Shishir Adhikari sadhik9@uic.edu University of Illinois Chicago Chicago, IL, USA Sourav Medya medya@uic.edu University of Illinois Chicago Chicago, IL, USA Elena Zheleva ezheleva@uic.edu University of Illinois Chicago Chicago, IL, USA

Abstract

In causal inference, interference refers to the phenomenon in which the actions of peers in a network can influence an individual's outcome. For example, whether the contacts of a person wear masks can affect whether that person gets a viral infection. Peer effect captures the influence of peers and refers to the difference in counterfactual outcomes of an individual for different levels of peer exposure, the extent to which an individual is exposed to the treatments, actions, or behaviors of peers. Estimating peer effects requires deciding how to represent peer exposure. Typically, researchers define an exposure mapping function that aggregates peer treatments and outputs peer exposure. Most existing approaches for defining exposure mapping functions assume peer exposure based on the number or fraction of treated peers. Recent studies have investigated more complex functions of peer exposure which capture that different peers can exert different degrees of influence. However, none of these works have explicitly considered the problem of automatically learning the exposure mapping function. In this work, we focus on learning this function for the purpose of estimating heterogeneous peer effects, where heterogeneity refers to the variation in counterfactual outcomes for the same peer exposure but different individual's contexts. We develop EGONETGNN, a graph neural network (GNN)-based method, to automatically learn the appropriate exposure mapping function allowing for complex peer influence mechanisms that, in addition to peer treatments, can involve the local neighborhood structure and edge attributes. We show that GNN models that use peer exposure based on the number or fraction of treated peers or learn peer exposure naively face difficulty accounting for such influence mechanisms. Our comprehensive evaluation on synthetic and semi-synthetic network data shows that our method is more robust to different unknown underlying influence mechanisms when estimating heterogeneous peer effects when compared to state-of-the-art baselines.

Keywords

causal inference, peer effects, network interference, exposure mapping function, graph neural network estimators

ACM Reference Format:

1 Introduction

Causal inference is central to the development of artificial intelligence (AI) systems that can anticipate the consequences of potential actions or interventions and understand underlying causal mechanisms. Such systems often operate in complex environments with interacting units, in which a unit's outcome can be impacted by actions, behaviors, or treatments of other units, a phenomenon known as interference. For example, the vaccination status (treatment) of peers may affect an individual's viral infection rate (outcome) in a contact network and the political affiliations (treatment) of peers may influence one's stance on a policy issue (outcome) in a social network. Peer effect refers to the difference in a unit's counterfactual outcomes for different treatment regimes of peers (e.g., some contacts vaccinated versus no contact vaccinated or observed peer political affiliations versus flipped peer affiliations). Peer effect estimation has become important for policy-making and targeted intervention design in various domains such as healthcare [6], online advertisement [23], and education [25].

In interference settings, the counterfactual outcomes of a unit are ultimately impacted by *peer exposure* rather than the raw peer treatments. Peer exposure reflects the extent to which a unit is exposed to the treatments, actions, or behaviors of peers and depends on some underlying influence mechanisms. For example, in a contact network, peer exposure is zero if no contacts are vaccinated; however, if some contacts are vaccinated, the peer exposure could have different possible representations, e.g., it could depend on the proportion of vaccinated peers or the frequency of contact with vaccinated peers. Peer effect for a unit is measured as the difference in the unit's outcome between two different counterfactual peer exposure values. For instance, peer effect in the contact network could be the difference in infection rate between two exposure conditions, e.g., three-fourths of peers vaccinated versus one-fourth of peers vaccinated.

Peer effect estimation necessitates determining how to represent peer exposure. *Exposure mapping* [4] is a function that maps peer treatments and other contexts (e.g., unit's degree) to peer exposure, a representation that summarizes exposure to peer treatments, reduces high dimensionality, and is invariant to irrelevant contexts (e.g., permutation of peers). Usually, domain experts define exposure mapping appropriate to the causal question and the domain of interest. Existing research has mainly considered two types of peer exposure: binary peer exposure (e.g. which captures if any friends are treated [5]) and *homogeneous peer exposure* (e.g., based on the number or the fraction of treated peers [9, 15, 16, 29]). Homogeneous peer exposure assumes all peers influence equally and is agnostic to the identity of the treated peers. While binary

Conference'17, Washington, DC, USA 2025. ACM ISBN 978-x-xxxx-x/YYYY/MM https://doi.org/10.1145/nnnnnn.nnnnnn



(a) Gaby's ego network with observed (b) Example peer exposures on Gaby for the and counterfactual treatments. observed and counterfactual treatments.

Figure 1: Illustration of different possible peer exposure representations for an ego node in a social network.

and homogeneous peer exposure are intuitive, they cannot capture complex peer influence mechanisms.

Recent research efforts have focused on studying heterogeneous influence among units and designing exposure mapping that capture such influence mechanisms. Some works considered exposure mapping that uses the weighted fraction of treated peers based on known tie strengths [12] or known node attributes [26]. Zhao et al. [34] used attention weights derived based on the similarities of the units' covariates to determine peer exposure as the weighted sum of treated peers. Yuan et al. [33] extract features by counting causal network motifs, attributed subgraphs with treatment assignments as the attributes, to capture peer exposure due to local neighborhood conditions. Figure 1 illustrates different possible representations of peer exposure for a unit due to peer treatment assignments in a social network. Figure 1(a) shows Gaby's ego network, i.e., a subnetwork with a unit and immediate peers with edges among them, along with observed (i.e., factual) and hypothetical (i.e., counterfactual) treatments for Gaby and six peers. The units in the treatment group (e.g., smokers) are depicted as red nodes, and the units in the control group (e.g., non-smokers) are depicted as blue nodes. The edge weights capture the tie strengths in the network. Figure 1(b) demonstrates peer exposure values for Gaby based on different representations for the factual and counterfactual peer treatments that exist in the research literature. For instance, binary peer exposure can reflect whether an individual is exposed to secondhand smoke [5]. The number or fraction of treated (smoker) peers captures the extent to which an individual is exposed to secondhand smoke [9, 16]. Linear threshold exposure assumes exposure is homogeneous, but a unit is susceptible to exposure only when the proportion of treated peers exceeds a given threshold [28]. More complex peer exposure mechanisms could depend on tie strength [12] and attribute similarity [34]. For example, Gaby could be more exposed to secondhand smoke if her

close friends are smokers or if her female friends are smokers. Moreover, the local neighborhood structure may influence the extent to which an individual is exposed to peer treatments [33]. For example, if treated peers are well-connected, Gaby could be exposed to a higher volume of secondhand smoke from her peers, assuming they smoke together. If treated peers are not well-connected, Gaby could be exposed to secondhand smoke on multiple occasions while interacting with diverse peers.

