## Causal Machine Learning: Homework 1

Due date: September 22, 11:59PM

Your name:

## **Bias-Variance Tradeoff**

- 1. In your own words, explain the bias–variance tradeoff when using a *sample* to approximate the *population* Conditional Expectation Function (CEF), and clarify where the variance in prediction comes from.
- 2. In your own words, explain how *Random Forests* address the bias–variance trade-off, and why balancing this tradeoff is important.
- 3. In your own words, explain how *Boosted Trees* differ from *Bagging* and *Random Forests* in how they address the bias–variance tradeoff.

## Frisch-Waugh-Lovell Theorem

In lecture, we showed that the multivariate OLS regression of  $Y_i$  against the treatment variable  $D_i$  and control covariates  $W_i$ 

$$Y_i = \beta_1 D_i + \beta_2' W_i + \epsilon_i$$

can be recovered in a bivariate regression,

$$\tilde{Y}_i = \beta_1 \tilde{D}_i + \mu_i$$

$$\beta_1 = \frac{Cov(\tilde{Y}_i, \tilde{D}_i)}{Var(\tilde{D}_i)}$$

where  $\tilde{D}_i$  and  $\tilde{Y}_i$  are defined as residuals from their respective regressions against  $W_i$ .

$$\tilde{D}_{i} = D_{i} - \gamma'_{DW} W_{i}, \quad \tilde{Y}_{i} = Y_{i} - \gamma'_{YW} W_{i}$$

$$\gamma_{DW} = \underset{\gamma}{\operatorname{arg min}} E\left[ (D_{i} - \gamma' W_{i})^{2} \right], \quad \gamma_{YW} = \underset{\gamma}{\operatorname{arg min}} E\left[ (Y_{i} - \gamma' W_{i})^{2} \right]$$

1. Show that  $\beta_1$  can be similarly recovered by using  $Y_i$  rather than residualized  $\tilde{Y}_i$ 

$$\beta_1 = \frac{Cov(Y_i, \tilde{D}_i)}{Var(\tilde{D}_i)}$$

2. Symmetrically, can one use unresidualized  $D_i$  in the numerator to express  $\beta_1$ ?

$$\beta_1 \stackrel{?}{=} \frac{Cov(\tilde{Y}_i, D_i)}{Var(\tilde{D}_i)}$$

- 3. In a high-dimensional setting where  $p/n \rightarrow 0$ , the OLS estimator of  $\beta_1$  is no longer well-behaved, and its sampling variability can be severely inflated. We introduced Double LASSO in lecture to address this high-dimensional problem.
- (a) Explain in words the relationship between the *penalty level*  $\lambda$  in Double LASSO and the theoretical variance of your estimated  $\beta_1$ .
- (b) After running Double LASSO, we obtain residualized  $D_i$  and  $Y_i$  by partialling out high-dimensional controls. In the final bivariate regression of residualized  $Y_i$  on residualized  $D_i$ , can we rely on the standard sandwich formula for the standard error of  $\hat{\beta}_1$ ? Why or why not?

## **Test of Convergence Hypothesis**

In lecture, we provided an empirical example of partialling-out with Double LASSO to estimate the regression coefficient  $\beta_1$  in the high-dimensional linear regression model. Specifically, we estimated how the rates at which economies of different countries grow  $(Y_i)$  are related to the initial wealth levels in each country  $(D_i)$  controlling for country's institutional, educational, and other similar characteristics (W). The relationship is captured by  $\beta_1$ , the *speed of convergence/divergence*, which measures the speed at which poor countries catch up  $(\beta_1 < 0)$  or fall behind  $(\beta_1 > 0)$  rich countries, after controlling for  $W_i$ .

Indeed, residualized  $D_i$  and  $Y_i$  can also be estimated using Machine Learning (ML) methods beyond LASSO, as demonstrated in lecture. In this question, you will estimate residualized  $D_i$  and  $Y_i$  using the ML methods introduced in class. For this exercise, we will use the dataset GrowthData, which is included in the hdm package.

```
library(hdm)
## function to get data
getdata <- function(...) {
    e <- new.env()
    name <- data(..., envir = e)[1]
    e[[name]]
}

## now load your data calling getdata()
growth <- getdata(GrowthData)</pre>
```

```
## create the outcome variable y, treatment d, and control covariates W
y <- growth$Outcome
W <- growth[-which(colnames(growth) %in% c("Outcome", "intercept", "gdpsh465"))]
D <- growth$gdpsh465</pre>
```

- 1. Using the package randomForest and its default settings of ntree and nodesize, report the estimated  $\beta_1$ . Use set.seed(1). What can you conclude from your estimation?
- 2. Now change the setting and let ntree = 10 and nodesize = 1. Use set.seed(1). Re-estimate  $\beta_1$  and report your findings. In your own words, explain the possible reasons of changes in your findings.

```
set.seed(1)
library(randomForest)
```

- 3. We may also use a Neural Network model to estimate the residualized  $D_i$  and  $Y_i$ . Set the random seed with set.seed(1). Configure the hyperparameters as follows:
- Build a neural network with one hidden layer containing 200 neurons.
- Train the network using Stochastic Gradient Descent (SGD) with a learning rate of 0.05, 200 epochs, and a batch size of 10.
- Implement early stopping based on performance on a 20% validation set, with a patience of 10 epochs.

Based on your estimation results  $\beta_1$  under this model, what can you conclude about the relationship between country's initial wealth and growth rate?

```
set.seed(1)
library(keras3)
```