

Automatic Doubly Robust Forests

Zhaomeng Chen*

Department of Statistics
Stanford University
zc313@stanford.edu

Junting Duan*

Department of Management Science and Engineering
Stanford University
duanjt@stanford.edu

Victor Chernozhukov

Department of Economics and Center for Statistics and Data Science
Massachusetts Institute of Technology
vchern@mit.edu

Vasilis Syrgkanis

Department of Management Science and Engineering
Stanford University
vsyrgk@stanford.edu

This draft: December 1st, 2024

Abstract

This paper proposes the automatic Doubly Robust Random Forest (DRRF) algorithm for estimating the conditional expectation of a moment functional in the presence of high-dimensional nuisance functions. DRRF combines the automatic debiasing framework using the Riesz representer (Chernozhukov et al., 2022c) with non-parametric, forest-based estimation methods for the conditional moment (Athey et al., 2019; Oprescu et al., 2019). In contrast to existing methods, DRRF does not require prior knowledge of the form of the debiasing term nor impose restrictive parametric or semi-parametric assumptions on the target quantity. Additionally, it is computationally efficient for making predictions at multiple query points and significantly reduces runtime compared to methods such as Orthogonal Random Forest (Oprescu et al., 2019). We establish the consistency and asymptotic normality results of DRRF estimator under general assumptions, allowing for the construction of valid confidence intervals. Through extensive simulations in heterogeneous treatment effect (HTE) estimation, we demonstrate the superior performance of DRRF over benchmark approaches in terms of estimation accuracy, robustness, and computational efficiency.

*These authors contributed equally and are listed alphabetically.

1 Introduction

A wide range of problems in social and life sciences can be framed as estimating the conditional expectation of a moment functional that depends on an unknown nuisance function:

$$\mathbb{E}[m(Z; g_0(x, W)) \mid X = x] := \theta_0(x). \tag{1}$$

Here, $m(z; g)$ is a known moment functional, $g_0(x, w) = \mathbb{E}[Y \mid W = w, X = x]$ is an unknown nuisance regression function, and the observation $Z = (Y, X, W)$ consists of an outcome Y , target covariates X , and additional variables W . A key example is the estimation of heterogeneous treatment effects (HTE) in causal inference, where the goal is to understand how a treatment D affects the outcome Y across different sub-populations or covariate groups defined by X . In HTE estimation, $W = (D, \tilde{X})$ includes the treatment variable D and additional confounders \tilde{X} that need to be controlled for. The estimation of HTE has crucial applications across various fields. For example, in personalized medicine, it helps identify effective treatments tailored to individual patient characteristics. In marketing and business analytics, it guides customer segmentation and enables targeted interventions.

A primary challenge in estimating (1) arises from the high dimensionality of the nuisance regression function. In many applications, it is desirable for g_0 to depend on high-dimensional variables W . For example, in HTE estimation, controlling for a large number of confounders \tilde{X} is crucial to estimate the potential outcomes $g_0(x, w)$. To achieve high-quality predictions in high-dimensional settings, modern machine learning methods with regularization and model selection are frequently used. However, these methods often introduce non-negligible bias as a result of the bias-variance trade-off inherent in optimizing the mean squared error. This bias is problematic for inference, as it leads to poor coverage of confidence intervals for the target estimand, particularly when plug-in estimators based on machine learning methods are used (Chernozhukov et al., 2018a, 2022a).

Much of the prior literature on non-parametric estimation of $\theta_0(x)$ assumes low-dimensional nuisance parameterizations (Wager and Athey, 2018; Athey et al., 2019), which simplifies the estimation process but limits its applicability in real-world applications. On the other hand, some existing works accommodate high-dimensional nuisance functions by constructing Neyman orthogonal moment functionals, which eliminate the first-order effect of the nuisance estimation on the expected moment functional. However, these works typically impose parametric assumptions on the target function $\theta_0(x)$. Chernozhukov et al. (2017a) and Chernozhukov et al. (2022a) study the estimation of average treatment effects (ATE), where $\theta_0(x)$ is a constant over x . Chernozhukov et al. (2017b) and Chernozhukov et al. (2018b) assume $\theta_0(x) = \theta_0^\top \phi(x)$, where θ_0 is sparse and $\phi(x)$ is a known feature mapping. Estimating a non-parametric function $\theta_0(x)$ is inherently more challenging than its parametric counterpart.

In this paper, we propose the Doubly Robust Random Forest (DRRF) algorithm to address these challenges. DRRF employs an automatic debiasing method using the Riesz representer to accommodate high-dimensional nuisance functions and performs non-parametric, forest-based estimation of the conditional functional $\theta_0(x)$. This method is automatic, doubly robust, and computationally efficient for estimating $\theta_0(x)$ at multiple query points x_1, \dots, x_m .

Our method builds upon the automatic debiasing framework from [Chernozhukov et al. \(2022c\)](#) and the two-stage Orthogonal Random Forest (ORF) algorithm proposed in [Oprescu et al. \(2019\)](#). To mitigate the effect of regularization bias of plug-in machine learners, our algorithm constructs a Neyman orthogonal moment functional by incorporating a debiasing term using the Riesz representer associated with the original functional. This debiasing approach is automatic in the sense that it requires no prior knowledge of the form of the debiasing term. We provide an algorithm to estimate the Riesz representer and construct the debiasing term based on the forest lasso algorithm ([Oprescu et al., 2019](#)). Similar to ORF, our method performs a two-stage forest-based algorithm to estimate the kernel weights for each sample point when evaluating $\theta_0(x)$ at a query point x . However, our algorithm is significantly more computationally efficient than ORF when making predictions at multiple query points x_1, \dots, x_m . Specifically, our algorithm estimates the nuisance functions only at the training data points, eliminating the need to re-estimate them for each query point as ORF requires. Since estimating the nuisance functions is typically the most computationally intensive step, our approach substantially reduces computation time when handling a large number of query points.

We show that our estimator is consistent and asymptotically normal, which allows for the construction of asymptotically valid confidence intervals. By incorporating the debiasing term, we derive a doubly robust moment functional that relaxes the convergence rate requirements for the nuisance regression functions needed for consistency. Under appropriate regularity conditions, we show that the estimator achieves the same consistency rate as estimating the conditional functional with oracle nuisance functions, provided that the product of the estimation errors for the nuisance regression function and the Riesz representer remains small. This property accommodates high-dimensional and complex nuisance functions, making our approach particularly advantageous in settings where accurate estimation of the Riesz representer is achievable. Furthermore, under additional conditions, we show that our estimator is asymptotically normal, enabling the construction of confidence intervals using bootstrap methods.

Our work contributes to two streams of recent literature at the intersection of causal inference and machine learning. First, our work builds on the literature on the estimation and inference of treatment effects that are robust to errors introduced by sophisticated machine learning methods. [Chernozhukov et al. \(2017a\)](#) propose the Double Machine Learning (double ML) method, which constructs a Neyman orthogonal moment by residualizing the effects of high-dimensional covariates on both treatments and outcomes. The treatment effect is then estimated through a linear regres-

sion between the residualized variables. They show that their approach achieves \sqrt{n} -consistency and asymptotic normality under mild conditions on the first-stage errors of the machine learners. Chernozhukov et al. (2022c) introduce a debiasing method using the Riesz representer of the score function, which not only ensures Neyman orthogonality but also achieves double robustness for the resulting moment functional. Chernozhukov et al. (2022b) further develop an automatic debiasing procedure to learn the Riesz representation using neural networks and random forests, demonstrating strong empirical performance. While our paper also leverages the Riesz representer debiasing method, we focus on the non-parametric estimation of heterogeneous treatment effects, distinguishing our work from this literature.

Second, our work contributes to the literature on the estimation of conditional moments using machine learning methods. Athey et al. (2019) introduce the Generalized Random Forest (GRF), a flexible tree-based method designed to estimate solutions to conditional moment equations. They propose an adaptive weighting scheme with partitioning in the trees to capture heterogeneity in the quantity of interest. Since GRF can not directly perform high-dimensional local nuisance estimations, it has been combined with global estimations of these nuisance functions in high-dimensional settings. For example, the ForestDRLearner in EconML (Battocchi et al., 2019) integrates GRF with doubly robust estimators of potential outcomes. However, in these hybrid methods, the global estimation in the first stage typically optimizes overall mean squared error, which may not align well with the local estimation at the target point x using the forest algorithm.

On the other hand, Oprescu et al. (2019) extend GRF to the Orthogonal Random Forest (ORF) algorithm by combining the forest-based algorithm with Neyman orthogonal moments. While ORF allows for local fitting of high-dimensional nuisance functions around the target feature, it has several limitations. First, constructing Neyman orthogonal moments in ORF typically requires parametric or semi-parametric assumptions on the data generating process. For example, when estimating HTE, correctly specified models for both the outcome and treatment variables are often necessary for employing double ML to achieve Neyman orthogonality. Second, ORF requires refitting nuisance functions for each target prediction point x , leading to high computational costs when the number of query points is large. In contrast, our DRRF method automatically constructs a Neyman orthogonal and doubly robust moment functional for estimating $\theta_0(x)$ without relying on any parametric or semi-parametric assumptions about the treatment variable. It also facilitates efficient estimation of $\theta_0(x)$ across multiple query points. Additionally, compared to other doubly robust estimators that depend on the inverse of propensity score estimates, such as ForestDRLearner and the one proposed by Zimmert and Lechner (2019), our approach directly estimates the debiasing term, ensuring stability even when the propensity scores are near boundary values. Moreover, our use of forest-based kernel designed to capture heterogeneity in the target quantity is more effective than the Gaussian kernel used by Zimmert and Lechner (2019), which also suffers from the curse of dimensionality.

We conduct extensive simulations to demonstrate the superior performance of the DRRF algorithm in HTE estimation over benchmark approaches, including variants of ORF and GRF. We identify three main advantages of DRRF. First, like ORF, DRRF performs local fitting of nuisance functions and generally outperforms GRF variants that rely on global fitting. Second, DRRF performs automatic debiasing and does not require a well-specified model for the treatment variable. When ORF incorrectly specifies the model for the treatment variable, it can have significant bias or variance, whereas DRRF can still provide accurate estimates. Lastly, DRRF is significantly more computationally efficient than ORF, with much shorter evaluation runtime when estimating at multiple target query points.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we introduce our doubly robust conditional moment estimation procedure. In particular, we define the general framework in Section 2.3 and propose the Doubly Robust Random Forest algorithm in Section 2.4 as an efficient implementation of the general framework. In Section 3, we provide theoretical results that establish the consistency and asymptotic normality of our estimator under appropriate conditions. Finally, in Section 4, we conduct comprehensive synthetic data simulations to demonstrate the advantages of our method over benchmark approaches.

2 Doubly Robust Conditional Moment Estimation

2.1 Problem Statement

Consider a dataset with $2n$ i.i.d. observations $Z_i = (Y_i, X_i, W_i)$, where each observation Z_i contains a scalar outcome of interest Y_i , target covariates X_i , and additional variables W_i . This paper provides an automatic, doubly robust, and computationally efficient approach for estimating the conditional expectation of a moment functional

$$\theta_0(x) = \mathbb{E}[m(Z; g_0(x, W)) \mid X = x], \quad (2)$$

evaluated at multiple target points $x = x_1, \dots, x_m$. Here, $g_0(x, w)$ is an unknown nuisance regression function defined by $g_0(x, w) := \mathbb{E}[Y \mid W = w, X = x]$, and $m(z; g)$ is a known moment functional that depends on a data observation z and a possible regression function g . We assume that the target feature space $\mathcal{X} = [0, 1]^d$ has a fixed dimension d , and that X has a density bounded away from both zero and infinity. We allow the dimension of W to be large and grow with n , positioning the problem in a high-dimensional setting where the nuisance regression function can depend on a significant number of variables.

To provide concrete examples of (2), we consider the estimation of heterogeneous treatment effect (HTE) in Examples 1 and 2. These examples also highlight the importance of including a large number of covariates in the nuisance regression function g_0 , as doing so enhances the plausibility of

the unconfoundedness assumption in treatment effect estimation.

Example 1 (Conditional Average Treatment Effect). Suppose that D is a binary treatment variable. Our objective is to estimate the average treatment effect conditional on the target covariates X :

$$\theta_0(x) = \mathbb{E}[Y(1) - Y(0) \mid X = x],$$

at multiple values x . Under the unconfoundedness assumption that $D \perp\!\!\!\perp Y(d) \mid X, \tilde{X}$, we have

$$\theta_0(x) = \mathbb{E} \left[g_0(x, (1, \tilde{X})) - g_0(x, (0, \tilde{X})) \mid X = x \right].$$

In this example, $W := (D, \tilde{X})$ includes the treatment indicator D and additional control covariates \tilde{X} . We take $m(z; g)$ in (2) to be $m(z; g) = g(x, (1, \tilde{x})) - g(x, (0, \tilde{x}))$.

Example 2 (Conditional Average Marginal Effect). With continuous treatment variable D , the conditional average marginal effect is defined by

$$\theta_0(x) = \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\partial Y(D)}{\partial d} \mid X = x \right].$$

Under the unconfoundedness assumption that $D \perp\!\!\!\perp Y(d) \mid X, \tilde{X}$,

$$\theta_0(x) = \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\partial g_0(x, (D, \tilde{X}))}{\partial d} \mid X = x \right].$$

Here, we take $W := (D, \tilde{X})$ and $m(z; g)$ in (2) to be $m(z; g) = \partial g(x, (d, \tilde{x})) / \partial d$.

Notations. In the following, we define $\|g\|_x = (\mathbb{E}[g(x, W)^2 \mid X = x])^{1/2}$ and let \mathcal{G}_x be the set of functions such that $\|g\|_x < \infty$. We use $f(n) = \omega(g(n))$ to denote that f asymptotically dominates g , i.e., $f(n)/g(n) \rightarrow \infty$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Additionally, $f(n) = \Theta(g(n))$ denotes that f is asymptotically bounded by g both from above and below, i.e., $f(n) = O(g(n))$ and $g(n) = O(f(n))$.

2.2 Riesz Representer and Debiased Moment Functional

In this section, we show how to adapt the automatic debiasing method using the Riesz representer (Chernozhukov et al., 2022c) to estimate $\theta_0(x)$ in our setup. To apply the Riesz representation theorem, we assume that, for any $x \in \mathcal{X}$, the conditional expected moment $\mathbb{E}[m(Z; g(x, W)) \mid X = x]$ is a continuous linear functional of g with domain \mathcal{G}_x .

By the Riesz representation theorem, there exists a unique function $\alpha_0 \in \mathcal{G}_x$, called the Riesz representer (RR), such that for any $g \in \mathcal{G}_x$,

$$\mathbb{E}[m(Z; g(x, W)) \mid X = x] = \mathbb{E}[\alpha_0(x, W)g(x, W) \mid X = x]. \quad (3)$$

We illustrate the Riesz representer in the context of CATE estimation in Example 1.

