

# Hypothesis testing counterexample

Kellie Ottoboni

Draft May 4, 2016

## 1 Set-Up and General Case

Suppose we observe  $N$  units with outcomes  $Y$ . The response schedule is

$$Y_i = aX_i$$

for some  $a \in \mathbb{R}$ . Instead of  $X$ , we observe  $\tilde{X} = X - \delta Z$ , where  $X \perp Z$ . We observe  $Z$ . We are interested in whether  $Z$  has an effect on  $Y$ . According to the response schedule, any association is purely through association with  $X$ .

We will use the absolute value of correlation between  $Z$  and the residuals as our test statistic:

$$\rho(Z, Y - \hat{Y}) = \frac{\langle Z, Y - \hat{Y} \rangle}{\|Z\| \|Y - \hat{Y}\|}$$

Since the denominator does not depend on the order of elements of  $Z$ , we may disregard it, since it will be constant when we permute  $Z$ . Thus our test statistic will be  $\tau = |\langle Z, Y - \hat{Y} \rangle|$ .

### 1.1 No stratification

Suppose we do not attempt to stratify observations. Assume that we know  $a$ , but instead of observing  $X$  we observe  $\tilde{X}$ . Then our prediction will be  $\hat{Y} = a\tilde{X}$ . The observed test statistic will be

$$\begin{aligned}
\tau^{obs} &= |\langle Z, Y - a\tilde{X} \rangle| \\
&= |\langle Z, Y - a(X - \delta Z) \rangle| \\
&= |\langle Z, a\delta Z \rangle| \\
&= |a\delta| \|Z\|^2
\end{aligned}$$

Let  $\Pi$  be the set of all permutations of  $Z$ . For any permutation  $Z^* \in \Pi$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
\tau^* &= |\langle Z^*, Y - a\tilde{X} \rangle| \\
&= |\langle Z^*, a\delta Z \rangle| \\
&\leq |a\delta| \|Z\| \|Z^*\| && \text{by Cauchy-Schwarz} \\
&= |a\delta| \|Z\|^2
\end{aligned}$$

with equality if and only if  $Z = Z^*$ . Therefore the p-value of the test will be

$$p = \mathbb{P}(\tau^* \geq \tau^{obs} \mid H_0) = \frac{\#\{Z^* \in \Pi \mid Z^* = Z\}}{N!}$$

The p-value is anti-conservative if  $p \leq \alpha$  more than  $\alpha(100)\%$  of the time. If  $Z$  has a continuous distribution, all elements of  $Z$  will be distinct with probability 1, so  $p < \alpha$  whenever  $N! > \alpha^{-1}$ . This is problematic: for example, if  $\alpha = 0.05$ , the test is anti-conservative when  $N \geq 4$ .

Suppose instead that  $Z$  has a discrete distribution. Let  $D$  be the number of distinct elements in  $Z$ , and suppose the  $i$ th distinct element appears  $d_i$  times, so that  $d_1 + \dots + d_D = N$ . Then the numerator is  $\#\{Z^* \in \Pi \mid Z^* = Z\} = d_1! \dots d_D!$ . Therefore the test is anti conservative whenever  $d_1! \dots d_D! \leq \lfloor \alpha N! \rfloor$ . Suppose that  $\alpha = 0.05$  and  $N = 10$ . The lefthand side is 181,440. The test will only have the correct level if there are only 2 distinct elements, one of which appears 9 times, or all elements are the same (in which case the test is not informative).

### 1.1.1 Issue

The test goes wrong because the elements of  $Z$  are not exchangeable given  $\hat{Y}$ . In particular, we introduce a bit of  $Z$  into  $\hat{Y}$  because we model the outcome incorrectly, only observing the noisy

measure  $\tilde{X}$  instead of the true  $X$ .

## 1.2 Stratified

Suppose we stratify by  $\hat{Y}$ . Let the subscript  $s$  index stratum, for  $s = 1, \dots, S$ . Let  $\tau_s$  be the inner product of  $Z$  and  $Y - \hat{Y}$  for individuals in stratum  $s$ . The test statistic will be  $\tau = \sum_{s=1}^S \tau_s$ . We have the same problem as before, but now  $\tau_s^{obs} \geq \tau_s^*$  for all permutations of  $Z$  for which  $Z_s = Z_s^*$ .

$$\begin{aligned}
\tau^{obs} &= \sum_{i=1}^S \tau_s^{obs} \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^S |a\delta| \|Z_s\|^2 \\
&= |a\delta| \|Z\| \\
\tau^* &= \sum_{i=1}^S \tau_s^* \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^S |\langle Z_s^*, a\delta Z_s \rangle| \\
&\leq \sum_{i=1}^S |a\delta| \|Z_s\| \|Z_s^*\| && \text{by Cauchy-Schwarz} \\
&= |a\delta| \|Z\|^2
\end{aligned}$$

We have the same issue:  $\tau^{obs} \geq \tau^*$ , with equality if and only if  $Z_s^* = Z_s$  for each  $s = 1, \dots, S$ .

