

Combining Rollout Designs and Clustering for Causal Inference under Low-order Interference

Mayleen Cortez-Rodriguez¹, Matthew Eichhorn¹, and Christina Lee Yu²

²School of Operations Research and Information Engineering, Cornell University

¹Center for Applied Mathematics, Cornell University

May 9, 2024

Abstract

Estimating causal effects under interference is pertinent to many real-world settings. However, the true interference network may be unknown to the practitioner, precluding many existing techniques that leverage this information. A recent line of work with low-order potential outcomes models uses staggered rollout designs to obtain unbiased estimators that require no network information. However, their use of polynomial extrapolation can lead to prohibitively high variance. To address this, we propose a two-stage experimental design that restricts treatment rollout to a sub-population. We analyze the bias and variance of an interpolation-style estimator under this experimental design. Through numerical simulations, we explore the trade-off between the error attributable to the subsampling of our experimental design and the extrapolation of the estimator. Under low-order interactions models with degree greater than 1, the proposed design greatly reduces the error of the polynomial interpolation estimator, such that it outperforms baseline estimators, especially when the treatment probability is small.

1 Introduction

The stable unit treatment value assumption (SUTVA) is critical for many classic causal inference methods, but is violated in settings with interference, where the outcome of an individual can be affected by the treatment assignment of another. Interference poses an issue even in randomized experiments, often considered the “gold standard” for causal inference [1], by introducing bias into estimators, potentially leading to inaccurate conclusions about causal effects when ignored [2]. Many domains experience interference. For example, when evaluating the effect of a public health intervention such as a vaccine, it is generally understood that an individual is not affected only by their own uptake of the vaccine but also may be affected by the uptake (or lack thereof) of those they interact with regularly [3]. Online platforms also experience interference. For example, a social media company may want to evaluate the effect of a new feature on user engagement but must consider the fact that how a user engages with the platform is impacted by how their friends engage with the platform, whether they are directly exposed to the new feature or not [4, 5]. Because of its prevalence, interference has become a flourishing research area in causal inference.

In this work, we exploit both a rich two-stage randomized experimental design and a flexible potential outcomes model to estimate the *total treatment effect* (TTE), the difference in average outcomes of the population when everyone is treated versus untreated, even when the underlying network is unknown. The TTE estimand, sometimes called the *global average treatment effect*, is

a natural choice in applications where the decision-maker needs to decide between adopting the new intervention for everyone or sticking with the status quo, such as a tech company choosing a single user-feed content recommendation algorithm for their social media platform. The class of experimental designs we consider in this paper are called *staggered rollout designs*, sometimes called rollout/ramp-up designs or stepped wedge designs. In staggered rollout experiments, treatment is assigned over different time periods to increasing subsets of participants until it has been rolled out to all subjects designated for treatment. This style of experiment is common on online platforms [6] to mitigate the possible, unknown risks related to introducing a new feature, and in medicine [7], where for logistical, practical or financial reasons it may be impossible to deliver treatment to all participants at once.

1.1 Related work

Besides risk mitigation and meeting logistical constraints, recent works have shown that rollout designs can be useful for causal inference under interference. Han et al. [8] present statistical tests to detect the presence of interference using rollout designs. Our work differs from theirs in that our focus is estimating treatment effects under interference, not detecting its presence. Boyarsky et al. [9] leverage rollout designs as part of a model selection mechanism to select a “best” model for interference. While they also study the TTE, their focus is on its identification conditions and how rollout designs aid in satisfying them. Viviano [10] does not leverage rollout designs, instead considering a two-wave experiment that uses a pilot study in the first wave to minimize variance in causal effect estimation from a main experiment in the second wave. Unlike our two-stage approach, their two-wave design does not utilize clustering or a staggered rollout. Furthermore, they require *anonymous interference* [3, 11, 12], which posits that only the number, not identity, of treated units affects an individual’s outcome, whereas our approach does not require this assumption. The approach most similar to our work is [13], since they consider staggered rollout designs for estimating the TTE alongside the class of models and estimators we analyze in the present work. We present a modification to their experiment design that reduces the mean squared error (MSE) in many settings.

In addition to staggered rollouts, our work also incorporates clustering in the experiment design. Many prior approaches in the literature on causal inference under interference consider cluster randomized designs [2, 3, 11, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19]. These works focus on exploiting structural assumptions on the underlying interference network to reduce bias in the difference in means estimator or reduce variance in the Horvitz-Thompson estimator via cluster randomized designs. Some of these works rely on the assumption of *partial interference*, which posits that the underlying network is made up of disjoint groups and interference only occurs within, not across, groups [2, 3, 11, 14, 20]. Other works are devoted to proposing cluster randomized designs that exploit knowledge about the network and its structure to minimize the number of edges that cross clusters in settings where partial interference may not hold [15, 16, 17, 18, 19]. To the best of our knowledge, we are the first to consider cluster designs alongside staggered rollout designs. Furthermore, unlike previous approaches, our design uses covariate information about the individuals in the population of interest rather than the underlying network itself. Approaches that aim to minimize the number of cut edges crossing clusters naturally require information about the edges in the network. While our approach can utilize this information when it is available, we focus on settings where this type of “fine-grain” knowledge of the network may be unavailable.

Additional approaches to causal inference under interference focus on exploiting potential outcomes modeling assumptions in their methodology while considering simpler, unit-randomized designs

instead of, or in addition to, cluster-randomized designs [21, 22, 16, 23, 24]. These approaches assume linear or generalized linear potential outcomes models, reducing the estimation task to regression. A drawback of these approaches is that they assume anonymous interference and that the individuals in the population share the same outcomes model. To address this, Cortez et al. [13] introduced a flexible class of potential outcomes models that allow for heterogeneous treatment effects by swapping the anonymous interference assumption with the β -order interactions assumption, where interference effects are constrained to small subsets of the population, also explored in [25, 26]. In both our work and [13], the class of estimators under consideration are based on polynomial interpolation, where a key insight is that under a β -order potential outcomes model, the expected average outcome of the population is a β -degree polynomial in the treatment assignment probability. This style of estimator was first introduced by Yu et al. [27] for the case when the polynomial is degree 1. Cortez et al. [13] generalized this to polynomials of higher degree and established the connection to polynomial interpolation but did not use any clustering in their design. A drawback is that when the polynomial degree is greater than 1, the estimator has prohibitively high variance, especially when the treatment probability is small. The present work addresses this by utilizing clustering alongside staggered rollouts in a two-stage experimental design to reduce variance in polynomial interpolation estimators for the TTE. A key contribution of [27] and [13] is the unbiased estimation of causal effects *without any knowledge of the underlying interference network*, which the majority of prior approaches require. Our approach can incorporate available knowledge to further reduce error, but does not require it.

1.2 Contributions

To address the high variance of polynomial interpolation estimators under β -order interactions with $\beta > 1$, we propose a two-stage experiment design. The first stage utilizes a clustering of the interference network to select a subset of the population, and the second stage runs a staggered rollout on the selected subset. We derive the bias of the polynomial interpolation estimator for the TTE under this two-stage design and present bounds on its variance. We also derive exact expressions for the variance of the estimator in the $\beta = 1$ and $\beta = 2$ settings. When $\beta = 1$, we recommend a simple Bernoulli rollout with no clustering because the estimator is unbiased and already has low extrapolation variance. However, when $\beta > 1$, the extrapolation variance is severe enough that using the new, proposed design results in significant error reduction. We validate and interpret our findings via simulated experiments on both real and synthetic networks, showing a trade-off between bias and the two sources of variance that arise naturally from the design.

2 Preliminaries

We estimate the effect of a treatment on a population of n individuals, denoted $[n] := \{1, \dots, n\}$, via a randomized experiment. Their treatment assignments are collected in a binary vector $\mathbf{z} \in \{0, 1\}^n$, where $z_i = 1$ (resp. $z_i = 0$) indicates that unit i is assigned to treatment (resp. control). We allow for *interference*, so the potential outcome of individual i may be a function of the entire treatment vector $Y_i : \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. We frame our analysis around potential outcomes with the following two features.

First, individual i 's outcome is a function of a small subset of the population. We visualize this subset as i 's in-neighborhood \mathcal{N}_i in a directed interference graph, where an edge from j to i indicates that j 's treatment affects i 's outcome; we call j an *in-neighbor* of i . We assume the graph does not change over the timescale of the experiment.

Assumption 1 (Neighborhood Interference): If \mathbf{z}, \mathbf{z}' have $z_j = z'_j \forall j \in \mathcal{N}_i$, then $Y_i(\mathbf{z}) = Y_i(\mathbf{z}') \forall i$.

We use $d := \max_{i \in [n]} |\mathcal{N}_i|$ to denote the maximum in-degree of the network. Differing from most prior work with neighborhood interference, we assume that the underlying interference graph may be *unknown*. In some cases, we may have covariates that allow us to infer some network structure.

Second, following Cortez et al. [13], Cortez-Rodriguez et al. [25], we use the binary nature of the treatments $z_i \in \{0, 1\}$ to represent *any* potential outcomes under neighborhood interference as a polynomial in \mathbf{z} :

$$Y_i(\mathbf{z}) = \sum_{\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{N}_i} c_{i,\mathcal{S}} \prod_{j \in \mathcal{S}} z_j, \quad (2.1)$$

where the coefficients $c_{i,\mathcal{S}}$ represent the additive effect to individual i 's outcome if everyone in \mathcal{S} is treated. Our second assumption posits that each outcome is affected only by *small* treated subsets.

Assumption 2 (β -Order Interactions): $c_{i,\mathcal{S}} = 0$ for all $|\mathcal{S}| > \beta$.

In this case, $Y_i(\mathbf{z})$ is a polynomial with degree at most β . This is motivated by settings where an individual is separately affected by smaller sub-communities of their neighbors (e.g. colleagues, family members, close friends) rather than the neighborhood as a whole. The case $\beta = 1$ is the heterogeneous linear outcomes model explored in [27], which generalizes the linear models commonly used in applied settings. When $\beta = d$, we return to the unrestricted neighborhood interference setting. Like [13, 25], the current work exploits this structure when β is much smaller than d .

Our estimand of interest is the *total treatment effect* (TTE), the average difference in outcomes when everyone versus no one is treated. Using the notation $\mathcal{S}_i^\beta := \{\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{N}_i : |\mathcal{S}| \leq \beta\}$, the TTE is

$$\text{TTE} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (Y_i(\mathbf{1}) - Y_i(\mathbf{0})) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{\mathcal{S} \in \mathcal{S}_i^\beta \setminus \emptyset} c_{i,\mathcal{S}}. \quad (2.2)$$

2.1 Staggered rollout design with polynomial interpolation estimators

Without knowledge of the underlying interference network, we cannot differentiate between the baseline ($c_{i,\emptyset}$) and interference effects in a single outcome observation $Y_i(\mathbf{z})$. Nevertheless, following a method first introduced by Yu et al. [27] for the $\beta = 1$ setting and generalized for $\beta > 1$ by Cortez et al. [13], we estimate the TTE by leveraging a *staggered rollout* experimental design, where multiple observations are taken at varying treatment levels. Here we review the design and estimator presented in [13], but restricted to *even rollouts* where the treatment probability at time t is $\frac{tp}{\beta}$.

