

Sharp Bounds on the Variance of General Regression Adjustment in Randomized Experiments

Jonas M. Mikhaeil*¹ and Donald P. Green²

¹Department of Statistics, Columbia University, New York

²Department of Political Science, Columbia University, New York

September 2024

Abstract

Building on statistical foundations laid by Neyman [1923] a century ago, a growing literature focuses on problems of causal inference that arise in the context of randomized experiments where the target of inference is the average treatment effect in a finite population and random assignment determines which subjects are allocated to one of the experimental conditions. In this framework, variances of average treatment effect estimators remain unidentified because they depend on the covariance between treated and untreated potential outcomes, which are never jointly observed. Aronow et al. [2014] provide an estimator for the variance of the difference-in-means estimator that is asymptotically sharp. In practice, researchers often use some form of covariate adjustment, such as linear regression when estimating the average treatment effect. Here we extend the Aronow et al. [2014] result, providing asymptotically sharp variance bounds for general regression adjustment. We apply these results to linear regression adjustment and show benefits both in a simulation as well as an empirical application.

1 Introduction

Although a century has passed since the publication of Neyman [1923], the finite population framework for analyzing randomized experiments remains a vibrant topic, perhaps because it cleanly differentiates between the analysis of an experiment on a given set of subjects and extrapolations to other populations. Recent scholarship has made important contributions to the understanding of the finite population setting (cf. central limit theorems in [Li and Ding, 2017, Schochet et al., 2022, Liu et al., 2022]), yet variance estimation remains a lingering concern. Neyman’s original result noted the fact that the variance of the difference-in-means estimator is not point-identified except under special conditions, such as homogeneous treatment effects among all subjects. The widely-used classical variance estimator, described below, is unbiased under homogeneous treatment effects but positively biased under heterogeneous treatment effects. The classical variance estimator is recommended in textbook treatments [Ding, 2023, Rubin, 1974, Gerber and Green, 2012] on the grounds that it offers a “conservative” assessment of variance, which in turn implies that confidence intervals will have nominal coverage or greater.

Unsatisfied with this approach, Neyman [1923] derived an alternative variance estimator based on the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality that provided a somewhat less conservative upper

*Email for correspondence: j.mikhaeil@columbia.edu

bound on the variance. In a similar vein, Aronow et al. [2014], generalizing a result in [Robins, 1988], derive an alternative variance estimator that provides a sharp upper bound for the estimated variance. Aronow et al. show that this estimator renders a less conservative variance estimate than the classic formula as well as the bounds proposed by Neyman [1923]. Because the advantage of their method lies in its performance under heterogeneous treatment effects, it is well-suited to randomized trials in which treatment effects are suspected to be heterogeneous *ex ante*, e.g., when pre-analysis plans propose to investigate heterogeneous effects across subgroups. Given the many literature reviews in domains such as biomedical research [Kent et al., 2018], policy analysis [Ferraro and Miranda, 2013], political science [Kertzer, 2022], evaluation research [Smith, 2022], psychology [Hickin et al., 2021], and behavioral science more generally [Bryan et al., 2021] that offer theoretical and empirical grounds for expecting heterogeneous effects, it appears that many domains would benefit from less conservative variance estimation. Even if the gains in precision from the sharp bounds estimator amount are often modest,¹ the cumulative gains are sizable given the vast number of studies that could potentially benefit from more accurate variance estimation.²

As noted by Ding [2023, p. 53], however, the method proposed by Aronow et al. [2014] is limited to differences-in-means estimation, whereas researchers analyzing randomized control trials typically use some form of covariate adjustment, such as linear regression [Lin, 2013] or machine learning methods [Bloniarz et al., 2016, Wu and Gagnon-Bartsch, 2018, Su et al., 2023]. The same limitation applies to the causal bootstrap [Imbens and Menzel, 2021]. To fill this gap, the present paper extends the sharp bounds estimator to general regression adjustment. We explicitly derive sharp bounds for the variance of linear regression adjustment [Lin, 2013] as well as a decorrelation method for general regression adjustment [Su et al., 2023]. We provide an R package³ to make our sharp variance estimators accessible to practitioners.

The operating characteristics of our sharp variance estimator for linear regression adjustment are demonstrated via simulations. Reanalyzing experimental data from Harrison and Michelson [2012] that were used by Aronow et al. [2014], we illustrate the potential practical benefits of sharp variance bounds for linear regression adjustment. We conclude by discussing the advantages and limitations of sharp bounds for variance estimation in the context of regression-adjusted estimation of average treatment effects.

2 Setup

2.1 Finite population paradigm

Consider a finite population $U_N = \{(Y_i(1), Y_i(0), X_i)\}_{i=1}^N$, where $Y_i(1)$ and $Y_i(0)$ are the potential outcomes [Neyman, 1923, Rubin, 1974] under treatment and control⁴, and $X_i = (x_{i1}, \dots, x_{ik})^\top$ are pre-treatment covariates (for convenience, we will assume $\bar{X} = 0$ throughout). Additionally, $Z = (Z_1, \dots, Z_N)^\top$ is a vector encoding the treatment assignment, such that $Z_i = 1$ if the unit is treated and $Z_i = 0$ otherwise.

¹Aronow et al. 2014 page 857 present an empirical example in which the conventional variance estimator is roughly 7 percent larger than the sharp bounds estimator.

²Like Aronow et al. [2014], Imbens and Menzel [2021] use Frechét-Hoeffding copula bounds (see Section 2.2) to develop a bootstrap method for obtaining more accurate confidence intervals for the average treatment effect in the presence of treatment effect heterogeneity.

³<https://github.com/JonasMikhaeil/SharpVarianceBounds>

⁴We implicitly invoke the Stable Unit Treatment Value Assumption, which holds that subjects respond solely to their own treatment condition and that there are no hidden values of the treatment.

We are interested in determining the population average treatment effect

$$\tau = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N Y_i(1) - Y_i(0) = \bar{Y}(1) - \bar{Y}(0). \quad (1)$$

We consider the case of either a completely randomized experiment (CRE) in which n_1 of the N units are randomly sampled into the treatment group and the remaining n_0 units receive the control or a Bernoulli randomized experiment (BRE) in which units are sampled into the treatment arm with probability π_1 (in this case, we define $n_1 = \pi_1 N$ and $n_0 = (1 - \pi_1)N$). In both settings the difference-in-means (DiM) estimator

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\tau}^{DiM} &= \frac{1}{n_1} \sum_{i=1}^N Z_i Y_i(1) + \frac{1}{n_0} \sum_{i=1}^N (1 - Z_i) Y_i(0) \\ &\equiv \bar{Y}(1)^S - \bar{Y}(0)^S \end{aligned}$$

is unbiased and consistent (under mild regularity conditions on the outcomes) for the average treatment effect τ .

Although the average treatment effect is point-identified, the variance of the difference-in-means estimator

$$\text{Var}(\hat{\tau}^{DiM}) = \frac{1}{N} \left(\frac{n_0}{n_1} S^2(Y(1)) + \frac{n_1}{n_0} S^2(Y(0)) + 2S(Y(1), Y(0)) \right) \quad (2)$$

is not. The sample variances $\hat{S}^2(Y(1)) = \frac{1}{n_1-1} \sum_{i=1}^N Z_i (Y_i(1) - \bar{Y}(1)^S)^2$ and $\hat{S}^2(Y(0)) = \frac{1}{n_0-1} \sum_{i=1}^N (1 - Z_i) (Y_i(0) - \bar{Y}(0)^S)^2$ are consistent (and unbiased) estimators for the population variances $S^2(Y(z))$ [Li and Ding, 2017]; however, the covariance between the potential outcomes $S(Y(1), Y(0))$ remains unidentified because $Y_i(1)$ and $Y_i(0)$ are never observed jointly. Following Neyman [1923], a variance estimator based on the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and the arithmetic mean-geometric mean (AM-GM) inequality $2S(Y(1), Y(0)) \leq 2\sqrt{S^2(Y(1))S^2(Y(0))} \leq S^2(Y(1)) + S^2(Y(0))$ may be used [Ding, 2023]:

$$\widehat{\text{Var}}(\hat{\tau}^{DiM}) = \frac{1}{N} \left(\frac{1}{n_1} \hat{S}^2(Y(1)) + \frac{1}{n_0} \hat{S}^2(Y(0)) \right). \quad (3)$$

This estimator is conservative in that $\mathbb{E}[\widehat{\text{Var}}(\hat{\tau}^{DiM})] - \text{Var}(\hat{\tau}^{DiM}) \geq 0$. Equality holds if and only if the treatment effect is constant $\tau_i \equiv \tau$ [Gadbury, 2001].⁵

In the remainder of this paper, we will often work with the marginals $G_N(y) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{1}[Y_i(1) \leq y]$ and $F_N(y) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{1}[Y_i(0) \leq y]$ of the potential outcomes. These finite population distributions are useful as their moments match the finite population quantities we are interested in. Define $Y(1) \sim G_N$. Then, for example, $\mathbb{E}_{G_N}[Y(1)] = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N Y_i(1) = \bar{Y}(1)$ and $\frac{N}{N-1} \text{Var}_{G_N}(Y(1)) = \frac{1}{N-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{i=1}^N (Y_i(1) - \bar{Y}(1))^2 = S^2(Y(1))$.

2.2 Fréchet-Hoeffding Copula bounds and sharp variance bounds for DiM

Neyman's conservative variance estimator (Equation 3) uses only information about the second moments of the distribution of the potential outcomes. Aronow et al. [2014] derive

⁵Li and Ding [2017] provide a central limit theorem for the finite-sample setting and show that $\hat{\tau}^{DiM}$ is asymptotically normal under classical regularity conditions. Using Neyman's conservative variance estimator $\widehat{\text{Var}}(\hat{\tau}^{DiM})$, an asymptotically conservative level- α Wald-type confidence interval $\hat{\tau}^{DiM} \pm z_{1-\alpha/2} \sqrt{\widehat{\text{Var}}(\hat{\tau}^{DiM})}$ can be constructed.

sharp variance bounds for the difference-in-means estimator in a CRE using the marginal distributions of the potential outcomes. For further discussion of sharpness and optimality of variance bounds, see Appendix E.

Using the Fréchet-Hoeffding copula bounds, the largest and smallest attainable variances given the marginal distributions of the potential outcomes can be identified. The works of Fréchet [1960] and Hoeffding [1940] provide bounds on copulas:

Theorem 1 (Fréchet–Hoeffding bounds, see [Jaworski et al., 2010]). *For any d -dimensional copula C and any $u = (u_1, \dots, u_d)$, the following bounds hold*

$$W(u) \leq C(u) \leq M(u),$$

where $W(u) := \max(1-d+\sum_{i=1}^d u_i, 0)$ and $M(u) := \min(u_1, \dots, u_d)$ are the Fréchet–Hoeffding lower and upper bounds, respectively.

The upper bound is always a copula and hence sharp. The lower bound is generally only a copula for $d < 3$ [Joe, 2014]. In two dimensions, this leads to the following Lemma:

Lemma 1. *Given only the marginal CDFs G and F of the random variables Y_1 and Y_0 , the bounds*

$$\mathbb{E}_W[G(Y_1)F(Y_0)] \leq \mathbb{E}[Y_1 Y_0] \leq \mathbb{E}_M[G(Y_1)F(Y_0)]$$

are sharp. The upper bound is attained if Y_1 and Y_0 are comonotonic, and the lower bound is attained if Y_1 and Y_0 are countermonotonic.

The application to randomized experiments is immediate. For a finite population U_N with marginals $G_N(y) = 1/N \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{1}\{Y_i(1) \leq y\}$ and $F_N(y) = 1/N \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{1}\{Y_i(0) \leq y\}$, the joint distributions of extremal dependence are $H_N^H(Y_1, Y_0) = \min\{G_N(Y_1), F_N(Y_0)\}$ and $H_N^L(Y_1, Y_0) = \max\{0, G_N(Y_1) + F_N(Y_0) - 1\}$. With Lemma 1, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} V_N^H &= \frac{n_0}{Nn_1} \text{Var}_{G_N}(Y(1)) + \frac{n_1}{Nn_0} \text{Var}_{F_N}(Y(0)) + \frac{2}{N} \text{Cov}_{H_N^H}(Y(1), Y(0)), \\ V_N^L &= \frac{n_0}{Nn_1} \text{Var}_{G_N}(Y(1)) + \frac{n_1}{Nn_0} \text{Var}_{F_N}(Y(0)) + \frac{2}{N} \text{Cov}_{H_N^L}(Y(1), Y(0)) \end{aligned}$$

are sharp bounds for $\text{Var}(\hat{\tau}^{DiM})$. In the context of a randomized experiment, the marginals G_N and F_N remain unobserved. Instead we estimate the marginals with the empirical distributions $\hat{G}_N(y) = 1/n_1 \sum_{i=1}^N Z_i \mathbb{1}\{Y_i(1) \leq y\}$ and $\hat{F}_N(y) = 1/n_0 \sum_{i=1}^N (1 - Z_i) \mathbb{1}\{Y_i(0) \leq y\}$. We provide a P-Glivenko-Cantelli result for empirical distributions in the finite population setting in Appendix A.

