bar{D}^{1/2}), \end{aligned}$$

following similar arguments as in proof of Theorem 3.2, we can conclude that

$$|\hat{\tau}(\hat{\beta}_1, \hat{\beta}_0) - \hat{\tau}(\beta_1^*, \beta_0^*)| = o_p\left(n^{-1/2}\bar{D}^{1/2}\right).$$

By Proposition 4.1, $\hat{\tau}(\beta_1^*, \beta_0^*)$ converges in probability to τ . Hence $\hat{\tau}(\hat{\beta}_1, \hat{\beta}_0)$ is also consistent to τ .

The asymptotic distribution of $\hat{\tau}(\hat{\beta}_1, \hat{\beta}_0)$ follows from Slutsky's Theorem and the fact that

$$\{v_n(\beta_1^*, \beta_0^*)\}^{-1/2} \left\{ \hat{\tau}(\hat{\beta}_1, \hat{\beta}_0) - \tau \right\} \rightarrow \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$$

in distribution. □

B.9 Proof of Theorem 4.2

$$\begin{aligned} & n^{-2} \sum_{i,j} \frac{T_i T_j (Y_i - \hat{\mu}_1 - \hat{\beta}_1^T \tilde{X}_i)(Y_j - \hat{\mu}_1 - \hat{\beta}_1^T \tilde{X}_j)(\Lambda_1)_{i,j}}{p^{|S_i \cup S_j|}} \\ = & n^{-2} \sum_{i,j} \frac{T_i T_j \{\tilde{Y}_i - \beta_1^{*T} \tilde{X}_i - (\hat{\mu}_1 - \mu_1) - (\hat{\beta}_1 - \beta^*)^T \tilde{X}_i\} \{\tilde{Y}_j - \beta_1^{*T} \tilde{X}_j - (\hat{\mu}_1 - \mu_1) - (\hat{\beta}_1 - \beta^*)^T \tilde{X}_j\} (\Lambda_1)_{i,j}}{p^{|S_i \cup S_j|}} \\ = & n^{-2} \sum_{i,j} \frac{T_i T_j (\tilde{Y}_i - \beta_1^{*T} \tilde{X}_i)(\tilde{Y}_j - \beta_1^{*T} \tilde{X}_j)(\Lambda_1)_{i,j}}{p^{|S_i \cup S_j|}} \\ & + 2n^{-2} \sum_{i,j} \frac{T_i T_j (\tilde{Y}_i - \beta_1^{*T} \tilde{X}_i) \{(\hat{\mu}_1 - \mu_1) + (\hat{\beta}_1 - \beta^*)^T \tilde{X}_j\} (\Lambda_1)_{i,j}}{p^{|S_i \cup S_j|}} \\ & + n^{-2} \sum_{i,j} \frac{T_i T_j \{(\hat{\mu}_1 - \mu_1) + (\hat{\beta}_1 - \beta^*)^T \tilde{X}_i\} \{(\hat{\mu}_1 - \mu_1) + (\hat{\beta}_1 - \beta^*)^T \tilde{X}_j\} (\Lambda_1)_{i,j}}{p^{|S_i \cup S_j|}} \\ = & \text{I} + \text{II} + \text{III}. \end{aligned}$$

Following a similar proof as that of Theorem 3.3, we have

$$\text{I} = v_1^*(\beta_1^*) + O_p(n^{-3/2}\bar{D}^{-3/2}), \quad \text{II} = o_p(n^{-3/2}\bar{D}^{-3/2}), \quad \text{III} = o_p(n^{-3/2}\bar{D}^{-3/2}).$$

Meanwhile, due to the fact that $v_1^*(\beta_1) \asymp n^{-1}\bar{D}$, we have

$$\hat{v}_{1,n}(\hat{\beta}_1) = v_1^*(\beta_1^*) + O_p(n^{-3/2}\bar{D}^{-3/2})$$

and similarly

$$\hat{v}_{0,n}(\hat{\beta}_0) = v_0^*(\beta_0^*) + O_p(n^{-3/2}\bar{D}^{-3/2}).$$

Therefore,

$$\left\{ \hat{v}_{1,n}(\hat{\beta}_1) \right\}^{1/2} + \left\{ \hat{v}_{0,n}(\hat{\beta}_0) \right\}^{1/2} = \{v_1^*(\beta_1^*)\}^{1/2} + \{v_0^*(\beta_0^*)\}^{1/2} + O_p(n^{-3/4}\bar{D}^{-3/4}),$$

and thus

$$\frac{\{\hat{v}_{1,n}(\hat{\beta}_1)\}^{1/2} + \{\hat{v}_{0,n}(\hat{\beta}_0)\}^{1/2}}{\{v_1^*(\beta_1^*)\}^{1/2} + \{v_0^*(\beta_0^*)\}^{1/2}} = 1 + O_p(n^{-1/4}\bar{D}^{-1/4})$$

by the fact that $v_1^*(\beta_1^*) \asymp n^{-1}\bar{D}$ and $v_0^*(\beta_0^*) \asymp n^{-1}\bar{D}$. Therefore, $\hat{v}_{n,\text{UB}}(\hat{\beta}_1, \hat{\beta}_0)/v_{n,\text{UB}}(\beta_1^*, \beta_0^*)$ converges in probability to 1.

The conservativeness of $v_{\text{UB}}^*(\beta_1^*, \beta_0^*)$ for the true variance $v^*(\beta_1^*, \beta_0^*)$ can be established similarly to Theorem 3.3 when no covariates are adjusted. The trick is to take $\mathbf{Y}(\mathbf{1}) - \tilde{\mathbf{X}}\beta_1^*$ and $\mathbf{Y}(\mathbf{0}) - \tilde{\mathbf{X}}\beta_0^*$ as pseudo potential outcomes and apply the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality for the covariance. Details are omitted. □