Definition 2.1 (Bern(β, p) Rollout Design). *Given a treatment budget p and model degree β , treatment assignments \mathbf{z}^t for $t \in \{0, \dots, \beta\}$ comprise a Bern(β, p) rollout design if:*

Per-Round Treatment Distributions: $z_i^t \stackrel{iid}{\sim} \text{Bern}(\frac{tp}{\beta})$ for all $i \in [n], t \in \{0, \dots, \beta\}$.

Treatment Monotonicity: $z_i^t \geq z_i^{t-1}$ for all $i \in [n], t \in [\beta]$.

The monotonicity imposes that the staggered rollout designs we consider will assign treatment to increasing subsets of the population over time. One can generate such a design by independently sampling $U_i \sim \text{Unif}(0, 1)$ for each $i \in [n]$ and setting each $z_i^t = \mathbb{I}(U_i \leq \frac{tp}{\beta})$.




Figure 1: Visualization of extrapolated polynomials used to estimate TTE across 200 runs of a rollout experiment on an SBM(200, 10, 0.25, 0.05) instance with $\beta = 2$. The left plot uses a Bernoulli rollout, as in [13], while the right plot uses a clustered 2-stage rollout. While the sampling error at the observation points $x = 0.1, 0.2$ is less in the Bernoulli experiment, the extrapolation error leads to a higher overall variance.

By the β -order interactions assumption, we observe that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n Y_i(\mathbf{z}^t) \right] = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{\mathcal{S} \in \mathcal{S}_i^\beta} c_{i,\mathcal{S}} \cdot \mathbb{E} \left[\prod_{j \in \mathcal{S}} z_j^t \right] = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{\mathcal{S} \in \mathcal{S}_i^\beta} c_{i,\mathcal{S}} \cdot \left(\frac{tp}{\beta} \right)^{|\mathcal{S}|} =: F\left(\frac{tp}{\beta}\right),$$

where F is a polynomial with degree at most β . In each round t , we observe a noisy measurement $\widehat{F}\left(\frac{tp}{\beta}\right) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n Y_i(\mathbf{z}^t)$ of $F\left(\frac{tp}{\beta}\right)$ and wish to estimate TTE = $F(1) - F(0)$. As presented in [13], viewing the estimation problem as a polynomial interpolation problem gives rise to the following unbiased estimator for the TTE:

$$\widehat{\text{TTE}}_{\text{PI}} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{t=0}^{\beta} \left(\ell_{t,\mathbf{p}}(1) - \ell_{t,\mathbf{p}}(0) \right) Y_i(\mathbf{z}^t), \quad \ell_{t,\mathbf{p}}(x) = \prod_{\substack{s=0 \\ s \neq t}}^{\beta} \frac{\beta x - ps}{pt - ps}. \quad (2.3)$$

While β is a parameter of the potential outcomes model, it also appears in the estimator due to its use of polynomial interpolation: fitting a β -degree polynomial requires $\beta + 1$ points.

3 Staggered rollout designs with clustering

Under bounded potential outcomes, [13] shows that (2.3) is an unbiased estimator with variance $O\left(\frac{d^2 \beta^{2\beta}}{np^{2\beta}}\right)$. In each time step, we incur sampling variance when we estimate $F(p_t)$ by the observed mean outcome $\widehat{F}(p_t)$. Then, the extrapolation of these observations to estimate $\widehat{F}(1)$ magnifies this variance by a factor of $(\beta/p)^{2\beta}$ (see Figure 1). To lessen the effects of extrapolation, we would like to sample points closer to 1; however, our treatment budget p precludes this. Instead, we introduce a two-stage design (visualized in Figure 2) that leverages a clustering of the interference network to amplify the treatment probability on a sub-population, reducing extrapolation error in many cases.

To motivate this design, suppose the network could be clustered into two fairly disconnected components. With a treatment budget of $p = 0.1$, we could treat 10 percent of individuals in each component. Alternatively, we could run the rollout experiment in only one cluster. This increases the effective treatment budget on this cluster to $q = 0.2$, which reduces the variance magnification from extrapolation by a factor of $2^{-2\beta}$.




Figure 3: The MSE (black) of the two-stage estimator for different values of q on SBM instances under β -order potential outcomes models with $\beta \in \{1, 2, 3\}$. The shading indicates three components: squared bias (blue), variance from sampling (orange), and variance from extrapolation (green).

Intuitively, we can think of the $\text{Var}[\mathbb{E}(\widehat{\text{TTE}}_{\text{PI}}|\mathcal{U})]$ term as first averaging the estimates over all possible treatment assignments, keeping the set of experimental units, \mathcal{U} , fixed. Taking the variance of this conditional expectation tells us how much the average estimate varies as we vary the particular sample of units \mathcal{U} i.e. sampling variance. Furthermore, we can think of the $\mathbb{E}[\text{Var}(\widehat{\text{TTE}}_{\text{PI}}|\mathcal{U})]$ term as first taking the variance with respect to \mathbf{z} for fixed \mathcal{U} , but this is exactly the variance under the one-stage rollout design. Since much of this variance can be attributed to extrapolation, taking the expectation over \mathcal{U} of the variance is intuitively looking at the average contribution to extrapolation variance.

When $q = p$ (corresponding to the left edge of each panel), we recover the setting from Section 2.1; every individual is included in \mathcal{U} and treatment is rolled out to a p -fraction of them. In this setting, the estimator is unbiased, and all of its variance is attributable to extrapolation. As q increases, the extrapolation variance decreases dramatically and vanishes when $q = 1$; in this setting, we select p fraction of the *clusters* (in expectation) and roll out treatment to all their individuals, directly giving us a sample of $F(1)$. On the other hand, the sampling variance increases with q . Intuitively, this is because the experimental units with neighbors outside \mathcal{U} cannot have fully treated neighborhoods, so there is zero probability of viewing fully treated subsets of their neighborhood when those subsets include units outside \mathcal{U} . Thus, the estimate is sensitive to the sampled \mathcal{U} . Finally, the estimator is biased when $\beta > 1$ and $q > p$. In Section 4, we present our main theoretical results, which further analyze this trade-off between extrapolation variance, sampling variance, and bias.

4 Theoretical results

In this section, we analyze the bias and variance of the two-stage TTE estimator given in (3.1). Both of these statistics depend on the properties of the chosen clustering of the causal network.

Theorem 4.1. *Under a β -order potential outcomes model and a $\text{Bern}(\beta, \Pi, p, q)$ Two-Stage Rollout Design, the polynomial interpolation estimator from (3.1) has bias*

$$\mathbb{E}[\widehat{\text{TTE}}_{\text{PI}}] - \text{TTE} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{\mathcal{S} \in \mathcal{S}_i^\beta \setminus \emptyset} c_{i,\mathcal{S}} \left[\left(\frac{p}{q}\right)^{|\Pi(\mathcal{S})|-1} - 1 \right]$$

This theorem tells us that the estimator will be unbiased whenever $p = q$ (i.e., for a $\text{Bern}(\beta, p)$ Rollout Design) or when $|\Pi(\mathcal{S})| = 1$ for all $\mathcal{S} \in \mathcal{S}_i^\beta \setminus \{\emptyset\}$ and all $i \in [n]$. This latter condition holds

when $\beta = 1$ or when the clustering Π of the network is perfect (that is, the graph contains no edges with endpoints from two distinct clusters). Theorem 4.2 provides insight for when the two-stage design reduces variance over the one-stage design. The term Y_{\max} is a bound on the potential outcomes.

Theorem 4.2. *For any β , under a $\text{Bern}(\beta, \Pi, p, q)$ Two-Stage Rollout Design, we may bound:*

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Extrapolation Variance:} \quad & \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{U}} \left[\text{Var}_{\mathbf{z}} \left(\widehat{\text{TTE}} \right) \right] \leq \frac{1}{q^{2(\beta-1)}} \cdot \frac{Y_{\max}^2 d^2 \beta^{2\beta} (\beta+1)^2}{np^2} \\ \text{Sampling Variance:} \quad & \text{Var}_{\mathcal{U}} \left(\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{z}} \left[\widehat{\text{TTE}} \right] \right) \leq q \cdot \max_{\pi \in \Pi} |\pi| \cdot \frac{Y_{\max}^2 d^2}{np}, \end{aligned}$$

In each of these bounds, the last fraction depends on the parameters of the network and the potential outcomes (n, Y_{\max}, d, β) as well as the treatment budget p , whereas the earlier factors depend on parameters of the two-stage experimental design (q and Π). These bounds align with our observations from Figure 3; namely, the extrapolation variance is a decreasing function and the sampling variance an increasing function of q . Importantly, we see that the extrapolation variance is constant with respect to q when $\beta=1$, while the sampling variance grows linearly in q . This agrees with the behavior we see in Figure 4. When $\beta \geq 2$, the extrapolation variance decreases significantly with q , reducing the total variance at the cost of incurring some sampling variance. This suggests that the estimator performs better under the two-stage design than the one-stage design when $\beta > 1$. Below, we will show that the scaling with q in these bounds is tight for $\beta \in \{1, 2\}$. Finally, the $1/n$ scaling in both bounds tells us that as the size of the network increases, the variance will tend to 0 as long as the potential outcomes remain bounded, and the network degree scales as $d = o(\sqrt{n})$.

4.1 Explicit variance formula when $\beta = 1$

Recall that our parameterization of the potential outcomes in 2.1 is in terms of the *incoming* effects to agent i , $c_{i,\mathcal{S}}$. However, it will often be useful in our calculations to flip perspectives and reason about the *outgoing* effects (or *influences*). To this end, for $\mathcal{S} \subseteq [n]$, let us define

$$L_{\mathcal{S}} := \sum_{i: \mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{N}_i} c_{i,\mathcal{S}}$$

When $\mathcal{S} = \{j\}$ for some $j \in [n]$, we write L_j to align with the definition of Yu et al. [27]. Following their convention, L_j is the influence of treating an individual j on their and their neighbors' outcomes. We interpret $L_{\mathcal{S}}$ as the contribution to the TTE of jointly treating all individuals in \mathcal{S} . The following theorem gives an exact expression for the variance when $\beta = 1$ in terms of these L_j effects.

Theorem 4.3. *Under a potential outcomes model with $\beta = 1$, the polynomial interpolation estimator under $\text{Bern}(\Pi, p, \mathbf{q})$ Two-Stage Rollout Design has variance*

$$\text{Var} \left[\widehat{\text{TTE}}_{\text{PI}} \right] = \frac{1}{n^2 p} \sum_{\pi \in \Pi} \left[(1-q) \sum_{j \in \pi} L_j^2 + (q-p) \left(\sum_{j \in \pi} L_j \right)^2 \right].$$

The sum of squares term corresponds to the extrapolation variance. As $q \rightarrow 0$, this term is $O(1)$. The square of sums term corresponds to the sampling variance and is $O(q)$ as $q \rightarrow 0$ when p is small and fixed. This suggests that when $\beta = 1$, the scaling in q in Theorem 4.2 is tight. To interpret the variance, we reason about the two extreme values $q = p$ and $q = 1$. When $q = p$, our two-stage

estimator reduces to a $\text{Bern}(\beta, p)$ rollout design, and the variance expression simplifies to

$$\frac{1-p}{n^2 p} \sum_{j \in [n]} L_j^2 = \frac{1-p}{np} \mathbb{E}_{j \in [n]} [L_j^2],$$

which corresponds to the variance expression derived in [27]. When $q = 1$, our two-stage experiment will roll out treatment to everyone in a chosen cluster. Here, the variance simplifies to

$$\frac{1-p}{n^2 p} \sum_{\pi \in \Pi} \left(\sum_{j \in \pi} L_j \right)^2$$

and the choice of clusters that minimizes the sum of squares in this expression is the one that best balances the sums of the L_j within each cluster. As q ranges between these two extremes, we see a trade-off. When q is closer to p and p is very small, $1 - q$ is close to 1 and $q - p$ is close to 0, penalizing us for any influence terms with large magnitudes. When q is closer to 1, we are instead penalized when the sums of influences within each cluster have large magnitudes. The following result gives us a practical recommendation for choosing q .

