ML in Economics and Finance: Where Do We Go Now? - Part I

Raul Riva
FGV EPGE

December, 2025

INSPER - São Paulo

Intro

Who is this guy?

- Just joined FGV EPGE as an Assistant Professor;
- PhD in Finance from Northwestern University;
- Asset Pricing + Macro-Finance + Econometrics;

Who is this guy?

- Just joined FGV EPGE as an Assistant Professor;
- PhD in Finance from Northwestern University;
- Asset Pricing + Macro-Finance + Econometrics;

I am **not** an ML developer, but maybe a mildly sophisticated consumer

Where are we?

- Last 20-30 years: explosion of computational power and popularization of ML techniques;
- Last 15 years: we economists imported several techniques from CS and Stats;

Where are we?

- Last 20-30 years: explosion of computational power and popularization of ML techniques;
- Last 15 years: we economists imported several techniques from CS and Stats;
- Many challenges in this translation:
  - Causality vs pattern recognition;
  - Interpretability;
  - Sophisticated notions of equilibrium;
  - Time series dynamics;

Where are we?

- Last 20-30 years: explosion of computational power and popularization of ML techniques;
- Last 15 years: we economists imported several techniques from CS and Stats;
- Many challenges in this translation:
  - Causality vs pattern recognition;
  - Interpretability;
  - Sophisticated notions of equilibrium;
  - Time series dynamics;

Right now:

- Better understanding of the limitations of "plug and play" ML;
- Great stuff: new hybrid methods designed by and for economists;
- Bad stuff: we are flooded with tutorials, books, videos, bootcamps...

Where do we go now?

- The Econ/Finance forecasting crowd was really fast in adopting ML...
- But what else? What is worth knowing about ML in Econ and Finance? What's the frontier?

Where do we go now?

- The Econ/Finance forecasting crowd was really fast in adopting ML...
- But what else? What is worth knowing about ML in Econ and Finance? What's the frontier?

What I will do:

- My own economist-crafted definition of ML methods and how to think about them;
- Three very cool agendas where ML can help economists;
- Causality in HD, seriously heterogeneous treatment effects, and solving large models;

Where do we go now?

- The Econ/Finance forecasting crowd was really fast in adopting ML...
- But what else? What is worth knowing about ML in Econ and Finance? What's the frontier?

What I will do:

- My own economist-crafted definition of ML methods and how to think about them;
- Three very cool agendas where ML can help economists;
- Causality in HD, seriously heterogeneous treatment effects, and solving large models;

What I will not do:

- Teach you how to code;

Where do we go now?

- The Econ/Finance forecasting crowd was really fast in adopting ML...
- But what else? What is worth knowing about ML in Econ and Finance? What's the frontier?

What I will do:

- My own economist-crafted definition of ML methods and how to think about them;
- Three very cool agendas where ML can help economists;
- Causality in HD, seriously heterogeneous treatment effects, and solving large models;

What I will not do:

- Teach you how to code;
- Walk you through proofs and be super formal;

Where do we go now?

- The Econ/Finance forecasting crowd was really fast in adopting ML...
- But what else? What is worth knowing about ML in Econ and Finance? What's the frontier?

What I will do:

- My own economist-crafted definition of ML methods and how to think about them;
- Three very cool agendas where ML can help economists;
- Causality in HD, seriously heterogeneous treatment effects, and solving large models;

What I will not do:

- Teach you how to code;
- Walk you through proofs and be super formal;
- Lie to you and say you can easily perform any of this in Stata! 🙄

Who is this for?

- Students starting their empirical research agendas;
- Fellow empirical researchers trying to grasp what kind of ML tools might be useful;
- Someone coming from Stats or CS into Economics;

Who is this for?

- Students starting their empirical research agendas;
- Fellow empirical researchers trying to grasp what kind of ML tools might be useful;
- Someone coming from Stats or CS into Economics;

Who is this not for?

- Super sophisticated economists already deploying these techniques everywhere;
- Hardcore econometricians looking for ~~*dark magic*~~ ultra fancy theorems and proofs;

Who is this for?

- Students starting their empirical research agendas;
- Fellow empirical researchers trying to grasp what kind of ML tools might be useful;
- Someone coming from Stats or CS into Economics;

Who is this not for?

- Super sophisticated economists already deploying these techniques everywhere;
- Hardcore econometricians looking for ~~*dark magic*~~ ultra fancy theorems and proofs;

DISCLAIMER: These are **my** own views, based on **my** experience, and **my** own readings. Other people will disagree.

Flight Plan ✈️

1. What is ML, anyway?
2. Causality in High Dimensions

} **Today**

3. (Seriously) Heterogeneous Partial Effects
4. Solving Large-Scale General Equilibrium Models

} **Tomorrow**

Flight Plan ✈

1. What is ML, anyway?
2. Causality in High Dimensions

} **Today**

3. (Seriously) Heterogeneous Partial Effects
4. Solving Large-Scale General Equilibrium Models

} **Tomorrow**

Please bring questions at any time!

