

# Algorithm of HOIF estimators for ATE

## Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Input Data</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Target Formula</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>The Integrated Algorithm (Main Interface)</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>Step-by-Step Technical Notes</b>	<b>5</b>
4.1	Transformation of Covariates . . . . .	5
4.2	Compute the Residuals . . . . .	6
4.3	Compute the Inverse of the Weighted Gram Matrix . . .	6
4.4	Compute the Projection Matrix . . . . .	7
4.5	Compute the HOIF Estimators . . . . .	7

## 1 Input Data

Denote the observed data by  $(X_i, A_i, Y_i)_{i=1}^n$ , where  $A_i \in \{0, 1\}$  is the binary treatment indicator,  $Y_i \in \mathbb{R}$  is the observed outcome, and  $X_i \in \mathbb{R}^p$  represents the vector of covariates.

We assume the availability of pre-computed nuisance function estimators: the conditional mean outcomes  $(\hat{\mu}(1, X_i), \hat{\mu}(0, X_i))$  and the propensity score  $\hat{\pi}(X_i)$ . All these estimators map to the real line  $\mathbb{R}$ . In standard applications,  $\hat{\mu}(\cdot)$  and  $\hat{\pi}(\cdot)$  should be estimated using an independent sample to avoid overfitting bias.

## 2 Target Formula

The core function `hoif_ate()` in this *R* package computes the estimators described below.

Let  $\hat{\psi}_a^{\text{AIPW}}$  denote the standard first-order doubly robust estimator (also known as double machine learning or AIPW estimator) of  $\psi_a = \mathbb{E}[Y(a)]$ , and let  $\widehat{\text{ATE}}^{\text{AIPW}} = \hat{\psi}_1^{\text{AIPW}} - \hat{\psi}_0^{\text{AIPW}}$ . Conditional on the estimated nuisance functions, this estimator is biased.

The quantity  $\mathbb{BC}_m^{\text{ATE}}$  is the  $m$ -th order higher order influence function (HOIF) estimator of the *estimable bias* of the AIPW estimator of the average treatment effect (ATE) in causal inference. This methodology was developed through a series of works by James M. Robins and his collaborators [4, 3, 2, 1]. It is *not* itself an estimator of the ATE; the sign convention is such that adding it to the AIPW estimate removes the estimable bias:

$$\widehat{\text{ATE}}_m = \widehat{\text{ATE}}^{\text{AIPW}} + \mathbb{BC}_m^{\text{ATE}}.$$

(In the output of `hoif_ate()`, the components `HOIF1`, `HOIF0` and `ATE` correspond to  $\text{HOIF}_m^1$ ,  $\text{HOIF}_m^0$  and  $\mathbb{BC}_m^{\text{ATE}}$ ; the component name `ATE` is kept for backward compatibility — it holds the ATE *bias correction*, not the ATE itself.)

The estimators are defined as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{BC}_m^{\text{ATE}} &= \text{HOIF}_m^1(\hat{\Omega}^1) - \text{HOIF}_m^0(\hat{\Omega}^0), \\ \text{HOIF}_m^a(\hat{\Omega}^a) &= \sum_{j=2}^m \mathbb{IF}_j^a(\hat{\Omega}^a) = \sum_{i=2}^m \sum_{j=2}^i \binom{i-2}{i-j} \mathbb{U}_j^a(\hat{\Omega}^a), \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{I}\mathbb{F}_m^a(\hat{\Omega}^a) &= (-1)^m \frac{(n-m)!}{n!} \sum_{\substack{(i_1, \dots, i_m) \in J_1^{\times m}: \\ i_1 \neq i_2 \neq \dots \neq i_m}} r_{i_1}^a Z_{i_1}^\top \hat{\Omega}^a \prod_{s=2}^{m-1} \{(Q_{i_s}^a - (\hat{\Omega}^a)^{-1}) \hat{\Omega}^a\} s_{i_m}^a Z_{i_m} R_{i_m}^a, \\
\mathbb{U}_m^a(\hat{\Omega}^a) &= (-1)^m \frac{(n-m)!}{n!} \sum_{\substack{(i_1, \dots, i_m) \in J_1^{\times m}: \\ i_1 \neq i_2 \neq \dots \neq i_m}} r_{i_1}^a Z_{i_1}^\top \hat{\Omega}^a \prod_{s=2}^{m-1} \{Q_{i_s}^a \hat{\Omega}^a\} s_{i_m}^a Z_{i_m} R_{i_m}^a \\
&= (-1)^m \frac{(n-m)!}{n!} \sum_{\substack{(i_1, \dots, i_m) \in J_1^{\times m}: \\ i_1 \neq i_2 \neq \dots \neq i_m}} r_{i_1}^a \prod_{s=1}^{m-1} \{Z_{i_s}^\top \hat{\Omega}^a s_{i_{s+1}}^a Z_{i_{s+1}}\} R_{i_m}^a.
\end{aligned}$$