Corollary 4.4. *When $\beta = 1$ and the influence terms L_j have the same sign for all $j \in [n]$, then the variance of the two-stage estimator under a $\text{Bern}(\Pi, p, q)$ Two-Stage Rollout Design is minimized when $q = p$.*

In other words, this corollary tells us that we should not cluster the network to correlate the treatment assignments when $\beta = 1$; rather, we are better off using the polynomial interpolation estimator with a $\text{Bern}(\beta, p)$ Rollout design. Experiments in Section 5 give us intuition for Corollary 4.4. In particular, we see that for $\beta = 1$, the extrapolation variance is relatively small. Thus, incurring *any* sampling variance from the two-stage design is too costly. As is evident in the proof, the same-signs assumption is sufficient but not necessary for this optimality result.

4.2 Explicit variance formula when $\beta = 2$

The next result is an explicit expression for the variance in the quadratic setting, also decomposed to show the two different sources of variance. As we will see in Section 5, when $\beta = 2$, the extrapolation variance is very large when $q = p$ such that setting $q > p$ greatly reduces variance, even at the expense of incurring some sampling variance. This indicates that the two-stage design can outperform the staggered rollout for settings where the model is truly a polynomial with degree greater than 1. In Theorem 4.5, we provide an explicit expression for the variance of the estimator when $\beta = 2$ and reason about its interpretation.

Theorem 4.5. *When $\beta = 2$, we can split the variance of the polynomial interpolation estimator under a $\text{Bern}(\Pi, p, \mathbf{q})$ Two-Stage Rollout Design into the following two additive components:*

Sampling variance contribution, $\text{Var}[\mathbb{E}(\widehat{TTE}_{PI}|\mathcal{U})]$:

$$\frac{q-p}{n^2 p q^2} \sum_{\pi \in \Pi} \left[\left(q \sum_{\substack{S \subset \pi \\ 1 \leq |S| \leq \beta}} L_S + p \sum_{\substack{\pi' \in \Pi \\ \pi' \neq \pi}} \sum_{\substack{S = \{i, i'\} \\ i \in \pi, i' \in \pi'}} L_S \right)^2 + pq \sum_{\substack{\pi' \in \Pi \\ \pi' \neq \pi}} \left(\sum_{\substack{S = \{i, i'\} \\ i \in \pi, i' \in \pi'}} L_S \right)^2 \right] \quad (4.1)$$

Extrapolation variance contribution, $\mathbb{E}[\text{Var}(\widehat{TTE}_{PI}|\mathcal{U})]$:

$$\frac{(1-q)(2-q)}{n^2 p q^2} \sum_{j \in [n]} \left[\left(L_j + q \sum_{\substack{j' \in \pi(j) \\ j' \neq j}} L_{\{j, j'\}} + p \sum_{j'' \notin \pi(j)} L_{\{j, j''\}} \right)^2 - L_j^2 \right] \quad (4.2)$$

$$+ (2 - q) \left(L_j^2 + q \sum_{\substack{j' \in \pi(j) \\ j' \neq j}} L_{\{j, j'\}}^2 + p \sum_{j' \notin \pi(j)} L_{\{j, j'\}}^2 \right) + p(q - p) \sum_{\pi' \neq \pi(j)} \left(\sum_{j' \in \pi'} L_{\{j, j'\}} \right)^2 \Big] \quad (4.3)$$

Thinking about the behavior of the variance asymptotically as $q \rightarrow 0$ and when p is very small and fixed with respect to q , we can argue that the scaling in 4.2 is tight in q . The fraction before the sum in the sampling variance expression (4.1) is $O(q^{-1})$, the first term inside the brackets is $O(q^2)$ and the second term inside the brackets is $O(q)$, showing that the scaling is $O(q)$ overall. Meanwhile, the fraction before the sum in (4.2), the first part of the extrapolation variance expression, is $O(q^{-2})$. The remaining terms in expression (4.2) are $O(1)$. Meanwhile, the terms in expression (4.3) are $O(q)$. Thus, the expression is $O(q^{-2})$ overall.

5 Experiments

To better understand the performance of our two-stage estimator, we carry out a series of experiments on both synthetic and real-world networks.

Potential Outcomes Model We use the following synthetic potential outcomes that generalize the response model of Ugander and Yin [19] to incorporate β -order interactions; refer to Section 6.2 in their paper for an in-depth description of the design choices of this model. Unless otherwise noted, our choices for the parameter values in this agree with Ugander and Yin [19].

$$Y_i(\mathbf{z}) = Y_i(\mathbf{0}) \cdot \left(1 + \delta z_i + \sum_{k=1}^{\beta} \gamma_k \cdot \binom{d_i}{k}^{-1} \sum_{\substack{\mathcal{S} \in \mathcal{S}_i^\beta \\ |\mathcal{S}|=k}} \prod_{j \in \mathcal{S}} z_j \right), \quad Y_i(\mathbf{0}) = \left(a + b \cdot h_i + \varepsilon_i \right) \cdot \frac{d_i}{\bar{d}}$$

In this model:

- a is a baseline effect. We select $a = 1$.
- $\mathbf{h} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is a Fiedler vector of the graph Laplacian of the network which has undergone an affine transformation so that $\min(\mathbf{h}) = -1$ and $\max(\mathbf{h}) = 1$. This models network homophily effects.
- b controls the magnitude of the homophily effect. We select $b = 0.5$.
- $\varepsilon_i \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} N(0, \sigma)$ is a random perturbation of the baseline effect. We select $\sigma = 0.1$.
- d_i is the in-degree of vertex i . \bar{d} is the average in-degree.
- δ is uniform direct effect on treated individuals. We select $\delta = 0.5$.
- γ_k is the effect of treated subsets of size k . We select $\gamma_k = 0.5^{k-1}$, which models marginal effects that decay with the size of the treated set.

Networks The synthetic networks that we consider are stochastic block models parameterized by four values: $\text{SBM}(n, n_c, p_{\text{in}}, p_{\text{out}})$, where n is the number of individuals, n_c is the number of (identically sized) communities, p_{in} is the uniform probability of a directed edge between individuals in the same community, and p_{out} is the uniform probability of directed edge between individuals in different communities. We automatically include all self-loops in these networks.




Figure 4: Mean Squared Error of the Two-Stage TTE estimator for three clusterings of the AMAZON network, for a β -degree potential outcomes model with $\beta = 2$.

In addition, we consider three real-world networks: an email communication network [28], a social network [29], and an online marketplace [30]; details of these networks can be found in Appendix C. Each dataset includes a network and a set of feature labels F assigned to its vertices. In the experiments below, we sometimes use these features to compute a clustering of the network.

Clustering of Real-World Networks We’ll use the following three clustering methods in our experiments on real-world networks:

- Clustering with full graph knowledge: We cluster the true underlying graph using the METIS clustering library [31].
- Clustering with covariate knowledge (features): When each vertex is assigned to one feature, we use these assignments as the clustering. When vertices may have multiple features we form a feature graph: an undirected weighted graph, where the weight of edge (i, j) is the number of feature labels shared by i and j . We cluster this weighted graph using METIS clustering library [31].
- Clustering without network knowledge: We randomly partition the vertices into the designated number of evenly-sized clusters.

Running the Experiments The source code to run all of our experiments and produce all of the plots found within our manuscript is available in the supplementary materials. All of our experiments were run on a MacBook Pro with an M3 chip and 16GB of memory, and ran in under an hour parallelized across its 8 cores.

5.1 Effect of clustering in two-stage estimator

One benefit of the two-stage estimator introduced in Section 3 is that it does not require structural knowledge of the underlying interference network. However, this estimator utilizes a clustering of the individuals in the network. As we discussed in Section 4, the properties of this clustering impact the statistical performance of our estimator: cut edges contribute to bias while increasing q contributes to sampling variance. To understand this impact, we carried out a series of experiments to compare the performance of the two-stage estimator for various clusterings.

Figure 4 depicts the results of such an experiment run on a co-purchasing network of Amazon products. We consider the three clusterings of this graph as described above, each time partitioning the network into 500 parts. To generate these plots, we compute the experimental bias, sampling

variance, and total variance, averaging over 5000 replications. In the first plot, showing the MSE of the estimator when the clustering uses full network knowledge, the MSE is minimized at $q = 0.49$ with value 0.022. In the second plot, showing the MSE of the estimator when the clustering only uses covariate knowledge, the MSE is minimized at $q = 0.37$ with value 0.044. In the final plot, showing the MSE of the estimator under a random clustering, the MSE is minimized at $q = 0.33$ with value 0.051. Recall that the leftmost endpoint of each plot correspond to the error when $q = p$, i.e. under the one-stage Bernoulli rollout. Although the best performance overall is achieved with a clustering that uses full knowledge of the network, we still see a significant error reduction with the two-stage design compared with the one-stage design, even under a random clustering. Thus, we find that using the two-stage estimator can reduce MSE (versus a single-stage Bernoulli rollout) *even when the clustering is chosen arbitrarily with no knowledge of the underlying network.*

5.2 Comparison with other estimators

In the next series of experiments, we compare the performance of various TTE estimators on our real-world networks. Specifically, we compare against the following estimators:

- The Polynomial Interpolation (PI) estimator under a $\text{Bern}(\beta, p)$ rollout.
- Two difference-in-means (DM) style estimators. The classical DM estimator, and a thresholded DM estimator, $\text{DM}(\lambda)$ that only considers individual's for which a λ -proportion of their neighborhood shares their treatment assignment.
- The Hájek estimator, an inverse probability weighted-style estimator.

The exact formulas for all of these estimators can be found in Appendix D. Although the Horvitz-Thompson estimator is also considered a baseline, due to its high variance, it consistently performs worse than all the other estimators considered and we omit it for ease of presentation.

Of these estimators, only the (unthresholded) difference in means does not require knowledge of the underlying causal network. Only the Horvitz-Thompson estimator is unbiased. Figure 5 compares the performance of these estimators with the two-stage estimator. In Figures 5 and 6, the column faceting distinguishes between the cases of $\beta = 1$ and $\beta = 2$. While the difference in means estimators has low variance, their bias leads to higher mean squared error than the two-stage estimator. In the $\beta = 2$ case, we can see the significant variance reduction of clustering on the two-stage estimator, which comes at the expense of a relatively smaller introduction of bias. The performance of the 2-Stage and PI estimators is similar for most of the parameter landscape, but the variance reduction of the 2-Stage estimator when $\beta = 2$ and p is small results in it having smaller MSE, despite its bias. Plots of the MSE, as well as for the two other network datasets can be found in Appendix B.