Example 1 continued (Conditional Average Treatment Effect). Note that for any function $g \in \mathcal{G}_x$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}[g(x, (1, \tilde{X})) - g(x, (0, \tilde{X})) \mid X = x] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\frac{D}{\mathbb{P}(D = 1 \mid \tilde{X}, X = x)} - \frac{1 - D}{\mathbb{P}(D = 0 \mid \tilde{X}, X = x)} \right) g(x, W) \mid X = x \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, under mild conditions,¹ the Riesz representer $\alpha_0 \in \mathcal{G}_x$ is given by

$$\alpha_0(x, W) = \frac{D}{\mathbb{P}(D = 1 \mid \tilde{X}, X = x)} - \frac{1 - D}{\mathbb{P}(D = 0 \mid \tilde{X}, X = x)}.$$

The Riesz representer is crucial in the debiased machine learning literature as it enables the construction of a debiased moment functional $\psi(Z; \alpha_0, g)$ for $m(Z; g)$, given by

$$\psi(Z; \alpha_0, g) := m(Z; g(X, W)) + \alpha_0(X, W)(Y - g(X, W)). \quad (4)$$

It is straightforward to show that the debiased moment functional ψ satisfies $\mathbb{E}[\psi(Z; \alpha_0, g_0) \mid X = x] = \theta_0(x)$ by conditioning on X and W and applying the law of iterated expectations. Therefore, we can estimate $\theta_0(x)$ through a plug-in weighted average of $\psi(Z; \hat{\alpha}, \hat{g})$, using estimators for both g_0 and α_0 . Importantly, the debiased moment functional $\psi(Z; \alpha, g)$ is locally Neyman orthogonal, meaning that the regression estimator \hat{g} and the RR estimator $\hat{\alpha}$ have no first-order effect on the moment at the target point x . Furthermore, $\psi(Z; \alpha, g)$ is doubly robust for the estimation of $\theta_0(x)$, which allows our estimator to achieve a fast convergence rate under mild consistency requirement for the nuisance estimators \hat{g} and $\hat{\alpha}$. We will elaborate on this property in our theoretical results in Section 3. In Propositions 1 and 2 below, we formally state the local Neyman orthogonality and double robustness properties of the debiased moment functional $\psi(Z; \alpha, g)$.

Proposition 1 (Local Orthogonality). *For any fixed estimators \hat{g} for the regression function and $\hat{\alpha}$ for the Riesz representer, the local gradients of ψ with respect to g and α satisfy*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\nabla_g \psi(Z; \alpha_0, g_0)[\hat{g} - g_0] \mid X = x] &= 0, \\ \mathbb{E}[\nabla_\alpha \psi(Z; \alpha_0, g_0)[\hat{\alpha} - \alpha_0] \mid X = x] &= 0. \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

Proposition 2 (Double Robustness). *For any fixed estimators \hat{g} for the regression function and $\hat{\alpha}$ for the Riesz representer,*

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}[\psi(Z; \hat{\alpha}, \hat{g}) \mid X = x] - \theta_0(x) \\ &= - \mathbb{E}[(\hat{\alpha}(x, W) - \alpha_0(x, W))(\hat{g}(x, W) - g_0(x, W)) \mid X = x]. \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

¹For example, it suffices to assume that $\mathbb{P}(D = 1 \mid \tilde{X}, X = x)$ is bounded away from 0 and 1, so that the Riesz representer $\alpha_0(x, W)$ defined by the propensity scores satisfies $\alpha_0 \in \mathcal{G}_x$.

In Proposition 1, the local orthogonality implies that the conditional expectation of the debiased moment functional is insensitive to local estimation errors in the nuisance functions \hat{g} and $\hat{\alpha}$ around their true values. The double robustness in Proposition 2 ensures the bias of the plug-in estimators of ψ converges to zero at the rate determined by the product of the convergence rates of $\hat{\alpha}$ and \hat{g} . This property is crucial since it indicates that a fast convergence rate for the estimation of θ_0 can be achieved without requiring highly accurate estimates of either g_0 or α_0 individually. The double robustness property accommodates complex nuisance regression functions with high-dimensional parameterizations and is particularly desirable in scenarios where accurate estimation of the Riesz representer is achievable.

2.3 Doubly Robust Estimation

Now, we introduce our doubly robust procedure for estimating $\theta_0(x)$. We first outline the procedure for estimating $\theta_0(x)$ at a single target point x , and then demonstrate how to efficiently estimate $\theta_0(x)$ at a large number of query points.

To estimate $\theta_0(x)$, we begin by splitting the $2n$ observations $Z_i = (Y_i, X_i, W_i)$ into two halves. The second half of the data is used to construct the regression estimator \hat{g} and the RR estimator $\hat{\alpha}$, while the first half is utilized to compute similarity weights and construct a plug-in estimator of $\theta_0(x) = \mathbb{E}[\psi(Z; \alpha_0, g_0) | X = x]$. Specifically, the procedure consists of the following two steps:

1. First step: Construct the regression estimator \hat{g} and the RR estimator $\hat{\alpha}$ using the second half of the data $Z_{n+1:2n} := \{Z_{n+1}, \dots, Z_{2n}\}$ with some guarantee (to be made precise in Section 3) on the conditional root mean squared error at x :

$$\mathcal{E}(\hat{g}, \hat{\alpha}) := \|\hat{g} - g_0\|_x \cdot \|\hat{\alpha} - \alpha_0\|_x. \quad (7)$$

Evaluate $\hat{g}(X_i, W_i)$ and $\hat{\alpha}(X_i, W_i)$ for each $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$.

2. Second step: Compute similarity weights (kernels) $K(x, X_i, Z_{1:n}, \xi)$ based on the first half of the data $Z_{1:n} := \{Z_1, \dots, Z_n\}$. Estimate $\theta_0(x)$ via the plug-in weighted average of debiasing moment functional ψ with $\hat{g}(X_i, W_i)$ and $\hat{\alpha}(X_i, W_i)$:

$$\hat{\theta}(x) = \sum_{i=1}^n K(x, X_i, Z_{1:n}, \xi) [m(Z_i; \hat{g}(X_i, W_i)) + \hat{\alpha}(X_i, W_i)(Y_i - \hat{g}(X_i, W_i))]. \quad (8)$$

In the second step, the weight $K(x, X_i, Z_{1:n}, \xi)$ is estimated based on $Z_{1:n}$ and measures the importance of the sample point X_i for estimating $\theta_0(x)$. In this paper, we consider the sub-sampled

kernel that is obtained by averaging B sub-samples of the base kernel \tilde{K} :

$$K(x, X_i, Z_{1:n}, \xi) = \frac{1}{B} \sum_{b=1}^B \tilde{K}(x, X_i, Z_{S_b}, \xi_b), \quad (9)$$

wheres $\{Z_{S_b}\}_{b=1}^B$ are random size- s sub-samples of $\{Z_1, \dots, Z_n\}$, ξ_b represents the internal randomness of the base kernel, and ξ contains the randomness from both sub-sampling and $\{\xi_b\}_{b=1}^B$. The base kernel \tilde{K} satisfies $\tilde{K}(x, X_i, Z_{S_b}, \xi_b) = 0$ for any $i \notin S_b$ and $\sum_{i \in S_b} \tilde{K}(x, X_i, Z_{S_b}, \xi_b) = 1$ for all b .

In Section 2.4, we propose a data-efficient tree-based algorithm to construct the base kernel \tilde{K} , which directly targets maximizing the heterogeneity of $\theta_0(x)$. Additionally, we demonstrate in Section 2.4 the use of the forest lasso algorithm for estimating the nuisance functions in the first step of our two-step procedure.

Estimation at multiple points. In many practical applications, we are often interested in simultaneously estimating $\theta_0(x)$ at a set of points $x = x_1, \dots, x_m$. Observe that our estimator in (8) depends on x only through the kernels $K(x, X_i, Z_{1:n}, \xi)$. Therefore, we can pre-compute and store $\{m(Z_i; \hat{g}(X_i, W_i)) + \hat{\alpha}(X_i, W_i)(Y_i - \hat{g}(X_i, W_i))\}_{i=1}^n$ based on the training data. To estimate $\theta_0(x_1), \dots, \theta_0(x_m)$, it is then sufficient to evaluate the kernel $K(x, X_i, Z_{1:n}, \xi)$ at $x = x_1, \dots, x_m$ for each $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$. Importantly, our estimator eliminates the need to re-estimate the nuisance functions at each target point x_i , significantly improving the efficiency of the algorithm.

A key distinction between our method and the Orthogonal Random Forest (ORF) approach (Oprescu et al., 2019), beyond the use of the Riesz debiasing function, lies in the estimation and utilization of the nuisance functions. Specifically, unlike ORF, our procedure estimates the nuisance functions at the sample covariates X_i rather than at the target point x , and incorporates these estimates into the plug-in estimator for $\theta_0(x)$. This modification allows for the pre-computation and storage of the nuisance function estimates. As a result, when querying multiple points x_1, \dots, x_m , our method avoids re-estimating the nuisance functions at each target point, significantly accelerating the estimation process. However, this modification makes the derivation of the asymptotic distribution results for our estimator more challenging, as it requires establishing a uniform bound on the nuisance error. This is accomplished in our proof of Theorem 2.

2.4 Doubly Robust Random Forest

In this section, we introduce the Doubly Robust Random Forest (DRRF) for estimating $\theta_0(x)$, which provides an efficient implementation of the doubly robust estimation procedure in Section 2.3. Specifically, we outline the estimation process for the nuisance functions g_0 and α_0 in Section 2.4.1 and detail the construction of the forest kernel in Section 2.4.2.

2.4.1 Estimation of g_0 and α_0

In practice, our framework allows for the use of a variety of methods for estimating the nuisance functions g_0 and α_0 . However, to provide a concrete example and establish the foundation for the theoretical results of our estimator, we adopt a specific form of the nuisance regression g_0 following [Oprescu et al. \(2019\)](#). Specifically, we assume that $g_0(x, w) = h(w, \nu_g(x))$ for some known function h and unknown function $\nu_g : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d_\nu}$. We consider the function h such that $\mathcal{H}_x := \{g \in \mathcal{G}_x : g(x, w) = h(w, \nu(x)) \text{ for some function } \nu : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d_\nu}\}$ is a closed linear subspace of \mathcal{G}_x . For example, this holds when $h(w, \nu(x)) = r(w)^\top \nu(x)$ for some function r , under mild conditions.² We allow the dimension d_ν to grow with n .

Consequently, the Riesz representer $\alpha_0(x, w)$ can be projected onto the space \mathcal{H}_x , yielding $\alpha_{\mathcal{H}_x}(x, w)$ such that for all $g \in \mathcal{H}_x$,

$$\mathbb{E}[m(Z; g(X, W)) \mid X = x] = \mathbb{E}[g(X, W)\alpha_{\mathcal{H}_x}(X, W) \mid X = x].$$

Therefore, without loss of generality, we can consider the Riesz representer $\alpha_0(w, x)$ as taking the form $h(w, \nu_\alpha(x))$, with the same function h and an unknown function $\nu_\alpha : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d_\nu}$.

Suppose that the unknown functions ν_g and ν_α can be identified as the minimizers of the following local losses with known loss functions l_g and l_α :

$$\nu_g(x) = \arg \min_{\nu \in V} \mathbb{E}[l_g(Z; \nu) \mid X = x],$$

and

$$\nu_\alpha(x) = \arg \min_{\nu \in V} \mathbb{E}[l_\alpha(Z; \nu) \mid X = x],$$

where V is a bounded space.

Example 4 (Locally Linear Parameterization). Consider the case where the function h is linear in w locally around each x , taking the form $h(w, \nu(x)) = w^\top \nu(x)$. Since g_0 is the conditional expectation of the outcome Y , we can define the loss function l_g for ν_g as the squared loss $l_g(Z; \nu) = (Y - W^\top \nu)^2$. Moreover, the Riesz representer satisfies $\mathbb{E}[f_j(X, W)\alpha_0(X, W) - m(Z; f_j(X, W)) \mid X = x] = 0$ for all $f_j(x, w) := w_j$ in \mathcal{H}_x . Let $\tilde{m}(Z; W) = (m(Z; W_1), \dots, m(Z; W_{d_\nu}))^\top$. Under the covariance condition $\mathbb{E}[WW^\top \mid X = x] \succ 0$, we can take the loss function l_α for ν_α to be $l_\alpha(Z; \nu) = (W^\top \nu)^2 - 2\tilde{m}(Z; W)^\top \nu$.

Next, we demonstrate the use of the Forest Lasso algorithm proposed by [Oprescu et al. \(2019\)](#) to estimate g_0 and α_0 in the first step of the doubly robust estimation procedure. Specifically, we run the tree learner defined in Section 2.4.2 on $\{Z_{n+1}, \dots, Z_{2n}\}$ based on B subsamples of size s to

²See Appendix A.2 for a proof.

obtain kernels $K(\cdot, X_i, Z_{n+1:2n}, \xi)$ for $i = n + 1, \dots, 2n$. Then, we solve the lasso problems

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{\nu}_g(\cdot) &= \arg \min_{\nu \in V} \sum_{i=n+1}^{2n} K(\cdot, X_i, Z_{n+1:2n}, \xi) l_g(Z_i; \nu) + \lambda_g \|\nu\|_1, \\ \hat{\nu}_\alpha(\cdot) &= \arg \min_{\nu \in V} \sum_{i=n+1}^{2n} K(\cdot, X_i, Z_{n+1:2n}, \xi) l_\alpha(Z_i; \nu) + \lambda_\alpha \|\nu\|_1\end{aligned}\tag{10}$$

at X_1, \dots, X_n . In contrast to [Oprescu et al. \(2019\)](#), which applies Forest Lasso at the target point x , our approach runs the algorithm at the training data points X_1, \dots, X_n . This modification eliminates the need to rerun the algorithm for each new target point once we solve the n Forest Lasso programs associated with X_1, \dots, X_n .

As to be shown in [Section 3](#), with appropriately chosen regularization parameters λ_g and λ_α , the estimators $\hat{\nu}_g$ and $\hat{\nu}_\alpha$ are consistent under the assumptions that the high-dimensional functions ν_g and ν_α are sparse and supported on a finite set of dimensions, along with other regularity conditions. These results are formalized in [Proposition 3](#), which will then be used to establish the asymptotic normality of the target parameter $\theta_0(x)$ in [Theorem 3](#).

2.4.2 Forest kernel

We proceed to describe the forest algorithm for computing the similarity weights $K(x, X_i, Z_{1:n}, \xi)$ in [\(10\)](#) and in the second step of our estimation. As stated in [Section 2.3](#), the kernel $K(x, X_i, Z_{1:n}, \xi)$ is the average over B base kernels $\tilde{K}(x, X_i, Z_{S_b}, \xi_b)$ constructed from random size- s sub-samples S_b for $b = 1, \dots, B$. Our algorithm combines the debiased moment functional with the tree-based learner from ORF ([Oprescu et al., 2019](#)) to compute the base kernel \tilde{K} .

For each sub-sample S_b , we randomly partition it into two equal-sized subsets S_b^1 and S_b^2 . We use S_b^1 to grow a tree learner that splits the feature space \mathcal{X} into small subspaces, and use S_b^2 to evaluate the similarity weights.

Splitting algorithm. For S_b^1 , we start from a root node containing the entire space \mathcal{X} . At each node P , we implement the following three-stage procedure:

1. Estimate ν_g by solving an equally weighted Lasso problem

$$\hat{\nu}_g = \arg \min_{v \in V} \frac{1}{|P \cap S_b^1|} \sum_{i \in P \cap S_b^1} l_g(Z_i; v) + \lambda_g \|v\|_1.$$

Estimate ν_α using the same method.³

³In practice, one can add a small ridge penalty to the minimization problems to improve stability, especially when the sample size $|P \cap S_b^1|$ is small. In our implementation, we apply this approach when estimating ν_α .

2. For each $i \in P \cap S_b^1$, compute the nuisance estimates $\hat{g}(X_i, W_i) = h(W_i, \hat{\nu}_g)$ and $\hat{\alpha}(X_i, W_i) = h(W_i, \hat{\nu}_\alpha)$.
3. For each potential split, calculate $\hat{\theta}$ at the resulting two children nodes C_1 and C_2 as:

$$\hat{\theta}_{C_k} = \frac{1}{|C_k \cap S_b^1|} \sum_{i \in C_k \cap S_b^1} [m(Z_i; \hat{g}(X_i, W_i)) + \hat{\alpha}(X_i, W_i)(Y_i - \hat{g}(X_i, W_i))], \quad k = 1, 2.$$

Denote $\psi_i = m(Z_i; \hat{g}(X_i, W_i)) + \hat{\alpha}(X_i, W_i)(Y_i - \hat{g}(X_i, W_i))$. Find the split that minimizes the sum of squares error (SSE)⁴

$$\sum_{i \in C_1 \cap S_b^1} (\hat{\theta}_{C_1} - \psi_i)^2 + \sum_{i \in C_2 \cap S_b^1} (\hat{\theta}_{C_2} - \psi_i)^2.$$

Throughout the tree-growing process, we need to maintain the tree properties specified in Assumption A.1.

