

Mostly Harmless Machine Learning: Learning Optimal Instruments in Linear IV Models*

Jiafeng Chen
Harvard Business School
Boston, MA
jchen@hbs.edu

Daniel L. Chen
Toulouse School of Economics
Toulouse, France
dlchen@nber.org

Greg Lewis
Microsoft Research
Cambridge, MA
glewis@microsoft.com

April 1, 2021

Abstract

We offer simple theoretical results that justify incorporating machine learning in the standard linear instrumental variable setting that is prevalent in empirical research in economics. The key idea is to use machine learning, combined with sample-splitting, to predict the treatment variable from the instrument and any exogenous covariates, and then use this predicted treatment and the covariates as technical instruments to recover the coefficients in the second-stage. This allows the researcher to extract non-linear co-variation between the treatment and instrument that may dramatically improve estimation precision and robustness by boosting instrument strength. Importantly, we constrain the machine-learned predictions to be linear in the exogenous covariates, thus avoiding spurious identification arising from non-linear relationships between the treatment and the covariates rather than from the instrument itself. We show that this approach delivers consistent and asymptotically normal estimates under weak conditions and that it may be adapted to be semiparametrically efficient (Chamberlain, 1992). Our method preserves standard intuitions and interpretations of linear instrumental variable methods and provides a simple, user-friendly upgrade to the applied economics toolbox. We illustrate our method with an example in law and criminal justice, examining the causal effect of appellate court reversals on district court sentencing decisions.

*This work previously appeared in the Machine Learning and Economic Policy Workshop at NeurIPS 2020. The authors thank Isaiah Andrews, Mike Droste, Bryan Graham, Jeff Gortmaker, Sendhil Mullainathan, Ashesh Rambachan, David Ritzwoller, Brad Ross, Jonathan Roth, Suproteem Sarkar, Neil Shephard, Rahul Singh, Jim Stock, Vasilis Syrgkanis, Chris Walker, Wilbur Townsend, and Elie Tamer for helpful comments.

1 Introduction

Instrumental variable (IV) designs are a popular method in empirical economics. Over 30% of all NBER working papers and top journal publications considered by Currie *et al.* (2020) include some discussion of instrumental variables. The vast majority of IV designs used in practice are linear IV estimated via two-stage least squares (TSLS), a familiar technique in standard graduate introductions to econometrics and causal inference (e.g. Angrist and Pischke, 2008). Standard TSLS, however, leaves on the table some variation provided by the instruments that may improve precision of estimates, as TSLS only exploits variation that is linearly related to the endogenous regressors. In the event that the instrument has a low linear correlation with the endogenous variable, but nevertheless predicts the endogenous variable well through a nonlinear transformation, we should expect TSLS to perform poorly in terms of both estimation precision and inference robustness. In particular, in some cases, TSLS would provide spuriously precise but biased estimates (due to weak instruments, see Andrews *et al.*, 2019). Such nonlinear settings become increasingly plausible when exogenous variation includes high dimensional data or alternative data, such as text, images, or other complex attributes like weather. We show that off-the-shelf machine learning techniques provide a general-purpose toolbox for leveraging such complex variation, improving instrument strength and estimate quality.

Replacing the first stage linear regression with more flexible specifications does not come without cost in terms of stronger identifying assumptions. The validity of TSLS hinges only upon the restriction that the instrument is linearly uncorrelated with unobserved disturbances in the response variable. Relaxing the linearity requires that endogenous residuals are mean zero conditional on the exogenous instruments, which is stronger. However, it is rare that a researcher has a compelling reason to believe the weaker non-correlation assumption, but rejects the slightly stronger mean-independence assumption. In fact, by not exploiting the nonlinearities, TSLS may accidentally make a strong instrument weak, and deliver spuriously precise inference: Dieterle and Snell (2016) and references therein find that several applied microeconomics papers have conclusions that are sensitive to the specification (linear vs. quadratic) of the first-stage.

A more serious identification concern with leveraging machine learning in the first-stage comes from the parametric functional form in the second stage. When there are exogenous covariates that are included in the parametric structural specification, nonlinear transformations of these covariates could in principle be valid instruments, and provide variation that precisely estimates the parameter of interest. For example, in the standard IV setup of $Y = D^\top \tau + X^\top \beta + U$ where X is an exogenous covariate, imposing $\mathbb{E}[U | X] = 0$ would formally result in X^2, X^3 , etc. being valid “excluded” instruments. However, given that the researcher’s stated source of identification comes from excluded instruments, such “identifying variation” provided by covariates is more of an artifact of parametric specification than any serious information from the data that relates to the researcher’s scientific inquiry.

One principled response to the above concern is to make the second stage structural specification likewise nonparametric, thereby including an infinite dimensional parameter to estimate, making the empirical design a *nonparametric instrumental variable* (NPIV) design. Significant theoretical and computational progress have been made in this regard (inter alia, Newey and Powell, 2003; Ai and Chen, 2003, 2007; Horowitz and Lee, 2007; Severini and Tripathi, 2012; Ai and Chen, 2012; Hartford *et al.*, 2017; Dikkala *et al.*, 2020; Chen *et al.*, 2020a,b; Chen and Pouzo, 2012, 2015; Chernozhukov *et al.*, 2018, 2016). However, regrettably, NPIV has received relatively little attention in applied work in economics, potentially due to theoretical complications, difficulty in interpretation and troubleshooting, and computational scalability. Moreover, in some cases parametric restrictions on structural functions come from theoretical considerations or techniques like log-linearization, where estimated parameters have intuitive theoretical interpretation and policy

relevance. In these cases the researcher may have compelling reasons to stick with parametric specifications.

In the spirit of being user-friendly to practitioners, this paper considers estimation and inference in an instrumental variable model where the second stage structural relationship is linear, while allowing for as much nonlinearity in the instrumental variable as possible, without creating unintended and spurious identifying variation from included covariates. We document some simple results via elementary techniques, which provide intuition and justification for using machine learning methods in instrumental variable designs. We show that with sample-splitting, under weak consistency conditions, a simple estimator that uses the predicted values of endogenous and included regressors as technical instruments is consistent, asymptotically normal, and semiparametrically efficient. The constructed instrumental variable also readily provides weak instrument diagnostics and robust procedures. Moreover, standard diagnostics like out-of-sample prediction quality are directly related to quality of estimates. In the presence of exogenous covariates that are parametrically included in the second-stage structural function, adapting machine learning techniques requires caution to avoid spurious identification from functional forms of the included covariates. To that end, we formulate and analyze the problem as a sequential moment restriction, and develop estimators that utilize machine learning for extracting nonlinear variation from and only from instruments.

Related Literature. The core techniques that allow for the construction of our estimators follow from Chamberlain (1987, 1992). The ideas in our proofs are also familiar in the double machine learning (Chernozhukov *et al.*, 2018; Belloni *et al.*, 2012) and semiparametrics literatures (e.g. Liu *et al.*, 2020); our arguments, however, follow from elementary techniques that are accessible to graduate students and are self-contained. Our proposed estimator is, of course, similar to the split-sample IV or jackknife IV estimators in Angrist *et al.* (1999), but we do not restrict ourselves to linear settings or linear smoothers. Using nonlinear or machine learning in the first stage of IV settings is considered by Xu (2021) (for probit), Hansen and Kozbur (2014) (for ridge), Belloni *et al.* (2012); Chernozhukov *et al.* (2015) (for lasso), and Bai and Ng (2010) (for boosting), among others; and our work can be viewed as providing a simple, unified analysis for practitioners, much in the spirit of Chernozhukov *et al.* (2018). To the best of our knowledge, we are the first to formally explore practical complications of making the first stage nonlinear in a context with exogenous covariates. Finally, we view our work as counterpoint to the recent work by Angrist and Frandsen (2019), which is more pessimistic about combining machine learning with instrumental variables—a point we explore in detail in Section 3.

2 Main theoretical results

We consider the standard cross-sectional setup where $(R_i)_{i=1}^N = (Y_i, D_i, X_i, W_i)_{i=1}^N \stackrel{\text{i.i.d.}}{\sim} P$ are sampled from some infinite population. Y_i is some outcome variable, D_i is a set of endogenous treatment variables, X_i is a set of exogenous controls, and W_i is a set of instrumental variables. The researcher is willing to argue that W_i is exogenously or quasi-experimentally assigned. Moreover, the researcher believes that W_i provides a source of variation that “identifies” an effect τ of D_i on Y_i . We denote the endogenous variables and covariates as $T_i \equiv [1, D_i^\top, X_i^\top]^\top$ and the excluded instrument and covariates as the *technical instruments* $Z_i \equiv [1, W_i^\top, X_i^\top]^\top$.

A typical specification in empirical economics is the linear instrumental variables setup:

$$Y_i = \alpha + D_i^\top \tau + X_i^\top \beta + U_i \quad \mathbb{E}[W_i U_i] = 0. \quad (1)$$

We argue that, in many settings, the researcher is willing to assume more than that U_i is uncorrelated from X_i, W_i . Common introductions of instrumental variables (Angrist and Pischke, 2008; Angrist and Krueger, 2001) stress that instruments induce variation in D_i and is otherwise unrelated to U_i , and that a common source of instruments is natural experiments. We argue that these narratives imply a stronger form of exogeneity than TSLS requires—the researcher is perhaps willing to assume mean independence $\mathbb{E}[U_i | W_i] = 0$ beyond $\mathbb{E}[W_i U_i] = 0$. After all, a symmetric mean-zero random variable S is uncorrelated with S^2 , but one would hardly be comfortable justifying S^2 as unrelated to S . We demonstrate that strengthening the exogeneity assumption to mean-independence allows the researcher to extract more identifying variation from instruments, but doing so calls for more flexible machinery for dealing with the first stage.