6 Conclusion

While it is possible to get unbiased estimates of the total treatment effect without using any knowledge of the underlying interference network using polynomial interpolation and a Bernoulli staggered rollout design, the required polynomial extrapolation results in very high variance under a β -order potential outcomes model with $\beta > 1$. We propose a two-stage experiment design where in the first stage we employ a clustering of the interference network to select a subset of the population. In the second stage, we utilize a Bernoulli staggered rollout to assign treatment to those selected by the first stage. This greatly reduces the variance due to extrapolation when $\beta > 1$, but at the cost




Figure 5: Performance of different estimators on the AMAZON network for various values of p . The bold line indicates the mean over 10,000 replications. The shading indicates the experimental standard deviation, calculated by taking the square root of the experimental variance over all replications.

of incurring bias and sampling variance. Via numerical simulations on stochastic block models as well as three real-world network datasets, we explore the tradeoff between error due to extrapolation and error due to sampling. It is clear that when $\beta > 1$, the proposed design decreases the error of the polynomial interpolation estimator such that it outperforms baseline estimators. However, when $\beta = 1$, we recommend the simple Bernoulli rollout design since the proposed two-stage design increases the overall error of the estimator. Our theoretical results, including an explicit expression for the bias and a bound on the variance of the estimator, validate our empirical findings. We also empirically explore the impact of the clustering on the performance of the estimator. We find, somewhat surprisingly, that even utilizing a random clustering of the network (which uses no knowledge of its structure) in the proposed two-stage design greatly reduces the overall error of the polynomial interpolation estimator. This tells us that in settings where $\beta > 1$, the variance due to extrapolation is the dominating portion of the error, such that reducing it is critical to reducing the error overall.

A limiting aspect of our results is that we require correct specification of the potential outcomes model. Incorrect specification of the model could lead to drawing incorrect causal conclusions, which could have negative impacts in domains where a decision-maker relies on these results. This plagues many works, not just our own. A critical direction for future work is analyzing the effects of model misspecification. An important related direction is model selection, particularly designing or proposing methods for determining the model parameter β , as it is most likely unknown a priori, but required for correct model specification. Perhaps the most limiting assumption in our work is that the network and potential outcomes do not vary with time. Since this is not likely to hold in many settings, especially on online platforms, we are interested in exploring avenues for handling time-dependence in future work. Finally, due to the polynomial interpolation, we only use $\beta + 1$ points for a β -order model. Ongoing work includes analyzing the value of additional measurements.

Acknowledgements

We gratefully acknowledge financial support from the National Science Foundation grants CCF-1948256 and CNS-1955997, the National Science Foundation Graduate Research Fellowship grant

DGE-1650441, and AFOSR grant FA9550-23-1-0301.

References

- [1] Nancy Cartwright. Are rcts the gold standard? *BioSocieties*, 2(1):11–20, 2007.
- [2] Michael E Sobel. What do randomized studies of housing mobility demonstrate? causal inference in the face of interference. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 101(476):1398–1407, 2006.
- [3] Michael G Hudgens and M Elizabeth Halloran. Toward causal inference with interference. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 103(482):832–842, 2008.
- [4] Niloy Biswas and Edoardo M Airoldi. Estimating peer-influence effects under homophily: Randomized treatments and insights. In *Complex Networks IX: Proceedings of the 9th Conference on Complex Networks CompleNet 2018 9*, pages 323–347. Springer, 2018.
- [5] Sinan Aral and Dylan Walker. Identifying influential and susceptible members of social networks. *Science*, 337(6092):337–341, 2012.
- [6] Ya Xu, Weitao Duan, and Shaochen Huang. Sqr: Balancing speed, quality and risk in online experiments. In *Proceedings of the 24th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery & Data Mining*, pages 895–904, 2018.
- [7] Celia A Brown and Richard J Lilford. The stepped wedge trial design: a systematic review. *BMC medical research methodology*, 6(1):1–9, 2006.
- [8] Kevin Han, Shuangning Li, Jialiang Mao, and Han Wu. Detecting interference in a/b testing with increasing allocation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2211.03262*, 2022.
- [9] Ariel Boyarsky, Hongseok Namkoong, and Jean Pouget-Abadie. Modeling interference using experiment roll-out. In *Proceedings of the 24th ACM Conference on Economics and Computation, EC '23*, page 298, New York, NY, USA, 2023. Association for Computing Machinery. ISBN 9798400701047. doi: 10.1145/3580507.3597757. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/3580507.3597757>.
- [10] Davide Viviano. Experimental design under network interference. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2003.08421*, 2020.
- [11] Lan Liu and Michael G Hudgens. Large sample randomization inference of causal effects in the presence of interference. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 109(505):288–301, 2014.
- [12] Shuangning Li and Stefan Wager. Random graph asymptotics for treatment effect estimation under network interference. *The Annals of Statistics*, 50(4):2334–2358, 2022.
- [13] Mayleen Cortez, Matthew Eichhorn, and Christina Lee Yu. Staggered rollout designs enable causal inference under interference without network knowledge. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:7437–7449, 2022.
- [14] Eric Auerbach and Max Tabord-Meehan. The local approach to causal inference under network interference. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2105.03810*, 2021.

- [15] Johan Ugander, Brian Karrer, Lars Backstrom, and Jon Kleinberg. Graph cluster randomization: Network exposure to multiple universes. In *Proceedings of the 19th ACM SIGKDD international conference on Knowledge discovery and data mining*, pages 329–337, 2013.
- [16] Huan Gui, Ya Xu, Anmol Bhasin, and Jiawei Han. Network a/b testing: From sampling to estimation. In *Proceedings of the 24th International Conference on World Wide Web*, pages 399–409, 2015.
- [17] Dean Eckles, Brian Karrer, and Johan Ugander. Design and analysis of experiments in networks: Reducing bias from interference. *Journal of Causal Inference*, 5(1):20150021, 2017.
- [18] Jennifer Brennan, Vahab Mirrokni, and Jean Pouget-Abadie. Cluster randomized designs for one-sided bipartite experiments. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35: 37962–37974, 2022.
- [19] Johan Ugander and Hao Yin. Randomized graph cluster randomization. *Journal of Causal Inference*, 11(1):20220014, 2023.
- [20] Rohit Bhattacharya, Daniel Malinsky, and Ilya Shpitser. Causal inference under interference and network uncertainty. In *Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence*, pages 1028–1038. PMLR, 2020.
- [21] Jing Cai, Alain De Janvry, and Elisabeth Sadoulet. Social networks and the decision to insure. *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics*, 7(2):81–108, 2015.
- [22] Alex Chin. Regression adjustments for estimating the global treatment effect in experiments with interference. *Journal of Causal Inference*, 7(2):20180026, 2019.
- [23] Ben M Parker, Steven G Gilmour, and John Schormans. Optimal design of experiments on connected units with application to social networks. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series C: Applied Statistics*, 66(3):455–480, 2017.
- [24] Panos Toulis and Edward Kao. Estimation of causal peer influence effects. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 1489–1497. PMLR, 2013.
- [25] Mayleen Cortez-Rodriguez, Matthew Eichhorn, and Christina Lee Yu. Exploiting neighborhood interference with low-order interactions under unit randomized design. *Journal of Causal Inference*, 11(1):20220051, 2023.
- [26] Matthew Eichhorn, Samir Khan, Christina Lee Yu, and Johan Ugander. Low-order outcomes and clustered designs: combining design and analysis for causal inference under interference. 2024.
- [27] Christina Lee Yu, Edoardo M Airoldi, Christian Borgs, and Jennifer T Chayes. Estimating the total treatment effect in randomized experiments with unknown network structure. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 119(44):e2208975119, 2022.
- [28] Jure Leskovec, Jon Kleinberg, and Christos Faloutsos. Graph evolution: Densification and shrinking diameters. *ACM transactions on Knowledge Discovery from Data (TKDD)*, 1(1): 2–es, 2007.
- [29] Ryan A. Rossi and Nesreen K. Ahmed. The network data repository with interactive graph analytics and visualization. In *AAAI*, 2015. URL <https://networkrepository.com>.

- [30] Jure Leskovec, Lada A Adamic, and Bernardo A Huberman. The dynamics of viral marketing. *ACM Transactions on the Web (TWEB)*, 1(1):5–es, 2007.
- [31] George Karypis and Vipin Kumar. A fast and high quality multilevel scheme for partitioning irregular graphs. *SIAM Journal on scientific Computing*, 20(1):359–392, 1998.
- [32] Hao Yin, Austin R Benson, Jure Leskovec, and David F Gleich. Local higher-order graph clustering. In *Proceedings of the 23rd ACM SIGKDD international conference on knowledge discovery and data mining*, pages 555–564, 2017.
- [33] Jure Leskovec and Andrej Krevl. SNAP Datasets: Stanford large network dataset collection. <http://snap.stanford.edu/data>, June 2014.
- [34] Lei Tang and Huan Liu. Scalable learning of collective behavior based on sparse social dimensions. In *Proceedings of the 18th ACM conference on Information and knowledge management*, pages 1107–1116, 2009.
- [35] Lei Tang and Huan Liu. Relational learning via latent social dimensions. In *Proceedings of the 15th ACM SIGKDD international conference on Knowledge discovery and data mining*, pages 817–826, 2009.
- [36] Debabrata Basu. *An essay on the logical foundations of survey sampling, part one*. Springer, 2011.
- [37] Samir Khan and Johan Ugander. Adaptive normalization for ipw estimation. *Journal of Causal Inference*, 11(1):20220019, 2023.

A Proofs of Theoretical Results

Theorem 4.1

Proof. We'll use the Law of Total Expectation, conditioning on the set of individuals \mathcal{U} selected in the first stage and reasoning about the randomness from the treatment assignments \mathbf{z} . We have,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{z}} [\widehat{\text{TTE}}_{\text{PI}} | \mathcal{U}] &= \frac{q}{np} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{\mathcal{S} \in \mathcal{S}_i^\beta} c_{i,\mathcal{S}} \cdot \sum_{t=0}^{\beta} \left(\ell_{t,q}(1) - \ell_{t,q}(0) \right) \cdot \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{z}} \left[\prod_{j \in \mathcal{S}} z_j^t \right] \\
&= \frac{q}{np} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{\mathcal{S} \in \mathcal{S}_i^\beta} c_{i,\mathcal{S}} \cdot \mathbb{I}(\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{U}) \sum_{t=0}^{\beta} \left(\ell_{t,q}(1) - \ell_{t,q}(0) \right) \cdot \left(\frac{qt}{\beta} \right)^{|\mathcal{S}|} \\
&= \frac{q}{np} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{\mathcal{S} \in \mathcal{S}_i^\beta} c_{i,\mathcal{S}} \cdot \mathbb{I}(\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{U}) \left(1^{|\mathcal{S}|} - 0^{|\mathcal{S}|} \right) \\
&= \frac{q}{np} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{\mathcal{S} \in \mathcal{S}_i^\beta \setminus \emptyset} c_{i,\mathcal{S}} \cdot \mathbb{I}(\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{U}) \tag{A.1}
\end{aligned}$$

Here, the third line follows from the definition of the Lagrange basis polynomials, which ensures that

$$\sum_{t=0}^{\beta} \ell_{t,q}(a) f\left(\frac{qt}{\beta}\right) = f(a)$$

for all polynomials f with degree at most β ; in this case, $f(x) = x^{|\mathcal{S}|}$. Now, taking the expectation over the randomness in \mathcal{U} , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E} [\widehat{\text{TTE}}_{\text{PI}}] &= \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{U}} \left[\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{z}} [\widehat{\text{TTE}}_{\text{PI}} | \mathcal{U}] \right] \\
&= \frac{q}{np} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{\mathcal{S} \in \mathcal{S}_i^\beta \setminus \emptyset} c_{i,\mathcal{S}} \cdot \Pr_{\mathcal{U}} \left(\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{U} \right) \\
&= \frac{q}{np} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{\mathcal{S} \in \mathcal{S}_i^\beta \setminus \emptyset} c_{i,\mathcal{S}} \cdot \left(\frac{p}{q} \right)^{|\Pi(\mathcal{S})|}.
\end{aligned}$$

The bias expression in the theorem statement follows from the expression for TTE given in (2.2). \square

Theorem 4.2

We will use the following algebraic lemma.

