

Inferring Treatment Effects in Large Panels by Uncovering Latent Similarities

Ben Deaner*

Chen-Wei Hsiang*

Andrei Zeleneev*

This version: March 28, 2025

First Circulated: January 31, 2025

Abstract

The presence of unobserved confounders is one of the main challenges in identifying treatment effects. In this paper, we propose a new approach to causal inference using panel data with large N and T . Our approach imputes the untreated potential outcomes for treated units using the outcomes for untreated individuals with similar values of the latent confounders. In order to find units with similar latent characteristics, we utilize long pre-treatment histories of the outcomes. Our analysis is based on a nonparametric, nonlinear, and nonseparable factor model for untreated potential outcomes and treatments. The model satisfies minimal smoothness requirements. We impute both missing counterfactual outcomes and propensity scores using kernel smoothing based on the constructed measure of latent similarity between units, and demonstrate that our estimates can achieve the optimal nonparametric rate of convergence up to log terms. Using these estimates, we construct a doubly robust estimator of the period-specific average treatment effect on the treated (ATT), and provide conditions, under which this estimator is \sqrt{N} -consistent, and asymptotically normal and unbiased. Our simulation study demonstrates that our method provides accurate inference for a wide range of data generating processes.

*Department of Economics, University College London, and CeMMAP. The previous (incomplete) version of this paper was prepared for the ESWC submission on January 31, 2025, and is also available [here](#). We thank Timothy B. Armstrong, Andrew Chesher, Timothy Christensen, Aureo de Paula, Kirill Ponomarev, and Liyang Sun for their valuable comments and suggestions. We have benefited from helpful discussions with participants at seminars and conferences including UCL and CeMMAP Ph.D./Post-doc Econometrics Research Day.

1 Introduction

The potential presence of unobserved confounding factors presents a challenging obstacle for casual inference. However, the availability of rich panel data can help solve this problem. Panel data contain multiple observations for each individual and thus it provides a possible means of controlling for time-invariant confounders (fixed effects). Moreover, panel data can enable the imputation of individual counterfactual outcomes. Methods for causal inference in panels have become dominant in empirical work, and their development is an active and rapidly growing area of research (see, e.g., [Arkhangelsky and Imbens, 2024](#)).

Many popular methods for causal inference using panel data assume that untreated potential outcomes have a linear/affine structure. For example, difference-in-differences (DiD) and two-way fixed effects (TWFE) methods rely on parallel trend assumptions, whereas synthetic control (SC) and most matrix completion methods require that untreated potential outcomes obey a linear factor model. The assumption of a linear model can simplify estimation and inference, and may be necessary given limited data availability. However, the assumption of linearity may be overly restrictive.

This paper presents a new method for estimation of, and inference on, the causal effects of a binary treatment $w_{i,t}$ in large panels. We assume that the untreated potential outcome of unit i in period t follows the possibly nonlinear and non-separable factor model below

$$Y_{i,t}(0) = \mu^{(0)}(\alpha_i, \lambda_t) + u_{i,t}, \quad (1)$$

where α_i and λ_t are unobserved unit and time effects, $\mu^{(0)}(\cdot, \cdot)$ is an *unknown* function, and $u_{i,t}$ is an (exogenous) residual.¹ We assume that conditional on the latent factors, untreated potential outcomes are independent of treatment. Importantly, we do not assume that $\mu^{(0)}(\cdot, \cdot)$ has any particular parametric form. Thus, the model (1) is substantially more general than the commonly used linear formulations $\mu^{(0)}(\alpha_i, \lambda_t) = \alpha_i + \lambda_t$ and $\mu^{(0)}(\alpha_i, \lambda_t) = \alpha'_i \lambda_t$ imposed by DiD/TWFE and SC methods, respectively.

While the generality of formulation (1) is appealing, it obscures identification and estimation of treatment effects because α_i cannot be identified without strong additional restrictions are on the form of $\mu^{(0)}(\cdot, \cdot)$. Instead of trying to model $\mu^{(0)}(\cdot, \cdot)$ and to estimate α_i directly, we follow an approach first developed by [Zhang et al. \(2017\)](#) to estimate the graphon in the context of network data. We use a long history of pre-treated outcomes to construct a pseudo-distance $\hat{d}_{i,j}$ that is informative about the closeness of the latent characteristics of individuals

¹It is also straightforward to allow for a linear covariates adjustment in (1). We abstract from this extension for clarity of exposition.

i and j . That is, the closeness of α_i and α_j . This allows us to impute the *values* of conditional mean potential outcomes and propensity scores (conditional on the latent factors) in a given post-treatment period t for all units by kernel smoothing based on \hat{d}_{ij} . This is despite the fact that α_i is neither observed nor identified.

We construct estimates of $\mu_{i,t}^{(0)}$ and $p_{i,t}$ and establish their rates of convergence (uniformly over i) when both the number of units N and the number of pre-treatment periods T_0 go to infinity. Notably, if T_0 goes to infinity sufficiently quickly, then our estimators achieve the optimal nonparametric rate of convergence in Stone (1980) (up to a log term), as if we observed the latent α_i .

Once the values of the conditional means and the propensity scores are imputed, we construct a doubly robust estimate of the average treatment effect on the treated (ATT) for a given post-treatment period t (e.g., Robins et al., 1994; Chernozhukov et al., 2018a). We propose a cross-fitting scheme which, together with double robustness, helps to ensure that our treatment effect estimates are \sqrt{N} -consistent, and asymptotically normal and unbiased. Remarkably, under certain regularity conditions and if T_0 grows sufficiently fast, our estimator achieves the semiparametric efficiency bound as if α_i was observed.

We provide extensive simulation evidence of the efficacy of our methods. We show reliable confidence interval coverage over a range of DGPs.

Related Literature

This paper contributes to the vast and rapidly growing literature on causal inference in panels. We refer the reader to Arkhangelsky and Imbens (2024) for an excellent recent overview of this field. DiD and TWFE are very widely used still growing in popularity in applied work, perhaps due to their practicality and perceived transparency (Goldsmith-Pinkham, 2024); see De Chaisemartin and d’Haultfoeuille (2023) and Roth et al. (2023) for extensive reviews of the DiD and TWFE literature. A focus of the recent econometrics literature concerning these methods is the accomodation of heterogeneous treatment effects (e.g., De Chaisemartin and d’Haultfoeuille, 2020; Callaway and Sant’Anna, 2021; Sun and Abraham, 2021; Wooldridge, 2021; Borusyak et al., 2024). However, the validity of DiD and TWFE methods crucially relies on the parallel trends assumption. A number of recent papers re-evaluate the restrictiveness of parallel trends in DiD and TWFE and in some cases propose relaxing the assumption at the expense of point identification (e.g., Manski and Pepper, 2018; Rambachan and Roth, 2023; Ghanem et al., 2022). In contrast, our framework relaxes the parallel trends assumption and allows for rich hetero-

geneity in treatment effects and selection mechanisms, but maintains point identification. However, in order to achieve this we require a sufficiently long pre-treatment history in contrast to these other methods.

Alternative popular approaches to causal inference in panels include SC and matrix completion methods; see [Abadie \(2021\)](#) for a recent review of SC methods. Some recent developments in the rapidly growing SC and causal matrix completion literatures include, among others, [Arkhangelsky et al. \(2021\)](#); [Cattaneo et al. \(2021\)](#); [Chernozhukov et al. \(2021, 2018b\)](#) and [Athey et al. \(2021\)](#); [Bai and Ng \(2021\)](#); [Agarwal et al. \(2023\)](#); [Abadie et al. \(2024\)](#), respectively. Similarly to the interactive fixed effects panel literature (e.g., [Pesaran, 2006](#); [Bai, 2009](#)), SC and matrix completion methods generalize the TWFE framework by allowing the (untreated) potential outcomes to follow a factor model. Similarly to this paper, these methods impute the missing counterfactual outcomes by leveraging the factor structure of a long history of pre-treatment outcomes. However, to establish statistical guarantees and validity of inference, most methods assume a linear factor model, i.e, $\mu^{(0)}(\alpha_i, \lambda_t) = \alpha_i' \lambda_t$, whereas we allow for a general nonparametric and nonlinear factor model. While some matrix completion methods consider extensions to nonlinear factor models, these papers either lack inferential theory and/or impose strong smoothness requirements on $\mu^{(0)}(\cdot, \cdot)$, e.g., assume that $\mu^{(0)}(\cdot, \cdot)$ belongs to a Hölder class (e.g., [Agarwal et al., 2020](#); [Fernández-Val et al., 2021](#); [Athey and Imbens, 2025](#)). In contrast, our imputation method (nearly) achieves the optimal nonparametric rate of convergence and allows us to provide a semiparametrically efficient estimator of the ATTs under a substantially weaker Lipschitz continuity assumption.

We measure latent similarity using a pseudo-distance suggested in [Zhang et al. \(2017\)](#), allowing us to identify individuals with similar latent characteristics, despite the inherent non-identifiability of the latent factors α . Various versions of this pseudo-distance have been utilized in the recent literature in numerous applications, including non-parametric graphon estimation ([Zhang et al., 2017](#); [Zeleneev, 2020](#); [Nowakowicz, 2024](#)), controlling for unobservables using network data ([Auerbach, 2022](#)), and estimation of nonlinear factor models ([Feng, 2024b](#)). Other recent applications to estimation of treatment effects in network and panel models include [Wang \(2022\)](#), [Hoshino and Yanagi \(2024\)](#), and [Athey and Imbens \(2025\)](#) but, unlike this paper, none of these works provides inferential theory.

Perhaps most closely related to the present work are [Feng \(2024a\)](#) and [Abadie et al. \(2024\)](#). [Feng \(2024a\)](#) studies causal inference in a cross-sectional setting. He uses a large number of auxiliary variables following a nonlinear factor model to control for unobservables. These auxiliary variables play effectively the same role as the pre-treatment history in our setting.

Similarly to our work, [Feng \(2024a\)](#) imputes the counterfactual means and the propensity scores and then uses the imputed values to construct doubly robust estimators and confidence intervals for causal estimands of interest. However, his imputation method is different from ours. Specifically, [Feng \(2024a\)](#) combines the pseudo-distance of [Zhang et al. \(2017\)](#) with local principal component analysis (PCA) to estimate latent factors and loadings and then employs quasi-maximum likelihood using these estimates for imputation. On the other hand, our approach imputes the counterfactual means and propensity score directly without estimating the factors nor factor loadings. The simplicity of our approach results in both theoretical and practical advantages. First, we are able to establish consistency of our estimators and obtain the desired rates of convergence under weaker smoothness requirements. Second, we find that our approach also performs better than [Feng \(2024a\)](#)'s method in small and moderate sample sizes typical for microeconomic applications.

[Abadie et al. \(2024\)](#) is another recent paper that provides a doubly robust approach to inference in latent factor models. While the standard matrix completion methods exclusively focus on imputing the counterfactual means, [Abadie et al. \(2024\)](#) suggest applying these methods to estimate the matrix of propensity scores as well. The latter imputation approach is fundamentally different than the one proposed in this paper. Specifically, [Abadie et al. \(2024\)](#) rely on denoising a large matrix of *treatment assignments* which have an underlying low-rank structure, whereas our approach imputes the propensity scores based on the pre-treatment *outcomes*. Another important difference is that [Abadie et al. \(2024\)](#) consider linear factor models, whereas we focus on and provide formal statistical guarantees for nonlinear factor models while imposing minimal smoothness requirements.

Our estimation approach is based on a doubly robust estimate of the ATT. As shown in [Stone \(1980\)](#), the optimal rate of convergence for nonparametric estimators is slow under weak smoothness assumptions, which can complicate inference. The use of doubly robust/Neyman orthogonal estimation (e.g., [Robins et al., 1994](#); [Robins and Rotnitzky, 1995](#); [Hahn, 1998](#); [Scharfstein et al., 1999](#); [Chernozhukov et al., 2018a, 2022](#)) can help ensure centered asymptotic normality for low-dimensional estimands in the presence of nonparametric nuisance parameters. Some recent literature on panel data leverages double robustness to achieve valid inference under relatively weak conditions (e.g., [Arkhangelsky and Imbens, 2022](#); [Arkhangelsky et al., 2024](#); [Sant'Anna and Zhao, 2020](#)).

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 introduces the framework and describes our estimator. Section 3 provides formal statistical guarantees. Section 4 presents

numerical evidence. All auxiliary lemmas and proofs are provided in Appendix A.

2 Notation and Proposed Method

2.1 Model and Notation

Our sample consists of individuals indexed by $i = 1, \dots, n$ and time periods indexed by $t = 1, \dots, T$. For each individual i and period t , we observe an outcome $Y_{i,t}$ and a binary indicator $w_{i,t}$. The indicator $w_{i,t}$ is equal to one if individual i is treated at or prior to time t and zero otherwise. We assume throughout that no individual in the population is treated prior to a period $T_0 + 1$ with $T_0 < T$. We let $Y_{i,s:t}$ denote the vector of outcomes for individual i from periods s to t inclusive and similarly for other variables.

Let $Y_{i,t}(0)$ denote the potential outcome of individual i at time t under a counterfactual in which the individual has not yet received treatment at period t . We assume that if $w_{i,t} = 0$ then $Y_{i,t} = Y_{i,t}(0)$. This precludes the possibility that individuals anticipate future treatment and that this impacts their outcomes (e.g., [Abbring and Van Den Berg, 2003](#); [Borusyak et al., 2022](#); [Sun and Abraham, 2021](#)). We state this formally in Assumption 1 below.

Assumption 1 (No Anticipation). If $w_{i,t} = 0$ then $Y_{i,t} = Y_{i,t}(0)$.

Central to our analysis is the assumption of a non-linear factor model for the untreated potential outcomes. Let α_i be some latent and time-invariant characteristics of individual i , and let λ_t be period-specific factors. α_i may capture say, unobserved demographic characteristics, individual preferences, or innate ability. λ_t may capture e.g., unobserved macro-economic conditions, government policy, or environmental factors. We model the potential outcomes and realized treatments as follows.

$$Y_{i,t}(0) = \mu^{(0)}(\alpha_i, \lambda_t) + u_{i,t}, \quad \mathbb{E}[u_{i,t} | \alpha_i, \lambda_t] = 0. \quad (2)$$

$$w_{i,t} = p_t(\alpha_i) + \epsilon_{i,t}, \quad \mathbb{E}[\epsilon_{i,t} | \alpha_i, \lambda_t] = 0. \quad (3)$$

The residuals $u_{i,t}$ and $\epsilon_{i,t}$ are unobserved. The functions $\mu^{(0)}$ and p_t are unknown and we do not assume that they have any particular functional form. Note that the model above implies that the mean of $Y_{i,t}(0)$ given the latent factors is time-invariant and does not depend on the individual i . However, the time-subscript on p_t allows the conditional mean of $w_{i,t}$ to vary over time, which reflects the fact that this variable is increasing and that it is therefore non-stationary.