Weight estimation. For each tree based on S_b^1 , let $L_b(x)$ denote the leaf that contains the target value x . We compute the base kernels $\tilde{K}(x, X_i, Z_{S_b}, \xi_b)$ for each point i as

$$\tilde{K}(x, X_i, Z_{S_b}, \xi_b) = \frac{\mathbb{1}((i \in S_b^2) \cap (X_i \in L_b(x)))}{|S_b^2 \cap L_b(x)|}.$$

Note that we only assign positive weights $\tilde{K}(x, X_i, Z_{S_b}, \xi_b)$ to the sample points in S_b^2 .

Estimation at multiple points. Following the discussion in Section 2.3, we pre-compute and store the quantities $\{m(Z_i; \hat{g}(X_i, W_i)) + \hat{\alpha}(X_i, W_i)(Y_i - \hat{g}(X_i, W_i))\}_{i=1}^n$ on the training data. Additionally, we store the B trees constructed by our splitting algorithm. With these stored trees, we can straightforwardly evaluate the kernel $K(x, X_i, Z_{1:n}, \xi)$ at a set of target points $x = x_1, \dots, x_m$ for each $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$. Now we have all the ingredients to estimate $\theta_0(x_1), \dots, \theta_0(x_m)$ using DRRF.

3 Theoretical Results

3.1 Consistency

First, we show that the doubly robust estimator $\hat{\theta}(x)$ with sub-sampled kernels, described in Section 2.3, is consistent for estimating $\theta_0(x)$. Following this, we establish the consistency of the

⁴This is equivalent to finding a split for the standard regression tree with response ψ_i for each sample point. Note that minimizing the SSE is also equivalent to maximizing the heterogeneity score $\frac{1}{|C_1 \cap S_b^1|} (\sum_{i \in C_1 \cap S_b^1} (\psi_i - \hat{\theta}_P))^2 + \frac{1}{|C_2 \cap S_b^1|} (\sum_{i \in C_2 \cap S_b^1} (\psi_i - \hat{\theta}_P))^2$, where $\hat{\theta}_P$ is the estimated $\hat{\theta}$ at the parent node.

DRRF estimator proposed in Section 2.4, which provides an effective implementation of the general estimator given in Section 2.3.

To establish consistency of the general doubly robust estimator from Section 2.3, we assume that the general base kernel \tilde{K} satisfies the following properties:

Assumption 1 (Honesty). *For any set S_b and sample i , the base kernel $\tilde{K}(x, X_i, Z_{S_b}, \xi_b)$ satisfies*

$$\tilde{K}(x, X_i, Z_{S_b}, \xi_b) \perp\!\!\!\perp m(Z_i; \hat{g}(X_i, W_i)) + \hat{\alpha}(X_i, W_i)(Y_i - \hat{g}(X_i, W_i)) \mid X_i, \{Z_j\}_{j \in S_b/\{i\}}.$$

Assumption 2 (Kernel Shrinkage). *For any size- s subset S_b of the data,*

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\max_i \left\{ \|X_i - x\| : \tilde{K}(x, X_i, Z_{S_b}, \xi_b) > 0 \right\} \right] \leq \epsilon(s).$$

Assumption 1 ensures the conditional independence of the base kernel and the estimated debiased moment functional. Assumption 2 states that, in expectation, positive weights are assigned only to sample points whose feature X_i is sufficiently close to the target x . It is straightforward to verify that Assumption 1 holds for the DRRF algorithm defined in Section 2.4. Moreover, following Wager and Athey (2018), the DRRFs that satisfy the forest regularity conditions specified in Assumption A.1 achieve a kernel shrinkage rate of $\epsilon(s) = O(s^{-1/(2\alpha d)})$,⁵ which decays polynomially in s .

Additionally, we impose the following Assumption 3 on the debiased moment functional, which introduces standard boundedness and regularity conditions on the moment functional.

Assumption 3. 1. (Boundedness). *There exists a bound ψ_{\max} such that $|\psi(Z_i; \alpha, g)| \leq \psi_{\max}$ for any observation Z_i and functions $g, \alpha \in \mathcal{G}_x$.*

2. (Smoothness). *The moment $\mathbb{E}[\psi(Z; \alpha, g) \mid X = x]$ is L -Lipschitz in x , uniformly over all functions $g, \alpha \in \mathcal{G}_x$.*

Now we formally state the consistency result for the general doubly robust estimator $\hat{\theta}(x)$ proposed in Section 2.3.

Theorem 1 (Consistency of the General Doubly Robust Estimator). *Define $\mathcal{E}(\hat{g}, \hat{\alpha}) = \|\hat{g} - g_0\|_x \cdot \|\hat{\alpha} - \alpha_0\|_x$. Suppose Assumptions 1, 2, and 3 hold. Then*

$$\hat{\theta}(x) - \theta_0(x) = O_p \left(\sqrt{\frac{1}{B}} + \sqrt{\frac{s}{n}} + \epsilon(s) + \mathcal{E}(\hat{g}, \hat{\alpha}) \right).$$

Furthermore, suppose $s \rightarrow \infty, s = o(n), B \geq n/s, \epsilon(s) \rightarrow 0$, and $\mathcal{E}(\hat{g}, \hat{\alpha}) \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Then, as

⁵The parameter $\alpha = \log(\rho^{-1})/(\pi \log((1-\rho)^{-1}))$, where ρ represents the smallest fraction of leaves on each side of the split, and π/d is the smallest probability that the split occurs along each feature, both as defined in Assumption A.1.

$n \rightarrow \infty$, the doubly robust estimator $\hat{\theta}(x)$ consistently estimates $\theta_0(x)$ for any fixed x :

$$\hat{\theta}(x) - \theta_0(x) = o_p(1).$$

Note that the convergence rate of $\hat{\theta}(x)$ depends on the nuisance functions solely through the product $\mathcal{E}(\hat{g}, \hat{\alpha}) = \|\hat{g} - g_0\|_x \cdot \|\hat{\alpha} - \alpha_0\|_x$. Therefore, the proposed estimation procedure is indeed doubly robust with respect to nuisance estimation, and it achieves the oracle rate as long as $\mathcal{E}(\hat{g}, \hat{\alpha})$ converges to 0 at a slow rate.

We now establish the consistency of the doubly robust estimator $\hat{\theta}(x)$ estimated by our DRRF algorithm introduced in Section 2.4. Following the discussion in Section 2.4.1, we focus on nuisance estimators of the form $\hat{g}(x, w) = h(w, \hat{\nu}_g(x))$ and $\hat{\alpha}(x, w) = h(w, \hat{\nu}_\alpha(x))$. To provide theoretical guarantees for the local regularized nuisance estimators in (10), we impose the following Assumption 4 on the true parameters ν_g and ν_α in h .

Assumption 4 (Nuisance Regularity). *The parameters and data distribution satisfy:*

1. For any $x \in \mathcal{X}$, $\nu_g(x)$ is k -sparse with support $S_g(x)$, and $\nu_\alpha(x)$ is k -sparse with support $S_\alpha(x)$.
2. Both $\nu_g(x)$ and $\nu_\alpha(x)$ are $O(1)$ -Lipschitz in x . The function $h(\cdot, \cdot)$ is $O(1)$ -Lipschitz in its second argument. Furthermore, the functions $\nabla_\nu L_g(x; \nu) = \mathbb{E}[\nabla_\nu l_g(Z; \nu) \mid X = x]$ and $\nabla_\nu L_\alpha(x; \nu) = \mathbb{E}[\nabla_\nu l_\alpha(Z; \nu) \mid X = x]$ are $O(1)$ -Lipschitz in x for any ν .
3. The data distribution satisfies the conditional restricted eigenvalue condition: for all ν and for all z , for some matrices $\mathcal{H}_g(z)$ and $\mathcal{H}_\alpha(z)$ that depend only on the data: $\nabla_{\nu\nu} l_g(z; \nu) \succeq \mathcal{H}_g(z) \succeq 0$ and $\nabla_{\nu\nu} l_\alpha(z; \nu) \succeq \mathcal{H}_\alpha(z) \succeq 0$. Let $C(S(x); 3) = \{\nu \in \mathbb{R}^d : \|\nu_{S(x)^c}\|_1 \leq 3\|\nu_{S(x)}\|_1\}$. For all x , $\nu_g \in C(S_g(x); 3)$, and $\nu_\alpha \in C(S_\alpha(x); 3)$:

$$\nu_g^\top \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{H}_g(Z) \mid X = x] \nu_g \geq \gamma \|\nu_g\|_2^2 \quad \text{and} \quad \nu_\alpha^\top \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{H}_\alpha(Z) \mid X = x] \nu_\alpha \geq \gamma \|\nu_\alpha\|_2^2.$$

Under Assumption 4, the local regularized nuisance estimators achieve the convergence rates specified in Proposition 3. These rates will be used to establish both the consistency and the asymptotic normality for DRRF estimator.

Proposition 3 (Oprescu et al. (2019)). *Suppose Assumption 4 holds, and $\hat{\nu}_g(x)$ and $\hat{\nu}_\alpha(x)$ are estimated as described in Section 2.4.1. Then, with probability at least $1 - 2\delta$, we have*

$$\begin{aligned} \|\hat{\nu}_g(x) - \nu_g(x)\|_2 &\leq \frac{2\lambda_g k}{\gamma - 32k\sqrt{s \ln(d_\nu/\delta)}/n}, \\ \|\hat{\nu}_\alpha(x) - \nu_\alpha(x)\|_2 &\leq \frac{2\lambda_\alpha k}{\gamma - 32k\sqrt{s \ln(d_\nu/\delta)}/n}, \end{aligned}$$

as long as $\lambda_g, \lambda_\alpha \geq \Theta \left(s^{-1/(2\alpha d)} + \sqrt{\frac{s \ln(d_\nu/\delta)}{n}} \right)$.

Now we are ready to present the consistency result for DRRF.

Corollary 1 (Consistency of DRRF). *Suppose that Assumptions 3 and 4 hold, and that DRRF satisfies the forest regularity conditions defined in Appendix A.1. Let the subsample size be chosen as $s = \Theta(n^\beta)$, where $(1 + \frac{1}{\alpha d})^{-1} < \beta < 1$, $B \geq n/s$, and the parameters*

$$\lambda_g, \lambda_\alpha = \Theta \left(s^{-1/(2\alpha d)} + \sqrt{\frac{s \ln(n^{\frac{1}{2}(1-\beta)} d_\nu)}{n}} \right).$$

Then, as $n \rightarrow \infty$, the DRRF algorithm consistently estimates $\theta_0(x)$ for any fixed x :

$$\hat{\theta}(x) - \theta_0(x) = O_p \left(n^{\frac{1}{2}(\beta-1)} \right).$$

Corollary 1 shows that the DRRF algorithm achieves the same consistency rate as estimating the conditional functional with oracle nuisance functions.

3.2 Asymptotic Normality

To establish asymptotic normality, we again focus on nuisance estimators of the form $\hat{g}(x, w) = h(w, \hat{\nu}_g(x))$ and $\hat{\alpha}(x, w) = h(w, \hat{\nu}_\alpha(x))$. Additionally, we assume that the dimensionality d_ν of ν_g and ν_α grows at most polynomially in n .

For asymptotic normality, we require an additional assumption on the debiased moment functional:

Assumption 5. (*Local Mean-Squared Continuity*). Define $V(x, g, \alpha) := \mathbb{E}[(\psi(Z; \alpha, g) - \psi(Z; \alpha_0, g_0))^2 | X = x]$. For any $x \in \mathcal{X}$ and $g, \alpha \in \mathcal{G}_x$, the moment $V(x, g, \alpha)$ satisfies

$$|V(x; g, \alpha)| \leq L \cdot \mathbb{E} [(g(X, W) - g_0(X, W))^2 + (\alpha(X, W) - \alpha_0(X, W))^2 | X = x].$$

Define

$$\eta(s) = Var \left(\mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{i=1}^s \tilde{K}(x, X_i, Z_S, \xi_S) \psi(Z_i; \alpha_0, g_0) \middle| Z_1 \right] \right),$$

where the set S is fixed to include the first s samples. We first show the asymptotic normality result for the general doubly robust estimator proposed in Section 2.3.

Theorem 2 (Asymptotic Normality of the General Doubly Robust Estimator). *Suppose Assumptions 1, 2, 3, and 5 hold. Let the subsample size s grow such that $s \rightarrow \infty$, $s = o(n)$, $B \geq (n/s)^2$, $\epsilon(s) \rightarrow 0$, $n\eta(s) \rightarrow \infty$, and $n\epsilon^2(s)/(s^2\eta(s)) \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Moreover, for any fixed x ,*

$$(\|\hat{\nu}_g(x) - \nu_g(x)\|_2^2 + \|\hat{\nu}_\alpha(x) - \nu_\alpha(x)\|_2^2)^{1/2} \leq r_n(\delta)$$

with probability at least $1 - \delta$. Suppose there exists a sequence $\{\delta_n\}_n$ such that

$$\sqrt{n/(s^2\eta(s))} \cdot \delta_n \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \sqrt{n/(s^2\eta(s))} \cdot r_n^2(\delta_n/n) \rightarrow 0.$$

Then, as $n \rightarrow \infty$, the asymptotic distribution of the doubly robust estimator $\hat{\theta}(x)$ is given by

$$\sqrt{\frac{n}{s^2\eta(s)}} \left(\hat{\theta}(x) - \theta_0(x) \right) \xrightarrow{d} N(0, 1).$$

In Theorem 2, the conditions $n\eta(s) \rightarrow \infty$ and $n\epsilon^2(s)/(s^2\eta(s)) \rightarrow 0$ require $\eta(s)$ to decay slower than $1/n$ and $\epsilon^2(s)/(s^2\eta(s))$ to decay faster than $1/n$. In fact, under the “double-sample” scheme in the DRRF algorithm, we can lower bound $\eta(s)$ by a constant multiple of

$$\gamma(s) := \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{E}[\tilde{K}(x, X_1, Z_S, \xi_S) \mid X_1]^2 \right],^6$$

and the aforementioned two conditions hold under an appropriate choice of the subsample size s . Moreover, the nuisance rate condition $\sqrt{n/(s^2\eta(s))} \cdot r_n^2(\delta_n/n) \rightarrow 0$ in Theorem 2 is usually mild and only requires the nuisance parameters ν_g and ν_α to converge at a slow rate.

Following Theorem 2, we immediately obtain the following asymptotic normality result for DRRF.

Theorem 3 (Asymptotic Normality of DRRF). *Suppose Assumptions 3, 5, 4, and A.1 hold. Set the subsample size $s = \Theta(n^\beta)$, where $(1 + \frac{1}{\alpha d})^{-1} < \beta < 1$, $B \geq (n/s)^2$, and the lasso parameters $\lambda_g, \lambda_\alpha = \Theta \left(s^{-1/(2\alpha d)} + \sqrt{\frac{s \ln(n^c d_\nu)}{n}} \right)$ for some $c > 1/2$. Furthermore, suppose there exists a strictly positive $\underline{\sigma}$ such that $\min_x \text{Var}(\psi(Z; \alpha_0, g_0) \mid X = x) \geq \underline{\sigma}^2 > 0$. Then, as $n \rightarrow \infty$, the asymptotic distribution of $\hat{\theta}(x)$ estimated by the DRRF algorithm is given by*

$$\sqrt{\frac{n}{s^2\eta(s)}} \left(\hat{\theta}(x) - \theta_0(x) \right) \xrightarrow{d} N(0, 1).$$

In light of Theorem 3, we can use the Bootstrap of Little Bags (Sexton and Laake, 2009; Athey et al., 2019) approach to construct asymptotically valid confidence intervals for $\theta_0(x)$.

