
VARIABLE NEIGHBORHOOD SEARCHING RERANDOMIZATION

Jiuyao Lu
 Johns Hopkins University
 jlu85@jhu.edu

Daogao Liu
 University of Washington
 dgliu@uw.edu

Abstract

Rerandomization discards undesired treatment assignments to ensure covariate balance in randomized experiments. However, rerandomization based on acceptance-rejection sampling is computationally inefficient, especially when numerous independent assignments are required to perform randomization-based statistical inference. Existing acceleration methods are suboptimal and are not applicable in structured experiments, including stratified experiments and experiments with clusters. Based on metaheuristics in combinatorial optimization, we propose a novel variable neighborhood searching rerandomization(VNSRR) method to draw balanced assignments in various experiments efficiently. We derive the unbiasedness and a lower bound for the variance reduction of the treatment effect estimator under VNSRR. Simulation studies and a real data example indicate that our method maintains the appealing statistical properties of rerandomization and can sample thousands of treatment assignments within seconds, even in cases where existing methods require an hour to complete the task.

Keywords causal inference · clinical trials · experimental design · combinatorial optimization · binary quadratic programming · variable neighborhood search

1 Introduction

Randomized experiments balance covariates on average and have been the gold standard for drawing causal inferences. However, as pointed out by Morgan and Rubin (2012), covariate imbalances between treatment groups often exist in practice due to the randomness in complete randomization(CR). An intuitive and practical solution to this issue is randomizing repeatedly until a prespecified covariate balance criterion is achieved. Despite the long history and widespread use of rerandomization (Student, 1938; Cox, 1982; Bailey and Rowley, 1987; Maclure et al., 2006; Imai et al., 2008; Bruhn and McKenzie, 2009), its theoretical implications were first studied by Morgan and Rubin (2012) using the Mahalanobis distance only recently. Since then, rerandomization has attracted growing research interests, and its theory underpinnings have been established in various scenarios (Morgan and Rubin, 2015; Li et al., 2018; Zhou et al., 2018; Li et al., 2020; Shi et al., 2022; Wang et al., 2023; Lu et al., 2023).

As the name of rerandomization indicates, researchers typically conduct rerandomization by repeatedly sampling treatment assignments until a balanced one is generated. This procedure is then repeated thousands of times since numerous independent qualified assignments are required to perform randomization-based inference. Therefore, rerandomization can be time-consuming using the acceptance-rejection sampling rerandomization(ARSR) strategy. Zhu and Liu (2022) proposed a pair-switching rerandomization(PSRR) method to reduce the computational cost of

rerandomization. However, the authors only considered a fixed number of covariates and a fixed covariate imbalance threshold. As we will show in Section 5, PSRR can be slower than ARSRR in certain settings. Moreover, both ARSRR and PSRR are computationally inefficient in settings considered by recent works, including diminishing covariate imbalance and high-dimensional covariates (Branson and Shao, 2021; Wang and Li, 2022; Zhang et al., 2023). Additionally, although Zhu and Liu (2022) extended PSRR to sequential experiments, PSRR is not applicable in other structured experiments such as stratified experiments or experiments with clusters.

In this work, we point out that a treatment assignment with a sufficiently small Mahalanobis distance can be achieved by optimizing a quadratic function of linearly constrained binary variables. Based on metaheuristics in combinatorial optimization, we propose a novel variable neighborhood searching rerandomization (VNSRR) method to accelerate rerandomization in various randomized experiments. Moreover, we derive the unbiasedness and a lower bound for the variance reduction of the treatment effect estimator under VNSRR. Our simulation studies and real data analysis illustrate that VNSRR significantly improves the computational efficiency of rerandomization while maintaining desired statistical properties. It can sample thousands of treatment assignments within seconds, even in cases where existing methods require hours to complete the task.

2 Related Work

2.1 The Neyman-Rubin Potential Outcome Framework

This study adopts the Neyman-Rubin potential outcome framework (Neyman, 1923; Rubin, 1974). We consider an experiment with n units, among which n_t units are assigned to the treatment group and $n_c = n - n_t$ units are assigned to the control group. We denote $W = (W_1, \dots, W_n)^T$ as the vector of treatment assignment indicators. $W_i = 1$ if unit i is assigned to the treatment group and $W_i = 0$ otherwise. Each unit i has two potential outcomes, $(Y_i(1), Y_i(0))$, which correspond to the two treatment arms. The individual treatment effect for unit i is defined as $\tau_i = Y_i(1) - Y_i(0)$. And the average treatment effect is defined as $\tau = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (Y_i(1) - Y_i(0))$. The observed outcome for unit i is $Y_i = W_i Y_i(1) + (1 - W_i) Y_i(0)$. We adopt the stable unit treatment value assumption (SUTVA) (Rubin, 1980), which states that the treatment levels are well-defined and there is no interference between $(Y_i(1), Y_i(0))$ and $\{W_j : j \neq i\}$. We estimate the treatment effects with the difference-in-means estimator, defined as $\hat{\tau}(W) = \frac{1}{n_t} \sum_{i:W_i=1} Y_i(1) - \frac{1}{n_c} \sum_{i:W_i=0} Y_i(0)$. We assume that each unit has p observed covariates, denoted by $X_i = (X_{i1}, \dots, X_{ip})^T$. The covariates of all units are gathered into a matrix $X = (X_1, \dots, X_n)^T$. The corresponding covariance matrix is denoted by $S_{XX} = \frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (X_i - \bar{X})(X_i - \bar{X})^T$.

2.2 Rerandomization Using the Mahalanobis Distance

For a given assignment W , the difference in the covariate means of the two treatment groups is

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{X}_t - \bar{X}_c &= \frac{1}{n_t} X^T W - \frac{1}{n_c} X^T (1_n - W) \\ &= \frac{n}{n_t n_c} X^T (W - \frac{n_t}{n} 1_n). \end{aligned}$$

And the Mahalanobis distance between the covariates means is defined as

$$\begin{aligned}
M(W) &:= (\bar{X}_t - \bar{X}_c)^T [Cov[(\bar{X}_t - \bar{X}_c)]]^{-1} (\bar{X}_t - \bar{X}_c) \\
&= \frac{n_t n_c}{n} (\bar{X}_t - \bar{X}_c)^T S_{XX}^{-1} (\bar{X}_t - \bar{X}_c) \\
&= \frac{n}{n_t n_c} (W - \frac{n_t}{n} \mathbf{1}_n)^T X S_{XX}^{-1} X^T (W - \frac{n_t}{n} \mathbf{1}_n) \\
&= (W - \frac{n_t}{n} \mathbf{1}_n)^T H (W - \frac{n_t}{n} \mathbf{1}_n),
\end{aligned}$$

where $H = \frac{n}{n_t n_c} X S_{XX}^{-1} X^T$.

Morgan and Rubin (2012) suggested to conduct rerandomization by sampling W from $\{W : \sum_{i=1}^n W_i = n_t, W_i \in \{0, 1\}\}$ repeatedly until $M(W) \leq a$, where a is a prespecified threshold. We refer to rerandomization based on this acceptance-rejection sampling strategy as ARSRR.

2.3 Pair-switching Rerandomization (PSRR)

To avoid the computationally inefficient acceptance-rejection sampling approach and accelerate rerandomization in both nonsequential and sequential experiments, Zhu and Liu (2022) suggested to search for balanced assignments with a pair-switching strategy, i.e., PSRR. The algorithm essentially starts with a random assignment and gradually improves it by switching between a treated unit and a control unit repeatedly. Motivated by the Metropolis-Hastings algorithm, PSRR allows moving to less balanced assignments with a non-zero probability to prevent being trapped in a local region. The authors obtained the unbiasedness and a lower bound on the variance reduction of the treatment effect estimator under PSRR. However, as pointed out in Section 1 and demonstrated by the simulation studies in Section 5, PSRR is still time-consuming in many settings and is not applicable in certain structured experiments.

3 Variable Neighborhood Searching Rerandomization(VNSRR)

We introduce our variable neighborhood searching rerandomization (VNSRR) in this section.

3.1 The VNSRR Algorithm

We notice that rerandomization is closely related with the following constrained binary quadratic programming problem.

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbf{minimize} && M(W) = (W - \frac{n_t}{n} \mathbf{1}_n)^T H (W - \frac{n_t}{n} \mathbf{1}_n), \\
&\mathbf{subject\ to} && \sum_{i=1}^n W_i = n_t, \\
&&& W_i \in \{0, 1\}, i = 1, \dots, n.
\end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

For simplification, we denote the feasible set of (1) as $\mathcal{F}_0 = \{W \in \{0, 1\}^n : \sum_i W_i = n_t\}$. While rerandomization aims to find a feasible W in \mathcal{F}_0 with sufficiently small $M(W)$ rather than the minimizer of $M(W)$ in \mathcal{F}_0 , we can still utilize combinatorial optimization techniques to conduct rerandomization and are allowed to terminate the optimization process as long as $M(W)$ falls below a prespecified threshold a .

There are few studies concerning the specific optimization problem in (1), but some related constrained binary quadratic programming problems have received extensive attention, such as

the maximum diversity problem and the heaviest k-subgraph problem. These problems share the same feasible sets as (1) but have different objective functions. We recommend that interested readers refer to Martí et al. (2013) for a detailed review of the literature. The authors presented extensive experiments to reveal that the best methods to solve the maximum diversity problem are local search based metaheuristics, especially variable neighborhood search (Brimberg et al., 2009; Aringhieri and Cordone, 2011) and tabu search (Palubeckis, 2007; Aringhieri and Cordone, 2011). Both methods update their solutions by exchanging coordinates of W that are ones with coordinates of W that are zeroes. Variable neighborhood search systematically changes the neighborhood by executing two steps iteratively. It descends to find local optimum in local search steps and perturbs to avoid being trapped in local regions in shaking steps. Tabu search maintains a list of forbidden moves, namely the tabu list, to avoid looping over recently visited coordinates of W . Aringhieri and Cordone (2011) proposed to incorporate tabu search in the local search step of variable neighborhood search.