Different peer exposure representations capture different possible underlying influence mechanisms. However, we rarely know the true mechanism and the best representation of peer exposure. Learning the exposure mapping function has the advantage of reducing subjectivity and allowing for automated representation of peer exposure under unknown and complex peer influence mechanisms. Our work focuses on learning the exposure mapping function to estimate heterogeneous peer effects, where heterogeneity manifests due to the variation in counterfactual outcomes in the units with the same peer exposure but distinct contexts. While we introduce exposure mapping function learning in the context of peer effects, the concepts can easily be adapted to other causal effects under interference, such as direct and total effects.

We propose EGONETGNN, a graph neural network (GNN)-based method, to automatically learn the appropriate exposure mapping function, allowing for complex peer influence mechanisms that, in addition to peer treatments, can involve the local neighborhood structure and edge attributes. To add robustness to the downstream peer effect estimation task, EGONETGNN is designed to learn the exposure mapping function to produce peer exposure representation that is expressive to differentiate between different peer exposure conditions and invariant to irrelevant contexts. Furthermore, EGONETGNN is designed to promote a balanced representation with substantial coverage of possible peer exposure values. Recently, GNNs have been extensively used for causal effect estimation in networks [9, 13, 16], but their use has been mostly limited to automatic feature aggregation and addressing network confounding. We show that GNN-based approaches that solely rely on homogeneous peer exposure or only learn the weights in heterogeneous exposure lack expressiveness in capturing heterogeneous peer influence based on local neighborhood conditions. Experimental evaluation with synthetic and semi-synthetic network data shows the advantage of our approach in heterogeneous peer effect estimation when there is complex influence mechanisms involving local neighborhood structure.

2 Related Work

Research in causal inference under interference has focused on estimating three main causal effects of interest, referred to as network effects: direct effects induced by a unit's own treatment, peer effects induced by treatment of other units, and total effects induced by both the unit's and others' treatment [15]. These network effects are estimated as average effects (e.g., [3, 29]) for the entire population or as heterogeneous effects (e.g., [5, 12]) for specific subpopulations or contexts. Our work focuses on heterogeneous peer effect estimation. Most methods for estimating heterogeneous or individual-level causal effects under interference, including peer effects, assume peer exposure is binary [5] or homogeneous, e.g., based on fraction of treated peers [8, 9, 16, 24]. These methods

assume a homogeneous or known exposure mapping function and focus on enhancing network effect estimation by adapting techniques like adversarial training [16], propensity score reweighting [8], double machine learning [17] and doubly robust estimation via targeted learning [9] to the interference settings.

Recent research has looked into more complex functions of peer exposure, allowing for heterogeneous peer influence, in which different peers can have varying degrees of influence. Some of these works refer to heterogeneous peer influence as heterogeneous interference [20, 26, 34]. Forastiere et al. [12] considered peer exposure as a weighted fraction of treated peers using known edge attributes as weights. Lin et al. [20] consider heterogeneity due to multiple entities types and Qu et al. [26] considered heterogeneity due to known node attributes for defining peer exposure. Tran and Zheleva [28] studied peer effect estimation with linear threshold peer exposure model but different unit-level threshold could be vary for different units capturing heterogeneous susceptibilities to the influence. Zhao et al. [34] used attention weights derived based on the similarities of the units' covariates to determine peer exposure as the weighted sum of treated peers. Yuan et al. [33] capture peer exposure with features based on counts of different causal network motifs, i.e., recurrent subgraphs in a unit's ego network with treatment assignments as attributes. Ma and Tresp [22] consider homogeneous peer exposure based on fraction of treated peers but they summarize the covariates of treated peers using a graph neural network (GNN) to capture heterogeneous contexts involving treatment assignments. Unlike our work, none of these studies has explicitly studied the issue of automatically learning the exposure mapping functions to define peer exposure representation while capturing the underlying influence mechanisms.

Ma and Tresp [22] learn heterogeneous contexts based on peer treatments but not the exposure mapping function or the peer exposure representation. Although Zhao et al. [34] use attention weights to define peer exposure, they assume a specific exposure mapping function, and it cannot adapt according to the underlying peer influence mechanism. Adhikari and Zheleva [1] use GNNs to learn peer exposure embedding by addressing unknown peer influence mechanisms, but their scope is limited to direct effect estimation, i.e., the effect of a unit's own treatment. Ma et al. [21] employ similar method like Ma and Tresp [22] for hypergraphs to model heterogeneity due to model group interactions. The idea is to learn a summary function and representation equivalent to the exposure mapping function and peer exposure using a hypergraph convolution network and attention mechanism. However, they assume the learned representation is expressive enough to capture the underlying influence mechanism. In this work, we do not make such an assumption and evaluate how well the learned peer exposure representation captures the underlying influence mechanisms.

Recently, graph neural networks (GNNs) have been widely utilized for estimating causal effects in networks [8, 9, 16, 17]; however, their application has largely been confined to addressing confounding specific to networks (e.g., due to latent homophily, a tendency of similar units to be connected [11]). Our work explores the potential of GNNs to learn exposure mapping functions with the goal of capturing underlying influence mechanisms due to local neighborhood structures. Prior research [10, 32] on the expressiveness of GNNs has shown popular message-passing GNNs lack expressiveness to count subgraphs. On the other hand, counts of causal network motifs are rich features that could capture underlying influence mechanisms due to local neighborhood structure [33]. Counting such subgraphs can be computationally expensive, and they may not be able to capture every local structure. We design EGONETGNN to excel in counting attributed triangle subgraphs, enhancing its expressiveness to capture underlying mechanisms involving neighborhood structure.

3 Causal Inference Problem Setup

Notations. We represent the network of interacting units as an undirected graph G = (V, E) with all units represented by a set of N = |V| nodes and interactions between units represented with a set of edges *E*. We denote node attributes with X and edge attributes with Z. Let $T = \langle T_1, ..., T_i, ..., T_N \rangle$ be a random variable comprising the treatment variables T_i for each node v_i in the network and Y_i be a random variable for v_i 's outcome. Let $\pi = \langle \pi_1, ..., \pi_i, ..., \pi_N \rangle$ be an assignment to T with $\pi_i \in \{0, 1\}$ assigned to T_i . Let $T_{-i} = T \setminus T_i$ and $\pi_{-i} = \pi \setminus \pi_i$ denote random variable and its value for treatment assignment to other units except v_i .

