# ML for SS: Causal Machine Learning

# Session 8

Dr. Richard M. Crowley rcrowley@smu.edu.sg http://rmc.link/

## Overview

1



## **Papers**

### Chernozhukov et al. 2017 AAER

- Introduces a ML-based method for causal identification useful in standard DID and IV approaches
  - Focused on calculating ATE and ATTE

Gentzkow, Shapiro, and Taddy 2019 Econometrica

• A paper showing the methodological benefits that can come from careful merging of econometrics and machine learning



Focus on the DoubleML method





• The doubleML library is available in R as well • The AAER paper's source code is also available

# **Double ML: Theory**

/



# Background

- There are a number of relevant papers published in economics in recent years developing and using Double ML
- The method is developed largely from:
  - Chernozhukov et al. (2017 AER), "Double/debiased/Neyman machine learning of treatment effects"
  - Chernozhukov et al. (2018 Econometrics J), "Double/debiased machine learning for treatment and structural parameters."

Impact or overlap with methodological work by Susan Athey, Matthew Gentzkow, Trevor Hastie, Guido Imbens, Matt Taddy, and Stefan Wager

# What is Double ML?

1. Split your sample as you would for K-fold cross validation, into sets  $\{I_k\}_{k \in \{1,...,K\}}$ 

- K sample of N/K observations each
- Let  $I_k^c = \cup \{I_j\}_{j \neq k}$
- 2. Construct K estimators using a machine learning estimator over nuisance parameters (e.g., controls) applied to the data  $I_{K}^{c}$
- 3. Average the K estimators to obtain a final estimator
  - This average estimator is approximately unbiased and normally distributed
  - The estimator is also asymptotically efficient

And repeat. Bootstrap this out and take the mean or median of the estimators



# Where Double ML excels: Endogenous treatment

- Suppose a policy affects a subset of individuals (people, corporations, etc.)
- Suppose individuals have the ability to alter their treatment status
  - E.g., state laws (move), labor laws, etc.
- Linear controls may be insufficient to claim causality of the treatment on anything

There are a lot of older methods that try to address this, though incompletely

- 1. Linear controls
- 2. Propensity score adjustments (e.g., weighting)
- 3. Matching methods
- 4. "doubly-robust" estimators



# Why is machine learning needed?

- Suppose a true form of a specification is as follows
  - *T* is a treatment indicator, *C* is a vector of controls

$$egin{aligned} Y &= g_0(T,C) + arepsilon_1 \ T &= m_0(C) + arepsilon_2 \end{aligned}$$

- We often assume  $g_0$  to be something like  $lpha+ heta_0 \; T+\gamma\cdot C$
- We often assume  $m_0$  to be a constant (i.e., assume that T is exogenous)

 $G^{2}(\varepsilon)$ 

(an cosnx + bn sinn x)

 $\Delta NE$ 

We know these assumptions aren't true!

# Why is machine learning needed?

How can we estimate a more general form for  $g_0$  and  $m_0$ ?

- We could use a more flexible econometric approach, such as including interactions between T and C
  - This is still very restrictive purely linear
- We could include transformations of C and its interactions
  - This is still restrictive T is additive separable
- We could use a nonparametric estimator!
  - This is where machine learning is very useful: efficient and reasonably accurate nonparametric estimation
    - LASSO, random forest, XGBoost, etc.

# Model variants

- The models described in the last few slides are referred to as the "Interactive regression model" or IRM
- If you can separate your treatment effect from the controls but suspect nonlinear effects of controls, the "Partially linear regression model" or PLR is appropriate
  - Solves  $Y = heta_0 T + g_0(C) + arepsilon_0$  and  $T = m_0(C) + arepsilon_2$
- There are also instrumental variable variants of both IRM and PLR

eractive regression model" or IRM ct nonlinear effects of controls, the

# Reconciling these slides notation with the paper

- These slides use a somewhat simpler oriented notation.
- Reconciliation from slides to papers:
  - *T* is *D*
  - C is X
  - $\varepsilon_0$  is U or  $\zeta$  depending on the paper
  - $arepsilon_1$  is V



# Implementing DoubleML

1



# Walking through an implementation of DoubleML

Problem: How does 401k participation impact wealth?