Aronow et al. [2014] show that under some regularity conditions estimates of the sharp bounds \hat{V}_N^H and \hat{V}_N^L based on the empirical distributions \hat{G}_N and \hat{F}_N are consistent for the upper and lower bound, respectively. Based on the upper bound \hat{V}_N^H , the asymptotically narrowest conservative level- α Wald-type confidence interval $\hat{\tau}^{DiM} \pm z_{1-\alpha/2} \sqrt{\hat{V}_N^H}$ can be constructed.

2.3 Regression adjustment

The simple difference-in-means estimator $\hat{\tau}^{DiM}$ gives an unbiased estimate of the treatment effect. If prognostic covariates are available, their inclusion can improve the precision with which the average treatment effect is estimated [Freedman, 2008, Lei and Ding, 2021, Lu et al., 2023, Zhao et al., 2024, Su et al., 2023].

In general, the goal of regression adjustment is to find outcome models $f_1 : \mathbb{R}^k \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $f_0 : \mathbb{R}^k \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that the population-adjusted potential outcomes

$$\varepsilon_i(q) := Y_i(q) - f_q(X_i) \quad \text{for } q \in \{0, 1\}$$

are as close to zero as possible.

If all potential outcomes were observable, we would choose the optimal outcome model given a function class \mathcal{F}

$$f_q \in \arg \min_{f_q \in \mathcal{F}} \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^N (Y_i(q) - f_q(X_i))^2 \right\}.$$

Based on these (inaccessible) *oracle* models, we can form an oracle-adjusted estimator

$$\hat{\tau}_N^{\text{oracle}} = \frac{1}{n_T} \sum_{i=1}^N T_i (Y_i(1) - f_1(X_i)) - \frac{1}{n_{\bar{T}}} \sum_{i=1}^N \bar{T}_i (Y_i(0) - f_0(X_i)) + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N (f_1(X_i) - f_0(X_i)). \quad (4)$$

To allow for a more general class of estimators, the oracle-adjusted estimator is not defined in terms of the treatment indicators $(Z_i, 1 - Z_i)$ directly but instead based on more general sampling indicators T_i and \bar{T}_i that determine which units are included in the calculation of the oracle-adjusted estimator. They need to satisfy $T_i \leq Z_i$ and $\bar{T}_i \leq 1 - Z_i$ because we can only include observed potential outcomes. These indicators can be chosen to be the treatment indicator $(Z_i, 1 - Z_i)$ themselves so that all units are included in the calculation of the oracle-adjusted estimator. However, they can also be chosen to fulfill other properties (such as decorrelation, see [Su et al., 2023]). To accommodate both the setting for BREs and CREs, we will make the following assumption about the indicators:

Assumption 1 (Random indicators). *The random indicators (T_i, \bar{T}_i) are one of the following*

1. *Bernoulli random variables such that $\text{Cov}(T_i, T_j) = \pi_T(1 - \pi_T)\delta_{ij}$, $\text{Cov}(\bar{T}_i, \bar{T}_j) = \pi_{\bar{T}}(1 - \pi_{\bar{T}})\delta_{ij}$ and $\text{Cov}(T_i, \bar{T}_j) = -\pi_T\pi_{\bar{T}}\delta_{ij}$. Assume $\pi_T, \pi_{\bar{T}} \in (0, 1)$ and define $n_T := N\pi_T$ and $n_{\bar{T}} := N\pi_{\bar{T}}$.*
2. *$(T_i, \bar{T}_i) = (T_i, 1 - T_i)$, where T_i encodes a simple random sample (without replacement) of n_T out of N units. In this case, further assume that $n_T/N \rightarrow \pi_T \in (0, 1)$ as $N \rightarrow \infty$ and define $n_{\bar{T}} = N - n_T$ and $\pi_{\bar{T}} = 1 - \pi_T$.*

The variance of the oracle estimator under this assumption is

$$\text{Var}(\hat{\tau}_N^{\text{oracle}}) = \frac{1}{N} \left(\frac{N - n_T}{n_T} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \varepsilon_{i,N}(1)^2 + \frac{N - n_{\bar{T}}}{n_{\bar{T}}} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \varepsilon_{i,N}(0)^2 + 2 \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \varepsilon_{i,N}(1)\varepsilon_{i,N}(0) \right). \quad (5)$$

We refer to the last term including both adjusted potential outcomes as the cross-term between adjusted potential outcomes.

In practice, we face the difficulty that only the potential outcomes associated with the allocated treatment are observed. Due to this inherent problem of missingness, we need to work with an estimator of the form

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\tau}_N &= \frac{1}{n_T} \sum_{i=1}^N T_i (Y_i(1) - \hat{f}_{1,N}(X_i)) - \frac{1}{n_{\bar{T}}} \sum_{i=1}^N \bar{T}_i (Y_i(0) - \hat{f}_{0,N}(X_i)) + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N (\hat{f}_{1,N}(X_i) - \hat{f}_{0,N}(X_i)) \\ &\equiv \frac{1}{n_T} \sum_{i=1}^N T_i \hat{\varepsilon}_{i,N}(1) - \frac{1}{n_{\bar{T}}} \sum_{i=1}^N \bar{T}_i \hat{\varepsilon}_{i,N}(0) + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N (\hat{f}_{1,N}(X_i) - \hat{f}_{0,N}(X_i)), \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

where \hat{f}_1 is an estimate of f_1 based on some subset of the treated units and \hat{f}_0 is an estimate of f_0 based on a subset of the control units. We refer to $\hat{\varepsilon}_{i,N}(q) = Y_i(q) - \hat{f}_{q,N}(X_i)$ as the sample-adjusted potential outcomes. In Section 3.2, we will focus on linear regression adjustment [Lin, 2013], where \mathcal{F} is chosen to be the class of all linear outcome models and the estimates \hat{f}_q are calculated on all observed units in the respective treatment group. Section 3.3 focuses on a framework that allows for more general regression adjustment.

In the cases considered in this paper, the additional variation introduced by the estimates \hat{f}_1 and \hat{f}_0 is asymptotically negligible. However, even if the oracle models f_q were known, the variance of the oracle estimator (Equation 5) is not point-identified because we cannot observe the cross-term including both the adjusted treated and untreated potential outcomes. Following [Neyman, 1923], one can use the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality to arrive at the following asymptotically conservative variance estimator

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\text{Var}}(\hat{\tau}_N)^{\text{CS}} &= \frac{1}{N} \left(\frac{N - n_T}{n_T} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \hat{\varepsilon}_{i,N}(1)^2 + \frac{N - n_{\bar{T}}}{n_{\bar{T}}} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \hat{\varepsilon}_{i,N}(0)^2 \right. \\ &\quad \left. + 2 \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \hat{\varepsilon}_{i,N}(1)^2 \right)^{1/2} \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \hat{\varepsilon}_{i,N}(0)^2 \right)^{1/2} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

Conventionally, the more convenient (but often more conservative) estimator based on the AM-GM inequality is used

$$\widehat{\text{Var}}(\hat{\tau}_N)^{\text{Conv}} = \frac{1}{n_T} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \hat{\varepsilon}_{i,N}(1)^2 + \frac{1}{n_{\bar{T}}} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \hat{\varepsilon}_{i,N}(0)^2. \quad (8)$$

In Section 3, we discuss a Proposition that provides consistency results on estimators of sharp variance bounds for general regression estimators.

While linear regression adjustment is the main focus of this paper, our results are more general. For our results on sharp bounds (Proposition 1) to be practically applicable, there needs to be an available asymptotic theory for the estimator in question. For linear regression, such an asymptotic theory was offered in [Lin, 2013, Li and Ding, 2017]. While the asymptotics of general regression adjustment have received much attention recently [Bloniarz et al., 2016, Wu and Gagnon-Bartsch, 2018, Guo and Basse, 2023], we will focus on the decorrelation method for general regression adjustments developed in [Su et al., 2023] because their results only require $o_p(1)$ consistency for the outcome estimates. In their case, \mathcal{F} remains broad (e.g, non-parametric function classes under fairly general constraints, see Section 4.3 of [Su et al., 2023]), but the subsets on which \hat{f}_q are calculated are chosen to achieve decorrelation. This mitigates finite-sample bias and allows us to establish asymptotic normality for general regression adjustment assuming only standard regularity conditions and $o_p(1)$ consistency of the outcome models.

Linear regression adjustment and the decorrelation method for general regression adjustment are, however, only examples of applications of our sharp bounds. If in the future other asymptotic results for general regression adjustment are derived, it is likely that our sharp bounds (Proposition 1) will apply to them as well.

3 Sharp bounds for general regression adjustment

Aronow et al. [2014] derived consistent estimators for sharp variance bounds of the difference-in-means estimator in a CRE (see Section 2.2). We want to extend their Fréchet-Hoeffding-type sharp variance bounds to general regression adjustment. Consider the variance of the

oracle estimator for general regression adjustment (under Assumption 1):

$$\text{Var}(\hat{\tau}_N^{\text{oracle}}) = \frac{1}{N} \left(\frac{N - n_T}{n_T} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \varepsilon_{i,N}(1)^2 + \frac{N - n_{\bar{T}}}{n_{\bar{T}}} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \varepsilon_{i,N}(0)^2 + 2 \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \varepsilon_{i,N}(1) \varepsilon_{i,N}(0) \right).$$

Even when the oracle models f_1 and f_0 are known, the variance is not point-identified because of the cross-term between the population-adjusted potential outcomes.

To make use of Fréchet-Hoeffding type bounds, define the marginal distributions over the population-adjusted potential outcomes $G_N(\xi) = 1/N \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{1}\{\varepsilon_{i,N}(1) \leq \xi\}$ and $F_N(\xi) = 1/N \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{1}\{\varepsilon_{i,N}(0) \leq \xi\}$. Application of Lemma 1 leads to

$$\begin{aligned} V_N^H &= \frac{1}{N} \left(\frac{N - n_T}{n_T} \mathbb{E}_{G_N} [\varepsilon_N(1)^2] + \frac{N - n_{\bar{T}}}{n_{\bar{T}}} \mathbb{E}_{F_N} [\varepsilon_N(0)^2] + 2 \mathbb{E}_{H_N^H} [\varepsilon_N(1) \varepsilon_N(0)] \right), \\ V_N^L &= \frac{1}{N} \left(\frac{N - n_T}{n_T} \mathbb{E}_{G_N} [\varepsilon_N(1)^2] + \frac{N - n_{\bar{T}}}{n_{\bar{T}}} \mathbb{E}_{F_N} [\varepsilon_N(0)^2] + 2 \mathbb{E}_{H_N^L} [\varepsilon_N(1) \varepsilon_N(0)] \right) \end{aligned}$$

sharp bounds on $\text{Var}(\hat{\tau}_N^{\text{oracle}})$. The joint distributions of extremal dependence are defined as $H_N^H(\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_0) = \min\{G_N(\varepsilon_1), F_N(\varepsilon_0)\}$ and $H_N^L(\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_0) = \max\{0, G_N(\varepsilon_1) + F_N(\varepsilon_0) - 1\}$.

The marginals G_N and F_N remain unobserved; instead, we work with the empirical distribution functions $\hat{G}_N(\xi) = 1/\tilde{n}_T \sum_{i=1}^N T_i \mathbb{1}\{\hat{\varepsilon}_{i,N}(1) \leq \xi\}$ and $\hat{F}_N(\xi) = 1/\tilde{n}_{\bar{T}} \sum_{i=1}^N \bar{T}_i \mathbb{1}\{\hat{\varepsilon}_{i,N}(0) \leq \xi\}$, where $\tilde{n}_T = \sum_{i=1}^N T_i$ and $\tilde{n}_{\bar{T}} = \sum_{i=1}^N \bar{T}_i$.⁶ These yield the plug-in estimators for the sharp variance bounds

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{V}_N^H &= \frac{1}{N} \left(\frac{N - n_T}{n_T} \mathbb{E}_{\hat{G}_N} [\hat{\varepsilon}_N(1)^2] + \frac{N - n_{\bar{T}}}{n_{\bar{T}}} \mathbb{E}_{\hat{F}_N} [\hat{\varepsilon}_N(0)^2] + 2 \mathbb{E}_{\hat{H}_N^H} [\hat{\varepsilon}_N(1) \hat{\varepsilon}_N(0)] \right), \quad (9) \\ \hat{V}_N^L &= \frac{1}{N} \left(\frac{N - n_T}{n_T} \mathbb{E}_{\hat{G}_N} [\hat{\varepsilon}_N(1)^2] + \frac{N - n_{\bar{T}}}{n_{\bar{T}}} \mathbb{E}_{\hat{F}_N} [\hat{\varepsilon}_N(0)^2] + 2 \mathbb{E}_{\hat{H}_N^L} [\hat{\varepsilon}_N(1) \hat{\varepsilon}_N(0)] \right). \end{aligned}$$

To study the asymptotic regime of these estimators of the sharp bounds, we need the following regularity condition:

Assumption 2 (Convergence of the joint distribution of the population-adjusted potential outcomes). *The joint distribution of the population-adjusted potential outcomes H_N converges weakly to a distribution H with marginals $H(\cdot, \infty) = G(\cdot)$ and $H(\infty, \cdot) = F(\cdot)$.*

Compared to [Aronow et al., 2014], we face the additional difficulty that the arguments of the indicator functions in \hat{G}_N and \hat{F}_N now depend on the random indicators (T_i, \bar{T}_i) . This difficulty arises because we do not get to observe the population-adjusted potential outcomes $\varepsilon_{i,N}(z)$ based on the oracle models $f_{1,N}$ and $f_{0,N}$ but only the sample-adjusted potential outcomes $\hat{\varepsilon}_{i,N}(z)$ that depend on the (random) estimates of the outcome models $\hat{f}_{1,N}$ and $\hat{f}_{0,N}$. The following proposition shows that this difficulty can be overcome without additional assumptions (beyond classical regularity conditions). We show that the plug-in estimators for the sharp variance bounds (Equation 9) are consistent.