Knowledge of the latent factors α_i and λ_t is insufficient to identify causal quantities of interest. This is because the residual in the treatment model (3) may be correlated with the residual in the outcome equation (2). In particular, there may be confounding factors that are not included in α_i and λ_t and which influence both the outcome and treatment status. In order to achieve identification we make the key assumption that the latent factors α_i and λ_t together account for all confounding between the outcome and treatment. Formally, we assume that after controlling for these latent factors, there is no residual dependence between the untreated potential outcome and treatment.

Assumption 2 (Latent Unconfoundedness). $Y_{i,t}(0) \perp\!\!\!\perp w_{i,t} | \alpha_i, \lambda_t$.

The assumption of latent unconfoundedness is common in the literature (e.g. [Abadie et al., 2024](#); [Agarwal et al., 2021](#); [Arkhangelsky and Imbens, 2022](#); [Athey et al., 2021](#); [Fernández-Val et al., 2021](#)). Note that the assumption effectively requires that the latent factors are sufficiently rich.

Exposure to macroeconomic conditions and other shared aggregate factors may induce dependence between the potential outcomes of different individuals. We assume that the time-specific factors λ_t are sufficiently rich that after controlling for these factors and the individual-specific factors, the untreated potential outcomes of any two individuals are independent.

Assumption 3 (Latent Independence). For any individuals $i \neq j$, $Y_{i,t}(0) \perp\!\!\!\perp Y_{j,t}(0) | \{\alpha_k\}_{k=1}^N, \lambda_t$.

Under Assumption 2, key counterfactual quantities of interest can be written in terms of the latent factors and functions $\mu^{(0)}$ and p . For notational convenience, let $p_{i,t} := p_t(\alpha_i)$ and $\mu_{i,t}^{(0)} := \mu^{(0)}(\alpha_i, \lambda_t)$. Under Assumption 2, the average effect of treatment on the treated at time t , which is defined as $\mathbb{E}_t[Y_{i,t} - Y_{i,t}(0) | w_{i,t} = 1]$, can be written in doubly-robust form as follows.

$$ATT_t = \frac{1}{P(w_{i,t} = 1)} \mathbb{E}_t \left[Y_{i,t} w_{i,t} - \frac{(1 - w_{i,t}) Y_{i,t} p_{i,t} + (w_{i,t} - p_{i,t}) \mu_{i,t}^{(0)}}{1 - p_{i,t}} \right]$$

The time subscript on the expectation above indicates that it is taken with respect to the period t -specific distribution of the observables (i.e., conditional on λ_t). The doubly-robust form of ATT above is proposed and used in panel data settings by [Sant'Anna and Zhao \(2020\)](#). Additionally, the proposed method can also adopt other causal estimands with their respective doubly robust score functions (e.g., [Arkhangelsky and Imbens, 2022](#)).

In this paper we provide new methods for estimating $p_{i,t}$ and $\mu_{i,t}^{(0)}$. Given these estimates, one can construct a doubly-robust estimate of ATT_t and perform inference on this object.

Let $\hat{p}_{i,t}$ and $\hat{\mu}_{i,t}^{(0)}$ be estimates of $p_{i,t}$ and $\mu_{i,t}^{(0)}$ respectively. Then a corresponding doubly-robust estimate of ATT_t is given below, where N is the sample size, and $N_{1,t}$ the number of individuals treated by time t .

$$\widehat{\text{ATT}}_t = \frac{1}{N_{1,t}} \sum_{i=1}^N \left(Y_{i,t} w_{i,t} - \frac{(1 - w_{i,t}) Y_{i,t} \hat{p}_{i,t} + (w_{i,t} - \hat{p}_{i,t}) \hat{\mu}_{i,t}^{(0)}}{1 - \hat{p}_{i,t}} \right) \quad (4)$$

2.2 Proposed Method

Our proposed estimation method uses pre-treatment outcomes to find untreated individuals whose latent factors α_i are similar to those of treated individuals. To motivate our approach, let us first suppose α_i were observed. Under Assumptions 1 and 2, we have

$$\mu^{(0)}(\alpha, \lambda_t) = \mathbb{E}_t[Y_{i,t} | \alpha_{i,t} = \alpha, w_{i,t} = 0], \quad p_t(\alpha) = \mathbb{E}_t[w_{i,t} | \alpha_{i,t} = \alpha].$$

The objects on the right-hand sides of each equation above are regression functions. If $\alpha_{i,t}$ were observable, we could apply Nadaraya-Watson to non-parametrically estimate the functions $\mu^{(0)}(\cdot, \lambda_t)$ and $p_t(\cdot)$ and thus $p_{i,t}$ and $\mu_{i,t}^{(0)}$. To be precise, we could obtain the following estimates.

$$\hat{\mu}_{i,t}^{(0)} = \frac{\sum_{j:w_{j,t}=0} K(\|\alpha_i - \alpha_j\|/h) Y_{j,t}}{\sum_{j:w_{j,t}=0} K(\|\alpha_i - \alpha_j\|/h)}, \quad \hat{p}_{i,t} = \frac{\sum_j K(\|\alpha_i - \alpha_j\|/h) w_{j,t}}{\sum_j K(\|\alpha_i - \alpha_j\|/h)}$$

The estimates above are infeasible because in practice, we do not directly observe α_i for any individual i . In order to obtain feasible estimates, we replace the infeasible distance $\|\alpha_i - \alpha_j\|$ in the expressions above, with a feasible pseudo-distance. To define this pseudo-distance, suppose that no individuals in the population are treated prior to some period $T_0 + 1$ and let $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ be the Euclidean inner-product. We use the pseudo-distance defined below:

$$\hat{d}_{i,j} = \frac{1}{T_0} \max_{k \notin \{i,j\}} |\langle Y_{k,1:T_0}, Y_{i,1:T_0} - Y_{j,1:T_0} \rangle|$$

A pseudo-distance of the form above is employed in [Zhang et al. \(2017\)](#). To motivate the use of the pseudo-distance, suppose Assumption 3 holds. Then conditional on the individual latent factors, the inner-product in the pseudo-distance is an unbiased estimate of the object on the right-hand side below.

$$\mathbb{E}[\langle Y_{k,1:T_0}, Y_{i,1:T_0} - Y_{j,1:T_0} \rangle | \alpha_i, \alpha_j, \alpha_k] = \int \mu^{(0)}(\alpha, \lambda) (\mu^{(0)}(\alpha_i, \lambda) - \mu^{(0)}(\alpha_j, \lambda)) d\pi(\lambda).$$

In the above, π is the stationary distribution of λ_t . As such, we can understand the pseudo-distance as the sample analogue of the population pseudo-distance below, where \mathcal{A} is the

support of α_i .

$$\begin{aligned} d_{i,j} &= \sup_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}} \left| \int \mu^{(0)}(\alpha, \lambda) (\mu^{(0)}(\alpha_i, \lambda) - \mu^{(0)}(\alpha_j, \lambda)) d\pi(\lambda) \right| \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2} \int (\mu^{(0)}(\alpha_i, \lambda) - \mu^{(0)}(\alpha_j, \lambda))^2 d\pi(\lambda) \end{aligned}$$

The inequality relates the size of the pseudo-distance $d_{i,j}$ to a squared L_2 distance between the functions $\mu^{(0)}(\alpha_i, \cdot)$ and $\mu^{(0)}(\alpha_j, \cdot)$. Thus $d_{i,j}$ measures similarity of the latent factors to the extent that they impact outcomes. We provide sufficient conditions for the consistency of the sample pseudo-metric to this quantity.

It is worth contrasting the sample pseudo-distance above with the Euclidean distance between the history of pre-treatment outcomes, which is defined as $\|Y_{i,1:T_0} - Y_{j,1:T_0}\|^2$. The mean of the squared Euclidean distance conditional on the individual latent factors is given below, where we again assume that untreated potential outcomes of different individuals are independent conditional on the latent factors.

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\|Y_{i,1:T_0} - Y_{j,1:T_0}\|^2 | \alpha_i, \alpha_j] &= \int (\mu^{(0)}(\alpha_i, \lambda) - \mu^{(0)}(\alpha_j, \lambda))^2 d\pi(\lambda) \\ &\quad + \int E[u_{i,t}^2 | \alpha_i, \lambda_t = \lambda] + E[u_{j,t}^2 | \alpha_j, \lambda_t = \lambda] d\pi(\lambda) \end{aligned}$$

Thus the Euclidean distance is increasing in the conditional residual variance $E[u_{j,t}^2 | \alpha_j, \lambda_t = \lambda]$. Thus in the presence of conditional heteroskedasticity, a small Euclidean distance may reflect that individual j 's outcomes have a low residual variance and not that individual j and i have similar latent factors. It is the need to be robust to conditional heteroskedasticity that motivates our use of the pseudo-metric.

Given the pseudo-distance, we may form feasible estimates of $p_{i,t}$ and $\mu_{i,t}^{(0)}$ as follows.

$$\hat{\mu}_{i,t}^{(0)} = \frac{\sum_{j:w_{j,t}=0} K(\hat{d}_{i,j}/h) Y_{j,t}}{\sum_{j:w_{j,t}=0} K(\hat{d}_{i,j}/h)}, \quad \hat{p}_{i,t} = \frac{\sum_j K(\hat{d}_{i,j}/h) w_{j,t}}{\sum_j K(\hat{d}_{i,j}/h)}$$

One could plug the estimates above into the the formula for the doubly-robust ATT_{*t*} estimate (4). However, we instead employ a cross-fitting scheme to further de-bias our estimates. This is in-line with the extensive literature on double machine learning, which demonstrates the utility of cross-fitting for reducing bias and obtaining valid inference (e.g., Chernozhukov et al., 2018a; Abadie et al., 2024). The full algorithm with cross-fitting is detailed below along with a variance estimate and confidence interval.

Algorithm 1 Doubly-Robust Estimation and Inference with Cross-Fitting

Inputs: Number of folds \mathcal{K} , list of bandwidth $\{h_1, \dots, h_b\}$, confidence level α

Returns: ATT_t estimate $\widehat{\text{ATT}}_t$, variance estimate \widehat{V}_t , and level $1 - \alpha$ confidence interval

1: Randomly partition $[N] = \{1, 2, \dots, N\}$ into \mathcal{K} folds $\{\mathcal{I}_k\}_{k=1}^{\mathcal{K}}$ of size $\approx N/\mathcal{K}$. Let $\mathcal{I}_{-k} = [N] \setminus \mathcal{I}_k$

2: **for all** $k \in [\mathcal{K}]$ **do**

3: **for all** $i \in \mathcal{I}_k$ and $j \in \mathcal{I}_{-k}$ **do**

4: Calculate $\hat{d}_{i,j}$, the pseudo distance between $i \in \mathcal{I}_k$ and $j \in \mathcal{I}_{-k}$, as follows:

$$\hat{d}_{i,j} \leftarrow \frac{1}{T_0} \max_{\ell \notin \{i,j\}; \ell \in \mathcal{I}_{-k}} \left| \langle Y_{\ell,1:T_0}, Y_{i,1:T_0} - Y_{j,1:T_0} \rangle \right|$$

5: **end for**

6: **end for**

7: **for all** $h \in \{h_1, \dots, h_b\}$ **do**

8: **for all** $k \in [\mathcal{K}]$ and $i \in \mathcal{I}_k$ **do**

9: Calculate $\hat{\mu}_{i,t}^{(1)}$, $\hat{\mu}_{i,t}^{(0)}$, and $\hat{p}_{i,t}$ as follows:

$$\hat{\mu}_{i,t}^{(1)} \leftarrow \frac{\sum_{j \in \mathcal{I}_{-k}; w_{j,t}=1} K(\hat{d}_{i,j}/h) Y_{j,t}}{\sum_{j \in \mathcal{I}_{-k}; w_{j,t}=1} K(\hat{d}_{i,j}/h)}, \quad \hat{\mu}_{i,t}^{(0)} \leftarrow \frac{\sum_{j \in \mathcal{I}_{-k}; w_{j,t}=0} K(\hat{d}_{i,j}/h) Y_{j,t}}{\sum_{j \in \mathcal{I}_{-k}; w_{j,t}=0} K(\hat{d}_{i,j}/h)}, \quad \hat{p}_{i,t} \leftarrow \frac{\sum_{j \in \mathcal{I}_{-k}} K(\hat{d}_{i,j}/h) w_{j,t}}{\sum_{j \in \mathcal{I}_{-k}} K(\hat{d}_{i,j}/h)}$$

10: **end for**

11: Calculate least squares cross-validation error with the bandwidth h as follows:

$$\text{CV}(h) \leftarrow \frac{1}{N} \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{N_{\text{treated}}} [Y_{i,t} - \hat{\mu}_{i,t}^{(1)}]^2 + \sum_{i=1}^{N_{\text{control}}} [Y_{i,t} - \hat{\mu}_{i,t}^{(0)}]^2 \right\}$$

12: **end for**

13: Select the optimal bandwidth $h_{\text{CV}} := \arg \min_{h \in \{h_1, \dots, h_b\}} \text{CV}(h)$ and use the corresponding $\hat{\mu}_{i,t}^{(1)}$, $\hat{\mu}_{i,t}^{(0)}$, and $\hat{p}_{i,t}$

14: Construct $\widehat{\text{ATT}}_t$ using the formula below

$$\widehat{\text{ATT}}_t \leftarrow \frac{1}{N_{1,t}} \sum_{i=1}^N \left(Y_{i,t} w_{i,t} - \frac{(1 - w_{i,t}) Y_{i,t} \hat{p}_{i,t} + (w_{i,t} - \hat{p}_{i,t}) \hat{\mu}_{i,t}^{(0)}}{1 - \hat{p}_{i,t}} \right)$$
$$\widehat{V}_t \leftarrow \frac{N}{N_{1,t}^2} \sum_{i=1}^N \left(Y_{i,t} w_{i,t} - \frac{(1 - w_{i,t}) Y_{i,t} \hat{p}_{i,t} + (w_{i,t} - \hat{p}_{i,t}) \hat{\mu}_{i,t}^{(0)}}{1 - \hat{p}_{i,t}} - \frac{N_{1,t}}{N} \widehat{\text{ATT}}_t \right)^2$$

15: Form $1 - \alpha$ level confidence interval $[\widehat{\text{ATT}}_t \pm Z_{(1-\alpha)/2} \sqrt{\widehat{V}_t/N}]$.

