

Estimating the causal effect

ITS & Synthetic control method

In this part

- More sophisticated methods for causal policy evaluation
- First: interrupted time series
- Last: Synthetic control
- Practical: synthetic control using tidysynth

Control Units



None

Some

Time-Points



Two

Pre-Post

Diff-in-Diff

Many

Interrupted
Time-Series
(ITS)

Synthetic
Control

	Two	Pre-Post	Diff-in-Diff
	Many	Interrupted Time-Series (ITS)	Synthetic Control

Interrupted Time Series (in brief)

Control Units



None

Some

Time-Points



Two

Pre-Post

Diff-in-Diff


Many

Interrupted
Time-Series
(ITS)

Synthetic
Control

	Two	Pre-Post	Diff-in-Diff
# Time-Points	Many	Interrupted Time-Series (ITS)	Synthetic Control

Panel data for California



Interrupted Time Series

Main idea: predicting the counterfactual

Using **time-forward** or **forecasting** model

- i.e., use **past** pre-intervention data to **impute** the missing counterfactual at each point in time

Interrupted Time Series

<i>Time</i>	Y_t	A_t	Y_t^0	Y_t^1
1	7	0	7	NA
2	9	0	9	NA
3	6	0	6	NA
4	5	0	5	NA
5	6	0	6	NA
<hr/>				
6	2	1	\widehat{Y}_6^0	2
7	3	1	\widehat{Y}_7^0	3
8	1	1	\widehat{Y}_8^0	1
...
T	2	1	\widehat{Y}_T^0	2

Train a forecasting model, e.g.
 $\widehat{Y}_t = \phi_1 Y_{t-1} + \phi_2 Y_{t-2} + \dots + \beta * Time$

Make forecasts

$$\widehat{CE}_t = Y_t^1 - \widehat{Y}_t^0$$

Building a forecasting model

Challenge: choosing an appropriate **forecasting** model

Can be very simple or very complex, e.g.:


- Forecast by fitting a **growth curve** which models the overall time trend


$$Y_t = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \text{Time} + e_t$$

- Forecast by using **time-series models** that model **autocorrelation**

$$Y_t = \phi_1 Y_{t-1} + e_t \quad Y_t = \phi_1 Y_{t-1} + \phi_2 Y_{t-2} + e_t \quad Y_t - Y_{t-1} = \gamma e_{t-1} + e_t$$

e.g., ARIMA models can account for autocorrelation and time trends





Key Assumptions

In contrast to pre-post, we model the trend

But: inferences about causal effect entirely dependent on ability to fit **an appropriate forecasting model**

- i.e., one that correctly captures the trend(s) and autocorrelation structures in the data

In practice, this may be **very difficult**

Synthetic control

„arguably the most important innovation in the policy evaluation literature in the last 15 years”

Athey, S., & Imbens, G. W. (2017). The state of applied econometrics: Causality and policy evaluation. Journal of Economic perspectives, 31(2), 3-32.

Basic idea

With diff-in-diff we used a control unit to attempt a correction for unmeasured time-varying confounders (e.g., macroeconomic situation in U.S.A.)


- You need a good control unit!
- How much is Utah like California?

We can instead use a weighted average of a **donor pool** of control units to create a **synthetic control** unit

- Choose the weights such that control is like California

<i>Time</i>	Y_t	A_t	Y_t^0	Y_t^1	C_{1t}	C_{2t}	...	C_{jt}
1	7	0	7	NA	2	9	...	6
2	9	0	9	NA	6	9	...	8
3	6	0	6	NA	4	3	...	5
4	5	0	5	NA	2	1	...	4
5	6	0	6	NA	1	2	...	7
6	2	1	NA	2	3	6	...	7
7	3	1	NA	3	2	5	...	6
8	1	1	NA	1	4	6	...	5
...	4
T	2	1	NA	2	3	4	...	6

Panel data for proposition 99



Synthetic control

Introduced in 2000s

- Abadie, A., & Gardeazabal, J. (2003). *The economic costs of conflict: A case study of the Basque Country*. *American Economic Review*, 93(1), 113-132.
- Abadie, A., Diamond, A., & Hainmueller, J. (2010). *Synthetic control methods for comparative case studies: Estimating the effect of California's tobacco control program*. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 105(490), 493-505.