Questions?

A General Framework

What is *Machine Learning*?

- Different fields = different definitions: CS, Stats, Operations Research, ...
- Many types: Supervised, Unsupervised, Reinforcement Learning, ...
- More buzzwords = better consulting gigs! 🤑

What is *Machine Learning*?

- Different fields = different definitions: CS, Stats, Operations Research, ...
- Many types: Supervised, Unsupervised, Reinforcement Learning, ...
- More buzzwords = better consulting gigs! 🤑
- Today and tomorrow: **Supervised Learning**;

What is *Machine Learning*?

- Different fields = different definitions: CS, Stats, Operations Research, ...
- Many types: Supervised, Unsupervised, Reinforcement Learning, ...
- More buzzwords = better consulting gigs! 🤑
- Today and tomorrow: **Supervised Learning**;
- I will be brave enough and provide the one I think is really useful for Economists:

What is *Machine Learning*?

- Different fields = different definitions: CS, Stats, Operations Research, ...
- Many types: Supervised, Unsupervised, Reinforcement Learning, ...
- More buzzwords = better consulting gigs! 🤑
- Today and tomorrow: **Supervised Learning**;
- I will be brave enough and provide the one I think is really useful for Economists:

(Supervised) **Machine Learning** is a set of tools that enable computationally-feasible data-driven search over high-dimensional functional spaces.

A General Framework

$$y = f(\boldsymbol{x}) + \varepsilon$$

- $y \in \mathbb{R}^k$ is some "target" or "outcome";
- $\boldsymbol{x} \in \mathbb{R}^p$ is a vector of "features", or "predictors", or "covariates";
- $f : \mathbb{R}^p \to \mathbb{R}^k$ is some unknown function;
- ε is some unobserved noise because the world is messy;

A General Framework

$$y = f(\boldsymbol{x}) + \varepsilon$$

- $y \in \mathbb{R}^k$ is some "target" or "outcome";
- $\boldsymbol{x} \in \mathbb{R}^p$ is a vector of "features", or "predictors", or "covariates";
- $f : \mathbb{R}^p \to \mathbb{R}^k$ is some unknown function;
- ε is some unobserved noise because the world is messy;

Question: given a function space $\mathcal{F}$, how to find $\hat{f} \in \mathcal{F}$ that approximates f well?

A General Framework

$$y = f(\boldsymbol{x}) + \varepsilon$$

- $y \in \mathbb{R}^k$ is some "target" or "outcome";
- $\boldsymbol{x} \in \mathbb{R}^p$ is a vector of "features", or "predictors", or "covariates";
- $f : \mathbb{R}^p \to \mathbb{R}^k$ is some unknown function;
- ε is some unobserved noise because the world is messy;

Question: given a function space $\mathcal{F}$, how to find $\hat{f} \in \mathcal{F}$ that approximates f well?

- Collect data $\{(y_1, \boldsymbol{x}_1), \ldots, (y_n, \boldsymbol{x}_n)\}$;
- Define some notion of "approximates well" $\implies$ (a loss function);
- Be explicit about $\mathcal{F}$;
- Be explicit about your optimization mechanism;

You are already doing ML!

Consider an outcome y_i, and a set of covariates $\boldsymbol{x}_i$ for $i = 1, \ldots, n$:

$$y_i = \alpha + \boldsymbol{x}_i'\boldsymbol{\beta} + \varepsilon_i$$

- This is a linear regression model;
- The function space $\mathcal{F}$ is the set of all affine functions of the treatment and covariates;
- The loss function is the MSE: $\mathcal{L}(y_i, \hat{y}_i) = (y_i - \hat{y}_i)^2$;
- OLS: minimize a convex loss function over the space of parameters;

You are already doing ML!

Consider an outcome y_i, and a set of covariates $\boldsymbol{x}_i$ for $i = 1, \ldots, n$:

$$y_i = \alpha + \boldsymbol{x}_i'\boldsymbol{\beta} + \varepsilon_i$$

- This is a linear regression model;
- The function space $\mathcal{F}$ is the set of all affine functions of the treatment and covariates;
- The loss function is the MSE: $\mathcal{L}(y_i, \hat{y}_i) = (y_i - \hat{y}_i)^2$;
- OLS: minimize a convex loss function over the space of parameters;

Conclusion: Linear regression is a (very simple) ML method! But there is so much more...

Hold on... Isn't Machine Learning just Non-Parametric Estimation?

- The general framework I used could be used in a non-parametric estimation class...
- Why do we need new tools? We already have the good and old kernel regression!

Hold on... Isn't Machine Learning just Non-Parametric Estimation?

- The general framework I used could be used in a non-parametric estimation class...
- Why do we need new tools? We already have the good and old kernel regression!
- Well... there is the curse of dimensionality! If $p \approx 6$, you are already in trouble!