2.1 No covariates

Let us first consider the case in which we do not have exogenous covariates X_i . Our mean-independence restrictions give rise to a conditional moment restriction, $\mathbb{E}[Y_i - T_i^\top \theta | W_i] = 0$, where $\theta = (\alpha, \tau^\top, \beta^\top)^\top$. The conditional moment restriction encodes an infinite set of unconditional moment restrictions in the form of orthogonalities from the prediction errors:

$$\text{For all square integrable } \tilde{v} : \mathbb{E}[\tilde{v}(W_i)(Y_i - T_i^\top \theta)] = 0.$$

Chamberlain (1987) finds that all relevant statistical information in a conditional moment restriction is contained in a single unconditional moment restriction involving an *optimal instrument* Υ^* , and the unconditional moment restriction with the optimal instrument delivers semiparametrically efficient estimation and inference. In our case, $\Upsilon^*(W_i) = \frac{1}{\sigma^2(W_i)}[1, \mu(W_i)^\top]^\top$, where $\mu(W_i) \equiv \mathbb{E}[D_i | W_i]$ and $\sigma^2(W_i) = \mathbb{E}[U_i^2 | W_i]$. We estimate Υ^* with $\hat{\Upsilon}$ and form a plug-in estimator for θ :

$$\hat{\theta}_N = \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \hat{\Upsilon}(W_i) T_i^\top \right)^{-1} \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \hat{\Upsilon}(W_i) Y_i \right). \quad (2)$$

This is numerically equivalent to estimating (1) with two-stage weighted least-squares with $\hat{\mu}(W_i)$ as an instrument and weighting with $1/\sigma^2(W_i)$. In particular, under homoskedasticity, the optimal instrument is simply $[1, \mu(W_i)^\top]^\top$, and two-stage least-squares with an estimate of $\mu(W_i)$ returns an estimate $\hat{\theta}_N$. We stress that the instrument $[1, \mu(W_i)^\top]^\top$ is the optimal instrument—from a perspective of semiparametric efficiency—under homoskedasticity, but downstream inferences with $[1, \mu(W_i)^\top]^\top$ as the instrument need not assume homoskedastic errors to ensure validity. Therefore, we shall refer to the instrument with the weighting $1/\sigma^2(W_i)$ as the *optimal instrument under efficient weighting* and the instrument without $1/\sigma^2$ as the *optimal instrument under identity weighting*.

Estimating Υ^* amounts to learning $\mu(W_i) \equiv \mathbb{E}[D_i | W_i]$ under identity weighting, which is well-suited to machine learning techniques; this is only slightly complicated by the estimation of $\sigma^2(W_i) \equiv \mathbb{E}[U_i^2 | W_i]$ under efficient weighting. One might worry that the preliminary estimation of Υ^* complicates asymptotic analysis of $\hat{\theta}_N$. Under a simple sampling-splitting scheme, however, we state a high-level condition for consistency, normality, and efficiency of $\hat{\theta}_N$. Though it simplifies the proof and potentially weakens regularity conditions, sample-splitting does reduce the size of data used to estimate the optimal instrument Υ^* , but such problems can be effectively mitigated by k -fold sample-splitting: 20-fold sample-splitting, for instance, limits the loss of data to 5% at the cost of 20 computations that can be effectively parallelized. Such concerns notwithstanding,

we focus our exposition to two-fold sample-splitting.

Specifically, assume $N = 2n$ for simplicity and let $S_1, S_2 \subset [N]$ be the two subsamples with size n . For $j \in \{1, 2\}$, form $\hat{\Upsilon}^{(j)}$ by estimating $\mu(W_i)$ and $\sigma^2(W_i)$ with data from the other sample, S_{-j} . An estimator for μ may be a neural network or a random forest trained via empirical risk minimization, or a penalized linear regression such as elastic net.¹ The estimated instrument, under identity weighting, $\hat{\Upsilon}_i$ is then formed by evaluating $\hat{\Upsilon}^{(j)}(W_i)$ for all $i \in S_j$. We may then use (2) to form an (identity-weighted) estimator of θ by plugging in $\hat{\Upsilon}$. Under efficient weighting, on each S_{-j} , we would use the identity-weighted estimator of θ as an initial estimator to obtain an estimate of U_i , and similarly predict U_i^2 with W_i to form an estimate of $\sigma^2(W_i)$. The resulting estimated optimal instrument under efficient weighting may then be plugged into (2) and form an efficient-weighted estimator. We term such estimators the machine learning split-sample estimator (MLSS) estimators. The pseudocode for major procedures considered in this paper is in [Algorithm 1](#).

[Theorem 1](#) shows that the MLSS estimator is consistent and asymptotically normal when the first-stage estimator $\hat{\Upsilon}^{(j)}$ converges to a strong instrument. Moreover, it is semiparametrically efficient when $\hat{\Upsilon}^{(j)}$ is consistent for the optimal instrument $\Upsilon^*(W_i) \equiv [1, \mu(W_i)^\top] / \sigma^2(W_i)$ in L^2 norm. The L^2 consistency condition² is not strong—in particular, it is weaker than the L^2 consistency at $o(N^{-1/4})$ -rate condition commonly used in the double machine learning literature ([Chernozhukov et al., 2018](#)),³ where such conditions are considered mild.⁴

Formally, regularity conditions are stated in [Assumption 1](#). The first condition simply states that the nuisance estimation attains some limit in the asymptotic experiment implicitly considered. The second condition states that the limit is a strong instrument. The third condition is a technical one in order to show a central limit theorem. The last condition, which is only required for semiparametric efficiency, states that the nuisance estimation is consistent for the optimal instrument in L^2 norm. For consistency of standard error estimates, we assume more bounded moments in [Assumption 2](#).

Assumption 1. Recall that $Z_i = [1, W_i^\top]$, and so $\Upsilon(W_i)$ and $\Upsilon(Z_i)$ denote the same object.

1. ($\hat{\Upsilon}^{(j)}$ attains a limit Υ in L^2 distance) There exists some $\Upsilon(Z_i)$ such that

$$\mathbb{E} \|\hat{\Upsilon}^{(j)}(Z_i) - \Upsilon(Z_i)\|^2 \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{for } j = 1, 2,$$

where the expectation integrates over both the randomness in $\hat{\Upsilon}^{(j)}$ and in Z_i , but $\hat{\Upsilon}^{(j)}$ and Z_i may be assumed to be independent.

2. (Strong identification) The matrix $G \equiv \mathbb{E}[\Upsilon(Z_i)T_i^\top]$ exists and is full rank.
3. (Lyapunov condition) (i) $\mathbb{E}|U_i|^{2+\epsilon} < \infty$ and $\mathbb{E}\|U_i\|^{2+\epsilon}\|\Upsilon_i\|^{2+\epsilon}$ for some $\epsilon > 0$, (ii) $\mathbb{E}\|\Upsilon(Z_i)\|^2 < \infty$, (iii) $\mathbb{E}\|T_i\|^2 < \infty$, and (iv) $\Omega \equiv \mathbb{E}[U_i^2\Upsilon(Z_i)\Upsilon(Z_i)^\top] < \infty$.
4. (Consistency to the optimal instrument) We may take $\Upsilon^*(Z_i)$ as the $\Upsilon(Z_i)$ in condition 1.

¹With k -fold sample-splitting, S_{-j} is the union of all sample-split folds other than the j -th one.

²In many-instrument settings under [Bekker \(1994\)](#)-type asymptotic sequences, there may be no consistent estimator of the optimal instrument in the absence of sparsity assumptions ([Raskutti et al., 2011](#)).

³We are not claiming that the procedure has advantage over the double machine learning literature, but simply that the statistical problem here is sufficiently well-behaved such that we enjoy weaker conditions than double machine learning and semiparametrics typically require.

⁴The nuisance parameter $\mathbb{E}[D_i | W_i]$ in this setting enjoys higher-order orthogonality property described in [Mackey et al. \(2018\)](#). In particular, it is infinite-order orthogonal, thereby requiring no rate condition to work. Intuitively, estimation error in $\Upsilon(\cdot)$ has no effect on the moment condition $\mathbb{E}[\Upsilon(Y_i - \alpha - T_i^\top \theta)] = 0$ holding, and this feature of the problem makes the estimation robust to estimation of Υ .

Assumption 2 (Variance estimation). Let Υ be the object defined in [Assumption 1](#). Assume additionally that the following moments are bounded:

$$\mathbb{E}[\|T_i\|^4], \mathbb{E}[U_i^4], \mathbb{E}\|\Upsilon(Z_i)\|^4, \limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[\|\hat{\Upsilon}^{(j)}(Z_i) - \Upsilon(Z_i)\|^4] < \infty.$$

Theorem 1. Let $\hat{\theta}_N^{\text{MLSS}}$ be the machine learning split-sample estimator described above. Under conditions 1–3 in [Assumption 1](#),

$$\sqrt{N} \left(\hat{\theta}_N^{\text{MLSS}} - \theta \right) \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{N}(0, V) \quad V \equiv (G\Omega^{-1}G^\top)^{-1} = G^{-1}\Omega G^{-\top},$$

where G, Ω are defined in [Assumption 1](#). Moreover, if condition 4 in [Assumption 1](#) holds, then the asymptotic variance V attains the semiparametric efficiency bound.

Moreover, if we assume [Assumption 2](#) along with conditions 1–3 of [Assumption 1](#), then the sample counterparts of G, Ω are consistent for the two matrices.

Proof of [Theorem 1](#). We may compute that

$$\sqrt{N} \left(\hat{\theta}_N^{\text{MLSS}} - \theta \right) = \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \hat{\Upsilon}(Z_i) T_i^\top \right)^{-1} \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{i=1}^N \hat{\Upsilon}(Z_i) U_i.$$

We compute in [Lemma 3](#) that, for Υ defined in condition 1 of [Assumption 1](#), the following expansions hold:

$$\hat{G} \equiv \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \hat{\Upsilon}(Z_i) T_i^\top = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \Upsilon(Z_i) T_i^\top + o_p(1) \quad \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{i=1}^N \hat{\Upsilon}(Z_i) U_i = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{i=1}^N \Upsilon(Z_i) U_i + o_p(1). \quad (3)$$

Note that (3) implies that $\hat{\theta}_N^{\text{MLSS}}$ is first-order equivalent to the oracle estimator that plugs in Υ :

$$\hat{\theta}_N^* \equiv \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \Upsilon(Z_i) T_i^\top \right)^{-1} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \Upsilon(Z_i) Y_i,$$

whose consistency and asymptotic normality follows from usual arguments under condition 3 of [Assumption 1](#). Given (3), then we have a law of large numbers $\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \hat{\Upsilon}(Z_i) T_i^\top \xrightarrow{p} G$ by condition 2 of [Assumption 1](#); and we obtain a central limit theorem $\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{i=1}^N \Upsilon(Z_i) U_i \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{N}(0, \Omega)$ by condition 3. Lastly, by Slutsky's theorem and the fact that G^{-1} is nonsingular, we obtain the desired convergence $\sqrt{N} \left(\hat{\theta}_N^{\text{MLSS}} - \theta \right) \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{N}(0, V)$.

