

# Targeted learning under shape constraints

Anders Munch and Thomas Gerds

September 11, 2023

# Motivation

The road map of causal learning tells us to incorporate all the knowledge that we have into the statistical model for the distribution of the data

In many real applications, subject matter knowledge is available regarding the shape of the underlying conditional density and regression functions

Examples of biologically motivated shapes are

- risk of disease is not decreasing with age (given other covariates)
- The risk of disease should be a monotone function of age (given other covariates)
- The number of comorbidities increases the risk of disease
- the effect of a biomarker on the risk of disease is an unimodal function (given other covariates)


## Working hypotheses

- Shape constraints can be incorporated into machine learning for nuisance parameters
- Biologically motivated shape constraints may lead to improved estimators

## Goal for the workshop


- Discuss some initial hypotheses and ideas
- Help us move in the right research direction

# Multivariate shape constraints



# Machine learning (from the shelf)

Random forest fit without tuning



# Shape constraints

## Examples

- Monotonicity
- Unimodality
- Convexity
- Log-concave densities

## Constraints imposed on target or nuisance parameter

Shape constraint on a function-valued target parameter has been considered [e.g., ???]. We will mostly discuss imposing shape-constraints on nuisance parameters.

# Information bounds

## Claim 1

Most shape constraints will not restrict the tangent space, and hence imposing shape constraints does not change the information bound for a statistical estimation problem.

- Which shape constraints (if any) is this true for?
- Can we still expect to improve a TMLE by imposing shape constraints on the nuisance parameters?

## Claim 2

Constructing a TMLE under a shape constrained model will typically result in a sub-model that is not contained in the shape constrained model.

- Is this a problem?

# (Un)necessary restrictions on nuisance parameters?

## Undersmoothing

It has been argued that undersmoothing estimators of nuisance parameters can provide better estimators of a low-dimensional target parameter [e.g., Goldstein and Khasminskii, 1996, Hjort and Walker, 2001, ?]. Could shape constrained estimators provide unnecessary smoothing of nuisance parameter estimators, which might in fact be damaging?

## Biologically reasonable nuisance parameter estimators?

Should we pay attention to whether nuisance parameters are estimated by biologically meaningful estimators?

Should we accept a biologically unreasonable estimator of a nuisance parameter as long as it provides a good estimator of the target parameter?



# Challenges for future research

- Should we distinguish between learning  $Q$  vs  $G$  parts of a causal model/information loss model?
- How do we translate “marginal” smoothness constraints into constraints on a multivariate function?
- In longitudinal settings: need to discuss shape-constraints on the history (filtration)

# References

- L. Goldstein and R. Khasminskii. On efficient estimation of smooth functionals. *Theory of Probability & Its Applications*, 40(1):151–156, 1996.
- N. L. Hjort and S. G. Walker. A note on kernel density estimators with optimal bandwidths. *Statistics & Probability Letters*, 54(2):153–159, 2001.