Algorithm 1: Variable neighborhood searching rerandomization

Input: Covariates X , group sizes (n_t, n_c) , threshold a , hyperparameter (L, S) .
Set $t = 0$;
Set $W^{(0)}$ as n_t elements equal to 1 and n_c elements equal to 0 with random positions;
Set $M^{(0)} = M(W^{(0)})$;
while $M^{(t)} > a$ **do**
 Randomly select L positions of the 1's in $W^{(t)}$, denoted by O_1, \dots, O_L ;
 Randomly select L positions of the 0's in $W^{(t)}$, denoted by Z_1, \dots, Z_L ;
 Set $\tilde{S} = S$;
 for $l = 1, \dots, L$ **do**
 Obtain W^* by switching the 1 at position O_l and the 0 at position Z_l in $W^{(t)}$;
 Set $M^* = M(W^*)$;
 if $M^* < M^{(t)}$ **then**
 Set $\tilde{S} = 0$;
 Set $t = t + 1$;
 Set $W^{(t)} = W^*$;
 Set $M^{(t)} = M^*$;
 if $M^{(t)} < a$ **then** break;
 if $\tilde{S} > 0$ **then**
 Randomly select \tilde{S} positions of the 1's in $W^{(t)}$, denoted by O_1, \dots, O_S ;
 Randomly select \tilde{S} positions of the 0's in $W^{(t)}$, denoted by Z_1, \dots, Z_S ;
 for $s = 1, \dots, \tilde{S}$ **do**
 Obtain $W^{(t+1)}$ by switching the 1 at position O_s and the 0 at position Z_s in $W^{(t)}$;
 Set $M^{(t+1)} = M(W^{(t+1)})$;
 Set $t = t + 1$;
Output: $W = W^{(t)}$.

Motivated by the empirical success of local-search-based metaheuristics in related optimization problems, we propose a novel VNSRR method for rerandomization through variable neighborhood searching, as summarized by Algorithm 1. VNSRR starts with a random assignment and then executes the local search step and the shaking step iteratively until an acceptable assignment is reached. VNSRR conducts the local search step differently from any existing variable neighborhood

search methods. It is inspired by but different from tabu search methods. In the local search step, VNSRR sequentially examines L disjoint random pairs of treated units and control units and swaps a pair if it leads to a more balanced assignment. We borrow the idea of preventing looping over recently visited units from tabu search. However, VNSRR differs from tabu search in that VNSRR avoids maintaining the tabu list and checking whether each swap is forbidden, further improving computational efficiency. We note that when selecting multiple treated units or control units in the local search step, the ordering of the units is also randomly selected. In other words, we randomly select a permutation of L positions of the 1's or 0's in $W^{(t)}$. In the shaking step, VNSRR generates an assignment in the neighborhood of the current assignment by randomly switching \tilde{S} pairs of treated and control units. When no pairs are switched in the local search step, indicating a likely local optimum, \tilde{S} is set as a positive value S to prevent getting stuck. Otherwise, \tilde{S} is set as 0, and no perturbation is performed to allow for further search in the current local region. We compare different choices of L and S in our experiments, and the results are relegated to the Supplement.

We point out that both PSRR and VNSRR use pairwise swap as the basic operation in their algorithms, but use it with different strategies. PSRR allows switching recently considered units, while VNSRR does not. PSRR, as motivated by simulated annealing and Metropolis-Hastings algorithm, accepts swaps that lead to worse covariate balance, i.e., larger $M(W)$, with a certain probability determined by a temperature parameter. In contrast, VNSRR keeps moving to new W with smaller $M(W)$ in the local search step until none of the L swaps lead to smaller $M(W)$, and then the shaking step is conducted. Our experiments illustrate that PSRR can move to W with worse $M(W)$ quite frequently, while the strategy of VNSRR leads to a faster descent of $M(W)$. In fact, PSRR with zero temperature is equivalent to VNSRR with $L = 1$ and without shaking steps. Our experiments show that this special version lies in the middle of PSRR and VNSRR. The zero-temperature version of PSRR was not considered by the authors of PSRR and is faster than their default version. Our default VNSRR is faster than VNSRR with $L = 1$ and without shaking steps.

Like PSRR, we adopt the following trick to update the Mahalanobis distance efficiently. When we obtain a new assignment W^* by switching the 1 at position O_l and the 0 at position Z_l in $W^{(t)}$, $M(W^*)$ can be efficiently calculated as

$$M(W^*) = M^{(t)} - 2 \sum_{i=1}^n W_i^{(t)} H_{O_l i} + H_{O_l O_l} + 2 \sum_{i=1}^n W_i^* H_{Z_l i} - H_{Z_l Z_l} + h_{O_l} - h_{Z_l},$$

where $h = 2 \frac{n_t}{n} H 1_n$.

We note that some deterministic or semi-deterministic algorithms might generate a single acceptable assignment faster than VNSRR. However, such algorithms cannot be used to generate numerous independent assignments and do not guarantee the unbiasedness of the corresponding treatment effect estimator. The next section discusses the statistical properties of different rerandomization methods.

3.2 Statistical Properties of VNSRR

In this section, we establish the statistical properties of various rerandomization algorithms based on the Mahalanobis distance. For clarification, a rerandomization algorithm here is a sampling algorithm that randomly generates a balanced treatment assignment from the feasible set $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathcal{F}_0$ by generating a chain of treatment assignments, $(W^{(0)}, \dots, W^{(T)})$, where $W^{(t)} \in \mathcal{F}$ for all t and $W^{(T)} \in \mathcal{F} \cap \{W : M(W) \leq a\}$ is the final output. We provide sufficient conditions for a rerandomization algorithm to yield unbiased treatment effect estimators with bounded variance.

Specifically, we consider the following conditions, which assumes Morgan and Rubin (2012) as well as Zhu and Liu (2022).

Condition 1 (*linear decomposition*) For $w_i = 0, 1$, $Y_i(w_i) = \beta_0 + \beta^T X_i + \tau w_i + e_i$, where $\beta_0 + \beta^T X_i$ is the linear projection of $Y_i(0)$ onto $(1, X)$ and e_i is the deviation from the linear projection.

Condition 2 (*normality*) $\hat{\tau}$ and $\bar{X}_t - \bar{X}_c$ are normally distributed.

And we focus on three key properties of rerandomization algorithms.

Property 1 (*symmetric feasible set*) $\mathcal{F} = 1 - \mathcal{F}$.

Property 2 (*uniform initialization*) For any $w \in \mathcal{F}$,

$$P\left(W^{(0)} = w\right) = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{F}|}.$$

Property 3 (*updating rule*) There exists a sequence of functions $\{u_t\}_{t \geq 1}$, such that for any t and $(w^{(0)}, \dots, w^{(t)})$ that may appear consecutively in the generated chain,

$$P\left(W^{(t)} = w^{(t)} \mid W^{(0)} = w^{(0)}, \dots, W^{(t-1)} = w^{(t-1)}\right) = u_t(M(w^{(0)}), \dots, M(w^{(t)})),$$

Based on Property 1-3, we prove that the difference-in-means estimator is unbiased.

Theorem 1 If W is generated by a rerandomization algorithm satisfying Property 1, Property 2 and Property 3, then $E[\hat{\tau}] = \tau$.

Based on Condition 1-2 and Property 1-3, we prove that the difference-in-means estimator has smaller variance than that under complete randomization and construct a lower bound for the variance reduction. Denote V_{CR} as the variance of the difference-in-means estimator under complete randomization, we prove the following theorem.

Theorem 2 Under Condition 1 and Condition 2, if W is generated by a rerandomization algorithm satisfying Property 1, Property 2 and Property 3, then

$$\frac{V_{CR} - \text{Var}[\hat{\tau}]}{V_{CR}} \geq \left(1 - \frac{a}{p}\right) R^2,$$

where $R^2 = \frac{\beta^T \text{Cov}_{CR}[\bar{X}_t - \bar{X}_c] \beta}{V_{CR}} = \frac{n\beta^T S_{XX}\beta}{n_t n_c V_{CR}}$. Similar to the definition of V_{CR} , $\text{Cov}_{CR}[\bar{X}_t - \bar{X}_c]$ represents the covariance matrix of $\bar{X}_t - \bar{X}_c$ under complete randomization.

One can verify that VNSRR with \mathcal{F}_0 as the feasible set satisfies our proposed requirements under the following conditions.

Condition 3 (*equal group sizes*) $n_t = n_c = \frac{n}{2}$.

Proposition 1 VNSRR satisfies Property 2 and Property 3. Under Condition 3, VNSRR satisfies Property 1.

Therefore, the unbiasedness and variance reduction of the difference-in-means estimator under VNSRR are immediately evident as corollaries of Theorem 1 and Theorem 2.

Corollary 1 Under Condition 3 and VNSRR, $E[\hat{\tau}] = \tau$.

Corollary 2 Under Condition 1, Condition 2, Condition 3, and VNSRR,

$$\frac{V_{CR} - \text{Var}[\hat{\tau}]}{V_{CR}} \geq \left(1 - \frac{a}{p}\right) R^2.$$

One can verify that CR, ARSRR, and PSRR all satisfy Property 1, Property 2, and Property 3 under certain conditions. As a result, their statistical properties are established by this framework as well. All verifications and proofs are included in the Supplement.

4 VNSRR for Structured Randomized Experiments

In this section, we extend VNSRR to randomized experiments with various types of structures. For each VNSRR variant, we derive the unbiasedness and a lower bound for the variance reduction of the difference-in-means estimator. We will reuse several notations across different settings, leveraging the similarities between settings to streamline our notation system. The pseudocode of each variant, along with the theoretical results and their proofs, is provided in the Supplement.

4.1 VNSRR for Sequentially Randomized Experiments

In Section 3, we consider offline rerandomization, which assigns treatment to all units at once. However, as pointed out by Zhou et al. (2018), experimenters may be unable to wait for all units to arrive before performing the experiments. It is common to assign treatment to units group by group in practice. To balance the covariates in such sequential experiments, Zhou et al. (2018) suggested performing sequential rerandomization, which can be computationally challenging. Bertsimas et al. (2019) proposed a novel algorithm for online allocation that leverages robust mixed-integer optimization. However, the authors focused on optimal designs, which are inherently different from the rerandomization framework.