If, additionally, we assume the consistency condition 4, then $\hat{\theta}_N^*$ is exactly the efficient optimal instrument estimator ([Chamberlain, 1987](#)), and hence V attains the semiparametric efficiency bound. Finally, when used with the law of large numbers, (3) implies that $\hat{G} \xrightarrow{p} G$, and [Lemma 4](#) implies $\hat{\Omega} \equiv \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N (Y_i - T_i^\top \hat{\theta}_N^{\text{MLSS}})^2 \hat{\Upsilon}_i \hat{\Upsilon}_i^\top \xrightarrow{p} \Omega$, and thus the variance can be consistently estimated. \square

2.2 Exogenous covariates

The presence of covariates X_i complicates the analysis considerably. Under the researcher's model, both W_i and X_i are considered exogenous, and thus we may assume $\mathbb{E}[U_i | Z_i] = 0$ and use it as a conditional moment restriction, under which the efficient instrument is $\text{Var}(U_i | Z_i)^{-1} \mathbb{E}[T_i | Z_i]$ and our analysis from the previous section continues to apply *mutatis mutandis*. However, if the researcher maintains a linear specification $Y_i = T_i^\top \theta + U_i$, estimating θ based on the conditional moment restriction $\mathbb{E}[U_i | Z_i] = 0$

may inadvertently “identify” θ through nonlinear behavior in X_i rather than the variation in W_i . Such a specification may allow the researcher to precisely estimate θ even when the instrument W_i is completely irrelevant, when, say, higher-order polynomial terms in the scalar X_i , X_i^2, X_i^3 , are strongly correlated with D_i , perhaps due to misspecification of the linear moment condition. There may well be compelling reasons why these nonlinear terms in X_i allow for identification of τ under an economic or causal model; however, they are likely not the researcher’s stated source of identification, and allowing their influence to leak into the estimation procedure undermines credibility of the statistical exercise.

One idea to resolve such a conundrum is to make the structural function nonparametric as well, and convert the model to a nonparametric instrumental variable regression (Newey and Powell, 2003; Ai and Chen, 2003, 2007, 2003, 2012; Chen and Pouzo, 2012) (See Appendix B for discussion).⁵ Another idea, which we undertake in this paper, is to weaken the moment condition and rule nonlinearities in X_i as inadmissible for inference.

The conditional moment restriction $\mathbb{E}[U_i | Z_i] = 0$ is equivalent to

$$\text{For all (square integrable) } \Upsilon, \mathbb{E}[\Upsilon(W_i, X_i)(Y_i - T_i^\top \theta)] = 0, \quad (4)$$

which is too strong, since it allows nonlinear transforms of X_i to be valid instruments. A natural idea is to restrict the class of allowable instruments $\Upsilon(W_i, X_i)$ to those that are partially linear in X_i , $\Upsilon(W_i, X_i) = h(W_i) + X_i^\top \ell$, thereby deliberately discarding information from nonlinear transformations of X_i . Doing so yields the following

$$\text{For all (square integrable) } \Upsilon, \mathbb{E}[\Upsilon(W_i)(Y_i - T_i^\top \theta)] = \mathbb{E}[X_i(Y_i - T_i^\top \theta)] = 0. \quad (5)$$

We may view (5) as imposing an orthogonality condition on the structural errors U_i that is intermediate between that of TSLS and that of (4). In particular, if we define $\mathbb{E}_{(\text{PL})}[\cdot | X_i, W_i]$ as a projection operator that projects onto partially linear functions of (X_i, W_i) , i.e.

$$\mathbb{E}_{(\text{PL})}[U_i | X_i, W_i] = \underset{\substack{h(X_i, W_i) \\ h(X_i, W_i) = X_i^\top \ell + g(W_i)}}{\text{arg min}} \mathbb{E}(U_i - h(X_i, W_i))^2,$$

then requiring (5) is equivalent to requiring

$$\mathbb{E}_{(\text{PL})}[U_i | X_i, W_i] = 0. \quad (6)$$

In contrast, the $\text{Cov}(U_i, Z_i) = 0$ requirement of TSLS can be written as $\mathbb{E}_{(\text{L})}[\cdot | Z_i] = 0$, where $\mathbb{E}_{(\text{L})}[\cdot | Z_i]$ analogously defined as a projection operator onto *linear* functions of Z_i . We see that (6) is a natural interpolation between the respective orthogonality structures on the errors U_i induced by the TSLS and the conditional moment restrictions.

Similarly, (5) interpolates moment restrictions (4) and $\mathbb{E}[U_i Z_i] = 0$. In fact, the moment restriction equivalent to (5) is the following *sequential moment restriction*

$$\mathbb{E}[X_i(Y_i - T_i^\top \theta)] = \mathbb{E}[Y_i - T_i^\top \theta | W_i] = 0. \quad (7)$$

⁵More recently, Chernozhukov *et al.* (2018) derive Neyman-orthogonal moment conditions assuming a partially linear second stage in Section 4.2 of their paper.

Table 1: List of nonparametric nuisance parameters that require estimation. Note that nuisance parameters that require the unobserved error U_i require additional preliminary consistent estimators of θ .

Covariates X_i	Identity weighting?	Nonparametric nuisance parameters
No	Yes	$\mathbb{E}[D_i W_i]$
No	No	$\mathbb{E}[D_i W_i], \mathbb{E}[U_i^2 W_i]$
Yes	Yes	$\mathbb{E}[D_i W_i], \mathbb{E}[X_i W_i]$
Yes	No	$\mathbb{E}[D_i W_i], \mathbb{E}[X_i U_i^2 W_i], \mathbb{E}[U_i^2 W_i]$

We see that (7) is a natural interpolation between the usual unconditional moment condition, $\mathbb{E}[Z_i U_i] = 0$, and the conditional moment restriction that may be spurious $\mathbb{E}[U_i | Z_i] = 0$, by only allowing nonlinear information in W_i to be used for estimation and inference.

Having set up the estimation problem as (equivalently) characterized by (5), (6), or (7), efficient estimation is discussed by Chamberlain (1992). In particular, the optimal instrument under identity weighting takes the convenient form

$$\Upsilon^*(Z_i) = \mathbb{E}_{(\text{PL})} [T_i | X_i, W_i] = \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ \mathbb{E}_{(\text{PL})} [D_i | X_i, W_i] \\ X_i \end{bmatrix}, \quad (8)$$

which is simply $(1, X_i)$, along with the best partially linear prediction of the endogenous treatment D_i from W_i, X_i . Observe that the only difference between (8) and Chamberlain (1987)'s optimal instrument under homoskedasticity is modifying \mathbb{E} into $\mathbb{E}_{(\text{PL})}$. Implementing (8) is straightforward, as by Robinson (1988), partially linear regression is reducible to fitting two nonparametric regressions $\mathbb{E}[D_i | W_i]$ and $\mathbb{E}[X_i | W_i]$, and forming the following prediction function

$$\mathbb{E}_{(\text{PL})} [D_i | X_i, W_i] = \mathbb{E}[D_i | W_i] + \mathbb{E}_{(\text{L})}[D_i | (X_i - \mathbb{E}[X_i | W_i])].$$

Efficient estimation in the heteroskedastic case is more complex. The optimal instrument is

$$\Upsilon^*(Z_i) = \frac{\mathbb{E}[T_i | W_i]}{\sigma^2(W_i)} + \mathbb{E} \left[T_i \tilde{X}_i^\top \right] \mathbb{E} \left[U_i^2 \tilde{X}_i \tilde{X}_i^\top \right]^{-1} \tilde{X}_i, \quad \tilde{X}_i \equiv X_i - \frac{\mathbb{E}[X_i U_i^2 | W_i]}{\sigma^2(W_i)}$$

and the associated unconditional moment restriction is

$$\mathbb{E} \{ U_i \cdot \Upsilon^*(Z_i) \} = 0 \quad (9)$$

The intuition for (9) is the following: the two moment conditions $\mathbb{E}[U_i X_i] = \mathbb{E}[U_i | W_i] = 0$ provide non-orthogonal information for θ that prevents us from applying the optimal instrument on each moment condition. However, we may orthogonalize one against the other.⁶ In particular, the moment condition $\mathbb{E}[\tilde{X}_i U_i] = 0$ is orthogonal to $\mathbb{E}[U_i | W_i]$ in the sense that $\mathbb{E}[\tilde{X}_i U_i \cdot U_i | W_i] = 0$. Indeed, the term $\frac{\mathbb{E}[X_i U_i^2 | W_i]}{\sigma^2(W_i)} U_i \equiv \frac{\langle X_i U_i, U_i \rangle}{\langle U_i, U_i \rangle} U_i$ is constructed to the projection of $X_i U_i$ onto U_i under the inner product $\langle A, B \rangle = \mathbb{E}[AB | W_i]$.