The notation above involves the following components:

$$\begin{aligned}
J_1, J_2 &\subseteq \{1, 2, \dots, n\}, \\
a &\in \{0, 1\}, \\
s_i^a &= A_i^a (1 - A_i)^{1-a}, \\
r_i^a &= 1 - s_i^a / \left( (\hat{\pi}(X_i))^a (1 - \hat{\pi}(X_i))^{1-a} \right), \\
R_i^a &= Y_i - \hat{\mu}(a, X_i), \\
Z_i &= \text{transform}(X_i) \in \mathbb{R}^k, \\
Q_i^a &= s_i^a Z_i Z_i^\top, \\
\hat{\Omega}^a &= \left( \frac{1}{|J_2|} \sum_{i \in J_2} s_i^a Z_i Z_i^\top \right)^{-1}.
\end{aligned}$$

Here, we designate the sample in  $J_1$  as the *estimation sample* and the sample in  $J_2$  as the *training sample* for  $\hat{\Omega}^a$ . The function  $\text{transform}(X_i)$  denotes a transformation of the covariates, with the transformed variable  $Z_i$  taking values in  $\mathbb{R}^k$ .

**Sample Splitting (Cross-Fitting):** When employing  $K$ -fold sample splitting  $(I_1, I_2, \dots, I_K)$ , for each fold  $j \in \{1, \dots, K\}$ , the sample in  $I_j$  serves as the estimation sample (i.e.,  $I_j = J_1$ ), while samples not in  $I_j$  form the training sample (i.e.,  $i \in J_2 \Leftrightarrow i \notin I_j$ ). The training sample is used to compute  $\hat{\Omega}^a$ , which is then applied along

with the estimation sample to calculate  $\text{HOIF}_m^a$ . The final estimator is obtained by averaging across all folds, yielding the empirical HOIF (eHOIF) estimator [2].

**No Sample Splitting:** When sample splitting is not used, we simply set  $J_1 = J_2$ , using the entire dataset for both training and estimation, which corresponds to the stable HOIF (sHOIF) estimator [1].

### 3 The Integrated Algorithm (Main Interface)

The whole function combines all the following steps to get the HOIF bias-correction terms for the ATE. It serves as the primary entry point, orchestrating the data transformation, residual calculation, and the choice of cross-fitting strategy.

**Function Inputs:**

- Full observed data  $(X_i, A_i, Y_i)_{i=1}^n$ .
- Nuisance function estimators  $(\hat{\mu}(1, X_i), \hat{\mu}(0, X_i), \hat{\pi}(X_i))$ .
- Transformation method and its tuning parameters.
- Inverse method of weighted Gram matrix.
- Maximum HOIF order  $m$  and ustat backend.
- **Switch:** A boolean flag for sample splitting and the number of splits  $K$ .

**Procedure:**

1. **Global Pre-processing:**
  - Transform the covariates  $X_i$  on the whole data to obtain basis functions  $(Z_i)_{i=1}^n$ .
  - Compute the global residuals  $((R_i^1, r_i^1), (R_i^0, r_i^0))_{i=1}^n$ .
2. **Branching Logic:**

- *If not using sample splitting:*

Proceed with the entire dataset using the steps described in the following sections. Output  $(\text{BC}_l^{\text{ATE}}, \text{HOIF}_l^a, \text{IIF}_l^a)$  for  $l = 2, \dots, m$  and  $a \in \{0, 1\}$  (returned by the package as `ATE`, `HOIF1/HOIF0`, `IIF1/IIF0`).