### 1.2.1 Issue

We have the same problem as in the last section. Now, the issue would be solved with a weaker condition: exchangeability of the residuals *within strata*. Intuitively, stratum assignment may depend on  $Z$  in some way, but within strata, there should be no dependence on  $Z$ . A stronger condition is the following.

**Assumption 1.** *Conditional independence between potential outcomes and treatment given stratum assignment:  $Y(Z) \perp\!\!\!\perp Z \mid S$ .*

For Assumption 1 to hold, the stratification must be so fine that its variations in  $\hat{Y}$  within strata are unrelated to treatment assignment. Intuitively, the results within each strata must act

as though they had come from a randomized experiment. This condition implies that  $\mathbb{P}(Z_i = z \mid S_i = s, Y_i(Z)) = \mathbb{P}(Z_i = z \mid S_i = s)$ , so the probability of any particular unit receiving level  $z$  of treatment is constant within strata.<sup>1</sup> In an actual randomized experiment, the analogous condition is that the treatment is assigned at random within strata.

## 2 With Orthogonalization

Suppose now that  $Y_i = aX_i$ , and we observe  $X$  and  $Z$ . However,  $X$  and  $Z$  are correlated. We'll begin by orthogonalizing the covariate. Define  $\tilde{X}$  to be  $X$  minus the projection of  $X$  onto  $Z$ :

$$\tilde{X} = X - \frac{\langle X, Z \rangle}{\|Z\|^2} Z$$

This is a special case of the previous section, setting  $\delta = \frac{\langle X, Z \rangle}{\|Z\|^2}$ . Now, we predict  $Y$  by  $\hat{Y} = \hat{a}\tilde{X}$  for an appropriately chosen  $\hat{a}$ .

## 3 Noise In Prediction

Return to the general case where  $\tilde{X} = X - \delta Z$ . Suppose that we don't know  $a$  and we estimate it by  $\hat{a}$ . It is unclear whether the test has the right level: there doesn't seem to be any general rule about it.

$$\begin{aligned} \tau^{obs} &= |\langle Z, Y - \hat{Y} \rangle| \\ &= |\langle Z, aX - \hat{a}\tilde{X} \rangle| \\ &= \left| a\langle Z, \tilde{X} + \delta Z \rangle - \hat{a}\langle Z, \tilde{X} \rangle \right| \\ &= |a - \hat{a}| |\langle Z, \tilde{X} \rangle| + |a\delta| \|Z\|^2 \end{aligned}$$

In the orthogonal case, the first term is 0. In terms of  $X$  instead of  $\tilde{X}$ ,

---

<sup>1</sup>Wager and Athey [2015] make this assumption about the leaves of their causal trees: the leaves are so fine that they approximate a randomized experiment within them.

$$\begin{aligned}
\tau^{obs} &= |\langle Z, Y - \hat{Y} \rangle| \\
&= |\langle Z, aX - \hat{a}\tilde{X} \rangle| \\
&= |a\langle Z, X \rangle - \hat{a}\langle Z, X - \delta Z \rangle| \\
&= |a - \hat{a}||\langle Z, X \rangle| + |\hat{a}\delta| \|Z\|^2
\end{aligned}$$

Now, the permuted test statistic will be

$$\begin{aligned}
\tau^* &= |\langle Z^*, Y - \hat{Y} \rangle| \\
&= \left| a\langle Z^*, \tilde{X} + \delta Z \rangle - \hat{a}\langle Z^*, \tilde{X} \rangle \right| \\
&= |a - \hat{a}||\langle Z^*, \tilde{X} \rangle| + |a\delta| |\langle Z^*, Z \rangle|
\end{aligned}$$

Equivalently,

$$\begin{aligned}
\tau^* &= |\langle Z^*, Y - \hat{Y} \rangle| \\
&= |a\langle Z^*, X \rangle - \hat{a}\langle Z^*, X - \delta Z \rangle| \\
&= |a - \hat{a}||\langle Z^*, X \rangle| + |\hat{a}\delta| |\langle Z^*, Z \rangle|
\end{aligned}$$

We can use Cauchy-Schwarz to bound  $\langle Z^*, Z \rangle$ , but we don't know anything about how  $\langle Z^*, X \rangle$  and  $\langle Z^*, \tilde{X} \rangle$  vary across  $Z^* \in \Pi$ .

