

# RERANDOMIZATION WITH DIMINISHING COVARIATE IMBALANCE AND DIVERGING NUMBER OF COVARIATES

BY YUHAO WANG<sup>1,a</sup> AND XINRAN LI<sup>2,b</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Institute for Interdisciplinary Information Sciences, Tsinghua University, [yuhaow@tsinghua.edu.cn](mailto:yuhaow@tsinghua.edu.cn)*

<sup>2</sup>*Department of Statistics, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, [xinranli@illinois.edu](mailto:xinranli@illinois.edu)*

Completely randomized experiments have been the gold standard for drawing causal inference because they can balance all potential confounding on average. However, they may suffer from unbalanced covariates for realized treatment assignments. Rerandomization, a design that rerandomizes the treatment assignment until a prespecified covariate balance criterion is met, has recently got attention due to its easy implementation, improved covariate balance and more efficient inference. Researchers have then suggested to use the treatment assignments that minimize the covariate imbalance, namely the optimally balanced design. This has caused again the long-time controversy between two philosophies for designing experiments: randomization versus optimal and thus almost deterministic designs. Existing literature argued that rerandomization with overly balanced observed covariates can lead to highly imbalanced unobserved covariates, making it vulnerable to model misspecification. On the contrary, rerandomization with properly balanced covariates can provide robust inference for treatment effects while sacrificing some efficiency compared to the ideally optimal design. In this paper, we show it is possible that, by making the covariate imbalance diminishing at a proper rate as the sample size increases, rerandomization can achieve its ideally optimal precision that one can expect with perfectly balanced covariates, while still maintaining its robustness. We further investigate conditions on the number of covariates for achieving the desired optimality. Our results rely on a more delicate asymptotic analysis for rerandomization, allowing both diminishing covariate imbalance threshold (or equivalently the acceptance probability) and diverging number of covariates. The derived theory for rerandomization provides a deeper understanding of its large-sample property and can better guide its practical implementation. Furthermore, it also helps reconcile the controversy between randomized and optimal designs in an asymptotic sense.

**1. Introduction.** Since the seminal work of Fisher (1935), randomized experiments have become the gold standard for drawing causal inference, since they can balance all potential confounding factors, no matter observed or unobserved, on average. Moreover, they allow assumption-free inference for causal effects that uses only the randomization of the treatment assignment as the reasoned basis, without imposing any model or distributional assumption on the experimental units, such as independent and identically distributed (i.i.d.) sampling from some (often hypothetical) superpopulation or some model assumptions for the dependence of potential outcomes on covariates. This is often called randomization-based or design-based inference, as well as the finite population inference emphasizing its focus on the finite population of experimental units in hand; see Fisher (1935) and Neyman (1923) for origins of this inferential framework.

---

*MSC2020 subject classifications:* Primary 62K99; secondary 62K05.

*Keywords and phrases:* causal inference, optimal rerandomization, Mahalanobis distance, high-dimensional covariates, Berry–Esseen bound.

However, as pointed out by [Morgan and Rubin \(2012\)](#), the covariate distribution between two treatment groups are likely to be imbalanced for a realized treatment assignment, and a practical remedy hinted by Fisher is to simply rerandomize. The idea of rerandomization is intuitive and has a long history in the literature, traced back to Fisher (see [Savage, 1962](#), Page 88), [Student \(1938\)](#) and [Cox \(1982\)](#); see also [Morgan and Rubin \(2012\)](#) and references therein. Besides, it is often used implicitly in the design of experiments when the allocated treated and control groups exhibit undesired imbalances (see, e.g., [Bruhn and McKenzie, 2009](#); [Heckman and Karapakula, 2021](#)), although it is often not well-documented. Nevertheless, the rerandomization design was formally proposed, analyzed and advocated until recently by [Morgan and Rubin \(2012\)](#). As noted by the authors, one main explanation for the less popularity of rerandomization is that it brings additional difficulty in analyzing the experiments, and in practice people often ignore rerandomization and analyze the experiments as if they were, say, completely randomized experiments. [Morgan and Rubin \(2012\)](#) then proposed randomization tests for sharp null hypotheses (e.g., the treatment has no effect for any unit) taking into account rerandomization. More recently, [Li, Ding and Rubin \(2018\)](#) studied the repeated sampling property of the difference-in-means estimator under rerandomization, which exhibits a non-Gaussian distribution, and further demonstrated that the estimator can be more precise under rerandomization than that under complete randomization. Importantly, rerandomization still allows assumption-free randomization-based inference as the complete randomization, and moreover it provides more efficient difference-in-means estimator and shorter confidence intervals for the average treatment effect.

Researchers, e.g., [Kasy \(2016\)](#) and [Kallus \(2018\)](#), have then suggested rerandomization with as small threshold as possible for the covariate imbalance, i.e., an optimally balanced design, whose idea can be traced back to [Student \(1938\)](#), [Kiefer \(1959\)](#) and [Taves \(1974\)](#). With general continuous covariates, there is likely only one acceptable treatment assignment or two if the two treatment groups have equal sizes, resulting in an almost deterministic design. Obviously, due to the lack of randomization in the treatment assignment, randomization-based inference is no longer applicable or becomes powerless, since it is generally impossible to asymptotically approximate the randomization distribution of a certain estimator (which is a discrete distribution whose support consists of one or two points) and the minimum possible  $p$ -value from a randomization test is either 1 or 0.5 ([Morgan and Rubin, 2012](#); [Johansson, Rubin and Schultzberg, 2021](#)). Therefore, the statistical inference for an optimally balanced design is often driven by additional distributional assumptions on the experimental units, such as i.i.d. sampling of units from some superpopulation that is usually hypothetical ([Johansson, Rubin and Schultzberg, 2021](#)), and the criteria for choosing the optimal assignments are often based on some model assumptions for the dependence of potential outcomes on covariates.

Not surprisingly, there is a long-time debate between these two philosophies, randomized versus optimal (and thus almost deterministic) designs, for conducting experiments. Intuitively, it is similar in spirit to the classical trade-off between efficiency and robustness. Randomized design allows assumption-free and robust inference for treatment effects, while the optimal design tries to maximize the inference efficiency under some hypothesized data-generating models. Specifically, randomized design and its inference can use only the randomization of treatment assignments as the “reasoned basis” ([Fisher, 1935](#)), with all the potential outcomes being conditioned on or equivalently viewed as fixed constants. The optimal design often imposes some probabilistic models on the potential outcomes, and its efficiency and inference relies crucially on the randomness in the potential outcomes. Thus, these two designs use quite different sources of randomness. The randomized design has the advantage that the randomness in the treatment assignment is fully controlled by the experimenter and can be readily available for analysis. However, the optimal design relies on

the randomness of potential outcomes as well as their dependence on covariates, which may be misspecified in practice. For example, [Kapelner et al. \(2020\)](#) demonstrated that the “perfect” allocation with minimum covariate imbalance can endanger the estimation precision because unobserved covariates can be highly imbalanced, and [Banerjee et al. \(2020\)](#) suggested that targeting a fixed quantile of balance is safer than targeting an absolute balance objective from an ambiguity-averse decision-making perspective. Indeed, rerandomization can be viewed as a design standing between the completely randomized design and the optimally balanced design. More precisely, instead of ignoring covariate imbalance as in the completely randomized design or pursuing the minimum possible covariate imbalance as in the optimally balanced design, rerandomization repeatedly randomize treatment assignments until the induced covariate imbalance is below a certain threshold, which is chosen carefully to ensure there is sufficient randomness in the treatment assignment. As demonstrated in [Li, Ding and Rubin \(2018\)](#), under rerandomization with a fixed and positive covariate imbalance threshold, we can still conduct large-sample randomization-based inference; moreover, the difference-in-means estimator will be more precise (at least asymptotically) than that under complete randomization, which can further lead to shorter confidence intervals for the average treatment effect.

Nevertheless, there is still a gap in the current theory of rerandomization. Specifically, [Li, Ding and Rubin \(2018\)](#) showed that, the smaller the covariate imbalance threshold or equivalently the *acceptance probability* (namely the probability that the covariate imbalance for a completely randomized treatment assignment is below the threshold) is, the more precise the difference-in-means estimator will be under rerandomization. However, this does not mean we should use as small threshold as possible, since it essentially leads to the optimal design for which randomization-based inference is not feasible or powerless. Technically, this is because the current asymptotic theory for rerandomization in [Li, Ding and Rubin \(2018\)](#) requires a fixed and positive covariate imbalance threshold that does not change with the sample size. This then raises the theoretical question that if we can conduct asymptotic analysis for rerandomization allowing a sample-size dependent covariate imbalance threshold, especially with the acceptance probability diminishing towards zero. Philosophically, we are interested in whether, by diminishing the acceptance probability to zero as sample size increases, we can asymptotically achieve the *ideally optimal precision* that one would expect with perfectly balanced covariates while still allowing robust randomization-based inference.

To answer the above questions, we will conduct more delicate finite population asymptotic analysis for rerandomization, allowing the covariate balance criterion including both the threshold and number of involved covariates to vary with the sample size. Our asymptotic analysis relies on a Berry-Essen-type bound for the finite population central limit theorem. We derive the asymptotic distribution of the difference-in-means estimator under rerandomization and construct large-sample confidence intervals for the average treatment effect, which extends [Li, Ding and Rubin \(2018\)](#) that requires a fixed positive threshold and a fixed number of covariates for rerandomization. Moreover, we investigate whether rerandomization can achieve the ideally optimal precision. Specifically, we demonstrate that, when the number of covariates satisfies certain conditions (generally being a smaller order of the logarithm of the sample size), we can diminish the covariate imbalance threshold such that the corresponding acceptance probability converges to zero at a proper rate and the resulting difference-in-means estimator achieves the ideally optimal precision and becomes asymptotically Gaussian distributed, under which we can use the usual Wald-type confidence intervals. Note that this does not contradict with the general asymptotic non-Gaussianity for rerandomization established in [Li, Ding and Rubin \(2018\)](#); it is because the non-Gaussian part in the limiting distribution can be asymptotically ignorable when we diminish the acceptance probability as the sample size increases.

The paper proceeds as follows. Section 2 introduces the framework and reviews existing results. Section 3 studies the multivariate Berry–Esseen-type bound for the finite population central limit theorem under complete randomization, which serves as the basis for studying the asymptotic properties of rerandomization in Section 4. Section 5 studies whether rerandomization can achieve the ideally optimal precision that we can expect with perfectly balanced covariates. Section 6 constructs large-sample confidence intervals for the average treatment effect under rerandomization. Section 7 investigates all the involved regularity conditions and discusses their practical implications, including both the covariate trimming and computational cost. Section 8 concludes with a short discussion.

## 2. Framework, Notation and Literature Review.

2.1. *Potential outcomes and treatment assignment.* We consider an experiment with two treatment arms (labeled as treatment and control) and  $n$  units, among which  $n_1$  units will be assigned to the treatment group and the remaining  $n_0 = n - n_1$  units will be assigned to the control group, where  $n_1$  and  $n_0$  are predetermined fixed integers. We invoke the potential outcome framework (Neyman, 1923; Rubin, 1974) to define treatment effects, where each unit  $i$  has two potential outcomes  $Y_i(1)$  and  $Y_i(0)$  depending on its treatment assignment. The individual treatment effect for unit  $i$  is then  $\tau_i = Y_i(1) - Y_i(0)$ , and the corresponding average treatment effect for all units is  $\tau = n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \tau_i$ , which is our estimand of interest. We use  $\mathbf{X}_i \in \mathbb{R}^K$  to denote the available  $K$ -dimensional covariate vector for each unit  $i$ , and  $Z_i$  to denote the treatment assignment indicator, where  $Z_i = 1$  if the unit receives treatment and  $Z_i = 0$  otherwise. The observed outcome for unit  $i$  is then one of its two potential outcomes depending on its treatment assignment, i.e.,  $Y_i = Z_i Y_i(1) + (1 - Z_i) Y_i(0)$ .

Throughout the paper, we will conduct the finite population inference where all potential outcomes and covariates are viewed as fixed constants and the randomness in the observed data (e.g.,  $Y_i$ 's) comes solely from the random treatment assignments  $Z_i$ 's. This is equivalent to conditional inference conditioning on all potential outcomes and covariates; see Li and Ding (2017) for a review of finite population inference with emphasis on applications to causal inference. The finite population inference has the advantage of imposing no model or distributional assumptions on the potential outcomes or covariates. Consequently, the distribution of the treatment assignments for all units, namely the treatment assignment mechanism, plays a crucial role for statistical inference. In a completely randomized experiment (CRE), the probability that the treatment assignment vector  $\mathbf{Z} \equiv (Z_1, Z_2, \dots, Z_n)^\top$  takes a particular value  $\mathbf{z} \equiv (z_1, z_2, \dots, z_n)^\top$  is  $n_1! n_0! / n!$  if  $z_i \in \{0, 1\}$  for all  $i$  and  $\sum_{i=1}^n z_i = n_1$ , and zero otherwise.

For descriptive convenience, we introduce several finite population quantities. For  $z = 0, 1$ , let  $\bar{Y}(z)$  and  $\bar{\mathbf{X}}$  be the finite population averages of potential outcome and covariates,  $S_z^2 = (n-1)^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \{Y_i(z) - \bar{Y}(z)\}^2$ ,  $S_{\mathbf{X}}^2 = (n-1)^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (\mathbf{X}_i - \bar{\mathbf{X}})(\mathbf{X}_i - \bar{\mathbf{X}})^\top$  and  $S_{z, \mathbf{X}} = S_{\mathbf{X}, z}^\top = (n-1)^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \{Y_i(z) - \bar{Y}(z)\}(\mathbf{X}_i - \bar{\mathbf{X}})^\top$  be the finite population variance and covariances for potential outcomes and covariates. For the individual treatment effect, we define analogously its finite population variance  $S_\tau^2 = (n-1)^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (\tau_i - \tau)^2$  and its finite population covariance with covariates  $S_{\tau, \mathbf{X}} = S_{\mathbf{X}, \tau}^\top = (n-1)^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (\tau_i - \tau)(\mathbf{X}_i - \bar{\mathbf{X}})^\top$ .

2.2. *Covariate imbalance and rerandomization.* Under the CRE, the units are completely randomized into the two treatment arms, which guarantees that all pretreatment covariates, no matter observed or unobserved, are balanced *on average* between the two treatment groups. However, as pointed out by Morgan and Rubin (2012), the covariate imbalance is likely to occur for a realized treatment assignment. The classical literature in experimental design (see, e.g., Box, Hunter and Hunter, 2005) suggests blocking on pretreatment covariates, which, however, is not obvious to implement when the covariates are continuous.

Recently, [Morgan and Rubin \(2012\)](#) formally proposed a design called rerandomization to actively avoid the unlucky covariate imbalance, by discarding those treatment assignments with unacceptable covariate imbalance. A general rerandomization design consists of the following steps.

1. Collect the covariate data for the experimental units, and specify a covariate balance criterion.
2. Randomly assign  $n_1$  units to treatment group and the remaining  $n_0$  units to control group.
3. Check the covariate balance for the treatment assignment from Step 2. If the balance criterion is satisfied, proceed to Step 4; otherwise return to Step 2.
4. Conduct the experiment using the acceptable treatment assignment from Step 3.