3 Large Sample Theory

The estimator $\widehat{\text{ATT}}_t$ is doubly robust and employs cross-fitting. An extensive literature (e.g., [Robins et al. \(2008\)](#); [Chernozhukov et al. \(2018a\)](#); [Abadie et al. \(2024\)](#)) provides sufficient conditions for \sqrt{N} -consistency of such estimates and asymptotically correct coverage of the corresponding confidence intervals. A key condition is that the first stage nuisance-parameter estimates (in our case $\hat{\mu}_{i,t}^{(0)}$ and $\hat{p}_{i,t}$) converge sufficiently quickly. For this condition, the following rates suffice:

$$\max_{i \in [N]} |\hat{\mu}_{i,t}^{(0)} - \mu_{i,t}^{(0)}| = o_p(N^{-1/4}) \quad \text{and} \quad \max_{i \in [N]} |\hat{p}_{i,t} - p_{i,t}| = o_p(N^{-1/4})$$

We establish convergence rates for the first-stage estimates. These rates may be of interest per se because $\mu_{i,t}^{(0)}$ is the optimal prediction of individual i 's untreated potential outcome given the latent factors. We show that under certain conditions, the estimates achieve the [Stone, 1980](#) optimal rate for non-parametric regression on α_i under Lipschitz continuity. That is, we can achieve the same optimal rate attainable for the infeasible estimates that take α_i as known. However, in order to achieve this rate, we require that the number of pre-treatment periods T_0 grows sufficiently quickly with N .

3.1 Rate of Convergence for Outcome and Propensity Score

In order to derive convergence rates for our first-stage estimates of $\mu^{(0)}$ and p_t we impose the following additional assumptions.

Assumption 4 (Model and Latent Factors).

- (i) There is some $\underline{c} > 0$ so that $p_{i,t} \geq \underline{c}$ almost surely for all i and $t > T_0$.
- (ii) $\mathbb{E}[u_{i,t} | \alpha, \lambda] = 0$, and for some $\delta > 0$, $\mathbb{E}[\exp(\eta u_{i,t}) | \alpha, \lambda] \leq \exp(\delta \eta^2)$ for all $\eta \in \mathbb{R}$ almost surely and likewise for $\epsilon_{i,t}$. These error terms are jointly independent across time and across individuals conditional on the latent factors.
- (iii) $\text{supp}(\alpha) \subseteq \mathcal{A}$ where \mathcal{A} is a compact subset of \mathbb{R}^{d_α} . α_i and λ_t are jointly i.i.d. across i and t , respectively. There are constants $0 < \underline{c} < \bar{c} < \infty$ so that for any fixed $\alpha \in \text{supp}(\alpha)$ and any η , $\underline{c} \eta^{d_\alpha} \leq \mathbb{P}(\|\alpha - \alpha_i\| \leq \eta) \leq \bar{c} \eta^{d_\alpha}$.
- (iv) The functions $\mu^{(0)}, \mu^{(1)}, p : \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{L} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ are uniformly bounded and satisfy, for some

$L_0, L_p < \infty$,

$$\begin{aligned} |\mu^{(0)}(\alpha_1, \lambda) - \mu^{(0)}(\alpha_2, \lambda)| &\leq L_0 \|\alpha_1 - \alpha_2\| \\ |p_t(\alpha_1) - p_t(\alpha_2)| &\leq L_p \|\alpha_i - \alpha_j\| \end{aligned}$$

for all $\alpha_i, \alpha_j \in \mathcal{A}$, $\lambda \in \mathcal{L}$, and $t \in [T]$.

(v) $K : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is weakly positive and strictly positive at zero, supported on compact set and bounded by $\bar{K} < \infty$. K satisfies $|K(z) - K(z')| \leq \bar{K}'|z - z'|$ for all $z, z' \in \mathbb{R}_+$ for some $\bar{K}' > 0$.

(vi) There exist constants $c_1, c_2 > 0$ so that for all $\alpha_1, \alpha_2 \in \mathcal{A}$

$$\int_{\lambda \in \text{supp}(\lambda)} (\mu^{(0)}(\alpha_1, \lambda) - \mu^{(0)}(\alpha_2, \lambda))^2 d\pi(\lambda) \geq c_1 \|\alpha_1 - \alpha_2\|^2 \quad (5)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} &\sup_{\alpha \in \text{supp}(\alpha)} \int_{\lambda \in \text{supp}(\lambda)} \mu^{(0)}(\alpha, \lambda) (\mu^{(0)}(\alpha_1, \lambda) - \mu^{(0)}(\alpha_2, \lambda)) d\pi(\lambda) \\ &\geq c_2 \sqrt{\int_{\lambda \in \text{supp}(\lambda)} (\mu^{(0)}(\alpha_1, \lambda) - \mu^{(0)}(\alpha_2, \lambda))^2 d\pi(\lambda)} \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

Assumption 4 (i) is a standard overlap condition and would be required for regular estimation of the ATT even if α_i were observed. Note that because we are interested in the average effect of treatment on the treated, we only require that the conditional probability of treatment is bounded below away from zero and not above away from one. Assumption 4 (ii) restricts that the tail behavior of the error terms, requiring them to be sub-Gaussian. The assumption also imposes that the residuals are independent over time given the time-specific factors. This condition allows us to apply particular concentration inequalities in order to obtain fast rates of convergence.

Assumption 4 (iii) imposes that the latent factors are independent and identically distributed and that the individual-specific factors have compact support. Compact support of the individual-specific latent factors helps to ensure that with high probability, for each treated individual i , there exist untreated individuals in the sample whose latent factors are close to those of i . Independence and identical distribution of the individual-specific latent factors follows if we understand individuals to be drawn identically and independently from the underlying population. Independence of λ_t over time may be plausible if time periods are sufficiently far apart. This restriction on λ_t allows us to apply concentration inequalities and ensure fast convergence of the pseudo-distance.

Assumption 4 (iv) imposes that the functions $\mu^{(0)}$ and p_t are bounded and vary smoothly with the individual-specific factors. This smoothness assumption ensures that individuals with similar latent factors also have similar conditional-mean potential outcomes and treatments. Assumption 4 (v) stipulates properties of the kernel K . Kernels that satisfy this condition include are common in the literature, with the Epanechnikov kernel a particularly prevalent choices.

Assumption 4 (vi) relates the pseudo-distance to the distance between individual latent factors. The assumption imposes first, that the mean-squared distance between $\mu^{(0)}(\alpha_1, \cdot)$ and $\mu^{(0)}(\alpha_2, \cdot)$ is at least proportional to the Euclidean distance between α_1 and α_2 . In addition, the assumption states that the population pseudo-distance is at least proportional to this mean-squared distance. Consider the special case in which $\mu^{(0)}(\alpha, \lambda) = \alpha' M \lambda$ for some fixed matrix M . In this case, the condition (5) holds so long as the matrix $M \int_{\lambda \in \text{supp}(\lambda)} \lambda \lambda' d\pi(\lambda) M'$ is strictly positive definite. If this is the case, then the second condition (6) holds if there is a $c > 0$ so that for any $\alpha_1, \alpha_2 \in \mathcal{A}$ we have $\frac{c}{\|\alpha_1 - \alpha_2\|}(\alpha_1 - \alpha_2) \in \mathcal{A}$. This is true, for example, if \mathcal{A} is a Euclidean ball centered at zero.

Theorem 1 (Rate of Convergence for the Outcome Model). *Suppose Assumptions 1 to 4 hold and $\frac{1}{h} \sqrt{\frac{\log(N)}{T_0}} \rightarrow 0$ and $\frac{\log(N)}{h^{2d_\alpha} N} \rightarrow 0$, then*

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{i \in [N]} |\hat{\mu}_{i,t}^{(0)} - \mu_{i,t}^{(0)}| &= O_p \left(h + \sqrt{\frac{\log(N)}{h^{d_\alpha} N}} \right) \\ \max_{i \in [N]} |\hat{p}_{i,t}^{(0)} - p_{i,t}^{(0)}| &= O_p \left(h + \sqrt{\frac{\log(N)}{h^{d_\alpha} N}} \right) \end{aligned}$$

The convergence rate in Theorem 1 is identical to that of the Nadaraya-Watson estimator with observed covariates up to a log term. Setting $h \propto N^{-1/(d_\alpha+2)}$ we get convergence rate $N^{-1/(d_\alpha+2)} \sqrt{\log(N)}$ which, up to a log term, is the optimal rate in Stone (1980) under Lipschitz continuity. However, the rate at which h can converge to zero is restricted by the condition that $\frac{1}{h} \sqrt{\frac{\log(N)}{T_0}} \rightarrow 0$. Thus the theorem above allows us to achieve the rate in Stone (1980), up to log terms, if and only if T_0 grows sufficiently quickly that $N^{2/(d_\alpha+2)}/T_0 \rightarrow 0$. In order to obtain \sqrt{N} -consistency and \sqrt{N} centered asymptotic normality of the doubly-robust ATT estimator, we require $\max_{i \in [N]} |\hat{\mu}_{i,t}^{(0)} - \mu_{i,t}^{(0)}| = o_p(N^{-1/4})$ and similarly for $\hat{p}_{i,t}$. In the case of a one-dimensional individual latent factor ($d_\alpha = 1$), Theorem 1 ensures that this holds for an appropriate choice of h if and only if T_0 grows quickly enough that $\frac{N^{1/2} \log(N)}{T_0} \rightarrow 0$.

3.2 Inference Framework with Rate Double Robustness

Theorem 2 below applies well-established ideas from the literature on double machine learning to this setting. The result applies to the estimator with cross-fitting as specified in Algorithm 1.

Theorem 2 (Asymptotic Normality). *Suppose Assumptions 1-4 all hold. In addition, suppose $\max_{i \in [N]} |\hat{p}_{i,t} - p_{i,t}| = o_p(1)$, $\max_{i \in [N]} |\hat{\mu}_{i,t} - \mu_{i,t}| = o_p(1)$, $\max_{i \in [N]} |(p_{i,t} - \hat{p}_{i,t})(\mu_{i,t}^{(0)} - \hat{\mu}_{i,t}^{(0)})| = o_p(N^{-1/2})$. Finally, suppose that for each k , the size of fold \mathcal{I}_k grows at the same rate as the same size, that is, $\frac{|\mathcal{I}_k|}{N} \rightarrow c_k$ for some finite $c_k > 0$. It follows that*

$$\sqrt{N} \hat{A} \hat{T}_t = \frac{\sqrt{N}}{N_{1,t}} \sum_{i=1}^N \left(Y_{i,t} w_{i,t} - \frac{(1 - w_{i,t}) Y_{i,t} p_{i,t} + (w_{i,t} - p_{i,t}) \mu_{i,t}^{(0)}}{1 - p_{i,t}} \right) + o_p(1)$$

and thus under the stated conditions, $\sqrt{N} (\hat{A} \hat{T}_t - ATT_t) = N(0, V_t) + o_p(1)$.

The first result in Theorem 2 relates the estimate $\hat{A} \hat{T}_t$ to an infeasible estimate in which the first stage estimates of $\mu_{i,t}^{(0)}$ and $p_{i,t}$ are replaced by their true values. In particular, the Theorem states that under certain conditions, the difference between $\hat{A} \hat{T}_t$ and the infeasible estimate disappears strictly faster than $N^{-1/2}$. It then follows from standard results that $\hat{A} \hat{T}_t$ is root- N asymptotically normal and centered at ATT_t .

The proof of Theorem 2 proceeds by similar steps to the results in Chernozhukov et al. (2018a) for DML2 estimators. A complicating factor is that, unlike in standard DML2 estimation of the ATT, in our setting the estimates $\hat{\mu}_{i,t}^{(0)}$ and $\hat{p}_{i,t}$ are constructed using the pseudo-distance which includes both outcome and treatment data for individual i in the pre-treatment period. That is, unlike in standard DML2 ATT estimation, the first-stage estimates $\hat{\mu}_{i,t}^{(0)}$ and $\hat{p}_{i,t}$ depend on some of the outcome data from the fold that contains individual i . However, using the conditional serial independence of the errors in Assumption 4, it is straight-forward to accommodate this dependence.

Theorem 2 requires not only that the first stage estimates are uniformly consistent over the sample, but that the product of the estimation error in $\hat{\mu}_{i,t}^{(0)}$ and $\hat{p}_{i,t}$ goes to zero uniformly strictly faster than root- N . A sufficient condition, mentioned earlier in this section, is that each of these estimates converges strictly faster than $N^{-1/4}$. The theorem further requires that each fold grows at the same rate as the sample data. This is satisfied if the number of folds is fixed and all of the folds are of equal size. In recent work, Velez (2024) provides conditions under which DML2 estimates are centered root- N asymptotically normal even if leave-one-out cross-fitting is applied, and so it may be possible to weaken this condition on the fold size in Theorem 2.

4 Simulation Study

In this section, we illustrate the finite sample properties of the proposed method in a number of numerical experiments. We also compare it with (1) the workhorse TWFE approach, and (2) the method proposed by [Feng \(2024a\)](#).

4.1 Comparison with the TWFE approach

The TWFE approach is widely used in applied research and is designed to adjust for unobserved additive individual and time fixed effects. In this section, we demonstrate that the proposed method performs comparably well in settings in which the TWFE approach is valid. We also show that the proposed method maintains good finite sample properties in a more complicated setting in which the TWFE approach fails.

Consider a large panel data setting with individuals labeled $i = 1, \dots, N$ over time periods $t = 1, \dots, T$, where $N \in \{50, 250\}$ and $T_0 \in \{50, 250\}$ with only one post-treatment time period in this numerical study. For the outcome model, we consider the following data generating processes:

$$\begin{cases} \text{Model 1 (Additive fixed effects):} & Y_{i,t} = \alpha_i + \lambda_t + 0.5 \cdot w_{i,t} + u_{i,t}, \\ \text{Model 2 (Interactive fixed effects):} & Y_{i,t} = \alpha_i \cdot \lambda_t + 0.5 \cdot w_{i,t} + u_{i,t}, \end{cases}$$

where the individual latent factor is distributed as $\alpha_i \sim \text{Uniform}(-1, 1)$, the time latent factor as $\lambda_t \sim \text{Uniform}(-1, 1)$, and $u_{i,t} \sim N(0, 0.5^2)$. Here, the target estimand, the average treatment effect on the treated, is $\text{ATT}_t = 0.5$. Models 1 and 2 are standard additive and interactive fixed effects models commonly used in panel data.

The treatment assignment mechanism depends on unobserved latent characteristics for each i . Specifically, the propensity score $p_{i,t}$ follows the model

$$p_{i,t} = \frac{\exp(\alpha_i)}{1 + \exp(\alpha_i)}$$

With the configuration of factors located on compact supports, it results in roughly $p_{i,t} \in [0.2689, 0.7311]$, which satisfies the overlapping condition required for the proposed method.

We simulate 500 replications from these models. In these simulations, we utilize the Epanechnikov kernel, that satisfies the requirements of Theorem 1 and is defined as $K(x) = \frac{3}{4}(1 - x^2) \cdot \mathbf{1}\{|x| \leq 1\}$. We use this kernel for both the outcome and propensity score imputations in our proposed method. Using this kernel, we compared the performance of different

methods: (i) TWFE; (ii) the local PCA method proposed by Feng (2024a) with leave-one-out cross validation for the choice of nearest neighbors²; (iii) an infeasible doubly robust estimates in which the pseudo-distance is replaced by the oracle ℓ_2 distance between the true αs and in which the estimated propensity score is replaced with the true propensity score; (iv) an infeasible doubly robust estimates in which the pseudo-distance is replaced by the ℓ_2 distance between the true αs but in which the propensity score is unknown and estimated using the oracle distance; (iv) our proposed method.