Hold on... Isn't Machine Learning just Non-Parametric Estimation?

- The general framework I used could be used in a non-parametric estimation class...
- Why do we need new tools? We already have the good and old kernel regression!
- Well... there is the curse of dimensionality! If $p \approx 6$, you are already in trouble!

OLS

- Leverages linearity (strong!);
- Easy to compute and interpret;

Fully Non-Parametric Methods

- Extreme flexibility;
- Super data hungry!

Hold on... Isn't Machine Learning just Non-Parametric Estimation?

- The general framework I used could be used in a non-parametric estimation class...
- Why do we need new tools? We already have the good and old kernel regression!
- Well... there is the curse of dimensionality! If $p \approx 6$, you are already in trouble!

OLS

- Leverages linearity (strong!);
- Easy to compute and interpret;

Fully Non-Parametric Methods

- Extreme flexibility;
- Super data hungry!

Machine Learning = a *compromise*: richer parametrizations while still computationally feasible in high dimensions.

Questions?

Causality in High Dimensions

Preliminaries

- No estimator will lead to causality by itself – only careful design will;

Preliminaries

- No estimator will lead to causality by itself – only careful design will;
- ML methods were *not* created to tackle causality problems;
- See Varian (2014), Mullainathan and Spiess (2017), Athey and Imbens (2019), and Masini et al. (2023);

Preliminaries

- No estimator will lead to causality by itself – only careful design will;
- ML methods were *not* created to tackle causality problems;
- See Varian (2014), Mullainathan and Spiess (2017), Athey and Imbens (2019), and Masini et al. (2023);
- Kleinberg et al. (2015): many policy-relevant questions are prediction problems!

Preliminaries

- No estimator will lead to causality by itself – only careful design will;
- ML methods were *not* created to tackle causality problems;
- See Varian (2014), Mullainathan and Spiess (2017), Athey and Imbens (2019), and Masini et al. (2023);
- Kleinberg et al. (2015): many policy-relevant questions are prediction problems!
- Belloni 🇧🇷, Chernozhukov, Hansen and co-authors took it even further:
  - Computing the propensity score *is* forecasting!
  - The first-stage regression in an IV context *is* forecasting!

Treatment Effects in High Dimensions

Suppose you're interested in the treatment effect $\theta_0 \in \mathbb{R}$:

$$y_i = d_i\theta_0 + \boldsymbol{x}_i'\boldsymbol{\beta} + \varepsilon_i$$

- $y_i \in \mathbb{R}$ is an outcome;
- $d_i \in \mathbb{R}$ is a treatment;
- $\boldsymbol{x}_i \in \mathbb{R}^p$ is a vector of available covariates;
- ε_i is some unobserved noise with $\mathbb{E}[\varepsilon_i \mid d_i, \boldsymbol{x}_i] = 0$;

Treatment Effects in High Dimensions

Suppose you're interested in the treatment effect $\theta_0 \in \mathbb{R}$:

$$y_i = d_i\theta_0 + \boldsymbol{x}_i'\boldsymbol{\beta} + \varepsilon_i$$

- $y_i \in \mathbb{R}$ is an outcome;
- $d_i \in \mathbb{R}$ is a treatment;
- $\boldsymbol{x}_i \in \mathbb{R}^p$ is a vector of available covariates;
- ε_i is some unobserved noise with $\mathbb{E}[\varepsilon_i \mid d_i, \boldsymbol{x}_i] = 0$;
- You have an i.i.d. sample $\{y_i, d_i, \boldsymbol{x}_i\}_{i=1}^n$ and we allow for $p \gg n$;

Treatment Effects in High Dimensions

Suppose you're interested in the treatment effect $\theta_0 \in \mathbb{R}$:

$$y_i = d_i\theta_0 + \boldsymbol{x}_i'\boldsymbol{\beta} + \varepsilon_i$$

- $y_i \in \mathbb{R}$ is an outcome;
- $d_i \in \mathbb{R}$ is a treatment;
- $\boldsymbol{x}_i \in \mathbb{R}^p$ is a vector of available covariates;
- ε_i is some unobserved noise with $\mathbb{E}[\varepsilon_i \mid d_i, \boldsymbol{x}_i] = 0$;
- You have an i.i.d. sample $\{y_i, d_i, \boldsymbol{x}_i\}_{i=1}^n$ and we allow for $p \gg n$;
- **Goal**: estimate θ_0 and get a confidence interval;

Treatment Effects in High Dimensions

Suppose you're interested in the treatment effect $\theta_0 \in \mathbb{R}$:

$$y_i = d_i\theta_0 + \boldsymbol{x}_i'\boldsymbol{\beta} + \varepsilon_i$$

- $y_i \in \mathbb{R}$ is an outcome;
- $d_i \in \mathbb{R}$ is a treatment;
- $\boldsymbol{x}_i \in \mathbb{R}^p$ is a vector of available covariates;
- ε_i is some unobserved noise with $\mathbb{E}[\varepsilon_i \mid d_i, \boldsymbol{x}_i] = 0$;
- You have an i.i.d. sample $\{y_i, d_i, \boldsymbol{x}_i\}_{i=1}^n$ and we allow for $p \gg n$;
- **Goal**: estimate θ_0 and get a confidence interval;

Question: what will happen if you try OLS here?