The balance criterion in Step 1 is an accept-reject function of the treatment assignment vector  $\mathbf{Z}$  and the pretreatment covariates  $\mathbf{X}_i$ 's. [Morgan and Rubin \(2012\)](#) suggested to use the Mahalanobis distance between covariate means in two treatment groups as the covariate balance criterion, which enjoys the affinely invariant property. Specifically, the difference-in-means of covariates between the two treatment groups is

$$(1) \quad \hat{\tau}_{\mathbf{X}} \equiv \bar{\mathbf{X}}_1 - \bar{\mathbf{X}}_0 = \frac{1}{n_1} \sum_{i=1}^n Z_i \mathbf{X}_i - \frac{1}{n_0} \sum_{i=1}^n (1 - Z_i) \mathbf{X}_i,$$

where  $\bar{\mathbf{X}}_z$  denotes the covariate mean for units under treatment arm  $z$ , and the corresponding Mahalanobis distance for measuring covariate imbalance is

$$\begin{aligned} M &= \hat{\tau}_{\mathbf{X}}^\top \text{Cov}^{-1}(\hat{\tau}_{\mathbf{X}}) \hat{\tau}_{\mathbf{X}} = \hat{\tau}_{\mathbf{X}}^\top \left( \frac{n}{n_1 n_0} \mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{X}}^2 \right)^{-1} \hat{\tau}_{\mathbf{X}} \\ &= \frac{n_1 n_0}{n} (\bar{\mathbf{X}}_1 - \bar{\mathbf{X}}_0)^\top (\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{X}}^2)^{-1} (\bar{\mathbf{X}}_1 - \bar{\mathbf{X}}_0). \end{aligned}$$

Under rerandomization using the Mahalanobis distance (ReM) with a predetermined threshold  $a$ , a treatment assignment  $\mathbf{Z}$  is acceptable if and only if the corresponding Mahalanobis distance is less than or equal to the threshold  $a$ , i.e.,  $M \leq a$ . Throughout the paper, we will focus on ReM to illustrate our theory. Our results can be generalized to other covariate balance criteria as well.

*2.3. Recent results and challenges.* Rerandomization has a long history and has been utilized a lot in practice, although often implicitly. A formal proposition of rerandomization does not appear until [Morgan and Rubin \(2012\)](#), likely due to the critique that the classical Gaussian distribution theory is no longer valid for rerandomization; see [Morgan and Rubin \(2012\)](#) and references therein. Recently, [Li, Ding and Rubin \(2018\)](#) demonstrated that the usual difference-in-means estimator,

$$(2) \quad \hat{\tau} \equiv \bar{Y}_1 - \bar{Y}_0 = \frac{1}{n_1} \sum_{i=1}^n Z_i Y_i - \frac{1}{n_0} \sum_{i=1}^n (1 - Z_i) Y_i,$$

is indeed asymptotically non-Gaussian distributed, where  $\bar{Y}_z$  denotes the average observed outcome for units under treatment arm  $z$ . Specifically, they proved that, with a fixed positive threshold  $a$  and a fixed number of covariates  $K$  that do not vary with the sample size  $n$ , the asymptotic distribution for  $\hat{\tau}$  under ReM has the following form:

$$(3) \quad \sqrt{n}(\hat{\tau} - \tau) \mid M \leq a \sim \sqrt{nV_{\tau\tau}} \left( \sqrt{1 - R^2} \cdot \varepsilon + R \cdot L_{K,a} \right),$$

where  $\sim$  means that the distributions on both sides of (3) converge weakly to the same distribution. In (3),  $\varepsilon \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$  follows a standard Gaussian distribution,  $L_{K,a} \sim D_1 \mid \mathbf{D}^\top \mathbf{D} \leq a$

follows a constrained Gaussian distribution with  $\mathbf{D} = (D_1, D_2, \dots, D_K)^\top \sim \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{I}_K)$ , and  $\varepsilon$  and  $L_{K,a}$  are mutually independent. Besides,  $V_{\tau\tau}$  is the variance of  $\hat{\tau}$  under the CRE,  $R^2$  is the squared multiple correlation between  $\hat{\tau}$  and  $\hat{\tau}_{\mathbf{X}}$  under the CRE, and we defer the explicit expression for  $V_{\tau\tau}$  and  $R^2$  to Section 3.1. From (3), the difference-in-means estimator under ReM is asymptotically distributed as the convolution of a Gaussian and a constrained Gaussian random variables. Intuitively, the  $\varepsilon$  component represents the part of  $\hat{\tau}$  that cannot be explained by  $\hat{\tau}_{\mathbf{X}}$ , and the  $L_{K,a}$  component represents the part that can be explained by  $\hat{\tau}_{\mathbf{X}}$  and thus it depends on both the threshold  $a$  for balance criterion and the number  $K$  of involved covariates.

The asymptotic derivation for (3) requires that both the threshold  $a$  and number of covariates  $K$  for the Mahalanobis distance criterion are fixed and do not change as the sample size  $n$  increases. However, both requirements are likely to be violated in practice. We first consider the choice of threshold for rerandomization. Generally, smaller threshold can provide us better covariate balance and more precise treatment effect estimator as indicated by (3); see Li, Ding and Rubin (2018, Theorem 2). Therefore, researchers (Kasy, 2016; Kallus, 2018) have suggested to use as small threshold as possible, say the minimum Mahalanobis distance between covariate means in the two treatment groups. However, as argued by Morgan and Rubin (2012) and Li, Ding and Rubin (2018), too small threshold can lead to powerless randomization tests and inaccurate asymptotic approximations. For example, with general continuous covariates and using the minimum Mahalanobis distance as the covariate imbalance threshold, very likely there is only one (or two when  $n_1 = n_0$ ) acceptable treatment assignment, and the corresponding minimum  $p$ -value that we can get from randomization tests is 1 (or 0.5 when  $n_1 = n_0$ ), indicating no power to reject any hypothesis at a reasonable significance level. Besides, the resulting difference-in-means estimator is either deterministic or having only two possible values, under which it is impossible for the estimator to converge to any continuous distribution, and thus the asymptotic approximation derived in (3) no longer holds. Based on these observations, Li, Ding and Rubin (2018) suggested to use small, but not overly small threshold, for conducting rerandomization, which not only provides better covariate balance but also allows large-sample valid inference for the average treatment effect that bases only on the randomization of the treatment assignments.

Nevertheless, there is still a theoretical gap for the choice of the rerandomization threshold. The existing study assumes a fixed threshold  $a$  that does not vary with the sample size  $n$ . It is then natural to ask: can we decrease the threshold with the sample size such that the difference-in-means estimator under ReM converges weakly to a Gaussian distribution as the right-hand side of (3) with  $a = 0$ , the ideally optimal precision we expect when the covariates are perfectly balanced? This essentially requires a theoretical understanding of rerandomization when the threshold  $a$  (or the acceptance probability) varies and especially converges to zero as the sample size goes to infinity.

We then consider the number of covariates for rerandomization. With the rapidly growing ability for collecting data, it is common to have a large number of covariates for the experimental units. For example, Bloniarz et al. (2016), Wager et al. (2016) and Lei and Ding (2020) studied regression adjustment for the CRE in the analysis stage when the experiments were completed. However, only a few studies have considered a large number of covariates in the design stage of an experiment; two examples are Branson and Shao (2021) and Zhang, Yin and Rubin (2021) where the authors proposed ridge and PCA rerandomizations to deal with collinearity among covariates, an issue that becomes increasingly serious as the number of covariates increases with the sample size. There is even fewer studies on the theoretical property of rerandomization when the amount of covariate information increases as the sample size grows. Note that practitioner often tends to balance as many covariates as possible with the hope to get more precise estimator. This is also hinted by the previous asymptotic result (3) in which the asymptotic distribution becomes more concentrated

around zero as  $R^2$  (a measure for the association between covariates and potential outcomes) increases. Therefore, it is important to establish a theory for rerandomization allowing diverging number of covariates, which can also provide guidelines on how to choose covariates for rerandomization in practice.

### 3. A Multivariate Berry–Esseen-type Bound for the Finite Population Central Limit Theorem.

3.1. *Motivation and finite population central limit theorem for a fixed dimension.* The key for deriving the asymptotic property of ReM in (3) includes the following facts. First, the distribution of the difference-in-means estimator under ReM is essentially the same as its conditional distribution under the CRE given that the treatment assignment satisfies the Mahalanobis distance criterion, as indicated by the left-hand side of (3). This then motivates us to investigate the joint distribution of the difference-in-means of the outcome and covariates in (1) and (2) under the CRE. Second, by the finite population central limit theorem (Hájek, 1960; Li and Ding, 2017), the joint distribution of  $(\hat{\tau}, \hat{\boldsymbol{\tau}}_{\mathbf{X}}^\top)^\top$  under the CRE is asymptotically Gaussian with mean and covariance matrix the same as its sampling mean and covariance matrix under the CRE:  $\mathbb{E}(\hat{\tau}, \hat{\boldsymbol{\tau}}_{\mathbf{X}}^\top)^\top = (\tau, \mathbf{0}_K^\top)^\top$  and

$$(4) \quad \text{Cov} \begin{pmatrix} \hat{\tau} \\ \hat{\boldsymbol{\tau}}_{\mathbf{X}} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} n_1^{-1}S_1^2 + n_0^{-1}S_0^2 - n^{-1}S_\tau^2 & n_1^{-1}\mathbf{S}_{1,\mathbf{X}} + n_0^{-1}\mathbf{S}_{0,\mathbf{X}} \\ n_1^{-1}\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{X},1} + n_0^{-1}\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{X},0} & n/(n_1n_0) \cdot \mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{X}}^2 \end{pmatrix} \equiv \mathbf{V} \equiv \begin{pmatrix} V_{\tau\tau} & \mathbf{V}_{\tau\mathbf{x}} \\ \mathbf{V}_{\mathbf{x}\tau} & \mathbf{V}_{\mathbf{x}\mathbf{x}} \end{pmatrix},$$

where we introduce  $\mathbf{V}$  to denote the covariance matrix of  $(\hat{\tau}, \hat{\boldsymbol{\tau}}_{\mathbf{X}}^\top)^\top$  under the CRE and  $V_{\tau\tau}$  to denote the variance of  $\hat{\tau}$  used in (3). Specifically,  $\sqrt{n}(\hat{\tau} - \tau, \hat{\boldsymbol{\tau}}_{\mathbf{X}}^\top)^\top \sim \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}_{K+1}, n\mathbf{V})$ , recalling that  $\sim$  means that the two distributions have the same weak limits. Based on these observations, Li, Ding and Rubin (2018) demonstrated that the asymptotic distribution of the difference-in-means estimator under ReM is essentially a conditional distribution from a multivariate Gaussian distribution, which simplifies to (3) and depends crucially on the squared multiple correlation between potential outcomes and covariates (or more precisely between  $\hat{\tau}$  and  $\hat{\boldsymbol{\tau}}_{\mathbf{X}}$  under the CRE):

$$(5) \quad R^2 = \text{Corr}^2(\hat{\tau}, \hat{\boldsymbol{\tau}}_{\mathbf{X}}) = \frac{\mathbf{V}_{\tau\mathbf{x}}\mathbf{V}_{\mathbf{x}\mathbf{x}}^{-1}\mathbf{V}_{\mathbf{x}\tau}}{V_{\tau\tau}} = \frac{n_1^{-1}S_{1|\mathbf{X}}^2 + n_0^{-1}S_{0|\mathbf{X}}^2 - n^{-1}S_{\tau|\mathbf{X}}^2}{n_1^{-1}S_1^2 + n_0^{-1}S_0^2 - n^{-1}S_\tau^2},$$

where  $S_{z|\mathbf{X}}^2 = \mathbf{S}_{z,\mathbf{X}}\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{X}}^{-2}\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{X},z}$  and  $S_{\tau|\mathbf{X}}^2 = \mathbf{S}_{\tau,\mathbf{X}}\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{X}}^{-2}\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{X},\tau}$  are the finite population variances of the linear projections of potential outcomes  $Y_i(z)$ 's and individual effects  $\tau_i$ 's on the covariates  $\mathbf{X}_i$ 's.

Apparently, the above arguments require a fixed number of covariates  $K$ . Moreover, the weak convergence from the joint distribution to the conditional distribution requires that the probability of the conditioning event  $\mathbb{P}(M \leq a)$  has a positive limit, which implies a positive and non-diminishing threshold  $a$  for the Mahalanobis distance criterion. Otherwise, the original derivation in Li, Ding and Rubin (2018) will involve ratios between terms of order  $o(1)$ , e.g.,  $\mathbb{P}\{\sqrt{n}(\hat{\tau} - \tau) \leq c \mid M \leq a\} = \mathbb{P}\{\sqrt{n}(\hat{\tau} - \tau) \leq c, M \leq a\} / \mathbb{P}(M \leq a)$ , of which the limits are unclear.

From the above discussion, it is obvious that the original form of finite population central limit theorem is not enough for studying the asymptotic property of rerandomization with a diminishing threshold and a diverging number of covariates. Furthermore, it leaves the question that whether rerandomization with threshold or acceptance probability diminishing at a certain rate can lead to difference-in-means estimator with the ideally optimal precision. We will address these concerns in the remaining of the paper.

3.2. *Gaussian approximation under the completely randomized experiment.* We first study the convergence rate for the finite population central limit theorem under the CRE. More precisely, we will focus on the convergence rate for the Gaussian approximation of the joint distribution of the difference-in-means of the outcome and covariates under the CRE, and investigate explicitly how the convergence rate depends on the finite population including the dimension of the covariates.

Let  $r_1 = n_1/n$  and  $r_0 = n_0/n$  be the proportions of treated and control units, and for each unit  $1 \leq i \leq n$ , let  $\mathbf{u}_i = (r_0 Y_i(1) + r_1 Y_i(0), \mathbf{X}_i^\top)^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{K+1}$  be a vector consisting of a weighted average of the two potential outcomes and the covariates. By the definitions in (1) and (2), we can verify that the difference-in-means vector  $(\hat{\tau}, \hat{\boldsymbol{\tau}}_{\mathbf{X}}^\top)^\top$  has the following equivalent form:

$$(6) \quad \begin{pmatrix} \hat{\tau} \\ \hat{\boldsymbol{\tau}}_{\mathbf{X}} \end{pmatrix} = \frac{n}{n_1 n_0} \sum_{i=1}^n Z_i \mathbf{u}_i - \frac{n}{n_0} \begin{pmatrix} \bar{Y}(0) \\ \bar{\mathbf{X}} \end{pmatrix},$$

which, up to a linear transformation, is essentially the summation of a simple random sample of size  $n_1$  from the finite population  $\mathcal{U}_n \equiv \{\mathbf{u}_i : i = 1, 2, \dots, n\}$ . Thus, the sampling property of the difference-in-means  $(\hat{\tau}, \hat{\boldsymbol{\tau}}_{\mathbf{X}}^\top)^\top$  can be fully characterized by the population  $\mathcal{U}_n$ . Let  $\bar{\mathbf{u}} = n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{u}_i$  and  $\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{u}}^2 = (n-1)^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (\mathbf{u}_i - \bar{\mathbf{u}})(\mathbf{u}_i - \bar{\mathbf{u}})^\top$  be the finite population mean and covariance matrix for  $\mathcal{U}_n$ , and let  $\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{u}}^{-1}$  denote the inverse of the positive semidefinite square root of  $\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{u}}^2$ . Define

$$(7) \quad \gamma_n \equiv \frac{(K+1)^{1/4}}{\sqrt{nr_1 r_0}} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \|\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{u}}^{-1}(\mathbf{u}_i - \bar{\mathbf{u}})\|_2^3,$$

which is the third moment of the standardized finite population  $\{\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{u}}^{-1}(\mathbf{u}_i - \bar{\mathbf{u}}) : i = 1, 2, \dots, n\}$  up to a certain scale. For descriptive convenience, we define  $\gamma_n$  to be infinity when  $r_1$  or  $r_0$  equals zero or  $\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{u}}^2$  is singular. In (7), we use the subscript  $n$  to emphasize the dependence of  $\gamma_n$  on the finite population  $\mathcal{U}_n$  of size  $n$ . Note that  $\gamma_n$  is uniquely determined by  $r_1, r_0$  and the potential outcomes and covariates of the  $n$  experimental units.