Proposition 1. *Let Assumption 1 and 2 hold. Further, assume*

(a) *The estimates of the outcome models are $o_p(1)$ consistent, that is,*

$$\left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N (f_{q,N}(X_i) - \hat{f}_{q,N}(X_i))^2 \right)^{1/2} = o_p(1) \quad \text{for } q \in \{0, 1\}.$$

⁶In case that either \tilde{n}_T or $\tilde{n}_{\bar{T}}$ are 0, we define the respective empirical distribution to be $\delta(0)$. The probability of this happening vanishes as N tends to infinity so that this choice does not affect our asymptotic results. For details, see the proof of Proposition 1 in Appendix B.

(b) The population-adjusted potential outcomes $\varepsilon_{i,N}(q) = Y_i(q) - f_{q,N}$ are uniformly square-integrable, that is

$$\sup_N \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \varepsilon_{i,N}(q)^2 \mathbb{1}[\varepsilon_{i,N}(q)^2 \geq \beta] \rightarrow 0$$

as $\beta \rightarrow \infty$ for $q \in \{0, 1\}$.

Let \mathcal{H} be the collection of all bivariate distributions with marginals G and F , then

$$\begin{aligned} NV_N^H &\rightarrow \frac{1 - \pi_T}{\pi_T} \mathbb{E}_G[\varepsilon(1)^2] + \frac{1 - \pi_{\bar{T}}}{\pi_{\bar{T}}} \mathbb{E}_F[\varepsilon(0)^2] + 2 \sup_{h \in \mathcal{H}} \mathbb{E}_h[\varepsilon(1)\varepsilon(0)] \\ NV_N^L &\rightarrow \frac{1 - \pi_T}{\pi_T} \mathbb{E}_G[\varepsilon(1)^2] + \frac{1 - \pi_{\bar{T}}}{\pi_{\bar{T}}} \mathbb{E}_F[\varepsilon(0)^2] + 2 \inf_{h \in \mathcal{H}} \mathbb{E}_h[\varepsilon(1)\varepsilon(0)], \end{aligned}$$

and $(\hat{V}_N^L - V_N^L, \hat{V}_N^H - V_N^H) = o_p(1/N)$.

Proof. The proof of Proposition 1 can be found in Appendix B. Notice that the proof strategy provided by Aronow et al. [2014] does not generalize to covariate adjustment because it requires uniform convergence of the empirical distributions. Our proof proceeds by using weaker metrics - the Lévy distance and the bounded-Lipschitz distance - that metrize weak convergence and thus allow us to establish consistency without requiring convergence of CDFs on discontinuity points. This turns out to be crucial when extending to covariate adjustment because of the additional challenge of the indicator functions in the empirical distributions being random. Our proof builds on a P-Glivenko-Cantelli result for the empirical distributions \hat{G}_N and \hat{F}_N that we derive in Appendix A. \square

Remark. By using weaker metrics than total variation that metrize weak convergence, the proof strategy developed here does not require the marginals G_N and F_N to converge pointwise to G and F at their respective discontinuity points. Following the proof developed here, this assumption in [Aronow et al., 2014] Proposition 1 can thus be relaxed. Our work also extends their results to BREs.

3.1 Calculation of the Estimators for the Sharp Variance Bounds

In this section, we will show how to compute the cross-term between adjusted potential outcomes under the joint distribution of extremal dependence. These, in turn, allow for the computation of our sharp variance bound estimators. The sharp bounds on the second moments in Lemma 1 correspond to random variables that are co- or countermonotonic. Defining the left-continuous inverse of CDFs as $F^{-1}(x) = \inf\{y : F(y) \geq x\}$, we can express co-monotonicity of the sample-adjusted potential outcomes as $(\hat{\varepsilon}_N(1), \hat{\varepsilon}_N(0)) \sim (\hat{G}_N^{-1}(U), \hat{F}_N^{-1}(U))$ and counter-monotonicity as $(\hat{\varepsilon}_N(1), \hat{\varepsilon}_N(0)) \sim (\hat{G}_N^{-1}(U), \hat{F}_N^{-1}(1 - U))$, where $U \sim \text{Unif}[0, 1]$ is uniformly random [Puccetti and Wang, 2015]. Hence

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{\hat{H}_N^H}(\hat{\varepsilon}_N(1)\hat{\varepsilon}_N(0)) &= \int_0^1 \hat{G}_N^{-1}(u)\hat{F}_N^{-1}(u)du \quad \text{and} \\ \mathbb{E}_{\hat{H}_N^L}(\hat{\varepsilon}_N(1)\hat{\varepsilon}_N(0)) &= \int_0^1 \hat{G}_N^{-1}(u)\hat{F}_N^{-1}(1 - u)du. \end{aligned}$$

Let $\hat{\varepsilon}_{(1)1}^{obs}, \dots, \hat{\varepsilon}_{(\bar{n}_T)1}^{obs}$ and $\hat{\varepsilon}_{(1)0}^{obs}, \dots, \hat{\varepsilon}_{(\bar{n}_{\bar{T}})0}^{obs}$ be the ordered sample-adjusted outcomes corresponding to $T_i = 1$ and $\bar{T}_i = 1$, respectively, and let $\{p_0, \dots, p_P\}$ be the ordered and distinct

elements of $(\cup_{i=0}^{\bar{n}_T} \frac{i}{\bar{n}_T}) \cup (\cup_{i=0}^{\bar{n}_T} \frac{i}{\bar{n}_T})$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}_{\hat{H}_N^H}(\hat{\varepsilon}_N(1)\hat{\varepsilon}_N(0)) &= \sum_{i=1}^P (p_i - p_{i-1}) \hat{\varepsilon}_{(\lceil \frac{\bar{n}_T p_i}{\bar{n}_T} \rceil)_1}^{obs} \hat{\varepsilon}_{(\lceil \frac{\bar{n}_T p_i}{\bar{n}_T} \rceil)_0}^{obs} \quad \text{and} \\ \mathbb{E}_{\hat{H}_N^L}(\hat{\varepsilon}_N(1)\hat{\varepsilon}_N(0)) &= \sum_{i=1}^P (p_i - p_{i-1}) \hat{\varepsilon}_{(\lceil \frac{\bar{n}_T p_i}{\bar{n}_T} \rceil)_1}^{obs} \hat{\varepsilon}_{(\lceil \frac{\bar{n}_T p_{P+1-i}}{\bar{n}_T} \rceil)_0}^{obs}.\end{aligned}\quad (10)$$

We provide code to calculate these sharp bounds in the form of an R package.

3.2 Application to Linear Regression Adjustment

One common way of adjusting for covariates is choosing \mathcal{F} to be the class of all linear outcome models (i.e., $f_q(X_i) = \alpha_q + \beta_q^\top X_i$) and to estimate \hat{f}_1 and \hat{f}_0 on all available data in the respective treatment arms, i.e., choosing $(T_i, \bar{T}_i) = (Z_i, 1 - Z_i)$. While this adjustment comes with finite-sample bias [Freedman, 2008], Lin [2013] showed that with large samples, linear covariate adjustment (with full treatment-covariate interactions) is at least as efficient as a difference-in-means estimator, which makes no use of the covariates. For linear outcome models, the treatment effect estimator in Equation 4 is equivalent to

$$\hat{\tau}_N(\beta_1, \beta_0) = \frac{1}{n_1} \sum_{i=1}^N Z_i (Y_i(1) - \beta_1^\top X_i) - \frac{1}{n_0} \sum_{i=1}^n (1 - Z_i) (Y_i(0) - \beta_0^\top X_i). \quad (11)$$

Li and Ding [2017] show that the variance of $\hat{\tau}(\beta_1, \beta_0)$ is minimized by choosing β_1 and β_0 as the OLS coefficients of X_i in the linear projection of the potential outcomes $Y(1)$ and $Y(0)$ onto $(1, X_i)$:

$$(\beta_{q,N}, \gamma_{q,N}) = \underset{\beta_q, \gamma_q}{\operatorname{argmin}} \sum_{i=1}^N \left(Y_i(q) - \gamma_q - \beta_q^\top X_i \right)^2 \quad \text{for } q = 0, 1.$$

These optimal coefficients remain unknown, and we have to make do with the estimated least-squares coefficients

$$\begin{aligned}(\hat{\beta}_{1,N}, \hat{\gamma}_{1,N}) &= \underset{\beta_1, \gamma_1}{\operatorname{argmin}} \sum_{i=1}^N Z_i \left(Y_i(1) - \gamma_1 - \beta_1^\top X_i \right)^2 \quad \text{and} \\ (\hat{\beta}_{0,N}, \hat{\gamma}_{0,N}) &= \underset{\beta_0, \gamma_0}{\operatorname{argmin}} \sum_{i=1}^N (1 - Z_i) \left(Y_i(0) - \gamma_0 - \beta_0^\top X_i \right)^2.\end{aligned}$$

While using the estimates $\hat{\beta}_{1,N}$ and $\hat{\beta}_{0,N}$ introduces finite-sample bias of order $o_p(1/\sqrt{N})$ [Lin, 2013], Li and Ding [2017] show that $\hat{\tau}_N(\beta_{1,N}, \beta_{0,N})$ and $\hat{\tau}_N(\hat{\beta}_{1,N}, \hat{\beta}_{0,N})$ have the same asymptotic distribution. Here the population-adjusted potential outcomes are $\varepsilon_{i,N}(q) = Y_i(q) - (\alpha_{q,N} + \beta_{q,N}^\top X_i)$, and the variance of $\hat{\tau}(\beta_{1,N}, \beta_{0,N})$ can be expressed as

$$\operatorname{Var}(\hat{\tau}(\beta_{1,N}, \beta_{0,N})) = \frac{1}{N} \left(\frac{n_0}{n_1} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \varepsilon_{i,N}(1)^2 + \frac{n_1}{n_0} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \varepsilon_{i,N}(0)^2 + 2 \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \varepsilon_{i,N}(1) \varepsilon_{i,N}(0) \right). \quad (12)$$

Typically, the (asymptotically) conservative estimator

$$\widehat{\operatorname{Var}}(\hat{\tau}(\beta_{1,N}, \beta_{0,N})) = \frac{1}{n_1(n_1 - 1)} \sum_{i=1}^N Z_i \hat{\varepsilon}_{i,N}(1)^2 + \frac{1}{n_0(n_0 - 1)} \sum_{i=1}^N (1 - Z_i) \hat{\varepsilon}_{i,N}(0)^2,$$

where $\hat{\varepsilon}_{i,N}(q) = Y_i(q) - (\hat{\alpha}_{q,N} + \hat{\beta}_{q,N}^\top X_i)$ are the sample-adjusted outcomes, is used. Lin [2013] showed that this conservative variance estimator can be conveniently approximated by Huber-White (EHW) robust standard errors.

Additionally, it can be shown that post-stratification [Miratrix et al., 2013] based on discrete covariates C_i with K categories is equivalent to linear regression adjustment with covariates $X_i = (\mathbb{1}\{C_i = 1\} - \pi_1, \dots, \mathbb{1}\{C_i = K - 1\} - \pi_{K-1})$, where π_k is the proportion of units within stratum k [Ding, 2023].

In practice, Lin's estimator can be calculated by linearly regressing Y^{obs} on $(1, Z, X, Z \times X)$ after mean-centering X . Lin's estimator $\hat{\tau}(\hat{\beta}_{1,N}, \hat{\beta}_{0,N})$ of the average treatment effect is then given by the OLS coefficient of Z .

The following Corollary applies Proposition 1 to the case of linear regression adjustment.

Corollary 1. *Let Assumption 1.2 and 2 hold. Further, assume the following classical regularity conditions:*

- (a) *Finite population variances and covariances among potential outcomes, and covariates have limiting values.*
- (b) *Finite population covariance of covariates S_X^2 , and its limits are nonsingular.*
- (c) *The potential outcomes and covariates fulfill*

$$\frac{1}{N} \max_{1 \leq i \leq N} \{(Y_i(z) - \bar{Y}(z))^2\} \rightarrow 0, \frac{1}{N} \max_{1 \leq i \leq N} \{x_{ki}^2\} \rightarrow 0 \quad (z = 0, 1; k = 1, \dots, K).$$

Then the following holds

$$\frac{(\hat{\tau}_N(\hat{\beta}_1, \hat{\beta}_0) - \tau)}{\sqrt{\gamma \hat{V}_N^H}} \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$$

for the asymptotic distribution of Lin's estimator, where $\gamma \leq 1$.