Heterogeneous peer effect. Three main types of causal effects are studied in the context of interference: direct effects, peer effects and total effects. In this work, we focus on estimating peer effect which measures the difference in counterfactual outcomes for different values of *peer exposure*. Peer exposure reflects the degree to which a unit is exposed to the treatments, actions, or behaviors of peers and we define formally later in this section. The *heterogeneous peer effect* (HPE) for a unit v_i , denoted as δ_i , for peer exposures $P_i = \rho_i$ versus $P_i = \rho'_i$ and unit's treatment $T_i = \pi_i$ conditioned on the unit's contexts Z_i is defined as:

$$\delta_i = \mathbb{E}[Y_i(T_i = \pi_i, \mathbb{P}_i = \boldsymbol{\rho}_i) | \mathcal{Z}_i] - \mathbb{E}[Y_i(T_i = \pi_i, \mathbb{P}_i = \boldsymbol{\rho}'_i) | \mathcal{Z}_i], \quad (1)$$

where the term $Y_i(T_i = \pi_i, P_i = \rho_i)$, captures that, in interference settings, the counterfactual outcome of unit v_i is influenced not only by unit's treatment $T_i = \pi_i$ but also peer exposure $P_i = \rho_i$. The conditioning of Z_i in Eq. 1 indicates that the counterfactual outcome for the same treatment π_i and peer exposure ρ_i is heterogeneous and could vary for different unit v_i depending on context Z_i , referred to as *effect modifiers*.

Exposure mapping function. Peer effect, in Eq. 1, is defined in terms of peer exposure, but peer exposure itself is not observed directly and cannot be intervened upon. Peer exposure, ρ_i , depends on peer treatments, $T_{-i} = \pi_{-i}$, and other relevant contexts (e.g., $\{G, X, Z\}$), which are determined by an unknown underlying influence mechanism.

Definition 3.1 (Peer exposure and exposure mapping function). Peer exposure for unit v_i is defined as $\rho_i \in \mathbb{R}^d = \phi_e(\pi_{-i}, G, \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Z})$, where ϕ_e is the *exposure mapping function* because it maps high-dimensional contexts to a lower *d*-dimensional peer exposure representation.

Note that the exposure mapping function is unknown and it could map different contexts to the same peer exposure. Similarly, the effect modifiers Z_i are unknown contexts defined by some functions of node attributes X, edge attributes Z, and network structure *G*, i.e., $Z_i = \phi_f(G, \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Z})$. In this work we focus on learning the exposure mapping function for estimating individual peer effects.

(a)

Substituting peer exposure with the exposure mapping function in Eq. 1, we get:

$$\delta_{i} = E[Y_{i}(T_{i} = \pi_{i}, P_{i} = \phi_{e}(\pi_{-i}, G, X, Z)) | \mathcal{Z}_{i}] - E[Y_{i}(T_{i} = \pi_{i}, P_{i} = \phi_{e}(\pi_{-i}', G, X, Z)) | \mathcal{Z}_{i}],$$
(2)

where ϕ_e is the exposure mapping function and π_{-i} versus π'_{-i} are two peer treatment assignments that can be intervened on.

Causal identification. Now, we discuss the identification of peer effects that involves expressing counterfactual in terms of observational and/or interventional distributions. A fundamental prerequisite for causal identification is the consistency assumption, which enables equivalence among counterfactual, interventional, and factual outcomes.

ASSUMPTION 1 (CONSISTENCY UNDER INTERFERENCE). The underlying outcome generation is independent of the treatment assignment mechanisms (i.e., hypothetical or experimental or natural). For a unit v_i , if $T_i = \pi_i$ and $T_{-i} = \pi_{-i}$, then $Y_i(T_i = \pi_i, T_{-i} = \pi_{-i}) = Y_i(T_i = \pi_i, P_i = \phi_e(\pi_{-i}, G, \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Z})) = Y_i$.

In addition to the standard consistency assumption, Assumption 1 indicates that peer exposure P_i completely mediates the effects of peer treatments T_{-i} , establishing an equivalence between peer treatments and peer exposure. Peer effects in Eq. 2 can be expressed in terms of interventional distributions (e.g., A/B tests) as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_{i} \stackrel{(a)}{=} & E[Y_{i}(T_{i} = \pi_{i}, P_{i} = \phi_{e}(\pi_{-i}, G, X, Z))|do(T_{i} = \pi_{i}, T_{-i} = \pi_{-i}), Z_{i}] - \\ & E[Y_{i}(T_{i} = \pi_{i}, P_{i} = \phi_{e}(\pi_{-i}', G, X, Z))|do(T_{i} = \pi_{i}, T_{-i} = \pi_{-i}'), Z_{i}] \\ & \delta_{i} \stackrel{(b)}{=} & E[Y_{i}|do(T_{i} = \pi_{i}, P_{i} = \phi_{e}(\pi_{-i}, G, X, Z)), Z_{i}] - \\ & E[Y_{i}|do(T_{i} = \pi_{i}, P_{i} = \phi_{e}(\pi_{-i}', G, X, Z)), Z_{i}], \end{aligned}$$

where do(.) operator denotes assignment by intervention. Here, step (a) follows from the fact that treatment assignments are randomized and thus independent of the counterfactual outcome. Moreover, the contexts Z_i are unaffected by the intervention because they are, by definition, effect modifiers that do not mediate the treatment assignments. Step (b) directly follows from the consistency assumption that establishes equivalence between peer treatments and peer exposure as well as factual and counterfactual outcomes.

For identification of peer effects in observational studies, we need unconfoundedness assumption that restricts the presence of hidden confounders between treatment and peer exposure conditions $\{T_i, P_i\}$ and the outcome Y_i .

ASSUMPTION 2 (UNCONFOUNDEDNESS FOR OBSERVATIONAL DATA). The counterfactual outcomes are independent of treatment and peer exposure conditions given the contexts Z_i , i.e., $Y_i(T_i = \pi_i, P_i = \phi_e(\pi_{-i}, G, \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Z})), Y_i(T_i = \pi_i, P_i = \phi_e(\pi'_{-i}, G, \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Z})) \perp \{T_i, P_i\} | Z_i$.

With the unconfoundedness assumption, Eq. 2 is written as:

$$\delta_{i} \stackrel{(c)}{=} E[Y_{i}(T_{i} = \pi_{i}, P_{i} = \phi_{e}(\pi_{-i}, G, X, Z))|T_{i}, P_{i}, Z_{i}] - E[Y_{i}(T_{i} = \pi_{i}, P_{i} = \phi_{e}(\pi_{-i}', G, X, Z))|T_{i}, P_{i}, Z_{i}],$$

$$\delta_{i} \stackrel{(d)}{=} E[Y_{i}|T_{i} = \pi_{i}, P_{i} = \phi_{e}(\pi_{-i}, G, X, Z), Z_{i}] - E[Y_{i}|T_{i} = \pi_{i}, P_{i} = \phi_{e}(\pi_{-i}', G, X, Z), Z_{i}],$$
(4)

where step (c) follows from the unconfoundedness assumption and step (d) follows from the consistency assumption.