As before, complications in nonparametric estimation can be avoided by sample splitting, where nuisance

⁶Orthogonal here does not refer to Neyman orthogonality (Chernozhukov et al., 2018), but simply means that the two moments are uncorrelated.

parameters are estimated on $K - 1$ folds of the data and the moment condition is evaluated on the remaining fold. As a summary across our settings, we collect the nuisance parameters that require a first-step estimation in [Table 1](#). The estimator

$$\hat{\theta}_N^{\text{MLSS}} = \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \hat{\Upsilon}(Z_i) T_i^\top \right)^{-1} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \hat{\Upsilon}(Z_i) Y_i$$

remains the same as (2) and is subjected to the same analysis in [Theorem 1](#)—under 1–3 in [Assumption 1](#), $\hat{\theta}_N^{\text{MLSS}}$ is consistent and asymptotically normal, and additionally, it is semiparametrically efficient if the L^2 -limit of $\hat{\Upsilon}$ coincides with the optimal instrument Υ^* in their respective settings.

In concluding this section, we make two remarks about the case with exogenous covariates, assuming identity weighting for tractability. First, it is possible for $\mathbb{E}[D_i | W_i] = 0$ and for (8) to generate precise estimates of the coefficient τ . The reason is that it is possible for the partially linear specification $D_i = h(W_i) + X_i^\top \ell + V_i$ to generate nonzero $h(W_i)$ but zero conditional expectation, in much the same way that some regression coefficients may be zero without adjusting for X_i , but nonzero when adjusted for X_i . Whether or not this makes W_i a plausibly exogenous and strong instrument is likely to be context specific. A robustness check may be generated by replacing $\mathbb{E}_{(\text{PL})}[D_i | X_i, W_i]$ with $\mathbb{E}[D_i | W_i]$, which delivers consistent and asymptotically normal estimates (assuming strong instrument) at the cost of efficiency. Second, the procedure where we partial out X_i from Y_i, D_i and treat

$$Y_i - \mathbb{E}_{(\text{L})}[Y_i | X_i] = \tau (D_i - \mathbb{E}_{(\text{L})}[D_i | X_i]) + U_i \quad \mathbb{E}[U_i | W_i] = 0 \quad (10)$$

as a conditional moment restriction also delivers consistent and asymptotically normal estimates. However, using the “optimal” instrument for (10), $\mathbb{E}[D_i - \mathbb{E}_{(\text{L})}[D_i | X_i] | W_i]$, *does not* achieve semiparametric efficiency, since it uses the information in the sequential moment restriction (7) separately, without considering them jointly and orthogonalizing one against the other, thereby resulting in efficiency loss.

3 Discussion

Interpretation under heterogeneous treatment effects. Assume D_i is binary and suppose $Y_i = D_i Y_i(1) + (1 - D_i) Y_i(0)$. Suppose the treatment follows a representation $D_i = \mathbb{1}(\mu(W_i) \geq V_i)$, where $V_i \sim \text{Unif}[0, 1]$. In this setting, the conditional moment restriction (1) is misspecified, since it assumes constant treatment effects, and different choices of the instrument would generate estimators of different estimands.

More precisely, suppose $\Upsilon(W_i) = a(W_i)[1, b(W_i)]'$ for some scalar functions a, b with $a(\cdot) \geq 0$ and $\mathbb{E}[a(W_i)] < \infty$. Then the corresponding linear IV estimand, using Υ as instrument, can be written as a weighted average of *marginal treatment effects*, a result due to [Heckman and Vytlacil \(2005\)](#), which we reproduce here:

$$\tau_\Upsilon = \int_0^1 w(v) \cdot \text{MTE}_a(v) dv \equiv \int_0^1 w(v) \cdot \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{a(W_i)}{\mathbb{E}a(W_i)} (Y_1 - Y_0) | V = v \right] dv$$

where the weights are

$$w(v) \equiv \frac{\mathbb{E} \left[a(W_i) \tilde{b}(W_i) \mathbb{1}(\mu(W_i) > v) \right]}{\mathbb{E} \left[a(W_i) \tilde{b}(W_i) \mu(W_i) \right]} \quad \tilde{b}(W_i) \equiv b(W_i) - \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{a(W_i)}{\mathbb{E}a(W_i)} b(W_i) \right].$$

The weights $w(\cdot)$ integrate to 1 and are *nonnegative* whenever $b(W_i)$ is a monotone transformation of $\mu(W_i)$.⁷

In the special case where $a(W_i) = 1$ and $b(W_i) = \mu(W_i)$, which corresponds to using the optimal instrument under identity weighting, the estimand is a convex average of marginal treatment effects. In the case where $a(W_i) = 1/\sigma^2(W_i)$ and $b(W_i) = \mu(W_i)$, the estimand is a convex average of *precision-weighted* marginal treatment effects. In the heterogeneous treatment effects setting, we stress that efficiency comparisons are no longer meaningful, since the estimators do not converge to the same estimand. However, we nonetheless highlight the benefit of using an optimal instrument-based estimator compared to a standard linear IV estimator: Optimal instrument-based estimators are guaranteed to recover convex-weighted average treatment effects, where linear IV estimators with W_i as the instrument may not.

Connection between first-stage fitting and estimate quality. Consider a setting with no covariates and i.i.d. U_i .⁸ Consider an estimated instrument $\hat{v}(Z_i)$,⁹ meant to approximate $\mu(Z_i) = \mathbb{E}[D_i | Z_i]$. In linear IV, $\hat{v}(Z_i)$ is the linear projection of D_i onto Z_i . Define the *extra-sample error*¹⁰ of an estimator $\hat{\tau}$ based on $\hat{v}(Z_i)$ to be the random quantity

$$\text{Err}(\hat{v}) \equiv n \cdot \left(\frac{\text{Cov}_n(\hat{v}(Z_i), Y_i)}{\text{Cov}_n(\hat{v}(Z_i), D_i)} - \tau \right)^2$$

where $(Y_i, D_i, Z_i)_{i=1}^n$ is a new and independent sample unrelated to the estimate \hat{v} , and we hold \hat{v} fixed. The subscript n denotes sample quantities such as sample variances and covariances. The quantity $\text{Err}(\hat{v})$ is an optimistic measure of the quality of using \hat{v} as the instrument, as construction of \hat{v} without sample-splitting or jackknifing typically introduces a bias term since $\text{Cov}(\hat{v}, U_i)$ cannot be assumed to be small. A simple calculation shows that $\text{Err}(\hat{v})$ scales with the inverse out-of-sample R^2 of \hat{v} as a predictor of D_i :

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Err}(\hat{v}) &= n \frac{\text{Cov}_n(\hat{v}(Z_i), U_i)^2}{\text{Cov}_n(\hat{v}(Z_i), D_i)^2} \\ &= \frac{1}{R_n^2(\hat{v}(Z_i), D_i)} \cdot \text{Var}_n(D_i)^{-1} \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\hat{v}(Z_i)}{\sqrt{\text{Var}_n(\hat{v}(Z_i))}} (U_i - \bar{U}) \right)^2 \\ &\rightsquigarrow \frac{1}{R^2(\hat{v}(Z_i), D_i)} \frac{\text{Var}(U_i)}{\text{Var}(D_i)} \cdot \chi_1^2 \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty, \end{aligned}$$

where R_n^2 is the out-of-sample R^2 of predicting D_i with $\hat{v}(Z_i)$, and $R^2(\cdot, \cdot)$ is its limit in probability.¹¹

The out-of-sample R^2 , which can be readily computed from a split-sample procedure, therefore offers a useful indicator for quality of estimation. In particular, if one is comfortable with the strengthened identification assumptions, there is little reason not to use the model that achieves the best out-of-sample prediction performance on the split-sample. In some settings, this best-performing model will be linear regression, but in many settings it may not be, and using more complex tools may deliver benefits.

Moreover, much of the discussion on using machine learning for instrumental variables analysis has been focused on *selecting* instruments (Belloni *et al.*, 2012; Angrist and Frandsen, 2019) assuming some level of

⁷See Section 4 of Heckman and Vytlacil (2005) for a derivation where $a(W_i) = 1$. The result with general positive $a(W_i)$ follows with the change of measure $p(W_i, D_i, Y_i) \mapsto \frac{a(W_i)}{\mathbb{E}[a(W_i)]} p(W_i, D_i, Y_i)$, and so we may simply replace expectation operators with expectation weighted by $a(W_i)$.

⁸In the presence of covariates under identity weighting, we may, without loss of generality, partial out the covariates.

⁹i.e. $\hat{Y}(Z_i) = [1, \hat{v}(Z_i)]^\top$.

¹⁰See, for instance, Friedman *et al.* (2001) Section 7.4.

¹¹The F -statistic is a monotone transformation of the R^2 , which also serves as an indication of estimation quality.

sparsity, motivated by statistical difficulties encountered when the number of instruments is high. In light of the heuristic above, a more precise framing is perhaps *combining* instruments to form a better prediction of the endogenous regressor, as noted by Hansen and Kozbur (2014).

Weak IV detection and robust inference. A major practical motivation for our work, following Bai and Ng (2010), is to use machine learning to rescue otherwise weak instruments due to a lack of linear correlation; nonetheless, the instrument may be irredeemably weak, and providing weak-instrument robust inference is important in practice. Relatedly, Xu (2021) and Antoine and Lavergne (2019) also consider weak IV inference with nonlinear first-stages; the benefits of split-sampling in the presence of many or weak instruments are recently exploited by Mikusheva and Sun (2020) and date to Dufour (2003); Angrist *et al.* (1999); Staiger and Stock (1994) and references therein; Kaji (2019) proposes a general theory of weak identification in semiparametric settings.

On weak IV detection, our procedure produces estimated optimal instruments, which result in just-identified moment conditions. As a result, in models with *a single endogenous treatment variable*, the Stock and Yogo (2005) F -statistic rule-of-thumb has its exact interpretation¹² regardless of homo- or heteroskedasticity (Andrews *et al.*, 2019), and the first stage F -statistic may be used as a tool for detecting weak instruments.

Pre-testing for weak instruments distorts downstream inferences since it is a form on model selection. As a consequence, weak IV robust inferences, which are inferences of τ that are valid regardless of instrument strength, are often preferred. The procedure we propose, under identity-weighting, is readily compatible with weak IV robust inference. In particular, on each subsample S_j , we may perform the Anderson–Rubin test (Anderson *et al.*, 1949) and combining the results across subsamples via Bonferroni. For a confidence interval at the 95% nominal level with two-fold sample-splitting, this amounts to intersecting two 97.5%-nominal AR confidence intervals on each subsample.