Proof. Under these assumptions, Li and Ding [2017, Example 9] establish a CLT for Lin's estimator. The regularity conditions imply both Assumptions (a) and (b) of Proposition 1. The corollary thus follows immediately. For details of the proof, see Appendix C. \square

Remark. V^H is the sharp upper bound given only information on the marginals. Consequently, $\hat{\tau}_N(\hat{\beta}_1, \hat{\beta}_0) \pm z_{1-\alpha/2} \sqrt{\hat{V}_N^H}$ is the asymptotically narrowest conservative Wald-type confidence interval with the nominal coverage.

Remark. When adjusting for covariates, bias is a concern when the number of observations is small. The difference between Lin's regression estimator $\hat{\tau}(\hat{\beta}_1, \hat{\beta}_0)$ and the optimal (and unbiased) linear regression $\hat{\tau}(\beta_1, \beta_0)$ that could be obtained if all potential outcomes were observed is $o_p(1/\sqrt{N})$ [Li and Ding, 2017]. In light of this small sample bias, and comparing it with the rate of convergence of our sharp variance bounds in Proposition 1, our sharp variance bounds can be used whenever N is large enough such that bias is no concern when using linear regression adjustment.

When using linear regression to calculate Lin's estimator, the sharp variance bounds (Equation 9) can be conveniently calculated based on the regression residuals r from the regression of Y^{obs} on $(1, Z, X, Z \times X)$. The residuals r can be directly plugged into Equation 10.

3.3 Decorrelation method for general regression adjustment

To illustrate how our sharp bounds apply to general regression adjustment beyond linear regression, we focus on the decorrelation estimator proposed by Su et al. [2023]. Their decorrelation method replaces the original treatment variables Z_i and $1 - Z_i$ with a decorrelation sequence $\{M_i, \bar{M}_i, R_i, \bar{R}_i\}$, see [Su et al., 2023] Lemma 1. The random variables R and \bar{R} determine on which units $\hat{f}_R \equiv \hat{f}_1$ and $\hat{f}_{\bar{R}} \equiv \hat{f}_0$ are estimated, and M_i and \bar{M}_i replace Z_i and $1 - Z_i$ in the calculation of the estimator. Their oracle DC-estimator

$$\hat{\tau}_N^{\text{dc.oracle}} := \frac{1}{n_M} \sum_{i=1}^N M_i(Y_i(1) - f_1(X_i)) - \frac{1}{n_{\bar{M}}} \sum_{i=1}^N \bar{M}_i(Y_i(0) - f_0(X_i)) + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N (f_1(X_i) - f_0(X_i)),$$

has the following variance:

$$\text{Var}(\hat{\tau}_N^{\text{dc.oracle}}) = \frac{1}{N} \left(\frac{1 - \pi_M}{\pi_M} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \varepsilon_i(1)^2 + \frac{1 - \pi_{\bar{M}}}{\pi_{\bar{M}}} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \varepsilon_i(0)^2 + \frac{2}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \varepsilon_i(1)\varepsilon_i(0) \right).$$

Their decorrelation estimator is

$$\hat{\tau}_N^{\text{dc}} := \frac{1}{n_M} \sum_{i=1}^N M_i(Y_i(1) - \hat{f}_R(X_i)) - \frac{1}{n_{\bar{M}}} \sum_{i=1}^N \bar{M}_i(Y_i(0) - \hat{f}_{\bar{R}}(X_i)) + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N (\hat{f}_R(X_i) - \hat{f}_{\bar{R}}(X_i))$$

and they propose the following identified, conservative variance estimator based on Neyman's upper-bound

$$\hat{V}_N^{\text{dc}} = \frac{1}{N\pi_M^2} \sum_{i=1}^N M_i(Y_i(1) - \hat{f}_R(X_i))^2 + \frac{1}{N\pi_{\bar{M}}^2} \sum_{i=1}^N \bar{M}_i(Y_i(0) - \hat{f}_{\bar{R}}(X_i))^2.$$

Under the conditions of their proposition guaranteeing asymptotic normality ([Su et al., 2023] Proposition 1), our Proposition 1 provides sharp variance bounds:

Corollary 2. *Let Assumption 2 hold. Further, assume*

- (a) *that the quadruple $\{T, \bar{T}, R, \bar{R}\}$ is a decorrelation sequence as in Lemma 1 in [Su et al., 2023]*
- (b) $\liminf_{N \rightarrow \infty} \text{Var}(\hat{\tau}_N^{\text{dc.oracle}}) > 0$
- (c) *The fourth moment of the population-adjusted outcomes is bounded: $\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \varepsilon_{i,N}^4(q) \leq C$ for $q \in \{0, 1\}$*
- (d) *The treatment probability remains uniformly bounded away from 0, i.e., $\pi_T \in [\alpha, 1 - \alpha]$ for some $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ independent of N .*
- (e) *We have $o_p(1)$ consistency of the outcome models, i.e., $(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N (f_1(X_i) - \hat{f}_R(X_i))^2)^{1/2} = o_p(1)$ and $(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N (f_0(X_i) - \hat{f}_{\bar{R}}(X_i))^2)^{1/2} = o_p(1)$.*

Then

$$\frac{(\hat{\tau}_N^{\text{dc}} - \tau)}{\sqrt{\gamma \hat{V}_N^{\text{dc}}}} \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$$

with $\gamma \leq 1$.




Figure 1: (Left) Comparison of the small-sample bias of the different variance estimators under the sharp null. We plot the log bias of the conventional, Cauchy-Schwarz, and sharp upper bound variance estimators for different levels of informativeness of the covariates. (Right) How the simulation parameter (horizontal axis) changes the Conventional, Cauchy-Schwarz, and sharp upper bound estimates of the cross-term between the population-adjusted potential outcomes (vertical axis).

Proof. The asymptotic normality is proven in [Su et al., 2023]. Condition (a) implies that our Assumption 1 about the random indicators holds. Condition (c) immediately implies that $\varepsilon_N(1)$ and $\varepsilon_N(0)$ are uniformly square-integrable. Thus, the conditions of Proposition 1 are met, and the corollary follows. \square

Remark. V^H is the sharp upper bound given only information on the marginals. Consequently, $\hat{\tau}_N^{dc} \pm z_{1-\alpha/2} \sqrt{\hat{V}_N^H}$ is the asymptotically narrowest conservative Wald-type confidence interval for the decorrelation estimator.

4 Simulation Results

In this section, we perform a simulation study to investigate when sharp variance bounds for linear regression adjustment generate more accurate estimates of this estimator’s true sampling variance. From Section 2.1, we know that the conventional variance estimator is consistent in the case of constant treatment effects. When the sample-adjusted potential outcomes are linearly dependent, the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality is exact. In both cases, sharp variance bounds cannot provide any benefits. The following simulation avoids these extremes and illustrates a simple case in which sharp variance bounds outperform the alternative variance estimators.

Let $p_i \stackrel{i.i.d}{\sim} \text{Bernoulli}(\theta)$, $e_i \stackrel{i.i.d}{\sim} \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$, and $Y_i(0) = \alpha_0 + \beta_0 x_i + e_i$. We then define

$$Y_i(1) = \begin{cases} Y_i(0) & \text{if } p_i = 0 \\ 10 + 0.5e_i & \text{else.} \end{cases}$$

In keeping with the finite-population framework, we only draw the potential outcomes $Y(0)$ and $Y(1)$ once. The randomness in the subsequent simulations stems purely from randomly drawing the treatment indicator Z , i.e., $Y_i^{obs} = Z_i Y_i(1) + (1 - Z_i) Y_i(0)$ inherits its randomness only from Z_i . The parameter θ moves the simulation between the extremes of the sharp null ($\theta = 0$) and linear dependence between the adjusted potential outcomes ($\theta = 1$). For intermediate values of θ , this data-generating process yields heterogeneous effects with a non-linear relationship between the adjusted potential outcomes $\varepsilon(1)$ and $\varepsilon(0)$. Figure 1 (Left) shows the bias (on a logarithmic scale) of the conventional, the Cauchy-Schwarz, and

	Unadjusted		Adjusted	
	Variance Estimate	Ratio	Variance Estimate	Ratio
Conventional	0.199	0.938	0.197	0.940
Cauchy-Schwarz	0.195	0.954	0.194	0.956
Sharp	0.186	-	0.185	-

Table 1: Variance estimates and ratio of the variance estimate to the sharp variance bound. Data are from [Harrison and Michelson, 2012]. The left panel reports results for difference-in-means (unadjusted); the right panel, for linear regression adjustment (adjusted).

our sharp bound estimator of the variance as a function of sample size under the sharp null. While all three variance estimators show small-sample bias, this simulation shows that the bias of our sharp variance estimator is of similar order as the bias of the conventional (EWH robust) variance estimator and diminishes quickly.

Figure 1 (Right) shows estimates of the unidentified covariance in Equation 12. For increasing values of θ , the true correlation between the adjusted potential outcomes $\varepsilon(1)$ and $\varepsilon(0)$ decreases from unity to zero. As expected, there are no benefits when using sharp variance bounds for either of the limiting cases (the sharp null $\theta = 0$ and linear dependence $\theta = 1$). For intermediate values of θ , however, there are non-linear heterogeneous effects and clear benefits of the sharp variance estimator. Q-Q plots of the sample-adjusted outcomes in treatment and control offer a practical tool to assess potential benefits of sharp variance bounds beyond the Cauchy-Schwarz variance estimator. In Appendix D Figure 2, we show the Q-Q plot for simulations with $\theta = 0.5$. We also discuss the conditions under which sharp bounds offer gains in precision.

5 Application

To illustrate the use of sharp variance bounds when average treatment effects are estimated via linear covariate adjustment, we return to the empirical example presented by Aronow et al. [2014], an experiment on fundraising for an organization supporting same-sex marriage [Harrison and Michelson, 2012]. A total of 1,561 subjects were called with a fundraising appeal. Half (781) were randomly assigned to receive an appeal from a caller who identified themselves as LGBT, while 780 received the same appeal but with no mention of the caller’s LGBT identification. The point estimates are negative, suggesting that contributions on average diminished when callers revealed their LGBT identification.

We begin by replicating the sharp upper bound variance reported by Aronow et al. [2014] for the difference-in-means estimator. The results in Table 1 show that the sharp upper bound is lower than the conventional variance estimate. The sharp upper bound is also lower than the Cauchy-Schwarz upper bound estimator.

This dataset features a set of covariates (age, sex, political affiliation) that are jointly significant predictors of the outcome. The right panel of Table 1 shows that the benefits of using sharp upper bounds persist when using linear regression to adjust for these covariates. We find a 6% decrease in variance when using the sharp variance estimator compared to the conventional (robust) variance estimator.

6 Conclusion

This paper extends Fréchet-Hoeffding-type variance bounds to general regression adjustment for two-arm randomized experiments. We provide a consistent estimator for sharp variance

bounds for both linear regression adjustment [Lin, 2013] and a decorrelation method for general regression adjustment [Su et al., 2023]. Moreover, we provide software (in the form of an R package) that enables experimental researchers to make use of this method.

Our sharp variance estimator provides the least conservative variance estimate if no information beyond the marginals of the covariate-adjusted outcomes is known.⁷ This method of variance estimation has practical implications for power calculations, confidence intervals, and significance testing in randomized treatment-control experiments.

That said, sharp variance bounds may provide negligible improvements when the distributions of the adjusted potential outcomes in treatment and control are similar. In many experimental applications, treatment effects appear to be small and homogeneous, in which case sharp bounds will generate variance estimates that are similar to conventional estimates. By the same token, the benefits of sharp variance estimates may be marginal in applications where most of the variation in outcomes is predicted by the observed covariates, as this reduces the heterogeneity in the adjusted outcomes that drives the improvement beyond Neyman’s Cauchy-Schwarz estimator.

Although the benefits of sharp variance bounds may be small in such cases, sharp bounds may nevertheless help clarify when Neyman’s Cauchy-Schwarz variance estimator is already sharp. Even though the Cauchy-Schwarz variance estimator is rarely used in practice, less conservative variance estimators, and sharp estimators in particular, have the potential for large cumulative benefits even if the gains in precision may be modest for individual studies. The potential advantages of sharp variance bounds are especially relevant for biomedical trials, which often involve small numbers of subjects but evaluate treatments that are expected *ex ante* to produce heterogeneous effects. Quite often, such trials use regression adjustment to wring additional precision from limited data, and the method presented here offers an opportunity to estimate the variance in a less conservative manner.

Despite their advantages, sharp variance bounds are limited to experimental designs that reveal just two types of potential outcomes, treated and untreated. It is unclear how to extend Frechét-Hoeffding-type sharp variance bounds to randomized trials in which multiple dosages are assigned and the target parameter is the slope of the dose-response function.

Acknowledgments

We thank Christopher Harshaw, Bodhisattva Sen, Nabarun Deb, Getoar Sopa, and Andres Valdevenito for fruitful discussions. We thank Melissa Michelson for providing replication data.

References

- Peter M. Aronow, Donald P. Green, and Donald K. K. Lee. Sharp bounds on the variance in randomized experiments. *The Annals of Statistics*, 42(3):850–871, 2014. ISSN 0090-5364.
- Rémi Bardenet and Odalric-Ambrym Maillard. Concentration inequalities for sampling without replacement. *Bernoulli*, 21(3):1361–1385, August 2015. ISSN 1350-7265. doi: 10.3150/14-BEJ605.
- Patrice Bertail and Stephan Cléménçon. Bernstein-type exponential inequalities in survey sampling: Conditional poisson sampling schemes. *Bernoulli*, 25(4B):3527–3554, November 2019. ISSN 1350-7265. doi: 10.3150/18-BEJ1101.