Lemma A.1. *For all $q \in (0, 1]$, $\beta \geq 1$, and $t \in \{0, \dots, \beta\}$,*

$$|\ell_{t,q}(1) - \ell_{t,q}(0)| \leq \left(\frac{\beta}{q} \right)^\beta.$$

Proof. When $\beta = 1$, $|\ell_{0,q}(1) - \ell_{0,q}(0)| = |\ell_{1,q}(1) - \ell_{1,q}(0)| = \frac{1}{q}$, so the inequality holds. Thus, we can restrict our attention to $\beta \geq 2$, for which we consider in two cases. First, if $t \geq 1$, we have

$$|\ell_{t,q}(1) - \ell_{t,q}(0)| = \left| \prod_{\substack{s=0 \\ s \neq t}}^{\beta} \frac{\beta - qs}{qt - qs} \right| = \prod_{\substack{s=0 \\ s \neq t}}^{\beta} \frac{\beta - qs}{|qt - qs|} \leq \left(\frac{\beta}{q} \right)^\beta.$$

The first equality uses the definition of $\ell_{t,q}$, the second equality uses the fact that $qs < \beta$, and the inequality upper bounds the numerator of each factor with β and lower bounds the denominator of each factor by q . When $t = 0$, we apply the triangle inequality to conclude that

$$|\ell_{0,q}(1) - \ell_{0,q}(0)| = \left| \prod_{s=1}^{\beta} \frac{\beta - qs}{-qs} - 1 \right| \leq \prod_{s=1}^{\beta} \frac{\beta}{qs} + 1 = \frac{1}{\beta!} \left(\frac{\beta}{q} \right)^{\beta} + 1.$$

Since $\beta \geq 2$ and $q \leq 1$, we must have $1 \leq \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\beta}{q} \right)^{\beta}$. Thus we can upper-bound this last expression by

$$\frac{1}{\beta!} \left(\frac{\beta}{q} \right)^{\beta} + \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\beta}{q} \right)^{\beta} = \left(\frac{1}{\beta!} + \frac{1}{2} \right) \cdot \left(\frac{\beta}{q} \right)^{\beta} \leq \left(\frac{\beta}{q} \right)^{\beta}.$$

□

Proof of Theorem 4.2.

Extrapolation Variance:

By Bienaymé's Identity, the bilinearity of covariance, and the triangle inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Var} \left(\widehat{\text{TTE}}_{\text{PI}} \mid \mathcal{U} \right) &= \frac{q^2}{n^2 p^2} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{i'=1}^n \sum_{t=0}^{\beta} \sum_{t'=0}^{\beta} \left(\ell_t(1) - \ell_t(0) \right) \left(\ell_{t'}(1) - \ell_{t'}(0) \right) \cdot \text{Cov}_{\mathbf{z}^t | \mathcal{U}} \left[Y_i(\mathbf{z}^t), Y_{i'}(\mathbf{z}^{t'}) \right] \\ &\leq \frac{q^2}{n^2 p^2} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{i'=1}^n \sum_{t=0}^{\beta} \sum_{t'=0}^{\beta} \left| \ell_t(1) - \ell_t(0) \right| \cdot \left| \ell_{t'}(1) - \ell_{t'}(0) \right| \cdot \left| \text{Cov}_{\mathbf{z}^t | \mathcal{U}} \left[Y_i(\mathbf{z}^t), Y_{i'}(\mathbf{z}^{t'}) \right] \right|. \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma A.1 and another application of the bilinearity of covariance,

$$\leq \frac{1}{q^{2(\beta-1)}} \cdot \frac{\beta^{2\beta}}{n^2 p^2} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{i'=1}^n \sum_{t=0}^{\beta} \sum_{t'=0}^{\beta} \sum_{\mathcal{S} \in \mathcal{S}_i^{\beta}} \sum_{\mathcal{S}' \in \mathcal{S}'_{i'}^{\beta}} |c_{i,\mathcal{S}}| |c_{i',\mathcal{S}'}| \left| \text{Cov}_{\mathbf{z}^t | \mathcal{U}} \left[\prod_{j \in \mathcal{S}} z_j^t, \prod_{j' \in \mathcal{S}'} z_{j'}^{t'} \right] \right|.$$

Let $\mathcal{M}_i := \{i' : |\mathcal{N}_i \cap \mathcal{N}_{i'}| \geq 1\}$ denote the set of individuals who share an in-neighbor with i . Note that $|\mathcal{M}_i| \leq d^2$. In addition, for all $i' \notin \mathcal{M}_i$, all $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{N}_i$, and all $\mathcal{S}' \subseteq \mathcal{N}_{i'}$, we have $\mathcal{S} \cap \mathcal{S}' = \emptyset$. In this case, covariance term above is equal to 0. When $i' \in \mathcal{M}_i$, we can bound the covariance by 1 as it is the covariance between two indicator variables. Thus, we may continue our simplification

$$\begin{aligned} &\leq \frac{1}{q^{2(\beta-1)}} \cdot \frac{\beta^{2\beta}}{n^2 p^2} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{i' \in \mathcal{M}_i} \sum_{t=0}^{\beta} \sum_{t'=0}^{\beta} \sum_{\mathcal{S} \in \mathcal{S}_i^{\beta}} |c_{i,\mathcal{S}}| \sum_{\mathcal{S}' \in \mathcal{S}'_{i'}^{\beta}} |c_{i',\mathcal{S}'}| \\ &\leq \frac{1}{q^{2(\beta-1)}} \cdot \frac{\beta^{2\beta}}{n^2 p^2} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{i' \in \mathcal{M}_i} \sum_{t=0}^{\beta} \sum_{t'=0}^{\beta} Y_{\max}^2 \\ &\leq \frac{1}{q^{2(\beta-1)}} \cdot \frac{Y_{\max}^2 d^2 \beta^{2\beta} (\beta+1)^2}{np^2}, \end{aligned}$$

where $Y_{\max} := \max_{i \in [n]} \sum_{\mathcal{S}' \in \mathcal{S}'_i} |c_{i,\mathcal{S}'}|$. As the above expression does not depend on \mathcal{U} ,

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{z}} \left[\text{Var} \left(\widehat{\text{TTE}}_{\text{PI}} \mid \mathcal{U} \right) \right] \leq \frac{1}{q^{2(\beta-1)}} \cdot \frac{Y_{\max}^2 d^2 \beta^{2\beta} (\beta+1)^2}{np^2}.$$

Sampling Variance:

Let $\mathcal{M}_i^{\text{cl}} := \{i' : |\Pi(\mathcal{N}_i) \cap \Pi(\mathcal{N}_{i'})| \geq 1\}$. Notice that $|\mathcal{M}_i^{\text{cl}}| \leq d^2 \max_{\pi \in \Pi} |\pi|$ for all i . Applying Bienaymé's Identity to (A.1), we have,

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{Var}_{\mathcal{U}} \left[\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{z}} \left(\widehat{\text{TTE}}_{\text{PI}} \mid \mathcal{U} \right) \right] &= \frac{q^2}{n^2 p^2} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{i'=1}^n \sum_{\substack{\mathcal{S} \in \mathcal{S}_i^\beta \\ \mathcal{S} \neq \emptyset}} \sum_{\substack{\mathcal{S}' \in \mathcal{S}'^{\beta} \\ \mathcal{S}' \neq \emptyset}} c_{i,\mathcal{S}} \cdot c_{i',\mathcal{S}'} \cdot \text{Cov}_{\mathcal{U}} \left[\mathbb{I}(\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{U}), \mathbb{I}(\mathcal{S}' \subseteq \mathcal{U}) \right] \\
&= \frac{q^2}{n^2 p^2} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{i' \in \mathcal{M}_i^{\text{cl}}} \sum_{\substack{\mathcal{S} \in \mathcal{S}_i^\beta \\ \mathcal{S} \neq \emptyset}} \sum_{\substack{\mathcal{S}' \in \mathcal{S}'^{\beta} \\ \mathcal{S}' \neq \emptyset}} c_{i,\mathcal{S}} c_{i',\mathcal{S}'} \left[\left(\frac{p}{q} \right)^{|\Pi(\mathcal{S} \cup \mathcal{S}')|} - \left(\frac{p}{q} \right)^{|\Pi(\mathcal{S})| + |\Pi(\mathcal{S}')|} \right] \\
&\leq \frac{q^2}{n^2 p^2} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{i' \in \mathcal{M}_i^{\text{cl}}} \sum_{\substack{\mathcal{S} \in \mathcal{S}_i^\beta \\ \mathcal{S} \neq \emptyset}} |c_{i,\mathcal{S}}| \sum_{\substack{\mathcal{S}' \in \mathcal{S}'^{\beta} \\ \mathcal{S}' \neq \emptyset}} |c_{i',\mathcal{S}'}| \cdot \frac{p}{q} \\
&\leq q \cdot \max_{\pi} |\pi| \cdot \frac{Y_{\max}^2 d^2}{np}.
\end{aligned}$$

□

Proof of Theorem 4.3

Proof. When $\beta = 1$, the estimator simplifies to

$$\widehat{\text{TTE}} = \frac{1}{np} \sum_{i \in [n]} \left(Y_i(\mathbf{z}) - Y_i(\mathbf{0}) \right) = \frac{1}{np} \sum_{i \in [n]} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} c_{ij} z_j = \frac{1}{np} \sum_{j \in [n]} L_j z_j.$$

Notice that conditioned on the set \mathcal{U} of individuals selected in the first stage of our experiment, the treatment assignments z_j are independent. Thus,

$$\text{Var}_{\mathbf{z}} \left(\widehat{\text{TTE}}_{\text{PI}} \mid \mathcal{U} \right) = \frac{1}{n^2 p^2} \sum_{j \in [n]} L_j^2 \cdot \text{Var}_{\mathbf{z}} (z_j \mid \mathcal{U}) = \frac{q(1-q)}{n^2 p^2} \sum_{j \in [n]} L_j^2 \cdot \mathbb{I}(j \in \mathcal{U}),$$

so that

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{U}} \left[\text{Var}_{\mathbf{z}} \left(\widehat{\text{TTE}}_{\text{PI}} \mid \mathcal{U} \right) \right] = \frac{q(1-q)}{n^2 p^2} \sum_{j \in [n]} L_j^2 \cdot \Pr_{\mathcal{U}} (j \in \mathcal{U}) = \frac{1-q}{n^2 p} \sum_{j \in [n]} L_j^2.$$