4 Simulations

In this section, we conduct comprehensive simulations to demonstrate the superior performance of our DRRF estimator compared to other tree-based non-parametric methods in the context of heterogeneous treatment effect estimation.

⁶See Proposition A.1 in the Appendix for the proof.

We generate data from the following process:

$$Y_i = \theta_0(X_i) \cdot D_i + \tilde{X}_i^\top \nu_0 + \epsilon_i,$$

where the target covariates $X_i \stackrel{i.i.d.}{\sim} U[0, 1]$ and noise $\epsilon_i \stackrel{i.i.d.}{\sim} U[-1, 1]$. The vector ν_0 is a k -sparse vector with non-zero coefficients drawn i.i.d. from $U[-1, 1]$. We set $p = 100$ for the number of additional covariates \tilde{X}_i and vary the support size $k \in \{5, 10, 15\}$. Following [Oprescu et al. \(2019\)](#), we define the true heterogeneous treatment effect $\theta_0(x)$ to be a piecewise linear function:

$$\theta_0(x) = \begin{cases} x + 2 & \text{if } x \leq 0.3 \\ 6x + 0.5 & \text{if } 0.3 < x \leq 0.6 \\ -3x + 5.9 & \text{if } x > 0.6 \end{cases}.$$

Our goal is to estimate $\theta_0(x)$ over various query points x . We consider both settings with continuous treatment variables and binary treatment variables D_i . For each setting, we consider setups with various data-generating processes for the treatment variables D_i and the distributions of the additional covariates \tilde{X}_i . The detailed descriptions of the data-generating processes are provided in [Table 1](#) for continuous treatment setting and in [Table 2](#) for binary treatment setting.

We evaluate two variants of DRRF alongside two variants each of ORF ([Oprescu et al., 2019](#)) and GRF ([Athey et al., 2019](#)):

- **DRRF variants:** (1) DRRF: Our automatic DRRF algorithm, described in [Section 2.4](#), with parameters set based on theoretical guidance: subsample power $\beta = 0.88$, number of trees $B = 100$, split balance parameter $\rho = 0.3$, minimum leaf size $r = 5$, and L_1 regularization parameters $\lambda_g, \lambda_\alpha = \sqrt{s \ln(n(p+1))/n}/15$ for the continuous treatment setting, and $\lambda_g, \lambda_\alpha = \sqrt{s \ln(n(p+1))/n}/5$ for the binary treatment setting. (2) DRRF-CV: A variant of DRRF where the L_1 regularization parameter λ_g for the Forest Lasso estimator $\hat{\nu}_g$ in [\(10\)](#) is chosen by 5-fold cross-validation.
- **ORF variants:** (1) ORF: The ORF algorithm from [Oprescu et al. \(2019\)](#) with fixed Lasso penalty parameters for tree splitting and Forest Lasso, as specified in [Oprescu et al. \(2019\)](#). (2) ORF-CV: A cross-validated variant of ORF where L_1 regularization parameters in Forest Lasso are chosen using 5-fold cross-validated Lasso.
- **GRF variants:** (1) ForestDR-Linear: A combination of GRF with a doubly robust moment, using cross-validated linear models regularized by L_1 or L_2 norms to estimate the conditional outcomes $\mathbb{E}[Y \mid D = d, X, \tilde{X}]$ and propensity scores $\mathbb{P}(D = d \mid X, \tilde{X})$. This is implemented by the ForestDRLearner in the EconML package ([Battocchi et al., 2019](#)), and it is only applicable to the binary treatment setting. (2) ForestDR-RF: Similar to ForestDR-Linear, this variant

combines a doubly robust moment with GRF. However, it employs cross-validated Random Forests instead of linear models to estimate the conditional outcomes and propensity scores.

There are two key differences among the three variants. First, both DRRF variants and ORF variants accommodate high-dimensional nuisance functions and perform local nuisance estimation. In contrast, the GRF variants apply tree learner-generated weights to moment functions constructed with global nuisance estimators. Second, while both DRRF and GRF variants conduct estimation based on a doubly robust moment, the ORF variants use an orthogonal moment without the doubly robust property. On the other hand, constructing the doubly robust moment in the GRF variants requires propensity score estimation, which limits their applicability to continuous treatment settings. In contrast, our DRRF variants automatically construct the doubly robust moment without the need for propensity score estimation, making them applicable to both discrete and continuous treatment settings.

Tables 1 and 2 compare the estimation accuracy and evaluation runtime of different estimators for continuous and binary treatment setups, respectively. Specifically, these tables report the root mean squared error (RMSE) of the estimated $\hat{\theta}(x_i)$ and the average evaluation runtime across 100 test points x_i over a uniform grid in $[0, 1]$. In each setup, we set the total number of observations to $2n = 5000$ and report results from 100 simulations. Figures 2-7 illustrate the performance of each estimator by plotting the average estimated effects, along with the 5th and 95th percentiles of the estimated effects across 100 replications. Figures 2-4 show the results for the continuous treatment setups, while Figures 5-7 plot the results for the binary treatment setups. Figure 1 provides an example of the bootstrap confidence intervals for the DRRF algorithm, demonstrating reliable finite-sample coverage.

In the following, we highlight three key advantages of DRRF variants. First, similar to ORF variants, DRRF variants perform local fitting of nuisance functions, which generally leads to superior performance compared to GRF variants that rely on global fitting. The global fitting in GRF variants aims to minimize the overall mean squared error, which does not align with the objective of final-stage local estimation. As reported in Table 2 for the binary treatment setting, both DRRF variants exhibit significantly lower RMSE than GRF variants. In fact, Figures 5-7 show that GRF variants suffer from substantially higher variance. This high variance may also be related to their dependence on the inverse of propensity score estimates, which can become unstable when the propensity scores are near boundary values.

Second, DRRF variants does not require a well-specified model in the data-generating process for the treatment variable. While ORF variants can suffer from significant bias or variance when the model for the treatment variable is misspecified, DRRF variants is able to provide accurate estimates. As shown in Tables 1 and 2, DRRF variants outperform ORF variants in most cases in terms of RMSE when the relationship between treatment D_i and covariates \tilde{X}_i is non-linear. In the

Table 1: RMSE and runtime for continuous treatment setups

	RMSE			Time (seconds)		
Setup 1						
	$k = 5$	$k = 10$	$k = 15$	$k = 5$	$k = 10$	$k = 15$
DRRF	0.121	0.105	0.091	0.16	0.17	0.17
DRRF-CV	0.120	0.105	0.093	0.17	0.17	0.17
ORF	0.125	0.115	0.120	0.55	0.54	0.53
ORF-CV	0.090	0.101	0.106	17.8	17.9	18.5
Setup 2						
	$k = 5$	$k = 10$	$k = 15$	$k = 5$	$k = 10$	$k = 15$
DRRF	0.057	0.082	0.112	0.17	0.16	0.17
DRRF-CV	0.049	0.038	0.039	0.17	0.17	0.17
ORF	0.127	0.194	0.259	1.5	1.6	1.6
ORF-CV	0.096	0.131	0.162	25.2	24.2	24.1
Setup 3						
	$k = 5$	$k = 10$	$k = 15$	$k = 5$	$k = 10$	$k = 15$
DRRF	0.062	0.088	0.142	0.16	0.17	0.17
DRRF-CV	0.059	0.036	0.034	0.17	0.17	0.17
ORF	0.161	0.177	0.191	3.1	3.4	3.5
ORF-CV	0.150	0.242	0.332	25.4	25.3	26.2


This table reports the root mean squared error (RMSE) and the evaluation runtime for different estimators in continuous treatment setups. We generate data from the process $Y_i = \theta_0(X_i) \cdot D_i + \tilde{X}_i^\top \nu_0 + \epsilon_i$, where $X_i \stackrel{i.i.d.}{\sim} U[0, 1]$ and ν_0 is a k -sparse vector with non-zero coefficients drawn i.i.d. from $U[-1, 1]$. The continuous treatment variables D_i 's and the additional covariates \tilde{X}_i are generated as follows: (1) Setup 1: $D_i = \tilde{X}_i^\top \gamma_0 + \eta_i$, and $\tilde{X}_i \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I_p)$. (2) Setup 2: $D_i = (\tilde{X}_i^\top \gamma_0)^3 + \eta_i$, and $\tilde{X}_i \sim \mathcal{N}(2X_i, I_p)$. (3) Setup 3: $D_i = (\tilde{X}_i^\top \gamma_0)^2 + \eta_i$, and $\tilde{X}_i \sim \mathcal{N}(2, I_p)$. In each setup, γ_0 is a k -sparse vector with the same support as ν_0 , where its non-zero coefficients are drawn i.i.d. from $U[0, 1]$, and the noise terms are drawn as $\eta_i \stackrel{i.i.d.}{\sim} U[-1, 1]$. We set the number of covariates \tilde{X}_i to be $p = 100$ and the sample size $2n = 5000$. We perform 100 simulations for each setup. The evaluation runtime is the average runtime over 10 runs for estimating $\hat{\theta}(x_i)$ at 100 test points x_i over a uniform grid in $[0, 1]$. The results are measured on a 2019 MacBook Pro with a 2.6 GHz 6-Core Intel Core i7.

Table 2: RMSE and runtime for binary treatment setups

	RMSE			Time (seconds)		
Setup 1						
	$k = 5$	$k = 10$	$k = 15$	$k = 5$	$k = 10$	$k = 15$
DRRF	0.126	0.134	0.149	0.17	0.16	0.16
DRRF-CV	0.108	0.110	0.108	0.17	0.17	0.17
ORF	0.196	0.201	0.201	0.54	0.54	0.54
ORF-CV	0.108	0.119	0.130	21.0	20.5	19.6
ForestDR-Linear	0.279	0.288	0.281	0.10	0.09	0.09
ForestDR-RF	0.212	0.316	0.404	0.08	0.08	0.09
Setup 2						
DRRF	0.136	0.151	0.161	0.16	0.16	0.17
DRRF-CV	0.113	0.119	0.115	0.17	0.17	0.17
ORF	0.157	0.157	0.156	0.51	0.51	0.57
ORF-CV	0.160	0.174	0.189	20.8	20.0	19.6
ForestDR-Linear	0.345	0.352	0.345	0.09	0.09	0.09
ForestDR-RF	0.238	0.351	0.453	0.09	0.09	0.09
Setup 3						
DRRF	0.126	0.148	0.156	0.17	0.16	0.17
DRRF-CV	0.110	0.116	0.106	0.16	0.17	0.17
ORF	0.129	0.174	0.196	2.6	2.8	3.0
ORF-CV	0.184	0.242	0.293	120.9	118.5	138.7
ForestDR-Linear	0.348	0.329	0.338	0.09	0.09	0.09
ForestDR-RF	0.246	0.379	0.512	0.09	0.08	0.09

This table reports the root mean squared error (RMSE) and the evaluation runtime for different estimators in binary treatment setups. We generate data from the process $Y_i = \theta_0(X_i) \cdot D_i + \tilde{X}_i^\top \nu_0 + \epsilon_i$, where $X_i \stackrel{i.i.d.}{\sim} U[0, 1]$ and ν_0 is a k -sparse vector with non-zero coefficients drawn i.i.d. from $U[-1, 1]$. The binary treatment variables D_i 's are generated according to the propensity scores $\mathbb{P}(D_i = 1 \mid X_i, \tilde{X}_i)$. The propensity scores and the additional covariates \tilde{X}_i are generated as follows: (1) Setup 1: $\mathbb{P}(D_i = 1 \mid X_i, \tilde{X}_i) = 0.3 + 0.4 \cdot I(X_i > 0.5)$, and $\tilde{X}_i \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I_p)$. (2) Setup 2: $\mathbb{P}(D_i = 1 \mid X_i, \tilde{X}_i) = 0.1 + 0.3 \cdot I(\tilde{X}_i^\top \gamma_0 > 0) + 0.4 \cdot I(X_i > 0.5)$, and $\tilde{X}_i \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I_p)$. (3) Setup 3: $\mathbb{P}(D_i = 1 \mid X_i, \tilde{X}_i) = 0.2 + 0.6 \cdot I(\tilde{X}_i^\top \gamma_0 > 3)$, and $\tilde{X}_i \sim \mathcal{N}(3, I_p)$. In Setup 2, γ_0 is a k -sparse vector with the same support as ν_0 , and its non-zero coefficients are drawn i.i.d. from $U[0, 1]$. In Setup 3, γ_0 is a k -sparse vector with the same support as ν_0 and non-zero coefficients equal to $1/k$. We set the number of covariates \tilde{X}_i to be $p = 100$ and the sample size $2n = 5000$. We perform 100 simulations for each setup. The evaluation runtime is the average runtime over 10 runs for estimating $\hat{\theta}(x_i)$ at 100 test points x_i over a uniform grid in $[0, 1]$. The results are measured on a 2019 MacBook Pro with a 2.6 GHz 6-Core Intel Core i7.

Figure 1: Example of bootstrap confidence intervals for DRRF




This figure presents the 90% confidence intervals constructed using the bootstrap of little bags algorithm for Setup 1 in the continuous treatment setting. We set the support size to $k = 5$ and the number of trees to $B = 100$. Approximately 90% of the sampled test points are contained in the intervals.

first continuous treatment setup, which replicates a setup in [Oprescu et al. \(2019\)](#) with a correctly specified model for residualization (linear relationship between treatment D_i and covariates \tilde{X}_i), our DRRF algorithms perform comparably to the ORF variants. However, in the second and third continuous setups, as well as in all three binary treatment setups, where the relationship between treatment D_i and covariates \tilde{X}_i is non-linear, the DRRF variants significantly outperform both ORF and ORF-CV. In the second continuous treatment setup (as shown in [Figure 3](#)), ORF and ORF-CV yield biased estimates, particularly for larger values of k . In the third continuous treatment setup (as shown in [Figure 4](#)), ORF and ORF-CV show substantial variance in estimating the true effects. Similar patterns are observed in the binary treatment setups. The non-linear relationship in these setups limits Lasso’s ability to adequately residualize D from \tilde{X} , degrading the performance of ORF variants. In contrast, our DRRF algorithms automatically construct a debiasing term without relying on a well-specified model between D and \tilde{X} .

Finally, our algorithms are significantly more computationally efficient than ORF variants, especially ORF-CV, when estimating $\theta_0(x)$ at multiple query points. As shown in [Tables 1 and 2](#), the evaluation runtimes of both DRRF and DRRF-CV are significantly shorter than those of ORF and ORF-CV. In general, DRRF-CV’s average evaluation runtime is 100 times faster than ORF-CV. This demonstrates the efficiency of the DRRF algorithm, making it a more practical choice for real-world applications.


These results collectively demonstrate the advantages of the proposed DRRF algorithms in terms of estimation accuracy, robustness, and computational efficiency, underscoring their potential for practical applications.

Figure 2: Treatment effect estimations for Setup 1 in continuous treatment setting




This figure shows the treatment effect estimations for Setup 1 in the continuous treatment setting. The plot shows the average estimated effects, with shaded regions representing the 5th to 95th percentile intervals of the estimated effects across 100 replications. The data is generated from the process $Y_i = \theta_0(X_i) \cdot D_i + \tilde{X}_i^\top \nu_0 + \epsilon_i$, where $X_i \stackrel{i.i.d.}{\sim} U[0, 1]$, $\tilde{X}_i \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I_p)$, and $D_i = \tilde{X}_i^\top \gamma_0 + \eta_i$. Both ν_0 and γ_0 are k -sparse vectors with the same support, and their non-zero coefficients are drawn i.i.d. from $U[-1, 1]$. We set the number of observations to $2n = 5000$ and $p = 100$.