Below we consider the Berry–Esseen-type bound for the Gaussian approximation of the difference-in-means vector in (6) under the CRE. Note that, under the CRE,  $(\hat{\tau}, \hat{\boldsymbol{\tau}}_{\mathbf{X}}^\top)^\top$  has mean  $(\tau, \mathbf{0}_{1 \times K})^\top$  and covariance matrix  $\mathbf{V}$  as in (4). Let  $\mathcal{C}_{K+1}$  denote the collection of all measurable convex sets in  $\mathbb{R}^{K+1}$ . We then focus on bounding the supremum of the absolute difference between the probabilities of being in any measurable convex set for the standardized difference-in-means vector and the standard Gaussian random vector:

$$(8) \quad \Delta_n \equiv \sup_{\mathcal{Q} \in \mathcal{C}_{K+1}} \left| \mathbb{P} \left\{ \mathbf{V}^{-1/2} \begin{pmatrix} \hat{\tau} - \tau \\ \hat{\boldsymbol{\tau}}_{\mathbf{X}} \end{pmatrix} \in \mathcal{Q} \right\} - \mathbb{P}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \in \mathcal{Q}) \right|.$$

By some algebra,  $\mathbf{V} = (nr_1 r_0)^{-1} \mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{u}}^2$ , and thus  $\Delta_n$  is well-defined as long as  $\gamma_n < \infty$ . For descriptive convenience, we define  $\Delta_n$  to be 1 when  $r_1$  or  $r_0$  equals zero or  $\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{u}}^2$  is singular. The bound for (8) is a natural multivariate extension of the classical univariate Berry–Esseen bound for the absolute difference between two distribution functions. More importantly, it suffices for our asymptotic analysis of rerandomization, noticing that the acceptance region for  $\hat{\boldsymbol{\tau}}_{\mathbf{X}}$  under the Mahalanobis distance criterion is indeed a convex set in  $\mathbb{R}^K$ . From (6), we essentially need to understand the Berry–Esseen-type bound for the central limit theorem under simple random sampling, which itself is also a special case of the combinatorial central limit theorem. Below we give a brief literature review.

Berry (1941) and Esseen (1942) independently discovered the original Berry–Esseen theorem when studying the convergence rate for Gaussian approximation of summations of independent univariate random variables. Bentkus (2003, 2005) and Raič (2019) then extended



it to the multivariate case, considering the Gaussian approximation for probabilities of being in any measurable convex sets. Recently, [Chernozhukov, Chetverikov and Kato \(2017\)](#), [Chernozhukov, Chetverikov and Koike \(2020\)](#) and [Fang and Koike \(2021\)](#) achieved tighter bounds by focusing only on Gaussian approximation for probabilities of being in hyperrectangles (or more generally sparsely convex sets), where the bounds can vanish even when the dimension of random vectors is much larger than the sample size in the summation. Note that all of these results are for independent summands.

In the context of combinatorial central limit theorem (including the central limit theorem for simple random sampling as a special case), the summands become weakly dependent. [Bikelis \(1969\)](#) and [Höglund \(1978\)](#) studied the corresponding Berry–Esseen-type bound in the univariate case. However, there has been much less study for the multivariate case, in contrast to the rich literature for independent summands. One exception is [Bolthausen and Götze \(1993\)](#), who established the Berry–Esseen-type bound for the multivariate combinatorial central limit theorem. Based on their results, we can show that there exists an absolute constant  $C_K$  that depends only on the dimension  $K$  such that  $\Delta_n \leq C_K \gamma_n$ , with  $\gamma_n$  and  $\Delta_n$  defined in (7) and (8). However, the authors did not characterize how the constant  $C_K$  may increase with the dimension  $K$  and thus the bound is not sufficient for studying rerandomization with diverging number of covariates. To the best of our knowledge, there has not been any formal result of the Berry–Esseen-type bound for the combinatorial central limit theorem with explicit dependence on the dimension, except for an informal result presented by [Raič \(2015\)](#) at a workshop. Based on the result in [Raič \(2015\)](#), we can show that there exists an absolute constant  $C$  such that  $\Delta_n \leq C \gamma_n$ , noting that the definition of  $\gamma_n$  in (7) involves a term of  $(K + 1)^{1/4}$  that depends explicitly on the dimension of the difference-in-means vector in (6).

Since the result in [Raič \(2015\)](#) has not been proved yet, we also derive a Berry–Esseen-type bound for the central limit theorem under simple random sampling ourselves. Our proof makes use of the multivariate Berry–Esseen-type bound for sum of independent random vectors (see, e.g., [Raič, 2019](#)) and the coupling between simple random sampling and Bernoulli independent sampling utilized by [Hájek \(1960\)](#). Based on our proof, we can derive that  $\Delta_n \leq 174\gamma_n + 7\gamma_n^{1/3}$ , where the first term of  $\gamma_n$  is from the Bernoulli independent sampling or more generally the Berry–Esseen-type bound for sum of independent random vectors, and the additional term of  $\gamma_n^{1/3}$  comes from the coupling between simple random sampling and Bernoulli independent sampling. There is actually a tighter bound than  $\gamma_n^{1/3}$  for the coupling, but we present the bound  $\gamma_n^{1/3}$  for the ease of understanding; see the Supplementary Material ([Wang and Li, 2022](#)) for more details. Obviously, our rate of convergence is slower than that conjectured in [Raič \(2015\)](#). Nevertheless, it is still able to reveal the interesting property of rerandomization with diminishing threshold for covariate imbalance and diverging number of covariates, as studied in detail shortly. We summarize these results for bounding  $\Delta_n$  in the following theorem.

**THEOREM 1.** *For any  $n \geq 2, K \geq 0, r_1, r_0 \in (0, 1)$ , and any finite population  $\Pi_n \equiv \{(Y_i(1), Y_i(0), \mathbf{X}_i) : i = 1, 2, \dots, n\}$  with nonsingular  $\mathbf{V}$  defined as in (4), define  $\gamma_n$  and  $\Delta_n$  as in (7) and (8). Then*

- (i) *there exists an absolute constant  $C_K$  that depends only on  $K$  such that  $\Delta_n \leq C_K \gamma_n$ ;*
- (ii) *if the conjecture in [Raič \(2015\)](#) hold, then there exists a universal constant  $C$  such that  $\Delta_n \leq C \gamma_n$ ;*
- (iii)  $\Delta_n \leq 174\gamma_n + 7\gamma_n^{1/3}$ .

3.3. *Gaussian approximation with stronger moment conditions.* Theorem 1 provides Berry–Esseen-type bounds for the finite population central limit theorem under complete

randomization, with (ii) and (iii) characterizing explicit dependence on the dimension of covariates  $K$  and thus crucial for studying rerandomization with diverging number of covariates. Compared to that conjectured by Raič (2015), our derived bound in Theorem 1(iii) has an additional term of order  $\gamma_n^{1/3}$ . As discussed before, this additional term is due to the coupling between simple random sampling and Bernoulli independent sampling. Intuitively, under simple random sampling (or equivalently complete randomization), the treatment indicators for all units are dependent, because the total number of units assigned to the active treatment is constrained to be  $n_1$ . Such a dependence among these indicators makes it more challenging to bound the error for Gaussian approximation. Ignoring the dependence on  $K$ ,  $\gamma_n$  is of order  $n^{-1/2}$ , making  $\gamma_n^{1/3}$  of order  $n^{-1/6}$  and thus the bound in Theorem 1(iii) larger than usual Berry-Essen-type bounds.

Below we also provide more accurate bounds for the coupling between simple random sampling and Bernoulli independent sampling and consequently improve the Berry–Esseen-type bound for the Gaussian approximation in Theorem 1(iii), at least in terms of the explicit dependence on the sample size  $n$ , with stronger moment conditions on the centered finite population  $\{\mathbf{S}_u^{-1}(\mathbf{u}_i - \bar{\mathbf{u}}) : 1 \leq i \leq n\}$ . We summarize the results in the following theorem.

**THEOREM 2.** *Under the same setting as Theorem 1,*

$$\Delta_n \leq 180\gamma_n + \frac{3(\log n)^{3/4}(K+1)^{3/4}}{n^{1/4}\sqrt{r_1 r_0}} \cdot \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \|\mathbf{S}_u^{-1}(\mathbf{u}_i - \bar{\mathbf{u}})\|_\infty,$$

and, for any  $\iota \geq 2$ , there exists a universal constant  $C_\iota$  depending only on  $\iota$  such that

$$\Delta_n \leq 174\gamma_n + \frac{C_\iota(K+1)^{3\iota/\{4(\iota+1)\}}}{n^{\iota/\{4(\iota+1)\}}\{r_1 r_0\}^{\iota/2}} \cdot \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \|\mathbf{S}_u^{-1}(\mathbf{u}_i - \bar{\mathbf{u}})\|_\iota^\iota.$$

From Theorem 2 and ignoring the dependence on  $K$ , if all coordinates of the centered finite population have bounded  $\iota$ th moments for some  $\iota \geq 2$ , then the additional term in the Berry–Esseen-type bound is of order  $n^{-\iota/\{4(\iota+1)\}}$ ; if further they are bounded, then the additional term becomes of order  $n^{-1/4}$  except for a  $\log n$  term. These bounds are more accurate than that of order  $n^{-1/6}$  in Theorem 1(iii), but there are still gaps between them and that of order  $n^{-1/2}$  conjectured by Raič (2015), which requires future work. Nevertheless, the derived bounds are already sufficient to discover interesting properties of rerandomization and provide almost the same quantitative message for the design of rerandomization (see, e.g., Table 1 and its discussion).

It is worth mentioning that there are other approaches for deriving Berry–Esseen-type bound, such as Stein’s method that was actually used by Bolthausen and Götze (1993) and helps justify Theorem 1(i); see also the recent work by Shi and Ding (2022). Here we use the coupling approach, mainly because we can utilize the recent results on Berry–Esseen-type bounds for Gaussian approximations of summations of independent random vectors (Bentkus, 2005; Raič, 2019). It will be interesting to investigate whether other approaches can give tighter Berry–Esseen-type bounds or even prove the conjectured rate in Raič (2015). In addition, the coupling approach also justifies central limit theorems for stratified randomized experiments (Bickel and Freedman, 1984; Liu, Ren and Yang, 2021), and our results can be useful for deriving the corresponding Berry–Esseen-type bounds. We leave these for future work.

**4. Asymptotic Property of Rerandomization with Sample-size Dependent Mahalanobis Distance Criterion.** Throughout the paper, we conduct finite population asymptotic analysis for rerandomization. Specifically, we embed the finite population of size  $n$  into

a sequence of finite populations with increasing sizes. Importantly, we allow both the threshold  $a$  and dimension of covariates  $K$  for the Mahalanobis distance criterion to depend on the sample size  $n$ , and will write them explicitly as  $a_n$  and  $K_n$ , using the subscript  $n$  to emphasize such dependence. We further define  $p_n \equiv \mathbb{P}(\chi_{K_n}^2 \leq a_n)$ , where  $\chi_{K_n}^2$  denotes a random variable following the chi-square distribution with degrees of freedom  $K_n$ . By the definition of  $\Delta_n$  in (8), we can derive that the acceptance probability of a completely randomized treatment assignment under ReM,  $\mathbb{P}(M \leq a_n)$ , is bounded between  $p_n - \Delta_n$  and  $p_n + \Delta_n$ . Thus, we can intuitively understand  $p_n$  as the approximate acceptance probability for rerandomization; specifically,  $\mathbb{P}(M \leq a_n)/p_n = 1 + o(1)$  when  $p_n \gg \Delta_n$ . In practice, given the number of covariates  $K_n$ , the choice of the threshold  $a_n$  is often based on the approximate acceptance probability  $p_n$ , i.e.,  $a_n$  is the  $p_n$ th quantile of the chi-square distribution with degrees of freedom  $K_n$ . For example, [Morgan and Rubin \(2012\)](#) and [Li, Ding and Rubin \(2018\)](#) suggested to choose small but not overly small approximate acceptance probability, e.g.,  $p_n = 0.001$ . Therefore, in the remaining discussion, we will mainly focus on the approximate acceptance probability  $p_n$  and number of covariates  $K_n$ , since they are more relevant for the practical implementation of ReM, and view the threshold  $a_n$  as a deterministic function of  $p_n$  and  $K_n$ . For descriptive convenience, we sometimes call  $p_n$  simply as the acceptance probability, while emphasizing  $\mathbb{P}(M \leq a_n)$  as the actual acceptance probability.

**4.1. Asymptotic distribution under ReM.** We first invoke the following regularity condition on the sequence of finite populations, which, by [Theorem 1](#), implies the Gaussian approximation for the difference-in-means of the outcome and covariates under the CRE.

**CONDITION 1.** As  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , the sequence of finite populations satisfies that  $\gamma_n \rightarrow 0$ .

Recall the definition of  $\gamma_n$  in (7). [Condition 1](#) requires that, for sufficiently large sample size  $n$ , there are positive proportions of units in both treatment and control groups (i.e.,  $r_1 > 0$  and  $r_0 > 0$ ), and the covariance matrix  $\mathbf{V}$  in (4) for the difference-in-means vector  $(\hat{\tau}, \hat{\boldsymbol{\tau}}_{\mathbf{X}}^\top)^\top$  is nonsingular. The latter essentially requires that the covariates are not collinear, which can be guaranteed by our design, and that the potential outcomes cannot be perfectly explained by covariates, in the sense that the corresponding  $R^2$  in (5) is strictly less than 1, which is likely to hold in most applications. Besides, as demonstrated in the [Supplementary Material \(Wang and Li, 2022\)](#),

$$(9) \quad \gamma_n \geq 2^{-3/2} (nr_1r_0)^{-1/2} (K_n + 1)^{7/4}.$$

Thus, a necessary condition for [Condition 1](#) is  $K_n = o((nr_1r_0)^{2/7}) = o(n^{2/7})$ , i.e., the number of covariates increases at most a polynomial rate of the sample size as  $n$  goes to infinity. If the standardized finite population  $\{\mathbf{S}_u^{-1}(\mathbf{u}_i - \bar{\mathbf{u}}) : 1 \leq i \leq n\}$  is coordinate-wise bounded, and the proportions of treated and control units  $r_1$  and  $r_0$  are bounded away from zero, then  $K_n = o(n^{2/7})$  is also sufficient for [Condition 1](#); see the [Supplementary Material \(Wang and Li, 2022\)](#) for details. We defer more detailed discussions about [Condition 1](#) to [Section 7](#).