We now review the basic concepts and notations of sequential rerandomization. We assume that the experiment consists of K stages, and the n units are divided into K sequential groups of sizes (n_1, \dots, n_K) . In the k -th stage, n_{tk} units in the k -th group are assigned to the treatment arm, and the remaining n_{ck} units are assigned to the control arm. We use the subscript $[k]$ to represent the reduced version of a term calculated based on only the first k groups. The covariates of the first k groups are denoted by $X_{[k]}$ and its covariance matrix is denoted by $S_{XX_{[k]}}$. The assignment status of the first k groups is denoted by $W_{[k]}$. And we define $n_{[k]} = \sum_{g=1}^k n_g$, $n_{t[k]} = \sum_{g=1}^k n_{tg}$, $n_{c[k]} = \sum_{g=1}^k n_{cg}$, $H_{[k]} = \frac{n_{[k]}}{n_{t[k]}n_{c[k]}} X_{[k]} S_{XX_{[k]}}^{-1} X_{[k]}^T$. The Mahalanobis distance corresponding to $W_{[k]}$ is defined as

$$M_{[k]} = \left(W_{[k]} - \frac{n_{t[k]}}{n_{[k]}} \mathbf{1}_{n_{[k]}}\right)^T H_{[k]} \left(W_{[k]} - \frac{n_{t[k]}}{n_{[k]}} \mathbf{1}_{n_{[k]}}\right)$$

Sequential rerandomization proceeds as follows: When the k -th group enrolls in the experiment, the experimenter randomly assigns treatment to the units without changing the assignment status of the previously enrolled groups. The experimenter aims to balance the covariates of all units in the first k groups. Therefore, the experimenter rerandomizes the n_k units until $M_{[k]} \leq a_k$, where a_k is a prespecified threshold. Zhou et al. (2018) proposed to use acceptance-rejection sampling in this procedure, so we refer to their method as SeqARSRR. Recently, Zhu and Liu (2022) proposed a sequential pair-switching rerandomization (SeqPSRR) method to reduce the computational cost.

SeqPSRR essentially performs PSRR in each stage of the sequential experiment. In Section 5.2, we will show that both SeqARSRR and SeqPSRR can be time-consuming.

We note that sequential rerandomization in the k -th stage can be formulated into the following constrained binary quadratic programming problem, whose feasible set we refer to as $\mathcal{F}_{[k]}$.

$$\begin{aligned}
& \text{minimize} && M_{[k]}(W_{[k]}), \\
& \text{subject to} && \sum_{i=n_{[k-1]}+1}^{n_{[k]}} W_{[k],i} = n_{tk}, \\
& && W_{[k],i} \in \{0, 1\}, \quad i = n_{[k-1]} + 1, \dots, n_{[k]}, \\
& && W_{[k],i} = W_{[k-1],i}, \quad i = 1, \dots, n_{[k-1]}.
\end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

Based on this observation, we extend VNSRR to sequentially randomized experiments and refer to this variant as SeqVNSRR. SeqVNSRR performs VNSRR in each stage of the experiment while fixing the assignments obtained in previous stages. It also adopts the updating trick, the specific form of the local search step, and the hyperparameter combination mentioned in Section 3 to reduce the computational cost.

To analyze the statistical properties of SeqVNSRR, we consider the following variants of Condition 3 and Property 1-3 in sequential experiments.

Condition 4 $n_{tk} = n_{ck} = \frac{n_k}{2}$, $k = 1, \dots, K$.

Property 4 For any k , $\mathcal{F}_{[k]} = 1 - \mathcal{F}_{[k]}$.

Property 5 For any k and $w \in \mathcal{F}_{[k]}$,

$$P\left(W_{[k]}^{(0)} = w\right) = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{F}_{[k]}|}.$$

Property 6 There exists a sequence of functions $\{u_t\}_{t \geq 1}$, such that for any k , t and $(w^{(0)}, \dots, w^{(t)})$ that may appear consecutively in the generated chain for the k -th stage,

$$P\left(W_{[k]}^{(t)} = w^{(t)} \mid W_{[k]}^{(0)} = w^{(0)}, \dots, W_{[k]}^{(t-1)} = w^{(t-1)}\right) = u_t(M_{[k]}(w^{(0)}), \dots, M_{[k]}(w^{(t)})),$$

Based on these conditions and properties, we derive the unbiasedness and a lower bound for the variance reduction of the difference-in-means estimator under SeqVNSRR.

4.2 VNSRR for Stratified Randomized Experiments

Other than rerandomization, stratification stands out as another approach to balance covariates. The idea of stratification, or blocking, was first introduced by Fisher (1926) to balance discrete covariates. In stratified randomized experiments, experimenters divide units into strata, namely, layers or levels, according to the discrete covariates and conduct complete randomization within each stratum. Wang et al. (2023) proposed two strategies that combine stratification and rerandomization to improve covariate balance further. The overall strategy rerandomizes over all strata and measures the overall covariate imbalance, while the stratum-specific strategy rerandomizes within each strata separately and measures the stratum-specific covariate imbalance. Both strategies have their unique advantages. However, since the stratum-specific strategy is identical to the setting we consider in Section 3 within each stratum, we mainly focus on the overall strategy in this section.

We assume that the n units are divided into K strata of sizes (n_1, \dots, n_K) . The index set of units in the k -th stratum is denoted by \mathcal{I}_k . In the k -th stratum, n_{tk} units are assigned to the treatment arm and $n_{ck} = n_k - n_{tk}$ units are assigned to the control arm. Similar to Section 2, the assignment status is represented by a n -dimensional vector W and the covariates are gathered into a $n \times p$ matrix X . The overall strategy proposed by Wang et al. (2023) samples assignments from the space $\{W \in \{0, 1\}^n : \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} W_i = n_{tk}, \forall k\}$ repeatedly until $M(W) < a$. To our knowledge, the only existing method to achieve this goal is to perform acceptance-rejection sampling, which we refer to as StratARSRR.

We note that rerandomization in stratified experiments can be formulated into the following constrained binary quadratic programming problem.

$$\begin{aligned}
& \text{minimize} && M(W), \\
& \text{subject to} && \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} W_i = n_{tk}, \quad k = 1, \dots, K \\
& && W_i \in \{0, 1\}, \quad i = 1, \dots, n.
\end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

Based on this observation, we extend VNSRR to stratified randomized experiments and refer to this variant as StratVNSRR. StratVNSRR performs variable neighborhood searching while considering the constraints imposed by the stratum structure. In the local search step, StratVNSRR randomly selects a list of multiple disjoint pairs of treated units and control units from each stratum. Then StratVNSRR aggregates the lists from different strata and permutes the pairs in the aggregated list. StratVNSRR follows this new ordering of unit pairs to examine whether switching each pair leads to a more balanced assignment. Compared to consecutively examining pairs in the same stratum, this procedure avoids any predetermined ordering of units or strata and allows for more flexible search in the local region. In the shaking step, StratVNSRR conducts random unit swaps within every stratum. This ensures that the new assignment is sufficiently distant from the current one.

We note that the feasible set in (3) is a subset of the feasible set in (1). As a result, StratVNSRR belongs to the class of rerandomization methods we consider in Section 3. We verify that StratVNSRR always satisfies Property 2-3 and satisfies Property 1 under Condition 4. Therefore, the statistical properties of the difference-in-means estimator under StratVNSRR can be derived as corollaries of Theorem 1 and Theorem 2.

4.3 VNSRR for Cluster Randomized Experiments

Many public health and social science experiments (Donner et al., 2000; Hayes and Moulton, 2017; Schochet, 2020) assign the treatment at the cluster level rather than the individual level due to practical limitations or policy factors. Suppose the n units are divided into K clusters of sizes (n_1, \dots, n_K) in a cluster randomized experiment. We denote \mathcal{I}_k as the index set of units in the k -th cluster. The experimenter assigns K_t clusters to the treatment arm and $K_c = K - K_t$ clusters to the control arm. We note that when the n_i 's are not all equal, neither the treatment arm nor the control arm has a fixed number of units, which is different from all the settings we consider in previous sections. The assignment status of the clusters is denoted by a K -dimensional vector, U . And the assignment status of all units is denoted by a n -dimensional vector, W . $W_i = U_k$ if the k -th cluster includes the i -th unit.

Lu et al. (2023) suggested conducting cluster rerandomization to balance covariates in cluster randomized experiments. The authors proposed two metrics that measure the covariate imbalance.

One is the Mahalanobis distance of cluster-level covariates, and the other is the Mahalanobis distance of individual-level covariates. Since using the first metric is equal to treating a cluster as an aggregated unit and can be efficiently solved by the approach proposed in Section 3, we mainly focus on the second metric in this section. We denote the individual-level covariates as a $n \times p$ matrix, X . Some cluster-level covariates may also be available, but we can construct individual-level covariates from cluster-level ones by ensuring they are identical within each cluster. We then formulate cluster rerandomization into the following constrained binary quadratic programming problem.

$$\begin{aligned}
& \text{minimize} && M(W), \\
& \text{subject to} && W_i = U_k, \text{ for all } k \text{ and } i \in \mathcal{I}_k \\
& && \sum_{k=1}^K U_k = K_t, \\
& && U_k \in \{0, 1\}, k = 1, \dots, K.
\end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

We propose the ClustVNSRR method, a variant of VNSRR, to solve (4) efficiently and accelerate cluster rerandomization. ClustVNSRR performs variable neighborhood searching at the cluster level and treats the clusters as the operational units in the local and shaking search steps. Similar to Section 4.2, we note that the feasible set in (4) is a subset of the feasible set in (1). Therefore, we derive the statistical properties of the difference-in-means estimator under ClustVNSRR by verifying that ClustVNSRR always satisfies Property 2-3 and satisfies Property 1 under the following variant of Condition 3.

Condition 5 $K_t = K_c = \frac{K}{2}$.

