

Counterfactuals via Deep IV

Matt Taddy (Chicago + MSR) Greg Lewis (MSR)
Jason Hartford (UBC) Kevin Leyton-Brown (UBC)

Endogenous Errors

$$y = g(p, \mathbf{x}) + e \text{ and } \mathbb{E}[p e] \neq 0$$


If you estimate this using naïve ML, you'll get

$$E[y|p, \mathbf{x}] = E_{e|p}[g(p, \mathbf{x}) + e] = g(p, \mathbf{x}) + E[e|p, \mathbf{x}]$$

This works for **prediction**. It doesn't work for **counterfactual** inference:

What happens if I change p independent of e ?


Instrumental Variables (IV)



In IV we have a special $z \perp e$ that influences policy p but not response y .

- Supplier costs that move price independent of demand (e.g., fish, oil)
- Any source of treatment randomization (intent to treat, AB tests, lottery)

Instrumental Variables (IV)



The *exclusion structure* implies

$$\mathbb{E}[y|x, z] = \int g(p, x) dF(p|x, z)$$

You can observe and estimate $\hat{\mathbb{E}}[y|x, z]$ and $\hat{F}(p|x, z)$

\Rightarrow to solve for *structural* $g(p, x)$ we have an inverse problem.

$$\min_{g \in G} \sum \left(y_i - \int g(p, x_i) dF(p|x_i, z_i) \right)^2$$

2SLS: $p = \beta z + v$ and $g(p) = \tau p$ so that $\int g(p) dF(p|z) = \tau \mathbb{E}[p|z]$

So you first regress p on z then regress y on \hat{p} to recover $\hat{\tau}$.

$$\min_{g \in G} \sum \left(y_i - \int g(p, x_i) dF(p|x_i, z_i) \right)^2$$

Or nonparametric sieves where $g(p, x_i) \approx \sum_k \gamma_k \varphi_k(p, x_i)$ and

$$\mathbb{E}_F[\varphi_k(p, x_i)] \approx \sum_j \alpha_{kj} \beta_j(x_i, z_i) \text{ (Newey+Powell)}$$

or

$$\mathbb{E}_F[y_i - \sum_k \gamma_k \varphi_k(p, x_i)] \approx \sum_j \alpha_j \beta_j(x_i, z_i) \text{ (BCK, Chen+Pouzo)}$$

Also Darolles et al (2011) and Hall+Horowitz (2005) for kernel methods.

But this requires careful crafting and will not scale with $\dim(x)$

$$\min_{g \in G} \sum \left(y_i - \int g(p, x_i) dF(p|x_i, z_i) \right)^2$$



Instead, we propose to **target the integral loss function directly**

For discrete (or discretized) treatment

- Fit distributions $\hat{F}(p|x_i, z_i)$ with probability masses $\hat{f}(p_b|x_i, z_i)$
- Train \hat{g} to minimize $\left[y_i - \sum_b g(\hat{p}_b, x_i) \hat{f}(p_b|x_i, z_i) \right]^2$

And you've turned IV into two *generic* machine learning tasks

Learning to love Deep Nets




What is a deep net?

$$\hat{y}_i = \sum_k h_k^L(a_{ik}^L), \quad a_{ik}^L = \mathbf{z}_{ik}^{L'} W^L, \quad \mathbf{z}_{ik}^L = \sum_j h_j^{L-1}(a_{ij}^{L-1}), \dots$$

And so-on until you get down to the input layer $\mathbf{a}_i = \mathbf{h}^0(\mathbf{x}'_i)$

Many different variations here: recursive, convolutional, ...

Apart from the bottom, usually $h(v) = \max\{0, v\}$




Deep nets are not really sieves

1st layer is a big dimension reduction

e.g.,



- word embedding for text
- matrix convolution for images

We need to study these...



e.g., first-stage learning for $F(p|x_i, z_i)$

Bishop 96: Final layer of network parametrizes a mixture of Gaussians



Stage 2: Integral Loss

The second stage involves an integral loss function

If p is not discrete or can take many values, not easy!

Brute force just samples from $\hat{F}(p|x_i, z_i)$ and you take gradients on

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_i \left(y_i - \frac{1}{B} \sum_b g(p_b, x_i; \theta) \right)^2, \quad p_b \sim \hat{F}(p|x_i, z_i)$$

This is what economists usually do, but this is super inefficient

Stochastic Gradient Descent

You have loss $L(\mathbf{D}, \theta)$ where $\mathbf{D} = [\mathbf{d}_1 \dots \mathbf{d}_N]$

In the usual GD, you iteratively descend

$$\theta_t = \theta_{t-1} - \mathbf{C}_t \nabla L(\mathbf{D}, \theta_{t-1})$$

In SGD, you instead follow *noisy* but *unbiased* sample gradients

$$\theta_t = \theta_{t-1} - \mathbf{C}_t \nabla L(\{\mathbf{d}_{t_b}\}_{b=1}^B, \theta_{t-1})$$