- This problem is walked through in Chernozhukov et al. (2017 AER, Web Appendix)
  - The R code for the AER paper is available from AER as well
    - Quite clean code at that!
- We will implement this in python using the DoubleML library
  - Which Chernozhukov was involved in the development of



(2017 AER, Web Appendix) s well

library nt of

# Importing the data

Conveniently, the data is available from the DoubleML package

# Grab the dataset
import doubleml.datasets
df = dml.datasets.fetch\_401K('DataFrame')
df

##		nifa	net tfa	tw	age	inc	• • •	twoearn	e401	p401	pira
##	0	0.0	_0.0	4500.0	47	6765.0	• • •	0	0	0	0
##	1	6215.0	1015.0	22390.0	36	28452.0	• • •	0	0	0	0
##	2	0.0	-2000.0	-2000.0	37	3300.0	• • •	0	0	0	0
##	3	15000.0	15000.0	155000.0	58	52590.0	• • •	1	0	0	0
##	4	0.0	0.0	58000.0	32	21804.0	• • •	0	0	0	0
##	• • •	• • •	• • •	• • •	• • •	• • •	• • •	• • •	• • •	• • •	• • •
##	9910	98498.0	98858.0	157858.0	52	73920.0	• • •	0	1	1	0
##	9911	287.0	6230.0	15730.0	41	42927.0	• • •	1	1	1	1
##	9912	99.0	6099.0	7406.0	40	23619.0	• • •	0	1	0	1
##	9913	0.0	-32.0	2468.0	47	14280.0	• • •	0	1	1	0
##	9914	4000.0	5000.0	8857.0	33	11112.0	• • •	0	1	1	0
##											
##	[9915	rows x 1	4 columns	1							



1002

作员作员



# Using your own data

- We can also do this manually, by importing the Stata file from AER
- We then need to prep the data into the format DoubleML expects
  - This is fairly straightforward, just defining our Y, treatment, and control variables

```
df = pd.read_stata('../../Data/S8_sipp1991.dta')
y = 'net_tfa'
treat = 'e401'
controls = [x for x in df.columns.tolist() if x not in [y, treat]]
```

1008

df\_dml = dml.DoubleMLData(df, y\_col=y, d\_cols=treat, x\_cols=controls)



### .0011000

的创新

### from AER L expects nent, and control variables

# What is the data format used by DoubleML?

print(df\_dml)

1008

生活生成

##	======================================							
# # # # # #	Outcome variable: net tfa							
##	Treatment variable(s): ['e401']							
##	Covariates: ['nifa', 'tw', 'age', 'inc', 'fsize', 'educ', 'db', 'marr', 'twoearn							
## ##	Instrument variable(s): None							
##								
##	DataFrame info							
##	<class 'pandas.core.frame.dataframe'=""></class>							
##	Int64Index: 9915 entries, 0 to 9914							
##	Columns: 14 entries, nifa to hown							
##	dtypes: float32(4), int8(10)							
##	memory usage: 329.2 KB							

- Pandas dataframe
- A pre-specified outcome variable
- One or more treatment indicators
- One or more controls
- Optional instruments



# Set up the Nuisance functions

• Recall that there are two functions,  $m_0$  and  $g_0$  that need to be solved for this method

• We can specify any form for these that we want, so long as they are consistent with Scikit-learn

### g<sub>0</sub>: Continuous GBM

g\_0 = GradientBoostingRegressor(
 loss='ls',
 learning\_rate=0.01,
 n\_estimators=1000,
 subsample=0.5,
 max\_depth=2
 )

n\_0 = GradientBoostingClassifier( loss='exponential', learning\_rate=0.01, n\_estimators=1000, subsample=0.5, max\_depth=2 )