Figure 3: Treatment effect estimations for Setup 2 in continuous treatment setting




This figure shows the treatment effect estimations for Setup 2 in the continuous treatment setting. The plot shows the average estimated effects, with shaded regions representing the 5th to 95th percentile intervals of the estimated effects across 100 replications. The data is generated from the process $Y_i = \theta_0(X_i) \cdot D_i + \tilde{X}_i^\top \nu_0 + \epsilon_i$, where $X_i \stackrel{i.i.d.}{\sim} U[0, 1]$, $\tilde{X}_i \sim \mathcal{N}(2X_i, I_p)$, and $D_i = (\tilde{X}_i^\top \gamma_0)^3 + \eta_i$. Both ν_0 and γ_0 are k -sparse vectors with the same support, and their non-zero coefficients are drawn i.i.d. from $U[-1, 1]$. We set the number of observations to $2n = 5000$ and $p = 100$.

Figure 4: Treatment effect estimations for Setup 3 in continuous treatment setting




This figure shows the treatment effect estimations for Setup 3 in the continuous treatment setting. The plot shows the average estimated effects, with shaded regions representing the 5th to 95th percentile intervals of the estimated effects across 100 replications. The data is generated from the process $Y_i = \theta_0(X_i) \cdot D_i + \tilde{X}_i^\top \nu_0 + \epsilon_i$, where $X_i \stackrel{i.i.d.}{\sim} U[0, 1]$, $\tilde{X}_i \sim \mathcal{N}(2, I_p)$, and $D_i = (\tilde{X}_i^\top \gamma_0)^2 + \eta_i$. Both ν_0 and γ_0 are k -sparse vectors with the same support, and their non-zero coefficients are drawn i.i.d. from $U[-1, 1]$. We set the number of observations to $2n = 5000$ and $p = 100$.


Figure 5: Treatment effect estimations for Setup 1 in binary treatment setting



(a) $k = 5$




(b) $k = 10$




(c) $k = 15$

This figure shows the treatment effect estimations for Setup 1 in the binary treatment setting. The plot shows the average estimated effects, with shaded regions representing the 5th to 95th percentile intervals of the estimated effects across 100 replications. The data is generated from the process $Y_i = \theta_0(X_i) \cdot D_i + \tilde{X}_i^\top \nu_0 + \epsilon_i$, where $X_i \stackrel{i.i.d.}{\sim} U[0, 1]$, $\tilde{X}_i \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I_p)$, and γ_0 is a k -sparse vector with non-zero coefficients drawn i.i.d. from $U[-1, 1]$. The binary treatment variable D_i is randomly generated based on the propensity score $\mathbb{P}(D_i = 1 | X_i, \tilde{X}_i) = 0.3 + 0.4 \cdot I(X_i > 0.5)$. We set the number of observations to $2n = 5000$ and $p = 100$.


Figure 6: Treatment effect estimations for Setup 2 in binary treatment setting



(a) $k = 5$




(b) $k = 10$




(c) $k = 15$

This figure shows the treatment effect estimations for Setup 2 in the binary treatment setting. The plot shows the average estimated effects, with shaded regions representing the 5th to 95th percentile intervals of the estimated effects across 100 replications. The data is generated from the process $Y_i = \theta_0(X_i) \cdot D_i + \tilde{X}_i^\top \nu_0 + \epsilon_i$, where $X_i \stackrel{i.i.d.}{\sim} U[0, 1]$, $\tilde{X}_i \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I_p)$, and γ_0 is a k -sparse vector with non-zero coefficients drawn i.i.d. from $U[-1, 1]$. The binary treatment variable D_i is randomly generated based on the propensity score $\mathbb{P}(D_i = 1 \mid X_i, \tilde{X}_i) = 0.1 + 0.3 \cdot I(\tilde{X}_i^\top \gamma_0 > 0) + 0.4 \cdot I(X_i > 0.5)$, where γ_0 is a k -sparse vector with the same support as ν_0 , and its non-zero coefficients are drawn i.i.d. from $U[0, 1]$. We set the number of observations to $2n = 5000$ and $p = 100$.


Figure 7: Treatment effect estimations for Setup 3 in binary treatment setting



(a) $k = 5$



(b) $k = 10$



(c) $k = 15$

This figure shows the DRRF treatment effect estimations for Setup 3 in the binary treatment setting. The plot shows the average estimated effects, with shaded regions representing the 5th to 95th percentile intervals of the estimated effects across 100 replications. The data is generated from the process $Y_i = \theta_0(X_i) \cdot D_i + \tilde{X}_i^\top \nu_0 + \epsilon_i$, where $X_i \stackrel{i.i.d.}{\sim} U[0, 1]$, $\tilde{X}_i \sim \mathcal{N}(3, I_p)$, and γ_0 is a k -sparse vector with non-zero coefficients drawn i.i.d. from $U[-1, 1]$. The binary treatment variable D_i is randomly generated based on the propensity score $\mathbb{P}(D_i = 1 | X_i, \tilde{X}_i) = 0.2 + 0.6 \cdot I(\tilde{X}_i^\top \gamma_0 > 0)$, where γ_0 is a k -sparse vector with the same support as ν_0 and non-zero coefficients equal to $1/k$. We set the number of observations to $2n = 5000$ and $p = 100$.

References

- Susan Athey, Julie Tibshirani, and Stefan Wager. Generalized random forests. 2019.
- Keith Battocchi, Eleanor Dillon, Maggie Hei, Greg Lewis, Paul Oka, Miruna Oprescu, and Vasilis Syrgkanis. EconML: A Python Package for ML-Based Heterogeneous Treatment Effects Estimation. <https://github.com/py-why/EconML>, 2019. Version 0.x.
- Victor Chernozhukov, Denis Chetverikov, Mert Demirer, Esther Duflo, Christian Hansen, and Whitney Newey. Double/debiased/neyman machine learning of treatment effects. *American Economic Review*, 107(5):261–265, 2017a.
- Victor Chernozhukov, Matt Goldman, Vira Semenova, and Matt Taddy. Orthogonal machine learning for demand estimation: High dimensional causal inference in dynamic panels. *arXiv*, pages arXiv–1712, 2017b.
- Victor Chernozhukov, Denis Chetverikov, Mert Demirer, Esther Duflo, Christian Hansen, Whitney Newey, and James Robins. Double/debiased machine learning for treatment and structural parameters. *The Econometrics Journal*, 21(1):C1–C68, 2018a.
- Victor Chernozhukov, Denis N Nekipelov, Vira Semenova, and Vasilis Syrgkanis. Plug-in regularized estimation of high-dimensional parameters in nonlinear semiparametric models. Technical report, cemmap working paper, 2018b.
- Victor Chernozhukov, Juan Carlos Escanciano, Hidehiko Ichimura, Whitney K Newey, and James M Robins. Locally robust semiparametric estimation. *Econometrica*, 90(4):1501–1535, 2022a.
- Victor Chernozhukov, Whitney Newey, Victor M Quintas-Martinez, and Vasilis Syrgkanis. Riesznets and forestriesz: Automatic debiased machine learning with neural nets and random forests. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 3901–3914. PMLR, 2022b.
- Victor Chernozhukov, Whitney K Newey, and Rahul Singh. Automatic debiased machine learning of causal and structural effects. *Econometrica*, 90(3):967–1027, 2022c.
- Yingying Fan, Jinchi Lv, and Jingbo Wang. Dnn: A two-scale distributional tale of heterogeneous treatment effect inference. *Available at SSRN 3238897*, 2018.
- Miruna Oprescu, Vasilis Syrgkanis, and Zhiwei Steven Wu. Orthogonal random forest for causal inference. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 4932–4941. PMLR, 2019.
- Thomas Peel, Sandrine Anthoine, and Liva Ralaivola. Empirical bernstein inequalities for u-statistics. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 23, 2010.

Joseph Sexton and Petter Laake. Standard errors for bagged and random forest estimators. *Computational Statistics & Data Analysis*, 53(3):801–811, 2009.

Stefan Wager and Susan Athey. Estimation and inference of heterogeneous treatment effects using random forests. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 113(523):1228–1242, 2018.

Michael Zimmert and Michael Lechner. Nonparametric estimation of causal heterogeneity under high-dimensional confounding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1908.08779*, 2019.

Appendix

A.1 Technical Assumptions

Assumption A.1 (Forest Regularity). *The tree satisfies*

1. ρ -balanced: *Each split leaves at least a fraction ρ of the observations in S_b^2 on each side of the split for some parameter of $\rho \leq 0.2$.*
2. Minimum leaf size r : *There are between r and $2r - 1$ observations from S_b^2 in each leaf of the tree.*
3. π -random-split: *At every step, marginalizing over the internal randomness of the learner, the probability that the next split occurs along the j -th feature is at least π/d for some $0 < \pi \leq 1$, for all $j = 1, \dots, d$.*

A.2 Sufficient Conditions for the Form of Riesz Representer

In this section, we give sufficient conditions with which we can assume without loss of generality that $\alpha_0(w, x) = h(w, \nu_\alpha(x))$ if $g_0(x, w) = h(w, \nu_g(x))$.

Recall that $\mathcal{G}_x = \{g : \mathbb{E}[g(X, W)^2 \mid X = x] < \infty\}$. Since \mathcal{G}_x is the L_2 space under the law $\mathcal{L}([X, W] \mid X = x)$, it is a Hilbert space with inner product defined by

$$\langle g_1, g_2 \rangle_x = \mathbb{E}[g_1(X, W)g_2(X, W) \mid X = x].$$

Suppose that \mathcal{H}_x is a closed linear subspace of \mathcal{G}_x . Let $\alpha_0 \in \mathcal{G}_x$ be the Riesz representer. Then by Hilbert space projection theorem, we can write $\alpha_0 = \alpha_{\mathcal{H}_x} + \alpha_{\mathcal{H}_x}^\perp$, where $\alpha_{\mathcal{H}_x} \in \mathcal{H}_x$ and $\alpha_{\mathcal{H}_x}^\perp \in \mathcal{H}_x^\perp$. As a result, for any $g \in \mathcal{H}_x$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[m(Z; g(X, W)) \mid X = x] &= \mathbb{E}[g(X, W)\alpha_0(X, W) \mid X = x] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[g(X, W)\alpha_{\mathcal{H}_x}(X, W) \mid X = x]. \end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

Since throughout our theoretical analysis, we only work with those $g \in \mathcal{H}_x$, we can assume without loss of generality that $\alpha_0(x, w)$ also takes form of $h(w, \nu_\alpha(x))$ for some $\nu_\alpha(x)$. In fact, it is the minimal norm Riesz representer such that (11) holds for all $g \in \mathcal{H}_x$.

Now we show that with $h(w, \nu) = w^\top \nu$, \mathcal{H}_x is a closed linear subspace of \mathcal{G}_x , under mild conditions. Since

$$h(w, \nu_1(x)) + ch(w, \nu_2(x)) = w^\top (\nu_1(x) + c\nu_2(x)) \in \mathcal{H}_x$$

for any $c \in \mathbb{R}$, \mathcal{H}_x is a linear subspace of \mathcal{G}_x . Suppose that $h(w, \nu_1(x)), h(w, \nu_2(x)), \dots$ is a sequence of elements in \mathcal{H}_x that converges to a limit $g^*(x, w) \in \mathcal{G}_x$. Then the sequence is a Cauchy sequence.

It follows that

$$(\nu_n(x) - \nu_m(x))^\top \mathbb{E}[WW^\top \mid X = x](\nu_n(x) - \nu_m(x)) \rightarrow 0$$

as $m, n \rightarrow \infty$. Assume that $\mathbb{E}[WW^\top \mid X = x]$ is positive definite. Then above implies that $\|\nu_n(x) - \nu_m(x)\|_2 \rightarrow 0$ as $m, n \rightarrow \infty$. Therefore $\{\nu_n(x)\}_n$ is a Cauchy sequence that converges to some limit $\nu^*(x) \in \mathbb{R}^{d_\nu}$. Since

$$\|h(w, \nu_n(x)) - h(w, \nu^*(x))\|_{\mathcal{G}_x}^2 = (\nu_n(x) - \nu^*(x))^\top \mathbb{E}[WW^\top \mid X = x](\nu_n(x) - \nu^*(x)) \rightarrow 0$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$, we get that $h(w, \nu_n(x)) \rightarrow h(w, \nu^*(x))$ in the norm induced by the Hilbert space \mathcal{G}_x . Therefore \mathcal{H}_x is a closed linear subspace of \mathcal{G}_x . It is easy to see that the above argument extends straightforwardly to the case where $h(w, \nu) = r(w)^\top \nu$ for some known function r .

A.3 Proofs

A.3.1 Proof of Proposition 1

The local gradient of $\psi(Z; \alpha_0, g_0) = m(Z; g_0) + \alpha_0(Y - g_0)$ with respect to g is

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}[\nabla_g \psi(Z; \alpha_0, g_0)[\hat{g} - g_0] \mid X = x] \\ &= \mathbb{E}\left[\lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{h} (\psi(Z; \alpha_0, g_0 + h(\hat{g} - g_0)) - \psi(Z; \alpha_0, g_0)) \mid X = x\right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}\left[\lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{h} (m(Z; g_0 + h(\hat{g} - g_0)) - m(Z; g_0)) \mid X = x\right] - \mathbb{E}[\alpha_0(\hat{g} - g_0) \mid X = x]. \end{aligned}$$

Under regularity conditions,⁷ the limit and expectation are exchangeable. Then by the definition of the RR, the first part on the RHS can be further simplified as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\left[\lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{h} (m(Z; g_0 + h(\hat{g} - g_0)) - m(Z; g_0)) \mid X = x\right] &= \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{h} \mathbb{E}[(g_0 + h(\hat{g} - g_0))\alpha_0 - g_0\alpha_0 \mid X = x] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[\alpha_0(\hat{g} - g_0) \mid X = x], \end{aligned}$$

⁷For example, it suffices to assume that m is Lipschitz in its argument g and $\hat{g} \in \mathcal{G}_x$.

which implies that $\mathbb{E}[\nabla_g \psi(Z; \alpha_0, g_0)[\hat{g} - g_0] | X = x] = 0$. Similarly, the local gradient of $\psi(Z; \alpha_0, g_0)$ with respect to α is

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\nabla_\alpha \psi(Z; \alpha_0, g_0)[\hat{\alpha} - \alpha_0] | X = x] &= \mathbb{E}\left[\lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{h} (\psi(Z; \alpha_0 + h(\hat{\alpha} - \alpha_0), g_0) - \psi(Z; \alpha_0, g_0)) | X = x\right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[(\hat{\alpha}(x, W) - \alpha_0(x, W))(Y - g_0(x, W)) | X = x] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[(\hat{\alpha}(x, W) - \alpha_0(x, W))(\mathbb{E}[Y | X = x, W] - g_0(x, W)) | X = x] \\ &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

A.3.2 Proof of Proposition 2

For the new score function $\psi(Z; \hat{\alpha}, \hat{g}) = m(Z; \hat{g}) + \hat{\alpha}(W)(Y - \hat{g}(W))$ with any fixed nuisance estimators \hat{g} and $\hat{\alpha}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E}[\psi(Z; \hat{\alpha}, \hat{g}) | X = x] - \theta_0(x) \\ &= \mathbb{E}[m(Z; \hat{g}(x, W)) + \hat{\alpha}(x, W)(Y - \hat{g}(x, W)) - \theta_0(x) | X = x] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[\alpha_0(x, W)\hat{g}(x, W) + \hat{\alpha}(x, W)(Y - \hat{g}(x, W)) - \alpha_0(x, W)g_0(x, W) | X = x] \\ &= -\mathbb{E}[(\hat{\alpha}(x, W) - \alpha_0(x, W))(\hat{g}(x, W) - g_0(x, W)) | X = x], \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality holds since $\mathbb{E}[Y | W, X = x] = g_0(x, W)$ by definition.