5 Simulation Studies and Real Applications

This section compares VNSRR with CR, ARSRR, and PSRR. To compare the computation time of VNSRR and the existing methods, we use each method to sample 1000 acceptable assignments respectively in one simulation and replicate the simulation 100 times on a MacBook Pro (Apple M1 Max Chip, 32 GB Memory, 10 Cores). To examine the statistical properties, we use each method to sample one acceptable assignment in the design stage to conduct the experiment and 1000 acceptable assignments in the analysis stage to conduct randomization-based inference. We replicate the simulation 1000 times using a High-Performance Computing cluster.

5.1 Simple Randomized Experiments

We first consider the simple randomized experiments described in Section 3 and mimic the simulation settings in Zhu and Liu (2022). We assume that the covariates follow the standard normal distribution identically and independently, $X_{ij} \stackrel{i.i.d.}{\sim} N(0, 1)$, $i = 1, \dots, n$, $j = 1, \dots, p$. The potential outcomes of the control group are generated independently from a linear model, $Y_i(0) = \sum_{j=1}^p X_{ij} + \epsilon_i$, where $\epsilon_i \sim N(0, p)$. We conduct simulations under both the null hypothesis and the alternative hypothesis, where we set $Y_i(1) = Y_i(0)$ and $Y_i(1) = Y_i(0) + 0.2\sqrt{\text{Var}[Y_i(0)]}$, respectively. We consider three sample sizes, $n \in \{30, 100, 500\}$. The size of the treatment group and the control group are set as equal.

Morgan and Rubin (2012) proved that the asymptotic acceptance probability of the assignment is $p_a = P(\chi_p^2 < a)$ and Li et al. (2018) recommended that $p_a = 10^{-3}$. Wang and Li (2022) considered settings where p_a and p are allowed to grow with n rather than fixed. Motivated by these works,

we considered two thresholds of the Mahalanobis distance, $p_a \in \{10^{-3}, 10^{-4}\}$, and two regimes for the number of covariates, $p = 2$ and $p = n/2$.

We perform Fisher randomization tests with a significance level $\alpha = 0.1$ and construct randomization-based confidence intervals with a nominal coverage rate of 90%. The exact formulas of Fisher randomization test p-values and randomization-based confidence intervals are provided in the Supplement. We use the default tuning parameter of PSRR, as Zhu and Liu (2022) pointed out that different tuning parameters lead to similar performance. For each method, we examine the absolute bias and standard deviation of the difference-in-means estimator, the size and power of the Fisher randomization test, the coverage and length of confidence intervals, and the average run time to sample 10^3 acceptable assignments. We also use the randomness metric in Zhu and Liu (2022) to measure the randomness of different methods in the Supplement.

Table 1 shows the statistical and computational performances of all methods in two typical settings: a low-dimensional setting with $(n, p) = (30, 2)$ and a high-dimensional setting with $(n, p) = (500, 250)$. The complete results are provided in the Supplement. VNSRR is significantly faster than ARSRR and PSRR in all settings. VNSRR merely requires seconds to generate 1000 acceptable assignments, even in cases where ARSRR or PSRR requires an hour. For all methods, the finite-sample biases are negligible, Fisher randomization test controls the type-1 error, and the confidence intervals are valid. Compared to CR, all the rerandomization methods reduce the variance of the difference-in-means estimator, increase the statistical power, produce tighter confidence intervals, and have comparable performances in terms of these aspects. These results demonstrate that VNSRR maintains the appealing statistical properties of rerandomization and substantially reduces the computational cost in simple randomized experiments.

Table 1: Statistical and computational performance of different methods in simple randomized experiments.

n	p	Method	Statistical Inference ($\times 10^{-3}$)						Run Time (second)
			Bias	SD	Size	Power	Coverage	Length	
30	2	CR	6.2	74	10.5	14	89.5	246	< 0.1
		ARSRR	0.1	51	8.7	19	91.3	177	12.7
		PSRR	1.5	51	10.1	18	89.9	177	50.3
		VNSRR	1.6	52	11.0	17	89.0	177	1.4
500	250	CR	0.8	201	10.4	73	89.6	660	< 0.1
		ARSRR	4.0	186	9.2	77	90.8	619	4137.4
		PSRR	4.5	189	9.8	78	90.2	619	275.3
		VNSRR	7.6	199	12.6	73	87.4	615	1.2

5.2 Structured Randomized Experiments

This section considers the three types of structured experiments described in Section 4. We simulate the covariates and potential outcomes in the same way as in Section 5.1, except that we set $Y_i(1) = Y_i(0) + 0.15\sqrt{\text{Var}[Y_i(0)]}$ under the alternative to ensure the power of different methods remains within a moderate range. For sequential experiments, we set the number of groups as $K = 2$ and consider two group sizes, $n_k \in \{100, 500\}$. We use the strategy proposed by Zhou et al. (2018) to determine a_k . Specifically, we set $(s_1, s_2) = (239, 761)$ when $p = 50$ and $(s_1, s_2) = (264, 736)$ when $p = 250$, where $a_k = \frac{n_k}{n_{[k]}}q_k$ and q_k is the $\frac{1}{s_k}$ quantile of a non-central chi-square distribution with p

degrees of freedom and a non-central parameter $\frac{n_{[k-1]}}{n_k}M_{[k-1]}$. For stratified experiments, we set the stratum number as $K = 2$ and consider two stratum sizes, $n_k \in \{100, 500\}$. For cluster randomized experiments, we set the cluster size as $n_k = 2$ and consider two options for the number of clusters, $K \in \{100, 500\}$. We set $p_a = P(\chi_p^2 < a) = 10^{-3}$ for both stratified randomized experiments and cluster randomized experiments and set $p = n/4$ for all settings in this section.

Table 2 shows the results when $n = 1000$. The complete results are provided in the Supplement. For clarity, we use a unified name to refer to different method variants. Since PSRR is not extended to stratified experiments and cluster experiments, it is excluded from the two schemes. The overall findings are consistent with the results in Section 5.1. VNSRR substantially reduces the computational burden of rerandomization, especially for high-dimensional datasets and in stratified randomized experiments and cluster randomized experiments, where ARSRR is the only method available to perform rerandomization. VNSRR maintains the statistical properties of rerandomization in all the settings and significantly improves statistical inference compared to CR.

Table 2: Statistical and computational performance of different methods in structured randomized experiments.

Scheme	Method	Statistical Inference ($\times 10^{-3}$)						Run Time (second)
		Bias	SD	Size	Power	Coverage	Length	
Sequential	CR	3.2	146	10.7	76	89.3	466	< 0.1
	ARSRR	6.0	139	12.2	80	87.8	428	3288.5
	PSRR	3.3	135	11.5	82	88.5	429	339.1
	VNSRR	5.8	138	11.4	81	88.6	428	5.8
Stratified	CR	3.0	140	10.0	76	90.0	466	< 0.1
	ARSRR	2.7	131	9.1	82	90.9	434	3386.8
	VNSRR	0.0	130	10.5	83	89.5	436	3.0
Cluster	CR	0.9	140	9.8	77	90.2	465	< 0.1
	ARSRR	6.2	132	9.3	80	90.7	435	3116.2
	VNSRR	3.3	131	10.1	82	89.9	436	3.9

5.3 A Clinical Trail Example

In addition to the simulation studies, we analyze a real dataset from a phase 1 clinical trial to illustrate the advantages of VNSRR. This dataset was analyzed by Zhu and Liu (2022) as well. The goal of this trial was to evaluate the interactions between intravenous methamphetamine and oral reserpine. In this trial, 20 participants were randomly assigned to the treatment group, and 10 participants were assigned to the control group. We aim to balance better three covariates, age, weight, and pre-treatment heart rate, which are significantly unbalanced in the original study, to better infer the treatment effects on post-treatment heart rate.

We set a as the 0.001 quantile of χ_3^2 and generate 10,000 acceptable assignments using each method. RR takes approximately 2.3 minutes to complete the task, and PSRR takes more than half an hour. In contrast, VNSRR requires only 12 seconds, which demonstrates that VNSRR accelerates the rerandomization process significantly. Based on the original dataset, we simulate semi-synthetic data and examine the statistical performance of each method. The results are provided in the Supplement.

6 Conclusion

In this work, we propose a novel VNSRR method to perform rerandomization efficiently in various types of randomized experiments. We derive the unbiasedness and a lower bound for the variance reduction of the difference-in-means estimator under VNSRR. Our empirical results demonstrate that VNSRR maintains the appealing statistical properties of rerandomization and significantly reduces the computational cost compared to existing methods. A future direction is to extend the proposed method to experiments with tiers of covariates. Multi-objective optimization techniques are required to search for assignments that simultaneously balance the covariates within each tier.

References

- Roberto Aringhieri and Roberto Cordone. Comparing local search metaheuristics for the maximum diversity problem. *Journal of the Operational research Society*, 62:266–280, 2011.
- RA Bailey and CA Rowley. Valid randomization. *Proceedings of the royal society of London. A. Mathematical and Physical Sciences*, 410(1838):105–124, 1987.
- Dimitris Bertsimas, Nikita Korolko, and Alexander M Weinstein. Covariate-adaptive optimization in online clinical trials. *Operations Research*, 67(4):1150–1161, 2019.
- Zach Branson and Stephane Shao. Ridge rerandomization: An experimental design strategy in the presence of covariate collinearity. *Journal of Statistical Planning and Inference*, 211:287–314, 2021.
- Jack Brimberg, Nenad Mladenović, Dragan Urošević, and Eric Ngai. Variable neighborhood search for the heaviest k-subgraph. *Computers & Operations Research*, 36(11):2885–2891, 2009.
- Miriam Bruhn and David McKenzie. In pursuit of balance: Randomization in practice in development field experiments. *American economic journal: applied economics*, 1(4):200–232, 2009.
- DR Cox. Randomization and concomitant variables in the design of experiments. statistics and probability.(eds. g kallianpur, p krishnaiah, j ghosh) pp. 197-202, 1982.
- Allan Donner, Neil Klar, and Neil S Klar. *Design and analysis of cluster randomization trials in health research*, volume 27. Arnold London, 2000.
- Ronald Aylmer Fisher. The arrangement of field experiments. *Journal of the Ministry of Agriculture*, 33:503–513, 1926.
- Richard J Hayes and Lawrence H Moulton. *Cluster randomised trials*. CRC press, 2017.
- Kosuke Imai, Gary King, and Elizabeth A Stuart. Misunderstandings between experimentalists and observationalists about causal inference. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series A: Statistics in Society*, 171(2):481–502, 2008.
- Xinran Li, Peng Ding, and Donald B Rubin. Asymptotic theory of rerandomization in treatment–control experiments. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 115(37):9157–9162, 2018.
- Xinran Li, Peng Ding, and Donald B Rubin. Rerandomization in 2k factorial experiments. *Annals of Statistics*, 48(1):43–63, 2020.
- Xin Lu, Tianle Liu, Hanzhong Liu, and Peng Ding. Design-based theory for cluster rerandomization. *Biometrika*, 110(2):467–483, 2023.
- Xiaokang Luo, Tirthankar Dasgupta, Minge Xie, and Regina Y Liu. Leveraging the fisher randomization test using confidence distributions: Inference, combination and fusion learning. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B: Statistical Methodology*, 83(4):777–797, 2021.
- Malcolm Maclure, Anne Nguyen, Greg Carney, Colin Dormuth, Hendrik Roelants, Kendall Ho, and Sebastian Schneeweiss. Measuring prescribing improvements in pragmatic trials of educational tools for general practitioners. *Basic & clinical pharmacology & toxicology*, 98(3):243–252, 2006.