More formally, consider the null hypothesis $\tau = \tau_0$. Let $U_i(\tau_0) \equiv Y_i - D_i^\top \tau_0$. Let $\tilde{U}_i(\tau_0) \equiv U_i(\tau_0) - \tilde{\delta}^\top \bar{X}_i$ be the residual of $U_i(\tau_0)$ projected onto $\bar{X}_i \equiv [1, X_i^\top]^\top$. Suppose the estimated instrument takes the form $\hat{Y}(Z_i) = [1, \hat{v}(Z_i)^\top, X_i^\top]^\top$, where $\dim \hat{v}(Z_i) = \dim D_i$. Let

$$V_{n,j}(\tau_0) \equiv \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i \in S_j} \hat{v}^{(j)}(Z_i) \tilde{U}_i(\tau_0) \text{ and } \Omega_{n,j}(\tau_0) \equiv \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in S_j} \tilde{U}_i(\tau_0)^2 \tilde{v}^{(j)}(Z_i) \tilde{v}^{(j)}(Z_i)^\top,$$

where $\tilde{v}^{(j)} \equiv \hat{v}^{(j)} - \tilde{\lambda}^\top \bar{X}_i$ be the residual after projecting onto \bar{X}_i . Finally, let the Anderson–Rubin statistic on the j -th subsample be $\text{AR}_j(\tau_0) \equiv V_{n,j}^\top \Omega_{n,j}^{-1} V_{n,j}$. **Theorem 2** shows that on each subsample, under mild bounded moment conditions that ensure convergence (**Assumption 3**), $\text{AR}_j(\tau_0)$ attains a limiting χ^2 distribution. Under weak IV asymptotics, it is not necessarily the case that the AR statistics are asymptotically uncorrelated across subsamples, and so we resort to the Bonferroni procedure in outputting a single confidence interval.

Assumption 3 (Bounded moments for the AR statistic). *Without loss of generality and normalizing if necessary, assume $\sum_{i \in S_j} \hat{v}_k^{(j)}(Z_i)^2 = 1$ for all $k = 1, \dots, \dim D_i$. Let $\lambda_n \equiv \mathbb{E}[\bar{X}_i \bar{X}_i]^{-1} \mathbb{E}[\hat{v}^{(j)}(Z_i) \bar{X}_i^\top \mid \hat{v}^{(j)}]$ be the projection coefficient of $\hat{v}^{(j)}(Z_i)$ onto \bar{X}_i . Assume that with probability 1, the sequence $\hat{v}^{(j)} = \hat{v}_n^{(j)}$ satisfies the Lyapunov conditions*

$$(i) \mathbb{E}[U_i^4 \mid \hat{v}^{(j)}(Z_i) - \lambda_n \bar{X}_i] < C_1 < \infty \text{ for some } \epsilon, C_1 > 0$$

¹²Namely, the worst-case bias of TSLS exceed 10% of the worst-case bias of OLS (Andrews *et al.*, 2019).

$$(ii) \mathbb{E}[U_i^2(\hat{v}^{(j)}(Z_i) - \lambda_n \bar{X}_i)(\hat{v}^{(j)}(Z_i) - \lambda_n \bar{X}_i)^\top \mid \hat{v}^{(j)}] \rightarrow \Omega.$$

Moreover, assume (iii) $\mathbb{E}[\|\hat{v}^{(j)}\|^4], \mathbb{E}[U_i^4], \mathbb{E}[\|X_i\|^4] < C_2 < \infty$ and that (iv) $\mathbb{E}[\bar{X}_i \bar{X}_i^\top]$ is invertible.

Theorem 2. Under [Assumption 3](#), $\text{AR}_j(\tau_0) \rightsquigarrow \chi_{\dim D_i}^2$.

Proof. We relegate the proof, which amounts to checking convergences $V_{n,j} \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{N}(0, \Omega)$ and $\Omega_{n,j} \xrightarrow{p} \Omega$ under [Assumption 3](#), to the appendix. \square

(When) is machine learning useful? We conclude this section by discussing our work relative to [Angrist and Frandsen \(2019\)](#), who note that using lasso and random forest methods in the first stage does not seem to provide large performance benefits in practice, on a simulation design based on the data of [Angrist and Krueger \(1991\)](#). We note that, per our discussion above in the connection between first-stage fitting and estimate quality, a good heuristic summary for the estimation precision is the R^2 between the fitted instrument and the true optimal instrument— $\mathbb{E}[D_i \mid W_i]$ in the homoskedastic case. It is quite possible that in some settings, the conditional expectation $\mathbb{E}[D_i \mid W_i]$ is estimated well with linear regression, and lasso or random forest do not provide large benefits in terms of out-of-sample prediction quality. Since [Angrist and Krueger \(1991\)](#)’s instruments are quarter-of-birth interactions and are hence binary, it is in fact likely that predicting D with linear regression performs well relative to nonlinear or complex methods¹³ in the setting. Whether or not machine learning methods work well relative to linear methods is something that the researcher may verify in practice, via evaluating performance on a hold-out set, which is standard machine learning practice but is not yet widely adopted in empirical economics. Indeed, we observe that in both real ([Section 4](#)) and Monte Carlo ([Appendix C](#)) settings where the out-of-sample prediction quality of more complex machine learning methods out-perform linear regression, MLSS estimators perform better than TSLS.

4 Empirical Application

We consider an empirical application in the criminal justice setting of [Ash et al. \(2019\)](#), where we consider the causal effect of appellate court decisions at the U.S. circuit court level on lengths of criminal sentences at the U.S. district courts under jurisdiction of the circuit court. [Ash et al. \(2019\)](#) exploit the fact that appellate judges are randomly assigned, and use the characteristics of appellate judges—including age, party affiliation, education, and career backgrounds—as instrumental variables. In criminal justice cases, plaintiffs rarely appeal, as it would involve trying the defendant twice for the same offense—generally not permitted in the United States; therefore, an appellate court reversal would typically be in favor of defendants, and we may posit a causal channel in which such reversals affect sentencing; for instance, the district court may be more lenient as a result of a reversal, as would be naturally predicted if the reversal sets up a precedent in favor of the defendant.

To connect the set up with our notation, the outcome variable Y is the change in sentencing length before and after an appellate decision, measured in months, where larger values of Y indicates that sentences become longer after the appellate court decision. The endogenous treatment variable D is whether or not an appellate decision reverses a district court ruling. The instruments W are the characteristics of the randomly assigned

¹³Indeed, in some of our experiments calibrated to the [Angrist and Krueger \(1991\)](#) data, using a simple gradient boosting method (`lightgbm`) does not outperform linear regression in terms of out-of-sample R^2 (0.039% vs. 0.05%).

circuit judge presiding over the appellate case in question, and covariates X contain textual features from the circuit case, represented by Doc2Vec embeddings (Le and Mikolov, 2014).¹⁴

We present our results in Table 2, comparing an MLSS estimator to a linear IV estimator, with or without sample-splitting. The first three columns of Table 2 display the point estimate, standard errors, and Wald confidence intervals. The point estimate of MLSS estimators fall in the range -1.7 to -0.6, suggesting a small effect of appellate court reversals—typically in favor of an appealing defendant—on district court leniency. The Wald confidence intervals are of the range -3 to 0.8, which fail to reject the null hypothesis of zero effect. These results do not vary wildly across sample splits and are robust to inclusion of covariates. In the fourth column, we display our preferred inference method, the identification-robust Anderson–Rubin confidence interval. For MLSS estimators, the AR interval mostly agrees with the Wald interval, suggesting that the estimated instrument \hat{Y} is in fact strong, despite that judge characteristics are a relatively weak predictor for appellate court decisions.

Linear IV-based methods, however, suffer considerably from weak identification. Standard errors are significantly larger for linear IV estimates, and the Wald confidence intervals are dramatically different from the Anderson–Rubin confidence intervals. Indeed, the Wald intervals are often significantly shorter than AR intervals, which can sometimes even be $(-\infty, \infty)$, suggesting that the instruments are uninformative of the treatment. In this case, Wald confidence intervals for linear IV estimators lead to overall imprecise inference and are sometimes quite misleading—Wald intervals for the non-split-sample linear IV estimator are quite spuriously narrow, masking identification issues.

Table 2: Estimates and confidence intervals of the treatment effect of appeals decision reversal on criminal sentence length (months)

Split-sample ID	Estimate	SE	Wald	Anderson-Rubin	R^2	Estimator
0	-1.71	0.70	[-3.08, -0.35]	[-3.04, -0.23]	0.0199	MLSS (Random Forest)
0	5.35	5.17	[-4.78, 15.47]	$[-\infty, \infty]$	-0.0137	Split-sample linear IV
1	-0.65	0.61	[-1.85, 0.55]	[-2.34, 0.80]	0.0261	MLSS (Random Forest)
1	1.14	2.74	[-4.24, 6.52]	[-11.04, 11.58]	-0.0078	Split-sample linear IV
2	-0.91	0.67	[-2.22, 0.40]	[-3.06, 0.98]	0.0250	MLSS (Random Forest)
2	2.31	4.10	[-5.73, 10.35]	$[-\infty, \infty]$	-0.0114	Split-sample linear IV
3	-1.26	0.65	[-2.54, 0.02]	[-2.64, -0.09]	0.0250	MLSS (Random Forest)
3	5.74	5.17	[-4.39, 15.87]	$(-\infty, -33.49] \cup [-8.54, \infty)$	-0.0132	Split-sample linear IV
4	-1.06	0.65	[-2.34, 0.22]	[-2.96, 0.76]	0.0263	MLSS (Random Forest)
4	-3.24	5.51	[-14.05, 7.56]	[-10.88, 79.99]	-0.1174	Split-sample linear IV
0	-1.76	0.82	[-3.37, -0.16]	[-3.04, -0.33]		MLSS with covariates
1	-0.68	0.75	[-2.14, 0.78]	[-2.48, 0.89]		MLSS with covariates
2	-0.93	0.77	[-2.44, 0.59]	[-2.95, 1.05]		MLSS with covariates
3	-1.31	0.77	[-2.82, 0.21]	[-2.71, 0.01]		MLSS with covariates
4	-1.09	0.76	[-2.57, 0.39]	[-3.12, 0.99]		MLSS with covariates
Full-sample	0.8300	1.0600	[-1.25, 2.91]	[-1.00, 14.06]	—	Linear IV

Notes: Parameter estimates and confidence intervals over five random sample-splits shown. For each split-sample, we further split S_1 to form a validation sample 10% the size for tuning hyperparameters. Hyperparameters of the random forest are chosen to minimize validation error on this subsample of S_1 . All Anderson–Rubin intervals for split-sample designs are applied to the estimated instrument, and thus are just-identified.