To estimate the expectations in Eq. 4.d and Eq. 3.b, we need the positivity assumption that requires every possible treatment and peer exposure condition to have non-zero probability. Note that assumptions 1 to 3 are typical assumptions in causal inference and are not specific to our work.

ASSUMPTION 3 (POSITIVITY). There is non-zero probability of treatment and peer exposure condition, i.e., $0 < \mathbb{P}(T_i, P_i) < 1$, for every level of T_i and P_i .

Learning and Estimation. Peer effects can be estimated using the network structure, node attributes, edge attributes, and treatments as inputs to learn two functions ϕ_f for contexts Z_i and ϕ_e for peer exposure P_i and estimate two conditional expectations of the outcome. Formally, the problem of exposure mapping function learning is defined for generic network effects τ as follows.

PROBLEM 1 (EXPOSURE MAPPING FUNCTION LEARNING). Given a network G(V, E) of N units with node attributes X, edge attributes Z, treatments T, and outcome Y, estimate the exposure mapping function $\hat{\phi}_e$ such that mean squared error between true conditional average network effect (CANE) τ_i and estimated CANE $\hat{\tau}_i$ is minimized:

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} (\tau_i - \hat{\tau}_i)^2, \tag{5}$$

where $\hat{\tau}_i = \hat{f}_{\boldsymbol{\pi}_{-i}}(\pi_i, \hat{\phi}_e(\boldsymbol{\pi}_{-i}, G, \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Z}), G, \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Z}) - \hat{f}_{\boldsymbol{\pi}'_{-i}}(\pi'_i, \hat{\phi}_e(\boldsymbol{\pi}'_{-i}, G, \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Z}), G, \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Z})$.

The true CANE is unknown, but due to the consistency assumption, factual and counterfactual outcome prediction may provide some indication of the true nature of the exposure mapping function. The counterfactual outcome $Y_i(T_i = \pi_i, P_i = \phi_e(\pi_{-i}, G, \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Z}))|\mathcal{Z}_i$ can be estimated by learning the conditional expectation $E[Y_i|T_i = \pi_i, P_i = \phi_e(\pi_{-i}, G, \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Z}), \mathcal{Z}_i]$, and its loss function is defined as follows:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\boldsymbol{\pi}_{-i}} = \operatorname{argmin}_{\boldsymbol{\Theta}} \operatorname{loss}(Y_i, f_{\boldsymbol{\pi}_{-i}}^{-}(T_i = \pi_i, \mathbf{P}_i = \phi_e^{-}(\boldsymbol{\pi}_{-i}, G, \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Z}; \boldsymbol{\Theta}_e),$$

$$\mathcal{Z}_i = \phi_f^{-}(G, \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Z}; \boldsymbol{\Theta}_f); \boldsymbol{\Theta}_Y), \quad \forall_{v_i}, v_i \in V, \quad T_i = \pi_i \land T_{-i} = \boldsymbol{\pi}_{-i},$$
(6)

where $\Theta = \{\Theta_e, \Theta_f, \Theta_Y\}$ are learning parameters to be optimized and *loss* is an appropriate loss function based on data type of the outcome. Individual peer effect could be estimated as $\hat{\delta}_i = \hat{f}_{\pi_{-i}} - \hat{f}_{\pi'_{-i}}$ using learned conditional expectations.

Scope and Assumptions. Here, we focus on learning exposure mapping functions that capture heterogeneous peer influence due to local neighborhood structure and features. We consider peer treatments, graph structure, and edge attributes as relevant contexts for peer exposure representation, i.e., $P_i = \phi_e(\pi_{-i}, G, Z)$. We also make a commonly used neighborhood interference assumption that the peer exposure depends on immediate peers only. However, our work can easily be extended to consider multiple-hop neighborhoods.

ASSUMPTION 4 (NEIGHBORHOOD INTERFERENCE). The counterfactual outcome of a unit depends on its immediate neighborhood, i.e., $Y_i(T_i = \pi_i, \mathbf{T}_{-i} = \pi_{-i}) = Y_i(T_i = \pi_i, \mathbf{T}_{Ni} = \pi_{Ni})$, where \mathbf{T}_{Ni} denotes random variable to capture neighborhood assignments π_{Ni} .

4 EGONETGNN: Learning Exposure Mapping Function with GNNs

Figure 2 shows the high-level overview of our peer effect estimation framework with the exposure mapping function learned with the EGONETGNN model. *First*, the attributed network is passed through a standard GNN that approximates feature mapping ϕ_f to learned feature embedding Z_i that captures confounders or effect modifiers. *Second*, EGONETGNN approximates the exposure mapping function ϕ_e by taking the ego network extracted from the attributed network and aggregating the edge attributes and peer treatments to produce peer exposure embedding. The feature embedding, exposure embedding, treatments, and outcomes are passed to an off-the-shelf peer effect estimator to get the peer effects. In this work, we demonstrate an end-to-end exposure mapping learning with EGONETGNN along with the Treatment Agnostic Representation Network (TAR-Net) [27] estimator adopted for peer effect estimation.

4.1 Feature Mapping with GNNs

The purpose of learning feature mapping is to capture contexts that are potentially confounders or effect modifiers. Capturing confounders ensures the estimates are unbiased and valid, while capturing effect modifiers reduces error in unit-level causal effect estimates. Prior works [1, 13, 16] have established GNNs are suitable for capturing such contexts in network settings. Our framework is agnostic to the specific GNN architecture, i.e., any GNN (e.g., GCN [18] or GAT [30]) could be used to extract the feature embedding. Let Θ denote a multi-layer perceptron (MLP) and || denote a concatenation operator. The feature embedding Z_i is obtained for *l*-th layer as:

$$\mathcal{Z}_i = \Theta_0(X_i) || \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} \Theta_l h_j^{l-1}, \text{ with } h_j^0 = X_j || Z_{ij}$$

where N_i denote neighbors of node v_i .

4.2 Exposure Mapping with EGONETGNN

The reliability of an exposure mapping function ϕ_e can be assessed in terms of three key properties: 1) expressiveness, 2) invariance, and 3) bounded and balanced representation. The expressiveness property ensures the peer exposure representation P_{N_i} returned by the function ϕ_e is unique for different relevant contexts, while the invariance property assures the representation P_{N_i} does not vary due to irrelevant contexts. For example, in a social network, if the underlying peer influence depends on the number of mutual connections, the function ϕ_e is expressive if it can actually capture the number of mutual connections, e.g., by counting the number of triangles. For the above example, the function ϕ_e is invariant to irrelevant contexts if the difference in other features like edge weights does not change the learned representation P_{N_i} . To satisfy the third property of bounded representation, the learned representation P_{N_i} should be bounded, e.g., between 0 and 1, to reflect no exposure and maximum exposure. Moreover, the representation should be balanced, which means that the learned representation P_{N_i} should be distributed across the entire bound.