An R package with JSS paper in 2011

- Abadie, A., Diamond, A., & Hainmueller, J. (2011). *Synth: An R package for synthetic control methods in comparative case studies*. *Journal of Statistical Software*, 42(13).

A great overview paper with recent learnings in 2021

- Abadie, A. (2021). *Using synthetic controls: Feasibility, data requirements, and methodological aspects*. *Journal of Economic Literature*, 59(2), 391-425.

Synthetic control

Causal **estimand** is the effect of the intervention at time t :

$$CE_t = Y_t^1 - Y_t^0$$

where $t > T_0$ (i.e., the post-intervention time period)

Synthetic control

$$CE_t = Y_t^1 - Y_t^0$$

- Again, Y_t^1 is observed
the post-intervention time series for the treated unit
- But Y_t^0 is an unobserved counterfactual
what would have happened had the treated unit been untreated?

Synthetic control

$$CE_t = Y_t^1 - Y_t^0$$

The problem of estimating the effect of a policy intervention is equivalent to the problem of estimating Y_t^0

Abadie, A. (2021). Using synthetic controls: Feasibility, data requirements, and methodological aspects. Journal of Economic Literature, 59(2), 391-425.

Synthetic control

We can estimate the counterfactual as follows:

$$Y_t^0 = \sum_{j=1}^J w_j C_{jt}$$

- C_{jt} is the time-series for donor pool unit j at time t
e.g., cigarette sales in Utah in 1989-2000
- w_j is a weight for this state
e.g., a single value like 0.334

Synthetic Control

<i>Time</i>	Y_t	A_t	Y_t^0	Y_t^1	C_{1t}^0	C_{2t}^0	...	C_{jt}^0
1	7	0	7	NA	2	9	...	6
2	9	0	9	NA	6	9	...	8
3	6	0	6	NA	4	3	...	5
4	5	0	5	NA	2	1	...	4
5	6	0	6	NA	1	2	...	7
6	2	1	NA	2	3	6	...	7
7	3	1	NA	3	2	5	...	6
8	1	1	NA	1	4	6	...	5
...	4
T	2	1	NA	2	3	4	...	6

Estimate Weights

$$Y_t = \sum_{j=1}^J \widehat{w}_j C_{jt} \quad t < T_0$$

Synthetic Control

Time	Y_t	A_t	Y_t^0	Y_t^1	C_{1t}^0	C_{2t}^0	...	C_{jt}^0
1	7	0	7	NA	2	9	...	6
2	9	0	9	NA	6	9	...	8
3	6	0	6	NA	4	3	...	5
4	5	0	5	NA	2	1	...	4
5	6	0	6	NA	1	2	...	7
6	2	1	\widehat{Y}_6^0	2	3	6	...	7
7	3	1	\widehat{Y}_7^0	3	2	5	...	6
8	1	1	\widehat{Y}_8^0	1	4	6	...	5
...	4
T	2	1	\widehat{Y}_T^0	2	3	4	...	6

Estimate Weights


$$Y_t = \sum_{j=1}^J \widehat{w}_j C_{jt} \quad t < T_0$$



$$\widehat{Y}_t^0 = \sum_{j=1}^J \widehat{w}_j C_{jt} \quad t > T_0$$

Impute counterfactual

$$\widehat{CE}_t = Y_t^1 - \widehat{Y}_t^0$$



Dashed line denotes the time of the intervention.

Three questions

- How to choose the weights?
- Which units can go in the donor pool?
- How to make sure that the synthetic control is interpretable?

Estimating weights

Estimating weights

- Choose weights such that the synthetic control **looks like** the treated unit
- Use only pre-intervention data for this
- Weights should be positive and sum to one
Interpolation constraint / convex hull

Estimating weights

What does it mean to looks like California? This is a choice by the researcher!