## 4 Instrumental Variables Set-up

This is the typical two-stage structural model for instrumental variables.

$$Y = aX + \varepsilon$$

$$X = bZ + \delta$$

where  $X$ ,  $Z$ , and  $(\delta, \varepsilon)$  are all mutually independent, but  $\text{Cov}(\delta, \varepsilon) \neq 0$ . Predict  $Y$  by  $\hat{Y} = \hat{a}X$  for some appropriate  $\hat{a}$ . Then,

$$\begin{aligned}\tau^{obs} &= |\langle Z, Y - \hat{Y} \rangle| \\ &= |\langle Z, aX + \varepsilon - \hat{a}X \rangle| \\ &= |\langle Z, (a - \hat{a})(bZ + \delta) + \varepsilon \rangle| \\ &= |\langle Z, (a - \hat{a})\delta + \varepsilon \rangle| + |(a - \hat{a})b| \|Z\|^2\end{aligned}$$

And similarly,

$$\begin{aligned}\tau^* &= |\langle Z^*, (a - \hat{a})\delta + \varepsilon \rangle| + |(a - \hat{a})b| |\langle Z^*, Z \rangle| \\ &\leq |\langle Z^*, (a - \hat{a})\delta + \varepsilon \rangle| + |(a - \hat{a})b| \|Z\|^2\end{aligned}$$

While we don't know exactly the first term in finite samples, we know it ought to be small because of the independence between  $Z$  and  $(\delta, \varepsilon)$ . However, it seems that the observed test statistic may be systematically larger than the permuted statistic because of the second term involving  $Z$ .

## 5 Philip's email

I just tried to do the math, and I'm not getting what I expected...

To simplify the notation let  $T = \tilde{X} = X - \delta Z$ . We have  $Y = aX$  and  $\langle X, Z \rangle = 0$ , which implies that  $\langle Y, Z \rangle = a \times 0 = 0$ . First,  $\langle Y, T \rangle = \langle Y, X - \delta Z \rangle = \langle Y, X \rangle - \delta \langle Y, Z \rangle = \langle Y, X \rangle = a \|X\|^2$ . So,

$$\hat{a} = \langle Y, T \rangle / \|X\|^2 = a.$$

But if we don't know  $X$  (or at least  $\|X\|^2$ ), we can't compute that.

If we defined  $U = T - Z\langle T, Z \rangle / \|Z\|^2$ , then  $U = X - \delta Z - Z\langle X - \delta Z, Z \rangle / \|Z\|^2 = X - \delta Z + \delta Z\|Z\|^2 / \|Z\|^2 = X$ , so we can find  $X$ .

It remains to show that the OLS estimate of  $a$  is  $\hat{a}$ .

The proof strategy is to suppose that the OLS estimate is  $a + \gamma$ , then show that  $\gamma = 0$ .

Now,  $\|Y - (a + \gamma)T\|^2 = \|Y\|^2 - 2(a + \gamma)\langle Y, T \rangle + (a + \gamma)^2\|T\|^2$ . Since  $\|Y\|^2$  is fixed, we minimize that by minimizing the last two terms.

Substitute  $\langle Y, T \rangle = a\|X\|^2$ . Then the sum of the last two terms is

$$-2(a + \gamma)a\|X\|^2 + (a + \gamma)^2\|T\|^2.$$

Differentiating wrt  $\gamma$  to find a stationary point gives (if I got the algebra right)

$$\gamma = a \left( \frac{\|X\|^2}{\|T\|^2} - 1 \right).$$

Since  $\|X\|^2 < \|X\|^2 + \delta^2\|Z\|^2 = \|T\|^2$ , that seems to show that  $\gamma \neq 0$ , and hence that  $\hat{a}$  isn't the OLS estimator...which doesn't make sense to me.

## References

Stefan Wager and Susan Athey. Estimation and Inference of Heterogeneous Treatment Effects using Random Forests. *arXiv:1510.04342 [math, stat]*, October 2015. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/1510.04342>. arXiv: 1510.04342.