⁷Improving variance bounds for complicated designs and under interference is an open problem. In this context, Harshaw et al. [2024] recently investigated optimized variance bounds for linear treatment effect estimators in the class of bounds that are quadratic forms (in the potential outcome vectors).

- Patrice Bertail, Emilie Chautru, and Stephan Cl  men  on. Empirical processes in survey sampling with (conditional) poisson designs. *Scandinavian Journal of Statistics*, 44(1): 97–111, 2017. ISSN 1467-9469. doi: 10.1111/sjos.12243.
- Adam Bloniarz, Hanzhong Liu, Cun-Hui Zhang, Jasjeet S. Sekhon, and Bin Yu. Lasso adjustments of treatment effect estimates in randomized experiments. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 113(27):7383–7390, 2016. doi: 10.1073/pnas.1510506113. URL <https://www.pnas.org/doi/abs/10.1073/pnas.1510506113>.
- Christopher J. Bryan, Elizabeth Tipton, and David S. Yeager. Behavioural science is unlikely to change the world without a heterogeneity revolution. *Nature Human Behaviour*, 5(8): 980–989, August 2021. ISSN 2397-3374. doi: 10.1038/s41562-021-01143-3.
- Peng Ding. A first course in causal inference, 2023.
- Paul J. Ferraro and Juan Jos   Miranda. Heterogeneous treatment effects and mechanisms in information-based environmental policies: Evidence from a large-scale field experiment. *Resource and Energy Economics*, 35(3):356–379, September 2013. ISSN 0928-7655. doi: 10.1016/j.reseneeco.2013.04.001.
- David A. Freedman. On regression adjustments in experiments with several treatments. *The Annals of Applied Statistics*, 2(1), March 2008. ISSN 1932-6157. doi: 10.1214/07-AOAS143. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/0803.3757>. arXiv:0803.3757 [stat].
- Maurice Fr  chet. Sur les tableaux dont les marges et des bornes sont donn  es. *Revue de l’Institut International de Statistique / Review of the International Statistical Institute*, 28(1/2):10–32, 1960. ISSN 03731138. URL <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1401846>.
- Gary L Gadbury. Randomization inference and bias of standard errors. *The American Statistician*, 55(4):310–313, 2001. doi: 10.1198/000313001753272268. URL <https://doi.org/10.1198/000313001753272268>.
- A.S. Gerber and D.P. Green. *Field Experiments: Design, Analysis, and Interpretation*. W. W. Norton, 2012. ISBN 9780393979954. URL <https://books.google.com/books?id=yxEGyWAACAAJ>.
- Kevin Guo and Guillaume Basse. The generalized oaxaca-blinder estimator. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 118(541):524–536, January 2023. ISSN 0162-1459. doi: 10.1080/01621459.2021.1941053.
- Brian F. Harrison and Melissa R. Michelson. Not that there’s anything wrong with that: The effect of personalized appeals on marriage equality campaigns. *Political Behavior*, 34(2):325–344, June 2012. ISSN 1573-6687. doi: 10.1007/s11109-011-9169-6.
- Christopher Harshaw, Joel A. Middleton, and Fredrik S  vje. Optimized variance estimation under interference and complex experimental designs, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2112.01709>.
- Nisha Hickin, Anton K  ll, Roz Shafran, Sebastian Sutcliffe, Grazia Manzotti, and Dean Langan. The effectiveness of psychological interventions for loneliness: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Clinical Psychology Review*, 88:102066, August 2021. ISSN 0272-7358. doi: 10.1016/j.cpr.2021.102066.
- Wassily Hoeffding. Ma  stabinvariante korrelationstheorie. *Schriften des Mathematischen Instituts und des Instituts f  r Angewandte Mathematik der Universit  t Berlin* 5(3), 179–233, 1940.

- Wassily Hoeffding. Probability inequalities for sums of bounded random variables. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 58(301):13–30, 1963. ISSN 0162-1459. doi: 10.2307/2282952.
- Guido Imbens and Konrad Menzel. A causal bootstrap. *The Annals of Statistics*, 49(3): 1460–1488, June 2021. ISSN 0090-5364, 2168-8966. doi: 10.1214/20-AOS2009.
- Piotr Jaworski, Fabrizio Durante, Wolfgang Karl Hardle, and Tomasz Rychlik. *Copula Theory and Its Applications: Proceedings of the Workshop Held in Warsaw, 25-26 September 2009*, volume 198 of *Lecture Notes in Statistics*. Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2010. ISBN 978-3-642-12464-8. doi: 10.1007/978-3-642-12465-5. URL <https://link.springer.com/10.1007/978-3-642-12465-5>.
- Harry Joe. *Dependence Modeling with Copulas*. Chapman and Hall/CRC, New York, June 2014. ISBN 978-0-429-10318-6. doi: 10.1201/b17116.
- David M. Kent, Ewout Steyerberg, and David van Klaveren. Personalized evidence based medicine: predictive approaches to heterogeneous treatment effects. *BMJ*, 363:k4245, December 2018. ISSN 0959-8138, 1756-1833. doi: 10.1136/bmj.k4245.
- Joshua D. Kertzer. Re-assessing elite-public gaps in political behavior. *American Journal of Political Science*, 66(3):539–553, 2022. ISSN 1540-5907. doi: 10.1111/ajps.12583.
- Lihua Lei and Peng Ding. Regression adjustment in completely randomized experiments with a diverging number of covariates. *Biometrika*, 108(4):815–828, December 2021. ISSN 0006-3444. doi: 10.1093/biomet/asaa103.
- Xinran Li and Peng Ding. General forms of finite population central limit theorems with applications to causal inference. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 112(520):1759–1769, 2017. doi: 10.1080/01621459.2017.1295865. URL <https://doi.org/10.1080/01621459.2017.1295865>.
- Winston Lin. Agnostic notes on regression adjustments to experimental data: Reexamining Freedman’s critique. *The Annals of Applied Statistics*, 7(1):295 – 318, 2013. doi: 10.1214/12-AOAS583. URL <https://doi.org/10.1214/12-AOAS583>.
- Hanzhong Liu, Jiyang Ren, and Yuehan Yang. Randomization-based joint central limit theorem and efficient covariate adjustment in stratified 2^k factorial experiments. (arXiv:2103.04050), 2022. doi: 10.48550/arXiv.2103.04050. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2103.04050>. arXiv:2103.04050 [stat].
- Xin Lu, Fan Yang, and Yuhao Wang. Debiased regression adjustment in completely randomized experiments with moderately high-dimensional covariates. (arXiv:2309.02073), September 2023. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2309.02073>. arXiv:2309.02073 [math, stat].
- Luke W. Miratrix, Jasjeet S. Sekhon, and Bin Yu. Adjusting treatment effect estimates by post-stratification in randomized experiments. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)*, 75(2):369–396, 2013. ISSN 1467-9868. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9868.2012.01048.x.
- Jerzy Neyman. On the application of probability theory to agricultural experiments. essay on principles. section 9. *Statistical Science*, 5(4):465–472, 1923. ISSN 0883-4237.
- Giovanni Puccetti and Ruodu Wang. Extremal dependence concepts. *Statistical Science*, 30(4):485–517, 2015. ISSN 0883-4237.

- James M. Robins. Confidence intervals for causal parameters. *Statistics in Medicine*, 7(7):773–785, 1988. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1002/sim.4780070707>. URL <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/sim.4780070707>.
- Donald B. Rubin. Estimating causal effects of treatments in randomized and nonrandomized studies. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 66(5):688–701, 1974. ISSN 1939-2176. doi: 10.1037/h0037350.
- Peter Z. Schochet, Nicole E. Pashley, Luke W. Miratrix, and Tim Kautz. Design-Based Ratio Estimators and Central Limit Theorems for Clustered, Blocked RCTs. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 117(540):2135–2146, October 2022. doi: 10.1080/01621459.2021.190. URL <https://ideas.repec.org/a/taf/jnlasa/v117y2022i540p2135-2146.html>.
- Jeffrey Smith. Treatment effect heterogeneity. *Evaluation Review*, 46(5):652–677, October 2022. ISSN 0193-841X. doi: 10.1177/0193841X221090731.
- Fangzhou Su, Wenlong Mou, Peng Ding, and Martin J. Wainwright. A decorrelation method for general regression adjustment in randomized experiments. (arXiv:2311.10076), November 2023. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2311.10076>. arXiv:2311.10076 [math, stat].
- Aad W. Van Der Vaart and Jon A. Wellner. *Weak Convergence and Empirical Processes*. Springer Series in Statistics. Springer, New York, NY, 1996. ISBN 978-1-4757-2547-6. doi: 10.1007/978-1-4757-2545-2. URL <http://link.springer.com/10.1007/978-1-4757-2545-2>.
- Cédric Villani. *Optimal Transport*, volume 338 of *Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften*. Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2009. ISBN 978-3-540-71049-3. doi: 10.1007/978-3-540-71050-9. URL <http://link.springer.com/10.1007/978-3-540-71050-9>.
- Edward Wu and Johann A. Gagnon-Bartsch. The loop estimator: Adjusting for covariates in randomized experiments. *Evaluation Review*, 42(4):458–488, 2018. doi: 10.1177/0193841X18808003. URL <https://doi.org/10.1177/0193841X18808003>. PMID: 30442034.
- Anqi Zhao, Peng Ding, and Fan Li. Covariate adjustment in randomized experiments with missing outcomes and covariates. (arXiv:2311.10877), March 2024. doi: 10.48550/arXiv.2311.10877. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2311.10877>. arXiv:2311.10877 [stat].

Appendix

A Some Results on Empirical Process Theory for Finite Populations

In this section, we will extend some results of empirical process theory to the finite-population setting. Let $\{T_i\}_{i=1}^N$ be random (sampling) indicators that fulfill Assumption 1, i.e., $\{T_i\}_{i=1}^N$ are either iid. Bernoulli random variables with $P(T_i = 1) = \pi_T$ (in this case, define $n_T := \pi_T N$) or they encode a simple random sample without replacement in which n_T units are sampled from a population of size N . Based on these random sampling indicators, we have $\hat{P}_N = \frac{1}{n_T} \sum_{i=1}^N T_i \delta_{y_i}$ as an (Horvitz-Thompson) approximation to the empirical distribution $P_N = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \delta_{y_i}$ of the population $\{y_i\}_{i=1}^N$.

We are interested in convergence results for

$$\|\hat{P}_N - P_N\|_{\mathcal{F}} = \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \frac{1}{n_T} \sum_{i=1}^N T_i f(y_i) - \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N f(y_i),$$

where \mathcal{F} is some class of measurable functions.⁸ While \hat{P}_N is neither a probability distribution nor a (classical) empirical distribution, these Horvitz-Thompson type-empirical distributions [Bertail et al., 2017] lend themselves to propositions similar to those in empirical process theory. Our goal here is to derive results on which classes of functions \mathcal{F} are P-Glivenko-Cantelli (see Proposition 2).

We will require the following two lemmata provided by Hoeffding [1963]. The first is the well-known result for bounded iid. random variables.

Lemma 2 (Hoeffding Inequality for Bernoulli design). *Let X_1, \dots, X_n be independent with $a_i \leq X_i \leq b_i$ a.s. ($i=1, 2, \dots, n$), then for $t > 0$*

$$P\left(\left|\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n X_i - \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n X_i\right]\right| \geq t\right) \leq 2 \exp\left(-2 \frac{n^2 t^2}{\sum_{i=1}^n (b_i - a_i)^2}\right). \quad (13)$$

Hoeffding extended this result to simple random samples without replacement [Hoeffding, 1963, Bardenet and Maillard, 2015, Bertail and Cl  men  on, 2019]:

Lemma 3 (Hoeffding Inequality for simple random samples without replacement). *Let $\mathcal{Y} = \{y_1, \dots, y_N\}$ be a finite population of N points and let X_1, \dots, X_n be a simple random sample (without replacement) drawn from \mathcal{Y} . Let*

$$a = \min_{1 \leq i \leq N} y_i \quad \text{and} \quad b = \max_{1 \leq i \leq N} y_i \quad (14)$$

Then for all $t > 0$

$$P\left(\left|\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n X_i - \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N y_i\right| \geq t\right) \leq 2 \exp\left(-2 \frac{nt^2}{(b-a)^2}\right). \quad (15)$$

These lemmata are useful because they allow us to bound the Orlicz norm $\|X\|_{\psi_p} = \inf\{C > 0 : \mathbb{E}[\psi_p(\frac{|X|}{C})] \leq 1\}$, where $\psi_p(x) = \exp(x^p) - 1$ for $p \geq 1$. These Orlicz norms, in turn, bound the L_p -norms, $\|X\|_p \leq \|X\|_{\psi_p}$.

The following Lemma [Van Der Vaart and Wellner, 1996, Lemma 2.2.1] gives bounds of the ψ_p -Orlicz-norm based on tail inequalities.

⁸To simplify our presentation, we will refrain from using outer probabilities. To avoid potential measurability issues, we will instead assume that \mathcal{F} is pointwise measurable, see [Van Der Vaart and Wellner, 1996].