Treatment Effects in High Dimensions

- Let's say you believe only a few β_j's are $\neq 0 \implies$ *"sparsity"* in $\boldsymbol{\beta}$;
- But you do not know which ones!

Treatment Effects in High Dimensions

- Let's say you believe only a few β_j's are $\neq 0 \implies$ *"sparsity"* in $\boldsymbol{\beta}$;
- But you do not know which ones!
- What about using your economic intuition to select a subset of controls?

Treatment Effects in High Dimensions

- Let's say you believe only a few β_j's are $\neq 0 \implies$ *"sparsity"* in $\boldsymbol{\beta}$;
- But you do not know which ones!
- What about using your economic intuition to select a subset of controls?
- Applying Econ theory is always a good idea, but:
  - You might not get a meaningful reduction with theory alone;
  - Your referee might not agree with your choices;
  - You might get lost in a sea of robustness checks...

Treatment Effects in High Dimensions

- Let's say you believe only a few β_j's are $\neq 0 \implies$ *"sparsity"* in $\boldsymbol{\beta}$;
- But you do not know which ones!
- What about using your economic intuition to select a subset of controls?
- Applying Econ theory is always a good idea, but:
  - You might not get a meaningful reduction with theory alone;
  - Your referee might not agree with your choices;
  - You might get lost in a sea of robustness checks...
- Good news: ML researchers devoted a lot of attention to *sparse regressions*!

Welcome to SBE, Mr. LASSO

The Least Absolute Shrinkage and Selection Operator (LASSO) estimator solves:

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{\delta}} \equiv \arg\min_{\boldsymbol{\delta}\in\mathbb{R}^p} \left\{ \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}(y_i - \boldsymbol{w}_i'\boldsymbol{\delta})^2 + \lambda \sum_{j=1}^{p} |\delta_j| \right\}$$

- $\lambda \geq 0$ is a tuning parameter that controls the amount of penalization ("*regularization*");
- $\boldsymbol{w}_i$ is a general vector of regressors of size p;

Welcome to SBE, Mr. LASSO

The Least Absolute Shrinkage and Selection Operator (LASSO) estimator solves:

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{\delta}} \equiv \arg\min_{\boldsymbol{\delta} \in \mathbb{R}^p} \left\{ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} (y_i - \boldsymbol{w}_i' \boldsymbol{\delta})^2 + \lambda \sum_{j=1}^{p} |\delta_j| \right\}$$

- $\lambda \geq 0$ is a tuning parameter that controls the amount of penalization ("*regularization*");
- $\boldsymbol{w}_i$ is a general vector of regressors of size p;
- The ℓ_1 penalty $\sum_{j=1}^{p} |\delta_j|$ induces sparsity in $\hat{\boldsymbol{\delta}}$;

Welcome to SBE, Mr. LASSO

The Least Absolute Shrinkage and Selection Operator (LASSO) estimator solves:

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{\delta}} \equiv \arg\min_{\boldsymbol{\delta} \in \mathbb{R}^p} \left\{ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} (y_i - \boldsymbol{w}_i' \boldsymbol{\delta})^2 + \lambda \sum_{j=1}^{p} |\delta_j| \right\}$$

- $\lambda \geq 0$ is a tuning parameter that controls the amount of penalization ("*regularization*");
- $\boldsymbol{w}_i$ is a general vector of regressors of size p;
- The ℓ_1 penalty $\sum_{j=1}^{p} |\delta_j|$ induces sparsity in $\hat{\boldsymbol{\delta}}$;
- If $\lambda = 0$, we get OLS; if $\lambda \to \infty$, we get $\hat{\boldsymbol{\delta}} = \mathbf{0}$;

Welcome to SBE, Mr. LASSO

The Least Absolute Shrinkage and Selection Operator (LASSO) estimator solves:

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{\delta}} \equiv \arg\min_{\boldsymbol{\delta}\in\mathbb{R}^p} \left\{ \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}(y_i - \boldsymbol{w}_i'\boldsymbol{\delta})^2 + \lambda \sum_{j=1}^{p} |\delta_j| \right\}$$

- $\lambda \geq 0$ is a tuning parameter that controls the amount of penalization ("*regularization*");
- $\boldsymbol{w}_i$ is a general vector of regressors of size p;
- The ℓ_1 penalty $\sum_{j=1}^{p} |\delta_j|$ induces sparsity in $\hat{\boldsymbol{\delta}}$;
- If $\lambda = 0$, we get OLS; if $\lambda \to \infty$, we get $\hat{\boldsymbol{\delta}} = \mathbf{0}$;
- For intermediate values of λ, some $\hat{\delta}_j$'s will be exactly zero!