- Rafael Martí, Micael Gallego, Abraham Duarte, and Eduardo G Pardo. Heuristics and metaheuristics for the maximum diversity problem. *Journal of Heuristics*, 19:591–615, 2013.
- Kari Lock Morgan and Donald B Rubin. Rerandomization to improve covariate balance in experiments. *The Annals of Statistics*, pages 1263–1282, 2012.
- Kari Lock Morgan and Donald B Rubin. Rerandomization to balance tiers of covariates. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 110(512):1412–1421, 2015.
- Jerzy Neyman. On the application of probability theory to agricultural experiments. essay on principles. *Ann. Agricultural Sciences*, pages 1–51, 1923.
- Gintaras Palubeckis. Iterated tabu search for the maximum diversity problem. *Applied Mathematics and Computation*, 189(1):371–383, 2007.
- Donald B Rubin. Estimating causal effects of treatments in randomized and nonrandomized studies. *Journal of educational Psychology*, 66(5):688, 1974.
- Donald B Rubin. Randomization analysis of experimental data: The fisher randomization test comment. *Journal of the American statistical association*, 75(371):591–593, 1980.
- Peter Z Schochet. Analyzing grouped administrative data for rcts using design-based methods. *Journal of Educational and Behavioral Statistics*, 45(1):32–57, 2020.
- Wenqi Shi, Anqi Zhao, and Hanzhong Liu. Rerandomization and covariate adjustment in split-plot designs. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2209.12385*, 2022.
- Student. Comparison between balanced and random arrangements of field plots. *Biometrika*, pages 363–378, 1938.
- Xinhe Wang, Tingyu Wang, and Hanzhong Liu. Rerandomization in stratified randomized experiments. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 118(542):1295–1304, 2023.
- Yuhao Wang and Xinran Li. Rerandomization with diminishing covariate imbalance and diverging number of covariates. *The Annals of Statistics*, 50(6):3439–3465, 2022.
- Hengtao Zhang, Guosheng Yin, and Donald B Rubin. Pca rerandomization. *Canadian Journal of Statistics*, 2023.
- Quan Zhou, Philip A Ernst, Kari Lock Morgan, Donald B Rubin, and Anru Zhang. Sequential rerandomization. *Biometrika*, 105(3):745–752, 2018.
- Ke Zhu and Hanzhong Liu. Pair-switching rerandomization. *Biometrics*, 2022.

Appendix

In Appendix A, we provide the pseudocode of the three VNSRR variants. In Appendix B, we state and prove all the theoretical results. In Appendix C, we introduce the Fisher randomization test and randomization-based confidence intervals. In Appendix D, we show the simulation results not included in the main text.

A Algorithmic Description of VNSRR Variants

A.1 Algorithmic Description of SeqVNSRR

The pseudocode of SeqVNSRR is presented in Algorithm 2. As mentioned in the main text, SeqVNSRR performs VNSRR in each experiment stage sequentially while fixing the assignments obtained in previous stages.

A.2 Algorithmic Description of StratVNSRR

The pseudocode of StratVNSRR is presented in Algorithm 3. StratVNSRR differs from VNSRR in that there are linear constraints within each stratum, $\sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} W_i = n_{tk}$. Therefore, StratVNSRR only exchanges units in the same stratum to ensure that the aforementioned linear constraints are always satisfied. StratVNSRR does not loop over the strata sequentially. Instead, after selecting the pairs of units to examine from each stratum, StratVNSRR aggregates the lists of pairs and randomly permutes the combined list. In this way, we ensure that all strata are equally treated, allowing for flexible exploration of the neighborhood without a predetermined ordering of the strata or the units.

A.3 Algorithmic Description of ClustVNSRR

The pseudocode of ClustVNSRR is presented in Algorithm 4. ClustVNSRR treats each cluster as a whole and uses the clusters as the operational units in the search process. In other words, ClustVNSRR essentially conducts VNSRR at the cluster level rather than the unit level. Recall that we denote the assignment status of the clusters as a K -dimensional vector U and all units' assignment status as a n -dimensional vector W . We have the following constraint imposed by the cluster structure of the experiment. $W_i = U_k$ if the k -th cluster includes the i -th unit. Since W is determined once we generate U , we denote $W(U)$ as the mapping from U to W in Algorithm 4.

Algorithm 2: Sequential Variable neighborhood searching rerandomization

Input: Covariates X ,
number of units to assign to the two arms in each stage (n_{t1}, \dots, n_{tK}) ,
 (n_{c1}, \dots, n_{cK}) ,
thresholds (a_1, \dots, a_K) ,
hyperparameter $(L_1, \dots, L_K), (S_1, \dots, S_K)$.

for $k = 1, \dots, K$ **do**
 Set $t = 0$;
 Initialize $W_{[k]}^{(0)}$: keep the elements obtained in previous stages fixed in $W_{[k]}^{(0)}$ if $k \geq 2$ and
 set the undetermined elements in $W_{[k]}^{(0)}$ as n_{tk} elements equal to 1 and n_{ck} elements
 equal to 0 with random positions;
 Set $M_{[k]}^{(0)} = M_{[k]}(W_{[k]}^{(0)})$;
 while $M_{[k]}^{(t)} > a_k$ **do**
 Randomly select L_k positions of the 1's in $W_{[k]}^{(t)}$, denoted by O_1, \dots, O_{L_k} ;
 Randomly select L_k positions of the 0's in $W_{[k]}^{(t)}$, denoted by Z_1, \dots, Z_{L_k} ;
 Set $\tilde{S} = S_k$;
 for $l = 1, \dots, L_k$ **do**
 Obtain W^* by switching the 1 at position O_l and the 0 at position Z_l in $W_{[k]}^{(t)}$;
 Set $M^* = M(W^*)$;
 if $M^* < M^{(t)}$ **then**
 Set $\tilde{S} = 0$;
 Set $t = t + 1$;
 Set $W_{[k]}^{(t)} = W^*$;
 Set $M_{[k]}^{(t)} = M^*$;
 if $M_{[k]}^{(t)} < a_k$ **then break**;
 if $\tilde{S} > 0$ **then**
 Randomly select \tilde{S} positions of the 1's in $W_{[k]}^{(t)}$, denoted by $O_1, \dots, O_{\tilde{S}}$;
 Randomly select \tilde{S} positions of the 0's in $W_{[k]}^{(t)}$, denoted by $Z_1, \dots, Z_{\tilde{S}}$;
 for $s = 1, \dots, \tilde{S}$ **do**
 Obtain $W_{[k]}^{(t+1)}$ by the 1 at position O_s and the 0 at position Z_s in $W_{[k]}^{(t)}$;
 Set $M_{[k]}^{(t+1)} = M_{[k]}(W_{[k]}^{(t+1)})$;
 Set $t = t + 1$;
 Output: $W = W^{(t)}$.

Algorithm 3: Stratified Variable neighborhood searching rerandomization

Input: Covariates X ,
index sets of units in each stratum $(\mathcal{I}_1, \dots, \mathcal{I}_K)$,
number of units to assign to the two arms in each stratum (n_{t1}, \dots, n_{tK}) ,
 (n_{c1}, \dots, n_{cK}) ,
threshold a ,
hyperparameter (L_1, \dots, L_K) , (S_1, \dots, S_K) , $L_{total} = \sum_k L_k$, $S_{total} = \sum_k S_k$.

Set $t = 0$;
Set $W^{(0)}$ as n_{tk} elements in \mathcal{I}_k equal to 1 and n_{ck} elements in \mathcal{I}_k equal to 0 with random positions for all $k \in \{1, \dots, K\}$;
Set $M^{(0)} = M(W^{(0)})$;
while $M^{(t)} > a$ **do**
 for $k = 1, \dots, K$ **do**
 Randomly select L_k positions of the 1's in $W^{(t)}$ that belong to \mathcal{I}_k , denoted by O_{k1}, \dots, O_{kL_k} ;
 Randomly select L_k positions of the 0's in $W^{(t)}$ that belong to \mathcal{I}_k , denoted by Z_{k1}, \dots, Z_{kL_k} ;
 Aggregate $\cup_{1 \leq k \leq K, 1 \leq l \leq L_k} \{O_{kl}\}$ and denote the union as $(O_1, \dots, O_{L_{total}})$ with random ordering;
 Aggregate $\cup_{1 \leq k \leq K, 1 \leq l \leq L_k} \{Z_{kl}\}$ and denote the union as $(Z_1, \dots, Z_{L_{total}})$. The ordering of $(Z_1, \dots, Z_{L_{total}})$ is consistent with that of $(O_1, \dots, O_{L_{total}})$;
 Set $\tilde{S} = S_{total}$;
 for $l = 1, \dots, L_{total}$ **do**
 Obtain W^* by switching the 1 at position O_l and the 0 at position Z_l in $W^{(t)}$;
 Set $M^* = M(W^*)$;
 if $M^* < M^{(t)}$ **then**
 Set $\tilde{S} = 0$;
 Set $t = t + 1$;
 Set $W^{(t)} = W^*$;
 Set $M^{(t)} = M^*$;
 if $M^{(t)} < a$ **then** break;
 if $\tilde{S} > 0$ **then**
 for $k = 1, \dots, K$ **do**
 Randomly select S_k positions of the 1's in $W^{(t)}$ that are in \mathcal{I}_k , denoted by O_{k1}, \dots, O_{kS_k} ;
 Randomly select S_k positions of the 0's in $W^{(t)}$ that are in \mathcal{I}_k , denoted by Z_{k1}, \dots, Z_{kS_k} ;
 Aggregate $\cup_{1 \leq k \leq K, 1 \leq l \leq S_k} \{O_{kl}\}$ and denote the union as $(O_1, \dots, O_{S_{total}})$;
 Aggregate $\cup_{1 \leq k \leq K, 1 \leq l \leq S_k} \{Z_{kl}\}$ and denote the union as $(Z_1, \dots, Z_{S_{total}})$;
 for $s = 1, \dots, S_{total}$ **do**
 Obtain $W^{(t+1)}$ by switching the 1 at position O_s and the 0 at position Z_s in $W^{(t)}$;
 Set $M^{(t+1)} = M(W^{(t+1)})$;
 Set $t = t + 1$;
Output: $W = W^{(t)}$.