A.3.3 Proof of Theorem 1

The estimator $\hat{\theta}(x)$ employs the sub-sampled symmetric kernel

$$K(x, X_i, Z_{1:n}, \xi) = \frac{1}{B} \sum_{b=1}^B \tilde{K}(x, X_i, Z_{S_b}, \xi_b), \quad i = 1, \dots, n,$$

which satisfies the normalization condition that $\sum_{i=1}^n K(x, X_i, Z_{1:n}, \xi) = 1$. For notational simplicity, we denote the nuisance regression function and Riesz representer estimated at point (X_i, W_i) by \hat{g}_i and $\hat{\alpha}_i$, respectively, i.e., $\hat{g}_i := \hat{g}(X_i, W_i)$ and $\hat{\alpha}_i := \hat{\alpha}(X_i, W_i)$.

Observe that we can decompose the estimation error $\hat{\theta}(x) - \theta_0(x)$ as

$$\begin{aligned}
& \hat{\theta}(x) - \theta_0(x) \\
= & \underbrace{\sum_{i=1}^n K(x, X_i, Z_{1:n}, \xi) (m(Z_i; \hat{g}_i) + \hat{\alpha}_i(Y_i - \hat{g}_i)) - \mathbb{E}_\xi \left[\sum_{i=1}^n K(x, X_i, Z_{1:n}, \xi) (m(Z_i; \hat{g}_i) + \hat{\alpha}_i(Y_i - \hat{g}_i)) \right]}_{\text{subsampling error } E(\hat{g}, \hat{\alpha})} \\
& + \underbrace{\mathbb{E}_\xi \left[\sum_{i=1}^n K(x, X_i, Z_{1:n}, \xi) (m(Z_i; \hat{g}_i) + \hat{\alpha}_i(Y_i - \hat{g}_i)) \right] - \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{i=1}^n K(x, X_i, Z_{1:n}, \xi) (m(Z_i; \hat{g}_i) + \hat{\alpha}_i(Y_i - \hat{g}_i)) \right]}_{\text{sampling error } \Delta(\hat{g}, \hat{\alpha})} \\
& + \underbrace{\mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{i=1}^n K(x, X_i, Z_{1:n}, \xi) (m(Z_i; \hat{g}_i) + \hat{\alpha}_i(Y_i - \hat{g}_i)) \right] - \mathbb{E} [m(Z_i; \hat{g}_i) + \hat{\alpha}_i(Y_i - \hat{g}_i) \mid X_i = x]}_{\text{kernel error } \Gamma(\hat{g}, \hat{\alpha})} \\
& + \underbrace{\mathbb{E} [m(Z_i; \hat{g}_i) + \hat{\alpha}_i(Y_i - \hat{g}_i) \mid X_i = x] - \mathbb{E} [m(Z_i; g_0(x, W_i)) \mid X_i = x]}_{\text{nuisance error } \Lambda(\hat{g}, \hat{\alpha})}.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, the estimation error can be bounded by:

$$\left| \hat{\theta}(x) - \theta_0(x) \right| \leq |E(\hat{g}, \hat{\alpha})| + |\Delta(\hat{g}, \hat{\alpha})| + |\Gamma(\hat{g}, \hat{\alpha})| + |\Lambda(\hat{g}, \hat{\alpha})|.$$

In the sequel, we analyze the four terms $E(\hat{g}, \hat{\alpha})$, $\Delta(\hat{g}, \hat{\alpha})$, $\Gamma(\hat{g}, \hat{\alpha})$, and $\Lambda(\hat{g}, \hat{\alpha})$ respectively.

Lemma A.1 (Subsampling Error). *Under Assumption 3.1, w.p. $1 - \delta$,*

$$|E(\hat{g}, \hat{\alpha})| = O \left(\sqrt{\frac{\log(1/\delta)}{B}} \right).$$

Proof. By the definition of $K(x, X_i, Z_{1:n}, \xi)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{\theta}(x) &= \sum_{i=1}^n K(x, X_i, Z_{1:n}, \xi) [m(Z_i; \hat{g}(X_i, W_i)) + \hat{\alpha}(X_i, W_i)(Y_i - \hat{g}(X_i, W_i))] \\
&= \frac{1}{B} \sum_{b=1}^B \sum_{i \in S_b} \tilde{K}(x, X_i, Z_{S_b}, \xi_b) [m(Z_i; \hat{g}(X_i, W_i)) + \hat{\alpha}(X_i, W_i)(Y_i - \hat{g}(X_i, W_i))],
\end{aligned}$$

where the second equality holds because $\tilde{K}(x, X_i, Z_{S_b}, \xi_b) = 0$ for any $i \notin S_b$. We denote

$$V_b = \sum_{i \in S_b} \tilde{K}(x, X_i, Z_{S_b}, \xi_b) [m(Z_i; \hat{g}(X_i, W_i)) + \hat{\alpha}(X_i, W_i)(Y_i - \hat{g}(X_i, W_i))].$$

Considering only the randomness in V_b driven by S_b and ξ_b , and by Assumption 3.1, V_b 's are bounded i.i.d. random variables. It follows from Hoeffding's bound that, for any $t \geq 0$, there exists a constant

c such that

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\left| \frac{1}{B} \sum_{b=1}^B V_b - \mathbb{E}_\xi [V_b] \right| \geq t \right) \leq e^{-ct^2 B}.$$

Setting $t = \sqrt{\log(1/\delta)/(cB)}$ gives that, w.p. $1 - \delta$,

$$|E(\hat{g}, \hat{\alpha})| = \left| \frac{1}{B} \sum_{b=1}^B V_b - \mathbb{E}_\xi [V_b] \right| = O \left(\sqrt{\frac{\log(1/\delta)}{B}} \right).$$

□

Lemma A.2 (Sampling Error). *Under Assumption 3.1, w.p. $1 - \delta$,*

$$|\Delta(\hat{g}, \hat{\alpha})| = O \left(\sqrt{\frac{s \log(1/\delta)}{n}} \right).$$

Proof. Since we estimate \hat{g} and $\hat{\alpha}$ based on the second half of the data $Z_{n+1:2n}$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_\xi \left[\sum_{i \in S_b} \tilde{K}(x, X_i, Z_{S_b}, \xi_b) (m(Z_i; \hat{g}(X_i, W_i)) + \hat{\alpha}(X_i, W_i)(Y_i - \hat{g}(X_i, W_i))) \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{\binom{n}{s}} \sum_{S_b: |S_b|=s} \mathbb{E}_{\xi_b} \left[\sum_{i \in S_b} \tilde{K}(x, X_i, Z_{S_b}, \xi_b) (m(Z_i; \hat{g}(X_i, W_i)) + \hat{\alpha}(X_i, W_i)(Y_i - \hat{g}(X_i, W_i))) \right] \end{aligned}$$

is a complete U -statistic with aggregation function

$$f(Z_{S_b}) = \mathbb{E}_{\xi_b} \left[\sum_{i \in S_b} \tilde{K}(x, X_i, Z_{S_b}, \xi_b) (m(Z_i; \hat{g}(X_i, W_i)) + \hat{\alpha}(X_i, W_i)(Y_i - \hat{g}(X_i, W_i))) \right].$$

The aggregation function $f(Z_{S_b})$ is symmetric and bounded. By Hoeffding's concentration inequality for U -statistics, we have w.p. $1 - \delta$,

$$|\Delta(\hat{g}, \hat{\alpha})| = \left| \frac{1}{\binom{n}{s}} \sum_{S_b: |S_b|=s} f(Z_{S_b}) - \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{\binom{n}{s}} \sum_{S_b: |S_b|=s} f(Z_{S_b}) \right] \right| = O \left(\sqrt{\frac{s \log(1/\delta)}{n}} \right).$$

□

Lemma A.3 (Kernel Error). *Under Assumptions 1, 2 and 3.2, we have $\Gamma(\hat{g}, \hat{\alpha}) = O(\epsilon(s))$.*

Proof. We let $Z_{S_b}^{(i)} = \{Z_j\}_{j \in S_b / \{i\}}$, $\hat{g}_i = \hat{g}(X_i, W_i)$ and $\hat{\alpha}_i = \hat{\alpha}(X_i, W_i)$. It holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{i=1}^n K(x, X_i, Z_{1:n}, \xi) (m(Z_i; \hat{g}_i) + \hat{\alpha}_i(Y_i - \hat{g}_i)) \right] \\
&= \frac{1}{\binom{n}{s}} \sum_{S_b: |S_b|=s} \sum_{i \in S_b} \mathbb{E} \left[\tilde{K}(x, X_i, Z_{S_b}, \xi_b) (m(Z_i; \hat{g}_i) + \hat{\alpha}_i(Y_i - \hat{g}_i)) \right] \\
&= \frac{1}{\binom{n}{s}} \sum_{S_b: |S_b|=s} \sum_{i \in S_b} \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{E} \left[\tilde{K}(x, X_i, Z_{S_b}, \xi_b) (m(Z_i; \hat{g}_i) + \hat{\alpha}_i(Y_i - \hat{g}_i)) \mid X_i, Z_{S_b}^{(i)} \right] \right] \text{ (tower law)} \\
&= \frac{1}{\binom{n}{s}} \sum_{S_b: |S_b|=s} \sum_{i \in S_b} \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{E} \left[\tilde{K}(x, X_i, Z_{S_b}, \xi_b) \mid X_i, Z_{S_b}^{(i)} \right] \cdot \mathbb{E} \left[m(Z_i; \hat{g}_i) + \hat{\alpha}_i(Y_i - \hat{g}_i) \mid X_i, Z_{S_b}^{(i)} \right] \right] \text{ (honesty)} \\
&= \frac{1}{\binom{n}{s}} \sum_{S_b: |S_b|=s} \sum_{i \in S_b} \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{E} \left[\tilde{K}(x, X_i, Z_{S_b}, \xi_b) \mid X_i, Z_{S_b}^{(i)} \right] \cdot \mathbb{E} [m(Z_i; \hat{g}_i) + \hat{\alpha}_i(Y_i - \hat{g}_i) \mid X_i] \right] \text{ (i.i.d. data)} \\
&= \frac{1}{\binom{n}{s}} \sum_{S_b: |S_b|=s} \sum_{i \in S_b} \mathbb{E} \left[\tilde{K}(x, X_i, Z_{S_b}, \xi_b) \cdot \mathbb{E} [m(Z_i; \hat{g}_i) + \hat{\alpha}_i(Y_i - \hat{g}_i) \mid X_i] \right] \text{ (tower law)}.
\end{aligned}$$

We define $M(x) = \mathbb{E} [m(Z_i; \hat{g}_i) + \hat{\alpha}_i(Y_i - \hat{g}_i) \mid X_i = x]$. Since $\sum_{i \in S_b} \tilde{K}(x, X_i, Z_{S_b}, \xi_b) = 1$, the kernel error $\Gamma(\hat{g}, \hat{\alpha})$ can be written as

$$\Gamma(\hat{g}, \hat{\alpha}) = \frac{1}{\binom{n}{s}} \sum_{S_b: |S_b|=s} \sum_{i \in S_b} \mathbb{E} \left[\tilde{K}(x, X_i, Z_{S_b}, \xi_b) (M(X_i) - M(x)) \right].$$

By Assumption 3.2, $M(x)$ is L -Lipschitz in x . Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{i \in S_b} \mathbb{E} \left[\tilde{K}(x, X_i, Z_{S_b}, \xi_b) (M(X_i) - M(x)) \right] &\leq L \cdot \sum_{i \in S_b} \mathbb{E} \left[\tilde{K}(x, X_i, Z_{S_b}, \xi_b) \cdot \|X_i - x\| \right] \\
&\leq L \cdot \mathbb{E} \left[\max_i \left\{ \|X_i - x\| : \tilde{K}(x, X_i, Z_{S_b}, \xi_b) > 0 \right\} \right] \\
&\leq L\epsilon(s),
\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows from the kernel shrinkage in Assumption 2. Averaging over the subsamples S_b , we complete our proof. \square

Lemma A.4 (Nuisance Error). *The nuisance error $\Lambda(\hat{g}, \hat{\alpha})$ can be bounded by $|\Lambda(\hat{g}, \hat{\alpha})| \leq \mathcal{E}(\hat{g}, \hat{\alpha})$, where $\mathcal{E}(\hat{g}, \hat{\alpha}) = \|\hat{g} - g_0\|_x \cdot \|\hat{\alpha} - \alpha_0\|_x$.*

Proof. By definition, $\mathbb{E}[m(Z_i; g(x, W_i)) \mid X_i = x] = \mathbb{E}[\alpha_0(x, W_i)g(x, W_i) \mid X_i = x]$ for any $g \in \mathcal{G}_x$. Plugging this into $\Lambda(\hat{g}, \hat{\alpha})$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\Lambda(\hat{g}, \hat{\alpha}) &= \mathbb{E} [m(Z_i; \hat{g}_i) + \hat{\alpha}_i(Y_i - \hat{g}_i) \mid X_i = x] - \mathbb{E} [m(Z_i; g_0(x, W_i)) \mid X_i = x] \\
&= \mathbb{E} [\alpha_0(x, W_i)(\hat{g}(x, W_i) - g_0(x, W_i)) + \hat{\alpha}(x, W_i)(Y_i - \hat{g}(x, W_i)) \mid X_i = x].
\end{aligned}$$

Further observe that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}[\hat{\alpha}(x, W_i)Y_i | X_i = x] &= \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[\hat{\alpha}(x, W_i)Y_i | X_i = x, W_i] | X_i = x] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[\hat{\alpha}(x, W_i) \cdot \mathbb{E}[Y_i | X_i = x, W_i] | X_i = x] = \mathbb{E}[\hat{\alpha}(x, W_i)g_0(x, W_i) | X_i = x].\end{aligned}$$

As a result,

$$\Lambda(\hat{g}, \hat{\alpha}) = \mathbb{E}[(\alpha_0(x, W_i) - \hat{\alpha}(x, W_i))(\hat{g}(x, W_i) - g_0(x, W_i)) | X_i = x].$$

By Hölder's inequality, we get that

$$\begin{aligned}|\Lambda(\hat{g}, \hat{\alpha})| &\leq \sqrt{\mathbb{E}[(\hat{g}(x, W_i) - g_0(x, W_i))^2 | X_i = x]} \cdot \sqrt{\mathbb{E}[(\hat{\alpha}(x, W_i) - \alpha_0(x, W_i))^2 | X_i = x]} \\ &= \|\hat{g} - g_0\|_x \cdot \|\hat{\alpha} - \alpha_0\|_x.\end{aligned}$$

□

Proof of Theorem 1: By Lemma A.1 and Lemma A.2, w.p. $1 - 2\delta$,

$$|E(\hat{g}, \hat{\alpha})| + |\Delta(\hat{g}, \hat{\alpha})| = O\left(\sqrt{\frac{\log(1/\delta)}{B}} + \sqrt{\frac{s \log(1/\delta)}{n}}\right).$$

Under the conditions that $s = o(n)$ and $B \geq n/s$, $|E(\hat{g}, \hat{\alpha})| + |\Delta(\hat{g}, \hat{\alpha})| = o_p(1)$. By Lemma A.3 and Lemma A.4, $|\Gamma(\hat{g}, \hat{\alpha})| + |\Lambda(\hat{g}, \hat{\alpha})| = o(1)$ under the assumptions that $\epsilon(s) \rightarrow 0$ and $\mathcal{E}(\hat{g}, \hat{\alpha}) \rightarrow 0$. Combining these terms, we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned}\left|\hat{\theta}(x) - \theta_0(x)\right| &\leq |E(\hat{g}, \hat{\alpha})| + |\Delta(\hat{g}, \hat{\alpha})| + |\Gamma(\hat{g}, \hat{\alpha})| + |\Lambda(\hat{g}, \hat{\alpha})| \\ &= o_p(1).\end{aligned}$$

A.3.4 Proof of Corollary 1

It suffices to show that the error rate of the nuisance estimators in (10) of the DRRF algorithm satisfies $\mathcal{E}(\hat{g}, \hat{\alpha}) = O(n^{\frac{1}{2}(\beta-1)})$.