We then invoke the following regularity condition on the choice of the acceptable probability, which is coherent with our intuition that too small threshold can prevent asymptotic approximation for ReM based on Gaussian and constrained Gaussian distributions, as discussed in [Section 2.3](#).

**CONDITION 2.** As  $n \rightarrow \infty$ ,  $p_n/\Delta_n \rightarrow \infty$ .

We are now ready to present our formal result for the asymptotic distribution of the difference-in-means estimator  $\hat{\tau}$  under ReM. Recall that  $V_{\tau\tau}$  in (4) is the variance of  $\hat{\tau}$  under the CRE,  $R^2$  in (5) is the squared multiple correlation between the difference-in-means of the outcome and covariates under the CRE, and  $\varepsilon_0$  and  $L_{K_n, a_n}$  are independent standard Gaussian and constrained Gaussian random variables defined as in Section 2.3. To emphasize its dependence on the sample size  $n$ , we will write  $R^2$  explicitly as  $R_n^2$ .

**THEOREM 3.** *Under ReM and Conditions 1 and 2, as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ ,*

$$(10) \quad \sup_{c \in \mathbb{R}} \left| \mathbb{P}\{V_{\tau\tau}^{-1/2}(\hat{\tau} - \tau) \leq c \mid M \leq a_n\} - \mathbb{P}(\sqrt{1 - R_n^2} \varepsilon_0 + \sqrt{R_n^2} L_{K_n, a_n} \leq c) \right| \rightarrow 0.$$

From Theorem 3, under ReM, the difference between the difference-in-means estimator and the true average treatment effect,  $\hat{\tau} - \tau$ , follows asymptotically the distribution of  $V_{\tau\tau}^{1/2}(\sqrt{1 - R_n^2} \varepsilon_0 + \sqrt{R_n^2} L_{K_n, a_n})$ , a convolution of standard Gaussian and constrained Gaussian random variables, with coefficients depending on  $V_{\tau\tau}$  and  $R_n^2$ . Compared to (3), the asymptotic distribution in Theorem 3 has the same form as that in Li, Ding and Rubin (2018, Theorem 1), which is not surprising given that both theorems focus on the same estimator  $\hat{\tau}$  and the same design ReM. However, Theorem 3 is more general and it covers Li, Ding and Rubin (2018, Theorem 1) as a special case. Specifically, when both  $K_n$  and  $a_n > 0$  are fixed and do not change with  $n$ ,  $p_n$  is a fixed positive constant and Condition 2 holds immediately from Condition 1 and Theorem 1. Besides, Condition 1 is almost implied by the regularity condition involved in Li, Ding and Rubin (2018); see the Supplementary Material (Wang and Li, 2022) for more details.

More importantly, Theorem 3 allows the dimension of covariates and the acceptance probability, as well as the rerandomization threshold, to vary with the sample size. Note that from Theorem 1,  $\gamma_n \rightarrow 0$  implies  $\Delta_n \rightarrow 0$ . Thus, Condition 2 holds naturally if we choose  $p_n$  to be any fixed positive number. Moreover, we can also let  $p_n$  decrease with  $n$  and eventually converge to zero as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , while maintaining that  $p_n \gg \Delta_n$ , under which the actual acceptance probability  $\mathbb{P}(M \leq a_n) = p_n(1 + o(1))$  also converges to zero as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . In simple words, Theorem 3 allows the acceptance probability to converge to zero as the sample size goes to infinity.

Note that all potential confounding factors, no matter observed or unobserved, can always be viewed as potential outcomes unaffected by the treatment. Therefore, Theorem 3 also implies that any potential confounding factor is asymptotically balanced between the two treatment groups.

**4.2. Asymptotic improvement from ReM.** We now investigate the improvement from ReM compared to the CRE, and in particular how such improvement depends on the acceptance probability and the covariate information. Note that the CRE can be viewed as a special case of ReM with  $\mathbf{X} = \emptyset$  and  $a_n = \infty$ . By the same logic as Theorem 3, we can derive that

$$(11) \quad \sup_{c \in \mathbb{R}} \left| \mathbb{P}\{V_{\tau\tau}^{-1/2}(\hat{\tau} - \tau) \leq c\} - \mathbb{P}(\varepsilon_0 \leq c) \right| \rightarrow 0,$$

i.e.,  $\hat{\tau} - \tau$  is asymptotically Gaussian distributed with mean zero and variance  $V_{\tau\tau}$  under the CRE. Obviously, the asymptotic distribution in (11) is a special form of that in (10) with  $R_n^2 = 0$ , which is intuitive in the sense that ReM with irrelevant covariates is asymptotically equivalent to the CRE. However, when  $R_n^2 > 0$ , which is likely to hold in practice, we expect ReM to provide more precise difference-in-means estimator than the CRE, as discussed in detail below.

From Theorem 3 and by the same logic as Li, Ding and Rubin (2018, Corollaries 1–3), we can derive the following asymptotic properties of ReM, demonstrating its advantage over the CRE. For  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ , let  $\nu_{\alpha, K, a}(R^2)$  denote the  $\alpha$ th quantile of the distribution of  $\sqrt{1 - R^2}\varepsilon_0 + \sqrt{R^2}L_{K, a}$ , and  $z_\alpha$  denote the  $\alpha$ th quantile of the standard Gaussian distribution. We further introduce  $v_{K, a} = \text{Var}(L_{K, a})$  to denote the variance of the constrained Gaussian random variable. From Morgan and Rubin (2012),  $v_{K, a} = \mathbb{P}(\chi_{K+2}^2 \leq a) / \mathbb{P}(\chi_K^2 \leq a)$ , where  $\chi_{K+2}^2$  and  $\chi_K^2$  follow chi-square distributions with degrees of freedom  $K + 2$  and  $K$ , respectively.

**COROLLARY 1.** Under ReM and Conditions 1 and 2, the asymptotic distribution of  $V_{\tau\tau}^{-1/2}(\hat{\tau} - \tau)$ ,  $\sqrt{1 - R_n^2}\varepsilon_0 + \sqrt{R_n^2}L_{K_n, a_n}$ , as shown in (10) is symmetric and unimodal around zero. Compared to the asymptotic distribution in (11) under the CRE, the percentage reductions in asymptotic variance and length of asymptotic  $1 - \alpha$  symmetric quantile range for  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$  are, respectively,

$$(12) \quad (1 - v_{K_n, a_n})R_n^2 \quad \text{and} \quad 1 - \frac{\nu_{1-\alpha/2, K_n, a_n}(R_n^2)}{z_{1-\alpha/2}}.$$

Both percentage reductions in (12) are nonnegative and are uniquely determined by  $(R_n^2, p_n, K_n)$ , and they are nondecreasing in  $R_n^2$  and nonincreasing in  $p_n$  and  $K_n$ .

First, from Corollary 1, the difference-in-means estimator  $\hat{\tau}$  is asymptotically unbiased for the average treatment effect  $\tau$ . As pointed out by Morgan and Rubin (2012), when the treated and control groups have different sizes (i.e.,  $n_1 \neq n_0$ ), the difference-in-means estimator is generally biased. Corollary 1 shows that the bias goes away as the sample size goes to infinity when Condition 1 holds, which requires that  $r_1$  and  $r_0$  are not too close to zero as implied by the definition in (7). Second, the improvement from ReM on estimation precision is nondecreasing in the strength of the association between potential outcomes and covariates measured by  $R_n^2$ . Generally, the more covariates involved in rerandomization, the larger the  $R_n^2$  will be. However, this does not mean that we should use as many covariates as possible. If the additional covariates provide little increment for  $R_n^2$ , the gain from ReM will deteriorate since the percentage reductions in (12) are nonincreasing in  $K_n$  with fixed  $R_n^2$  and  $p_n$ . Third, both percentage reductions in (12) are nonincreasing in the acceptance probability  $p_n$ , and approach their maximum values  $R_n^2$  and  $1 - \sqrt{1 - R_n^2}$  when  $p_n$  equals 0. Again, this does not mean that we should use as small threshold as possible, since the asymptotic derivation in Corollary 1 requires that  $p_n/\Delta_n \rightarrow \infty$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . This then raises the question that if we can choose  $p_n$  such that both percentage reductions in (12) achieve their maximum values as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  or the asymptotic distribution of  $V_{\tau\tau}^{-1/2}(\hat{\tau} - \tau)$  under ReM becomes essentially Gaussian with mean zero and variance  $1 - R_n^2$  (i.e., the asymptotic distribution in (10) with  $L_{K_n, a_n}$  replaced by zero), while still maintaining  $p_n/\Delta_n \rightarrow \infty$ . In other words, can we choose the acceptable probability such that rerandomization achieves its ideally optimal precision? We will answer this question in the next section.

**5. Optimal Rerandomization with Diminishing Acceptance Probability.** In this section, we investigate whether rerandomization can achieve its ideally optimal precision by diminishing the acceptance probability to zero at a proper rate as the sample size increases. Specifically, we wonder if the asymptotic approximation in (10) can hold with  $L_{K_n, a_n}$  replaced by zero, and what conditions we need to impose on the sequence of finite populations as well as the choice of acceptance probability. These questions rely crucially on the asymptotic behavior of the constrained Gaussian random variable  $L_{K_n, a_n}$ , and in particular

its dependence on the acceptance probability  $p_n$ . Below we will first study the asymptotic property of  $L_{K_n, a_n}$ , and then investigate whether we are able to achieve the ideally optimal rerandomization.

*5.1. Asymptotic properties of the constrained Gaussian random variable.* In this subsection, we will mainly focus on the asymptotic behavior of the variance of  $L_{K_n, a_n}$ , which as mentioned earlier has the following equivalent form:  $v_{K_n, a_n} \equiv \text{Var}(L_{K_n, a_n}) = \mathbb{P}(\chi_{K_n+2}^2 \leq a_n) / \mathbb{P}(\chi_{K_n}^2 \leq a_n)$ , due to the following two reasons. First, as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ ,  $L_{K_n, a_n} \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} 0$  if and only if  $v_{K_n, a_n} \rightarrow 0$ . This is because the random variables  $L_{K_n, a_n}^2$  for all  $n$  are always uniformly integrable, regardless of how  $K_n$  and  $p_n$  vary with  $n$ , as demonstrated in the Supplementary Material (Wang and Li, 2022, Proposition A2). Second, as shown in Corollary 1, the percentage reduction in asymptotic variance under ReM is  $(1 - v_{K_n, a_n})R_n^2$ , and its relative difference from the ideally optimal percentage reduction is  $1 - (1 - v_{K_n, a_n})R_n^2 / R_n^2 = v_{K_n, a_n}$ . Thus, the variance of  $L_{K_n, a_n}$  characterizes how different ReM is from the ideally optimal one in terms of the improvement on estimation precision, and such a difference will become asymptotically negligible if and only if  $v_{K_n, a_n} \rightarrow 0$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ .

The following theorem shows the asymptotic behavior of  $v_{K_n, a_n}$ , which depends crucially on the asymptotic behavior of the ratio between  $\log(p_n^{-1})$  and  $K_n$ .

**THEOREM 4.** *As  $n \rightarrow \infty$ ,*

- (i) *if  $\log(p_n^{-1})/K_n \rightarrow \infty$ , then  $v_{K_n, a_n} \rightarrow 0$ ;*
- (ii) *if  $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \log(p_n^{-1})/K_n < \infty$ , then  $\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} v_{K_n, a_n} > 0$ ;*
- (iii) *if  $\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \log(p_n^{-1})/K_n > 0$ , then  $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} v_{K_n, a_n} < 1$ ;*
- (iv) *if  $\log(p_n^{-1})/K_n \rightarrow 0$ , then  $v_{K_n, a_n} \rightarrow 1$ .*

From Theorem 4, the smaller the  $p_n$  and  $K_n$ , the larger the ratio  $\log(p_n^{-1})/K_n$ , and the smaller  $v_{K_n, a_n}$  tends to be. This is intuitive noting that Corollary 1 implicitly implies that  $v_{K_n, a_n}$ , viewed as a function of  $(p_n, K_n)$ , is nondecreasing in  $p_n$  and  $K_n$ . Theorem 4 has the following implications. First,  $v_{K_n, a_n}$  or equivalently  $L_{K_n, a_n}$  becomes asymptotically negligible if and only if  $\log(p_n^{-1})/K_n \rightarrow \infty$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . Intuitively, this means that the constrained Gaussian term in the asymptotic distribution in (10) becomes asymptotically negligible if and only if the acceptance probability  $p_n$  decreases super-exponentially with respect to the dimension of covariates, i.e.,  $p_n = \exp(-c_n K_n)$  with  $c_n \rightarrow \infty$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . Second, if  $\log(p_n^{-1})/K_n \rightarrow 0$ , then the variance of the constrained Gaussian variable  $L_{K_n, a_n}$  becomes asymptotically equivalent to that of the unconstrained standard Gaussian random variable, and, from Corollary 1, ReM asymptotically provides no gain compared to the CRE in the sense that the percentage reduction in asymptotic variance converges to zero as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . Thus, when the acceptance probability is too large and in particular decreases sub-exponentially with respect to the dimension of the covariates, i.e.,  $p_n = \exp(-o(1) \cdot K_n)$ , then ReM is essentially equivalent to the CRE in large samples. Third, when the acceptance probability decreases exponentially with respect to the dimension of covariates, i.e.,  $p_n = \exp(-c_n K_n)$  with  $c_n$  being of constant order, and assume that the squared multiple correlation  $R_n^2$  is of constant order and thus does not diminish to zero, asymptotically, ReM provides strictly more precise difference-in-means estimator than the CRE, although there is still a gap from the ideally optimal one.

From the above, the performance of ReM, in particular its asymptotic improvement over the CRE, depends crucially on the ratio between  $\log(p_n^{-1})$  and  $K_n$ , as well as  $R_n^2$  measuring the association between potential outcomes and covariates. To minimize  $v_{K_n, a_n}$ , Corollary 1 and Theorem 4 suggest to use as small acceptance probability and number of covariates as

possible. However, there is trade-off for the choice of both of them. First, although smaller  $K_n$  implies smaller  $v_{K_n, a_n}$ , it at the same time reduces the outcome-covariates association  $R_n^2$ . Second, although smaller  $p_n$  decreases  $v_{K_n, a_n}$ , it at the same time renders the asymptotic approximation inaccurate and may eventually invalidate the asymptotic approximation in (10); see Condition 2. While the former trade-off for  $K_n$  involves more subjective judgments concerning the unknown outcome-covariates dependence structure, the latter trade-off for  $p_n$  lies more on the technical side and will be studied in more detail in the next subsection.

*5.2. Optimal rerandomization and its implication.* From Theorem 4, to achieve the ideally optimal rerandomization with given number of covariates, we want to choose the acceptance probability such that the following condition holds.

CONDITION 3. As  $n \rightarrow \infty$ ,  $\log(p_n^{-1})/K_n \rightarrow \infty$ .

We further assume that the outcome-covariates association  $R_n^2$  is bounded away from 1, under which the first term  $\sqrt{1 - R_n^2}$  in the asymptotic approximation in (10) is not negligible as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . This condition on  $R_n^2$  is likely to hold in practice, since we generally do not expect that the covariates can perfectly explain the potential outcomes, which is too ideal for most applications. Moreover, if  $R_n^2$  indeed converges to 1 as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , then the asymptotic approximation in (10) can be of  $o_{\mathbb{P}}(1)$  itself, implying that  $\hat{\tau} - \tau$  can converge to zero faster than the usual  $n^{-1/2}$  rate, under which the causal effect estimation becomes much simpler.

