

Homework 1

Barbara Aleksandrov
337844252

Matan Solomon
209339894

April 30, 2025

1 Question 1

1.1 Example

In this part, we give an DGP example in the table given below (as requested with binary covariate X and treatment T).

Index	X	T	Y_0	Y_1	Y
1	0	0	2	3	2
2	0	0	1	2	1
3	0	1	2	3	3
4	1	1	4	5	5
5	1	1	3	4	4
6	1	0	3	4	3

1.2 $E[Y_t]$ and ATE calculation

$$E[Y_0] = \frac{1}{6}(2 + 1 + 2 + 4 + 3 + 3) = 2.5$$

$$E[Y_1] = \frac{1}{6}(3 + 2 + 3 + 5 + 4 + 4) = 3.5$$

$$ATE = E[Y_1 - Y_0] = 1$$

1.3 DGP example with different ATE based on ignorability

Notation: $Y = T \cdot Y_1 - (1 - T) \cdot Y_0$

Recap from Tutorial 2: Conditional ignorability means that the covariate X affects both the treatment assignment and the outcome - $Y(0), Y(1) \perp T | X$, while the full ignorability lets us assume that treatment is unaffected by X (meaning it is random): $Y(0), Y(1) \perp T$

In our example in Section 1.1, X affects both the treatment assignment and the outcome. For $X = 0$, we have that only $\frac{1}{3}$ of the items received treatment and overall Y values are lower in both outcomes. And for $X = 1$, we have that $\frac{2}{3}$ of items received the treatment, with higher outcome values Y.

1.4 ATE estimation

First let's assume that full ignorability assumption holds for this example, then we have:

$$\hat{ATE} = \hat{E}[Y|T = 1] - \hat{E}[Y|T = 0] = \frac{1}{3}(3 + 5 + 4 - 2 - 1 - 3) = 2$$

As we can see it overestimates an ATE by 1 unit.

Now let's assume that only conditional ignorability holds, meaning:

$$\hat{ATE} = E[E[Y|T = 1, X] - E[Y|T = 0, X]]$$

For that we need to calculate:

$$\hat{E}[Y|T = 1, X = 1] = \frac{1}{2}(5 + 4) = 4.5$$

$$\hat{E}[Y|T = 1, X = 0] = 3$$

$$\hat{E}[Y|T = 0, X = 1] = 3$$

$$\hat{E}[Y|T = 0, X = 0] = \frac{1}{2}(2 + 1) = 1.5$$

In the end we have: In the end we have:

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{ATE} &= \frac{1}{2}(\hat{E}[Y|T = 1, X = 1] + \hat{E}[Y|T = 1, X = 0]) - \frac{1}{2}(\hat{E}[Y|T = 0, X = 1] + \hat{E}[Y|T = 0, X = 0]) \\ &= \frac{1}{2}(4.5 + 3 - 3 - 1.5) = 1.5\end{aligned}$$

Clearly that the ATE that was adjusted to affect of X on both Y and T was closer to real ATE value. If we had a bigger data size (with similar correlation between the variables) the result would have been even more accurate.