In addition,

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{z}} \left[\widehat{\text{TTE}}_{\text{PI}} \mid \mathcal{U} \right] = \frac{1}{np} \sum_{j \in [n]} L_j \cdot \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{z}} [z_j \mid \mathcal{U}] = \frac{q}{np} \sum_{j \in [n]} L_j \cdot \mathbb{I}(j \in \mathcal{U}),$$

so that

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{Var}_{\mathcal{U}} \left(\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{z}} \left[\widehat{\text{TTE}}_{\text{PI}} \mid \mathcal{U} \right] \right) &= \frac{q^2}{n^2 p^2} \sum_{j \in [n]} \sum_{j' \in [n]} L_j L_{j'} \cdot \text{Cov}_{\mathcal{U}} \left(\mathbb{I}(j \in \mathcal{U}), \mathbb{I}(j' \in \mathcal{U}) \right) \\
&= \frac{q^2}{n^2 p^2} \sum_{j \in [n]} \sum_{j' \in [n]} L_j L_{j'} \cdot \left(\frac{p}{q} - \frac{p^2}{q^2} \right) \cdot \mathbb{I}(\pi(j) = \pi(j')) \\
&= \frac{q-p}{n^2 p} \sum_{j \in [n]} \sum_{j' \in \pi(j)} L_j L_{j'}
\end{aligned}$$

$$= \frac{q-p}{n^2 p} \sum_{\pi \in \Pi} \left(\sum_{j \in \pi} L_j \right)^2$$

By the Law of Total Variance, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Var}_{\mathbf{z}} \left(\widehat{\text{TTE}}_{\text{PI}} \right) &= \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{U}} \left[\text{Var}_{\mathbf{z}} \left(\widehat{\text{TTE}}_{\text{PI}} \mid \mathcal{U} \right) \right] + \text{Var}_{\mathcal{U}} \left(\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{z}} \left[\widehat{\text{TTE}}_{\text{PI}} \mid \mathcal{U} \right] \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{n^2 p} \sum_{\pi \in \Pi} \left[(1-q) \sum_{j \in \pi} L_j^2 + (q-p) \left(\sum_{j \in \pi} L_j \right)^2 \right]. \end{aligned}$$

□

Proof of Corollary 4.4

Proof. Differentiating the variance expression from Theorem 4.3, we obtain

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial q} \text{Var}_{\mathbf{z}} \left(\widehat{\text{TTE}}_{\text{PI}} \right) = \frac{1}{n^2 p} \sum_{\pi \in \Pi} \left[\left(\sum_{j \in \pi} L_j \right)^2 - \sum_{j \in \pi} L_j^2 \right]. = \frac{1}{n^2 p} \sum_{\pi \in \Pi} \sum_{j \in \pi} \sum_{\substack{j' \in \pi \\ j' \neq j}} L_j L_{j'}.$$

Our assumption that each L_j has the same sign ensures that this last expression is positive. Thus, the variance is increasing as a function of p on the interval $[p, 1]$, so it is smallest at $q = p$. □

Proof of Theorem 4.5

Proof. Given, $\beta = 2$ and $q \in [p, 1]$, let us start by deriving an expression for the two-stage estimator. Letting

$$h_t := \ell_{t,q}(1) - \ell_{t,q}(0) = \prod_{\substack{s=0 \\ s \neq t}} \frac{2-qs}{qt-qs} - \prod_{\substack{s=0 \\ s \neq t}} \frac{-qs}{qt-qs},$$

we calculate

$$h_0 = \frac{(2-q)(2-2q) - (-q)(-2q)}{(-q)(-2q)} = \frac{2-3q}{q^2}, \quad h_1 = \frac{2(2-2q)}{q(-q)} = \frac{4q-4}{q^2}, \quad h_2 = \frac{2(2-q)}{-q(-2q)} = \frac{2-q}{q^2}.$$

Thus, we have the estimator

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\text{TTE}}_{\text{PI}} &:= \frac{q}{np} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{t=0}^2 h_t \cdot Y_i(\mathbf{z}^{(t)}) \\ &= \frac{q}{np} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\frac{4q-4}{q^2} \sum_{\substack{\mathcal{S} \in \mathcal{S}_i^2 \\ \mathcal{S} \neq \emptyset}} c_{i,\mathcal{S}} \prod_{j \in \mathcal{S}} z_j^{(1)} + \frac{2-q}{q^2} \sum_{\substack{\mathcal{S} \in \mathcal{S}_i^2 \\ \mathcal{S} \neq \emptyset}} c_{i,\mathcal{S}} \prod_{j \in \mathcal{S}} z_j^{(2)} \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{npq} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{\substack{\mathcal{S} \in \mathcal{S}_i^2 \\ \mathcal{S} \neq \emptyset}} c_{i,\mathcal{S}} \left((4q-4) \prod_{j \in \mathcal{S}} z_j^{(1)} + (2-q) \prod_{j \in \mathcal{S}} z_j^{(2)} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Sampling Variance:

From (A.1), we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{z}}(\widehat{\text{TTE}}_{\text{PI}} | \mathcal{U}) &= \frac{q}{np} \sum_{i=1}^q \sum_{\substack{\mathcal{S} \in \mathcal{S}_i^2 \\ \mathcal{S} \neq \emptyset}} c_{i,\mathcal{S}} \cdot \mathbb{I}(\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{U}) \\ &= \frac{q}{np} \sum_{\substack{\mathcal{S} \subseteq [n] \\ 0 < |\mathcal{S}| \leq 2}} \mathbb{I}(\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{U}) \cdot L_{\mathcal{S}},\end{aligned}$$

where the first equality is from the proof of Theorem 4.1 and the second equality comes from defining $L_{\mathcal{S}} := \sum_{i: \mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{N}_i} c_{i,\mathcal{S}}$. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned}\text{Var}_{\mathcal{U}} \left(\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{z}}[\widehat{\text{TTE}}_{\text{PI}} | \mathcal{U}] \right) &= \frac{q^2}{n^2 p^2} \sum_{\substack{\mathcal{S} \subseteq [n] \\ 0 < |\mathcal{S}| \leq 2}} \sum_{\substack{\mathcal{S}' \subseteq [n] \\ 0 < |\mathcal{S}'| \leq 2}} L_{\mathcal{S}} L_{\mathcal{S}'} \text{Cov} \left[\mathbb{I}(\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{U}), \mathbb{I}(\mathcal{S}' \subseteq \mathcal{U}) \right] \\ &= \frac{q^2}{n^2 p^2} \sum_{\substack{\mathcal{S} \subseteq [n] \\ 0 < |\mathcal{S}| \leq 2}} \sum_{\substack{\mathcal{S}' \subseteq [n] \\ 0 < |\mathcal{S}'| \leq 2}} L_{\mathcal{S}} L_{\mathcal{S}'} \underbrace{\left[\binom{q}{q}^{|\Pi(\mathcal{S} \cup \mathcal{S}')|} - \binom{q}{q}^{|\Pi(\mathcal{S})| + |\Pi(\mathcal{S}')|} \right]}_{(\star)}\end{aligned}\quad (\text{A.2})$$

We can reason about the value of (\star) by separating the pairs of subsets $\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{S}'$ into different cases. Note that when $\Pi(\mathcal{S}) \cap \Pi(\mathcal{S}') = \emptyset$, this expression simplifies to 0. Hence, we need only to consider cases with some $\pi \in \Pi(\mathcal{S}) \cap \Pi(\mathcal{S}')$.

Case	$\Pi(\mathcal{S})$	$\Pi(\mathcal{S}')$	(\star)
(A)	$\{\pi\}$	$\{\pi\}$	$\frac{p(q-p)}{q^2}$
(B)	$\{\pi\}$	$\{\pi, \pi'\}$	$\frac{p^2(q-p)}{q^3}$
(B')	$\{\pi, \pi'\}$	$\{\pi\}$	$\frac{p^2(q-p)}{q^3}$
(C)	$\{\pi, \pi'\}$	$\{\pi, \pi'\}$	$\frac{p^2(q-p)(q+p)}{q^4}$
(D)	$\{\pi, \pi'\}$	$\{\pi, \pi''\}$	$\frac{p^3(q-p)}{q^4}$

Pulling out a factor of $\frac{p(q-p)}{q^4}$ from these expressions, we can continue our simplification:

$$\begin{aligned}(\text{A.2}) &= \frac{q-p}{n^2 p q^2} \sum_{\pi \in \Pi} \left[\underbrace{q^2 \cdot L_{\pi}^2}_{(A)} + \underbrace{2pq \cdot L_{\pi} \sum_{\substack{\pi' \in \Pi \\ \pi' \neq \pi}} L_{\{\pi, \pi'\}}}_{(B)+(B')} + \underbrace{p(q+p) \sum_{\substack{\pi' \in \Pi \\ \pi' \neq \pi}} L_{\{\pi, \pi'\}}^2}_{(C)} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \underbrace{p^2 \sum_{\substack{\pi' \in \Pi \\ \pi' \neq \pi}} \sum_{\substack{\pi'' \in \Pi \\ \pi'' \notin \{\pi, \pi'\}}} L_{\{\pi, \pi'\}} L_{\{\pi, \pi''\}}}_{(D)} \right] \\ &= \frac{q-p}{n^2 p q^2} \sum_{\pi \in \Pi} \left[\left(qL_{\pi} + p \sum_{\substack{\pi' \in \Pi \\ \pi' \neq \pi}} L_{\{\pi, \pi'\}} \right)^2 + pq \sum_{\substack{\pi' \in \Pi \\ \pi' \neq \pi}} L_{\{\pi, \pi'\}}^2 \right]\end{aligned}$$

Extrapolation Variance:

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{Var}_{\mathbf{z}}(\widehat{\text{TTE}}_{\text{PI}} | \mathcal{U}) &= \frac{1}{n^2 p^2 q^2} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{i'=1}^n \sum_{\substack{\mathcal{S} \in \mathcal{S}_i^2 \\ \mathcal{S} \neq \emptyset}} \sum_{\substack{\mathcal{S}' \in \mathcal{S}_{i'}^2 \\ \mathcal{S}' \neq \emptyset}} c_{i,\mathcal{S}} c_{i',\mathcal{S}'} \cdot \left[(4q-4)^2 \text{Cov}_{\mathbf{z}|\mathcal{U}} \left(\prod_{j \in \mathcal{S}} z_j^{(1)}, \prod_{j \in \mathcal{S}'} z_j^{(1)} \right) \right. \\
&\quad \left. + 2(4q-4)(2-q) \text{Cov}_{\mathbf{z}|\mathcal{U}} \left(\prod_{j \in \mathcal{S}} z_j^{(1)}, \prod_{j \in \mathcal{S}'} z_j^{(2)} \right) + (2-q)^2 \text{Cov}_{\mathbf{z}|\mathcal{U}} \left(\prod_{j \in \mathcal{S}} z_j^{(2)}, \prod_{j \in \mathcal{S}'} z_j^{(2)} \right) \right] \\
&= \frac{1}{n^2 p^2 q^2} \sum_{\substack{\mathcal{S} \subseteq [n] \\ 1 \leq |\mathcal{S}| \leq 2}} \sum_{\substack{\mathcal{S}' \subseteq [n] \\ 1 \leq |\mathcal{S}'| \leq 2}} L_{\mathcal{S}} L_{\mathcal{S}'} \cdot \mathbb{I}(\mathcal{S} \cup \mathcal{S}' \subseteq \mathcal{U}) \cdot \left[(4q-4)^2 \left(\frac{q}{2}\right)^{|\mathcal{S}|} \left(\left(\frac{q}{2}\right)^{|\mathcal{S}' \setminus \mathcal{S}|} + \left(\frac{q}{2}\right)^{|\mathcal{S}'|} \right) \right. \\
&\quad \left. + 2(4q-4)(2-q) \left(\frac{q}{2}\right)^{|\mathcal{S}|} \left(q^{|\mathcal{S}' \setminus \mathcal{S}|} - q^{|\mathcal{S}'|} \right) + (2-q)^2 q^{|\mathcal{S}|} \left(q^{|\mathcal{S}' \setminus \mathcal{S}|} - q^{|\mathcal{S}'|} \right) \right] \\
&\hspace{15em} \text{(A.3)}
\end{aligned}$$

We can again reason about this last bracketed expression by splitting into cases.