Lemma 4. Let X be a random variable with $P(|X| > x) \leq K \exp(-Cx^p)$ for every x , for constants K and C , and for $p \geq 1$. Then its Orlicz norm is bounded by

$$\|X\|_{\psi_p} \leq \left(\frac{1+K}{C}\right)^{1/p}. \quad (16)$$

Bounds on the Orlicz norm, in turn, provide maximal inequalities. We will require the following Lemma [Van Der Vaart and Wellner, 1996, Lemma 2.2.2]:

Lemma 5. For any random variables X_1, \dots, X_m , we have

$$\left\| \max_{1 \leq i \leq m} X_i \right\|_{\psi_p} \leq K \psi_p^{-1}(m) \max_{1 \leq i \leq m} \|X_i\|_{\psi_i}, \quad (17)$$

where K is a constant only depending on ψ_p .

We will now provide a proposition giving a sufficient condition for a class of functions \mathcal{F} to be Glivenko-Cantelli in probability.⁹

Proposition 2 (P-Glivenko-Cantelli by entropy). Let \mathcal{F} be a class of measurable functions with envelope F such that $P_N(\mathcal{F}) \leq \infty$. Let \mathcal{F}_M be the class of functions $f \mathbb{1}[F \leq M]$ for all $f \in \mathcal{F}$. Then under Assumption 1

$$\|\hat{P}_N - P_N\|_{\mathcal{F}} = \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \frac{1}{n_T} \sum_{i=1}^N T_i f(y_i) - \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N f(y_i) \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{in probability} \quad (18)$$

if there exists an $M > 0$ such that

$$\frac{1}{N} \log N(\varepsilon, \mathcal{F}_M, L_1(P_N)) \xrightarrow{P} 0 \quad (19)$$

for every $\varepsilon > 0$.

Proof. By the triangle inequality, we have

$$\mathbb{E} \|\hat{P}_N - P_N\|_{\mathcal{F}} \leq \mathbb{E} \left\| \frac{1}{n_T} \sum_{i=1}^N T_i f(y_i) - \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N f(y_i) \right\|_{\mathcal{F}_M} + 2P_N[F \mathbb{1}[F > M]]$$

for every M . The second term can be made arbitrarily small by choosing M sufficiently large. Thus to prove convergence in mean, it suffices to show that the first term converges to zero for a fixed M . Let \mathcal{G} be an η -net in $L_1(P_N)$ over \mathcal{F}_M , then for any $f \in \mathcal{F}_M$, there exists a $g \in \mathcal{G}$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \frac{1}{n_T} \sum_{i=1}^N T_i f(y_i) - \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N f(y_i) \right| &\leq \left| \frac{1}{n_T} \sum_{i=1}^N T_i g(y_i) - \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N g(y_i) \right| + \left| (\hat{P}_N - P_N)(f - g) \right| \\ &\leq \left\| \frac{1}{n_T} \sum_{i=1}^N T_i f(y_i) - \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N f(y_i) \right\|_{\mathcal{G}} + \left(\frac{N}{n_T} + 1\right)\eta. \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

Consequently,

$$\mathbb{E} \left\| \frac{1}{n_T} \sum_{i=1}^N T_i f(y_i) - \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N f(y_i) \right\|_{\mathcal{F}_M} \leq \mathbb{E} \left\| \frac{1}{n_T} \sum_{i=1}^N T_i g(y_i) - \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N f(g_i) \right\|_{\mathcal{G}} + \left(\frac{N}{n_T} + 1\right)\eta. \quad (21)$$

⁹Note that this proposition is weaker than the classical GC by entropy theorem. The classical result shows that the entropy condition is both necessary and sufficient, and also provides almost sure convergence of $\|\hat{F}_N - F_N\|_{\mathcal{F}}$.

The cardinality of \mathcal{G} can be chosen to be $N(\eta, \mathcal{F}_M, L_1(P_N))$. Under Assumption 1 and Lemma 2 and 3, we have

$$P\left(\left|\frac{1}{n_T} \sum_{i=1}^N T_i g(y_i) - \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N f(g_i)\right| \geq t\right) \leq 2 \exp\left(-2 \frac{n_T t^2}{\frac{N}{n_T} M^2}\right)$$

where we have used that $\sum_{i=1}^N g(y_i)^2/N \leq M^2$ (if necessary after truncating g if required) and that $\frac{N}{n_i} \geq 1$. Consequently, Lemma 4 yields that

$$\left\|\frac{1}{n_T} \sum_{i=1}^N T_i g(y_i) - \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N f(g_i)\right\|_{\psi_2} \leq \sqrt{\frac{3N}{2n_T}} \frac{M}{\sqrt{n_T}}. \quad (22)$$

Bounding the L_1 -norm on the right-hand side of Equation 21 by the ψ_2 -Orlicz-norm, application of Lemma 5 now yields

$$\mathbb{E} \left\| \frac{1}{n_T} \sum_{i=1}^N T_i f(y_i) - \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N f(y_i) \right\|_{\mathcal{F}_M} \leq K \sqrt{1 + N(\eta, \mathcal{F}_M, L_1(P_N))} \sqrt{\frac{3}{2}} \frac{N}{n_T} \frac{M}{\sqrt{N}} + \left(\frac{N}{n_T} + 1\right)\eta, \quad (23)$$

where K is a universal constant. Under Assumption 1, we have $\frac{n_T}{N} \rightarrow \pi_T \in (0, 1)$. Moreover, $\sqrt{\log N(\eta, \mathcal{F}_M, L_1(P_N))} \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}}$ tends to zero in probability by assumption, hence the right side of (23) tends to $(1/\pi_T + 1)\eta$ in probability. The argument is valid for every $\eta > 0$ so that we can conclude that the left side of (23) converges to zero in probability. Consequently $\|\hat{P}_N - P\|_{\mathcal{F}} \rightarrow 0$ in mean and hence in probability. \square

The proof of Proposition 1 will require the estimates \hat{G}_N and \hat{F}_N of the marginals in the finite-population setting to converge weakly to limits G and F . To show this, we will use the bounded-Lipschitz distance. We will require the following Lemma bounding the entropy of this class of functions:

Lemma 6. *Let $BL := \{f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow [-1, 1] \mid f \text{ is } 1\text{-Lipschitz}\}$ be the class of all 1-bounded-Lipschitz functions. Let P_N be such that $\mathbb{E}_{P_N}[|Y|] = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N |y_i| \leq C$ for some constant C . Then*

$$\log N(\varepsilon, BL, L_1(P_N)) \leq A \frac{C}{\varepsilon} \quad (24)$$

for some constant A and for all $\varepsilon > 0$.

Proof. For $\varepsilon > 1$ take $f_0 \equiv 0$ and observe that for any $f \in BL$, we have $\|f - f_0\|_{L_1(P_N)} \leq 1 < \varepsilon$ and hence $N(\varepsilon, BL, L_1(P_N)) = 1$.

Let $0 < \varepsilon < 1$. We will construct an ε -cover of BL (under the $L_1(P_N)$ -norm) with cardinality less than $\exp(A \frac{C}{\varepsilon})$ for some $A > 0$. This will complete the proof as $N(\varepsilon, BL, L_1(P_N))$ will then be bounded by $\exp(A \frac{C}{\varepsilon})$.

Define $B \in \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{1}\{|y_i| \geq B\} \leq \varepsilon. \quad (25)$$

We have $\mathbb{E}_{P_N}[\mathbb{1}\{|y_i| \geq B\}] \leq \frac{C}{B}$ by Markov's Inequality and the first-moment bound. Choosing $B = \lfloor \frac{C}{\varepsilon} \rfloor + 1$ thus satisfies Equation 25. We now construct an ε -grid covering

the interval $[-B, -B]$: Let $a_k := k\varepsilon - B$ for $k = 0, \dots, M$, where $M = 2B = 2\lfloor \frac{C}{\varepsilon} \rfloor + 1$. Additionally, define $B_k := (a_{k-1}, a_k]$ for $k = 1, \dots, M$. For each $f \in BL$, define

$$\tilde{f}(x) = \sum_{k=1}^M \varepsilon \left\lfloor \frac{f(a_k)}{\varepsilon} \right\rfloor \mathbb{1}_{B_k}(x). \quad (26)$$

For $x \in B_k$, we have

$$|f(x) - \tilde{f}(x)| \leq |f(x) - f(a_k)| + |f(a_k) - \tilde{f}(a_k)| \leq 2\varepsilon, \quad (27)$$

where we have used that f is 1-Lipschitz. For values outside of the grid over $[-B, B]$, we have

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i:|y_i| \geq B} |f(y_i) - \tilde{f}(y_i)| \leq \frac{2}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{1}\{|y_i| \geq B\} \leq 2\varepsilon, \quad (28)$$

where in the first inequality we have used that f is bounded. Hence $\|f - \tilde{f}\|_{L_1(P_N)} \leq 4\varepsilon$.

We now want to determine the cardinality of the set $\{\tilde{f} : f \in BL\}$. As f varies over BL , there are at most $2\lfloor \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \rfloor + 1$ choices for $\tilde{f}(a_0)$ (because f is bounded to be in $[-1, 1]$). Note that for any \tilde{f} and $k \in \{1, \dots, M\}$, we have

$$|\tilde{f}(a_k) - \tilde{f}(a_{k-1})| \leq |\tilde{f}(a_k) - f(a_k)| + |f(a_k) - f(a_{k-1})| + |f(a_{k-1}) - \tilde{f}(a_{k-1})| \leq 3\varepsilon. \quad (29)$$

Therefore there are at most 7 choices for $\tilde{f}(a_k)$ once $\tilde{f}(a_{k-1})$ has been chosen.

The collection $\{\tilde{f} : f \in BL\}$ is thus a 4ε -cover (w.r.t. the $L_1(P_N)$ -norm) of BL and has a cardinality upper bounded by $(2\lfloor \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \rfloor + 1)7^{M-1}$. Hence

$$N(4\varepsilon, BL, L_1(P_N)) \leq \left(2\lfloor \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \rfloor + 1\right) 7^{2\lfloor \frac{C}{\varepsilon} \rfloor}, \quad (30)$$

which completes the proof. \square

B Proof of Proposition 1

Proof. We have $\hat{G}_N(\xi) = \frac{1}{\tilde{n}_T} \sum_{i=1}^N T_i \mathbb{1}\{\hat{\varepsilon}_{i,N}(1) \leq \xi\}$ and $\hat{F}_N(\xi) = \frac{1}{\tilde{n}_{\bar{T}}} \sum_{i=1}^N \bar{T}_i \mathbb{1}\{\hat{\varepsilon}_{i,N}(0) \leq \xi\}$. Under Assumption 1.1, \tilde{n}_T and $\tilde{n}_{\bar{T}}$ are binomial random variables, whereas under Assumption 1.2, they are fixed to $\tilde{n}_T = n_T$ and $\tilde{n}_{\bar{T}} = n_{\bar{T}}$. In case either \tilde{n}_T or $\tilde{n}_{\bar{T}}$ are 0, we define $\hat{G}_N = \delta(0)$ or $\hat{F}_N = \delta(0)$, respectively. Let \mathcal{D} be the event that $\tilde{n}_T > 0$ and $\bar{\mathcal{D}}$ the event that $\tilde{n}_{\bar{T}} > 0$. We then have the following (random) expectations $\mathbb{E}_{\hat{G}_N}[\varepsilon_N(1)] = \mathbb{E}_{\hat{G}_N}[\varepsilon_N(1)|\mathcal{D}]P(\mathcal{D}) = \frac{P(\mathcal{D})}{\tilde{n}_T} \sum_{i=1}^N T_i \varepsilon_{i,N}(1)$ and $\mathbb{E}_{\hat{F}_N}[\varepsilon_N(0)] = \frac{P(\bar{\mathcal{D}})}{\tilde{n}_{\bar{T}}} \sum_{i=1}^N \bar{T}_i \varepsilon_{i,N}(0)$.

Now similarly, define $\tilde{G}_N^{(1)}(\xi) = \frac{1}{\tilde{n}_T} \sum_{i=1}^N T_i \mathbb{1}\{\varepsilon_{i,N}(1) \leq \xi\}$ and $\tilde{G}_N^{(2)}(\xi) = \frac{1}{\tilde{n}_T} \sum_{i=1}^N T_i \mathbb{1}\{\varepsilon_{i,N}(1) \leq \xi\}$, and $\tilde{F}_N^{(1)}(\xi) = \frac{1}{\tilde{n}_{\bar{T}}} \sum_{i=1}^N \bar{T}_i \mathbb{1}\{\varepsilon_{i,N}(0) \leq \xi\}$ and $\tilde{F}_N^{(2)}(\xi) = \frac{1}{\tilde{n}_{\bar{T}}} \sum_{i=1}^N \bar{T}_i \mathbb{1}\{\varepsilon_{i,N}(0) \leq \xi\}$.