- Pre-intervention target variables
 - Cigarette sales
- Pre-intervention covariates
 - Population composition
 - Average income of population
 - Price of cigarettes
 - Beer consumption

Estimating weights

- Choose w to minimize v -weighed multivariate Euclidean distance between treated and synthetic control pre-intervention

$$\hat{w}_j = \min_{w_j} \|v \cdot (X_T - w^T X_D)\|$$

- Like (weighted) nearest neighbours matching!
- Variable weights v :
How important is each variable p ?

Choosing donor pool

No interference / spillover

The donor pool unit does not receive any intervention effect

Example spillover effects

- Californians living near the border may buy their cigarettes in states across the border
- Other states may pass laws similar to on California

Measurement

Measure control variables and target variable in the donor pool unit **before and after** the intervention



- Ideally, large pre-intervention time window
Otherwise, risk overfitting pre-intervention; bad prediction for counterfactual
- Be able to measure target variable after intervention
counterfactual is weighted average of this

Convex hull condition

Distribution of control and target variables in donor pool should cover treated unit

- It should be possible to interpolate the target unit values pre-intervention using the donor pool units
- If donor pool units all have much higher cigarette sales, it is impossible to represent cigarette sales in California using positive weights which sum to 1

Interpolation



Interpretability

Interpretability

- If donor pool is large, synthetic control can be combination of many units
- Hard to interpret what the synthetic control unit is!
- Therefore: sparse estimation of weights
- Additional penalty such that most weights are 0
- The units belonging to nonzero weights can be manually inspected

Synthetic control using tidysynth

Synthetic control in practice

```
1 library(tidyverse)
2 library(tidysynth)
3
4 # Read the dataset
5 prop99 ← read_rds("data/proposition99.rds")
6
7 # Create synthetic control object
8 prop99_syn ←
9   prop99 ▷
10   synthetic_control(
11     outcome = cigsale,
12     unit = state,
13     time = year,
14     i_unit = "California",
15     i_time = 1988
16   )
```



```
37 # Now, generate the aggregate predictors used to estimate
38 # the weights
39 prop99_syn ←
40   prop99_syn ▷
41   generate_predictor(
42     time_window = 1980:1988,
43     lnincome = mean(lnincome, na.rm = TRUE),
44     retprice = mean(retprice, na.rm = TRUE),
45     age15to24 = mean(age15to24, na.rm = TRUE)
46   ) ▷
47   generate_predictor(
48     time_window = 1984:1988,
49     beer = mean(beer, na.rm = TRUE)
50   ) ▷
51   generate_predictor(
52     time_window = 1975,
53     cigsale_1975 = cigsale
54   ) ▷
55   generate_predictor(
56     time_window = 1980,
57     cigsale_1980 = cigsale
58   ) ▷
59   generate_predictor(
60     time_window = 1988,
61     cigsale_1988 = cigsale
62   )
```

Inspecting predictors

```
> grab_predictors(prop99_syn)
# A tibble: 7 × 2
  variable      California
  <chr>         <dbl>
1 age15to24      0.174
2 lnincome      10.1
3 retprice      89.4
4 beer          24.3
5 cigsale_1975  127.
6 cigsale_1980  120.
7 cigsale_1988   90.1
```

```
> grab_predictors(prop99_syn, type = "controls")
# A tibble: 7 × 39
  variable      Alabama Arkan...1 Color...2 Conne...3 Delaw...4 Georgia
  <chr>         <dbl>    <dbl>    <dbl>    <dbl>    <dbl>    <dbl>
1 age15to24      0.175    0.165    0.174    0.164    0.178    0.177
2 lnincome       9.68     9.64     9.98    10.2     9.97     9.82
3 retprice      89.3     89.9     82.6    103.     90.1     84.4
4 beer          19.0     18.5     25.1    20.7     26.1     21.8
5 cigsale_1975  112.     115.     131     110.     148.     123.
6 cigsale_1980  123.     132.     131     118      150.     134
7 cigsale_1988  112.     122.     94.6    105.     137.     124.
# ... with 32 more variables: Idaho <dbl>, Illinois <dbl>,
#   Indiana <dbl>, Iowa <dbl>, Kansas <dbl>, Kentucky <dbl>,
#   Louisiana <dbl>, Maine <dbl>, Minnesota <dbl>,
#   Mississippi <dbl>, Missouri <dbl>, Montana <dbl>,
#   Nebraska <dbl>, Nevada <dbl>, `New Hampshire` <dbl>,
#   `New Mexico` <dbl>, `North Carolina` <dbl>,
#   `North Dakota` <dbl>, Ohio <dbl>, Oklahoma <dbl>, ...
# i Use `colnames()` to see all variable names
```