SGD for integral loss functions

Our one-observation stochastic gradient is

$$\nabla L(d_i, \theta) = -2 \left(y_i - \int g_\theta(p, x_i) d\hat{F}(p|x_i, z_i) \right) \int g'_\theta(p, x_i) d\hat{F}(p|x_i, z_i)$$

Do SGD by pairing each observation with *two independent* treatment draws

$$\nabla \hat{L}(d_i, \theta) = -2(y_i - g_\theta(\dot{p}, x_i)) g'_\theta(\ddot{p}, x_i), \quad \dot{p}, \ddot{p} \sim \hat{F}(p|x_i, z_i)$$

So long as the draws are independent, $\mathbb{E} \nabla \hat{L}(d_i, \theta) = \mathbb{E} \nabla L(d_i, \theta) = \nabla L(\mathbf{D}, \theta)$

Aside: we can use SGD more in econ ...

There are a ton of setups where we use simulation to solve

$$\min_{\beta} \sum \left(y_i - \int g(x_i; \theta) dP(\theta | \beta) \right)^2$$

Random coefficient models, simulate ML or simulate MM...

Monte Carlo SGD is a perfect fit here

Validation and model tuning

We can do *causal validation* via two OOS loss functions

Leave-out deviance on first stage

$$\sum_{i \in LO} -\log \hat{f}(p|x_i, z_i)$$

Leave-out loss on second stage (constrained fit of $\mathbb{E}[y|xz]$)

$$\sum_{i \in LO} \left(y_i - \int g_{\theta}(p, x_i) d\hat{F}(p|x_i, z_i) \right)^2$$


You want to minimize both of these (in order).

heterogeneous price effects

$$y = 100 + s\psi_t + (\psi_t - 2)p + e,$$


$$p = 25 + (z + 3)\psi_t + v$$


$$z, v \sim N(0, 1) \text{ and } e \sim N(\rho v, 1 - \rho^2),$$





‘time’ dependent prices, sensitivity, utility

Customer ‘type’ 1-7 impacts demand





Make it
harder...



Inference? Good question

Data split! Get top node values and averages on left-out data:

$$\eta_{ik} = \eta_k(x_i, p_i) \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{\eta}_{ik} = \mathbb{E}_{\hat{F}(p|x_i, z_i)} \eta_k(x_i, p)$$

Stack as instruments $\bar{H} = [\bar{\eta}_1 \cdots \bar{\eta}_L]'$ and treatments $H = [\eta_1 \cdots \eta_L]'$

Post-net 2SLS coefficients are $\hat{\beta} = (\bar{H}' H)^{-1} \bar{H}' y$ with variance V_β and

$$\text{var}[\hat{g}(x, p)] = \boldsymbol{\eta}'(x, p) V_\beta \boldsymbol{\eta}(x, p)$$

Inference? Good question

Variational Bayes: fit q to minimize $\mathbb{E}_q[\log q(W) - \log p(W|D)]$

Diversion... in training we use **dropout**:

At each SGD update, calculate gradients against $W^l = \Xi^l \Omega^l$ at layer l where

$$\Xi^l = \text{diag}(\xi_{l1} \dots \xi_{lK_l}), \quad \xi_{kj} \sim \text{Bern}(c)$$

i.e., dropout randomly drops *rows* of each layer's weight matrix

Dropout is Variational Bayes!

VB minimizes $KL(q) \propto \mathbb{E}_q[\log q(W) - \log p(\mathbf{D}|W) - \log p(W)]$

If $q(W) = \prod_l \prod_k (c \mathbb{1}_{[W_k^l = \Omega_k^l]} + (1 - c) \mathbb{1}_{[W_k^l = 0]})$ and $w \sim N(0, \lambda^{-1})$,

$$KL(q) \propto \mathbb{E}_q L(\mathbf{D}|W) + c\lambda |\mathbf{W}|_2 + K [c \log c + (1 - c) \log(1 - c)]$$

(see also Gal and Ghahramani)






Figure 3: Bayesian (left) and Frequentist (right) inference for a central slice of the counterfactual function, taken at the average price and in our 4th customer category. Since the price effect for a given customer at a specific time is constant in (27), the curves here are a rescaling of the customer *price sensitivity* function.

Tuning the dropout rate is like treating it as a variational parameter



Ads Application

Taken from Goldman and Rao (2014)


We have 74 mil click-rates over 4 hour increments for 10k search terms

Treatment: **ad position 1-3**



Instrument: **background AB testing (bench of ~ 100 tests)**

Covariates: **advertiser id and ad properties, search text, time period**

Average Treatment Effects



These compare to observed click probabilities of 0.33, 0.1, and 0.05.



Heterogeneity across advertiser and search

Alice

Established: December 5, 2016



Automated Learning and Intelligence for Causation and Economics

We use economic theory to build systems of tasks that can be addressed with deep nets and other state-of-the-art ML.

This is the construction of systems for *Economic AI*