Case	$ \mathcal{S} $	$ \mathcal{S}' $	$ \mathcal{S}' \setminus \mathcal{S} $	Bracketed Expression in (A.3)
(a)	1	1	0	$q(1-q)(2-q)^2$
(b)	1	2	1	$q^3(1-q)(2-q)$
(b')	2	1	0	$q^2(1-q)(2-q)^2$
(c)	2	2	0	$2q^2(1-q)(2-q)$
(d)	2	2	1	$q^3(1-q)(2-q)$

Pulling out a factor of $q(1-q)(2-q)$ from these expressions, we can continue our simplification:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\text{Var}_{\mathbf{z}}(\widehat{\text{TTE}}_{\text{PI}} | \mathcal{U}) \\
&= \frac{(1-q)(2-q)}{n^2 p^2 q} \left[\underbrace{(2-q) \sum_{j \in [n]} L_j^2 \cdot \mathbb{I}(j \in \mathcal{U})}_{(a)} + \underbrace{2q \sum_{j \in [n]} \sum_{\substack{j' \in [n] \\ j' \neq j}} L_j L_{\{j,j'\}} \cdot \mathbb{I}(j, j' \in \mathcal{U})}_{(b)+(b')} \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \underbrace{2q \sum_{j \in [n]} \sum_{\substack{j' \in [n] \\ j' \neq j}} L_{\{j,j'\}}^2 \cdot \mathbb{I}(j, j' \in \mathcal{U})}_{(c)} + \underbrace{q^2 \sum_{j \in [n]} \sum_{\substack{j' \in [n] \\ j' \neq j}} \sum_{\substack{j'' \in [n] \\ j'' \neq j}} L_{\{j,j'\}} L_{\{j,j''\}} \cdot \mathbb{I}(j, j', j'' \in \mathcal{U})}_{(d)} \right]
\end{aligned}$$

To take the expected value, we need the probabilities $\mathbb{P}(j \in \mathcal{U})$, $\mathbb{P}(j, j' \in \mathcal{U})$, $\mathbb{P}(j, j', j'' \in \mathcal{U})$. For the probabilities involving multiple individuals, we must consider cluster memberships. For example, if $\pi(j) = \pi(j')$ then $\mathbb{P}(j, j' \in \mathcal{U}) = \frac{p}{q}$ but if $\pi(j) \neq \pi(j')$, then $\mathbb{P}(j, j' \in \mathcal{U}) = \frac{p^2}{q^2}$. We have,

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{U}} \left[\text{Var}_{\mathbf{z}}(\widehat{\text{TTE}}_{\text{PI}} | \mathcal{U}) \right]$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \frac{(1-q)(2-q)}{n^2 p^2 q} \sum_{j \in [n]} \left[(2-q)L_j^2 \cdot \frac{p}{q} + 2q \sum_{\substack{j' \in \pi(j) \\ j' \neq j}} L_j L_{\{j,j'\}} \cdot \frac{p}{q} + 2q \sum_{j' \notin \pi(j)} L_j L_{\{j,j'\}} \cdot \frac{p^2}{q^2} \right. \\
&+ 2q \sum_{\substack{j' \in \pi(j) \\ j' \neq j}} L_{\{j,j'\}}^2 \cdot \frac{p}{q} + 2q \sum_{j' \notin \pi(j)} L_{\{j,j'\}}^2 \cdot \frac{p^2}{q^2} + q^2 \sum_{\substack{j' \in \pi(j) \\ j' \neq j}} \sum_{\substack{j'' \in \pi(j) \\ j'' \notin \{j,j'\}}} L_{\{j,j'\}} L_{\{j,j''\}} \cdot \frac{p}{q} \\
&+ 2q^2 \sum_{\substack{j' \in \pi(j) \\ j' \neq j}} \sum_{j'' \notin \pi(j)} L_{\{j,j'\}} L_{\{j,j''\}} \cdot \frac{p^2}{q^2} + q^2 \sum_{j' \notin \pi(j)} \sum_{\substack{j'' \in \pi(j') \\ j'' \neq j'}} L_{\{j,j'\}} L_{\{j,j''\}} \cdot \frac{p^2}{q^2} \\
&+ \left. q^2 \sum_{j' \notin \pi(j)} \sum_{\substack{j'' \notin \pi(j') \\ j'' \notin \pi(j)}} L_{\{j,j'\}} L_{\{j,j''\}} \cdot \frac{p^3}{q^3} \right] \\
&= \frac{(1-q)(2-q)}{n^2 p q^2} \sum_{j \in [n]} \left[(2-q)L_j^2 + 2q \sum_{\substack{j' \in \pi(j) \\ j' \neq j}} L_j L_{\{j,j'\}} + 2p \sum_{j' \notin \pi(j)} L_j L_{\{j,j'\}} + 2q \sum_{\substack{j' \in \pi(j) \\ j' \neq j}} L_{\{j,j'\}}^2 \right. \\
&+ 2p \sum_{j' \notin \pi(j)} L_{\{j,j'\}}^2 + q^2 \sum_{\substack{j' \in \pi(j) \\ j' \neq j}} \sum_{\substack{j'' \in \pi(j) \\ j'' \notin \{j,j'\}}} L_{\{j,j'\}} L_{\{j,j''\}} + 2pq \sum_{\substack{j' \in \pi(j) \\ j' \neq j}} \sum_{j'' \notin \pi(j)} L_{\{j,j'\}} L_{\{j,j''\}} \\
&+ \left. pq \sum_{\substack{j' \notin \pi(j) \\ j' \neq j}} \sum_{\substack{j'' \in \pi(j') \\ j'' \neq j'}} L_{\{j,j'\}} L_{\{j,j''\}} + p^2 \sum_{j' \notin \pi(j)} \sum_{\substack{j'' \notin \pi(j') \\ j'' \notin \pi(j)}} L_{\{j,j'\}} L_{\{j,j''\}} \right]
\end{aligned}$$

Now, using the identity $\sum_i \sum_{i' \neq i} x_i x_{i'} = (\sum_i x_i)^2 - \sum_i x_i^2$, we rewrite these highlighted terms:

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \frac{(1-q)(2-q)}{n^2 p q^2} \sum_{j \in [n]} \left[\underbrace{(2-q)L_j^2}_{\text{red}} + 2q \underbrace{\sum_{\substack{j' \in \pi(j) \\ j' \neq j}} L_j L_{\{j,j'\}}}_{\text{blue}} + 2p \underbrace{\sum_{j' \notin \pi(j)} L_j L_{\{j,j'\}}}_{\text{blue}} + 2q \underbrace{\sum_{\substack{j' \in \pi(j) \\ j' \neq j}} L_{\{j,j'\}}^2}_{\text{blue}} \right. \\
&+ \underbrace{2p \sum_{j' \notin \pi(j)} L_{\{j,j'\}}^2}_{\text{blue}} + \underbrace{q^2 \left(\sum_{\substack{j' \in \pi(j) \\ j' \neq j}} L_{\{j,j'\}} \right)^2}_{\text{blue}} - \underbrace{q^2 \sum_{\substack{j' \in \pi(j) \\ j' \neq j}} L_{\{j,j'\}}^2}_{\text{blue}} + \underbrace{2pq \sum_{\substack{j' \in \pi(j) \\ j' \neq j}} \sum_{j'' \notin \pi(j)} L_{\{j,j'\}} L_{\{j,j''\}}}_{\text{blue}} \\
&+ \underbrace{pq \sum_{\pi' \notin \pi(j)} \left(\sum_{j' \in \pi'} L_{\{j,j'\}} \right)^2}_{\text{red}} - \underbrace{pq \sum_{j' \notin \pi(j)} L_{\{j,j'\}}^2}_{\text{red}} \\
&+ \left. \underbrace{p^2 \left(\sum_{j' \notin \pi(j)} L_{\{j,j'\}} \right)^2}_{\text{green}} - \underbrace{p^2 \sum_{\pi' \neq \pi(j)} \left(\sum_{j' \in \pi'} L_{\{j,j'\}} \right)^2}_{\text{green}} \right]
\end{aligned}$$

Finally, we factor this expression by grouping the underlined terms to obtain our desired expression:

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \frac{(1-q)(2-q)}{n^2 p q^2} \sum_{j \in [n]} \left[\underbrace{\left(L_j + q \sum_{\substack{j' \in \pi(j) \\ j' \neq j}} L_{\{j,j'\}} + p \sum_{j'' \notin \pi(j)} L_{\{j,j''\}} \right)^2}_{\text{blue}} - L_j^2 \right. \\
&+ \left. \underbrace{(2-q) \left(L_j^2 + q \sum_{\substack{j' \in \pi(j) \\ j' \neq j}} L_{\{j,j'\}}^2 + p \sum_{j'' \notin \pi(j)} L_{\{j,j''\}}^2 \right)}_{\text{blue}} + p(q-p) \sum_{\pi' \neq \pi(j)} \left(\sum_{j' \in \pi'} L_{\{j,j'\}} \right)^2 \right]
\end{aligned}$$

B Additional Experimental Results




Figure 6: MSE for AMAZON network.

In Figure 6, we compare the MSE of different estimators under β -order potential outcomes models with $\beta = 1$ (left panel) and $\beta = 2$ (right panel) for the AMAZON network from the same experiment described in Section 5.2. We compare the 2-stage polynomial interpolation (PI) estimator against the Bernoulli PI estimator from Equation (2.3), two difference in means-style estimators, and the Hájek estimator. The latter estimators are explicitly defined in Section D. On the x -axis we vary the treatment budget p . In all cases, both polynomial interpolation estimators (2-stage and PI) outperform the baseline estimators. When $\beta = 1$, PI outperforms the two-stage estimator for small values of p but they perform about the same for larger values of p . When $\beta = 2$, the two-stage estimator outperforms PI for values of $p < 0.25$ and then performs about the same for the higher values of p . This reinforces the results from Figure 5 in Section 5, that the two-stage estimator is recommended in settings where $\beta > 1$.