(i) *Weak convergence of the marginals in probability*

The bounded-Lipschitz (or Fortet–Mourier) distance between two measures μ, ν

$$d_{BL}(\mu, \nu) = \sup \left\{ \int \phi d\mu - \int \phi d\nu; \|\phi\|_{\infty} + \|\phi\|_{Lip} \leq 1 \right\}$$

metrizes weak convergence. Let BL be the space of all real-valued bounded Lipschitz functions (i.e., all $\phi : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that $\|\phi\|_\infty + \|\phi\|_{Lip} \leq 1$). We have

$$d_{\text{BL}}(\tilde{G}_N^{(2)}, G) \leq d_{\text{BL}}(\tilde{G}_N^{(2)}, G_N) + d_{\text{BL}}(G_N, G) \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{in probability,}$$

where the second term converges to 0 because of Assumption 2 and the first by Proposition 2 and Lemma 6. Note that Assumption (b) implies that $\varepsilon_N(1)$ is L_1 -bounded with respect to G_N as required by Lemma 6.

Additionally, we have

$$\begin{aligned} d_{\text{BL}}(\tilde{G}_N^{(1)}, \tilde{G}_N^{(2)}) &= \sup_{\phi \in \text{BL}} \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{G}_N^{(1)}}[\phi(\varepsilon_N)] - \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{G}_N^{(2)}}[\phi(\varepsilon_N)] \\ &= \sup_{\phi \in \text{BL}} \frac{P(\mathcal{D})}{\tilde{n}_T} \sum_{i=1}^N T_i \phi(\varepsilon_{i,N}(1)) - \frac{1}{n_T} \sum_{i=1}^N T_i \phi(\varepsilon_{i,N}(1)) \\ &\leq \sup_{\phi \in \text{BL}} \frac{(n_T P(\mathcal{D}) - \tilde{n}_T) \sum_{i=1}^N T_i \phi(\varepsilon_{i,N}(1))}{n_T \tilde{n}_T} \leq \frac{|n_T P(\mathcal{D}) - \tilde{n}_T|}{n_T}. \end{aligned} \quad (31)$$

Under Assumption 1.1, we have $P(\mathcal{D}) = 1 - (1 - \pi_T)^N \rightarrow 1$. With the law of large numbers, we then have $\frac{(n_T P(\mathcal{D}) - \tilde{n}_T)}{n_T} = o_p(1)$. Under simple random sampling without replacement (Assumption 1.2), $\tilde{n}_T = n_T$, $P(\mathcal{D}) = 1$, and the term vanishes. We thus have $d_{\text{BL}}(\tilde{G}_N^{(1)}, G_N) \xrightarrow{p} 0$ by the triangle inequality, and $\tilde{G}_N^{(1)} \xrightarrow{w} G$ in probability. Similarly, we have $\tilde{F}_N^{(1)} \xrightarrow{w} F$ in probability.

Now

$$\begin{aligned} d_{\text{BL}}(\hat{G}_N, \tilde{G}_N^{(1)}) &= \sup_{\phi \in \text{BL}} \mathbb{E}_{\hat{G}_N}[\phi(\hat{\varepsilon}_N)] - \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{G}_N^{(1)}}[\phi(\varepsilon_N)] \\ &= \sup_{\phi \in \text{BL}} \frac{P(\mathcal{D})}{\tilde{n}_T} \sum_{i=1}^N T_i \phi(\hat{\varepsilon}_{i,N}(1)) - \frac{P(\mathcal{D})}{\tilde{n}_T} \sum_{i=1}^N T_i \phi(\varepsilon_{i,N}(1)) \\ &\leq \frac{P(\mathcal{D})}{\tilde{n}_T} \sum_{i=1}^N T_i |\hat{\varepsilon}_{i,N}(1) - \varepsilon_{i,N}(1)| = o_p(1) \end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

by Assumption (a). Hence $d_{\text{BL}}(\hat{G}_N, G_N) \xrightarrow{p} 0$ by the triangle inequality, and $\hat{G}_N \xrightarrow{w} G$ in probability. Similarly, we have $\hat{F}_N \xrightarrow{w} F$ in probability.

(ii) *Integration to the limit*

Assumption (b) allows us to integrate to the limit. Under Assumption 1, there exists a N_0 such that for all $N \geq N_0$, we have $\frac{P(\mathcal{D})}{\tilde{n}_T} \leq \frac{2}{\pi_T N}$ almost surely. Hence

$$\frac{P(\mathcal{D})}{\tilde{n}_T} \sum_{i=1}^N T_i \varepsilon_{i,N}(1)^2 \mathbb{1}\{\varepsilon_{i,N}(1)^2 \geq \beta\} \leq \frac{2}{\pi_T} \sup_{N \geq N_0} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \varepsilon_{i,N}(1)^2 \mathbb{1}\{\varepsilon_{i,N}(1)^2 \geq \beta\} \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{a.s.}$$

as $\beta \rightarrow \infty$. Hence Assumption (b) implies that the population-adjusted potential outcomes $\varepsilon_{i,N}(1)$ are almost surely uniformly square-integrable with respect to the sequence of random distributions $\{\tilde{G}_N^{(1)}\}$. Similarly $\varepsilon_{i,N}(0)$ are almost surely uniformly square-integrable with respect to $\{\tilde{F}_N^{(1)}\}$. Pick a subsequence $\{N_k\}$ along which $\tilde{G}_{N_k}^{(1)} \xrightarrow{w} G$ almost surely. Integrating to the limit, we have $\mathbb{E}_{\tilde{G}_{N_k}^{(1)}}[\varepsilon_{N_k}(1)^2] \rightarrow \mathbb{E}_G[\varepsilon(1)^2]$ almost surely. Similarly, $\mathbb{E}_{\tilde{F}_{N_k}^{(1)}}[\varepsilon_{N_k}(0)^2] \rightarrow \mathbb{E}_F[\varepsilon(0)^2]$ almost surely.

Additionally,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}_{\hat{G}_N}[\hat{\varepsilon}_N(1)^2] - \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{G}_N^{(1)}}[\varepsilon_N(1)^2] &= \frac{P(\mathcal{D})}{\tilde{n}_T} \sum_{i=1}^N T_i \hat{\varepsilon}_{i,N}(1)^2 - \frac{P(\mathcal{D})}{\tilde{n}_T} \sum_{i=1}^N T_i \varepsilon_{i,N}(1)^2 \quad (33) \\
&= \frac{P(\mathcal{D})}{\tilde{n}_T} \sum_{i=1}^N T_i (\varepsilon_{i,N}(1) + (f_N(X_i) - \hat{f}_N(X_i))^2) - \frac{P(\mathcal{D})}{\tilde{n}_T} \sum_{i=1}^N T_i \varepsilon_{i,N}(1)^2 \\
&= \frac{P(\mathcal{D})}{\tilde{n}_T} \sum_{i=1}^N T_i (f_N(X_i) - \hat{f}_N(X_i))^2 + \frac{2P(\mathcal{D})}{\tilde{n}_T} \sum_{i=1}^N T_i \varepsilon_{i,N}(1) (f_N(X_i) - \hat{f}_N(X_i)) \\
&\leq P(\mathcal{D}) \frac{N}{\tilde{n}_T} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N (f_N(X_i) - \hat{f}_N(X_i))^2 \\
&\quad + P(\mathcal{D}) \frac{N}{\tilde{n}_T} \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \varepsilon_{i,N}(1)^2 \right)^{1/2} \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N (f_N(X_i) - \hat{f}_N(X_i))^2 \right)^{1/2} \\
&\rightarrow 0 \quad \text{in probability,}
\end{aligned}$$

where we used the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality. Moreover, $\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \varepsilon_{i,N}(1)^2$ is bounded because $\varepsilon_N(1)$ is uniformly square-integrable (Assumption (b)). The convergence follows because of Assumption (a). Thus $\mathbb{E}_{\hat{G}_N}[\hat{\varepsilon}_N(1)^2] - \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{G}_N^{(1)}}[\varepsilon_N(1)^2] = o_p(1)$. $\mathbb{E}_{\hat{F}_N}[\hat{\varepsilon}_N(0)^2] - \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{F}_N^{(0)}}[\varepsilon_N(0)^2] = o_p(1)$ follows similarly. We conclude

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}_{\hat{G}_N}[\hat{\varepsilon}_N(1)^2] &\xrightarrow{P} \mathbb{E}_G[\varepsilon(1)^2] \quad \text{and} \quad (34) \\
\mathbb{E}_{\hat{F}_N}[\hat{\varepsilon}_N(0)^2] &\xrightarrow{P} \mathbb{E}_F[\varepsilon(0)^2].
\end{aligned}$$

This L^2 -convergence (in probability) allows us to also conclude that there exists a subsequence $\{N_k\}$ along which $\hat{\varepsilon}_{N_k}(1)$ and $\hat{\varepsilon}_{N_k}(0)$ are square-uniformly integrable with respect to $\{\hat{G}_{N_k}\}$ and $\{\hat{F}_{N_k}\}$ almost surely.

(iii) *Convergence of the extremal joint distributions*

We define the extremal joint distributions $H^H(\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_0) = \min\{G(\varepsilon_1), F(\varepsilon_0)\}$ and $H^L = \max\{0, G(\varepsilon_1) + F(\varepsilon_0) - 1\}$ and want to show that if the marginals converge weakly, so do $\hat{H}_N^H(\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_0) = \min\{\hat{G}_N(\varepsilon_1), \hat{F}_N(\varepsilon_0)\}$ and $\hat{H}_N^L = \max\{0, \hat{G}_N(\varepsilon_1) + \hat{F}_N(\varepsilon_0) - 1\}$. The Levy metric

$$d_L(F_1, F_2) = \inf\{\epsilon > 0 : F_1(x - \epsilon \mathbf{1}_d) - \epsilon \leq F_2(x) \leq F_1(x + \epsilon \mathbf{1}_d) + \epsilon \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^d\}$$

metrizes weak convergence for multivariate cdfs. We have

$$\begin{aligned}
d_L(\hat{H}_N^H, H^H) &= \inf\{\epsilon > 0 : \min\{\hat{G}_N(y_1 - \epsilon), \hat{F}_N(y_0 - \epsilon)\} - \epsilon \leq \min\{G(y_1), F(y_0)\} \quad (35) \\
&\leq \min\{\hat{G}_N(y_1 + \epsilon), \hat{F}_N(y_0 + \epsilon)\} + \epsilon \forall (y_1, y_0) \in \mathbb{R}^2\} \\
&\leq 2(d_L(\hat{G}_N, G) + d_L(\hat{F}_N, F))
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
d_L(\hat{H}_N^L, H^L) &= \inf\{\epsilon > 0 : \max\{0, \hat{G}_N(y_1 - \epsilon) + \hat{F}_N(y_0 - \epsilon) - 1\} - \epsilon \quad (36) \\
&\leq \max\{0, G(y_1) + F(y_0) - 1\} \\
&\leq \max\{0, \hat{G}_N(y_1 + \epsilon) + \hat{F}_N(y_0 + \epsilon) - 1\} + \epsilon \forall (y_1, y_0) \in \mathbb{R}^2\} \\
&\leq 2(d_L(\hat{G}_N, G) + d_L(\hat{F}_N, F)).
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, we have

$$\begin{aligned} d_L(\hat{H}_{N_k}^H, H^H) &\rightarrow 0 \text{ almost surely and} \\ d_L(\hat{H}_{N_k}^L, H^L) &\rightarrow 0 \text{ almost surely.} \end{aligned} \quad (37)$$

We conclude $\hat{H}_N^H \xrightarrow{w} H^H$ and $\hat{H}_N^L \xrightarrow{w} H^L$ in probability.

With $\hat{\varepsilon}_{N_k}(q)$ being uniformly square-integrable with respect to $\{\hat{G}_{N_k}\}$ and $\{\hat{F}_{N_k}\}$ almost surely, we have that $\varepsilon_{N_k}(1)\varepsilon_{N_k}(0)$ is uniformly integrable with respect to $\{\hat{H}_{N_k}^H\}$ and $\{\hat{H}_{N_k}^L\}$ almost surely. Hence

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{\hat{H}_N^H}[\hat{\varepsilon}_N(1)\hat{\varepsilon}_N(0)] &\xrightarrow{P} E_{H^H}[\varepsilon(1)\varepsilon(0)] = \sup_{h \in \mathcal{H}} \mathbb{E}_h[\varepsilon(1)\varepsilon(0)] \text{ and} \\ \mathbb{E}_{\hat{H}_N^L}[\hat{\varepsilon}_N(1)\hat{\varepsilon}_N(0)] &\xrightarrow{P} E_{H^L}[\varepsilon(1)\varepsilon(0)] = \inf_{h \in \mathcal{H}} \mathbb{E}_h[\varepsilon(1)\varepsilon(0)]. \end{aligned} \quad (38)$$

The proposition now follows immediately. \square

C Proof of Corollary 1

Proof. Define $e_{i,N}(z) = Y_i(z) - \beta_{z,N}^\top X_i$. As Li and Ding [2017] point out, conditions (a-c) imply

$$\frac{1}{N} \max_{1 \leq i \leq N} \{(e_{i,N}(z) - \bar{e}_N(z))^2\} = \frac{1}{N} \max_{1 \leq i \leq N} \{\varepsilon_{i,N}(z)^2\} \rightarrow 0. \quad (39)$$

This condition implies square uniform integrability:

$$\sup_N \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i: \varepsilon_{i,N}(z)^2 \geq \beta} \varepsilon_{i,N}(z)^2 \rightarrow 0. \quad (40)$$

Moreover, they show that under these conditions, the difference between the sample covariance and the population covariance is of order $o_p(1)$. Thus $\hat{\beta}_{z,N} - \beta_{z,N} = o_p(1)$ and $\hat{\gamma}_{z,N} - \gamma_{z,N} = o_p(1)$. Hence

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N (f_{z,N}(X_i) - \hat{f}_{z,N}(X_i)) \right)^{1/2} &= \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N (\gamma_{z,N} - \hat{\gamma}_{z,N}) + (\beta_{z,N} - \hat{\beta}_{z,N})^\top X_i \right)^{1/2} \\ &= (\gamma_{z,N} - \hat{\gamma}_{z,N})^{1/2} = o_p(1). \end{aligned} \quad (41)$$

Consequently, the conditions of Proposition 1 are satisfied and the corollary follows. \square

D Practical Considerations regarding Benefits of Sharp Bounds

In this section, we compare the sharp variance estimator for regression adjustment with the conventional and Cauchy-Schwarz variance estimators. For ease of exposition, we focus on linear regression adjustment for which the sample-adjusted potential outcomes are mean-centered. This allows us to switch between second moments and covariances. We will also assume that the random indicators are exhaustive, that is $N - n_T = n_{\bar{T}}$.