In the numerical experiments, the bandwidth is selected between 0.05 and 5. Velez (2024) suggests that leave-one-out estimation is the optimal cross-fitting procedure for DML2 estimators in terms of both bias and the second-order asymptotic mean squared error under certain conditions. Hence, in addition to the results from 2-fold cross-fitting and cross-validation bandwidth selection, we also implemented the proposed method using the leave-one-out procedure for this numerical exercise. In Table 1 and 2, we report the 95% confidence interval coverage and other statistics across 500 replications in our simulation for each outcome model and each method. Additionally, we note that due to the non-existence of moments, some mean versions of the statistics can be distorted by outliers in the replications. This distortion is more pronounced when the number of individual N is small. For this reason, we report the median absolute deviation and median confidence interval length rather than the means.

²The implementation of the method proposed by Feng (2024a) follows the replication files available on the author's website: https://github.com/yingjieum/replication-Feng_2024.

Table 1: Simulation results for model 1 (additive fixed effects)

		TWFE	Local PCA (Feng, 2024a)	Proposed Method				
				W/ true $p_{i,t}$	W/ true α_i	Pseudo dist		
Cross-Fitting				NA	LOO	NA	LOO	2-Fold
Bandwidth Selection				LOO		LOO		2-Fold
$N = 50$ $T_0 = 50$	Median Abs. Dev.	0.0918	0.1374	0.1080	0.1207	0.1110	0.1210	0.1488
	95% CI Coverage	0.9383	0.9234	0.9340	0.9702	0.9489	0.9809	0.9532
	Median CI Length	0.5726	0.6906	0.6649	0.7714	0.6417	0.7806	0.8574
$N = 50$ $T_0 = 250$	Median Abs. Dev.	0.0919	0.1478	0.1112	0.1250	0.1155	0.1246	0.1682
	95% CI Coverage	0.9350	0.9036	0.9371	0.9748	0.9371	0.9665	0.9497
	Median CI Length	0.5670	0.6757	0.6673	0.7861	0.6455	0.7842	0.8480
$N = 250$ $T_0 = 50$	Median Abs. Dev.	0.0482	0.0527	0.0503	0.0506	0.0510	0.0524	0.0574
	95% CI Coverage	0.9460	0.9660	0.9620	0.9780	0.9620	0.9740	0.9540
	Median CI Length	0.2520	0.3049	0.2984	0.3112	0.2943	0.3139	0.3253
$N = 250$ $T_0 = 250$	Median Abs. Dev.	0.0430	0.0514	0.0487	0.0516	0.0490	0.0489	0.0550
	95% CI Coverage	0.9600	0.9640	0.9640	0.9720	0.9600	0.9780	0.9580
	Median CI Length	0.2502	0.2998	0.2974	0.3117	0.2945	0.3121	0.3230

Notes: LOO stands for leave-one-out procedure in cross-fitting or cross-validation in bandwidth selection. NA stands for not doing the procedure.

For model 1, the additive fixed effects model, the proposed method shows performance similar to the two-way fixed effects method in terms of 95% confidence interval coverage, which is under an ideal data generating process for TWFE. Additionally, the proposed method, which incorporates the pseudo distance, effectively captures the distance between unobserved latent characteristics, which is evinced by the performance of our method relative to the oracle estimators which use the true propensity score and/or the true distance in the α s. However, there is some loss of efficiency when the sample size N is small. This efficiency loss can be mitigated by increasing the number of folds or by using the leave-one-out procedure for bandwidth selection.

Table 2: Simulation results for model 2 (interactive fixed effects)

		TWFE	Local PCA (Feng, 2024a)	Proposed Method				
				W/ true $p_{i,t}$	W/ true α_i	Pseudo dist		
Cross-Fitting				NA	LOO	NA	LOO	2-Fold
Bandwidth Selection				LOO		LOO		2-Fold
$N = 50$ $T_0 = 50$	Median Abs. Dev.	0.1491	0.1165	0.1047	0.1115	0.0994	0.1088	0.1311
	95% CI Coverage	0.8655	0.9458	0.9414	0.9588	0.9393	0.9631	0.9544
	Median CI Length	0.6585	0.6753	0.6396	0.6878	0.6096	0.6946	0.7396
$N = 50$ $T_0 = 250$	Median Abs. Dev.	0.1735	0.1208	0.1112	0.1170	0.1093	0.1165	0.1416
	95% CI Coverage	0.8273	0.9296	0.9275	0.9510	0.9339	0.9616	0.9360
	Median CI Length	0.6581	0.6599	0.6476	0.7008	0.6179	0.6988	0.7264
$N = 250$ $T_0 = 50$	Median Abs. Dev.	0.1621	0.0550	0.0486	0.0493	0.0535	0.0521	0.0556
	95% CI Coverage	0.4420	0.9660	0.9660	0.9780	0.9600	0.9680	0.9620
	Median CI Length	0.2863	0.2999	0.2935	0.2964	0.2836	0.2965	0.3023
$N = 250$ $T_0 = 250$	Median Abs. Dev.	0.1459	0.0486	0.0481	0.0492	0.0474	0.0487	0.0543
	95% CI Coverage	0.5020	0.9680	0.9720	0.9660	0.9620	0.9680	0.9500
	Median CI Length	0.2860	0.2964	0.2927	0.2969	0.2849	0.2968	0.3011

Notes: LOO stands for leave-one-out procedure in cross-fitting or cross-validation in bandwidth selection. NA stands for not doing the procedure.

For model 2 with the interactive fixed effects, the TWFE method struggles to achieve approximately correct 95% confidence interval coverage. This problem worsens as N increases and there are more individual latent characteristics to capture. In contrast, the proposed method demonstrates relatively good coverage for all different choices of N and T .

4.2 Comparison with Method Proposed by Feng (2024a)

We compare the performance of our approach with the method proposed by Feng (2024a), which, to the best of our knowledge, is one of the few available inferential methods for average causal effects in nonlinear factor models. In this subsection, we use precisely the same data generating processes employed in Feng (2024a) but we consider different values of N and T . The implementation is based on the replication code provided by the author. These numerical exercises are designed to investigate how the considered methods perform under

relatively small sample sizes which may be more typical of microeconomic applications.

Again, consider a large panel data setting with individuals labeled $i = 1, \dots, N$ over time periods $t = 1, \dots, T$, where $N \in \{50, 250\}$ and $T_0 \in \{50, 250, 1000\}$ with only one post-treatment time period. Our target estimand is the counterfactual mean $\mathbb{E}[Y_{i,T}(0)|w_{i,T} = 1]$ which is the object of interest in the simulations of [Feng \(2024a\)](#). Note that this object is readily calculated from our $\hat{A\hat{T}}_t$ estimate because $\mathbb{E}[Y_{i,T}|w_{i,T} = 1]$ is trivially identified. We consider the following DGPs for the untreated potential outcomes:

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{ll} \text{Model 3 (Nonlinear factor model):} & Y_{i,t}(0) = (\alpha_i - \lambda_t)^2 + u_{i,t}, \\ \text{Model 4 (Gaussian kernel):} & Y_{i,t}(0) = \frac{1}{0.1 \cdot \sqrt{2\pi}} \exp[-100(\alpha_i - \lambda_t)^2] + u_{i,t}, \\ \text{Model 5 (Exponential kernel):} & Y_{i,t}(0) = \exp(-10|\alpha_i - \lambda_t|) + u_{i,t}, \end{array} \right.$$

for $t \in \{1, \dots, T_0\}$. In the post-treatment time period, all three models follow

$$\begin{aligned} Y_{i,T}(0) &= \alpha_i + \alpha_i^2 + \epsilon_{i,T} \\ Y_{i,T}(1) &= 2\alpha_i + \alpha_i^2 + 1 + \epsilon_{i,T} \end{aligned}$$

where the individual latent factor $\alpha_i \sim \text{Uniform}(-0.5, 0.5)$ and time latent factor $\lambda_t \sim \text{Uniform}(0, 1)$, $u_{i,t} \sim N(0, 0.5^2)$, and $\epsilon_{i,t} \sim N(0, 1)$. The propensity score is given by

$$p_{i,T} = \frac{\exp[(\alpha_i - 0.5) + (\alpha_i - 0.5)^2]}{1 + \exp[(\alpha_i - 0.5) + (\alpha_i - 0.5)^2]}.$$

For this DGP, we roughly have $p_{i,T} \in [0.4378, 0.6792]$, which satisfies the required overlapping condition.

Model 3 is a nonlinear factor model. Models 4 and 5 are the Gaussian kernel and exponential kernel. A similar simulation design is also used [Fernández-Val et al. \(2021\)](#).

The results are provided in Tables 3, 4, and 5 below. We consider the same methods and report the same statistics as for the previous numerical experiments. The number of replications is 500.

Table 3: Simulation results for model 3 (nonlinear factor model)

		Local PCA (Feng, 2024a)	Proposed Method				
			W/ true $p_{i,t}$	W/ true α_i	Pseudo distance		
Cross-Fitting Bandwidth Selection			NA	LOO	NA	LOO	2-Fold
			LOO		LOO		2-Fold
$N = 50$ $T_0 = 50$	Median Abs. Dev.	0.3008	0.1660	0.1910	0.1946	0.2024	0.2444
	95% CI Coverage	0.7992	0.8912	0.9310	0.7678	0.8954	0.8870
	Median CI Length	1.2260	0.8704	1.0483	0.7287	0.9957	1.0672
$N = 50$ $T_0 = 250$	Median Abs. Dev.	0.2267	0.1674	0.1978	0.1884	0.2067	0.2531
	95% CI Coverage	0.8628	0.8857	0.9314	0.7464	0.9064	0.8877
	Median CI Length	1.1340	0.8651	1.0505	0.6604	1.0277	1.1069
$N = 50$ $T_0 = 1000$	Median Abs. Dev.	0.2020	0.1602	0.1905	0.1801	0.2008	0.2397
	95% CI Coverage	0.9053	0.9011	0.9389	0.8442	0.9347	0.9158
	Median CI Length	1.0297	0.8782	1.0505	0.7094	1.0597	1.1487
$N = 250$ $T_0 = 50$	Median Abs. Dev.	0.1788	0.0683	0.0749	0.1175	0.1148	0.1282
	95% CI Coverage	0.6800	0.9360	0.9540	0.6700	0.8180	0.8080
	Median CI Length	0.4994	0.4093	0.4346	0.3361	0.4367	0.4463
$N = 250$ $T_0 = 250$	Median Abs. Dev.	0.0899	0.0683	0.0749	0.0831	0.0805	0.0930
	95% CI Coverage	0.9240	0.9360	0.9540	0.8380	0.9200	0.9220
	Median CI Length	0.4685	0.4093	0.4346	0.3451	0.4182	0.4401
$N = 250$ $T_0 = 1000$	Median Abs. Dev.	0.0792	0.0683	0.0749	0.0734	0.0768	0.0825
	95% CI Coverage	0.9420	0.9360	0.9540	0.8760	0.9480	0.9240
	Median CI Length	0.4534	0.4093	0.4346	0.3502	0.4468	0.4643

Notes: LOO stands for leave-one-out procedure in cross-fitting or cross-validation in bandwidth selection. NA stands for not doing the procedure.

Table 4: Simulation results for model 4 (Gaussian kernel)

		Local PCA (Feng, 2024a)	Proposed Method				
			W/ true $p_{i,t}$	W/ true α_i	Pseudo distance		
Cross-Fitting Bandwidth Selection			NA	LOO	NA	LOO	2-Fold
			LOO		LOO		2-Fold
$N = 50$ $T_0 = 50$	Median Abs. Dev.	0.2325	0.1588	0.1890	0.1823	0.2164	0.2391
	95% CI Coverage	0.8827	0.8971	0.9403	0.8416	0.9465	0.9095
	Median CI Length	1.0253	0.8641	1.0524	0.7793	1.2376	1.2539
$N = 50$ $T_0 = 250$	Median Abs. Dev.	0.1971	0.1600	0.1904	0.1779	0.2112	0.2779
	95% CI Coverage	0.8916	0.8978	0.9366	0.8425	0.9407	0.9243
	Median CI Length	0.9587	0.8651	1.0597	0.8034	1.2359	1.3176
$N = 50$ $T_0 = 1000$	Median Abs. Dev.	0.1980	0.1600	0.1904	0.1770	0.2254	0.2556
	95% CI Coverage	0.8941	0.8941	0.9389	0.8411	0.9328	0.9002
	Median CI Length	0.9606	0.8609	1.0535	0.7981	1.2234	1.2446
$N = 250$ $T_0 = 50$	Median Abs. Dev.	0.0905	0.0683	0.0749	0.0700	0.0737	0.1046
	95% CI Coverage	0.8920	0.9360	0.9540	0.9260	0.9680	0.9300
	Median CI Length	0.4514	0.4093	0.4346	0.3985	0.4700	0.5035
$N = 250$ $T_0 = 250$	Median Abs. Dev.	0.0757	0.0683	0.0749	0.0753	0.0788	0.0935
	95% CI Coverage	0.9420	0.9360	0.9540	0.9400	0.9620	0.9400
	Median CI Length	0.4430	0.4093	0.4346	0.4110	0.4584	0.4921
$N = 250$ $T_0 = 1000$	Median Abs. Dev.	0.0847	0.0683	0.0749	0.0733	0.0757	0.0935
	95% CI Coverage	0.9440	0.9360	0.9540	0.9420	0.9580	0.9440
	Median CI Length	0.4379	0.4093	0.4346	0.4129	0.4543	0.4787

Notes: LOO stands for leave-one-out procedure in cross-fitting or cross-validation in bandwidth selection. NA stands for not doing the procedure.