CONDITION 4. As  $n \rightarrow \infty$ ,  $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} R_n^2 < 1$ .

The following theorem shows that, under certain regularity conditions, ReM can achieve its ideally optimal precision.

THEOREM 5. *Under ReM and Conditions 1–4,*

$$(13) \quad \sup_{c \in \mathbb{R}} \left| \mathbb{P}\{V_{\tau\tau}^{-1/2}(\hat{\tau} - \tau) \leq c \mid M \leq a_n\} - \mathbb{P}(\sqrt{1 - R_n^2} \varepsilon_0 \leq c) \right| \rightarrow 0.$$

From Theorem 5,  $\hat{\tau}$  can be asymptotically Gaussian distributed under ReM. Moreover, its asymptotic distribution is the same as that of the regression-adjusted estimator under the CRE (Lin, 2013; Lei and Ding, 2020). Therefore, rerandomization and regression adjustment are essentially dual of each other (Li and Ding, 2020), and Theorem 5 closes the previous gap between them that is due to the constrained Gaussian random variable  $L_{K_n, a_n}$ . This new insight is important for practitioners who may worry about efficiency loss of rerandomization compared to regression adjustment. Moreover, compared to regression adjustment in the analysis stage, rerandomization in the design stage is blind of outcomes and has the advantage of avoiding data snooping (Lin, 2013). Besides, the difference-in-means estimator is simpler and provides more transparent analysis for treatment effects (Cox, 2007; Freedman, 2008; Rosenbaum, 2010).

Theorem 5 has important implications. First, it shows that, by diminishing the imbalance threshold as the sample size grows, rerandomization can achieve its ideally optimal precision that we can expect from an optimal design with even perfectly balanced covariates. Second, we should not choose too small rerandomization threshold (or acceptance probability), as implied by Condition 2, so that it is still possible to conduct robust randomization-based inference as completely randomized experiments, without imposing any distributional assumptions on potential outcomes and covariates. These imply that rerandomization with properly diminishing covariate imbalance threshold can achieve optimal efficiency as an ideal optimal

design while maintaining robustness as a randomized design, i.e., such an optimal rerandomization can enjoy advantages from both optimal and randomized designs. Therefore, Theorem 5 helps reconcile the long-time controversies between the two philosophies (randomized versus optimal) for conducting experiments in an asymptotic sense.

Theorem 5 also provides important insights for practitioners that are more used to optimal designs. First, the usual optimal designs and the corresponding inference are often sensitive to their model assumptions. Our theory shows that the optimal rerandomization can always achieve the ideally optimal precision, while still being robust to model misspecification. Second, it helps mitigate the computation burden for conducting optimal designs. In particular, Theorem 5 suggests that we should not pursue the best allocation minimizing the covariate imbalance between the two treatment groups, which is generally NP-hard. Instead, we only need to randomly choose one from the best approximately  $p_n$  proportion of all assignments, with  $p_n$  satisfying both Conditions 2 and 3. As discussed later in Section 7,  $p_n$  can often decrease at a polynomial order of the sample size  $n$ . This indicates that, in expectation, the computational complexity for getting one acceptable assignment is often of polynomial order of the sample size; see Section 7.3 for the more explicit rate. In sum, the optimal rerandomization can maintain the efficiency gain as an ideal optimal design, while being more robust and requiring less computation. In the Supplementary Material (Wang and Li, 2022), we provide more discussions on its connection with optimal designs under certain model assumptions.

The validity of the asymptotic Gaussian approximation for rerandomization depends crucially on Conditions 1–4, among which Conditions 2 and 3 involves the choice of the acceptance probability. Below we assume that the number of covariates  $K_n$  involved in rerandomization has been given and that Conditions 1 and 4 hold, and focus on investigating the existence of choice of acceptance probability  $p_n$  such that both Conditions 2 and 3 hold, or equivalently such that rerandomization can achieve its ideally optimal precision as in (13). It turns out the existence of such a choice of  $p_n$  relies crucially on the ratio between  $K_n$  and  $\log(\Delta_n^{-1})$ , recalling the definition of  $\Delta_n$  in (8).

**THEOREM 6.** *Under ReM and Conditions 1 and 4,*

- (i) *if and only if  $\log(\Delta_n^{-1})/K_n \rightarrow \infty$ , there exists a sequence  $\{p_n\}$  such that both Conditions 2 and 3 hold, under which ReM achieves its ideally optimal precision and the asymptotic Gaussian approximation in (13) holds;*
- (iii) *if  $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \log(\Delta_n^{-1})/K_n < \infty$ , then for any sequence  $\{p_n\}$  satisfying Condition 2 such that the asymptotic approximation in (10) holds,  $\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \nu_{K_n, a_n} > 0$ ;*
- (iii) *if  $\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \log(\Delta_n^{-1})/K_n > 0$ , then there exists a sequence  $\{p_n\}$  satisfying Condition 2 such that (10) holds and  $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \nu_{K_n, a_n} < 1$ ;*
- (iv) *if  $\log(\Delta_n^{-1})/K_n \rightarrow 0$ , then for any sequence  $\{p_n\}$  satisfying Condition 2 such that (10) holds, the corresponding  $\nu_{K_n, a_n} \rightarrow 1$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , under which ReM asymptotically provides no gain on estimation precision compared to the CRE.*

From Theorem 6, the optimal precision that ReM can achieve depends crucially on the asymptotic behavior of the ratio  $\log(\Delta_n^{-1})/K_n$ . For any fixed  $n$ , in general, as  $K_n$  increases,  $\Delta_n$  will increase, and thus the ratio  $\log(\Delta_n^{-1})/K_n$  will decrease. Therefore, intuitively, the smaller the number of involved covariates for rerandomization, the more likely we are able to satisfy the condition in Theorem 6(i), and consequently, to achieve the ideally optimal precision. Moreover, when ReM involves more and more covariates, it will eventually lose its advantage over the CRE. Therefore, Theorem 6 suggests that we should not use too many covariates when performing rerandomization. In practice, we should try to use a moderate number of covariates that are most relevant for the potential outcomes of interest, as measured by the corresponding  $R_n^2$ . For example, when  $\gamma_n$  has the same order as its lower bound in



(9), and  $r_1$  and  $r_0$  are bounded away from zero, then we can choose  $K_n = O(\log n)$  number of covariates, under which  $\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \log(\Delta_n^{-1})/K_n$  must be positive and ReM can provide non-negligible gain over the CRE as implied by Theorem 6(iii). As  $\gamma_n$  becomes further from its lower bound, we generally want to use fewer covariates. We defer more detailed discussion on the rate of  $\log(\Delta_n^{-1})/K_n$  to Section 7.

**6. Large-sample Inference under Rerandomization.** Theorems 3 and 5 provide asymptotic approximations for the distribution of the difference-in-means estimator  $\hat{\tau}$  under ReM, based on which we can construct large-sample confidence intervals for the average treatment effect  $\tau$ . From the asymptotic approximations in (10) and (13), the asymptotic distribution of  $\hat{\tau}$  under ReM depends on the variance  $V_{\tau\tau}$  for the CRE and the squared multiple correlation  $R_n^2$ , both of which are determined by the finite population variances of the potential outcomes and individual effects as well as their linear projections on covariates. For each treatment group  $z \in \{0, 1\}$ , recall that  $\bar{Y}_z$  and  $\bar{\mathbf{X}}_z$  are the average observed outcome and covariates, and define  $s_z^2 = (n_z - 1)^{-1} \sum_{i:Z_i=z} (Y_i - \bar{Y}_z)^2$  and  $\mathbf{s}_{z,\mathbf{X}} = \mathbf{s}_{\mathbf{X},z}^\top = (n_z - 1)^{-1} \sum_{i:Z_i=z} (Y_i - \bar{Y}_z)(\mathbf{X}_i - \bar{\mathbf{X}}_z)^\top$  as the sample variance and covariance for the observed outcome and covariates. We further introduce  $s_{z \setminus \mathbf{X}}^2 = s_z^2 - \mathbf{s}_{z,\mathbf{X}} \mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{X}}^{-2} \mathbf{s}_{\mathbf{X},z}$  and  $s_{\tau|\mathbf{X}}^2 = (\mathbf{s}_{1,\mathbf{X}} - \mathbf{s}_{0,\mathbf{X}}) \mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{X}}^{-2} (\mathbf{s}_{\mathbf{X},1} - \mathbf{s}_{\mathbf{X},0})$ . We can then estimate  $V_{\tau\tau}$  and  $R_n^2$  in (4) and (5) through replacing the finite population variances in their definitions by the corresponding sample analogues:

$$(14) \quad \hat{V}_{\tau\tau} = n_1^{-1} s_1^2 + n_0^{-1} s_0^2 - n^{-1} s_{\tau|\mathbf{X}}^2, \quad \hat{R}_n^2 = 1 - \hat{V}_{\tau\tau}^{-1} (n_1^{-1} s_{1 \setminus \mathbf{X}}^2 + n_0^{-1} s_{0 \setminus \mathbf{X}}^2).$$

Note that the finite population variance of individual effects  $S_\tau^2$  is generally not identifiable, since we can never observe the individual effect for any unit. Thus, we do not expect any consistent estimator for it as well as  $V_{\tau\tau}$  (Neyman, 1923). However, because  $S_\tau^2$  is bounded below by  $S_{\tau|\mathbf{X}}^2$  that has sample analogue  $s_{\tau|\mathbf{X}}^2$ , we can still estimate  $V_{\tau\tau}$  conservatively as in (14).

Based on the asymptotic approximation established in Theorem 3 and the estimators in (14), for any  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ , we can then construct the following  $1 - \alpha$  confidence interval for  $\tau$ :

$$(15) \quad \hat{C}_\alpha = \left[ \hat{\tau} - \hat{V}_{\tau\tau}^{1/2} \cdot \nu_{1-\alpha/2, K_n, a_n}(\hat{R}_n^2), \hat{\tau} + \hat{V}_{\tau\tau}^{1/2} \cdot \nu_{1-\alpha/2, K_n, a_n}(\hat{R}_n^2) \right],$$

recalling that  $\nu_{1-\alpha/2, K, a}(R^2)$  is the  $(1 - \alpha/2)$ th quantile of the distribution of  $\sqrt{1 - R^2} \varepsilon_0 + \sqrt{R^2} L_{K, a}$ .

To ensure the asymptotic validity of the confidence interval in (15), we invoke the following regularity condition. We defer more detailed discussion of the condition to Section 7. For  $z = 0, 1$ , let  $S_{z \setminus \mathbf{X}}^2 = S_z^2 - S_{z|\mathbf{X}}^2$  denote the finite population variance of the residuals from the linear projection of potential outcomes  $Y_i(z)$ 's on covariates  $\mathbf{X}_i$ 's.

CONDITION 5. As  $n \rightarrow \infty$ ,

$$(16) \quad \frac{\max_{z \in \{0, 1\}} \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \{Y_i(z) - \bar{Y}(z)\}^2}{r_0 S_{1 \setminus \mathbf{X}}^2 + r_1 S_{0 \setminus \mathbf{X}}^2} \cdot \frac{\max\{K_n, 1\}}{r_1 r_0} \cdot \sqrt{\frac{\max\{1, \log K_n, -\log p_n\}}{n}} \rightarrow 0.$$

The following theorem shows that the confidence interval in (15) is asymptotically conservative, and becomes asymptotically exact when  $S_{\tau \setminus \mathbf{X}}^2 \equiv S_\tau^2 - S_{\tau|\mathbf{X}}^2$  is asymptotically negligible.

THEOREM 7. Under ReM and Conditions 1, 2 and 5, as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ ,

(i) the estimators in (14) are asymptotically conservative in the sense that

$$\begin{aligned} & \max \{ |\hat{V}_{\tau\tau}(1 - \hat{R}_n^2) - V_{\tau\tau}(1 - R_n^2) - S_{\tau \setminus \mathbf{X}}^2/n|, |\hat{V}_{\tau\tau}\hat{R}_n^2 - V_{\tau\tau}R_n^2| \} \\ & = o_{\mathbb{P}} \left( V_{\tau\tau}(1 - R_n^2) + S_{\tau \setminus \mathbf{X}}^2/n \right); \end{aligned}$$

(ii) for any  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ , the resulting  $1 - \alpha$  confidence interval in (15) is asymptotically conservative, in the sense that  $\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}(\tau \in \hat{C}_\alpha \mid M \leq a_n) \geq 1 - \alpha$ ;

(iii) if further  $S_{\tau \setminus \mathbf{X}}^2 = nV_{\tau\tau}(1 - R_n^2) \cdot o(1)$ , the  $1 - \alpha$  confidence interval in (15) becomes asymptotically exact, in the sense that  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}(\tau \in \hat{C}_\alpha \mid M \leq a_n) = 1 - \alpha$ .

Note that in Theorem 7, we do not make the typical assumption that  $R_n^2$  and  $V_{\tau\tau}$  have limiting values as the sample size goes to infinity (see, e.g., Li, Ding and Rubin, 2018), since such an assumption may not be very satisfying given that we allow the number of covariates  $K_n$  to vary with the sample size (which consequently affects  $R_n^2$ ). This brings additional challenge to the proof of Theorem 7. Theorem 7 also highlights the conservativeness in the finite population inference that dates back to Neyman (1923)'s analysis for the CRE. The conservativeness of the confidence interval comes mainly from  $S_{\tau \setminus \mathbf{X}}^2$  as indicated in Theorem 7(i), which characterizes the individual effect heterogeneity after taking into account the covariates. The intervals become asymptotically exact when the individual effect heterogeneity is asymptotically linearly explained by the covariates, as shown in Theorem 7(iii).

If further Conditions 3 and 4 hold as in Theorem 5, not surprisingly, we can then use the usual Wald-type confidence intervals based on Gaussian quantiles, ignoring the term involving the constrained Gaussian random variable. Specifically, for any  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ , let

$$(17) \quad \tilde{C}_\alpha = \left[ \hat{\tau} - \sqrt{\hat{V}_{\tau\tau}(1 - \hat{R}_n^2)} \cdot z_{1-\alpha/2}, \hat{\tau} + \sqrt{\hat{V}_{\tau\tau}(1 - \hat{R}_n^2)} \cdot z_{1-\alpha/2} \right].$$

The following theorem shows the asymptotic validity of the above Wald-type confidence intervals.

**THEOREM 8.** *Under ReM and Conditions 1–5, Theorem 7(i)–(iii) still hold with  $\hat{C}_\alpha$  in (15) replaced by  $\tilde{C}_\alpha$  in (17).*

Theorem 8 shows that the usual Wald-type confidence intervals can be asymptotically valid for inferring the average treatment effect under ReM. However, we want to emphasize that it does involve additional regularity conditions, in particular Condition 3 on the choice of acceptance probability. While Theorem 8 provides confidence intervals of more convenient forms, we still recommend constructing confidence intervals based on Theorem 7, which takes into account explicitly the constrained Gaussian random variable that is determined by the acceptance probability and the number of covariates for rerandomization. The intervals from Theorem 7 not only requires fewer regularity conditions, but also becomes asymptotically equivalent to the ones from Theorem 8 when the additional Conditions 3 and 4 hold, under which the constrained Gaussian random variable  $L_{K_n, a_n}$  is of order  $o_{\mathbb{P}}(1)$  and is thus negligible asymptotically.