- *If using sample splitting (Cross-fitting):*

(a) Split the indices  $\{1, \dots, n\}$  into  $K$  disjoint parts  $(I_1, I_2, \dots, I_K)$ .

(b) **For each fold**  $j = 1, \dots, K$ :

– **Training:** Use data with indices not in  $I_j$  ( $i \notin I_j$ ) to compute the inverse Gram matrices  $(\Omega_{1,j}, \Omega_{0,j})$ .

– **Estimation:** Use data with indices in  $I_j$  ( $i \in I_j$ ) and the pre-computed  $(\Omega_{1,j}, \Omega_{0,j})$  to compute:

\* Local projection matrices  $(B_{1,j}, B_{0,j})$ .

\* Local HOIF bias-correction terms  $(\text{BC}_{l,j}^{\text{ATE}}, \text{HOIF}_{l,j}^a, \text{IIF}_{l,j}^a)$  for  $l = 2, \dots, m$ .

(c) **Aggregation:** Average the results across all  $K$  folds:

$$\text{BC}_l^{\text{ATE}} = \frac{1}{K} \sum_{j=1}^K \text{BC}_{l,j}^{\text{ATE}}, \quad \text{HOIF}_l^a = \frac{1}{K} \sum_{j=1}^K \text{HOIF}_{l,j}^a, \quad \text{IIF}_l^a = \frac{1}{K} \sum_{j=1}^K \text{IIF}_{l,j}^a \quad (1)$$

**Output:** Final averaged bias-correction terms  $(\text{BC}_l^{\text{ATE}}, \text{HOIF}_l^a, \text{IIF}_l^a)$  for  $l = 2, \dots, m$ .

## 4 Step-by-Step Technical Notes

### 4.1 Transformation of Covariates

First, we transform the covariates  $X_i$  into a set of basis functions  $Z_i \in \mathbb{R}^k$ . Common choices include B-splines or Fourier basis functions.

**Function Requirement:**

- *Input:* Covariate matrix  $X$ , the transformation method (e.g.,

Fourier or B-splines), and relevant tuning parameters (including the basis dimension  $k$ ).

- *Output:* The transformed basis matrix  $Z \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times k}$ , where each row  $Z_i$  corresponds to the  $i$ -th observation.

## 4.2 Compute the Residuals

Next, we compute two pairs of residuals, indexed by the treatment assignment  $a \in \{0, 1\}$ .

For the treatment group ( $a = 1$ ):

$$\begin{aligned} R_i^1 &= Y_i - \hat{\mu}(1, X_i) \\ r_i^1 &= 1 - A_i / \hat{\pi}(X_i) \end{aligned}$$

For the control group ( $a = 0$ ):

$$\begin{aligned} R_i^0 &= Y_i - \hat{\mu}(0, X_i) \\ r_i^0 &= 1 - (1 - A_i) / (1 - \hat{\pi}(X_i)) \end{aligned}$$

(The treatment indicator  $s_i^a$  is *not* folded into  $R_i^a$  here; it enters through the projection matrix  $B^a$  below, matching the implementation.)

### Function Requirement:

- *Input:* Observed data  $(A, Y)$  and estimated nuisance functions  $(\hat{\mu}(1, X), \hat{\mu}(0, X), \hat{\pi}(X))$ .
- *Output:* Two residual pairs  $((R_i^1, r_i^1))_{i=1}^n$  and  $((R_i^0, r_i^0))_{i=1}^n$ .

## 4.3 Compute the Inverse of the Weighted Gram Matrix

Compute the inverse of the weighted Gram matrix  $G_a$  for each  $a \in \{0, 1\}$ :

$$G_a = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n s_i^a Z_i Z_i^T, \quad (2)$$

where  $s_i^a = A_i^a(1 - A_i)^{1-a}$  serves as the indicator for the  $a$ -th group. Let  $\Omega_a = G_a^{-1}$  denote the corresponding inverse matrix.

Several estimation methods can be employed for  $\Omega_a$ , such as direct inversion (e.g., using `chol2inv()` in R for efficiency) or shrinkage estimators (e.g., via the `nlshrink` or `corpcor` R packages) to improve numerical stability in high-dimensional settings.