Welcome to SBE, Mr. LASSO

The Least Absolute Shrinkage and Selection Operator (LASSO) estimator solves:

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{\delta}} \equiv \arg\min_{\boldsymbol{\delta}\in\mathbb{R}^p} \left\{ \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}(y_i - \boldsymbol{w}_i'\boldsymbol{\delta})^2 + \lambda \sum_{j=1}^{p} |\delta_j| \right\}$$

- $\lambda \geq 0$ is a tuning parameter that controls the amount of penalization ("*regularization*");
- $\boldsymbol{w}_i$ is a general vector of regressors of size p;
- The ℓ_1 penalty $\sum_{j=1}^{p} |\delta_j|$ induces sparsity in $\hat{\boldsymbol{\delta}}$;
- If $\lambda = 0$, we get OLS; if $\lambda \to \infty$, we get $\hat{\boldsymbol{\delta}} = \mathbf{0}$;
- For intermediate values of λ, some $\hat{\delta}_j$'s will be exactly zero!
- $\hat{\boldsymbol{\delta}}$ is gives up unbiasedness for much lower variance;
- This problem is still feasible if $p \gg n$ and it is convex $\implies$ fast computation;

The Geometry of LASSO

For $c > 0$, consider the following:

$$\tilde{\boldsymbol{\delta}} \equiv \arg\min_{\boldsymbol{\delta} \in \mathbb{R}^p} \left\{ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} (y_i - \boldsymbol{w}_i' \boldsymbol{\delta})^2 \right\}$$

$$\text{subject to } \sum_{j=1}^{p} |\delta_j| \leq c$$

- Think about the Lagrangian of this problem!
- For every λ, there is a c such that $\hat{\boldsymbol{\delta}} = \tilde{\boldsymbol{\delta}}$;



Exploring Options

Recall our treatment effects model:

$$y_i = d_i\theta_0 + \boldsymbol{x}_i'\boldsymbol{\beta} + \varepsilon_i$$

- **Approach 1**: run LASSO of y_i on d_i and $\boldsymbol{x}_i$. Is this a good idea?

Exploring Options

Recall our treatment effects model:

$$y_i = d_i\theta_0 + \boldsymbol{x}_i'\boldsymbol{\beta} + \varepsilon_i$$

- **Approach 1**: run LASSO of y_i on d_i and $\boldsymbol{x}_i$. Is this a good idea?
- $\hat{\theta}_0$ will be severely biased and might even be set to zero!

Exploring Options

Recall our treatment effects model:

$$y_i = d_i\theta_0 + \boldsymbol{x}_i'\boldsymbol{\beta} + \varepsilon_i$$

- **Approach 1**: run LASSO of y_i on d_i and $\boldsymbol{x}_i$. Is this a good idea?
- $\hat{\theta}_0$ will be severely biased and might even be set to zero!

- **Approach 2**: run LASSO but with no penalty on θ_0. Is this a good idea?

Exploring Options

Recall our treatment effects model:

$$y_i = d_i\theta_0 + \boldsymbol{x}_i'\boldsymbol{\beta} + \varepsilon_i$$

- **Approach 1**: run LASSO of y_i on d_i and $\boldsymbol{x}_i$. Is this a good idea?
- $\hat{\theta}_0$ will be severely biased and might even be set to zero!

- **Approach 2**: run LASSO but with no penalty on θ_0. Is this a good idea?
- Still terrible! $\hat{\theta}_0$ will still be biased!

Exploring Options

Recall our treatment effects model:

$$y_i = d_i\theta_0 + \boldsymbol{x}_i'\boldsymbol{\beta} + \varepsilon_i$$

- **Approach 1**: run LASSO of y_i on d_i and $\boldsymbol{x}_i$. Is this a good idea?
- $\hat{\theta}_0$ will be severely biased and might even be set to zero!

- **Approach 2**: run LASSO but with no penalty on θ_0. Is this a good idea?
- Still terrible! $\hat{\theta}_0$ will still be biased!

- **Approach 3**: do Approach 2, but then run OLS on the selected x_i and d_i. Is this good?

Exploring Options

Recall our treatment effects model:

$$y_i = d_i\theta_0 + \boldsymbol{x}_i'\boldsymbol{\beta} + \varepsilon_i$$

- **Approach 1**: run LASSO of y_i on d_i and $\boldsymbol{x}_i$. Is this a good idea?
- $\hat{\theta}_0$ will be severely biased and might even be set to zero!

- **Approach 2**: run LASSO but with no penalty on θ_0. Is this a good idea?
- Still terrible! $\hat{\theta}_0$ will still be biased!

- **Approach 3**: do Approach 2, but then run OLS on the selected x_i and d_i. Is this good?
- Leeb and Pötscher (2008a) and Leeb and Pötscher (2008b): terrible idea again!
- Main problem: *omitted variable bias* if some relevant controls are not selected!
- If some x_j is correlated with d_i and affects y_i, omitting it biases $\hat{\theta}_0$!