Below we give a brief remark on improving the finite-sample performance of the confidence intervals. Note that  $s_{1 \setminus \mathbf{X}}^2$  and  $s_{0 \setminus \mathbf{X}}^2$  are almost equivalent to the sample variances of the residuals from the linear projection of observed outcome on covariates in treated and control groups, respectively. Inspired by the regression analysis (see, e.g., MacKinnon, 2013; Lei and Ding, 2020), we can consider rescaling the residuals to improve their finite-sample performance. For example, letting  $\hat{e}_i$  denote the residual from the linear projection of observed outcome on covariates for unit  $i$ , we can rescale  $\hat{e}_i$  to be  $\kappa_i \hat{e}_i$ , with  $\kappa_i = 1$

for HC0,  $\kappa_i = \sqrt{(n_{z_i} - 1)/(n_{z_i} - K_n - 1)}$  for HC1,  $\kappa_i = 1/\sqrt{1 - H_{z_i,ii}}$  for HC2, and  $\kappa_i = 1/(1 - H_{z_i,ii})$  for HC3, where  $H_{z,ii}$  is the leverage of unit  $i$  for the covariate matrix consisting of the intercept and  $K_n$  covariates under treatment arm  $z$ .

Finally, we remark that throughout Sections 4 to 6 we assume Conditions 1 and 2, which are stronger than that required by completely randomized experiments. When these conditions fail, the asymptotic properties of rerandomization may fail, making it challenging to conduct robust randomization-based inference for rerandomization; see Appendix A1 in the Supplementary Material (Wang and Li, 2022) for a finite-sample worst-case analysis and its application for practical diagnosis of rerandomization.

**7. Regularity Conditions and Practical Implications.** From the previous discussion, the asymptotic approximation of the difference-in-mean estimator  $\hat{\tau}$  under ReM relies on Conditions 1 and 2. Once further Conditions 3 and 4 hold, we can achieve the “optimal” rerandomization, under which  $\hat{\tau}$  becomes asymptotically Gaussian distributed. The large-sample inference for the average treatment effect  $\tau$  under ReM relies additionally on Condition 5. These regularity conditions depend crucially on the convergence rate of  $\Delta_n$  or its upper bound  $\gamma_n$ . In the following, we first investigate the convergence rate of  $\gamma_n$  when units are i.i.d. samples from some superpopulation, and discuss its implication on the validity of these regularity conditions. We then consider practical strategies that can make these regularity conditions more likely to hold, utilizing the advantage of finite population inference that requires no model or distributional assumptions on the potential outcomes and covariates. Finally, we discuss the computational cost of (optimal) rerandomization.

*7.1. Regularity conditions under i.i.d. sampling and their implications.* Throughout this subsection, we assume that the potential outcomes and covariates  $(Y_i(1), Y_i(0), \mathbf{X}_i)$ , for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$ , are i.i.d. from a superpopulation that depends implicitly on the sample size  $n$ , noting that the dimension of covariates is allowed to vary with  $n$ . Recall that  $\mathbf{u}_i = (r_0 Y_i(1) + r_1 Y_i(0), \mathbf{X}_i^\top)^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{K_n+1}$ , and  $\gamma_n$  in (7) is uniquely determined by the treatment group proportions  $r_1, r_0$ , the dimension of covariates  $K_n$ , the sample size  $n$ , and the finite population  $\{\mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{u}_2, \dots, \mathbf{u}_n\}$ , which is further assumed to consist of i.i.d. draws from a superpopulation. Below we impose some moment conditions on the sequence of superpopulations as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ .

**CONDITION 6.** For each sample size  $n$ ,  $\mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{u}_2, \dots, \mathbf{u}_n$  are i.i.d. random vectors in  $\mathbb{R}^{K_n+1}$  with finite and nonsingular covariance matrix. The standardized random vector  $\boldsymbol{\xi}_i = \text{Cov}(\mathbf{u}_i)^{-1/2}(\mathbf{u}_i - \mathbb{E}\mathbf{u}_i) \in \mathbb{R}^{K_n+1}$  satisfies that  $\sup_{\boldsymbol{\nu} \in \mathbb{R}^{K_n+1}, \boldsymbol{\nu}^\top \boldsymbol{\nu} = 1} \mathbb{E}|\boldsymbol{\nu}^\top \boldsymbol{\xi}_i|^\delta = O(1)$  for some  $\delta > 2$ , i.e., there exists an absolute constant  $C < \infty$  such that  $\mathbb{E}|\boldsymbol{\nu}^\top \boldsymbol{\xi}_i|^\delta \leq C$  for all  $n$  and all unit vector  $\boldsymbol{\nu}$  in  $\mathbb{R}^{K_n+1}$ .

From Lei and Ding (2020, Proposition F.1), a sufficient condition for the uniform boundedness of  $\sup_{\boldsymbol{\nu} \in \mathbb{R}^{K_n+1}, \boldsymbol{\nu}^\top \boldsymbol{\nu} = 1} \mathbb{E}|\boldsymbol{\nu}^\top \boldsymbol{\xi}_i|^\delta$  in Condition 6 is that  $\boldsymbol{\xi}_i$  has independent coordinates whose absolute  $\delta$ -th moment is uniformly bounded by a certain finite constant. The following proposition, which is a direct corollary of Lei and Ding (2020, Lemma H.1), gives a stochastic upper bound of  $\gamma_n$  under Condition 6.

**PROPOSITION 1.** If Condition 6 holds and the dimension of covariates  $K_n = O(n^\omega)$  for some  $\omega \in (0, 1)$ , then

$$\gamma_n = O_{\mathbb{P}} \left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{r_1 r_0}} \frac{(K_n + 1)^{7/4}}{n^{1/2 - 1/\delta}} \right).$$

Note that  $\gamma_n \geq 2^{-3/2}(nr_1r_0)^{-1/2}(K_n+1)^{7/4}$  as shown in (9). Therefore, the rate in Proposition 1 is precise up to an  $n^{1/\delta}$  factor; when  $\delta = \infty$ , the rate matches the lower bound rate in (9). From Proposition 1, we can immediately derive the following implications. Recall that  $r_1$  and  $r_0$  are the proportions of treated and control units. In practice, both treatment groups are likely to have non-negligible proportions of units, and thus it is reasonable to assume that both  $r_1^{-1}$  and  $r_0^{-1}$  are of order  $O(1)$ . Recall that  $R_n^2$  in (5) denotes the finite population squared multiple correlation between potential outcomes and covariates. We introduce  $R_{\text{sup},n}^2 = \text{Corr}^2(r_1Y(0) + r_0Y(1), \mathbf{X})$  to denote the superpopulation analogue with  $(Y(1), Y(0), \mathbf{X})$  following the superpopulation distribution at sample size  $n$ .

**COROLLARY 2.** If Condition 6 holds,  $r_z^{-1} = O(1)$  for  $z = 0, 1$ , and  $K_n = o(n^{2/7-4/(7\delta)})$ , then

- (i)  $\gamma_n = o_{\mathbb{P}}(1)$ , and thus  $\Delta_n$  in (8) is of order  $o_{\mathbb{P}}(1)$ ;
- (ii) the finite population and superpopulation squared multiple correlations  $R_n^2$  and  $R_{\text{sup},n}^2$  are asymptotically equivalent, in the sense that  $R_n^2 - R_{\text{sup},n}^2 = o_{\mathbb{P}}(1)$ ;
- (iii) if further the standardized potential outcomes have bounded  $b$ th moments for some  $b > 4$ , both  $\text{Var}(Y(1))$  and  $\text{Var}(Y(0))$  are of the same order as  $\text{Var}(r_0Y(1) + r_1Y(0))$ ,  $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} R_{\text{sup},n}^2 < 1$ , and  $K_n = O(n^c)$  and  $-\log p_n = o(n^{1-4/b-2c})$  for some  $c < 1/2 - 2/b$ , then the quantity on the left hand side of (16) is of order  $o_{\mathbb{P}}(1)$ .

Corollary 2(i) implies that Condition 1 holds with high probability, which, based on Theorem 3, further implies that the asymptotic approximation for the difference-in-means estimator under ReM using Gaussian and constrained Gaussian distributions is valid with high probability, given that the acceptance probability is chosen to satisfy Condition 2 with high probability (i.e.,  $\Delta_n/p_n = o_{\mathbb{P}}(1)$ ). With additional regularity conditions on the superpopulation variance and squared multiple correlations, Corollary 2(iii) implies that Condition 5 holds with high probability, which further implies that the large-sample inference for the average treatment effect discussed in Section 6 is valid with high probability. From the above, when the experimental units are i.i.d. from some superpopulation satisfying the moment conditions in Condition 6 and Corollary 2(iii), the number of covariates is not too large, and the acceptance probability is not too small, with high probability, we are able to asymptotically approximate the distribution of  $\hat{\tau}$  under ReM, as well as constructing asymptotically valid confidence intervals for the average treatment effect  $\tau$ .

Furthermore, Corollary 2(ii) implies that Condition 4 holds with high probability when  $R_{\text{sup},n}^2 \leq 1 - c$  for some absolute constant  $c > 0$ . Thus, based on Theorem 5, as long as the choice of acceptance probability satisfies Condition 3, with high probability, we can approximate the distribution of  $\hat{\tau}$  under ReM by a Gaussian distribution, under which ReM achieves its ideally optimal precision. Based on Theorem 5, we can then derive the following corollary. Recall that  $\mathcal{U}_n = \{\mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{u}_2, \dots, \mathbf{u}_n\}$ . In the corollary below, we will write the conditioning on  $\mathcal{U}_n$  explicitly to emphasize that we are considering the randomization distribution of  $\hat{\tau}$  under ReM.

**COROLLARY 3.** If Condition 6 holds,  $r_z^{-1} = O(1)$  for  $z = 0, 1$ ,  $R_{\text{sup},n}^2 \leq 1 - c$  for some absolute constant  $c > 0$ , and  $K_n = o(\log n)$ , then there exists a sequence of acceptance probabilities  $p_n$  (or equivalently a sequence of thresholds  $a_n$ ) such that, with probability converging to 1, the distribution of the difference-in-means estimator under ReM can be asymptotically approximated by a Gaussian distribution with mean zero and variance  $V_{\tau\tau}(1 - R_n^2)$ , i.e.,

$$\sup_{c \in \mathbb{R}} \left| \mathbb{P}\{V_{\tau\tau}^{-1/2}(\hat{\tau} - \tau) \leq c \mid M \leq a_n, \mathcal{U}_n\} - \mathbb{P}(\sqrt{1 - R_n^2} \varepsilon_0 \leq c \mid \mathcal{U}_n) \right| = o_{\mathbb{P}}(1).$$

TABLE 1

Asymptotic properties for rerandomization under various rates for the number of involved covariates. Column 1 shows the asymptotic rate of the number of covariates  $K_n$  as  $n$  increases. Column 2 shows the corresponding stochastic rate of  $\gamma_n$  based on Proposition 1. Column 3 shows the choice of acceptance probability that is sufficient for Condition 2 with high probability. Column 4 shows the asymptotic rate for the variance  $v_{K_n, a_n}$  of the corresponding constrained Gaussian random variable.

| $K_n$  | $\gamma_n$  | $p_n$   | $v_{K_n, a_n}$ |
|--|---|---|----------------|
| $K_n = o(\log n)$  | $o_{\mathbb{P}}\left(\frac{(\log n)^{7/4}}{n^{1/2-1/\delta}}\right)$              | $p_n \asymp n^{-\beta}, \beta \in (0, \frac{\kappa}{2} - \frac{\kappa}{\delta})$                          | $o(1)$         |
| $K_n \asymp \log n$  | $O_{\mathbb{P}}\left(\frac{(\log n)^{7/4}}{n^{1/2-1/\delta}}\right)$              | $p_n \asymp n^{-\beta}, \beta \in (0, \frac{\kappa}{2} - \frac{\kappa}{\delta})$                          | $(0, 1)$       |
| $K_n \asymp n^{\zeta}, \zeta \in (0, \frac{2}{7} - \frac{4}{7\delta})$ | $O_{\mathbb{P}}\left(n^{-(\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{\delta}-\frac{7\zeta}{4})}\right)$ | $p_n \asymp n^{-\beta}, \beta \in (0, \frac{\kappa}{2} - \frac{\kappa}{\delta} - \frac{7\zeta\kappa}{4})$ | $1 - o(1)$     |

Below we further consider the choice of acceptance probability under various cases for the number of covariates involved in rerandomization. We assume that Condition 6 holds and both treatment groups have non-negligible proportions of units, i.e.,  $r_z^{-1} = O(1)$  for  $z = 0, 1$ , and consider the cases where the number of covariates  $K_n$  increases sub-logarithmically, logarithmically and polynomially with the sample size  $n$ , as shown in the first column of Table 1. Proposition 1 then gives an upper bound of the stochastic rate of  $\gamma_n$ , as shown in the second column of Table 1, all of which are of order  $o_{\mathbb{P}}(1)$ . Note that in the polynomial increase case, the rate of  $K_n$  is restricted to  $K_n \asymp n^{\zeta}$  with  $\zeta \in (0, \frac{2}{7} - \frac{4}{7\delta})$ ; otherwise  $\gamma_n$  may not converge to zero in probability, under which Condition 1 may fail and the asymptotic inference will become difficult. From Theorem 1, under all the three cases, we can choose the acceptance probability  $p_n$  to decrease polynomially with the sample size such that Condition 2 holds with high probability, although there are various constraints on the exact polynomial decay rate. This is shown in the third column of Table 1, where  $\kappa$  can at least take value  $1/3$  based on our result in Theorem 1(iii) and it can take value 1 if Raič (2015)'s conjecture as in Theorem 1(ii) holds. The last column of Table 1 then shows the corresponding asymptotic behavior of the variance  $v_{K_n, a_n}$  of the constrained Gaussian random variable. Recall that the gain from ReM on estimation precision depends crucially on  $v_{K_n, a_n}$  as shown in Corollary 1. From Theorem 4, (i) when  $K_n$  increases sub-logarithmically with  $n$ ,  $v_{K_n, a_n}$  converges to zero and rerandomization achieves its ideally optimal precision; (ii) when  $K_n$  increases logarithmically with  $n$ ,  $v_{K_n, a_n}$  is strictly between 0 and 1 when  $n$  is sufficiently large and thus rerandomization provides gain in estimation precision compared to the CRE, although there is still a gap from the ideally optimal gain; (iii) when  $K_n$  increases polynomially with  $n$ ,  $v_{K_n, a_n}$  converges to 1 as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  and rerandomization provides no gain over the CRE. Therefore, in practice, we do not recommend using too many covariates, under which we will essentially lose the advantage from rerandomization. As a side note, these observations hold no matter which Berry-Essen bound we use for the asymptotic Gaussian approximation (either the conjectured (ii), our derived (iii) in Theorem 1, or the ones in Theorem 2), except for the explicit rate of the polynomially decaying acceptance probability.

**7.2. Practical implication.** From the previous discussion, the asymptotic approximation of rerandomization depends crucially on  $\gamma_n$  (which involves  $K_n$ ) and  $p_n$ . Below we provide suggestions and guidance on how to leverage these factors to improve the performance of rerandomization in practice.