**Function Requirement:**

- *Input:* Basis functions  $Z$ , treatment indicators  $A$ , and the inversion method (`direct`, `nlshrink`, or `corpcor`).
- *Output:* A pair of inverse matrices  $(\Omega_1, \Omega_0)$ .

#### 4.4 Compute the Projection Matrix

Compute the projection-like basis matrix  $B^a$  for each  $a \in \{0, 1\}$ :

$$B^a = Z\Omega_a(s^a \odot Z)^T, \quad \text{i.e.} \quad B_{ij}^a = Z_i^\top \Omega_a s_j^a Z_j, \quad (3)$$

where  $Z \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times k}$  is the matrix of basis functions and  $s^a \odot Z$  multiplies row  $j$  of  $Z$  by  $s_j^a$  (in code: `B1 = Z %*% Omega1 %*% t(Z * A)`). Note that  $B^a$  is an  $n \times n$  matrix carrying the treatment indicator on its second index.

**Function Requirement:**

- *Input:* Basis matrix  $Z$  and the inverse matrices  $(\Omega_1, \Omega_0)$ .
- *Output:* Basis matrices  $(B^1, B^0)$ .

#### 4.5 Compute the HOIF Estimators

Finally, we compute the HOIF bias-correction terms for the ATE.

**Function Requirement:**

- *Input:*
  - Maximum order  $m$ .
  - Residual pairs  $((R_i^a, r_i^a))_{a \in \{0,1\}}$ .
  - Projection matrices  $(B^1, B^0)$ .

– Backend for `ustat` (`numpy` or `torch`).

- *Procedure:*

For each order  $j$  from 2 to  $m$ , and for each treatment assignment  $a \in \{0, 1\}$ , calculate the  $U$ -statistics:

$$U_j^a = (-1)^j \text{ustat}(\text{tensors} = T_j^a, \text{expression} = E_j^a, \text{backend} = \text{"backend"}, \text{average} = 1) \quad (4)$$

The tensors  $T_j^a$  and index expressions  $E_j^a$  are defined as:

$$T_j^a = (r^a, \underbrace{B^a, \dots, B^a}_{j-1 \text{ times}}, R^a)$$

$$E_j^a = (1, (1, 2), \dots, (j-1, j), j)$$

so that the first tensor  $r^a$  is indexed by  $i_1$  and the last tensor  $R^a$  by  $i_j$ , matching the target formula.

Then, for each order  $l \in \{2, \dots, m\}$ , compute:

$$\text{IIF}^a_l = \sum_{j=2}^l \binom{l-2}{l-j} U_j^a$$

$$\text{HOIF}^a_l = \sum_{j=2}^l \text{IIF}^a_j$$

$$\text{BC}^{\text{ATE}}_l = \text{HOIF}^1_l - \text{HOIF}^0_l$$

- *Output:*  $(\text{BC}^{\text{ATE}}_l, \text{HOIF}^a_l, \text{IIF}^a_l)$  for  $l = 2, \dots, m$ , returned by the package as `ATE`, `HOIF1/HOIF0` and `IIF1/IIF0`.

## References

- [1] Lin Liu and Chang Li. New  $\sqrt{n}$ -consistent, numerically stable higher-order influence function estimators. *arXiv preprint*, 2023.
- [2] Lin Liu, Rajarshi Mukherjee, Whitney K Newey, and James M Robins. Semiparametric efficient empirical higher order influence function estimators. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1705.07577*, 2017.



- [3] James M. Robins, Lingling Li, Rajarshi Mukherjee, Eric J. Tchetgen Tchetgen, and Aad van der Vaart. Minimax estimation of a functional on a structured high-dimensional model. *The Annals of Statistics*, 45(5):1951–1987, 2017.
- [4] James M. Robins, Lingling Li, Eric Tchetgen Tchetgen, and Aad van der Vaart. Higher order influence functions and minimax estimation of nonlinear functionals. In *Probability and Statistics: Essays in Honor of David A. Freedman*, pages 335–421. Institute of Mathematical Statistics, Beachwood, OH, 2008. IMS Collections.