Algorithm 4: Cluster Variable neighborhood searching rerandomization

Input: Covariates X ,

index sets of units in each cluster $(\mathcal{I}_1, \dots, \mathcal{I}_K)$,

number of clusters in the treatment arm and the control arm (K_t, K_c) ,

threshold a ,

hyperparameter (L, S) .

Set $t = 0$;

Set $U^{(0)}$ as K_t elements equal to 1 and K_c elements equal to 0 with random positions;

Set $M^{(0)} = M(W(U^{(0)}))$;

while $M^{(t)} > a$ **do**

 Randomly select L positions of the 1's in $U^{(t)}$, denoted by O_1, \dots, O_L ;

 Randomly select L positions of the 0's in $U^{(t)}$, denoted by Z_1, \dots, Z_L ;

 Set $\tilde{S} = S$;

for $l = 1, \dots, L$ **do**

 Obtain U^* by switching the 1 at position O_l and the 0 at position Z_l in $U^{(t)}$;

 Set $M^* = M(W(U^*))$;

if $M^* < M^{(t)}$ **then**

 Set $\tilde{S} = 0$;

 Set $t = t + 1$;

 Set $W^{(t)} = W^*$;

 Set $U^{(t)} = U^*$;

if $M^{(t)} < a$ **then** break;

if $\tilde{S} > 0$ **then**

 Randomly select \tilde{S} positions of the 1's in $U^{(t)}$, denoted by $O_1, \dots, O_{\tilde{S}}$;

 Randomly select \tilde{S} positions of the 0's in $U^{(t)}$, denoted by $Z_1, \dots, Z_{\tilde{S}}$;

for $s = 1, \dots, \tilde{S}$ **do**

 Obtain $U^{(t+1)}$ by switching the 1 at position O_s and the 0 at position Z_s in $U^{(t)}$;

 Set $M^{(t+1)} = M(W(U^{(t+1)}))$;

 Set $t = t + 1$;

Output: $W = W(U^{(t)})$.

B Additional Theoretical Results and Proofs

VNSRR, StratVNSRR, and ClustVNSRR all assign treatment in an offline manner. In contrast, SeqVNSRR performs online allocation and needs to be handled differently. We will first establish the theoretical properties of VNSRR, StratVNSRR, and ClustVNSRR, and then obtain the results of SeqVNSRR.

For the convenience of readers, we first restate the conditions we propose in the main text, which are related to the offline methods.

Condition 1 For $w_i = 0, 1$, $Y_i(w_i) = \beta_0 + \beta^T X_i + \tau w_i + e_i$, where $\beta_0 + \beta^T X_i$ is the linear projection of $Y_i(0)$ onto $(1, X)$ and e_i is the deviation from the linear projection.

Condition 2 $\hat{\tau}$ and $\bar{X}_t - \bar{X}_c$ are normally distributed.

Condition 3 $n_t = n_c = \frac{n}{2}$.

Condition 4 $n_{tk} = n_{ck} = \frac{n_k}{2}$, $k = 1, \dots, K$.

Condition 5 $K_t = K_c = \frac{K}{2}$.

Property 1 $\mathcal{F} = 1 - \mathcal{F}$.

Property 2 For any $w \in \mathcal{F}$,

$$P(W^{(0)} = w) = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{F}|}.$$

Property 3 There exists a sequence of functions $\{u_t\}_{t \geq 1}$, such that for any t and $(w^{(0)}, \dots, w^{(t)})$ that may appear consecutively in the generated chain,

$$P(W^{(t)} = w^{(t)} \mid W^{(0)} = w^{(0)}, \dots, W^{(t-1)} = w^{(t-1)}) = u_t(M(w^{(0)}), \dots, M(w^{(t)})),$$

In this section, we first prove Theorem 1 and Theorem 2 based on the abovementioned conditions and properties.

Theorem 1 If W is generated by a rerandomization algorithm satisfying Property 1, Property 2 and Property 3, then $E[\hat{\tau}] = \tau$.

Theorem 2 Under Condition 1 and Condition 2, if W is generated by a rerandomization algorithm satisfying Property 1, Property 2 and Property 3, then

$$\frac{V_{CR} - \text{Var}[\hat{\tau}]}{V_{CR}} \geq \left(1 - \frac{a}{p}\right) R^2,$$

where $R^2 = \frac{n\beta^T S_{XX}\beta}{n_t n_c V_{CR}}$.

We then verify that VNSRR, StratVNSRR, and ClustVNSRR satisfy the requirements by proving the following propositions. Their unbiasedness and variance reduction are immediately evident as corollaries of Theorem 1 and Theorem 2.

Proposition 1 VNSRR satisfies Property 2 and Property 3. Under Condition 3, VNSRR satisfies Property 1.

Proposition 2 *StratVNSRR satisfies Property 2 and Property 3. Under Condition 4, StratVNSRR satisfies Property 1.*

Proposition 3 *ClustVNSRR satisfies Property 2 and Property 3. Under Condition 5, ClustVNSRR satisfies Property 1.*

We also show that the statistical properties of CR, ARSRR, and PSRR can be established in this way as well based on the following propositions.

Proposition 4 *CR satisfies Property 1, Property 2 and Property 3.*

Proposition 5 *ARSRR satisfies Property 2 and Property 3. Under Condition 3, ARSRR satisfies Property 1.*

Proposition 6 *PSRR satisfies Property 2 and Property 3. Under Condition 3, PSRR satisfies Property 1.*

Consequently, we will establish the statistical properties of SeqVNSRR by extending the conditions and properties we consider in the offline setting to the online setting.

B.1 Proof of Theorem 1

For any chain $(w^{(0)}, \dots, w^{(T)})$ that the rerandomization algorithm may generate, we have

$$P\left(W^{(0)} = w^{(0)}\right) = P\left(W^{(0)} = 1 - w^{(0)}\right),$$

since the initial point $W(0)$ is sampled uniformly from a symmetric space \mathcal{F} .

If we exchange the assignments to the two arms by replacing W with $1 - W$, the covariate imbalance between the two arms should remain unchanged. In other words, $M(W) = M(1 - W)$. As a result,

$$\begin{aligned} & P\left(W^{(t)} = w^{(t)} \mid W^{(0)} = w^{(0)}, \dots, W^{(t-1)} = w^{(t-1)}\right) \\ &= u_t\left(M(w^{(0)}), \dots, M(w^{(t)})\right) \\ &= u_t\left(M(1 - w^{(0)}), \dots, M(1 - w^{(t)})\right) \\ &= P\left(W^{(t)} = 1 - w^{(t)} \mid W^{(0)} = 1 - w^{(0)}, \dots, W^{(t-1)} = 1 - w^{(t-1)}\right), \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, for any w , we have

$$\begin{aligned} & P\left(W^{(0)} = w^{(0)}, \dots, W^{(T-1)} = w^{(T-1)}, W^{(T)} = w^{(T)}\right) \\ &= P\left(W^{(0)} = w^{(0)}\right) P\left(W^{(1)} = w^{(1)} \mid W^{(0)} = w^{(0)}\right) \dots P\left(W^{(T)} = w^{(T)} \mid W^{(0)} = w^{(0)}, \dots, W^{(T-1)} = w^{(T-1)}\right) \\ &= P\left(W^{(0)} = 1 - w^{(0)}\right) P\left(W^{(1)} = 1 - w^{(1)} \mid W^{(0)} = 1 - w^{(0)}\right) \dots \\ & \quad P\left(W^{(T)} = 1 - w^{(T)} \mid W^{(0)} = 1 - w^{(0)}, \dots, W^{(T-1)} = 1 - w^{(T-1)}\right) \\ &= P\left(W^{(0)} = 1 - w^{(0)}, \dots, W^{(T-1)} = 1 - w^{(T-1)}, W^{(T)} = 1 - w^{(T)}\right), \end{aligned}$$

We then sum over all possible $(w^{(0)}, \dots, w^{(T-1)})$ and obtain $P(W = w^{(T)}) = P(W = 1 - w^{(T)})$. As a result, $P(W_i = 1) = P(W_i = 0) = 1/2$. And we have

$$\begin{aligned} E[\hat{\tau}(W)] &= E \left[\frac{2}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n W_i Y_i(1) - \frac{2}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (1 - W_i) Y_i(0) \right] \\ &= \frac{2}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n Y_i(1) P(W_i = 1) - \frac{2}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n Y_i(0) P(W_i = 0) \\ &= \tau. \end{aligned}$$

B.2 Proof of Theorem 2

The difference-in-means estimator can be expressed as

$$\hat{\tau} = \tau + \beta^T (\bar{X}_t - \bar{X}_c) + (\bar{e}_t - \bar{e}_c).$$

$\bar{X}_t - \bar{X}_c$ and $\bar{e}_t - \bar{e}_c$ are uncorrelated since $\beta_0 + \beta^T X_i$ is the projection of $Y_i(0)$ onto $(1, X)$. In addition, $\hat{\tau}$ and $\bar{X}_t - \bar{X}_c$ are normally distributed, so $\bar{X}_t - \bar{X}_c$ and $\bar{e}_t - \bar{e}_c$ are independent. Since the rerandomization algorithm only affects $\bar{X}_t - \bar{X}_c$ and does not affect $\bar{e}_t - \bar{e}_c$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Var}[\hat{\tau}] &= \text{Cov}[\beta^T (\bar{X}_t - \bar{X}_c) \beta] + \text{Var}[\bar{e}_t - \bar{e}_c] \\ &= \beta^T \text{Cov}[\bar{X}_t - \bar{X}_c] \beta + (1 - R^2) V_{CR} \end{aligned}$$

We then bound the first term in the variance of $\hat{\tau}$.