Something That Finally Works!

Belloni et al. (2014a) thought about how d_i and $\boldsymbol{x}_i$ interact:

$$d_i = \boldsymbol{x}_i'\gamma + u_i, \quad \mathbb{E}[u_i \mid \boldsymbol{x}_i] = 0$$

- What if γ is also sparse, i.e., only a few x_j's affect d_i?
- Can we find a small subset of $\boldsymbol{x}_i$ that *predicts* treatment well?

Something That Finally Works!

Belloni et al. (2014a) thought about how d_i and $\boldsymbol{x}_i$ interact:

$$d_i = \boldsymbol{x}_i'\gamma + u_i, \quad \mathbb{E}[u_i \mid \boldsymbol{x}_i] = 0$$

- What if γ is also sparse, i.e., only a few x_j's affect d_i?
- Can we find a small subset of $\boldsymbol{x}_i$ that *predicts* treatment well?

They proposed the **Double LASSO** procedure:

1. Run LASSO of y_i on $\boldsymbol{x}_i$ to select controls $\hat{S}_y$;
2. Run LASSO of d_i on $\boldsymbol{x}_i$ to select controls $\hat{S}_d$;
3. Run OLS of y_i on d_i and $\boldsymbol{x}_i$ with $x_j \in \hat{S}_y \cup \hat{S}_d$;

A Really Cool Result

Belloni et al. (2014b) provide conditions under which:

$$\sqrt{n}(\hat{\theta}_0 - \theta_0) \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2)$$

where σ^2 is complicated but consistently estimated.

A Really Cool Result

Belloni et al. (2014b) provide conditions under which:

$$\sqrt{n}(\hat{\theta}_0 - \theta_0) \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2)$$

where σ^2 is complicated but consistently estimated.

The impressive stuff:

- This convergence is uniform over a large class of DGPs;
- Convergence still happens at the rate $\sqrt{n}$, even if $p \gg n$!
- Under homoskedasticity, it attains semi-parametric efficiency!
- Construct confidence intervals in the usual ways;

Key assumption: sparse representation;

Some Monte-Carlo Reassurance





Questions?

Limitations and Generalizations

Limitations

- What if we want to allow for non-linearities?
- What if we want to use other ML methods?
- What if sparsity is not a good assumption?
- What if treatment has heterogenous effects?
- What if outcomes are function-valued?

Generalization

Belloni et al. (2017) and Chernozhukov et al. (2018) generalize all of this:

$$y_i = g_0(d_i, \boldsymbol{x}_i) + \varepsilon_i, \quad \mathbb{E}[\varepsilon_i \mid d_i, \boldsymbol{x}_i] = 0$$
$$d_i = m_0(\boldsymbol{x}_i) + u_i, \quad \mathbb{E}[u_i \mid \boldsymbol{x}_i] = 0$$

- $g_0(\cdot)$ and $m_0(\cdot)$ are unknown (possibly non-linear) functions;
- You can use several different ML method to estimate $g_0(\cdot)$ and $m_0(\cdot)$;
- Sparsity is not necessary anymore;

Generalization

Belloni et al. (2017) and Chernozhukov et al. (2018) generalize all of this:

$$y_i = g_0(d_i, \boldsymbol{x}_i) + \varepsilon_i, \quad \mathbb{E}[\varepsilon_i \mid d_i, \boldsymbol{x}_i] = 0$$
$$d_i = m_0(\boldsymbol{x}_i) + u_i, \quad \mathbb{E}[u_i \mid \boldsymbol{x}_i] = 0$$

- $g_0(\cdot)$ and $m_0(\cdot)$ are unknown (possibly non-linear) functions;
- You can use several different ML method to estimate $g_0(\cdot)$ and $m_0(\cdot)$;
- Sparsity is not necessary anymore;
- Secrete sauce I: Neyman Orthogonal Scores ψ

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\psi(\text{data}, \underbrace{\text{param of interest}}_{\equiv\theta_0}, \underbrace{\text{nuisance params}}_{\equiv\eta_0})\right] = 0, \qquad \frac{\partial}{\partial\eta}\mathbb{E}\left[\psi(\text{data}, \theta_0, \eta)\right]\Big|_{\eta=\eta_0} = 0$$

Generalization

Belloni et al. (2017) and Chernozhukov et al. (2018) generalize all of this:

$$y_i = g_0(d_i, \boldsymbol{x}_i) + \varepsilon_i, \quad \mathbb{E}[\varepsilon_i \mid d_i, \boldsymbol{x}_i] = 0$$
$$d_i = m_0(\boldsymbol{x}_i) + u_i, \quad \mathbb{E}[u_i \mid \boldsymbol{x}_i] = 0$$