Since $g_0(x, w) = h(w, \nu_g(x))$ and $\alpha_0(x, w) = h(w, \nu_\alpha(x))$ for some known function h that is L -Lipschitz in its second argument, we have for any $x \in \mathcal{X}$ and $w \in \mathcal{W}$,

$$\begin{aligned}(\hat{g}(x, w) - g_0(x, w))^2 &= (h(w, \hat{\nu}_g(x)) - h(w, \nu_g(x)))^2 \leq L^2 \cdot \|\hat{\nu}_g(x) - \nu_g(x)\|^2, \\ (\hat{\alpha}(x, w) - \alpha_0(x, w))^2 &= (h(w, \hat{\nu}_\alpha(x)) - h(w, \nu_\alpha(x)))^2 \leq L^2 \cdot \|\hat{\nu}_\alpha(x) - \nu_\alpha(x)\|^2.\end{aligned}$$

As a result,

$$\mathcal{E}(\hat{g}, \hat{\alpha}) \lesssim \|\hat{\nu}_g(x) - \nu_g(x)\|_2 \cdot \|\hat{\nu}_\alpha(x) - \nu_\alpha(x)\|_2.$$

Let $\lambda = \max(\lambda_g, \lambda_\alpha)$. According to Proposition 3, with probability $1 - 2\delta$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\hat{\nu}_g(x) - \nu_g(x)\|_2 &\leq \frac{2\lambda_g k}{\gamma - 32k\sqrt{s \ln(d_\nu/\delta)}/n}, \\ \|\hat{\nu}_\alpha(x) - \nu_\alpha(x)\|_2 &\leq \frac{2\lambda_\alpha k}{\gamma - 32k\sqrt{s \ln(d_\nu/\delta)}/n}, \end{aligned}$$

as long as $\lambda_g, \lambda_\alpha \geq \Theta\left(s^{-1/(2\alpha d)} + \sqrt{\frac{s \ln(d_\nu/\delta)}{n}}\right)$.

We take $\delta = \delta_n = n^{\frac{1}{2}(\beta-1)}$, and $\lambda_g, \lambda_\alpha = \Theta\left(s^{-1/(2\alpha d)} + \sqrt{\frac{s \ln(d_\nu/\delta_n)}{n}}\right)$. Note that d_ν grows at a polynomial rate in n . Therefore, $\gamma - 32k\sqrt{s \ln(n \cdot 2d_\nu/\delta_n)}/n \rightarrow \gamma$ when $n \rightarrow \infty$. Furthermore, we have $s^{-1/(2\alpha d)} \leq \sqrt{\frac{s}{n}}$ as $\beta > (1 + \frac{1}{\alpha d})^{-1}$. Therefore, it holds that

$$\mathcal{E}(\hat{g}, \hat{\alpha}) \lesssim n^{\frac{1}{2}(\beta-1)} \left(\frac{s}{n} \ln\left(d_\nu \cdot n^{\frac{1}{2}(1-\beta)}\right) + 1\right) = O(n^{\frac{1}{2}(\beta-1)}).$$

A.3.5 Proof of Theorem 2

Note that the sampling error

$$\Delta(\hat{g}, \hat{\alpha}) = \Delta(g_0, \alpha_0) + \Delta(\hat{g}, \hat{\alpha}) - \Delta(g_0, \alpha_0).$$

Let $\hat{g}_i = \hat{g}(X_i, W_i)$, $g_{0,i} = g_0(X_i, W_i)$, $\hat{\alpha}_i = \hat{\alpha}(X_i, W_i)$ and $\alpha_{0,i} = \alpha_0(X_i, W_i)$. The last two terms $\Delta(\hat{g}, \hat{\alpha}) - \Delta(g_0, \alpha_0)$ form a complete U -statistic with aggregation function

$$\begin{aligned} f(Z_{S_b}) &= \mathbb{E}_{\xi_b} \left[\sum_{i \in S_b} \tilde{K}(x, X_i, Z_{S_b}, \xi_b) (m(Z_i; \hat{g}_i) + \hat{\alpha}_i(Y_i - \hat{g}_i) - m(Z_i; g_{0,i}) - \alpha_{0,i}(Y_i - g_{0,i})) \right] \\ &\quad - \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{i \in S_b} \tilde{K}(x, X_i, Z_{S_b}, \xi_b) (m(Z_i; \hat{g}_i) + \hat{\alpha}_i(Y_i - \hat{g}_i) - m(Z_i; g_{0,i}) - \alpha_{0,i}(Y_i - g_{0,i})) \right], \end{aligned}$$

which is symmetric and bounded. By the Bernstein's inequality for U -statistics (Peel et al., 2010), we get that

$$|\Delta(\hat{g}, \hat{\alpha}) - \Delta(g_0, \alpha_0)| = O_p \left(\sqrt{\frac{s \mathbb{E}[f(Z_{S_b})^2]}{n}} + \frac{s}{n} \right).$$

Note that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} [f(Z_{S_b})^2] \\
& \leq \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{i \in S_b} \tilde{K}(x, X_i, Z_{S_b}, \xi_b) (m(Z_i; \hat{g}_i) + \hat{\alpha}_i(Y_i - \hat{g}_i) - m(Z_i; g_{0,i}) - \alpha_{0,i}(Y_i - g_{0,i}))^2 \right] \text{ (Jensen's inequality)} \\
& = \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{i \in S_b} \mathbb{E} \left[\tilde{K}(x, X_i, Z_{S_b}, \xi_b) (m(Z_i; \hat{g}_i) + \hat{\alpha}_i(Y_i - \hat{g}_i) - m(Z_i; g_{0,i}) - \alpha_{0,i}(Y_i - g_{0,i}))^2 \mid X_i, Z_{S_b}^{(i)} \right] \right] \text{ (tower law)} \\
& = \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{i \in S_b} \mathbb{E} \left[\tilde{K}(x, X_i, Z_{S_b}, \xi_b) \mid X_i, Z_{S_b}^{(i)} \right] \mathbb{E} \left[(m(Z_i; \hat{g}_i) + \hat{\alpha}_i(Y_i - \hat{g}_i) - m(Z_i; g_{0,i}) - \alpha_{0,i}(Y_i - g_{0,i}))^2 \mid X_i, Z_{S_b}^{(i)} \right] \right] \text{ (honesty)} \\
& = \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{i \in S_b} \mathbb{E} \left[\tilde{K}(x, X_i, Z_{S_b}, \xi_b) \mid X_i, Z_{S_b}^{(i)} \right] \mathbb{E} \left[(m(Z_i; \hat{g}_i) + \hat{\alpha}_i(Y_i - \hat{g}_i) - m(Z_i; g_{0,i}) - \alpha_{0,i}(Y_i - g_{0,i}))^2 \mid X_i \right] \right] \text{ (i.i.d data)} \\
& = \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{i \in S_b} \tilde{K}(x, X_i, Z_{S_b}, \xi_b) \mathbb{E} \left[(m(Z_i; \hat{g}_i) + \hat{\alpha}_i(Y_i - \hat{g}_i) - m(Z_i; g_{0,i}) - \alpha_{0,i}(Y_i - g_{0,i}))^2 \mid X_i \right] \right] \text{ (tower law)}.
\end{aligned}$$

By the local mean-squared continuity condition in Assumption 5,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} \left[(m(Z_i; \hat{g}_i) + \hat{\alpha}_i(Y_i - \hat{g}_i) - m(Z_i; g_{0,i}) - \alpha_{0,i}(Y_i - g_{0,i}))^2 \mid X_i \right] \\
& \leq L \cdot \mathbb{E} \left[(\hat{g}_i - g_{0,i})^2 + (\hat{\alpha}_i - \alpha_{0,i})^2 \mid X_i \right].
\end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, since $g_0(x, w) = h(w, \nu_g(x))$ and $\alpha_0(x, w) = h(w, \nu_\alpha(x))$ with some known function h that is L -Lipschitz in the parameter ν , we have for any $x \in \mathcal{X}$ and $w \in \mathcal{W}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
(\hat{g}(x, w) - g_0(x, w))^2 &= (h(w, \hat{\nu}_g(x)) - h(w, \nu_g(x)))^2 \leq L \cdot \|\hat{\nu}_g(x) - \nu_g(x)\|^2, \\
(\hat{\alpha}(x, w) - \alpha_0(x, w))^2 &= (h(w, \hat{\nu}_\alpha(x)) - h(w, \nu_\alpha(x)))^2 \leq L \cdot \|\hat{\nu}_\alpha(x) - \nu_\alpha(x)\|^2.
\end{aligned}$$

As a result, $\mathbb{E} [f(Z_{S_b})^2]$ can be further bounded by

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E} [f(Z_{S_b})^2] &\lesssim \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{i \in S_b} \tilde{K}(x, X_i, Z_{S_b}, \xi_b) \left(\|\hat{\nu}_g(X_i) - \nu_g(X_i)\|^2 + \|\hat{\nu}_\alpha(X_i) - \nu_\alpha(X_i)\|^2 \right) \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{i \in S_b} \tilde{K}(x, X_i, Z_{S_b}, \xi_b) \left(\|\hat{\nu}_g(X_i) - \nu_g(X_i)\|^2 + \|\hat{\nu}_\alpha(X_i) - \nu_\alpha(X_i)\|^2 \right) \mid Z_{1:n} \right] \right].
\end{aligned}$$

Note that we estimate ν_g and ν_α using only the sample points Z_{n+1}, \dots, Z_{2n} , so $\hat{\nu}_g(\cdot)$ and $\hat{\nu}_\alpha(\cdot)$ are independent of Z_i and $\tilde{K}(x, X_i, Z_{S_b}, \xi_b)$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$. Since for any fixed x , with probability at least $1 - \delta_n$, where δ_n possibly depends on n , $(\|\hat{\nu}_g(x) - \nu_g(x)\|^2 + \|\hat{\nu}_\alpha(x) - \nu_\alpha(x)\|^2)^{1/2} \leq r_n(\delta_n)$,

we have

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{i \in S_b} \tilde{K}(x, X_i, Z_{S_b}, \xi_b) \left(\|\hat{\nu}_g(X_i) - \nu_g(X_i)\|^2 + \|\hat{\nu}_\alpha(X_i) - \nu_\alpha(X_i)\|^2 \right) \mid Z_{1:n} \right] \leq M\delta_n + r_n^2(\delta_n/n)$$

for some constant M .

Therefore, $\mathbb{E} [f(Z_{S_b})^2] = O(\delta_n + r_n^2(\delta_n/n))$, and

$$\Delta(\hat{g}, \hat{\alpha}) - \Delta(g_0, \alpha_0) = O_p \left(\sqrt{\frac{s(\delta_n + r_n^2(\delta_n/n))}{n}} + \frac{s}{n} \right) = O_p \left(\frac{s}{n} + \delta_n + r_n^2(\delta_n/n) \right),$$

where we have used

$$\sqrt{\frac{s(\delta_n + r_n^2(\delta_n/n))}{n}} \leq \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{s}{n} + \delta_n + r_n^2(\delta_n/n) \right).$$

Note that the above bound dominates the subsampling error $E(\hat{g}, \hat{\alpha})$ when $B \geq (n/s)^2$. In addition, the product error $\mathcal{E}(\hat{g}, \hat{\alpha})$ can be bounded by

$$\mathcal{E}(\hat{g}, \hat{\alpha}) \leq L \cdot \|\hat{\nu}_g(x) - \nu_g(x)\| \cdot \|\hat{\nu}_\alpha(x) - \nu_\alpha(x)\| = O(r_n^2(\delta_n/n) + \delta_n).$$

Therefore, from the proof of Theorem 1, we have that

$$\left| \hat{\theta}(x) - \theta_0(x) \right| = \Delta(g_0, \alpha_0) + O_p \left(\frac{s}{n} + \delta_n + r_n^2(\delta_n/n) + \epsilon(s) \right),$$

for any $\delta_n > 0$ that may depend on n .

The leading term $\Delta(g_0, \alpha_0)$ is of the form $U_n - \mathbb{E}[U_n]$, where U_n is a complete U -statistic with aggregation function

$$f(Z_{S_b}) = \mathbb{E}_{\xi_b} \left[\sum_{i \in S_b} \tilde{K}(x, X_i, Z_{S_b}, \xi_b) \psi(Z_i; \alpha_0, g_0) \right].$$

To establish the asymptotic normality of U_n , we employ the following CLT result for U -statistics:

Lemma A.5. *Let $\rho(z) = \mathbb{E}[f(z, Z_2, \dots, Z_s)]$ and let $\eta(s) = \text{Var}(\rho(Z_1))$. Suppose that $n\eta(s) \rightarrow \infty$ and that $\text{Var}(f(Z_S)) < \infty$. Let U_n be the complete U -statistic of order s associated with aggregation function f , then*

$$\sqrt{\frac{n}{s^2\eta(s)}} (U_n - \mathbb{E}[U_n]) \xrightarrow{d} N(0, 1).$$

Proof. The proof follows identical steps as the one in Theorem 2 of [Fan et al. \(2018\)](#). \square

Since $f(Z_{S_b}) = \mathbb{E}_{\xi_b} \left[\sum_{i \in S_b} \tilde{K}(x, X_i, Z_{S_b}, \xi_b) \psi(Z_i; \alpha_0, g_0) \right]$ is uniformly bounded by Assumption

3.1, its variance is also bounded. By Lemma 5, when $n\eta(s) \rightarrow \infty$, we have that

$$\sqrt{\frac{n}{s^2\eta(s)}} \Delta(g_0, \alpha_0) \xrightarrow{d} N(0, 1).$$

Note that under the following four conditions: (1) $n\eta(s) \rightarrow \infty$; (2) $\sqrt{n/(s^2\eta(s))} \cdot \delta_n \rightarrow 0$; (3) $\sqrt{n/(s^2\eta(s))} \cdot r_n^2(\delta_n/n) \rightarrow 0$; (4) $\sqrt{n/(s^2\eta(s))} \cdot \epsilon(s) \rightarrow 0$, we have that

$$\sqrt{\frac{n}{s^2\eta(s)}} \cdot O_p\left(\frac{s}{n} + \delta_n + r_n^2(\delta_n/n) + \epsilon(s)\right) = o_p(1),$$

from which Slutsky's lemma gives

$$\sqrt{\frac{n}{s^2\eta(s)}} (\hat{\theta}(x) - \theta_0(x)) \xrightarrow{d} N(0, 1).$$

A.3.6 Proof of Theorem 3

We first show that the two conditions $n\eta(s) \rightarrow \infty$ and $n\epsilon^2(s)/(s^2\eta(s)) \rightarrow 0$ in Theorem 2 are satisfied under the doubly robust random forest algorithm described in Section 2.4.

Proposition A.1. *Suppose that the base kernel \tilde{K} is constructed from a DRRF that satisfies Assumption A.1. Additionally, suppose there exists a strictly positive $\underline{\sigma}$ such that $\min_x \text{Var}(\psi(Z; \alpha_0, g_0) | X = x) \geq \underline{\sigma}^2 > 0$. Set $s = \Theta(n^\beta)$, where $(1 + \frac{1}{\alpha d})^{-1} < \beta < 1$. Then, $\gamma(s) = w(\epsilon(s)/s)$, and the conditions in Theorem 2 that $n\eta(s) \rightarrow \infty$ and $n\epsilon^2(s)/(s^2\eta(s)) \rightarrow 0$ hold.*

Note that when the kernel \tilde{K} is obtained from a DRRF that satisfies Assumption A.1, Wager and Athey (2018) shows that $\epsilon(s) = O(s^{-\frac{1}{2\alpha d}})$, where α is a positive constant that depends on the parameters specified in Assumption A.1. Moreover, Lemma 4 of Wager and Athey (2018) proves that $\gamma(s) \gtrsim \frac{1}{s \log(s)^d}$. Hence, $\gamma(s) = w(\epsilon(s)/s)$.