We ran the same experiments for both the EMAIL and BLOGCATALOG networks. These networks are described in further detail in Section C. In Figures 9 and 10, the left panel represents the performance of each estimator under a 1-order potential outcomes model for the EMAIL network while the right panel represents their performance under a 2-order model. As before, both polynomial interpolation-style estimators (2-Stage and PI) have lower MSE than difference in means and Hájek, but the PI estimator slightly outperforms 2-Stage. Under a 2-order potential outcomes model (right panel), we see that the two-stage estimator has the lowest MSE and for $p < 0.15$, the polynomial interpolation estimator under the one-stage design (PI) has the worst MSE.




Figure 7: Performance of different estimators on the EMAIL network for various values of p . The bold line indicates the mean over 10,000 replications. The shading indicates the experimental standard deviation, calculated by taking the square root of the experimental variance over all replications.




Figure 8: MSE of different estimators on the EMAIL network for various values of p , averaged over 10,000 replications.

In Figures 9 and 10, the left panel represents the performance of each estimator under a 1-order potential outcomes model for the BLOGCATALOG network while the right panel represents their performance under a 2-order model. As before, both polynomial interpolation-style estimators (2-Stage and PI) have lower MSE than difference in means and Hájek, but the PI estimator slightly outperforms 2-Stage. Under a 2-order potential outcomes model (right panel), we see that the two-stage estimator has the lowest MSE and for $p < 0.15$, the polynomial interpolation estimator under the one-stage design (PI) has the worst MSE, highlighting that error due to extrapolation is very severe when $\beta > 1$ (i.e. under a more complex model) and when the treatment budget p is small.




Figure 9: Performance of different estimators on the BLOGCATALOG network for various values of p . The bold line indicates the mean over 10,000 replications. The shading indicates the experimental standard deviation, calculated by taking the square root of the experimental variance over all replications.




Figure 10: MSE of different estimators on the BLOGCATALOG network for various values of p , averaged over 10,000 replications.

We also compare the performances of the estimators for the BLOGCATALOG network in Figure 10. This network has a higher average degree ($d = 65$) than the other networks. Since the Hájek estimator requires at least one fully treated and one fully control neighborhood to compute an estimate, and since there is a very low chance of this happening for any values of p , it performs much worse in this setting and we omit it from the plots for ease of presentation. Otherwise, the results lead us to the same conclusions as before: use the one-stage Bernoulli rollout and polynomial interpolation (PI) when the underlying potential outcomes model has $\beta = 1$, and when $\beta > 1$, use the proposed two-stage design and corresponding estimator (2-Stage).

Across all figures, the large takeaway is that when the treatment budget is very small and the model is more complex ($\beta > 1$) we greatly reduce error in estimation by using the two-stage rollout experiment design. This is because other estimators incur much more bias under interference, such as difference in means and Hájek, or otherwise incur a large cost in extrapolation variance, such as PI.

C Details of Real-World Networks

Here, we provide more details of the three real-world data sets that we use in our analysis. We include all raw data files we pulled from the listed sources, along with our cleaned data and processing scripts, in our provided source code. A summary of the datasets is given in the following table.

Dataset	Vertices	Edges	Degree	Features
EMAIL [28, 32, 33]	employees $n = 1,005$	correspondence directed $ E = 25,571$	min: 1 max: 334 average: 25	department $ F = 42$
BLOGCATALOG [29, 34, 35]	bloggers $n = 10,312$	connections undirected $ E = 333,983$	min: 1 max: 3,992 average: 65	interests $ F = 39$
AMAZON [30, 33]	products $n = 14,436$	co-purchases directed $ E = 70,832$	min: 1 max: 247 average: 5	category $ F = 13,591$

Email

The EMAIL dataset is publicly available at <https://snap.stanford.edu/data/email-Eu-core.html> and is licensed under the BSD license¹. This dataset models the email communications between members of a European research institution. The $n = 1,005$ vertices of the network are (anonymized) institution members, and there is a directed edge from individual i to individual j if i has sent at least one email to individual j .

It has minimum degree 1, maximum degree 212, and average degree 25.8, and its degree distribution is visualized in Figure 11; the support of the histogram has been cropped to remove some large outliers. The largest weakly connected component in the network contains 986 vertices, and the largest strongly connected component contains 803 vertices.




Figure 11: The degree distribution of the EMAIL graph

Each individual in the network has been assigned one of 42 department labels. The sizes of these departments vary greatly, with the smallest department including a single individual and the largest department including 109 individuals. The average department size is 23.9. In the EMAIL network, each vertex is assigned to exactly one department, and we use these assignments as our clustering.

¹For more information, see <https://snap.stanford.edu/snap/license.html> and https://groups.google.com/g/snap-datasets/c/52MRzGbMkFg/m/FIFy_6q0CAAJ

To pre-process this data for use in our experiments, we added self-loops to each node in the original dataset to represent the direct effect of the node’s treatment on their outcome (See Section 2).

BlogCatalog

The BLOGCATALOG dataset is publicly available at <https://networkrepository.com/soc-BlogCatalog-ASU.php> and is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike License². This dataset models the relationships between bloggers on the (now defunct) blogging website <http://www.blogcatalog.com>. The $n = 10,312$ nodes represent bloggers and the (undirected) edges represent the social network of the bloggers.

The network has minimum degree 1, maximum degree 3,992, and average degree 65, and its degree distribution is visualized in Figure 12; the support of the histogram has been cropped to remove some large outliers. The average clustering coefficient is approximately 0.46.




Figure 12: The degree distribution of the BLOGCATALOG graph

Each blogger in the network has an associated blog. Blogs (and thus, bloggers) are organized under interest categories specified by the website and can be listed under multiple categories. There are 39 such categories in this dataset and on average; on average, each blogger is listed under 1.6 categories. As part of the data pre-processing for our experiments, we added self-loops to each node in the original dataset, as we did with the EMAIL dataset.

Amazon

The AMAZON dataset is publicly available at <https://snap.stanford.edu/data/amazon-meta.html> and is licensed under the BSD license³. This dataset models an Amazon product co-purchasing network. The $n = 14,436$ nodes represent products and each node has outgoing edges to the top 5 products frequently co-purchased with it. Thus, in addition to the self-loop at each node, each node has exactly 5 outgoing edges.

The network has minimum in-degree 1, maximum in-degree 247, and average degree 5, and its in-degree distribution is visualized in Figure 13; the support of the histogram has been cropped to remove some large outliers.

²For more information, see <https://networkrepository.com/policy.php>

³For more information, see <https://snap.stanford.edu/snap/license.html> and https://groups.google.com/g/snap-datasets/c/52MRzGbMkFg/m/FIFy_6q0CAAJ




Figure 13: The degree distribution of the AMAZON graph

Products are organized into categories (which correspond to attributes such as the genre, setting, and actors in the film, as well as marketplace data such as the inclusion of these titles in certain deals or promotions) but can belong to multiple categories. There are 13,591 possible product categories; on average each product belongs to 13.2 categories. As part of the data pre-processing for our experiments, we added all self-loops and restricted the original dataset to only the product nodes labeled as DVDs.

D Other Estimators

Here, we provide additional details of the other estimators used in our experiments Section 5.

Difference in Means

The difference in means (DM) approach estimates the total treatment effect as the difference in the average outcome of a treated individual and the average outcome of an untreated individual.

$$\widehat{\text{TTE}}_{\text{DM}} = \frac{\sum_i z_i \cdot Y_i(\mathbf{z})}{\sum_i z_i} - \frac{\sum_i (1 - z_i) \cdot Y_i(\mathbf{z})}{\sum_i (1 - z_i)}.$$

This estimator does not utilize any knowledge of the underlying graph. It only requires knowledge of the treatment assignments and the observed outcomes, which are always known to the experimenter. Under SUTVA, this is an unbiased estimator (since an individual’s outcome is a function only of their treatment). However, it is not unbiased under interference; untreated individuals may have treated neighbors which impacts their outcome, introducing bias into our signal of the baseline effects. In general, in settings where the treatment effects are positive, this phenomenon outweighs the bias from untreated neighbors of treated individuals, so we observe a negative bias.

To counteract this bias, at the expense of requiring network knowledge, we can limit the set of individuals used in the estimator to those whose neighbors’ treatment assignments largely align with theirs. We refer to this as a thresholded DM estimator.

Thresholded Difference in Means:

This family of estimators is parameterized by a value $\lambda \in [0, 1]$, which can be thought of as a stringency requirement that we place on the treatment assignments within one’s neighborhood. In particular, we will only include an individual in the “treated” set in this DM estimator if they are treated and at least a γ fraction of their neighbors are also treated. Similarly, we will only include

an individual in the “untreated” set in this DM estimator if they are untreated and at most a $(1 - \gamma)$ fraction of their neighbors are treated.

$$\widehat{\text{TTE}}_{\text{DM}(\lambda)} = \frac{\sum_i z_i \cdot Y_i(\mathbf{z}) \cdot \mathbb{I}(\sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} z_j \geq \gamma d_i)}{\sum_i z_i \cdot \mathbb{I}(\sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} z_j \geq \gamma d_i)} - \frac{\sum_i (1 - z_i) \cdot Y_i(\mathbf{z}) \cdot \mathbb{I}(\sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} z_j \leq (1 - \gamma) d_i)}{\sum_i (1 - z_i) \cdot \mathbb{I}(\sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} z_j \leq (1 - \gamma) d_i)}$$

Note that these estimators for $\lambda > 0$ require network knowledge to calculate the neighborhood treatment proportions, and they are biased under interference for the same reasoning as the standard DM estimator. Note that DM(0) (that is, the thresholded DM estimator with parameter $\lambda = 0$) coincides with the ordinary DM estimator. The DM(1) estimator will only consider individuals with fully treated or fully untreated neighborhoods. As such, the DM(1) estimator will, under simpler randomization schemes like Bernoulli design, include very few individuals in its “treated” and “untreated” sets. The Horvitz-Thompson and Hájek estimators also exhibit this phenomenon.

Hájek

Since the HT estimator only considers individuals with fully treated and fully untreated neighborhoods, most of the bracketed terms within its summation will be 0. To compensate for this, we can adjust the $1/n$ normalization on the summation to use the expected number of non-zero entries corresponding to both terms in the bracketed expression. This change gives the Hájek estimator[36].

$$\widehat{\text{TTE}}_{\text{Hájek}} = \frac{\sum_{i \in [n]} \frac{Y_i(\mathbf{z}) \cdot \prod_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} z_j}{\Pr(\prod_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} z_j = 1)}}{\sum_{i \in [n]} \frac{\prod_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} z_j}{\Pr(\prod_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} z_j = 1)}} - \frac{\sum_{i \in [n]} \frac{Y_i(\mathbf{z}) \cdot \prod_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} (1 - z_j)}{\Pr(\prod_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} (1 - z_j) = 1)}}{\sum_{i \in [n]} \frac{\prod_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} (1 - z_j)}{\Pr(\prod_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} (1 - z_j) = 1)}}$$

The Hájek estimator trades off a reduction in the variance over the HT estimator for the introduction of some bias (a thorough discussion of this tradeoff is given by Khan and Ugander [37]). As with the HT estimator, the calculation of exposure probabilities in this estimator requires knowledge of the interference network.