- $g_0(\cdot)$ and $m_0(\cdot)$ are unknown (possibly non-linear) functions;
- You can use several different ML method to estimate $g_0(\cdot)$ and $m_0(\cdot)$;
- Sparsity is not necessary anymore;
- Secrete sauce I: Neyman Orthogonal Scores ψ

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\psi(\text{data}, \underbrace{\text{param of interest}}_{\equiv\theta_0}, \underbrace{\text{nuisance params}}_{\equiv\eta_0})\right] = 0, \qquad \frac{\partial}{\partial\eta}\mathbb{E}\left[\psi(\text{data}, \theta_0, \eta)\right]\Big|_{\eta=\eta_0} = 0$$

- Secrete sauce II: cross-fitting $\implies$ efficiency vs strict assumptions;

Generalization

Belloni et al. (2017) and Chernozhukov et al. (2018) generalize all of this:

$$y_i = g_0(d_i, \boldsymbol{x}_i) + \varepsilon_i, \quad \mathbb{E}[\varepsilon_i \mid d_i, \boldsymbol{x}_i] = 0$$
$$d_i = m_0(\boldsymbol{x}_i) + u_i, \quad \mathbb{E}[u_i \mid \boldsymbol{x}_i] = 0$$

- $g_0(\cdot)$ and $m_0(\cdot)$ are unknown (possibly non-linear) functions;
- You can use several different ML method to estimate $g_0(\cdot)$ and $m_0(\cdot)$;
- Sparsity is not necessary anymore;
- Secrete sauce I: Neyman Orthogonal Scores ψ

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\psi(\text{data}, \underbrace{\text{param of interest}}_{\equiv\theta_0}, \underbrace{\text{nuisance params}}_{\equiv\eta_0})\right] = 0, \qquad \frac{\partial}{\partial\eta}\mathbb{E}\left[\psi(\text{data}, \theta_0, \eta)\right]\Big|_{\eta=\eta_0} = 0$$

- Secrete sauce II: cross-fitting $\implies$ efficiency vs strict assumptions;
- Independence across i is essential;

A Concrete Example (A Partially Linear Model)

$$y_i = d_i\theta_0 + g_0(\boldsymbol{x}_i) + \varepsilon_i, \quad \mathbb{E}[\varepsilon_i \mid d_i, \boldsymbol{x}_i] = 0$$
$$d_i = m_0(\boldsymbol{x}_i) + u_i, \quad \mathbb{E}[u_i \mid \boldsymbol{x}_i] = 0$$

A Concrete Example (A Partially Linear Model)

$$y_i = d_i\theta_0 + g_0(\boldsymbol{x}_i) + \varepsilon_i, \quad \mathbb{E}[\varepsilon_i \mid d_i, \boldsymbol{x}_i] = 0$$
$$d_i = m_0(\boldsymbol{x}_i) + u_i, \quad \mathbb{E}[u_i \mid \boldsymbol{x}_i] = 0$$

Steps:

- Divide the data into two folds;
- On fold 1, estimate $\hat{g}_0(\boldsymbol{x}_i)$ and $\hat{m}_0(\boldsymbol{x}_i)$ using ML methods;
- On fold 2, compute residuals:

$$\hat{\varepsilon}_i = y_i - \hat{g}_0(\boldsymbol{x}_i)$$
$$\hat{u}_i = d_i - \hat{m}_0(\boldsymbol{x}_i)$$

- Regress $\hat{\varepsilon}_i$ on $\hat{u}_i$ to get $\hat{\theta}_0$;

A Concrete Example (A Partially Linear Model)

$$y_i = d_i\theta_0 + g_0(\boldsymbol{x}_i) + \varepsilon_i, \quad \mathbb{E}[\varepsilon_i \mid d_i, \boldsymbol{x}_i] = 0$$
$$d_i = m_0(\boldsymbol{x}_i) + u_i, \quad \mathbb{E}[u_i \mid \boldsymbol{x}_i] = 0$$

Steps:

- Divide the data into two folds;
- On fold 1, estimate $\hat{g}_0(\boldsymbol{x}_i)$ and $\hat{m}_0(\boldsymbol{x}_i)$ using ML methods;
- On fold 2, compute residuals:

$$\hat{\varepsilon}_i = y_i - \hat{g}_0(\boldsymbol{x}_i)$$
$$\hat{u}_i = d_i - \hat{m}_0(\boldsymbol{x}_i)$$

- Regress $\hat{\varepsilon}_i$ on $\hat{u}_i$ to get $\hat{\theta}_0$;
- Repeat switching folds and average $\hat{\theta}_0$'s;

A Concrete Example (A Partially Linear Model)

$$y_i = d_i\theta_0 + g_0(\boldsymbol{x}_i) + \varepsilon_i, \quad \mathbb{E}[\varepsilon_i \mid d_i, \boldsymbol{x}_i] = 0$$
$$d_i = m_0(\boldsymbol{x}_i) + u_i, \quad \mathbb{E}[u_i \mid \boldsymbol{x}_i] = 0$$