Table 5: Simulation results for model 5 (exponential kernel)

		Local PCA (Feng, 2024a)	Proposed Method				
			W/ true $p_{i,t}$	W/ true α_i	Pseudo distance		
Cross-Fitting			NA	LOO	NA	LOO	2-Fold
Bandwidth Selection			LOO		LOO		2-Fold
$N = 50$ $T_0 = 50$	Median Abs. Dev.	0.2980	0.1662	0.1910	0.1982	0.1980	0.2426
	95% CI Coverage	0.8189	0.8909	0.9321	0.7716	0.8951	0.8848
	Median CI Length	1.1975	0.8671	1.0501	0.7512	0.9773	1.0526
$N = 50$ $T_0 = 250$	Median Abs. Dev.	0.2459	0.1630	0.1910	0.1969	0.2035	0.2535
	95% CI Coverage	0.8627	0.8914	0.9344	0.7357	0.8996	0.8934
	Median CI Length	1.1007	0.8641	1.0507	0.6536	1.0476	1.1229
$N = 50$ $T_0 = 1000$	Median Abs. Dev.	0.2047	0.1602	0.1902	0.1715	0.1880	0.2444
	95% CI Coverage	0.8457	0.9027	0.9366	0.8013	0.9091	0.9133
	Median CI Length	0.9520	0.8787	1.0512	0.6684	1.1039	1.1549
$N = 250$ $T_0 = 50$	Median Abs. Dev.	0.2117	0.0683	0.0749	0.1402	0.1346	0.1379
	95% CI Coverage	0.6120	0.9360	0.9540	0.6160	0.7760	0.7660
	Median CI Length	0.4940	0.4093	0.4346	0.3449	0.4373	0.4473
$N = 250$ $T_0 = 250$	Median Abs. Dev.	0.1202	0.0683	0.0749	0.0906	0.0835	0.0937
	95% CI Coverage	0.8160	0.9360	0.9540	0.7860	0.9140	0.8860
	Median CI Length	0.4446	0.4093	0.4346	0.3333	0.4281	0.4388
$N = 250$ $T_0 = 1000$	Median Abs. Dev.	0.0925	0.0683	0.0749	0.0735	0.0828	0.0954
	95% CI Coverage	0.9120	0.9360	0.9540	0.8260	0.9540	0.9380
	Median CI Length	0.4228	0.4093	0.4346	0.3196	0.4884	0.5170

Notes: LOO stands for leave-one-out procedure in cross-fitting or cross-validation in bandwidth selection. NA stands for not doing the procedure.

For models 3 to 5, which involve different nonlinear data generating processes, the performance of both the proposed method and the local PCA method proposed by Feng (2024a) differs across various combinations of N and T_0 . In models 3 and 4 with the nonlinear and Gaussian kernel DGPs, the proposed method provides good coverage across for different sample sizes. Specifically, we find that the cross-fitting procedure substantially improves the confidence interval coverage, and the leave-one-out procedure improves the accuracy of point estimation. Here, the proposed method either performs similarly or better than the

local PCA method. In contrast, the local PCA method tends to underperform when the pre-treatment history is relatively short compared to the number of individuals. This issue gets amplified in model 5 with the exponential kernels DGP. In configurations with $N = 250$, the local PCA method requires a larger pre-treatment history of T_0 being 1000 to achieve satisfactory confidence interval coverage. On the other hand, the proposed method with the leave-one-out procedure achieves effective coverage with a shorter T_0 requirement.

In summary, the proposed method provides a simple and transparent estimation and inference procedure for different types of causal estimands with their associated doubly robust score function. With the aforementioned algorithm, we can effectively collect individuals who are similar to each other in terms of their latent characteristics in a more transparent manner. This simulation study showcases that the proposed method can match or even outperform the workhorse two-way fixed effects model and the method proposed by [Feng \(2024a\)](#) across different data generating processes, requiring fewer amount of pre-treatment history in certain settings.

References

- Abadie, A. (2021). Using synthetic controls: Feasibility, data requirements, and methodological aspects. *Journal of economic literature*, 59(2):391–425.
- Abadie, A., Agarwal, A., Dwivedi, R., and Shah, A. (2024). Doubly robust inference in causal latent factor models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.11652*.
- Abbring, J. H. and Van Den Berg, G. J. (2003). The nonparametric identification of treatment effects in duration models. *Econometrica*, 71:1491–1517.
- Agarwal, A., Dahleh, M., Shah, D., and Shen, D. (2021). Causal matrix completion. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2109.15154*.
- Agarwal, A., Dahleh, M., Shah, D., and Shen, D. (2023). Causal matrix completion. In *The thirty sixth annual conference on learning theory*, pages 3821–3826. PMLR.
- Agarwal, A., Shah, D., and Shen, D. (2020). Synthetic interventions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2006.07691*.
- Arkhangelsky, D., Athey, S., Hirshberg, D. A., Imbens, G. W., and Wager, S. (2021). Synthetic difference-in-differences. *American Economic Review*, 111(12):4088–4118.
- Arkhangelsky, D. and Imbens, G. (2024). Causal models for longitudinal and panel data: A survey. *The Econometrics Journal*, 27(3):C1–C61.
- Arkhangelsky, D. and Imbens, G. W. (2022). Doubly robust identification for causal panel data models. *The Econometrics Journal*, 25(3):649–674.
- Arkhangelsky, D., Imbens, G. W., Lei, L., and Luo, X. (2024). Design-robust two-way-fixed-effects regression for panel data. *Quantitative Economics*, 15(4):999–1034.
- Athey, S., Bayati, M., Doudchenko, N., Imbens, G., and Khosravi, K. (2021). Matrix completion methods for causal panel data models. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 116(536):1716–1730.
- Athey, S. and Imbens, G. (2025). Identification of average treatment effects in nonparametric panel models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2503.19873*.
- Auerbach, E. (2022). Identification and estimation of a partially linear regression model using network data. *Econometrica*, 90(1):347–365.

- Bai, J. (2009). Panel data models with interactive fixed effects. *Econometrica*, 77(4):1229–1279.
- Bai, J. and Ng, S. (2021). Matrix completion, counterfactuals, and factor analysis of missing data. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 116(536):1746–1763.
- Bennett, G. (1962). Probability inequalities for the sum of independent random variables. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 57(297):33–45.
- Borusyak, K., Jaravel, X., and Spiess, J. (2022). Revisiting event study designs: Robust and efficient estimation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2108.12419*.
- Borusyak, K., Jaravel, X., and Spiess, J. (2024). Revisiting event-study designs: robust and efficient estimation. *Review of Economic Studies*, page rdae007.
- Boucheron, S., Lugosi, G., and Massart, P. (2013). *Concentration Inequalities: A Nonasymptotic Theory of Independence*. Oxford University Press.
- Callaway, B. and Sant’Anna, P. H. (2021). Difference-in-differences with multiple time periods. *Journal of Econometrics*, 225(2):200–230.
- Cattaneo, M. D., Feng, Y., and Titiunik, R. (2021). Prediction intervals for synthetic control methods. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 116(536):1865–1880.
- Chernozhukov, V., Chetverikov, D., Demirer, M., Duflo, E., Hansen, C., Newey, W., and Robins, J. (2018a). Double/debiased machine learning for treatment and structural parameters: Double/debiased machine learning. *The Econometrics Journal*, 21(1).
- Chernozhukov, V., Newey, W. K., and Singh, R. (2022). Debiased machine learning of global and local parameters using regularized riesz representers. *The Econometrics Journal*, 25(3):576–601.
- Chernozhukov, V., Wuthrich, K., and Zhu, Y. (2018b). A t -test for synthetic controls. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1812.10820*.
- Chernozhukov, V., Wüthrich, K., and Zhu, Y. (2021). An exact and robust conformal inference method for counterfactual and synthetic controls. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 116(536):1849–1864.
- De Chaisemartin, C. and d’Haultfoeuille, X. (2020). Two-way fixed effects estimators with heterogeneous treatment effects. *American economic review*, 110(9):2964–2996.

- De Chaisemartin, C. and d'Haultfoeuille, X. (2023). Two-way fixed effects and differences-in-differences with heterogeneous treatment effects: A survey. *The Econometrics Journal*, 26(3):C1–C30.
- Feng, Y. (2024a). Causal inference in possibly nonlinear factor models. *Working paper*.
- Feng, Y. (2024b). Optimal estimation of large-dimensional nonlinear factor models. *Working paper*.
- Fernández-Val, I., Freeman, H., and Weidner, M. (2021). Low-rank approximations of non-separable panel models. *The Econometrics Journal*, 24(2):C40–C77.
- Ghanem, D., Sant'Anna, P. H., and Wüthrich, K. (2022). Selection and parallel trends. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2203.09001*.
- Goldsmith-Pinkham, P. (2024). Tracking the credibility revolution across fields. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.20604*.
- Hahn, J. (1998). On the role of the propensity score in efficient semiparametric estimation of average treatment effects. *Econometrica*, pages 315–331.
- Hoshino, T. and Yanagi, T. (2024). Estimating dyadic treatment effects with unknown confounders. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.16547*.
- Manski, C. F. and Pepper, J. V. (2018). How do right-to-carry laws affect crime rates? coping with ambiguity using bounded-variation assumptions. *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 100(2):232–244.
- Nowakowicz, K. (2024). Nonparametric network bootstrap.
- Pesaran, M. H. (2006). Estimation and inference in large heterogeneous panels with a multifactor error structure. *Econometrica*, 74(4):967–1012.
- Rambachan, A. and Roth, J. (2023). A more credible approach to parallel trends. *Review of Economic Studies*, 90(5):2555–2591.
- Robins, J., Li, L., Tchetgen, E., van der Vaart, A., et al. (2008). Higher order influence functions and minimax estimation of nonlinear functionals. In *Probability and statistics: essays in honor of David A. Freedman*, volume 2, pages 335–422. Institute of Mathematical Statistics.

- Robins, J. M. and Rotnitzky, A. (1995). Semiparametric efficiency in multivariate regression models with missing data. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 90(429):122–129.
- Robins, J. M., Rotnitzky, A., and Zhao, L. P. (1994). Estimation of regression coefficients when some regressors are not always observed. *Journal of the American statistical Association*, 89(427):846–866.
- Roth, J., Sant’Anna, P. H., Bilinski, A., and Poe, J. (2023). What’s trending in difference-in-differences? a synthesis of the recent econometrics literature. *Journal of Econometrics*, 235(2):2218–2244.
- Sant’Anna, P. H. and Zhao, J. (2020). Doubly robust difference-in-differences estimators. *Journal of econometrics*, 219(1):101–122.
- Scharfstein, D. O., Rotnitzky, A., and Robins, J. M. (1999). Adjusting for nonignorable drop-out using semiparametric nonresponse models. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 94(448):1096–1120.
- Stone, C. J. (1980). Optimal rates of convergence for nonparametric estimators. *The annals of Statistics*, pages 1348–1360.
- Sun, L. and Abraham, S. (2021). Estimating dynamic treatment effects in event studies with heterogeneous treatment effects. *Journal of Econometrics*, 225(2):175–199.
- Velez, A. (2024). On the asymptotic properties of debiased machine learning estimators.
- Wang, Z. (2022). The linking effect: Causal identification and estimation of the effect of peer relationship. In *4th EUI Alumni Conference in Economics*.
- Wooldridge, J. M. (2021). Two-way fixed effects, the two-way mundlak regression, and difference-in-differences estimators. *Available at SSRN 3906345*.
- Zeleneev, A. (2020). Identification and estimation of network models with nonparametric unobserved heterogeneity.
- Zhang, Y., Levina, E., and Zhu, J. (2017). Estimating network edge probabilities by neighbourhood smoothing. *Biometrika*, 104(4):771–783.

Appendix

A Proofs

A.1 Supporting Lemmas

Lemma A.1 (Rate of Convergence for the Pseudo Distance Estimator). *Suppose Assumption 4 holds and $\sqrt{\frac{\log(N)}{T_0}} \rightarrow 0$. Then for all $i, j \in [N]$*

$$\max_{i,j} |\hat{d}_{i,j} - d_{i,j}| = \mathcal{O}_p \left(\sqrt{\frac{\log(N)}{T_0}} + \frac{\log(N)}{N} \right).$$

Proof of Lemma A.1. By Assumption 4 (iii) we can write $d_{i,j}$ as follows:

$$d_{i,j} = \sup_{\alpha_k \in \text{supp}(\alpha)} \left| \mathbb{E}[\mu^{(0)}(\alpha_k, \lambda_t)(\mu^{(0)}(\alpha_i, \lambda_t) - \mu^{(0)}(\alpha_j, \lambda_t)) | \alpha_i, \alpha_j, \alpha_k] \right|$$

We further denote the oracle distance $\tilde{d}_{i,j}$, which will be helpful throughout the proof, as follows:

$$\tilde{d}_{i,j} := \max_{k \notin \{i,j\}} \left| \frac{1}{T_0} \sum_{t=1}^{T_0} \mu_{k,t}^{(0)} (\mu_{i,t}^{(0)} - \mu_{j,t}^{(0)}) \right|$$

The proof is then separated into two parts: (i) the rate of convergence from $\hat{d}_{i,j}$ to $\tilde{d}_{i,j}$ and (ii) the rate of convergence from $\tilde{d}_{i,j}$ to $d_{i,j}$.

From $\hat{d}_{i,j}$ to $\tilde{d}_{i,j}$ By applying the reverse triangle inequality and multiplying out, we derive the max difference between estimated distance and oracle distance as

$$\begin{aligned} & \max_{i,j} |\hat{d}_{i,j} - \tilde{d}_{i,j}| \\ &= \left| \max_{i,j,k: k \notin \{i,j\}} \left| \frac{1}{T_0} \sum_{t=1}^{T_0} (\mu_{k,t}^{(0)} + u_{k,t})(\mu_{i,t}^{(0)} - \mu_{j,t}^{(0)} + u_{j,t} - u_{j,t}) \right| - \max_{k \notin \{i,j\}} \left| \frac{1}{T_0} \sum_{t=1}^{T_0} \mu_{k,t}^{(0)} (\mu_{i,t}^{(0)} - \mu_{j,t}^{(0)}) \right| \right| \\ &\leq \max_{i,j,k: k \notin \{i,j\}} \left| \frac{1}{T_0} \sum_{t=1}^{T_0} [u_{k,t} (\mu_{i,t}^{(0)} - \mu_{j,t}^{(0)}) + \mu_{k,t}^{(0)} (u_{j,t} - u_{j,t}) + u_{k,t} (u_{j,t} - u_{j,t})] \right| \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

By Assumptions 4 (ii), for each $r, q \in \{i, j, k\}$ with $r \neq q$, it follows that $\mathbb{E}[u_{k,t} | \alpha_i, \alpha_j, \alpha_k, \lambda_t] = 0$ and $\mathbb{E}[u_{k,t}(u_{j,t} - u_{j,t}) | \alpha_i, \alpha_j, \alpha_k, \lambda_t] = 0$. Moreover, by Assumption 4 (iv), $\mu_{i,t}^{(0)}$, $\mu_{j,t}^{(0)}$, and $\mu_{k,t}^{(0)}$ are bounded, and by Assumption 4 (ii), $\{(u_{i,t}, u_{j,t}, u_{k,t})\}_{t=1}^{T_0}$ are jointly independent over time and sub-Gaussian conditional on $\alpha_i, \alpha_j, \alpha_k, \lambda_t$. Thus, from Bernstein's inequality in Lemma A.7, we get that for constants C, a , and b , for any $\eta > 0$, it follows that

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\left| \frac{1}{T_0} \sum_{t=1}^{T_0} [(u_{k,t}(\mu_{i,t}^{(0)} - \mu_{j,t}^{(0)}) + \mu_{k,t}^{(0)}(u_{j,t} - u_{j,t}) + u_{k,t}(u_{j,t} - u_{j,t}))] \right| > \eta \mid \alpha_i, \alpha_j, \alpha_k, \lambda_t \right) \leq C \exp \left(-\frac{T_0 \eta^2}{a + b\eta} \right)$$