Recall that

$$M = \frac{n}{n_t n_c} (W - \frac{n_t}{n} \mathbf{1}_n)^T X S_{XX}^{-1} X^T (W - \frac{n_t}{n} \mathbf{1}_n).$$

We define

$$Z = \sqrt{\frac{n}{n_t n_c}} S_{XX}^{-1/2} X^T (W - \frac{n_t}{n} \mathbf{1}_n) = \sqrt{\frac{n}{n_t n_c}} S_{XX}^{-1/2} (\bar{X}_t - \bar{X}_c).$$

Then we have $M = Z^T Z$.

$$E[Z] = \sqrt{\frac{n}{n_t n_c}} S_{XX}^{-1/2} X^T E[W - \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{1}_n] = 0. \text{ Therefore, } E[Z_j] = 0.$$

We note that the rows of $S_{XX}^{-1/2} X^T$ are exchangeable since the covariates are normalized. As a result, $\{Z_j\}_{1 \leq j \leq p}$ are exchangeable, and we have

$$\text{Var}[Z_j] = E[Z_j^2] = \frac{1}{p} E \left[\sum_{j=1}^p Z_j^2 \right] = \frac{1}{p} E[M] \leq \frac{a}{p}.$$

If we flip the sign of the j -th normalized covariate, the sign of Z_j is also flipped, but the mapping $M(W)$ remains unchanged. Since the updating rule only depends on the Mahalanobis distance, this operation does not affect the distribution of W , hence the distribution of Z_j . As a result, (Z_j, Z_l) and $(-Z_j, Z_l)$ are identically distributed. And we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Cov}[Z_j, Z_l] &= E[Z_j Z_l] \\ &= E[E[Z_j Z_l \mid Z_l]] \\ &= E[Z_l E[Z_j \mid Z_l]] \\ &= E[Z_j \times 0] \\ &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, $Cov[Z] = Var[Z_j]I_p$, and

$$\begin{aligned}
\beta^T Cov[\bar{X}_t - \bar{X}_c]\beta &= \beta^T Cov\left[\sqrt{\frac{n_t n_c}{n}} S_{XX}^{1/2} Z\right]\beta \\
&= \frac{n_t n_c}{n} \beta^T S_{XX}^{1/2} Cov[Z] S_{XX}^{1/2} \beta \\
&= \frac{n_t n_c}{n} Var[Z_j] \beta^T S_{XX} \beta \\
&= Var[Z_j] R^2 V_{CR} \\
&\leq \frac{a}{p} R^2 V_{CR}.
\end{aligned}$$

Consequently,

$$Var[\hat{\tau}] \leq \frac{a}{p} R^2 V_{CR} + (1 - R^2) V_{CR}.$$

Rearranging the terms, we obtain

$$\frac{V_{CR} - Var[\hat{\tau}]}{V_{CR}} \geq \left(1 - \frac{a}{p}\right) R^2.$$

B.3 Proof of the Propositions

Recall that $\mathcal{F}_0 = \{W \in \{0, 1\}^n : \sum_i W_i = n_t\}$. Under Condition 3, for any $W \in \mathcal{F}_0$,

$$\sum_i (1 - W_i) = n - n_t = n_c = n_t.$$

This implies that $1 - W \in \mathcal{F}_0$ as well. Thus, $\mathcal{F}_0 = 1 - \mathcal{F}_0$. Since CR, ARSRR, PSRR, and VNSRR treat \mathcal{F}_0 as the feasible set, they all satisfy Property 1.

StratVNSRR and ClustVNSRR conduct rerandomization with more constraints imposed by the structure of the experiments. We show that these constraints are also symmetric in nature.

We denote the feasible set of StratVNSRR and ClustVNSRR as \mathcal{F}_{Strat} and \mathcal{F}_{Clust} , respectively.

Under Condition 4, for any $W \in \mathcal{F}_{Strat}$,

$$\sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} (1 - W_i) = n_k - n_{tk} = n_{ck} = n_{tk}.$$

This implies that $1 - W \in \mathcal{F}_{Strat}$ and $\mathcal{F}_{Strat} = 1 - \mathcal{F}_{Strat}$.

Under Condition 5, for any $W \in \mathcal{F}_{Clust}$, suppose U represents the assignment status of the clusters that corresponds to W . Then $1 - U$ corresponds to $1 - W$. And we have

$$\sum_{k=1}^K (1 - U_k) = K - K_t = K_c = K_t.$$

This implies that $1 - W \in \mathcal{F}_{Clust}$ and $\mathcal{F}_{Clust} = 1 - \mathcal{F}_{Clust}$.

Therefore, both StratVNSRR and ClustVNSRR satisfy Property 1.

All of the methods satisfy Property 2 since they all start with a random assignment by uniformly sampling from the feasible set.

Regarding the updating rule, CR automatically satisfies Property 3 since it does not update the treatment assignment.

For ARSRR, we have

$$u_t = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{F}|}.$$

For PSRR, we have

$$u_t = \left(\frac{M(w^{(t-1)})}{M(w^{(t)})} \right)^\gamma.$$

Therefore, both ARSRR and PSRR satisfy Property 3.

For VNSRR and its variants, $(M(w^{(0)}), \dots, M(w^{(t-1)}))$ determines whether $W^{(t)}$ is obtained through the local search step or the shaking step.

In the local search step, we have

$$u_t = 1\{M(w^{(t)}) < M(w^{(t-1)})\}.$$

And in the shaking step, u_t is a constant which depends on the number of adjacent feasible solutions.

Therefore, VNSRR satisfies Property 3.

B.4 Theoretical Results for SeqVNSRR

In sequential experiments, we have the following Condition 4, which corresponds to the Condition 3 in the non-sequential settings.

Condition 4 $n_{tk} = n_{ck} = \frac{n_k}{2}$, $k = 1, \dots, K$.

We also have the corresponding version of Property 1-3, stated as follows.

Property 4 For any k , $\mathcal{F}_{[k]} = 1 - \mathcal{F}_{[k]}$.

Property 5 For any k and $w \in \mathcal{F}_{[k]}$,

$$P\left(W_{[k]}^{(0)} = w\right) = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{F}_{[k]}|}.$$

Property 6 There exists a sequence of functions $\{u_t\}_{t \geq 1}$, such that for any k , t and $(w^{(0)}, \dots, w^{(t)})$ that may appear consecutively in the generated chain for the k -th stage,

$$P\left(W_{[k]}^{(t)} = w^{(t)} \mid W_{[k]}^{(0)} = w^{(0)}, \dots, W_{[k]}^{(t-1)} = w^{(t-1)}\right) = u_t(M_{[k]}(w^{(0)}), \dots, M_{[k]}(w^{(t)})),$$

Based on these sufficient conditions, we obtain that

Theorem 3 If W is generated by a rerandomization algorithm satisfying Property 4, Property 5 and Property 6, then $E[\hat{\tau}] = \tau$.

Theorem 4 Under Condition 1 and Condition 2, if W is generated by a rerandomization algorithm satisfying Property 4, Property 5 and Property 6, then

$$\frac{V_{CR} - \text{Var}[\hat{\tau}]}{V_{CR}} \geq \left(1 - \frac{a_K}{p}\right) R^2,$$

We omit the proofs of Theorem 3 and Theorem 4, since they are almost the same as the proofs of Theorem 1 and Theorem 2, except that the chain $(W^{(0)}, \dots, W^{(T)})$ needs to be decomposed into K parts corresponding to the K stages. Each part can be analyzed in the same way as in simple randomized experiments.

We have verified that VNSRR satisfies Property 1-3. We note that SeqVNSRR can be viewed as a special version of VNSRR in each of its stages. As a result, SeqVNSRR satisfies the sequential version of Property 1-3.

Proposition 7 *SeqVNSRR satisfies Property 5 and Property 6. Under Condition 4, SeqVNSRR satisfies Property 4.*

The unbiasedness and variance reduction properties of SeqVNSRR are then immediately evident as corollaries of Theorem 3 and Theorem 4.