Steps:

- Divide the data into two folds;
- On fold 1, estimate $\hat{g}_0(\boldsymbol{x}_i)$ and $\hat{m}_0(\boldsymbol{x}_i)$ using ML methods;
- On fold 2, compute residuals:

$$\hat{\varepsilon}_i = y_i - \hat{g}_0(\boldsymbol{x}_i)$$
$$\hat{u}_i = d_i - \hat{m}_0(\boldsymbol{x}_i)$$

- Regress $\hat{\varepsilon}_i$ on $\hat{u}_i$ to get $\hat{\theta}_0$;
- Repeat switching folds and average $\hat{\theta}_0$'s;
- In practice you can use K folds!
- See Chernozhukov et al. (2017) for a practical guide!

Where do we go now?

Some open problems:

- Weak identification, in special in the IV context (see Scheidegger et al. (2025));
- Time series $\implies$ it's impossible to do cross-fitting (see Lewis and Syrgkanis (2021));
- Panel data $\implies$ usual estimators leverage linearity (see Chernozhukov et al. (2021) and Clarke and Polselli (2025));

Where do we go now?

Some open problems:

- Weak identification, in special in the IV context (see Scheidegger et al. (2025));
- Time series $\implies$ it's impossible to do cross-fitting (see Lewis and Syrgkanis (2021));
- Panel data $\implies$ usual estimators leverage linearity (see Chernozhukov et al. (2021) and Clarke and Polselli (2025));

Good news! Plenty of dissertation topics!

Questions?

Thank you!
See you tomorrow, stay tuned!


Appendix and References

References

Athey, Susan and Guido W. Imbens (Aug. 2019). "Machine Learning Methods That Economists Should Know About". en. In: *Annual Review of Economics* 11.1, pp. 685–725. ISSN: 1941-1383, 1941-1391. DOI: 10.1146/annurev-economics-080217-053433. URL: https://www.annualreviews.org/doi/10.1146/annurev-economics-080217-053433 (visited on 12/03/2025).

Belloni, A., V. Chernozhukov, and C. Hansen (Apr. 2014a). "Inference on Treatment Effects after Selection among High-Dimensional Controls". en. In: *The Review of Economic Studies* 81.2, pp. 608–650. ISSN: 0034-6527, 1467-937X. DOI: 10.1093/restud/rdt044. URL: https://academic.oup.com/restud/article-lookup/doi/10.1093/restud/rdt044 (visited on 12/03/2025).

Belloni, Alexandre, Victor Chernozhukov, Iván Fernandez-Val, and Christian Hansen (2017). "Program Evaluation and Causal Inference With High-Dimensional Data". en. In: *Econometrica* 85.1, pp. 233–298. ISSN: 0012-9682. DOI: 10.3982/ECTA12723. URL: https://www.econometricsociety.org/doi/10.3982/ECTA12723 (visited on 12/04/2025).

Belloni, Alexandre, Victor Chernozhukov, and Christian Hansen (May 2014b). "High-Dimensional Methods and Inference on Structural and Treatment Effects". en. In: *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 28.2, pp. 29–50. ISSN: 0895-3309. DOI: 10.1257/jep.28.2.29. URL: https://pubs.aeaweb.org/doi/10.1257/jep.28.2.29 (visited on 12/03/2025).

Chernozhukov, Victor, Denis Chetverikov, Mert Demirer, Esther Duflo, Christian Hansen, and Whitney Newey (May 2017). "Double/Debiased/Neyman Machine Learning of Treatment Effects". en. In: *American Economic Review* 107.5, pp. 261–265. ISSN: 0002-8282. DOI: 10.1257/aer.p20171038. URL: https://pubs.aeaweb.org/doi/10.1257/aer.p20171038 (visited on 12/02/2025).

Chernozhukov, Victor, Denis Chetverikov, Mert Demirer, Esther Duflo, Christian Hansen, Whitney Newey, and James Robins (Feb. 2018). "Double/debiased machine learning for treatment and structural parameters". en. In: *The Econometrics Journal* 21.1, pp. C1–C68. ISSN: 1368-4221, 1368-423X. DOI: 10.1111/ectj.12097. URL: https://academic.oup.com/ectj/article/21/1/C1/5056401 (visited on 12/03/2025).

Chernozhukov, Victor, Wolfgang Karl Härdle, Chen Huang, and Weining Wang (June 2021). "LASSO-driven inference in time and space". In: *The Annals of Statistics* 49.3. ISSN: 0090-5364. DOI: 10.1214/20-aos2019. URL: http://dx.doi.org/10.1214/20-AOS2019.

Clarke, Paul S and Annalivia Polselli (Apr. 2025). "Double machine learning for static panel models with fixed effects". In: *Econometrics Journal*. ISSN: 1368-423X. DOI: 10.1093/ectj/utaf011. URL: http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/ectj/utaf011.