And so, applying the law of iterated expectations gives

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\left|\frac{1}{T_0}\sum_{t=1}^{T_0}\left[(u_{k,t}(\mu_{i,t}^{(0)} - \mu_{j,t}^{(0)}) + \mu_{k,t}^{(0)}(u_{j,t} - u_{j,t}) + u_{k,t}(u_{j,t} - u_{j,t})\right]\right| > \eta\right) \leq C \exp\left(-\frac{T_0\eta^2}{a + b\eta}\right)$$

By taking the union bound and (7), we then get

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}\left(\max_{i,j} |\hat{d}_{i,j} - \tilde{d}_{i,j}| > \eta\right) &\leq \binom{N}{3} C \exp\left(-\frac{T_0\eta^2}{a + b\eta}\right) \\ &\leq N^3 C \exp\left(-\frac{T_0\eta^2}{a + b\eta}\right)\end{aligned}$$

By setting $\eta = \sqrt{\frac{3a \log(N)}{T_0}}$ in the above inequality, it follows that

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\max_{i,j} |\hat{d}_{i,j} - \tilde{d}_{i,j}| > \sqrt{\frac{a \log(N)}{T_0}}\right) \leq C \exp\left(3 \log(N) - \frac{3a \log(N)}{a + b \sqrt{\frac{a \log(N)}{T_0}}}\right)$$

As the RHS goes to C , hence, we conclude the rate for convergence from $\hat{d}_{i,j}$ to $\tilde{d}_{i,j}$ being

$$\max_{i,j} |\hat{d}_{i,j} - \tilde{d}_{i,j}| = \mathcal{O}_p\left(\sqrt{\frac{\log(N)}{T_0}}\right)$$

From $\tilde{d}_{i,j}$ to $d_{i,j}$ By applying the triangle inequality and reverse triangle inequality, we derive the max difference between oracle distance and actual distance as

$$\begin{aligned}&\max_{i,j,k: k \notin \{i,j\}} |d_{i,j} - \tilde{d}_{i,j}| \\ &\leq \max_{i,j,k: k \notin \{i,j\}} \left| \frac{1}{T_0} \sum_{t=1}^{T_0} \mu_{k,t}^{(0)} (\mu_{i,t}^{(0)} - \mu_{j,t}^{(0)}) - \mathbb{E} [\mu_{k,t}^{(0)} (\mu_{i,t}^{(0)} - \mu_{j,t}^{(0)}) \mid \alpha_i, \alpha_j, \alpha_k] \right| \quad (8) \\ &+ \max_{i,j} \sup_{\alpha \in \text{supp}(\alpha)} \left| \mathbb{E} [\mu^{(0)}(\alpha, \lambda_t) (\mu_{i,t}^{(0)} - \mu_{j,t}^{(0)}) \mid \alpha_i, \alpha_j] \right| - \max_{i,j,k: k \notin \{i,j\}} \left| \mathbb{E} [\mu_{k,t}^{(0)} (\mu_{i,t}^{(0)} - \mu_{j,t}^{(0)}) \mid \alpha_i, \alpha_j, \alpha_k] \right| \quad (9)\end{aligned}$$

We first derive the rate for (8). By Assumptions 4 (iii) and (iv), it follows that $\mu_{i,t}^{(0)}$, $\mu_{j,t}^{(0)}$, and $\mu_{k,t}^{(0)}$ are bounded and independent over time conditional on $\alpha_i, \alpha_j, \alpha_k$. Then by Hoeffding's inequality, there are constants C, a , and b such that for any $\eta > 0$,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\left|\frac{1}{T_0}\sum_{t=1}^{T_0}\mu_{k,t}^{(0)}(\mu_{i,t}^{(0)} - \mu_{j,t}^{(0)}) - \mathbb{E}[\mu_{k,t}^{(0)}(\mu_{i,t}^{(0)} - \mu_{j,t}^{(0)}) \mid \alpha_i, \alpha_j, \alpha_k]\right| \mid \alpha_i, \alpha_j, \alpha_k\right) \leq C \exp\left(-\frac{T_0\eta^2}{a + b\eta}\right)$$

which further leads to

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\left|\frac{1}{T_0}\sum_{t=1}^{T_0}\mu_{k,t}^{(0)}(\mu_{i,t}^{(0)} - \mu_{j,t}^{(0)}) - \mathbb{E}[\mu_{k,t}^{(0)}(\mu_{i,t}^{(0)} - \mu_{j,t}^{(0)}) \mid \alpha_i, \alpha_j, \alpha_k]\right|\right) \leq C \exp\left(-\frac{T_0\eta^2}{a + b\eta}\right)$$

Then applying union bound gives

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\max_{i,j,k: k \notin \{i,j\}} \left|\frac{1}{T_0}\sum_{t=1}^{T_0}\mu_{k,t}^{(0)}(\mu_{i,t}^{(0)} - \mu_{j,t}^{(0)}) - \mathbb{E}[\mu_{k,t}^{(0)}(\mu_{i,t}^{(0)} - \mu_{j,t}^{(0)}) \mid \alpha_i, \alpha_j, \alpha_k]\right|\right) \leq N^3 C \exp\left(-\frac{T_0\eta^2}{a + b\eta}\right)$$

By setting $\eta = \sqrt{\frac{3a \log(N)}{T_0}}$ in the above inequality, it follows that

$$\max_{i,j,k: k \notin \{i,j\}} \left| \frac{1}{T_0} \sum_{t=1}^{T_0} \mu_{k,t}^{(0)} (\mu_{i,t}^{(0)} - \mu_{j,t}^{(0)}) - \mathbb{E}[\mu_{k,t}^{(0)} (\mu_{i,t}^{(0)} - \mu_{j,t}^{(0)}) \mid \alpha_i, \alpha_j, \alpha_k] \right| = \mathcal{O}_p \left(\sqrt{\frac{\log(N)}{T_0}} \right)$$

Then we derive the rate of convergence for (9). By the reverse triangle inequality, the boundedness of $\mu_{i,t}^{(0)}$, and the Lipschitz condition in Assumption 4 (iv), we have that, for some constant C ,

$$\begin{aligned} & \max_{i,j} \sup_{\alpha \in \text{supp}(\alpha)} \left| \mathbb{E}[\mu^{(0)}(\alpha, \lambda_t) (\mu_{i,t}^{(0)} - \mu_{j,t}^{(0)}) \mid \alpha_i, \alpha_j] \right| - \max_{i,j,k: k \notin \{i,j\}} \left| \mathbb{E}[\mu_{k,t}^{(0)} (\mu_{i,t}^{(0)} - \mu_{j,t}^{(0)}) \mid \alpha_i, \alpha_j, \alpha_k] \right| \\ & \leq \max_{i,j} \sup_{\alpha \in \text{supp}(\alpha)} \min_{k \notin \{i,j\}} \left| \mathbb{E}[(\mu^{(0)}(\alpha, \lambda_t) - \mu^{(0)}(\alpha_k, \lambda_t)) (\mu_{i,t}^{(0)} - \mu_{j,t}^{(0)}) \mid \alpha_i, \alpha_j, \alpha_k] \right| \\ & \leq C \sup_{\alpha \in \text{supp}(\alpha)} \min_k \|\alpha - \alpha_k\| \end{aligned}$$

By the compactness of the support of α in Assumption 4 (iii), with a constant C , there is an η -covering of the support of α_i that consists of $J \leq \frac{C}{\eta^{d_\alpha}}$ open balls whose centers we will denote by $\{\bar{\alpha}_j\}_{j=1}^J$. Then by definition of the covering, it follows that

$$\sup_{\alpha \in \text{supp}(\alpha)} \min_k \|\alpha - \alpha_k\| \leq \max_{j \in [J]} \min_{k \in [N]} \|\bar{\alpha}_j - \alpha_k\| + L_0 \eta$$

Then applying the union bound gives

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\max_{j \in [J]} \min_{k \in [N]} \|\bar{\alpha}_j - \alpha_k\| > \epsilon \right) \leq \sum_{j=1}^J \mathbb{P} \left(\min_{k \in [N]} \|\bar{\alpha}_j - \alpha_k\| > \epsilon \right)$$

By Assumption 4 (iii), there is a $0 < \delta$ so that for any fixed $\alpha \in \text{supp}(\alpha)$ and any η , $\mathbb{P}(\|\alpha - \alpha_k\| > \eta) \leq 1 - \delta\eta$. With the independence of $\{\alpha_k\}_{k=1}^N$, we have

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\min_{k \in [N]} \|\bar{\alpha}_j - \alpha_k\| > \epsilon \right) = \left\{ \mathbb{P}(\|\bar{\alpha}_j - \alpha_k\| > \epsilon) \right\}^N \leq (1 - \delta\epsilon)^N$$

which further leads to

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\max_{j \in [J]} \min_{k \in [N]} \|\bar{\alpha}_j - \alpha_k\| > \epsilon \right) \leq J \delta^N \epsilon^N \leq \frac{C}{\eta^{d_\alpha}} (1 - \delta\epsilon)^N$$

By setting $\epsilon = \frac{d_\alpha \log(N)}{\delta N}$ and $\eta = \frac{1}{N}$, it follows that

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\max_{j \in [J]} \min_{k \in [N]} \|\bar{\alpha}_j - \alpha_k\| > \frac{\log(N)}{\delta N} \right) \leq J \delta^N \epsilon^N \leq \frac{C}{N^{d_\alpha}} \left(1 - \frac{d_\alpha \log(N)}{N} \right)^N \rightarrow C$$

Hence, we have

$$\sup_{\alpha \in \text{supp}(\alpha)} \min_k \|\alpha - \alpha_k\| = \mathcal{O}_p \left(\frac{\log(N)}{N} \right)$$

Combining with previous derivation, therefore, we conclude the rate for convergence from $\tilde{d}_{i,j}$ to $d_{i,j}$ being

$$\max_{i,j} |\hat{d}_{i,j} - d_{i,j}| = O_p \left(\sqrt{\frac{\log(N)}{T_0}} + \frac{\log(N)}{N} \right)$$

□

Lemma A.2. Under Assumptions 4 (iv) and (vi), there exists a $c > 0$ so that for all $\alpha_1, \alpha_2 \in \mathcal{A}$:

$$\sup_{\alpha \in \text{supp}(\alpha)} \int_{\lambda \in \text{supp}(\lambda)} \mu^{(0)}(\alpha_1, \lambda) (\mu^{(0)}(\alpha_1, \lambda) - \mu^{(0)}(\alpha_2, \lambda)) d\pi(\lambda) \geq c \|\alpha_1 - \alpha_2\|$$

Proof of Lemma A.2. By Assumption 4 (vi), for some $C > 0$ we have:

$$\begin{aligned} & C \sqrt{\int_{\lambda \in \text{supp}(\lambda)} (\mu^{(0)}(\alpha_1, \lambda) - \mu^{(0)}(\alpha_2, \lambda))^2 d\pi(\lambda)} \\ & \leq \sup_{\alpha \in \text{supp}(\alpha)} \int_{\lambda \in \text{supp}(\lambda)} \mu^{(0)}(\alpha, \lambda) (\mu^{(0)}(\alpha_1, \lambda) - \mu^{(0)}(\alpha_2, \lambda)) d\pi(\lambda) \end{aligned}$$

and the object on the LHS is bounded below by $C\|\alpha_1 - \alpha_2\|$. Thus letting $c = C^2 > 0$ gives the result. □

Lemma A.3. There exists a $\delta > 0$ so that with probability approaching 1, for all $i, j \in [N]$:

$$K \left(\frac{\hat{d}_{i,j}}{h} \right) = \mathbf{1} \{ \|\alpha_i - \alpha_j\| \leq \delta h \} K \left(\frac{\hat{d}_{i,j}}{h} \right)$$

Proof of Lemma A.3. By Lemma A.2, there exists a constant C , such that for any finite $\delta > 0$, we have

$$\|\alpha_i - \alpha_j\| > \delta h \implies d_{i,j} > 2C\delta h$$

Now, note that for all i, j ,

$$\frac{\hat{d}_{i,j}}{h} \geq \frac{d_{i,j}}{h} - \frac{\max_{i,j} |\hat{d}_{i,j} - d_{i,j}|}{h}.$$

Thus, it follows that

$$\|\alpha_i - \alpha_j\| > \delta h \implies \frac{\hat{d}_{i,j}}{h} > \delta C - \frac{\max_{i,j} |\hat{d}_{i,j} - d_{i,j}|}{h}$$

By Lemma A.1, we have

$$\frac{\max_{i,j} |\hat{d}_{i,j} - d_{i,j}|}{h} = O_p \left(\frac{1}{h} \sqrt{\frac{\log(N)}{T_0}} + \frac{\log(N)}{hN} \right)$$

By supposition, $\frac{1}{h} \sqrt{\frac{\log(N)}{T_0}}$ and $\frac{\log(N)}{hN}$ go to zero, and so with probability approaching one, we have $\frac{\max_{i,j} |\hat{d}_{i,j} - d_{i,j}|}{h} \leq \delta C$. Hence, with probability approaching one, for all i, j , it follows that

$$\|\alpha_i - \alpha_j\| > \delta h \implies \frac{\hat{d}_{i,j}}{h} > \delta C$$

As Assumption 4 (v) states that the kernel is zero everywhere other than some compact (and therefore bounded) sets. Hence, there is a constant c such that

$$\frac{\hat{d}_{i,j}}{h} > c \implies K\left(\frac{\hat{d}_{i,j}}{h}\right) = 0$$

Finally, setting $\delta > \frac{c}{C}$ gives the desired result. \square

Lemma A.4. *Suppose Assumption 4 holds, and $\frac{\log N}{Nh^{2d_\alpha}} \rightarrow 0$. Then for any fixed δ , there are constants $0 < \underline{c} < \bar{c} < \infty$ and $0 < \tilde{c}$, such that with probability approaching one and for all $i \in [N]$, it follows that*

$$\underline{c}h^{d_\alpha} \leq \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j:w_{jt}=0} \mathbf{1}\{\|\alpha_i - \alpha_j\| \leq \delta h\} \leq \bar{c}h^{d_\alpha}$$

and

$$\tilde{c} \leq \frac{1}{Nh^{d_\alpha}} \sum_{j:w_{jt}=0} K(d_{i,j}/h)$$

Proof of Lemma A.4. For the first statement in Lemma A.4, by Assumption 4 (i), for some $c > 0$, it follows that $\mathbb{P}(1 - w_{j,t} | \alpha_j) \geq c$ almost surely. And with the fact that $w_{j,t}$ is independent of α_i and that $\{\alpha_j\}_{j=1}^N$ are i.i.d. (by Assumption 4 (iii)), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{N} \sum_j (1 - w_{j,t}) \mathbf{1}\{\|\alpha_i - \alpha_j\| \leq \delta h\} \mid \alpha_i \right] &= \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{N} \sum_j P(1 - w_{j,t} | \alpha_j) \mathbf{1}\{\|\alpha_i - \alpha_j\| \leq \delta h\} \mid \alpha_i \right] \\ &\geq c \cdot \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{N} \sum_j \mathbf{1}\{\|\alpha_i - \alpha_j\| \leq \delta h\} \mid \alpha_i \right] \\ &= c \cdot \mathbb{P}(\|\alpha_i - \alpha_j\| \leq \delta h \mid \alpha_i) \end{aligned}$$