1008

生命生命

e solved for this method y are consistent with Scikit-learn

m<sub>0</sub>: Binary GBM



10010 10006

4.6

### **Run the DML model: Average Treatment Effects**

# Fix the random number generator for replicability
np.random.seed(1234)
# Run the model
dml\_model\_irm = dml.DoubleMLIRM(df\_dml, g\_0, m\_0)
# Output the model's findings
print(dml model irm.fit())

1000

生高生意

```
##
  ----- Data summary
##
## Outcome variable: net tfa
## Treatment variable(s): ['e401']
## Covariates: ['nifa', 'tw', 'age', 'inc', 'fsize', 'educ', 'db', 'marr', 'twoearn', 'p401', 'pira', 'hown']
## Instrument variable(s): None
## No. Observations: 9915
  ----- Score & algorithm ------
## Score function: ATE
## DML algorithm: dml2
##
  ----- Resampling
## No. folds: 5
## No. repeated sample splits: 1
## Apply cross-fitting: True
##
   ----- Fit summary
                   std err
            coef
                                                    2.5 %
                                                              97.5 %
                                         P>|t|
                                 t
  e401 3320.43343 383.604082 8.655887 4.890947e-18
                                              2568.583245 4072.283614
```

### 0011000



# 0011000 的第三 的的情味 **Run the DML model: ATTE** ATTE: Average Treatment Effects of the Treated P>|t| 2.5 % 97.5 % t

# Run the model dml model irm ATTE = dml.DoubleMLIRM(df\_dml, g\_0, m\_0, score='ATTE') # Output the model's findings print(dml\_model\_irm\_ATTE.fit())

1000

生态生态

## ----- Data summary ## Outcome variable: net tfa ## Treatment variable(s): ['e401'] ## Covariates: ['nifa', 'tw', 'age', 'inc', 'fsize', 'educ', 'db', 'marr', 'twoearn', 'p401', 'pira', 'hown'] ## Instrument variable(s): None ## No. Observations: 9915 ----- Score & algorithm ------## Score function: ATTE ## DML algorithm: dml2 ## ----- Resampling ## No. folds: 5 ## No. repeated sample splits: 1 ## Apply cross-fitting: True ## ----- Fit summary coef std err ## e401 10081.312662 392.074708 25.712734 8.421563e-146 9312.860354 10849.764969

# Other twists on the model

1. Change the machine learning backend

- Our models used dml2
- You can switch to dml1 using dml procedure='dml1'
- dml1 follows the math in these slides
  - Solve for a condition equal to zero for each model, and then average the estimators
  - dml2 solves the for the average of the condition being equal to zero overall
- 2. Run multiple iterations of the model
  - The paper uses 100 iterations, emulate this by adding n rep=100
- 3. Change the machine learning models fed to the DoubleML model
  - An example of using "Histogram-based Gradient Boosting" is in the Jupyter notebook
    - This is a much faster GBM-like model

# Conclusion







# Packages used for these slides

### Python

- doubleML
- numpy
- pandas





# References

- Chernozhukov, Victor, Denis Chetverikov, Mert Demirer, Esther Duflo, Christian Hansen, and Whitney Newey. "Double/debiased/neyman machine learning of treatment effects." American Economic Review 107, no. 5 (2017): 261-65.
- Chernozhukov, Victor, Denis Chetverikov, Mert Demirer, Esther Duflo, Christian Hansen, Whitney Newey, and James Robins. "Double/debiased machine learning for treatment and structural parameters." (2018): C1-C68.
- Gentzkow, Matthew, Jesse M. Shapiro, and Matt Taddy. "Measuring group differences in high-dimensional choices: method and application to congressional speech." Econometrica 87, no. 4 (2019): 1307-1340.