We first consider  $K_n$ . From Theorem 6 and the discussion in Section 7.1, we suggest to choose at most  $O(\log n)$  covariates, otherwise we may lose the advantage of rerandomization. Note that our finite population inference does not impose any model or distributional

assumptions on the potential outcomes and covariates as well as their dependence structure. Thus, we have the flexibility to pre-process the covariates in an arbitrary way. Note that the covariates, although do not affect our asymptotic inference as long as the corresponding regularity conditions hold, do affect the improvement from rerandomization as indicated by the outcome-covariates association  $R_n^2$ . Therefore, we suggest to choose a moderate subset of covariates or a moderate dimensional transformation of original covariates to conduct rerandomization. For example, we can choose a subset of covariates of size  $O(\log n)$  based on our subjective knowledge about the importance of these covariates for predicting/explaining the potential outcomes or based on some pilot studies. Recently, in the presence of high-dimensional covariates, [Zhang, Yin and Rubin \(2021\)](#) proposed to use principle component analysis to find some proper subspace of covariates to conduct rerandomization.

We then consider  $\gamma_n$ . Below we give an equivalent form of  $\gamma_n$  that can be more informative for its practical implications. For  $z = 0, 1$  and  $1 \leq i \leq n$ , let  $e_i(z) = Y_i(z) - \bar{Y}(z) - \mathbf{S}_{z, \mathbf{X}}(\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{X}}^2)^{-1}(\mathbf{X}_i - \bar{\mathbf{X}})$  be the residual from the linear projection of potential outcome  $Y_i(z)$  on covariates  $\mathbf{X}_i$ . Then  $r_0 e_i(1) + r_1 e_i(0)$  is the residual from the projection of  $r_0 Y_i(1) + r_1 Y_i(0)$  on  $\mathbf{X}_i$ . We further introduce  $e_i$  to denote the corresponding standardized residual for unit  $i$ , i.e.,  $r_0 e_i(1) + r_1 e_i(0)$  standardized by its finite population mean and standard deviation. Let  $\tilde{\mathbf{X}} = (\mathbf{X}_1, \mathbf{X}_2, \dots, \mathbf{X}_n)^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times K_n}$  be the matrix consisting of the covariates for all  $n$  units,  $\mathbf{H} = \tilde{\mathbf{X}}(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}^\top \tilde{\mathbf{X}})^{-1} \tilde{\mathbf{X}}^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$  be the corresponding projection or hat matrix, and  $H_{ii}$  be the  $i$ th diagonal element of  $\mathbf{H}$ , which is usually called the leverage score for unit  $i$  in regression analysis. As demonstrated in the Supplementary Material ([Wang and Li, 2022](#)),  $\gamma_n$  in (7) can be bounded by

$$\gamma_n = \frac{(K_n + 1)^{1/4}}{\sqrt{n r_1 r_0}} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (e_i^2 + (n-1)H_{ii})^{3/2} \in \left[ \frac{1}{4\sqrt{2}} \tilde{\gamma}_n, \sqrt{2} \tilde{\gamma}_n \right],$$

with

$$(18) \quad \tilde{\gamma}_n = \frac{(K_n + 1)^{1/4}}{\sqrt{r_1 r_0 n}} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n |e_i|^3 + \frac{(K_n + 1)^{1/4}}{\sqrt{r_1 r_0}} \sum_{i=1}^n H_{ii}^{3/2}.$$

Obviously,  $\gamma_n$  and  $\tilde{\gamma}_n$  are of the same order, and it is thus equivalent to consider  $\tilde{\gamma}_n$ . From (18),  $\tilde{\gamma}_n$  depends crucially on the absolute third moment of the standardized residuals  $n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n |e_i|^3$  and the summation of the leverage scores to the power of  $3/2$  over all  $n$  units. Note that  $e_i$ 's depend on the true potential outcomes and are generally unknown in the design stage of an experiment. When the potential outcomes  $Y_i(1)$  and  $Y_i(0)$ , or more precisely their residuals  $e_i(1)$  and  $e_i(0)$  are not too heavy-tailed, we expect  $n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n |e_i|^3$  to be of constant order, under which the first term in (18) is likely to be well-controlled. The second term in (18) seems to be more complicated, but fortunately it is known in the design stage since it depends only on the pretreatment covariates. Thus, we can and should check the leverage scores for all units before conducting rerandomization. If  $\sum_{i=1}^n H_{ii}^{3/2}$  is small, then we expect the asymptotic approximation for rerandomization to work well; otherwise, we need to be careful. As discussed before, under the finite population inference framework, we have the flexibility to pre-process the covariates in an arbitrary way. In particular, we can try to shrink the leverage scores via trimming, a practical strategy that is also recommended when conducting regression adjustment for completely randomized experiments ([Lei and Ding, 2020](#)). Note that too much trimming may reduce the outcome-covariates association  $R_n^2$  and thus deteriorate the improvement from rerandomization. Besides, as demonstrated in the Supplementary Material ([Wang and Li, 2022](#)),  $\sum_{i=1}^n H_{ii}^{3/2}$  is always lower bounded by  $K_n^{3/2}/\sqrt{n}$ . In practice, we may consider performing the minimum possible trimming such that the resulting  $\sum_{i=1}^n H_{ii}^{3/2}$  is close to its minimum value  $K_n^{3/2}/\sqrt{n}$ . As a side note, both ridge

and PCA rerandomizations recently proposed by [Branson, Dasgupta and Rubin \(2016\)](#) and [Zhang, Yin and Rubin \(2021\)](#) can also help reduce leverage scores. Thus, our theory also provides some justification for these two designs. Moreover, compared to their pre-processing on the covariates, trimming can be more robust to outliers. Besides, it does not change the original covariates (as well as their meaning) much and may be more helpful in preserving the explainability of original covariates (more precisely, their squared multiple correlation with the potential outcomes).

Finally, we consider  $p_n$ . The discussion in Section 7.1 suggests choosing the acceptance probability  $p_n$  such that it decays polynomially with the sample size  $n$ . However, such results may not be helpful for the choice of  $p_n$  under a finite sample size. Below we give some practical guideline on the choice of  $p_n$  with a moderate number of covariates  $K_n$ . First, from Corollary 1, the gap between rerandomization with a certain  $p_n$  and the ideally optimal one is characterized by  $v_{K_n, a_n}$ , the variance of the constrained Gaussian random variable. Therefore, we suggest choosing  $p_n$  such that the corresponding  $v_{K_n, a_n}$  is small, say, 0.01. Second, with a given  $p_n$ , we can check the asymptotic approximation by using some pseudo potential outcomes as proxies, e.g., some linear/nonlinear combinations of covariates based on some prior knowledge. Third, note that, with acceptance probability  $p_n$ , the number of randomizations needed for getting an acceptable treatment assignment is about  $1/p_n$ . In practice, our choice of  $p_n$  can also take into account this computation cost; see also Section 7.3.

*7.3. Computational cost of rerandomization.* Below we briefly discuss the computational cost for getting one acceptable treatment assignment from ReM with  $n$  units,  $K$ -dimensional covariates ( $K \leq n$ ) and acceptance probability  $p > 0$ . To facilitate the computation, we can first standardize the covariates, i.e., getting  $S_{\mathbf{X}}^{-1}(\mathbf{X}_i - \bar{\mathbf{X}})$  for each  $i$ , which has a complexity of  $O(nK^2)$ . Then the Mahalanobis distance  $M$  is equivalently the Euclidean norm of the difference-in-means of standardized covariates up to some scale, whose computation has complexity of  $O(nK)$  and in expectation needs to be done approximately  $p^{-1}$  times. Besides, in each iteration, one has to do a complete randomization of experimental units into treatment and control groups, which has complexity of  $O(n)$  ([Fan, Muller and Rezucha, 1962](#)); see also [Meng \(2013\)](#). Consequently, in expectation, the computational complexity for getting one acceptable assignment from ReM is approximately of  $O(nK(K + p^{-1}))$ . From the discussion in Section 7.1 and in particular Table 1, to achieve the ideally optimal rerandomization, we will choose  $K = o(\log n)$  and can choose  $p^{-1} = n^\beta$  for sufficiently small  $\beta$ , under which the computational complexity for getting an acceptable assignment from ReM is in expectation approximately of order  $o(n^{1+\beta} \log n)$  (i.e., polynomial in  $n$  with exponent slightly greater than 1). This implies that the optimal rerandomization is computationally feasible even for relatively large sample size.

**8. Conclusion and Discussion.** There is a long-time controversy between the two philosophies for designing an experiment: randomization versus optimal and thus often deterministic assignment. In the context of balancing covariates in randomized experiments, the optimal design tries to find the treatment assignment minimizing the covariate imbalance (say the Mahalanobis distance), while rerandomization tries to restrict the covariate imbalance and at the same time maintain sufficient randomness of the design, which is necessary for robust inference of treatment effects. In this paper, we demonstrated that, by letting the acceptance probability diminish to zero at a property rate (e.g., a polynomial rate), rerandomization can still have sufficient randomness for robust randomization-based inference of treatment effects, and more importantly, it can achieve the ideally optimal precision that one can expect from the optimally balanced design. Note that our theory also helps mitigate the computation burden for usual optimal designs. In particular, to achieve the ideally optimal

precision, we only need to randomly select assignments from a small proportion (which generally decreases with the sample size polynomially) of all assignments with the best covariate balance, whose computational complexity is generally of a polynomial order of the sample size with exponent slightly greater than 1 as discussed in Section 7.3.

The derived theory for rerandomization also allows for a diverging number of covariates. In particular, we found that, when the number of covariates is too large, not only will the asymptotic approximation for rerandomization become inaccurate, but also rerandomization will lose its gain on efficiency. Therefore, we suggest practitioners to use a moderate number of covariates, especially those important and useful for explaining the potential outcomes, and to also perform trimming as suggested in Section 7. Importantly, because our finite population inference imposes no distributional assumptions on potential outcomes and covariates, we are free to adjust the covariates in an arbitrary way, such as trimming or transforming using, e.g., principle components. In the Supplementary Material (Wang and Li, 2022), we also provide additional finite-sample diagnosis tools, discuss the choice of covariates and threshold for rerandomization, and conduct a simulation study.

In this paper, we mainly focused on the asymptotic properties of rerandomized treatment-control experiments using the Mahalanobis distance criterion; see the Supplementary Material (Wang and Li, 2022) for extension to regression adjustment under rerandomization. Beyond that, the derived theory, including both the finite population central limit theorem and the asymptotic behavior of the constrained Gaussian random variable, can also be useful for analyzing other covariate balance criteria, such as the Mahalanobis distance criterion with tiers of covariates (Morgan and Rubin, 2015; Li, Ding and Rubin, 2018). It will also be interesting to extend the theory to rerandomization in more complex experiments, such as blocked experiments (Schultzberg and Johansson, 2019; Wang, Wang and Liu, 2021), factorial experiments (Branson, Dasgupta and Rubin, 2016; Li, Ding and Rubin, 2020) and sequential experiments (Zhou et al., 2018). Besides, we mainly considered finite population inference focusing on the average treatment effect of the experimental units in hand. It will be interesting to also consider superpopulation inference of some population average treatment effect when the units are randomly sampled from some superpopulation (Schultzberg and Johansson, 2020).

**Acknowledgments.** We thank the Editor, the Associate Editor and three reviewers for constructive comments. Yuhao Wang is also affiliated with Shanghai Qi Zhi Institute.

**Funding.** The work of Yuhao Wang was supported by Tsinghua New Faculty Start-up Fund and the 2030 Innovation Megaprojects of China (Programme on New Generation Artificial Intelligence) Grant No. 2021AAA0150000.

## SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIAL

### Supplement to “Rerandomization with Diminishing Covariate Imbalance and Diverging Number of Covariates”

First, we provide additional finite-sample diagnosis tools for rerandomization, and conduct a simulation study. Second, we extend the asymptotic theory to regression adjustment under rerandomization. Third, we study the Berry–Esseen-type bound for finite population central limit theorem under simple random sampling. Fourth, we prove all the theorems, corollaries and propositions. Fifth, we connect rerandomization with usual optimal designs.

## REFERENCES

- ANGRIST, J., LANG, D. and OREOPOULOS, P. (2009). Incentives and Services for College Achievement: Evidence from a Randomized Trial. *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics* **1** 136–63.



- BALL, K. (1993). The reverse isoperimetric problem for Gaussian measure. *Discrete & Computational Geometry* **10** 411–420.
- BANERJEE, A. V., CHASSANG, S., MONTERO, S. and SNOWBERG, E. (2020). A Theory of Experimenters: Robustness, Randomization, and Balance. *American Economic Review* **110** 1206–1230.
- BARDENET, R. and MAILLARD, O.-A. (2015). Concentration inequalities for sampling without replacement. *Bernoulli* **21** 1361–1385.
- BENTKUS, V. (2003). On the dependence of the Berry–Esseen bound on dimension. *Journal of Statistical Planning and Inference* **113** 385–402.
- BENTKUS, V. (2005). A Lyapunov-type bound in  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . *Theory of Probability & Its Applications* **49** 311–323.
- BERRY, A. C. (1941). The accuracy of the Gaussian approximation to the sum of independent variates. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society* **49** 122–136.
- BICKEL, P. J. and FREEDMAN, D. A. (1984). Asymptotic Normality and the Bootstrap in Stratified Sampling. *The Annals of Statistics* **12** 470–482.
- BIKELIS, A. (1969). On the estimation of the remainder term in the central limit theorem for samples from finite populations. *Studia Sci. Math. Hungar* **4** 345–354.
- BLONIARZ, A., LIU, H., ZHANG, C. H., SEKHON, J. S. and YU, B. (2016). Lasso adjustments of treatment effect estimates in randomized experiments. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **113** 7383–7390.
- BOLTHAUSEN, E. and GÖTZE, F. (1993). The Rate of Convergence for Multivariate Sampling Statistics. *Annals of Statistics* **21** 1692–1710.
- BOX, G. E. P., HUNTER, J. S. and HUNTER, W. G. (2005). *Statistics for Experimenters: Design, Innovation, and Discovery*. New York: Wiley-Interscience.
- BRANSON, Z., DASGUPTA, T. and RUBIN, D. B. (2016). Improving covariate balance in 2K factorial designs via rerandomization with an application to a New York City Department of Education High School Study. *The Annals of Applied Statistics* **10** 1958–1976.
- BRANSON, Z. and SHAO, S. (2021). Ridge rerandomization: An experimental design strategy in the presence of covariate collinearity. *Journal of Statistical Planning and Inference* **211** 287–314.
- BRUHN, M. and MCKENZIE, D. (2009). In Pursuit of Balance: Randomization in Practice in Development Field Experiments. *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics* **1** 200–232.
- CHERNOZHUKOV, V., CHETVERIKOV, D. and KATO, K. (2017). Central limit theorems and bootstrap in high dimensions. *The Annals of Probability* **45** 2309–2352.
- CHERNOZHUKOV, V., CHETVERIKOV, D. and KOIKE, Y. (2020). Nearly optimal central limit theorem and bootstrap approximations in high dimensions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2012.09513*.
- COX, D. R. (1982). Randomization and concomitant variables in the design of experiments. In *Statistics and Probability: Essays in Honor of C. R. Rao* (P. R. K. G. Kallianpur and J. K. Ghosh, eds.) 197–202. North-Holland, Amsterdam.
- COX, D. R. (2007). Applied statistics: A review. *The Annals of Applied Statistics* **1** 1–16.
- DURRETT, R. (2019). *Probability: theory and examples* **49**. Cambridge university press.
- ESSEEN, C. G. (1942). On the Liapunov limit error in the theory of probability. *Ark. Mat. Astr. Fys.* **28** 1–19.
- FAN, C., MULLER, M. E. and REZUCHA, I. (1962). Development of sampling plans by using sequential (item by item) selection techniques and digital computers. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **57** 387–402.
- FANG, X. and KOIKE, Y. (2021). High-dimensional central limit theorems by Stein’s method. *The Annals of Applied Probability* **31** 1660–1686.
- FISHER, R. A. (1935). *The Design of Experiments*, 1st ed. Edinburgh, London: Oliver and Boyd.
- FREEDMAN, D. A. (2008). Editorial: Oasis or mirage? *CHANCE* **21** 59–61.
- HÁJEK, J. (1960). Limiting distributions in simple random sampling from a finite population. *Publications of the Mathematical Institute of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences* **5** 361–374.
- HECKMAN, J. J. and KARAPAKULA, G. (2021). Using a Satisficing Model of Experimenter Decision-Making to Guide Finite-Sample Inference for Compromised Experiments. *The Econometrics Journal* **in press**.
- HOEFFDING, W. (1963). Probability Inequalities for Sums of Bounded Random Variables. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **58** 13–30.
- HÖGLUND, T. (1978). Sampling from a finite population. A remainder term estimate. *Scandinavian Journal of Statistics* 69–71.
- JOHANSSON, P., RUBIN, D. B. and SCHULTZBERG, M. (2021). On optimal rerandomization designs. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)* **83** 395–403.
- KALLUS, N. (2018). Optimal a priori balance in the design of controlled experiments. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)* **80** 85–112.
- KAPELNER, A., KRIEGER, A. M., SKLAR, M., SHALIT, U. and AZRIEL, D. (2020). Harmonizing Optimized Designs With Classic Randomization in Experiments. *The American Statistician* **in press**.