¹⁴Empirically, the instrument does not seem to predict the covariates very well, and so we make the convenient assumption that $\mathbb{E}[X|Z]$ is constant in implementing the estimator with covariates, and the MLSS estimator with covariates under identity weighting is simply the TSLS estimator with the MLSS-estimated instrument \hat{Y} and covariates.

5 Conclusion

In this paper, we provide a simple and user-friendly analysis of incorporating machine learning techniques into instrumental variable analysis in a manner that is familiar to applied researchers. In particular, we document via elementary techniques that a split-sample IV estimator with machine learning methods as the first stage inherits classical asymptotic and optimality properties of usual instrumental regression, requiring only weak conditions governing the consistency of the first stage prediction. In the presence of covariates, we also formalize moment conditions for instrumental regression that continues to leverage nonlinearities in the excluded instrument without creating spurious identification from the nonlinearities in the included covariates. Leveraging such nonlinearity in the first stage allows the user to extract more identifying variation from the instrumental variables and can have the potential of rescuing seemingly weak instruments into strong ones, as we demonstrate with simulated data and real data from a criminal justice context. Conventional accoutrements of an instrumental variable analysis, such as identification-robust confidence sets, extend seamlessly in the presence of a machine learning first stage. We believe that machine learning in IV settings is a mostly harmless addition to the empiricist's toolbox.

References

- AI, C. and CHEN, X. (2003). Efficient estimation of models with conditional moment restrictions containing unknown functions. *Econometrica*, **71** (6), 1795–1843.
- and — (2007). Estimation of possibly misspecified semiparametric conditional moment restriction models with different conditioning variables. *Journal of Econometrics*, **141** (1), 5–43.
- and — (2012). The semiparametric efficiency bound for models of sequential moment restrictions containing unknown functions. *Journal of Econometrics*, **170** (2), 442–457.
- ANDERSON, T. W., RUBIN, H. *et al.* (1949). Estimation of the parameters of a single equation in a complete system of stochastic equations. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, **20** (1), 46–63.
- ANDREWS, I., STOCK, J. H. and SUN, L. (2019). Weak instruments in iv regression: Theory and practice. In *Annual Review of Economics*.
- ANGRIST, J. and FRANZSEN, B. (2019). *Machine labor*. Tech. rep., National Bureau of Economic Research.
- ANGRIST, J. D., IMBENS, G. W. and KRUEGER, A. B. (1999). Jackknife instrumental variables estimation. *Journal of Applied Econometrics*, **14** (1), 57–67.
- and KRUEGER, A. B. (1991). Does compulsory school attendance affect schooling and earnings? *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, **106** (4), 979–1014.
- and — (2001). Instrumental variables and the search for identification: From supply and demand to natural experiments. *Journal of Economic perspectives*, **15** (4), 69–85.
- and PISCHKE, J.-S. (2008). *Mostly harmless econometrics: An empiricist’s companion*. Princeton university press.
- ANTOINE, B. and LAVERGNE, P. (2019). Identification-robust nonparametric inference in a linear iv model.
- ASH, E., CHEN, D., ZHANG, X., HUANG, Z. and WANG, R. (2019). Deep iv in law: Analysis of appellate impacts on sentencing using high-dimensional instrumental variables. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (Causal ML Workshop)*.
- BAI, J. and NG, S. (2010). Instrumental variable estimation in a data rich environment. *Econometric Theory*, pp. 1577–1606.
- BEKKER, P. A. (1994). Alternative approximations to the distributions of instrumental variable estimators. *Econometrica: Journal of the Econometric Society*, pp. 657–681.
- BELLONI, A., CHEN, D., CHERNOZHUKOV, V. and HANSEN, C. (2012). Sparse models and methods for optimal instruments with an application to eminent domain. *Econometrica*, **80** (6), 2369–2429.
- CHAMBERLAIN, G. (1987). Asymptotic efficiency in estimation with conditional moment restrictions. *Journal of Econometrics*, **34** (3), 305–334.
- (1992). Comment: Sequential moment restrictions in panel data. *Journal of Business & Economic Statistics*, **10** (1), 20–26.

- CHEN, J., CHEN, X., LIAO, Y. and TAMER, E. (2020a). *Deep Learning Inference on Semi-Parametric Models with Weakly Dependent Data*. Tech. rep.
- , — and TAMER, E. (2020b). *Efficient Estimation of Expectation Functionals of Nonparametric Conditional Moments via Neural Networks*. Tech. rep.
- CHEN, X. and POUZO, D. (2012). Estimation of nonparametric conditional moment models with possibly nonsmooth generalized residuals. *Econometrica*, **80** (1), 277–321.
- and — (2015). Sieve wald and qlr inferences on semi/nonparametric conditional moment models. *Econometrica*, **83** (3), 1013–1079.
- CHERNOZHUKOV, V., CHETVERIKOV, D., DEMIRER, M., DUFLO, E., HANSEN, C., NEWEY, W. and ROBINS, J. (2018). Double/debiased machine learning for treatment and structural parameters.
- , ESCANCIANO, J. C., ICHIMURA, H., NEWEY, W. K. and ROBINS, J. M. (2016). Locally robust semi-parametric estimation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1608.00033*.
- , HANSEN, C. and SPINDLER, M. (2015). Post-selection and post-regularization inference in linear models with many controls and instruments. *American Economic Review*, **105** (5), 486–90.
- CURRIE, J., KLEVEN, H. and ZWIERS, E. (2020). Technology and big data are changing economics: mining text to track methods. In *AEA Papers and Proceedings*, vol. 110, pp. 42–48.
- DIETERLE, S. G. and SNELL, A. (2016). A simple diagnostic to investigate instrument validity and heterogeneous effects when using a single instrument. *Labour Economics*, **42**, 76–86.
- DIKKALA, N., LEWIS, G., MACKAY, L. and SYRGKANIS, V. (2020). Minimax estimation of conditional moment models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2006.07201*.
- DUFOUR, J.-M. (2003). Identification, weak instruments, and statistical inference in econometrics. *Canadian Journal of Economics/Revue canadienne d'économique*, **36** (4), 767–808.
- ESCANCIANO, J. C. and LI, W. (2020). Optimal linear instrumental variables approximations. *Journal of Econometrics*.
- FRIEDMAN, J., HASTIE, T., TIBSHIRANI, R. *et al.* (2001). *The elements of statistical learning*, vol. 1. Springer series in statistics New York.
- HANSEN, C. and KOZBUR, D. (2014). Instrumental variables estimation with many weak instruments using regularized jive. *Journal of Econometrics*, **182** (2), 290–308.
- HARTFORD, J., LEWIS, G., LEYTON-BROWN, K. and TADDY, M. (2017). Deep iv: A flexible approach for counterfactual prediction. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 1414–1423.
- HECKMAN, J. J. and VYTLACIL, E. (2005). Structural equations, treatment effects, and econometric policy evaluation 1. *Econometrica*, **73** (3), 669–738.
- HOROWITZ, J. L. and LEE, S. (2007). Nonparametric instrumental variables estimation of a quantile regression model. *Econometrica*, **75** (4), 1191–1208.
- KAJI, T. (2019). Theory of weak identification in semiparametric models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1908.10478*.

- LE, Q. and MIKOLOV, T. (2014). Distributed representations of sentences and documents. In *International conference on machine learning*, pp. 1188–1196.
- LIU, R., SHANG, Z. and CHENG, G. (2020). On deep instrumental variables estimate.
- MACKEY, L., SYRGKANIS, V. and ZADIK, I. (2018). Orthogonal machine learning: Power and limitations. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, PMLR, pp. 3375–3383.
- MIKUSHEVA, A. and SUN, L. (2020). Inference with many weak instruments. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2004.12445*.
- NEWKEY, W. K. and POWELL, J. L. (2003). Instrumental variable estimation of nonparametric models. *Econometrica*, **71** (5), 1565–1578.
- RASKUTTI, G., WAINWRIGHT, M. J. and YU, B. (2011). Minimax rates of estimation for high-dimensional linear regression over ℓ_q -balls. *IEEE transactions on information theory*, **57** (10), 6976–6994.
- ROBINSON, P. M. (1988). Root-n-consistent semiparametric regression. *Econometrica: Journal of the Econometric Society*, pp. 931–954.
- SEVERINI, T. A. and TRIPATHI, G. (2012). Efficiency bounds for estimating linear functionals of nonparametric regression models with endogenous regressors. *Journal of Econometrics*, **170** (2), 491–498.
- STAIGER, D. and STOCK, J. H. (1994). *Instrumental variables regression with weak instruments*. Tech. rep., National Bureau of Economic Research.
- STOCK, J. H. and YOGO, M. (2005). Testing for weak instruments in linear iv regression. *Identification and inference for econometric models: Essays in honor of Thomas Rothenberg*, **80** (4.2), 1.
- XU, R. (2021). *Weak Instruments with a Binary Endogenous Explanatory Variable*. Tech. rep.