Our goal is to learn an exposure mapping function that generates peer exposure representations that are expressive enough to capture underlying peer influence mechanisms involving peer treatments, Conference'17, July 2017, Washington, DC, USA

local network structure, and edge attributes as relevant contexts. Previous research has investigated the expressiveness of GNNs in terms of their ability to distinguish isomorphic graphs [32] or count substructures [10]. Despite the flexibility of message-passing GNNs (e.g., GCN or GAT), they lack the expressiveness to count subgraphs with cycles like triangles. On the other hand, causal network motifs counts have been shown as reliable features to capture peer exposure due to local neighborhood structure [33]. Due to the above limitation of GNNs, they cannot capture closed triad motifs (i.e., triangular motifs). Our proposed method EgoNetGNN is designed to make GNNs as least as expressive or even better than the approach of feature extraction by counting motifs. To this end, we transform the node regression task to graph regression by extracting ego networks for each unit. In an ego network, the triangle structures involving an ego node are transformed as edges, which mitigates the limitation of GNNs to capture closed triad motifs. Next, we describe the ego network construction and the architecture of our model.

Ego network construction. First, an ego network $\bar{G}_i(\bar{V}_i, \bar{E}_i)$ is extracted from G(V, E) for each node v_i such that node set \bar{V}_i consists neighbors of v_i , i.e., $\bar{V}_i = \{v_j : e_{ij} \in E \land v_j \in V\}$ and edge set \bar{E}_i consists edges between neighbors of v_i , i.e., $\bar{E}_i = \{e_{jk} : e_{jk} \in E \land v_j \in \bar{V}_i \land v_k \in \bar{V}_i\}$.

Node aggregation. We consider transforming an ego's edge attributes as node attributes of peers in the ego network because the ego node itself is not present in the ego network, and we want to capture the heterogeneous influence due to local neighborhood conditions. Next, node attribute \bar{X}_j of node $v_j \in \bar{V}_i$ in the ego network is set using edge attributes of ego node v_i and peer v_j , i.e., $\bar{X}_j = Z_{ij}$. The node aggregation is performed in the ego network \bar{G}_i for l layers as:

$$h_j^l = \sum_{k \in \mathcal{N}_i} h_k^{l-1}$$
, with $h_j^0 = T_j || \bar{X_j}$.

Encoder MLP. Now, the aggregated representation and raw edge attributes are passed into an encoder multi-layer perceptron (MLP) to extract a low dimensional embedding. The goal of this module is to capture complex mechanism based on the local neighborhood and reduce dimensionality. Formally, the output embedding h_i^{exp} is obtained as follows:

$$h_{i}^{exp} = ReLU(\Theta_{enc}(\bar{X}_{j}||h_{i}^{l})),$$

ReLU is a rectified linear unit activation function and Θ_{enc} is the encoder MLP.

Graph aggregation. Finally, the representation h^{exp} from the MLP module is aggregated on the entire ego network. The peer exposure embedding is obtained as follows:

$$P_{\mathcal{N}_i} = \frac{\sum_j (T_j \times h_j^{exp})}{\sum_j h_j^{exp}} ||1 - e^{-\sum_j (T_j \times h_j^{exp})}.$$

We consider two aggregations such that the peer exposure embedding is bounded between zero and one, with zero being the case of no peer exposure. The first aggregation is similar to the fraction of treated peers, but we weight each peer by $\frac{h_j^{exp}}{\sum_j h_j^{exp}}$ learned by



Figure 2: An overview of the proposed EGONETGNN model to learn exposure mapping function for peer effect estimation. EGONETGNN extracts ego networks, for each node v_i , with peer treatments as node attributes along with edge attributes from the attributed network G. Then, node-level aggregations are performed to capture local neighborhood contexts. These contexts are encoded by an MLP to learn relevant influence mechanisms and summarized with graph-level aggregation. The learned peer exposure embeddings (P_{N_i}), along with the feature embeddings (Z_i), treatment (T_i), and outcomes (Y_i), are passed to a suitable peer effect estimator to get peer effects (δ_i).

the preceding layer. The second aggregation is analogous to the number of treated peers, except that each peer is weighted by h_i^{exp} .

4.3 End-to-end Learning

As discussed in Section 3, peer effects can be estimated by learning two conditional expectations: $\hat{f_{\pi_{N_i}}} = E[Y_i|T_i = \pi_i, P_{N_i} = \phi_e(\pi_{N_i}, G, Z), Z_i]$ and $\hat{f_{\pi'_{N_i}}} = E[Y_i|T_i = \pi_i, P'_{N_i} = \phi_e(\pi'_{N_i}, G, Z), Z_i]$. Here, we apply the neighborhood interference assumption to consider the treatment of immediate peers instead of the treatment of overall peers. Such an estimator is referred to as TLearner [19] because it uses two conditional expectation learners. For the endto-end learning of the exposure mapping function and the counterfactual outcomes using TLearner, we minimize the mean square error (MSE) loss in factual outcome prediction along with the balance loss, a custom loss functions designed for EGONETGNN. This custom loss function introduce priors to make the learned exposure mapping function stable.

Peer Effect Estimation with TARNet. Treatment Agnostic Representation Network (TARNet) [27] is a TLearner estimator that uses neural networks to learn the conditional expectations. The TARNet architecture [27] consists of a single embedding MLP and two prediction modules to estimate counterfactual outcomes under treatment and control, i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned} h_i^{emb} &= \Theta_{emb}(\mathcal{Z}_i), \\ Y_i(0, P_{\mathcal{N}_i}) &= \Theta_{Y(0)}(h_i^{emb}||P_{\mathcal{N}_i}), and \\ Y_i(1, P_{\mathcal{N}_i}) &= \Theta_{Y(1)}(h_i^{emb}||P_{\mathcal{N}_i}). \end{aligned}$$

The peer effect for observed or assigned treatments is obtained as $\hat{\delta}_i = Y_i(0, P_{\mathcal{N}_i}) - Y_i(0, P'_{\mathcal{N}_i})$ if $T_i = 0$ and $\hat{\delta}_i = Y_i(1, P_{\mathcal{N}_i}) - Y_i(1, P'_{\mathcal{N}_i})$ if $T_i = 1$.

TARNet outcome prediction loss. This loss function minimizes the MSE error between predicted outcome and observed outcome, i.e., $L_{pred} = (Y_i - \hat{Y}_i)^2$, where $\hat{Y}_i = Y(1, P_{N_i})$ if $T_i = 1$ else $Y(0, P_{N_i})$.