Estimating weights (magic!)

```
69 # Then, we can create our weights matrix
70 # this uses a quadratic programming routine (ipop) for optimization
71 prop99_syn ←
72   prop99_syn ▷
73   generate_weights(
74     optimization_window = 1970:1988, # pre-intervention period
75     margin_ipop = 0.2, sigf_ipo = 7, bound_ipop = 6
76   )
```

Inspecting weights

```
> grab_unit_weights(prop99_syn) ▸  
+   arrange(-weight)  
# A tibble: 38 × 2  
  unit      weight  
  <chr>      <dbl>  
1 Utah      0.273  
2 Montana   0.266  
3 Nevada    0.180  
4 North Dakota 0.115  
5 Colorado  0.0900  
6 Connecticut 0.0693  
7 Texas     0.00297  
8 Minnesota 0.00151  
9 New Mexico 0.000513  
10 Idaho     0.000277  
# ... with 28 more rows  
# i Use `print(n = ...)` to see more rows
```


```
> grab_predictor_weights(prop99_syn)  
# A tibble: 7 × 2  
  variable      weight  
  <chr>      <dbl>  
1 age15to24    0.0133  
2 lnincome     0.0000658  
3 retprice     0.0814  
4 beer         0.0953  
5 cigsale_1975 0.00414  
6 cigsale_1980 0.0310  
7 cigsale_1988 0.775
```



Creating synthetic control

```
> # Generate the synthetic control
> prop99_syn_control ← generate_control(prop99_syn)
> grab_synthetic_control(prop99_syn_control)
# A tibble: 31 × 3
  time_unit real_y synth_y
  <int>    <dbl>    <dbl>
1    1970    123    113.
2    1971    121    115.
3    1972    124.    120.
4    1973    124.    121.
5    1974    127.    123.
6    1975    127.    124.
7    1976    128    126.
8    1977    126.    124.
9    1978    126.    124.
10   1979    122.    121.
# ... with 21 more rows
# i Use `print(n = ...)` to see more rows
>
```


Time Series of the synthetic and observed cigsale



Dashed line denotes the time of the intervention.

Inference


Time Series of the synthetic and observed cigsale



Dashed line denotes the time of the intervention.

How to quantify uncertainty?

- One common method: **placebo permutation test**
- Apply synthetic control method to each *donor unit*
- These units have no intervention effect → Create reference/null distribution of Y_t^0
- Compare target unit's counterfactual to reference distribution → permutation p-value
- There are better ways to do inference (active area of research)



Pruned all placebo cases with a pre-period RMSPE exceeding two times the treated unit's pre-period RMSPE.

Choices, choices ...

There are many choices

- Which units in the donor pool?
- Which control variables?
- What should my weights optimize?
- How many nonzero unit weights should I get?
- What settings do I give to the nonlinear optimizer?

“researcher degrees of freedom”

There are many choices

- These choices influence your causal estimate \widehat{CE}_t
- Make good choices 😊
- Think of your causal estimate as “conditional” on the “model” (choices)
- Investigate the impact of different choices through robustness checks / sensitivity analysis

Leave-one-unit-out validation




Figure 4. Leave-one-out Estimates of the Effect of the 1990 German Reunification

More of this in the practical

Practical