

Representation Learning for Treatment Effect Estimation from Observational Data

Liuyi Yao¹, Sheng Li², Yaliang Li³, Mengdi Huai¹, Jing Gao¹, Aidong Zhang¹
¹ University at Buffalo, ² University of Georgia, ³ Tencent Medical AI Lab

Problem Setting

Treated group X_T (with treatment $t = 1$) Control group X_C (with treatment $t = 0$)

Individual treatment effect (ITE) of unit i :
 $ITE_i = Y_{t=1}(x_i) - Y_{t=0}(x_i)$

Estimating ITE can help decision making:

- Policy Decision: Who will benefit from job training?
- Healthcare: Which medicine?

Why from the observational data?

- Randomized Controlled Trials (RCTs) → Need to control the treatment assignment
- Expensive 😞, Time consuming 😞, Ethical issues... 😞
- Observational Data → Natural observations
- Easy to access 😊, Large amount of Data 😊

Challenges

Missing counterfactuals
 $ITE_i = Y_{t=1}(x_i) - Y_{t=0}(x_i)$
 One is always missing in the data;
 The missing one is the **counterfactual**.

Selection bias

- Distributions of control & treated groups:
 $P(X_c) \neq P(X_T)$
- Counterfactual inference is more difficult.
- Provided data: $(X_c, Y_{t=0}), (X_T, Y_{t=1})$
 - $(X_T, Y_{t=1}) \xrightarrow{\text{infer}} Y_{t=1}|X_c$
 - $(X_c, Y_{t=0}) \xrightarrow{\text{infer}} Y_{t=0}|X_T$

Triplet Pair Selection

Original Space
 $(\hat{i}, \hat{j}) = \arg\min_{\hat{i} \in T, \hat{j} \in C} |s_i - 0.5| + |s_j - 0.5|$

$\hat{k} = \arg\max_{k \in C} |s_k - s_{\hat{i}}|$ $\hat{l} = \arg\min_l |s_l - s_{\hat{k}}|$ $\hat{m} = \arg\max_{m \in T} |s_m - s_{\hat{j}}|$ $\hat{n} = \arg\min_n |s_n - s_{\hat{m}}|$

s_* : propensity score (probability of a unit in treated group). → Can reflect the relative location of units in the original space.

PDDM & MPDM

Position-Dependent Deep Metric (PDDM):

- Preserve the similarity.

relative location

absolute location

Middle Point Distance Minimization (MPDM):

- MPDM makes the middle point of $(z_i, z_{\hat{m}})$ close to the middle point of $(z_j, z_{\hat{k}})$.
- Balance the distribution in the latent space.

Representation Space

Experiment Setting

IHDP Dataset:

- Treatment:** specialist home visits;
- Outcome:** Infants' cognitive test scores;
- Pre-treatment covariates:** 25 covariates measuring aspects of children and their mothers;
- Performance measurement:** Precision in Estimation of Heterogeneous Effect (ϵ_{PEHE}).

Jobs Dataset:

- Treatment:** Job training;
- Outcome:** employment status after training;
- Pre-treatment covariates:** 8 covariates, such as age, education, ethnicity, previous earnings;
- Performance measurement:** policy risk (R_{pol}).

Twins Dataset:

- Treatment:** being the heavier one in twin;
- Outcome:** one year mortality;
- Pre-treatment covariates:** 40 covariates measuring aspects of pregnancy;
- Performance measurement:** AUC.

Experimental Results

Results on three datasets:

Method	IHDP (ϵ_{PEHE})		Jobs (R_{pol})		Twins (AUC)	
	Within-sample	Out-of-sample	Within-sample	Out-of-sample	Within-sample	Out-of-sample
OLS/LR ₁	10.761 ± 4.350	7.345 ± 2.914	0.310 ± 0.017	0.279 ± 0.067	0.660 ± 0.005	0.500 ± 0.028
OLS/LR ₂	10.280 ± 3.794	5.245 ± 0.986	0.228 ± 0.012	0.733 ± 0.103	0.660 ± 0.004	0.500 ± 0.016
HSIC-NMM	14.384 ± 5.377	14.230 ± 5.566	0.282 ± 0.013	0.286 ± 0.080	0.762 ± 0.011	0.501 ± 0.017
PSM	7.490 ± 2.486	7.324 ± 2.230	0.284 ± 0.034	0.416 ± 0.313	0.500 ± 0.003	0.506 ± 0.011
k-NN	7.386 ± 2.623	7.443 ± 2.530	0.295 ± 0.026	0.416 ± 0.313	0.609 ± 0.010	0.492 ± 0.012
BNN	3.827 ± 2.044	4.874 ± 2.850	0.232 ± 0.008	0.240 ± 0.012	0.690 ± 0.008	0.676 ± 0.008
TARNet	0.729 ± 0.088	1.342 ± 0.597	0.228 ± 0.004	0.234 ± 0.012	0.849 ± 0.002	0.840 ± 0.006
CFR-MMD	0.663 ± 0.068	1.202 ± 0.550	0.213 ± 0.006	0.231 ± 0.009	0.852 ± 0.001	0.840 ± 0.006
CFR-WASS	0.649 ± 0.089	1.152 ± 0.527	0.225 ± 0.004	0.225 ± 0.010	0.850 ± 0.002	0.842 ± 0.005
SITE	0.604 ± 0.093	0.656 ± 0.108	0.224 ± 0.004	0.219 ± 0.009	0.862 ± 0.002	0.853 ± 0.006

Code of SITE: <https://github.com/Osier-Yi/SITE>