A Technical lemmas and proofs

Lemma 3. *Under conditions 1 and 3 of Assumption 1, we have (3).*

Proof. We first consider the first statement. Observe that

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \left(\hat{\Upsilon}(Z_i) - \Upsilon(Z_i) \right) T_i^\top = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j \in \{1,2\}} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in S_j} \left(\hat{\Upsilon}^{(j)}(Z_i) - \Upsilon(Z_i) \right) T_i^\top$$

We control the right-hand side, where $\|\cdot\|_F$ is the Frobenius norm:

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in S_j} \left(\hat{\Upsilon}^{(j)}(Z_i) - \Upsilon(Z_i) \right) T_i^\top \right\|_F^2 &\leq \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in S_j} \|\hat{\Upsilon}^{(j)}(Z_i) - \Upsilon(Z_i)\| \cdot \|T_i\| \right)^2 && (\|AB\|_F \leq \|A\|_F \|B\|_F) \\ &\leq \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in S_j} \|\hat{\Upsilon}^{(j)}(Z_i) - \Upsilon(Z_i)\|^2 \right) \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in S_j} \|T_i\|^2 \right) && (\text{Cauchy-Schwarz}) \\ &= O_p(1) \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in S_j} \|\hat{\Upsilon}^{(j)}(Z_i) - \Upsilon(Z_i)\|^2 && (\text{Since } \mathbb{E}\|T_i\|^2 < \infty \text{ in condition 3}) \\ &\xrightarrow{p} 0 \end{aligned}$$

The last step follows, because the nonnegative random variable $n^{-1} \sum_{i \in S_j} \|\hat{\Upsilon}^{(j)}(Z_i) - \Upsilon(Z_i)\|^2 \geq 0$ has expectation converging to zero by condition 1 of Assumption 1. Therefore

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \left(\hat{\Upsilon}(Z_i) - \Upsilon(Z_i) \right) T_i^\top = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j \in \{1,2\}} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in S_j} \left(\hat{\Upsilon}^{(j)}(Z_i) - \Upsilon(Z_i) \right) T_i^\top = o_p(1).$$

We now consider the second statement. Again we may decompose

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \left(\hat{\Upsilon}(Z_i) - \Upsilon(Z_i) \right) U_i = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j \in \{1,2\}} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in S_j} \left(\hat{\Upsilon}^{(j)}(Z_i) - \Upsilon(Z_i) \right) U_i \equiv \frac{Q_1 + Q_2}{2}$$

and show that $Q_j \equiv \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in S_j} \left(\hat{\Upsilon}^{(j)}(Z_i) - \Upsilon(Z_i) \right) U_i \equiv \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i \in S_j} \Delta_i U_i = o_p(1)$. It suffices to show that $\text{Var}(Q_j) = o(1)$, since $Q_j = \mathbb{E}Q_j + O_p(\sqrt{\text{Var}(Q_j)})$ and where $\mathbb{E}[Q_j] = 0$. We have,

$$\text{Var}(Q_j) = \mathbb{E} \text{Var}(Q_j | S_j) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in S_j} \mathbb{E} \text{Var}(\Delta_i U_i | S_{-j}) \leq \mathbb{E} [\mathbb{E}[\Delta_i^2 | S_{-j}] \mathbb{E}[U_i^2]] = \mathbb{E}[\Delta_i^2] \mathbb{E}[U_i^2] \rightarrow 0,$$

where the first equality is by law of total variance, second equality is by independence of $\Delta_i U_i$ conditional on S_{-j} , the inequality is by Cauchy-Schwarz, and the limit is by condition 1 of Assumption 1. \square

Lemma 4. *Under Assumption 2, $\hat{\Omega} \equiv \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N (Y_i - T_i^\top \hat{\theta}_N^{\text{MLSS}})^2 \hat{\Upsilon}_i \hat{\Upsilon}_i^\top \xrightarrow{p} \Omega$.*

Proof. Observe that $(Y_i - T_i^\top \hat{\theta}_N^{\text{MLSS}})^2 = U_i^2 + (\theta - \hat{\theta}_N^{\text{MLSS}})^\top (T_i T_i^\top (\theta - \hat{\theta}_N^{\text{MLSS}}) + 2U_i T_i) \equiv U_i^2 + (\theta - \hat{\theta}_N^{\text{MLSS}})^\top V_i$. Note that

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| (\theta - \hat{\theta}_N^{\text{MLSS}})^\top \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N V_i \hat{\Upsilon}_i \hat{\Upsilon}_i^\top \right\|_F &\leq \|\theta - \hat{\theta}_N^{\text{MLSS}}\| \cdot \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \|V_i\| \|\hat{\Upsilon}_i\| \\ &\leq o_p(1) \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N V_i^2 \cdot \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \|\hat{\Upsilon}_i\|^4 \right)^{1/2} \end{aligned}$$

$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \|V_i\|^2$ is $O_p(1)$ if $\|T_i\|^4, \|U_i\|^4$ have bounded expectations. $\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \|\hat{\Upsilon}_i\|^4$ is $O_p(1)$ since Υ has bounded fourth

moments and so does the difference $\|\hat{\Upsilon} - \Upsilon\|$. Thus

$$\hat{\Omega} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N U_i^2 \hat{\Upsilon}_i \hat{\Upsilon}_i^\top + o_p(1).$$

Next, we may compute

$$\left\| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N (\hat{\Upsilon}_i \hat{\Upsilon}_i^\top - \Upsilon_i \Upsilon_i^\top) U_i^2 \right\|_F \leq \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N 2U_i^2 \|\Upsilon_i\| \|\hat{\Upsilon}_i - \Upsilon_i\| + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \|\hat{\Upsilon}_i - \Upsilon_i\|^2 U_i^2.$$

Note that the expectation of the second term on the right-hand side is

$$\mathbb{E}[\|\hat{\Upsilon}_i - \Upsilon_i\|^2] \cdot \mathbb{E}[U_i^2] \rightarrow 0,$$

since the multiplicands are uncorrelated by virtue of sample-splitting. Thus the second term is a nonnegative sequence with vanishing expectation, and is hence $o_p(1)$. Applying Cauchy–Schwarz on the first term by sample, we have that the first term is $o_p(1)$ so long as

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N U_i^4 \|v_i\|^2 = O_p(1).$$

This is true since its expectation is $\mathbb{E}U_i^4 \mathbb{E}\|v_i\|^2 < \infty$, and the $O_p(1)$ follows by Markov’s inequality. \square

Theorem 5 (Theorem 2 in the main text). *Under Assumption 3, $\text{AR}_j(\tau_0) \rightsquigarrow \chi_{\dim D_i}^2$.*

Proof. We first show that $V_{n,j} \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{N}(0, \Omega)$. Observe that $\tilde{U}_i = -(\tilde{\delta} - \delta)^\top \bar{X}_i + U_i$ where

$$(\tilde{\delta} - \delta) = \left[\frac{1}{n} \sum_i \bar{X}_i \bar{X}_i^\top \right]^{-1} \frac{1}{n} \sum_i \bar{X}_i U_i^\top.$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} V_{n,j} &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i \in S_j} \hat{v}^{(j)}(Z_i) U_i - \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i \in S_j} \hat{v}^{(j)}(Z_i) \bar{X}_i^\top \right) (\tilde{\delta} - \delta) \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i \in S_j} \hat{v}^{(j)}(Z_i) U_i - \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in S_j} \hat{v}^{(j)}(Z_i) \bar{X}_i^\top \right) \sqrt{n} (\tilde{\delta} - \delta) \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i \in S_j} \left(\hat{v}^{(j)}(Z_i) - \lambda_n^\top \bar{X}_i \right) U_i + o_p(1). \end{aligned}$$

The last equality follows from the following laws of large numbers (in triangular arrays):

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_i \bar{X}_i \bar{X}_i^\top = \underbrace{\mathbb{E}[\bar{X}_i \bar{X}_i^\top]}_{\text{invertible}} + o_p(1) \quad \frac{1}{n} \sum_i \hat{v}^{(j)}(Z_i) \bar{X}_i^\top = \mathbb{E}[\hat{v}^{(j)}(Z_i) \bar{X}_i^\top \mid \hat{v}^{(j)}] + o_p(1),$$

for which the fourth-moment conditions (iii), (iv) of Assumption 3 are sufficient. The conditions (i) and (ii) are then Lyapunov conditions for the central limit theorem $V_{n,j} \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{N}(0, \Omega)$ conditional on $\hat{v}^{(j)}$. Since the limiting distribution does not depend on $\hat{v}^{(j)}$ and the conditions are stated as $\hat{v}^{(j)}$ -almost-sure, $V_{n,j} \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{N}(0, \Omega)$ unconditionally as well.¹⁵

Next, we show that $\Omega_{n,j} \xrightarrow{p} \Omega$. By condition (ii) and law of large numbers (so that $\frac{1}{n} \sum_i U_i^2 (\hat{v}^{(j)}(Z_i) - \lambda_n \bar{X}_i) (\hat{v}^{(j)}(Z_i) - \lambda_n \bar{X}_i)^\top \xrightarrow{p} \Omega$), it suffices to show that

$$\Omega_{n,j} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_i U_i^2 (\hat{v}^{(j)}(Z_i) - \lambda_n \bar{X}_i) (\hat{v}^{(j)}(Z_i) - \lambda_n \bar{X}_i)^\top + o_p(1).$$

¹⁵In one dimension, $\Pr(Z \leq t \mid \hat{v}^{(j)}) \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} \Phi(t)$ implies that $\Pr(Z \leq t) \rightarrow \Phi(t)$ by dominated convergence. We may reduce the multidimensional case to the scalar case with the Cramer–Wold device.