Balance loss. We use a prior that encourages a balanced distribution of the learned peer exposure embedding. This loss function checks how far the learned peer embedding distribution is from a continuous uniform distribution between 0 and 1, i.e., $L_{bal} = (mean(P_{N_i}) - 0.5)^2 + (var(P_{N_i}) - \frac{1}{12})^2 + (range(P_{N_i}) - 1)^2$. Here, we consider MSE of mean, variance, and range of learned embedding P_{N_i} against corresponding value of the uniform distribution.

Overall loss. We combine the TARNet loss and balance loss to obtain overall loss function \mathcal{L} to minimize as

$$\mathcal{L} = L_{pred} + \lambda_{bal} \times L_{bal} + \lambda_{L1} \times ||\Theta_{qnn}||_1, \tag{7}$$

where Θ_{gnn} denote overall parameters in feature mapping GNN and EGONETGNN, and the last term is L_1 loss to promote invariance to irrelevant contexts by preferring sparse weights. λ_{bal} is a hyperparameter to weigh the balance loss.

5 Experiments and Results

Here, we describe the datasets and experimental setup for the evaluation of our method, EGONETGNN. Then, we present the main takeaways from the results.

5.1 Dataset

Similar to other works in causal inference, we rely on synthetic and semi-synthetic data for the evaluation. We consider three synthetic network models with different data generating parameters and edge densities: (1) the Watts Strogatz (WS) network [31], which models small-world phenomena, (2) the Barabási Albert (BA) network [2], which models preferential attachment phenomena, and (3) the Stochastic Block (SB) network that model community structures. We generate all networks by fixing the number of nodes to 3000. We control the density of edges for BA and WS networks and the number of communities in the (SB). For the BA model, the preferential attachment parameter $m \in [1, 5, 10]$ is used to generate sparse to dense networks, where a new node connects to p_{ba} existing nodes to form the network. For the WS model, we set mean degree parameters $k \in \{0.002N, 0.005N, 0.01N\}$ with fixed rewiring probability of 0.5, similar to prior works [1, 33]. For the SB model, we use

number of blocks parameters $b \in \{500, 200, 100\}$ with randomly generated edge probabilities within and across communities.

We also use a real-world social network, BlogCatalog, with more realistic topology and attributes to generate treatments and outcomes. We use LDA [7] to reduce the dimensionality of raw features to 50.

Treatment model. The treatment assignments could depend on the unit's covariates as well as peer covariates and some edge attribute. We generate treatment T_i for a unit v_i as $T_i \sim \theta(a(\tau_c \mathbf{W}_T \times \frac{\sum_{j \in N_i} X^c_j}{\sum_{j \in N_i} Z^c_{ij}}) + (1 - \tau_c) \mathbf{W}_T \cdot \mathbf{X}^c_i)$, where θ denotes Bernoulli distribution, $a : \mathbb{R} \mapsto [0, 1]$ is an activation function, $\tau_c \in [0, 1]$ controls spillover influence from unit v_i 's peers, $\mathbf{X}^c \subset \mathbf{X}$ is a subset of node attributes, $Z^c \in \mathbf{Z}$ is an edge attribute, and \mathbf{W}_T is a weight matrix.

Outcome model. The outcomes depend on unit's treatment, peer treatments based on the local neighborhood condition, the confounders, and the effect modifiers. We generate outcome Y_i for a unit v_i as:

$$Y_{i} = (\delta_{exp} + \delta_{em} \times T_{i}) \times \phi_{e}(G, \mathbf{Z}, T_{-i}) + (\tau_{d} + \tau_{em} \times \phi_{em}(G, \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Z})) \times T_{i} + g(\mathbf{X}_{c}, Z_{c}, G) + \epsilon.$$
(8)

Here, the first term $(\delta_{exp} + \delta_{em} \times T_i) \times \phi_e(G, \mathbf{Z}, T_{-i})$ captures peer effects, where $\phi_e(G, \mathbf{Z}, T_{-i})$ captures peer exposure that depends on local neighborhood condition (e.g., the number of mutual connections between treated peers and ego unit) and δ_{exp} and δ_{em} are coefficients controlling magnitude/direction of peer effects. The term $g(\mathbf{X_c}, Z_c, G)$ captures confounding and $\epsilon \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ is random noise. The remaining term captures direct effect due to unit's own treatment with effect modification by some contexts. For semi-synthetic data, to generate heterogeneous peer effects, we use additional effect modification due to a unit's covariates, i.e., $\delta_{em} \times T_i \times \phi_v(\mathbf{X}_{em})$, where $\mathbf{X}_{em} \subset \mathbf{X}$ and ϕ_v is some function.

5.2 Experimental Setup

We design our experimental setup to answer the following research questions (RQ).

RQ1. How well do methods for peer effect estimation perform when peer exposure mechanisms depend on local neighborhood conditions? RQ1 investigates the performance of peer estimation baseline methods, including those considering homogeneous or heterogeneous peer influence, compared to our method, when peer influence mechanisms are based on local neighborhood conditions. We generate synthetic networks, BA and WS, with low, medium, and high edge density and SB network with different block sizes. For each network, we generate treatment and outcome according to treatment and outcome models above. For the outcome model, we consider four mechanisms for true peer exposure conditions ($\phi_e(G, \mathbb{Z}, T_{-i})$): 1) peer exposure is given by a weighted fraction of treated peers with weights depending on the number of mutual connections; 2) peer exposure is the clustering coefficient between the treated peers; 3) peer exposure depends on the number of connected components among treated peers; and 4) peer exposure depends on tie strength, i.e, edge attributes. Here, the only challenge is detecting peer effects. Therefore, we set the coefficient τ_d to 1 and τ_{em} to 0 in the outcome model (Eq. 8) capturing constant direct effect with no effect modification. The coefficients scaling peer effects δ_{exp} and δ_{em} are set to 20 for the first, second and

Conference'17, July 2017, Washington, DC, USA

fourth mechanisms and 1 for the third mechanism because true peer exposure in the former case are bounded from 0 to 1 while the later one is unbounded.

RQ2. How reliable are the models for peer effect estimation in more realistic scenario? RQ2 investigates the performance of EGONETGNN and baselines with semi-synthetic network and more realistic data generation with all direct effects, peer effects, effect modification, and confounding. This setting tests generalization capability of the models. Here, we consider the first three influence mechanisms discussed above.