With Assumption 4 (iii), for any fixed δ , there are constants $0 < \underline{c} < \bar{c} < \infty$ such that

$$2\underline{c}h^{d_\alpha} \leq \mathbb{P}(\|\alpha_i - \alpha_j\| \leq \delta h \mid \alpha_i) \leq \frac{1}{2}\bar{c}h^{d_\alpha}$$

By applying the union bound and Hoeffding's inequality for Bernoulli random variables, it follows that, for any C ,

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{P} \left(\max_{i \in [N]} \left| \frac{1}{N} \sum_j (1 - w_{j,t}) \cdot \mathbf{1}\{\|\alpha_i - \alpha_j\| \leq \delta h\} - \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{N} \sum_j (1 - w_{j,t}) \cdot \mathbf{1}\{\|\alpha_i - \alpha_j\| \leq \delta h\} \mid \alpha_i \right] \right| > Ch^{d_\alpha} \right) \\ &\leq 2N \cdot \exp(-2NC^2h^2) \\ &= 2 \cdot \exp(\log(N) - 2NC^2h^{2d_\alpha}) \end{aligned}$$

The RHS goes to zero if $\frac{\log N}{Nh^{2d_\alpha}} \rightarrow 0$, which holds by supposition. By setting $C = \underline{c}$ and $C = \frac{1}{2}\bar{c}$, we see that with probability approaching one, for all $i \in [N]$, it follows that

$$\underline{c}h^{d_\alpha} \leq \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j:w_{j,t}=0} (1 - w_{j,t}) \mathbf{1} \left\{ \|\alpha_i - \alpha_j\| \leq \delta h \right\} \leq \bar{c}h^{d_\alpha}$$

Now for the second statement in Lemma A.4, by Assumption 4 (iv), it follows that $\mu(\cdot, \lambda)$ is Lipschitz continuous and bounded (uniformly over λ in both cases). Thus, for some constant $C < \infty$, we have

$$\|\alpha_i - \alpha_j\| \leq x \implies d_{i,j} \leq Cx$$

By Assumption 4 (v) of the kernel being positive and strictly positive at zero, and alongside with Lipschitz continuous, thus, there must be some $a, b > 0$ such that for all $x \leq a$, $K(x) \geq b$. Combining these results gives

$$\|\alpha_i - \alpha_j\| \leq \frac{a}{C}h \implies d_{i,j} \leq ah \implies K(d_{i,j}/h) \geq b$$

Then with the positivity of the kernel, it follows that

$$b \cdot \frac{1}{N} \sum_j (1 - w_{j,t}) \mathbf{1} \left\{ \|\alpha_i - \alpha_j\| \leq \frac{a}{C} \cdot h \right\} \leq \frac{1}{N} \sum_j (1 - w_{j,t}) \cdot K(d_{i,j}/h)$$

But since we already established that for any fixed δ , there is a constant $\underline{c} > 0$ such that $\underline{c}h^{d_\alpha} \leq \frac{1}{N} \sum_j (1 - w_{j,t}) \mathbf{1} \left\{ \|\alpha_i - \alpha_j\| \leq \delta h \right\}$ for all $i \in [N]$ with probability approaching one, therefore, there is a constant $\tilde{c} > 0$ such that with probability approaching one, for all i ,

$$\tilde{c} \leq \frac{1}{Nh^{d_\alpha}} \sum_j (1 - w_{j,t}) \cdot K(d_{i,j}/h)$$

□

A.2 Proof of Theorem 1

Proof of Theorem 1. We prove the result for $\hat{\mu}_{i,t}^{(0)}$. The result for $\hat{p}_{i,t}$ follows by almost identical steps. By Lemma A.3, there exists a $\delta < \infty$ such that with probability approaching one, for all $i, j \in [N]$, we have

$$K(\hat{d}_{i,j}/h) = K(\hat{d}_{i,j}/h) \cdot \mathbf{1} \left\{ \|\alpha_i - \alpha_j\| \leq \delta h \right\}$$

And with the above equality holds, we can then decompose $\hat{\mu}_{i,t}^{(0)} - \mu_{i,t}^{(0)}$ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\mu}_{i,t}^{(0)} - \mu_{i,t}^{(0)} &= \frac{\sum_{j:w_{j,t}=0} \mathbf{1}\{\|\alpha_i - \alpha_j\| \leq \delta h\} K(\hat{d}_{i,j}/h) \cdot \mu_{j,t}^{(0)}}{\sum_{j:w_{j,t}=0} \mathbf{1}\{\|\alpha_i - \alpha_j\| \leq \delta h\} K(\hat{d}_{i,j}/h)} - \mu_{i,t}^{(0)} \\ &\quad + \frac{\frac{1}{h^{d_\alpha} N} \sum_{j:w_{j,t}=0} \mathbf{1}\{\|\alpha_i - \alpha_j\| \leq \delta h\} K(\hat{d}_{i,j}/h) \cdot u_{j,t}}{\frac{1}{h^{d_\alpha} N} \sum_{j:w_{j,t}=0} K(\hat{d}_{i,j}/h)} \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

The quantity on the first line of the RHS above is a weighted average of $\mu_{j,t}^{(0)}$ over individuals j for whom $\|\alpha_i - \alpha_j\| \leq \delta h$. Using the Lipschitz condition in Assumption 4 (iv), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \frac{\sum_{j:w_{j,t}=0} \mathbf{1}\{\|\alpha_i - \alpha_j\| \leq \delta h\} K(\hat{d}_{i,j}/h) \cdot \mu_{j,t}^{(0)}}{\sum_{j:w_{j,t}=0} \mathbf{1}\{\|\alpha_i - \alpha_j\| \leq \delta h\} K(\hat{d}_{i,j}/h)} - \mu_{i,t}^{(0)} \right| &\leq \sup_{\|\alpha - \alpha_i\| \leq \delta h} |\mu(\alpha, \lambda_t) - \mu(\alpha_i, \lambda_t)| \\ &\leq L_0 \delta h \end{aligned}$$

We now consider the term in the second line (10). First consider the numerator. By applying union bound, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{P}_t \left(\max_{i \in [N]} \left| \frac{1}{Nh} \sum_{j:w_{j,t}=0} \mathbf{1}\{\|\alpha_i - \alpha_j\| \leq \delta h\} K(\hat{d}_{i,j}/h) \cdot u_{j,t} \right| > \eta \right) \\ &\leq N \cdot \mathbb{P}_t \left(\left| \frac{1}{Nh} \sum_{j:w_{j,t}=0} \mathbf{1}\{\|\alpha_i - \alpha_j\| \leq \delta h\} K(\hat{d}_{i,j}/h) \cdot u_{j,t} \right| > \eta \right) \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma A.4, there exist constants $0 < \underline{c} < \bar{c} < \infty$ such that, with probability approaching one, for all i , $\underline{c} h^{d_\alpha} \leq \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j:w_{j,t}=0} \mathbf{1}\{\|\alpha_i - \alpha_j\| \leq \delta h\} \leq \bar{c} h^{d_\alpha}$, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{P}_t \left(\left| \frac{1}{Nh^{d_\alpha}} \sum_{j:w_{j,t}=0} \mathbf{1}\{\|\alpha_i - \alpha_j\| \leq \delta h\} K(\hat{d}_{i,j}/h) \cdot u_{j,t} \right| > \eta \mid \{\alpha_j, \hat{d}_{i,j}, w_{j,t}\}_{j=1}^N, \lambda_t \right) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}_t \left(\left| \frac{1}{\sum_{j:w_{j,t}=0} \mathbf{1}\{\|\alpha_i - \alpha_j\| \leq \delta h\}} \sum_{j:w_{j,t}=0, \|\alpha_i - \alpha_j\| \leq \delta h} K(\hat{d}_{i,j}/h) \cdot u_{j,t} \right| > \frac{1}{\bar{c}} \cdot \eta \mid \{\alpha_j, \hat{d}_{i,j}, w_{j,t}\}_{j=1}^N, \lambda_t \right) \end{aligned}$$

First, note that, given $\{\alpha_j, \hat{d}_{i,j}, w_{j,t}\}_{j=1}^N$ and λ_t , the terms $\{K(\hat{d}_{i,j}/h)\}_{j=1}^N$ are constants, and these are bounded above by Assumption 4 (v). By Assumptions 1 and 4 (ii), $\{u_{j,t}\}_{j=1}^N$ are sub-Gaussian, zero-mean, and independent random variables conditional on $\{\alpha_j, \hat{d}_{i,j}, w_{j,t}\}_{j=1}^N$ and λ_t . Thus, from the Bernstein inequality in Lemma A.7, it follows that for constants C , a , and b , for any

$\eta > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{P}_t \left(\left| \frac{1}{\sum_{j:w_{j,t}=0} \mathbf{1}\{\|\alpha_i - \alpha_j\| \leq \delta h\}} \sum_{j:w_{j,t}=0, \|\alpha_i - \alpha_j\| \leq \delta h} K(\hat{d}_{i,j}/h) \cdot u_{j,t} \right| > \frac{1}{\bar{c}} \cdot \eta \mid \{\alpha_j, \hat{d}_{i,j}, w_{j,t}\}_{j=1}^N, \lambda_t \right) \\
& \leq C \cdot \exp \left(- \frac{\sum_j \mathbf{1}\{\|\alpha_i - \alpha_j\| \leq \delta h\} \cdot \bar{c}^{-2} \eta^2}{a + b\eta} \right) \\
& \leq C \cdot \exp \left(\log(N) - \frac{cNh^{d_\alpha} \bar{c}^{-2} \eta^2}{a + b\eta} \right)
\end{aligned}$$

where the last line again uses that $\underline{c}h^{d_\alpha} \leq \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j:w_{j,t}=0} \mathbf{1}\{\|\alpha_i - \alpha_j\| \leq \delta h\} \leq \bar{c}h^{d_\alpha}$. Then by the law of iterated expectations, we have

$$N \cdot \mathbb{P}_t \left(\left| \frac{1}{Nh^{d_\alpha}} \sum_{j:w_{j,t}=0} \mathbf{1}\{\|\alpha_i - \alpha_j\| \leq \delta h\} K(\hat{d}_{i,j}/h) \cdot u_{j,t} \right| > \eta \right) \leq C \cdot \exp \left(\log(N) - \frac{cNh^{d_\alpha} \bar{c}^{-2} \eta^2}{a + b\eta} \right)$$

By setting $\eta = \bar{c} \sqrt{\frac{a \log(N)}{ch^{d_\alpha} N}}$ in the above inequality, it gives that

$$\begin{aligned}
& N \cdot \mathbb{P}_t \left(\left| \frac{1}{Nh^{d_\alpha}} \sum_{j:w_{j,t}=0} \mathbf{1}\{\|\alpha_i - \alpha_j\| \leq \delta h\} K(\hat{d}_{i,j}/h) \cdot u_{j,t} \right| > \bar{c} \sqrt{\frac{a \log(N)}{ch^{d_\alpha} N}} \right) \\
& \leq C \cdot \exp \left(\log(N) - \frac{a \log(N)}{a + b\eta} \right) \rightarrow C
\end{aligned}$$

and leads to

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{P}_t \left(\max_{i \in [N]} \left| \frac{1}{Nh^{d_\alpha}} \sum_{j:w_{j,t}=0} \mathbf{1}\{\|\alpha_i - \alpha_j\| \leq \delta h\} K(\hat{d}_{i,j}/h) \cdot u_{j,t} \right| > \bar{c} \sqrt{\frac{a \log(N)}{ch^{d_\alpha} N}} \right) \\
& \leq C + o(1)
\end{aligned}$$

Finally, we consider the denominator term $\frac{1}{Nh^{d_\alpha}} \sum_{j:w_{j,t}=0} K(\hat{d}_{i,j}/h)$. By adding and subtracting terms, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{Nh^{d_\alpha}} \sum_{j:w_{j,t}=0} \mathbf{1}\{\|\alpha_i - \alpha_j\| \leq \delta h\} K(\hat{d}_{i,j}/h) \\
& = \frac{1}{Nh^{d_\alpha}} \sum_{j:w_{j,t}=0} \mathbf{1}\{\|\alpha_i - \alpha_j\| \leq \delta h\} K(d_{i,j}/h) \\
& + \frac{1}{Nh^{d_\alpha}} \sum_{j:w_{j,t}=0} \mathbf{1}\{\|\alpha_i - \alpha_j\| \leq \delta h\} [K(\hat{d}_{i,j}/h) - K(d_{i,j}/h)]
\end{aligned}$$

Using that the kernel is Lipschitz by Assumption 4 (v), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \max_{i \in [N]} \left| \frac{1}{Nh^{d_\alpha}} \sum_{j:w_{j,t}=0} \mathbf{1}\{\|\alpha_i - \alpha_j\| \leq \delta h\} [K(\hat{d}_{i,j}/h) - K(d_{i,j}/h)] \right| \\
& \leq \bar{K}' \frac{\max_{j \neq i} |\hat{d}_{i,j} - d_{i,j}|}{h} \max_{i \in [N]} \frac{1}{Nh^{d_\alpha}} \sum_{j:w_{j,t}=0} \mathbf{1}\{\|\alpha_i - \alpha_j\| \leq \delta h\}
\end{aligned}$$

By Lemma A.1, $\frac{\max_{j \neq i} |\hat{d}_{i,j} - d_{i,j}|}{h} = o_p(1)$ and by Lemma A.4 $\max_{i \in [N]} \frac{1}{Nh^{d_\alpha}} \sum_{j; w_{j,t}=0} \mathbf{1} \{ \|\alpha_i - \alpha_j\| \leq \delta h \} = O_p(1)$, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} & \min_{i \in [N]} \frac{1}{Nh^{d_\alpha}} \sum_{j; w_{j,t}=0} \mathbf{1} \{ \|\alpha_i - \alpha_j\| \leq \delta h \} K(\hat{d}_{i,j}/h) \\ &= \min_{i \in [N]} \frac{1}{Nh^{d_\alpha}} \sum_{j; w_{j,t}=0} \mathbf{1} \{ \|\alpha_i - \alpha_j\| \leq \delta h \} K(d_{i,j}/h) + o_p(1) \end{aligned}$$