C Randomization-based Inference

We use the Fisher randomization test to test the sharp null hypothesis, $H_0 : Y_i(1) - Y_i(0) = 0, i = 1, \dots, n$, versus the two-sided alternative hypothesis, $H_1 : Y_i(1) - Y_i(0) \neq 0, i = 1, \dots, n$. As mentioned in Section 2, the observed outcome for unit i is $Y_i = W_i Y_i(1) + (1 - W_i) Y_i(0)$. Therefore, under H_0 , $Y_i(1) = Y_i(0) = Y_i$, and we can impute all the potential outcomes with the observed outcomes. We then know the distribution of $\hat{\tau}(W) = \frac{1}{n_t} \sum_{i:W_i=1} Y_i(1) - \frac{1}{n_c} \sum_{i:W_i=0} Y_i(0)$ since we can calculate $\hat{\tau}(W)$ for every acceptable W . However, it is unrealistic to calculate the exact distribution of $\hat{\tau}(W)$ due to the large size of the feasible set. As a result, we approximate the distribution of $\hat{\tau}(W)$ using the Monte Carlo method. We sample $B = 1000$ acceptable assignments $\{W^b\}_{1 \leq b \leq B}$ independently and calculate $\{\hat{\tau}(W^b)\}_{1 \leq b \leq B}$. The p-value is then calculated by comparing $\{\hat{\tau}(W^b)\}_{1 \leq b \leq B}$ with the observed treatment effect estimator $\hat{\tau}(W^{obs})$, $pv = \frac{1}{B} \sum_{b=1}^B 1\{|\hat{\tau}(W^b)| \geq |\hat{\tau}(W^{obs})|\}$

As pointed out by Zhu and Liu (2022), randomization-based confidence intervals can be constructed by inverting Fisher randomization tests. To construct a lower confidence bound for τ , we consider testing $H_0 : Y_i(1) - Y_i(0) = \theta, i = 1, \dots, n$, versus $H_1 : Y_i(1) - Y_i(0) > \theta, i = 1, \dots, n$. Similar to testing the sharp null hypothesis with $\theta = 0$, we can impute all the potential outcomes under H_0 . We sample $B = 1000$ acceptable assignments $\{W^b\}_{1 \leq b \leq B}$ independently and calculate the corresponding treatment effect estimators $\{\hat{\tau}(W^b, \theta)\}_{1 \leq b \leq B}$ using the imputed potential outcomes. The p-value is then calculated as $pv(\theta) = \frac{1}{B} \sum_{b=1}^B 1\{|\hat{\tau}(W^b, \theta)| \geq |\hat{\tau}(W^{obs})|\}$. Luo et al. (2021) proved that $\theta_l = \sup\{\theta : pv(\theta) \leq \alpha\}$ is a lower confidence bound for τ with confidence level α . And Zhu and Liu (2022) proposed an efficient approach to solve for θ_l , which we adopt in our numerical experiments. Similarly, we can construct an upper confidence bound θ_u with confidence level α . $[\theta_l, \theta_u]$ is then a confidence interval for τ with confidence level $1 - 2\alpha$.

D Simulation Results

In Section D.1, we provide the complete results of the simulation studies in the main text. In Section D.2, we examine the randomness of assignments generated by each method. In Section D.3, we generate semi-synthetic data based on the clinical trial dataset and compare the statistical performance of each method.

D.1 Statistical and Computational Performances

Table 3 and Table 4 show the complete results of our simulation studies for simple experiments and structured experiments, respectively. The results of ARSRR in the last setting of Table 3 where $(n, p, p_a) = (500, 250, 10^{-4})$ are omitted due to the substantial computational burden. The overall findings are similar to the conclusion in the main text. VNSRR substantially reduces the computational burden of rerandomization and maintains the appealing statistical properties of rerandomization.

D.2 Randomness Metric

Similar to Zhu and Liu (2022), we denote L_n as the largest eigenvalue of the covariance matrix of $2W - 1$ and use L_n to measure the randomness of assignments generated by each method. As pointed out by Zhu and Liu (2022), larger L_n implies less randomness.

Table 5 and Table 6 show the results in simple experiments and structured experiments, respectively. Similar to Table 3, the results of ARSRR in the last setting of Table 5 where $(n, p, p_a) = (500, 250, 10^{-4})$ are omitted due to the substantial computational burden. CR is the most random method as expected. The three rerandomization methods perform similarly in all settings. Therefore, one can safely perform randomization-based statistical inference based on the assignments generated by VNSRR without the risk of relying on a small set of unique assignments.

D.3 Semi-synthetic Data

We mimic the set-ups in Zhu and Liu (2022) and simulate semi-synthetic data based on the clinical trial dataset. Since we only observe half of the potential outcomes in the original dataset, we impute the counterfactual potential outcomes under the sharp null. We then compare VNSRR and the existing methods in the same way as in our simulation studies. The results are shown in Table 7 and are similar to our findings in the simulation studies. VNSRR significantly accelerates rerandomization and has comparable performances in other aspects compared to ARSRR and PSRR.

Table 3: Statistical and computational performance of different methods in simple randomized experiments.

n	p	p_a	Method	Statistical Inference ($\times 10^{-3}$)						Run Time (second)		
				Bias	SD	Size	Power	Coverage	Length			
30	2	10^{-3}	CR	6.2	74	10.5	14	89.5	246	< 0.1		
			ARSRR	0.1	51	8.7	19	91.3	177	11.4		
			PSRR	1.5	51	10.1	18	89.9	177	48.1		
			VNSRR	1.6	52	11.0	17	89.0	177	1.4		
			CR	9.2	199	9.3	18	90.7	678	< 0.1		
	15	10^{-3}	ARSRR	2.2	155	10.8	21	89.2	552	64.2		
			PSRR	3.8	156	10.6	22	89.4	547	1.6		
			VNSRR	6.8	152	10.4	22	89.6	547	0.3		
			2	10^{-3}	CR	1.4	42	11.7	29	88.3	132	< 0.1
					ARSRR	0.2	29	10.4	40	89.6	94	14.0
PSRR	0.3	29			9.6	40	90.4	94	2.1			
VNSRR	0.4	27			8.5	40	91.5	94	0.5			
100	10^{-4}	CR			1.4	42	11.7	29	88.3	132	< 0.1	
		ARSRR	0.0	28	9.8	40	90.2	94	139.6			
		PSRR	0.1	28	10.1	40	89.9	94	35.7			
		VNSRR	0.3	28	10.2	41	89.8	94	4.2			
		50	10^{-3}	CR	1.0	207	11.3	35	88.7	663	< 0.1	
ARSRR	1.4			174	9.9	39	90.1	579	215.3			
PSRR	5.1			170	10.1	42	89.9	574	8.2			
VNSRR	2.1			173	10.1	40	89.9	573	0.2			
500	10^{-4}			CR	1.0	207	11.3	35	88.7	663	< 0.1	
		ARSRR	10.2	165	7.8	39	92.2	567	2453.3			
		PSRR	2.8	167	9.9	43	90.1	560	27.0			
		VNSRR	6.4	163	9.1	42	90.9	558	0.3			
		250	2	10^{-3}	CR	1.0	18	8.7	74	91.3	59	< 0.1
ARSRR	0.4				13	8.8	94	91.2	42	24.3		
PSRR	0.6				12	9.1	94	90.9	42	1.6		
VNSRR	0.1				13	10.5	93	89.5	42	0.5		
500	10^{-4}				CR	1.0	18	8.7	74	91.3	59	< 0.1
			ARSRR	0.5	12	0.2	95	90.8	42	248.8		
			PSRR	0.5	13	11.2	92	88.8	42	6.4		
			VNSRR	0.2	12	11.3	92	88.7	42	1.7		
			250	10^{-3}	CR	0.8	201	10.4	73	89.6	660	< 0.1
ARSRR	4.0				186	9.2	77	90.8	619	4137.4		
PSRR	4.5	189			9.8	78	90.2	619	275.3			
VNSRR	7.6	199			12.6	73	87.4	615	1.2			
500	10^{-4}	CR			0.8	201	10.4	88	89.6	660	< 0.1	
		PSRR	4.3	187	10.3	91	89.7	611	2878.8			
		VNSRR	5.7	181	9.8	92	90.2	608	1.3			

Table 4: Statistical and computational performance of different methods in structured randomized experiments.

Scheme	n	Method	Statistical Inference ($\times 10^{-3}$)						Run Time (second)
			Bias	SD	Size	Power	Coverage	Length	
Sequential	200	CR	5.5	140	10.3	28	89.7	469	< 0.1
		ARSRR	3.3	112	8.1	36	91.9	391	162.4
		PSRR	1.7	118	10.4	36	89.6	391	14.1
		VNSRR	0.9	116	10.2	35	89.8	390	0.9
	1000	CR	3.2	146	10.7	76	89.3	466	< 0.1
		ARSRR	6.0	139	12.2	80	87.8	428	3288.5
		PSRR	3.3	135	11.5	82	88.5	429	339.1
		VNSRR	5.8	138	11.4	81	88.6	428	5.8
Stratified	200	CR	5.2	140	10.3	26	89.7	467	< 0.1
		ARSRR	4.5	121	10.6	35	89.4	401	148.0
		VNSRR	6.1	124	10.3	32	89.7	402	0.5
	1000	CR	3.0	140	10.0	76	90.0	466	< 0.1
		ARSRR	2.7	131	9.1	82	90.9	434	3386.8
		VNSRR	0.0	130	10.5	83	89.5	436	3.0
Cluster	200	CR	3.0	141	10.9	27	89.1	479	< 0.1
		ARSRR	3.3	116	8.8	32	91.2	405	126.4
		VNSRR	6.4	116	8.9	30	91.1	405	0.8
	1000	CR	0.9	140	9.8	77	90.2	465	< 0.1
		ARSRR	6.2	132	9.3	80	90.7	435	3116.2
		VNSRR	3.3	131	10.1	82	89.9	436	3.9

Table 5: L_n ($\times 10^{-2}$) of different methods in simple randomized experiments.

n	p	p_a	Method			
			CR	ARSRR	PSRR	VNSRR
30	2	10^{-3}	137	158	161	158
	15	10^{-3}	137	347	333	329
100	2	10^{-3}	170	174	174	174
		10^{-4}	170	174	174	174
	50	10^{-3}	170	231	234	233
		10^{-4}	170	242	248	245
500	2	10^{-3}	288	289	289	289
		10^{-4}	288	289	289	289
	250	10^{-3}	288	307	307	310
		10^{-4}	288	NA	314	317

Table 6: L_n ($\times 10^{-2}$) of different methods in structured randomized experiments.

Scheme	n	Method			
		CR	ARSRR	PSRR	VNSRR
Sequential	200	208	251	252	253
	1000	396	411	410	412
Stratified	200	208	228	NA	228
	1000	396	404	NA	404
Cluster	200	339	438	NA	430
	1000	576	606	NA	604

Table 7: Statistical and computational performance of different methods when applied to semi-synthetic data.

Method	Statistical Inference ($\times 10^{-3}$)					Computation Time (second)	L_n
	Bias	SD	Size	Coverage	Length		
CR	9.7	440	4.4	95.6	1804	< 0.1	122
ARSRR	2.9	317	4.3	95.7	1333	13.9	140
PSRR	0.6	319	4.8	95.2	1346	219.9	142
VNSRR	14.4	336	5.3	94.7	1338	1.2	139