Evaluation metrics. To evaluate the performance of heterogeneous peer effect (HPE) estimation, we use the *Precision in the Estimation of Heterogeneous Effects* (ϵ_{PEHE}) [14] metric defined as $\epsilon_{PEHE} = \sqrt{\frac{1}{N} \sum_i (\delta_i - \hat{\delta}_i)^2}$, where δ_i is true HPE and $\hat{\delta}_i = \hat{Y}_i(\pi_i, P_{N_i}) - \hat{Y}_i(\pi_i, P'_{N_i})$ is the estimated HPE. Here, P'_{N_i} denotes a counterfactual scenario where treatments of peers are flipped. ϵ_{PEHE} (lower better) measures the deviation of estimated HPEs from true HPEs.

Baselines. We compare our proposed approach, EGONETGNN, with state-of-the-art (SOTA) peer estimation methods. NetEst [16] and TNet [9] use the fraction of treated peers as peer exposure but the estimator is based on adversarial learning and doubly robust method, respectively, for robustness. As discussed in the related work, DWR [34] learns attention weights based on attribute similarity and 1-GNN-HSIC [22] use GNNs to summarize peer treatments as heterogeneous contexts while using homogeneous exposure. We also consider GNN-TARNet-Motifs approach that consider manually extracted causal motifs [33] as peer exposure and TARNet as estimators [27] as strong baselines. GNN-TARNet-Motifs serve as references to check whether the exposure mapping function learned by our method is as good as or better than manually extracted causal motifs. We also include INE-TARNet [1] adapted for peer effect estimation as a baseline, although it was developed for direct effect estimation. We discuss hyperparmeter tuning and model selection in the Appendix.

5.3 Results

Figures 3, 4, 6 (Appendix) and 7 (Appendix) depict results for the RQ1 and reveal our model performs reliably well in estimating peer effects when peer exposure depends on local neighborhood structure. Each figure shows the performance of peer estimation approaches in terms of the PEHE metric (lower is better) for BA, WS, and SB network models. For each setting, the experiment is repeated for 5 seeds, and we show the mean value and standard deviation as error bars. The x - axis shows the network model parameters and corresponding average edge densities (low to high) in the generated networks. The performance of our method EgoNet-GNN with TARNet estimator is shown as blue bar. The y - axis is shown in the log scale because the baseline models except GNN-TARNet-MOTIFS and INE-TARNet perform poorly accross all the settings. It is evident from the figures that our method is better than all of the baselines across most of the settings, and it is competitive with approaches that use causal motif counts in other settings.

In Figure 3, our method easily outperforms all baselines showing its capability to count triangles in the ego network and hence capture the number of mutual connections between an ego and other peers. In Figure 4, our method performs well compared to all Conference'17, July 2017, Washington, DC, USA

Shishir Adhikari, Sourav Medya, and Elena Zheleva



Network generating parameter and corresponding average edge densities (lower to higher)

Figure 3: Peer effect estimation error when true peer exposure depends on number of mutual connections. Our method significantly outperforms all baselines showing its capability to count triangles in the ego network.



Network generating parameter and corresponding average edge densities (lower to higher)

Figure 4: Peer effect estimation error when true peer exposure depends on connected components among treated peers. Our method performs well compared to all baselines when underlying peer exposure mechanism cannot be explained totally with motifs structures only.



Figure 5: Peer effect estimation error for semi-synthetic Blog-Catalog data for different underlying influence mechanisms. Our model outperforms other baselines even for more complicated data generation resembling real-world settings.

baselines when underlying peer exposure mechanism, i.e., based on the number of connected components, cannot be explained totally with motifs structures only. In Figure 6, our method is better than or competitive to motif-count based baselines when the underlying peer exposure mechanism can be explained by causal motif counts. In Figure 7, our method performs extremely well on WS and BA graphs but it's performance is slightly reduced for the denser SB. Figure 5 depicts results for RQ2 and includes the performance of estimators considering heterogeneity for BlogCatalog network data with more complex and realistic data generation settings. Here, the y-axis shows the underlying influence mechanisms and x-axis shows the error in estimation of peer effects. Even in more realistic setting, our method is performing better than all the baselines in average showing its generalization. The slightly high variance could be attributed to the flipped counterfactuals and different seeds with distinct ground truth causal effects.

6 Conclusion

This work motivates the problem of learning exposure mapping function for peer effect estimation and proposes EGONETGNN for addressing influence due to local neighborhood structure. Our experiments demonstrate increased expressiveness of our method to capture complex local neighborhood exposure conditions. We also show generalizability of the method to semi-synthetic data with more realistic data generation. This work can be applied to the estimation of other network effects like direct effects and total effects. Future work should extend the method to capture generic unknown influence mechanisms for peer effect estimation by addressing the invariance to irrelevant contexts. Another extension should consider relaxing the assumption of neighborhood interference condition.