Finally, by Lemma A.4, there exist a $\tilde{c} > 0$ such that, with probability approaching one,

$$\min_{i \in [N]} \frac{1}{Nh^{d_\alpha}} \sum_{j; w_{j,t}=0} \mathbf{1} \{ \|\alpha_i - \alpha_j\| \leq \delta h \} K(d_{i,j}/h) = \min_{i \in [N]} \frac{1}{Nh^{d_\alpha}} \sum_{j; w_{j,t}=0} K(d_{i,j}/h) > \tilde{c}$$

Therefore, we conclude that

$$\max_{i \in [N]} |\hat{\mu}_{i,t}^{(0)} - \mu_{i,t}^{(0)}| = O_p \left(h + \sqrt{\frac{\log(N)}{h^{d_\alpha} N}} \right)$$

and finish the proof. \square

A.3 Proof of Theorem 2

Proof of Theorem 2. Recall the definition of the ATT estimate,

$$\hat{\text{ATT}}_t = \frac{1}{N_{1,t}} \sum_{i=1}^N \left(Y_{i,t} w_{i,t} - \frac{(1 - w_{i,t}) Y_{i,t} \hat{p}_{i,t} + (w_{i,t} - \hat{p}_{i,t}) \hat{\mu}_{i,t}^{(0)}}{1 - \hat{p}_{i,t}} \right)$$

With some derivation, we can express this as

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\text{ATT}}_t &= \frac{1}{N_{1,t}} \sum_{i=1}^N \left(Y_{i,t} w_{i,t} - \frac{(1 - w_{i,t}) Y_{i,t} p_{i,t} + (w_{i,t} - p_{i,t}) \mu_{i,t}^{(0)}}{1 - p_{i,t}} \right) \\ &+ \frac{1}{N_{1,t}} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{1}{1 - \hat{p}_{i,t}} (p_{i,t} - \hat{p}_{i,t}) (\mu_{i,t}^{(0)} - \hat{\mu}_{i,t}^{(0)}) \\ &+ \frac{1}{N_{1,t}} \sum_{i=1}^N \epsilon_{i,t} \left(\frac{\mu_{i,t}^{(0)} - \hat{\mu}_{i,t}^{(0)}}{1 - \hat{p}_{i,t}} \right) \\ &+ \frac{1}{N_{1,t}} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{(1 - w_{i,t}) u_{i,t}}{(1 - p_{i,t})} \left(\frac{p_{i,t} - \hat{p}_{i,t}}{1 - \hat{p}_{i,t}} \right) \end{aligned}$$

We then tackle each line separately.

By Assumption 4 (i), we have $\frac{1}{1 - p_{i,t}} \geq c > 0$ with probability 1. And by supposition, we have $\max_{i \in [N]} |\hat{p}_{i,t} - p_{i,t}| = o_p(1)$, $\max_{i \in [N]} \left| \frac{1}{1 - \hat{p}_{i,t}} - \frac{1}{1 - p_{i,t}} \right| = o_p(1)$, and $\max_{i \in [N]} |(p_{i,t} - \hat{p}_{i,t}) (\mu_{i,t}^{(0)} - \hat{\mu}_{i,t}^{(0)})| = o_p(N^{-1/2})$. With Assumption 4 (i), $\frac{N}{N_{1,t}}$ is bounded below uniformly with probability approaching 1. Hence, it follows that

$$\frac{1}{N_{1,t}} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{1}{1 - \hat{p}_{i,t}} (p_{i,t} - \hat{p}_{i,t}) (\mu_{i,t}^{(0)} - \hat{\mu}_{i,t}^{(0)}) = o_p(N^{-1/2})$$

Define $\mathcal{D}_k := \left(\left\{ \left\{ (Y_{j,t}, w_{j,t}) \right\}_{t=1}^T \right\}_{j \in \mathcal{I}_{-k}}, \left\{ \left\{ Y_{i,t} \right\}_{t=1}^{T_0-1} \right\}_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \right)$. By Assumptions 2, 3, and 4 (ii), we have

$$\epsilon_{i,t} \perp\!\!\!\perp \mathcal{D}_k \mid \{\alpha_\ell\}_{\ell=1}^N, \lambda_t$$

This result implies

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\epsilon_{i,t} \mid \mathcal{D}_k, \{\alpha_\ell\}_{\ell=1}^N, \lambda_t \right] = 0$$

Also, for any $i, j \in \mathcal{I}_k$,

$$\epsilon_{i,t} \perp\!\!\!\perp \epsilon_{i,t} \mid \{\alpha_\ell\}_{\ell=1}^N, \lambda_t, \mathcal{D}_k$$

Thus, by the law of iterated expectations, and using the fact that $\hat{\mu}_{i,t}^{(0)}$ and $\hat{p}_{i,t}$ are non-stochastic given \mathcal{D}_k , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[\epsilon_{i,t} \left(\frac{\mu_{i,t}^{(0)} - \hat{\mu}_{i,t}^{(0)}}{1 - \hat{p}_{i,t}} \right) \mid \mathcal{D}_k, \{\alpha_\ell\}_{\ell=1}^N, \lambda_t \right] &= \mathbb{E} \left[\epsilon_{i,t} \mid \mathcal{D}_k, \{\alpha_\ell\}_{\ell=1}^N, \lambda_t \right] \left(\frac{\mu_{i,t}^{(0)} - \hat{\mu}_{i,t}^{(0)}}{1 - \hat{p}_{i,t}} \right) \\ &= 0 \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, because $\epsilon_{i,t} \in [-1, 1]$ for all i , it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[\epsilon_{i,t} \epsilon_{j,t} \left(\frac{\mu_{i,t}^{(0)} - \hat{\mu}_{i,t}^{(0)}}{1 - \hat{p}_{i,t}} \right) \left(\frac{\mu_{j,t}^{(0)} - \hat{\mu}_{j,t}^{(0)}}{1 - \hat{p}_{j,t}} \right) \mid \mathcal{D}_k, \{\alpha_\ell\}_{\ell=1}^N, \lambda_t \right] &= \mathbb{E} \left[\epsilon_{i,t} \epsilon_{j,t} \mid \mathcal{D}_k, \{\alpha_\ell\}_{\ell=1}^N, \lambda_t \right] \left(\frac{\mu_{i,t}^{(0)} - \hat{\mu}_{i,t}^{(0)}}{1 - \hat{p}_{i,t}} \right) \left(\frac{\mu_{j,t}^{(0)} - \hat{\mu}_{j,t}^{(0)}}{1 - \hat{p}_{j,t}} \right) \\ &\leq \mathbf{1}\{j = i\} \cdot \left(\frac{\mu_{i,t}^{(0)} - \hat{\mu}_{i,t}^{(0)}}{1 - \hat{p}_{i,t}} \right)^2 \end{aligned}$$

By Markov's inequality and with $\{w_{i,t}\}_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k}$, we have

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\left| \frac{1}{\sqrt{|\mathcal{I}_k|}} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \epsilon_{i,t} \left(\frac{\mu_{i,t}^{(0)} - \hat{\mu}_{i,t}^{(0)}}{1 - \hat{p}_{i,t}} \right) \right| \leq \epsilon \mid \mathcal{D}_k, \{\alpha_i\}_{i=1}^N, \lambda_t \right) \leq \frac{\frac{1}{|\mathcal{I}_k|} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \left(\frac{\mu_{i,t}^{(0)} - \hat{\mu}_{i,t}^{(0)}}{1 - \hat{p}_{i,t}} \right)^2}{\epsilon^2} = o_p(1)$$

Hence, by using $|\mathcal{I}_k| \asymp N$, it follows that

$$\frac{1}{|\mathcal{I}_k|} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \epsilon_{i,t} \left(\frac{\mu_{i,t}^{(0)} - \hat{\mu}_{i,t}^{(0)}}{1 - \hat{p}_{i,t}} \right) = o_p(N^{-1/2})$$

Similarly, by Assumptions 2, 3, and 4 (ii), we have

$$u_{i,t} \perp\!\!\!\perp \mathcal{D}_k \mid \{\alpha_k\}_{k=1}^N, \lambda_t, w_{i,t} = 0$$

Also, for any $i, j \in \mathcal{I}_k$, we have

$$u_{i,t} \perp\!\!\!\perp u_{i,j} \mid \{\alpha_k\}_{k=1}^N, \lambda_t, \mathcal{D}_k, w_{i,t} = w_{j,t} = 0$$

Thus, by the law of iterated expectations, alongside the fact that $\hat{p}_{i,t}$ is non-stochastic given \mathcal{D}_k , it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{u_{i,t}}{(1-p_{i,t})} \left(\frac{p_{i,t} - \hat{p}_{i,t}}{1 - \hat{p}_{i,t}} \right) \middle| \mathcal{D}_k, \{\alpha_k\}_{k=1}^N, \lambda_t, w_{i,t} = 0 \right] &= \mathbb{E} \left[u_{i,t} \middle| \{\alpha_k\}_{k=1}^N, \lambda_t, w_{i,t} = 0 \right] \frac{1}{1-p_{i,t}} \left(\frac{p_{i,t} - \hat{p}_{i,t}}{1 - \hat{p}_{i,t}} \right) \\ &= 0 \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{u_{i,t}}{(1-p_{i,t})} \frac{u_{j,t}}{(1-p_{j,t})} \left(\frac{p_{i,t} - \hat{p}_{i,t}}{1 - \hat{p}_{i,t}} \right) \left(\frac{p_{j,t} - \hat{p}_{j,t}}{1 - \hat{p}_{j,t}} \right) \middle| \mathcal{D}_k, \{\alpha_k\}_{k=1}^N, \lambda_t, w_{i,t} = w_{j,t} = 0 \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{u_{i,t}}{(1-p_{i,t})} \frac{u_{j,t}}{(1-p_{j,t})} \middle| \mathcal{D}_k, \{\alpha_k\}_{k=1}^N, \lambda_t, w_{i,t} = w_{j,t} = 0 \right] \left(\frac{p_{i,t} - \hat{p}_{i,t}}{1 - \hat{p}_{i,t}} \right) \left(\frac{p_{j,t} - \hat{p}_{j,t}}{1 - \hat{p}_{j,t}} \right) \\ &\leq \mathbf{1}\{j = i\} \cdot \mathbb{E} \left[u_{i,t}^2 \middle| \{\alpha_k\}_{k=1}^N, \lambda_t \right] \frac{1}{(1-p_{i,t})^2} \left(\frac{p_{i,t} - \hat{p}_{i,t}}{1 - \hat{p}_{i,t}} \right)^2 \\ &\leq \mathbf{1}\{j = i\} \cdot \bar{\sigma}_Y^2 \cdot \frac{1}{(1-p_{i,t})^2} \left(\frac{p_{i,t} - \hat{p}_{i,t}}{1 - \hat{p}_{i,t}} \right)^2 \end{aligned}$$

for some finite constant $\bar{\sigma}_Y^2$, which exists by Assumption 4 (ii). Thus, by Markov's inequality with $\{w_{i,t}\}_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k}$, it follows that

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\left| \frac{1}{\sqrt{|\mathcal{I}_k|}} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} (1-w_{i,t}) \frac{u_{i,t}}{1-p_{i,t}} \left(\frac{p_{i,t} - \hat{p}_{i,t}}{1 - \hat{p}_{i,t}} \right) \right| \leq \epsilon \middle| \mathcal{D}_k, \{\alpha_i\}_{i=1}^N, \lambda_t \right) \leq \frac{\frac{1}{|\mathcal{I}_k|} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \bar{\sigma}_Y^2 \frac{1}{1-p_{i,t}} \left(\frac{p_{i,t} - \hat{p}_{i,t}}{1 - \hat{p}_{i,t}} \right)^2}{\epsilon^2} = o_p(1)$$

Hence, we have

$$\frac{1}{|\mathcal{I}_k|} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} (1-w_{i,t}) \frac{u_{i,t}}{(1-p_{i,t})} \left(\frac{p_{i,t} - \hat{p}_{i,t}}{1 - \hat{p}_{i,t}} \right) = o_p(N^{-1/2})$$

Therefore, by combining all previous results, we have shown that

$$\sqrt{N} \text{ATT}_t = \frac{\sqrt{N}}{N_{1,t}} \sum_{i=1}^N \left(Y_{i,t} w_{i,t} - \frac{(1-w_{i,t}) Y_{i,t} p_{i,t} + (w_{i,t} - p_{i,t}) \mu_{i,t}^{(0)}}{1-p_{i,t}} \right) + o_p(1)$$

and the standard asymptotic theory for ATT can be further applied. \square

A.4 Bernstein Inequalities

In this section, we specify the Bernstein inequalities in Lemma A.5 to A.7 that are extensively used throughout the proofs.

Lemma A.5 (Bernstein inequality; see Bennett (1962)). *Let Z_1, \dots, Z_n be mean zero independent random variables. Assume there exists a positive constant M such that $|Z_i| \leq M$ with probability one for each i . Also let $\sigma^2 := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[Z_i^2]$. Then for all $\epsilon > 0$*

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n Z_i \right| \geq \epsilon \right) \leq 2 \exp \left(- \frac{n\epsilon^2}{2(\sigma^2 + \frac{1}{3}M\epsilon)} \right).$$

Lemma A.6 (Bernstein inequality for unbounded random variables; see [Boucheron et al. \(2013\)](#)). Let Z_1, \dots, Z_n be independent random variables. Assume that there exist some positive constants ν and c such that $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[Z_i^2] \leq \nu$ such that for all integers $q \geq 3$,

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[|Z_i|^q] \leq \frac{q! c^{q-2}}{2} \nu.$$

Then for all $\epsilon > 0$,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\left|\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (Z_i - \mathbb{E}[Z_i])\right| \geq \epsilon\right) \leq 2 \exp\left(-\frac{n\epsilon^2}{2(\nu + c\epsilon)}\right).$$

Proof of Lemma A.6. See Theorem 2.1 in [Boucheron et al. \(2013\)](#) for detailed discussion. \square

Lemma A.7 (Bernstein inequality for sub-exponential random variables; see [Zelenev \(2020\)](#)). Let Z_1, \dots, Z_n be mean zero independent random variables. Assume that there exist some $\nu > 0$ such that $\mathbb{E}[\exp(\lambda Z_i)] \leq \exp(\nu \lambda^2)$ for all $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$. Then, there exist some positive constants C , a , and b such that for all constants $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n$ satisfying $\max_i |\alpha_i| < \bar{\alpha}$ and for all $\epsilon > 0$,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\left|\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i Z_i\right| \geq \epsilon\right) \leq C \exp\left(-\frac{n\epsilon^2}{a + b\epsilon}\right)$$

and

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\left|\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i (Z_i^2 - \mathbb{E}[Z_i^2])\right| \geq \epsilon\right) \leq C \exp\left(-\frac{n\epsilon^2}{a + b\epsilon}\right).$$

Proof of Lemma A.7. See Corollary A.1 in [Zelenev \(2020\)](#) for detailed discussion. \square