Write $\tilde{U}_i = U_i - (\tilde{\delta} - \delta)^\top \bar{X}_i$ and $\tilde{v}^{(j)} = [\hat{v}^{(j)} - \lambda_n \bar{X}_i] - (\tilde{\lambda} - \lambda_n)^\top \bar{X}_i$. Expanding the sum yields

$$\Omega_{n,j} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_i U_i^2 [\hat{v}^{(j)} - \lambda_n \bar{X}_i] [\hat{v}^{(j)} - \lambda_n \bar{X}_i]^\top + (\tilde{\delta} - \delta)^\top \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_i A_{in} \right) + (\tilde{\lambda} - \lambda_n)^\top \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_i B_{in} \right)$$

for some A_{in}, B_{in} that involve products of up to four terms of $U_i, \bar{X}_i, \hat{v}^{(j)}$. Since the fourth moments are bounded by (iii), we have that $\frac{1}{n} \sum_i A_{in} = O_p(1)$ and $\frac{1}{n} \sum_i B_{in} = O_p(1)$. Since $\tilde{\delta} - \delta$ and $\tilde{\lambda} - \lambda_n$ are both $o_p(1)$, we have the desired expansion.

Therefore, by Slutsky's theorem, $\text{AR}_j(\tau) \rightsquigarrow Z^\top \Omega^{-1} Z \sim \chi_{\dim D_i}^2$ where $Z \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \Omega)$. \square

B Discussion related to NPIV

A principled modeling approach is the NPIV model, which treats the unknown structural function g as an infinite dimensional parameter and considers the model

$$\mathbb{E}[Y - g(T) \mid Z] = 0. \quad (\text{NPIV})$$

The researcher may be interested in g itself, or some functionals of g , such as the average derivative $\theta = \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\partial g}{\partial D}(T) \mid Z \right]$ or the best linear approximation $\beta = \mathbb{E}[TT^\top]^{-1} \mathbb{E}[Tg(T)]$. One might wonder whether choosing a parametric functional form in place of $g(T)$ is without loss of generality. Linear regression of Y on T , for instance, yields the best linear approximation to the structural function $\mathbb{E}[Y|T]$, and thus has an attractive nonparametric interpretation; it may be tempting to ask whether an analogous property holds for IV regression. If an analogous property does hold, we may have license in being more blasé about linearity in the second stage.

Unfortunately, modeling g as linear does not produce the best linear approximation, at least not with respect to the L^2 -norm.¹⁶ Escanciano and Li (2020) show that the best linear approximation can be written as a particular IV regression estimand

$$\beta = \mathbb{E}[h(Z)T^\top]^{-1} \mathbb{E}[h(Z)Y]$$

where h has the property that $\mathbb{E}[h(Z)|T] = T$. Note that with efficient instrument in a homoskedastic, no-covariate linear IV context as we consider in Section 2.1, the optimal instrument is $\hat{D}(W) = \mathbb{E}[D|W]$. A sufficient condition, under which the IV estimand based on the optimal instrument is equal to the best linear approximation β , is the somewhat strange condition that the projection onto D of *predicted* D is linear in D itself: For some invertible A , $\mathbb{E}[\hat{D}(W)|D] = AD$. The condition would hold, for instance, in a setting where D, W are jointly Gaussian and all conditional expectations are linear, but it is difficult to think it holds in general. As such, linear IV would not recover the best linear approximation to the nonlinear structural function in general.

A simple calculation can nevertheless characterize the bias of the linear approach if we take the estimand to be the best linear approximation to the structural function. Suppose we form an instrumental variable estimator that converges to an estimand of the form

$$\gamma = \mathbb{E}[f(Z)T^\top]^{-1} \mathbb{E}[f(Z)Y].$$

It is easy to see that

$$\gamma - \beta = \langle g - \mathbb{E}^*[g|T], \mu - \mathbb{E}^*[\mu|T] \rangle,$$

where $\langle A, B \rangle = \mathbb{E}[AB]$, $\mu(T) = \mathbb{E}[f(Z)|T]$, and $\mathbb{E}^*[A|B]$ is the best linear projection of A onto B . This means that the two estimands are identical if and only if at least one of $\mu(\cdot)$ or $g(\cdot)$ are linear, and all else equal the bias is smaller if μ or g is more linear. Importantly, $\mu - \mathbb{E}^*[\mu|T]$ are objects that we could empirically estimate since they are conditional means, and in practice the researcher may estimate $\mu - \mathbb{E}^*[\mu|T]$, which delivers bounds on $\gamma - \beta$ through assumptions on linearity of g .

¹⁶In fact, since it is possible for $g(\cdot)$ to be strictly monotone, instrument Z to be strong, and $\text{Cov}(Y, Z) = 0$, TSLS is not guaranteed to recover any convex-weighted linear approximation to g either.

C Monte Carlo example

We report in Table 3 the results of a Monte Carlo experiment corresponding to the simple case without covariates. We let $N = 500$, $W_i \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I_p)$ for $p = 5$, and let $D = f(W) + V$ where $f(\cdot)$ is linear in W and element-wise squares and cubes of W . We let $Y = D\tau + U$ for $U = \rho V + \sqrt{1 - \rho^2}S$, where the endogeneity is controlled by $\rho = 0.8$ and $S, V \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ independently.

We consider the performance of the traditional TSLS estimator, an MLSS estimator (where nuisance estimation is performed via two-layer ReLU feedforward network), and an oracle estimator (the efficient instrument $\Upsilon(W) = \mathbb{E}[D|W]$ is known) in two settings. In one setting (“quadratic only”), f is symmetric about zero (only containing quadratic terms in W), and thus W is a weak instrument from the linear IV perspective. In the other setting, W is a strong instrument for linear IV as well.

Unsurprisingly, MLSS performs significantly better in terms of estimation quality compared to linear TSLS when the instrument is linearly irrelevant. In the other setting, when the prediction performance of MLSS and TSLS are similar, we see that the performance in terms of coverage and RMSE is similar as well. However, this only indicates the performance of a specific machine learning estimator with minimal tuning; the first stage R^2 of the oracle estimator indicates that neither the linear regression nor the prediction function chosen by the MLSS estimator is close to the true conditional expectation function, and we should expect better machine learning methods, in terms of out-of-sample prediction quality, being able to do better in terms of RMSE of the structural parameter.

We see that Wald intervals for all these estimators cover at approximately the nominal level.¹⁷ The oracle estimator seems to confirm that we should expect mild coverage distortions in finite samples, relative to the 95% nominal level, as the oracle estimator also undercovers by 2–3%.

Table 3: Monte Carlo experiment results

		RMSE	Coverage	R^2
Quadratic only				
True	MLSS	0.0192	0.9150	0.7555
	TSLS	0.1422	0.9700	-0.1625
	Oracle	0.0168	0.9250	0.8897
False	MLSS	0.0041	0.9400	0.4777
	TSLS	0.0038	0.9400	0.4732
	Oracle	0.0030	0.9200	0.9959

Notes: Summary statistics across 200 experiments shown. *RMSE* refers to the root mean-square error of the parameter of interest. *Coverage* refers to the coverage of a nominal 95% Wald interval. R^2 refers to the statistic $R^2 \equiv 1 - \frac{\text{Mean Squared Prediction Error}}{\text{Var } Y}$ calculated out-of-sample, which can be negative. *Quadratic only* refers to whether $\mathbb{E}[D|W]$ has only quadratic terms in W —if so TSLS would be weak since the best linear approximation to $\mathbb{E}[D|W]$ when W is symmetric about zero is a constant function.

¹⁷This is a fortunate fact for the TSLS estimator in the quadratic only scenario, where the coverage happens to be above nominal despite the nonidentification.

Algorithm 1 Machine learning split-sample estimation and inference

Require: A subroutine $\text{PredictInstrument}(S_{-j}, S_j)$ that returns the estimated instrument $\{\hat{\Upsilon}(Z_i) : i \in S_j\}$, where $\hat{\Upsilon}$ is a function of S_{-j} .

procedure $\text{GENERATEINSTRUMENT}(K, \text{Data})$

Randomly split data into S_1, \dots, S_K

for j in $1, \dots, K$ **do**

$\hat{\Upsilon}^{(j)} \leftarrow \text{PredictInstrument}(S_{-j}, S_j)$

end for

Combine $\hat{\Upsilon}^{(j)}$ into $\hat{\Upsilon}$

Return $S_1, \dots, S_K, \hat{\Upsilon}$

end procedure

procedure $\text{MLSSESTIMATE}(K, \text{Data})$

$S_1, \dots, S_K, \hat{\Upsilon} \leftarrow \text{GenerateInstrument}(K, \text{Data})$

For the full parameter vector, return

$$\hat{\theta} = \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \hat{\Upsilon}(W_i) T_i^\top \right)^{-1} \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \hat{\Upsilon}(W_i) Y_i \right)$$

and variance estimate

$$\hat{V} = \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \hat{\Upsilon}_i T_i^\top \right) \cdot \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N (Y_i - T_i^\top \hat{\theta})^2 \hat{\Upsilon}_i \hat{\Upsilon}_i^\top \right) \cdot \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \hat{\Upsilon}_i T_i^\top \right)^{-\top}$$

For the subvector $\hat{\tau}$, residualize $\hat{\Upsilon}_i, Y_i, D_i$ against X_i to obtain $\tilde{v}_i, \tilde{Y}_i, \tilde{D}_i$, and compute $\hat{\tau} = \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \tilde{v}_i \tilde{D}_i^\top \right)^{-1} \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \tilde{v}_i \tilde{Y}_i \right)$.

▷ Assuming identity weighting

end procedure

procedure $\text{WEAKIVINFERENCE}(K, \text{Data}, \alpha)$

▷ Assuming identity weighting

▷ Assuming a routine $\text{AndersonRubin}(\alpha, \text{Data})$ that returns the $1 - \alpha$ Anderson–Rubin CI

$S_1, \dots, S_K, \hat{\Upsilon} \leftarrow \text{GenerateInstrument}(K, \text{Data})$

for j in $1, \dots, K$ **do**

On S_j , residualize $\hat{\Upsilon}^{(j)}(Z_i), Y_i, D_i$ against X_i to obtain $\tilde{v}_i, \tilde{Y}_i, \tilde{D}_i$

$\text{CI}_j \leftarrow \text{AndersonRubin} \left(\alpha/K, \left\{ \tilde{v}_i, \tilde{Y}_i, \tilde{D}_i \right\}_{i \in S_j} \right)$

end for

Return $\text{CI} = \bigcap_j \text{CI}_j$

end procedure