To prove the two conditions, $n\eta(s) \rightarrow \infty$ and $n\epsilon^2(s)/(s^2\eta(s)) \rightarrow 0$, hold, we first formalize the statement that $\eta(s)$ can be lower bounded by a constant multiple of $\gamma(s)$ in Lemma A.7. To prove Lemma A.7, we begin with Lemma A.6.

Lemma A.6. *Suppose $\{(K_i, H_i, X_i)\}_{i=1}^s$ is a set of random variables. Assume the following conditions hold:*

$$K_1 \perp\!\!\!\perp H_1 | X_1,$$

and

$$\mathbb{E}[K_i H_i | H_1, X_1] = \mathbb{E}[K_i H_i | X_1] \quad \text{for } i > 1.$$

Additionally, suppose there exists a strictly positive σ such that $\min_x \text{Var}(H_1 | X_1 = x) \geq \sigma^2 > 0$.

Let $T := \sum_{i=1}^s K_i H_i$. Furthermore, assume $\mathbb{E}[T | Z_1] = \mathbb{E}[T | H_1, X_1]$. Then,

$$\text{Var}(\mathbb{E}[T | Z_1]) \geq \sigma^2 \cdot \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[K_1 | X_1]^2].$$

Proof. We have the decomposition

$$\mathbb{E}[T | Z_1] = \underbrace{\mathbb{E}[T | X_1]}_A + \underbrace{\mathbb{E}[T | H_1, X_1] - \mathbb{E}[T | X_1]}_B.$$

Note that A and B are uncorrelated. Thus, we have

$$\text{Var}(\mathbb{E}[T | Z_1]) \geq \text{Var}(B) = \text{Var}\left(\sum_{i=1}^s (\mathbb{E}[K_i H_i | H_1, X_1] - \mathbb{E}[K_i H_i | X_1])\right).$$

Since for all $i > 1$, $\mathbb{E}[K_i H_i | H_1, X_1] = \mathbb{E}[K_i H_i | X_1]$, all terms in the summation, except the one associated with $i = 1$, vanish. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Var}(\mathbb{E}[T | Z_1]) &\geq \mathbb{E}\left[(\mathbb{E}[K_1 H_1 | H_1, X_1] - \mathbb{E}[K_1 H_1 | X_1])^2\right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}\left[(\mathbb{E}[K_1 | H_1, X_1] H_1 - \mathbb{E}[K_1 | X_1] \mathbb{E}[H_1 | X_1])^2\right] \quad (\text{honesty}) \\ &= \mathbb{E}\left[(\mathbb{E}[K_1 | X_1] H_1 - \mathbb{E}[K_1 | X_1] \mathbb{E}[H_1 | X_1])^2\right] \quad (\text{honesty}) \\ &= \mathbb{E}\left[\mathbb{E}[K_1 | X_1]^2 \mathbb{E}\left[(H_1 - \mathbb{E}[H_1 | X_1])^2 | X_1\right]\right] \quad (\text{tower law}) \\ &\geq \sigma^2 \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[K_1 | X_1]^2]. \end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma A.7. *Suppose that the DRRF constructed satisfies Assumption A.1. Furthermore, there exists a strictly positive $\underline{\sigma}$ such that $\min_x \text{Var}(\psi(Z; \alpha_0, g_0) | X = x) \geq \underline{\sigma}^2 > 0$. Then, for sufficiently large s , there exists a constant $c > 0$ such that*

$$\eta(s) \geq c \cdot \gamma(s).$$

Proof. With the doubly robust random forest algorithm in Section 2.4, we partition the samples in S into two equal-sized subsets S^1 and S^2 . The kernel is constructed using only the sample points from S^1 , and the weight assigned to all samples in S^1 is set to zero. For the samples in S^2 , the kernel construction satisfies strong honesty, i.e.:

$$\forall i, j \in S^2 : \tilde{K}(x, X_i, Z_{S_b}, \xi_b) \perp\!\!\!\perp \psi(Z_j; \alpha_0, g_0) | X_j.$$

To simplify notation, let

$$T = \sum_{i=1}^s \tilde{K}(x, X_i, Z_S, \xi_S) \psi(Z_i; \alpha_0, g_0).$$

We have $\mathbb{E}[T \mid Z_1] = \mathbb{E}[T \cdot I\{1 \in S^1\} \mid Z_1] + \mathbb{E}[T \cdot I\{1 \in S^2\} \mid Z_1]$. Since $\text{Var}(A + B) - (\frac{1}{2}\text{Var}(A) - \text{Var}(B)) = 2\text{Var}(B + \frac{1}{2}A) \geq 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \eta(s) = \text{Var}(\mathbb{E}[T \mid Z_1]) &\geq \frac{1}{2}\text{Var}(\mathbb{E}[T \mid Z_1, 1 \in S^2]\mathbb{P}(1 \in S^2)) - \text{Var}(\mathbb{E}[T \mid Z_1, 1 \in S^1]\mathbb{P}(1 \in S^1)) \\ &= \frac{1}{8}\text{Var}(\mathbb{E}[T \mid Z_1, 1 \in S^2]) - \frac{1}{4}\text{Var}(\mathbb{E}[T \mid Z_1, 1 \in S^1]). \end{aligned}$$

The last equality holds because S^1 and S^2 are randomly selected from S with equal probability.

Moreover, conditioning on the event $\{1 \in S^2\}$ doesn't change the distribution of the random variables, since S^2 is chosen fully at random without looking at the data. It is straightforward to verify that the assumptions of Lemma A.6 hold for $K_i = \tilde{K}(x, X_i, Z_S, \xi_S)$, and $H_i = \psi(Z_i; \alpha_0, g_0)$, $X_i = X_i$ under $\{1 \in S^2\}$. Therefore,

$$\text{Var}(\mathbb{E}[T \mid Z_1, 1 \in S^2]) \geq \underline{\sigma}^2 \gamma(s).$$

We now argue that the negative term is negligible. Let i_1 denote the random variable of the first index of the set S^1 , i.e. $S^1 = \{i_1, \dots, i_{s/2}\}$. Note that since T is stochastically symmetric under permutations of the input variables, we can write

$$\mathbb{E}[T \mid Z_1, 1 \in S^1] = \mathbb{E}[T \mid Z_{i_1}].$$

Note that the elements of S^1 can be thought of as a random subset of size $s/2$ among the n samples. Moreover, consider the symmetric function

$$g(Z_{S^1}) = \mathbb{E}[T \mid \{Z_i\}_{i \in S^1}].$$

We can view this as the aggregation function of a U -statistic. In the following, we perform an Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) decomposition as done in Fan et al. (2018).

Consider the following projection functions:

$$\begin{aligned} g_1(z_{i_1}) &= \mathbb{E}[g(z_{i_1}, Z_{i_2}, \dots, Z_{i_{s/2}})], \\ g_2(z_{i_1}, z_{i_2}) &= \mathbb{E}[g(z_{i_1}, z_{i_2}, Z_{i_3}, \dots, Z_{i_{s/2}})], \\ &\vdots \\ g_{s/2}(z_{i_1}, z_{i_2}, \dots, z_{i_{s/2}}) &= g(z_{i_1}, z_{i_2}, \dots, z_{i_{s/2}}), \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{g}_1(z_{i_1}) &= g_1(z_{i_1}) - \mathbb{E}[g], \\
\tilde{g}_2(z_{i_1}, z_{i_2}) &= g_2(z_{i_1}, z_{i_2}) - \mathbb{E}[g], \\
&\vdots \\
\tilde{g}_{s/2}(z_{i_1}, z_{i_2}, \dots, z_{i_{s/2}}) &= g_{s/2}(z_{i_1}, z_{i_2}, \dots, z_{i_{s/2}}) - \mathbb{E}[g],
\end{aligned}$$

where $\mathbb{E}[g] = \mathbb{E}[g(Z_{S^1})]$. Then we define the canonical terms of Hoeffding's U -statistic decomposition as

$$\begin{aligned}
h_1(z_{i_1}) &= \tilde{g}_1(z_{i_1}), \\
h_2(z_{i_1}, z_{i_2}) &= \tilde{g}_2(z_{i_1}, z_{i_2}) - h_1(z_{i_1}) - h_1(z_{i_2}), \\
h_3(z_{i_1}, z_{i_2}, z_{i_3}) &= \tilde{g}_3(z_{i_1}, z_{i_2}, z_{i_3}) - \sum_{k=1}^3 h_1(z_{i_k}) - \sum_{1 \leq k < l \leq 3} h_2(z_{i_k}, z_{i_l}), \\
&\vdots \\
h_{s/2}(z_{i_1}, z_{i_2}, \dots, z_{i_{s/2}}) &= \tilde{g}_{s/2}(z_{i_1}, z_{i_2}, \dots, z_{i_{s/2}}) - \sum_{k=1}^{s/2} h_1(z_{i_k}) - \sum_{1 \leq k < l \leq s/2} h_2(z_{i_k}, z_{i_l}) - \dots \\
&\quad - \sum_{1 \leq k_1 < k_2 < \dots < k_{(s/2)-1} \leq s/2} h_{s/2-1}(z_{i_{k_1}}, z_{i_{k_2}}, \dots, z_{i_{k_{(s/2)-1}}}).
\end{aligned}$$

Subsequently,

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{g}_{s/2}(z_{i_1}, \dots, z_{i_{s/2}}) &= g(z_{i_1}, \dots, z_{i_{s/2}}) - \mathbb{E}[g] \\
&= \sum_{k=1}^{s/2} h_1(z_{i_k}) + \sum_{1 \leq k < l \leq s/2} h_2(z_{i_k}, z_{i_l}) + \dots + h_{s/2}(z_{i_1}, \dots, z_{i_{s/2}}).
\end{aligned}$$

It is straightforward to show that all the canonical terms in the latter expression are uncorrelated. Hence, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{Var}[g(Z_{i_1}, \dots, Z_{i_{s/2}})] &= \binom{s/2}{1} \mathbb{E}[h_1^2] + \binom{s/2}{2} \mathbb{E}[h_2^2] + \dots + \binom{s/2}{s/2} \mathbb{E}[h_{s/2}^2] \\
&\geq \frac{s}{2} \mathbb{E}[h_1^2] = \frac{s}{2} \text{Var}(\mathbb{E}[T \mid Z_{i_1}]),
\end{aligned}$$

which implies $\text{Var}(\mathbb{E}[T \mid Z_{i_1}]) \leq 2/s \cdot \text{Var}(\mathbb{E}[T \mid \{Z_i\}_{i \in S^1}])$. Now observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[T \mid \{Z_i\}_{i \in S^1}] &= \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{i \in S^2} \tilde{K}(x, X_i, Z_S, \xi_S) \psi(Z_i; \alpha_0, g_0) \mid \{Z_i\}_{i \in S^1} \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{i \in S^2} \tilde{K}(x, X_i, Z_S, \xi_S) \mathbb{E}[\psi(Z_i; \alpha_0, g_0) \mid X_i] \mid \{Z_i\}_{i \in S^1} \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[\psi(Z_i; \alpha_0, g_0) \mid X = x] + \\ &\quad \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{i \in S^2} \tilde{K}(x, X_i, Z_S, \xi_S) (\mathbb{E}[\psi(Z_i; \alpha_0, g_0) \mid X_i] - \mathbb{E}[\psi(Z; \alpha_0, g_0) \mid X = x]) \mid \{Z_i\}_{i \in S^1} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{Var}(\mathbb{E}[T \mid \{Z_i\}_{i \in S^1}]) \\ &\leq \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{i \in S^2} \tilde{K}(x, X_i, Z_S, \xi_S) (\mathbb{E}[\psi(Z_i; \alpha_0, g_0) \mid X_i] - \mathbb{E}[\psi(Z; \alpha_0, g_0) \mid X = x]) \mid \{Z_i\}_{i \in S^1} \right]^2 \right] \\ &\leq L^2 \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{E} \left[\max_i \{\|X_i - x\|, i \in S^2 : \tilde{K}(x, X_i, Z_S, \xi_S) > 0\} \mid \{Z_i\}_{i \in S^1} \right]^2 \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Note that the kernel shrinkage property holds for any fixed values of the partition samples for honest forests that satisfy the balancedness and minimal random splitting criteria. Therefore, we have

$$\text{Var}(\mathbb{E}[T \mid \{Z_i\}_{i \in S^1}]) = O(\epsilon(s)^2).$$

Thus, overall, we have

$$\eta(s) = \text{Var}(\mathbb{E}[T \mid Z_1]) \gtrsim \underline{\sigma}^2 \gamma(s) - O\left(\frac{\epsilon(s)^2}{s}\right).$$

Since $\gamma(s) = w(\epsilon(s)/s)$, we have $\frac{\epsilon(s)^2}{s} = o(\epsilon(s)\gamma(s))$ is of lower order than $\gamma(s)$. \square

If we choose $s = \Theta(n^\beta)$, where $(1 + \frac{1}{\alpha d})^{-1} < \beta < 1$, then $\frac{n}{s \log(s)^d} \rightarrow \infty$ and $ns^{-(1 + \frac{1}{\alpha d} - \epsilon)} \rightarrow 0$ for some $\epsilon > 0$, which implies that $n\gamma(s) \rightarrow \infty$ and $n\epsilon^2(s)/(s^2\gamma(s)) \rightarrow 0$. By Lemma A.7, $\eta(s) \geq c \cdot \gamma(s)$ for sufficiently large s . Therefore, $n\eta(s) \rightarrow \infty$ and $n\epsilon^2(s)/(s^2\eta(s)) \rightarrow 0$, and we complete the proof of Proposition A.1.

In the following, we prove that the nuisance conditions

$$\sqrt{n/(s^2\eta(s))} \cdot \delta_n \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \sqrt{n/(s^2\eta(s))} \cdot r_n^2(\delta_n/n) \rightarrow 0$$

from Theorem 2 are satisfied with δ_n appropriately chosen for the DRRF algorithm.

Let $\lambda = \max(\lambda_g, \lambda_\alpha)$. According to Proposition 3,

$$r_n(\delta) = O\left(\frac{2\lambda k}{\gamma - 32k\sqrt{s \ln(2d_\nu/\delta)/n}}\right).$$

We take $\delta = \delta_n = n^{-c}$, where $c > 1/2$, and $\lambda_g, \lambda_\alpha = \Theta\left(s^{-1/(2\alpha d)} + \sqrt{\frac{s \ln(d_\nu/\delta_n)}{n}}\right)$. Note that d_ν grows at a polynomial rate in n . Therefore,

$$\gamma - 32k\sqrt{s \ln(n \cdot 2d_\nu/\delta_n)/n} \rightarrow \gamma$$

when $n \rightarrow \infty$. Hence, we only need to show

$$n^{-c}\sqrt{n/(s^2\eta(s))} \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{s}{n} \ln(n^{1+c} \cdot d_\nu) \cdot \sqrt{n/(s^2\eta(s))} \rightarrow 0,$$

where the second condition is sufficient since $s^{-1/(2\alpha d)} \leq \sqrt{\frac{s}{n}}$ as $\beta > (1 + \frac{1}{\alpha d})^{-1}$. In the case of doubly robust random forest, $\gamma(s) \gtrsim \frac{1}{s \log(s)^d}$. This completes the proof.