Comparing our sharp variance estimator (Equation 9) with the Cauchy-Schwarz variance estimator (Equation 7), we see that they only differ in how they treat the non-identified




Figure 2: (Left) Q-Q plot of the sample-adjusted potential outcomes in treatment and control for our simulation in Section 4 for $\theta = 0.5$. (Right) Q-Q plot of the sample-adjusted potential outcomes from [Harrison and Michelson, 2012].

cross-term. For the sharp variance estimator, the term is estimated based on the cross-moment of the sample-adjusted potential outcomes under the extremal joint distribution (i.e, assuming the sample-adjusted outcomes to be comonotonic). This cross-moment will match the estimate in the Cauchy-Schwarz estimator if and only if the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality yields an equality, that is, when the sample-adjusted potential outcomes are linearly dependent. Deviations from linear dependence can be detected by inspection of Q-Q plots. Figure 2(Left) shows the Q-Q plot for the sample-adjusted potential outcomes from the simulation performed in Section 4 for $\theta = 0.5$, and Figure 2(Right) presents the Q-Q plot of the sample-adjusted potential outcomes from [Harrison and Michelson, 2012], which we discuss in Section 5. Both plots clearly show deviations from the diagonal, apropos of the efficiency gains we found numerically in Figure 1 and Table 1.

In the case of linear regression, the sample-adjusted potential outcomes have zero mean. If we further assume a balanced design, the cross-moment under the extremal joint (Equation 10)

$$\mathbb{E}_{\hat{H}_N^H}(\hat{\varepsilon}_N(1)\hat{\varepsilon}_N(0)) = \sum_{i=1}^P (p_i - p_{i-1}) \hat{\varepsilon}_{(\lceil \frac{n_T p_i}{n} \rceil)1}^{obs} \hat{\varepsilon}_{(\lceil \frac{n_T p_i}{n} \rceil)0}^{obs} = Cov_{\hat{H}_N^H}(\hat{\varepsilon}_1^{obs}, \hat{\varepsilon}_0^{obs})$$

reduces to the covariance between the sorted sample-adjusted potential outcomes. Defining ρ to be the correlation between the sorted sample-adjusted potential outcomes in treatment and control, we have

$$\frac{\mathbb{E}_{\hat{H}_N^H}(\hat{\varepsilon}_N(1)\hat{\varepsilon}_N(0))}{(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \hat{\varepsilon}_{i,N}(1)^2)^{1/2} (\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \hat{\varepsilon}_{i,N}(0)^2)^{1/2}} = \rho.$$

The ratio of the cross-term estimate of the sharp variance estimator and the Cauchy-Schwarz estimator is given by the correlation ρ of the sorted sample-adjusted potential outcomes. In balanced designs, the correlation between sorted sample-adjusted outcomes provides an additional diagnostic tool beyond Q-Q plots to gauge the benefits of the sharp variance estimator compared to the Cauchy-Schwarz variance estimator.

The conventional variance estimator (Equation 8) is looser than the Cauchy-Schwarz variance estimator when the AM-GM inequality is loose. That is the case when the variances in treatment and control differ. It is straightforward to see, however, that very uneven variances in treatment and control lead the variance of the general regression estimator (Equation 5) to be dominated by the identified part. Let $\kappa = \frac{\sigma_1}{\sigma_0}$ be the ratio of the standard deviation of the sample-adjusted potential outcomes in treatment and control. We

then have

$$\frac{N\hat{V}_N^H}{\frac{N-n_T}{n_T}\mathbb{E}_{\hat{G}_N}[\hat{\epsilon}_N(1)^2] + \frac{N-n_{\bar{T}}}{n_{\bar{T}}}\mathbb{E}_{\hat{F}_N}[\hat{\epsilon}_N(0)^2]} = \frac{\frac{N-n_T}{n_T}\kappa^2 + \frac{N-n_{\bar{T}}}{n_{\bar{T}}} + 2\kappa\rho}{\frac{N-n_T}{n_T}\kappa^2 + \frac{N-n_{\bar{T}}}{n_{\bar{T}}}} \rightarrow 1$$

as $\kappa \rightarrow \infty$. Hence, with significantly different variances in treatment and control, the differences among the sharp, Cauchy-Schwarz, and conventional variance estimators become negligible.

Similarly, the differences among these estimators become less relevant for extremely unbalanced designs. We have

$$\frac{N\hat{V}_N^H}{\frac{n_{\bar{T}}}{n_T}\mathbb{E}_{\hat{G}_N}[\hat{\epsilon}_N(1)^2] + \frac{n_T}{n_{\bar{T}}}\mathbb{E}_{\hat{F}_N}[\hat{\epsilon}_N(0)^2]} \rightarrow 1$$

if either $\frac{n_{\bar{T}}}{n_T} \rightarrow \infty$ or $\frac{n_T}{n_{\bar{T}}} \rightarrow \infty$. Biomedical randomized controlled trials tend to use balanced designs, highlighting one key domain that may benefit from sharp variance bounds.

E Properties of Sharp Variance Bounds

We consider a finite population $U_N = \{Y_i(0), Y_i(1)\}_{i=1}^N$, where every unit is associated with two potential outcomes $Y(0)$ and $Y(1)$. Based on this finite population, we have the joint CDF of potential outcomes $\Gamma_N(y_0, y_1) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{1}[Y_i(0) \leq y_0, Y_i(1) \leq y_1]$, which has marginals $G_N(y) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{1}[Y_i(1) \leq y]$ and $F_N(y) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{1}[Y_i(0) \leq y]$. These finite population distributions are useful, as their moments match the finite population quantities we are interested in. Define $Y(1) \sim G_N$. Then, for example, $\mathbb{E}_{G_N}[Y(1)] = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N Y_i(1) = \bar{Y}(1)$ and $\frac{N}{N-1} \text{Var}_{G_N}(Y(1)) = \frac{1}{N-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{i=1}^N (Y_i(1) - \bar{Y}(1))^2 = S^2(Y(1))$. Importantly, the variance of the treatment effect estimators $\hat{\tau}$ considered here (see Sec 2.3) only depends on the potential outcomes through the joint distribution Γ_N . It is thus sensible to restrict our attention to variances of the treatment effect estimator under various joint distributions $\text{Var}_{\Gamma_N}(\hat{\tau})$ (instead of having to consider all possible finite populations U_N).

We want to cleanly separate the issue of identification from the issue of inference. We therefore distinguish between the principal problem of causal inference, namely that $Y_i(0)$ and $Y_i(1)$ are never jointly observed, and the fact that not all $\{Y_i(0)\}_{i=1}^N$ and $\{Y_i(1)\}_{i=1}^N$ are observed but only those with the corresponding treatment assignment. The first problem leads to the fact that the joint distribution Γ_N is never observed; the second to the fact that we do not observe $G_N(y)$ and $F_N(y)$ but instead the estimates $\hat{G}_N(y) = \frac{1}{n_1} \sum_{i=1}^N Z_i \mathbb{1}[Y_i(1) \leq y]$ and $\hat{F}_N(y) = \frac{1}{n_0} \sum_{i=1}^N (1 - Z_i) \mathbb{1}[Y_i(0) \leq y]$. We consider the first an issue of identification and the second one of estimation.

We focus on the issue of identification by assuming the sets of potential outcomes $\{Y_i(1)\}_{i=1}^N$ and $\{Y_i(0)\}_{i=1}^N$ are given but that we have no information on their correspondence, i.e., their joint distribution remains Γ_N unknown. This leads to the following definition:

Definition 1 (Variance bound). *A function $VB: U_N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is said to be design-compatible if it is invariant under permutations of the correspondence of potential outcomes: Consider a permuted population $\tilde{U}_N = \{Y_i(1), Y_{\pi(i)}(0)\}_{i=1}^N$, where π is a permutation of the indices, then design-compatible functions satisfy*

$$VB(U_N) = VB(\tilde{U}_N).$$

Let $\hat{\tau}$ be a treatment effect estimator, and let $\text{Var}_{\Gamma_N}(\hat{\tau})$ be its variance under the joint distribution Γ_N corresponding to a population U_N of potential outcomes. A design-compatible function is said to be a variance bound if $\text{Var}_{\Gamma_N}(\hat{\tau}) \leq \text{VB}(U_N)$ for all possible populations U_N .

Essentially, we want to find functions that have no information on the correspondence of potential outcomes that are upper bounds on the variance of a treatment effect estimator $\text{Var}_{\Gamma_N}(\hat{\tau})$ regardless of what the unknown joint distribution Γ_N is. We call these functions *variance bounds*.

It will turn out that we only have to consider variance bounds that are functionals of the marginals, i.e., $\text{VB} : \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}) \times \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, as this class contains an element that dominates all variance bounds (see Proposition 3). For this class, it is helpful to consider the set of all joint distributions with marginals F_N, G_N , which we denote with $\Pi(F_N, G_N)$ (see for example [Villani, 2009]).

It is natural to ask whether there is an optimal variance bound. We begin by considering the question of an optimal variance bound in the class of variance bounds that are functionals of the marginals. Given marginals F_N, G_N , no variance bound that is purely a functional of the marginals can be smaller than the largest possible variance of the treatment effect estimator under all joints with marginals F_N, G_N . For these variance bounds, we thus have

$$\text{VB}(F_N, G_N) \geq \sup_{\gamma \in \Pi(F_N, G_N)} \text{Var}_{\gamma}(\hat{\tau}). \quad (42)$$

If there exists a variance bound that is attained for some joint γ for every possible set of marginals F_N, G_N , we will call this variance bounds *sharp*¹⁰.

Definition 2 (Sharpness). *A variance bound VB is said to be sharp if for all marginals F_N, G_N , there exists a joint over the potential outcomes $\gamma \in \Pi(F_N, G_N)$ such that*

$$\text{VB}(F_N, G_N) = \text{Var}_{\gamma}(\hat{\tau}).$$

The existence of such sharp variance bounds in the setting of two-arm designs assuming SUTVA is guaranteed by the Fréchet-Hoeffding copula bounds, see Section 2.2.

We will now see that sharp variance bounds are optimal.

Proposition 3. *A sharp variance bound SVB dominates all other variance bounds. Let U_N be an arbitrary population of potential outcomes, let F_N, G_N be the corresponding marginals and let C be an arbitrary variance bound, then*

$$\text{SVB}(F_N, G_N) \leq C(U_N). \quad (43)$$

Proof. Assume there exists a population $U_N = \{Y_i(1), Y_i(0)\}$ (with marginals F_N, G_N) such that $C(U_N) < \text{SVB}(F_N, G_N)$. Because $\text{SVB}(F_N, G_N)$ is sharp, there exists a joint distribution $\gamma \in \Pi(F_N, G_N)$ such that $\text{SVB}(F_N, G_N) = \text{Var}_{\gamma}(\hat{\tau})$. There further exists a permutation π of indices such that $\tilde{U}_N = \{Y_i(1), Y_{\pi(i)}(0)\}$ has the joint distribution γ . Now by design-compatibility of C , we have $C(U_N) = C(\tilde{U}_N)$. Hence, we have $C(\tilde{U}_N) < \text{Var}_{\gamma}(\hat{\tau})$, which is a contradiction. \square

It is unclear if this notion of ‘optimality’ remains useful beyond the setting considered in this paper (i.e., two-arm trials without SUTVA violations, see Section 2.1). In more

¹⁰While the term sharpness was not defined in [Aronow et al., 2014], it is their notion that we try to define here. Recently, a definition of sharpness has been offered by Harshaw et al. [2024]. Our notion of sharpness entails theirs. To stick with the language established in [Aronow et al., 2014], we will call bounds fulfilling our definition sharp and suggest the term weak-sharpness for the definition offered in [Harshaw et al., 2024].

complicated designs, variance bounds may need to be more general functions of the potential outcomes (not only functions of the marginals F_N, G_N). Moreover, it is unclear under which circumstances variance bounds fulfilling our definition of sharpness exist. In settings in which no sharp bounds exist, the corresponding notion of ‘optimality’ becomes void.