Conference'17, July 2017, Washington, DC, USA

References

- Shishir Adhikari and Elena Zheleva. 2024. Inferring Individual Direct Causal Effects Under Heterogeneous Peer Influence. Machine Learning Journal (2024).
- [2] Réka Albert and Albert-László Barabási. 2002. Statistical mechanics of complex networks. *Reviews of modern physics* 74, 1 (2002), 47.
- [3] David Arbour, Dan Garant, and David Jensen. 2016. Inferring network effects from observational data. In Proceedings of the 22nd ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining. 715–724.
- [4] Peter M Aronow and Cyrus Samii. 2017. Estimating average causal effects under general interference, with application to a social network experiment. *The Annals* of Applied Statistics 11, 4 (2017), 1912–1947.
- [5] Falco J Bargagli-Stoffi, Costanza Tortù, and Laura Forastiere. 2020. Heterogeneous Treatment and Spillover Effects under Clustered Network Interference. arXiv preprint arXiv:2008.00707 (2020).
- [6] Brian G Barkley, Michael G Hudgens, John D Clemens, Mohammad Ali, and Michael E Emch. 2020. Causal inference from observational studies with clustered interference, with application to a cholera vaccine study. *Annals of Applied Statistics* 14, 3 (2020), 1432–1448.
- [7] David M Blei, Andrew Y Ng, and Michael I Jordan. 2003. Latent dirichlet allocation. Journal of machine Learning research 3, Jan (2003), 993–1022.
- [8] Ruichu Cai, Zeqin Yang, Weilin Chen, Yuguang Yan, and Zhifeng Hao. 2023. Generalization bound for estimating causal effects from observational network data. In CIKM. 163–172.
- [9] Weilin Chen, Ruichu Cai, Zeqin Yang, Jie Qiao, Yuguang Yan, Zijian Li, and Zhifeng Hao. 2024. Doubly Robust Causal Effect Estimation under Networked Interference via Targeted Learning. In *Forty-first International Conference on Machine Learning*.
- [10] Zhengdao Chen, Lei Chen, Soledad Villar, and Joan Bruna. 2020. Can graph neural networks count substructures? Advances in neural information processing systems 33 (2020), 10383-10395.
- [11] Irina Cristali and Victor Veitch. 2022. Using embeddings for causal estimation of peer influence in social networks. Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 35 (2022), 15616–15628.
- [12] Laura Forastiere, Edoardo M Airoldi, and Fabrizia Mealli. 2021. Identification and estimation of treatment and interference effects in observational studies on networks. J. Amer. Statist. Assoc. 116, 534 (2021), 901–918.
- [13] Ruocheng Guo, Jundong Li, and Huan Liu. 2020. Learning individual causal effects from networked observational data. In Proceedings of the 13th International Conference on Web Search and Data Mining. 232–240.
- [14] Jennifer L Hill. 2011. Bayesian nonparametric modeling for causal inference. Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics 20, 1 (2011), 217–240.
- [15] Michael G Hudgens and M Elizabeth Halloran. 2008. Toward causal inference with interference. J. Amer. Statist. Assoc. 103, 482 (2008), 832–842.
- [16] Song Jiang and Yizhou Sun. 2022. Estimating Causal Effects on Networked Observational Data via Representation Learning. In Proceedings of the 31st ACM International Conference on Information & Knowledge Management. 852–861.
- [17] Seyedeh Baharan Khatami, Harsh Parikh, Haowei Chen, Sudeepa Roy, and Babak Salimi. 2024. Graph Machine Learning based Doubly Robust Estimator for Network Causal Effects. arXiv:2403.11332 [cs.LG] https://arxiv.org/abs/2403. 11332
- [18] Thomas N Kipf and Max Welling. 2016. Semi-Supervised Classification with Graph Convolutional Networks. In International Conference on Learning Representations.
- [19] Sören R Künzel, Jasjeet S Sekhon, Peter J Bickel, and Bin Yu. 2019. Metalearners for estimating heterogeneous treatment effects using machine learning. *Proceedings* of the National Academy of Sciences 116, 10 (2019), 4156–4165.
- [20] Xiaofeng Lin, Guoxi Zhang, Xiaotian Lu, Han Bao, Koh Takeuchi, and Hisashi Kashima. 2023. Estimating Treatment Effects Under Heterogeneous Interference. In Joint European Conference on ML and KDD. Springer, 576–592.
- [21] Jing Ma, Mengting Wan, Longqi Yang, Jundong Li, Brent Hecht, and Jaime Teevan. 2022. Learning causal effects on hypergraphs. In Proceedings of the 28th ACM SIGKDD Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining. 1202–1212.
- [22] Yunpu Ma and Volker Tresp. 2021. Causal inference under networked interference and intervention policy enhancement. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*. PMLR, 3700–3708.
- [23] Razieh Nabi, Joel Pfeiffer, Denis Charles, and Emre Kıcıman. 2022. Causal inference in the presence of interference in sponsored search advertising. *Frontiers in big Data* 5 (2022).
- [24] Elizabeth L Ogburn, Oleg Sofrygin, Ivan Diaz, and Mark J Van der Laan. 2022. Causal inference for social network data. J. Amer. Statist. Assoc. (2022), 1–15.
- [25] Eleonora Patacchini, Edoardo Rainone, and Yves Zenou. 2017. Heterogeneous peer effects in education. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization* 134 (2017), 190–227.
- [26] Zhaonan Qu, Ruoxuan Xiong, Jizhou Liu, and Guido Imbens. 2021. Efficient Treatment Effect Estimation in Observational Studies under Heterogeneous Partial Interference. arXiv preprint arXiv:2107.12420 (2021).

- [27] Uri Shalit, Fredrik D Johansson, and David Sontag. 2017. Estimating individual treatment effect: generalization bounds and algorithms. In *International Confer*ence on Machine Learning. PMLR, 3076–3085.
- [28] Christopher Tran and Elena Zheleva. 2022. Heterogeneous Peer Effects in the Linear Threshold Model. Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence (2022).
- [29] Johan Ugander, Brian Karrer, Lars Backstrom, and Jon Kleinberg. 2013. Graph cluster randomization: Network exposure to multiple universes. In Proceedings of the 19th ACM SIGKDD international conference on Knowledge discovery and data mining. 329–337.
- [30] Petar Veličković, Guillem Cucurull, Arantxa Casanova, Adriana Romero, Pietro Liò, and Yoshua Bengio. 2018. Graph Attention Networks. In International Conference on Learning Representations. https://openreview.net/forum?id=rJXMpikCZ
- [31] Duncan J Watts and Steven H Strogatz. 1998. Collective dynamics of smallworld'networks. *nature* 393, 6684 (1998), 440–442.
- [32] Keyulu Xu, Weihua Hu, Jure Leskovec, and Stefanie Jegelka. 2018. How Powerful are Graph Neural Networks?. In International Conference on Learning Representations.
- [33] Yuan Yuan, Kristen Altenburger, and Farshad Kooti. 2021. Causal Network Motifs: Identifying Heterogeneous Spillover Effects in A/B Tests. In Proceedings of the Web Conference 2021. 3359–3370.
- [34] Ziyu Zhao, Kun Kuang, Ruoxuan Xiong, and Fei Wu. 2022. Learning Individual Treatment Effects under Heterogeneous Interference in Networks. arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.14080 (2022).

Conference'17, July 2017, Washington, DC, USA

Appendix

Hyperparameters and model selection. For the experiments, we choose $\lambda_{bal} = 0.01$ for encouraging balanced representation and $\lambda_{L1} = 1$ for encouraging invariance to irrelevant mechanism. Moreover, we perform grid search hyperparameter tuning by varying GNN learning rate {0.1, 0.04, 0.02, 0.01}, and setting TARNet learning rate to 0.01. A 20% held-out dataset is used for model selection, where model with lowest L_{pred} is chosen for reporting. The baselines INE-TARNet and GNN-TARNet-Motifs are also tuned similarly. Other baselines are tuned by varing the learning rate {0.02, 0.01}, keeping other hyperparameters default. DWR is calibrated for 5 epochs to balance representation. We set the output embedding dimension of encoder MLP to 3 giving 6-dimensional peer exposure.



Network generating parameter and corresponding average edge densities (lower to higher)

Figure 6: Peer effect estimation error when true peer exposure depends on clustering coefficient among treated peers. Our method is better than or competitive to motif-count based baseline when the underlying peer exposure mechanism can be explained by causal motif counts.



Network generating parameter and corresponding average edge densities (lower to higher)

Figure 7: Peer effect estimation error when true peer exposure depends on tie strengths between treated peers. Our method is better than the motif-count based baseline for WS and BA networks but competitive to causal motif counts for the SB network.