- KARATSUBA, E. A. (2001). On the asymptotic representation of the Euler gamma function by Ramanujan. *Journal of Computational and Applied Mathematics* **135** 225–240.
- KASY, M. (2016). Why Experimenters Might Not Always Want to Randomize, and What They Could Do Instead. *Political Analysis* **24** 324–338.
- KIEFER, J. (1959). Optimum Experimental Designs. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Methodological)* **21** 272–304.
- LEI, L. and DING, P. (2020). Regression adjustment in completely randomized experiments with a diverging number of covariates. *Biometrika* **in press**.
- LI, X. and DING, P. (2017). General forms of finite population central limit theorems with applications to causal inference. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **112** 1759–1769.
- LI, X., DING, P. and RUBIN, D. B. (2018). Asymptotic theory of rerandomization in treatment–control experiments. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **115** 9157–9162.
- LI, X. and DING, P. (2020). Rerandomization and regression adjustment. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)* **82** 241–268.
- LI, X., DING, P. and RUBIN, D. B. (2020). Rerandomization in  $2^K$  factorial experiments. *The Annals of Statistics* **48** 43–63.
- LIN, W. (2013). Agnostic notes on regression adjustments to experimental data: Reexamining Freedman’s critique. *The Annals of Applied Statistics* **7** 295 – 318.
- LIU, H., REN, J. and YANG, Y. (2021). Randomization-based joint central limit theorem and efficient covariate adjustment in stratified  $2^K$  factorial experiments. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2103.04050*.
- MACKINNON, J. G. (2013). Thirty years of heteroskedasticity-robust inference. In *Recent advances and future directions in causality, prediction, and specification analysis* 437–461. Springer.
- MENG, X. (2013). Scalable simple random sampling and stratified sampling. In *International Conference on Machine Learning* 531–539. PMLR.
- MORGAN, K. L. and RUBIN, D. B. (2012). Rerandomization to improve covariate balance in experiments. *Annals of Statistics* **40** 1263–1282.
- MORGAN, K. L. and RUBIN, D. B. (2015). Rerandomization to balance tiers of covariates. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **110** 1412–1421.
- NAZAROV, F. (2003). On the Maximal Perimeter of a Convex Set in  $\mathbb{R}^n$  with Respect to a Gaussian Measure. In *Geometric aspects of functional analysis* 169–187. Springer.
- NEYMAN, J. (1923). On the application of probability theory to agricultural experiments. Essay on principles (with discussion). Section 9 (translated). reprinted ed. *Statistical Science* **5** 465–472.
- NORDIN, M. and SCHULTZBERG, M. (2020). Properties of restricted randomization with implications for experimental design. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2006.14888*.
- RAIĆ, M. (2015). Multivariate normal approximation: permutation statistics, local dependence and beyond.
- RAIĆ, M. (2019). A multivariate Berry–Esseen theorem with explicit constants. *Bernoulli* **25** 2824–2853.
- RIGOLLET, P. and HÜTTER, J.-C. (2015). High dimensional statistics. *Lecture notes for course 18S997* **813** 814.
- ROSENBAUM, P. R. (2010). *Design of Observational Studies*. New York: Springer.
- RUBIN, D. B. (1974). Estimating causal effects of treatments in randomized and nonrandomized studies. *Journal of Educational Psychology* **66** 688–701.
- SAVAGE, L. J. (1962). *The Foundations of Statistical Inference*. Methuen and Co. Led., London.
- SCHULTZBERG, M. and JOHANSSON, P. (2019). Re-randomization: A complement or substitute for stratification in randomized experiments?
- SCHULTZBERG, M. and JOHANSSON, P. (2020). Asymptotic Inference for Optimal Rerandomization Designs. *Open Statistics* **1** 49–58.
- SHI, L. and DING, P. (2022). Berry–Esseen bounds for design-based causal inference with possibly diverging treatment levels and varying group sizes. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2209.12345*.
- STUDENT (1938). Comparison Between Balanced and Random Arrangements of Field Plots. *Biometrika* **29** 363–378.
- TAVES, D. R. (1974). Minimization: A new method of assigning patients to treatment and control groups. *Clinical Pharmacology & Therapeutics* **15** 443–453.
- WAGER, S., DU, W., TAYLOR, J. and TIBSHIRANI, R. J. (2016). High-dimensional regression adjustments in randomized experiments. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **113** 12673–12678.
- WANG, Y. and LI, X. (2022). Supplement to “Rerandomization with Diminishing Covariate Imbalance and Diverging Number of Covariates”.
- WANG, X., WANG, T. and LIU, H. (2021). Rerandomization in Stratified Randomized Experiments. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **in press**.
- WU, C. F. (1981). On the Robustness and Efficiency of Some Randomized Designs. *The Annals of Statistics* **9** 1168 – 1177.

- ZHANG, H., YIN, G. and RUBIN, D. B. (2021). PCA Rerandomization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2102.12262*.
- ZHOU, Q., ERNST, P. A., MORGAN, K. L., RUBIN, D. B. and ZHANG, A. (2018). Sequential rerandomization. *Biometrika* **105** 745–752.

## SUPPLEMENT TO “RERANDOMIZATION WITH DIMINISHING COVARIATE IMBALANCE AND DIVERGING NUMBER OF COVARIATES”

Appendix A1 provides some finite-sample diagnosis tools, discusses the choice of covariates and threshold for rerandomization, and conducts a simulation study.

Appendix A2 studies regression adjustment after rerandomization.

Appendix A3 studies Berry–Esseen-type bound for finite population central limit theorem in simple random sampling.

Appendix A4 studies asymptotic properties for completely randomized and rerandomized experiments. It includes the proofs of Theorems 1–3, Corollary 1; and technical details about the comments of (9).

Appendix A5 studies the limiting behavior of the constrained Gaussian random variable. It includes the proof of Theorem 4.

Appendix A6 studies asymptotics for the optimal rerandomization. It includes the proofs of Theorems 5 and 6.

Appendix A7 studies large-sample inference for rerandomization. It includes the proofs of Theorems 7 and 8.

Appendix A8 studies the regularity conditions and finite-sample diagnoses for rerandomization. It also provides the technical details for the comments on  $\gamma_n$  and  $\sum_{i=1}^n H_{ii}^{3/2}$  in Section 7.2.

Appendix A9 studies the asymptotic properties of regression adjustment under rerandomization with a diverging number of covariates. It includes the proof of Theorem A1.

Appendix A10 studies connections to optimal design under certain hypothesized model of the potential outcomes.

### A1. Finite-sample Diagnoses and Simulation Studies.

A1.1. *Finite-sample diagnoses for rerandomization.* Our theoretical results are mostly concerned with the asymptotic properties of rerandomization designs. In this section, we further provide some additional tools for the diagnosis of rerandomization in finite samples. Our diagnosis is based on the bias and mean squared error (MSE) of the difference-in-means estimator  $\hat{\tau}$  for estimating the average treatment effect  $\tau$ . [Kapelner et al. \(2020\)](#) and [Nordin and Schultzberg \(2020\)](#) also considered the MSE of  $\hat{\tau}$  under rerandomization, but they focused mainly on the case with equal treatment group sizes (i.e.,  $r_1 = r_0 = 1/2$ ). In the following, we consider a general design  $\mathcal{D}$  that randomly assigns  $r_1$  proportion of units to treatment and the remaining  $r_0$  proportion to control. For descriptive convenience, we introduce  $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{D}}(\cdot)$  and  $\text{Var}_{\mathcal{D}}(\cdot)$  to denote the mean and variance under the design  $\mathcal{D}$ . The bias and MSE of the difference-in-means estimator  $\hat{\tau}$  under the design  $\mathcal{D}$  can then be written as  $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{D}}(\hat{\tau} - \tau)$  and  $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{D}}\{(\hat{\tau} - \tau)^2\}$ .

Recall that  $\mathbf{Z} = (Z_1, \dots, Z_n)^\top$  is the treatment assignment vector for all  $n$  units. Let  $\boldsymbol{\pi} \equiv \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{D}}(\mathbf{Z}) \in \mathbb{R}^n$  and  $\boldsymbol{\Omega} \equiv \text{Cov}_{\mathcal{D}}(\mathbf{Z}) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$  be its mean and covariance matrix under the design  $\mathcal{D}$ . Let  $y_i = r_0 Y_i(1) + r_1 Y_i(0)$  denote the weighted average of potential outcomes for unit  $i$ ,  $\bar{y} = n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n y_i$  be the corresponding finite population average, and  $\tilde{\mathbf{y}} = (y_1 - \bar{y}, \dots, y_n - \bar{y})^\top \in \mathbb{R}^n$  be the vector consisting of the centered weighted averages of potential outcomes for all units. As demonstrated in Appendix A8, the bias and MSE of the difference-in-means estimator  $\hat{\tau}$  have the following forms:

(A1.1)

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{D}}(\hat{\tau} - \tau) = \frac{(\boldsymbol{\pi} - r_1 \mathbf{1}_n)^\top \tilde{\mathbf{y}}}{nr_1 r_0}, \quad \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{D}}\{(\hat{\tau} - \tau)^2\} = \frac{\tilde{\mathbf{y}}^\top \{\boldsymbol{\Omega} + (\boldsymbol{\pi} - r_1 \mathbf{1}_n)(\boldsymbol{\pi} - r_1 \mathbf{1}_n)^\top\} \tilde{\mathbf{y}}}{(nr_1 r_0)^2},$$

where  $\mathbf{1}_n$  denotes an  $n$ -dimensional vector with all elements being 1. In (A1.1),  $\tilde{\mathbf{y}}$  depends on the potential outcomes and is generally unknown in the design stage of an experiment. However, the other quantities in (A1.1) are fully determined by the design  $\mathcal{D}$ , and can be computed or at least approximated by Monte Carlo method before actually conducting the experiment. Below we consider the worst-case behavior of the design in terms of the estimation bias and MSE in (A1.1) over the unknown potential outcomes. Recall that  $V_{\tau\tau}$  in (4) is the variance of  $\hat{\tau}$  under the CRE. As verified in Appendix A8, we can equivalently write  $V_{\tau\tau}$  as  $V_{\tau\tau} = \tilde{\mathbf{y}}\tilde{\mathbf{y}}^\top / \{n(n-1)r_1r_0\}$ .

**PROPOSITION A1.** For any design  $\mathcal{D}$  that randomly assign  $r_1$  proportion of units to treatment and the remaining  $r_0$  to control, the maximum absolute bias and the maximum root MSE of the difference-in-means estimator  $\hat{\tau}$  under  $\mathcal{D}$ , standardized by the corresponding standard deviation of  $\hat{\tau}$  under the CRE, have the following forms:

$$(A1.2) \quad \max_{\tilde{\mathbf{y}} \neq \mathbf{0}} V_{\tau\tau}^{-1/2} |\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{D}}(\hat{\tau} - \tau)| = \sqrt{\frac{n-1}{nr_1r_0}} \cdot \|\boldsymbol{\pi} - r_1\mathbf{1}_n\|_2 \geq 0,$$

$$(A1.3)$$

$$\max_{\tilde{\mathbf{y}} \neq \mathbf{0}} V_{\tau\tau}^{-1/2} \sqrt{\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{D}}\{(\hat{\tau} - \tau)^2\}} = \sqrt{\frac{n-1}{nr_1r_0}} \cdot \lambda_{\max}^{1/2} \left( \boldsymbol{\Omega} + (\boldsymbol{\pi} - r_1\mathbf{1}_n)(\boldsymbol{\pi} - r_1\mathbf{1}_n)^\top \right) \geq 1,$$

where  $\tilde{\mathbf{y}}$ ,  $\boldsymbol{\pi}$  and  $\boldsymbol{\Omega}$  are the same as defined before, and  $\lambda_{\max}(\cdot)$  denotes the largest eigenvalue of a matrix.

Proposition A1 characterizes the maximum bias and root MSE under any given design. It is not difficult to see that, when the design  $\mathcal{D}$  is the CRE, the maximum mean in (A1.2) achieves its minimum value 0, and the maximum root MSE in (A1.3) achieves its minimum value 1. This implies that the CRE is minimax optimal; see also Wu (1981). However, this does not contradict with our Corollary 1, which shows that the difference-in-means estimator under ReM always has smaller or equal variance and shorter or equal symmetric quantile ranges than that under the CRE asymptotically. The reason is that Proposition A1 considers all possible configurations of potential outcomes, including the case with  $R_n^2 = 0$ , i.e., the potential outcomes are uncorrelated with the covariates. In this case, the asymptotic distribution of  $\hat{\tau}$  under ReM reduces to that under the CRE.

More importantly, Proposition A1 can help us conduct some finite-sample diagnoses for rerandomization. Given any acceptance probability  $p$  and covariates  $\mathbf{X}$  for each unit, we can estimate  $\boldsymbol{\pi}$  and  $\boldsymbol{\Omega}$  by simulating treatment assignments from the corresponding ReM, based on which we can then investigate the maximum bias and root MSE in (A1.2) and (A1.3). In practice, we may consider several choices of  $p$  and  $\mathbf{X}$ , and compare them taking into account both the improvement they can bring as shown in Corollary 1 and the finite-sample biases they may cause as shown in Proposition A1; see the next subsection for details.

**A1.2. Choice of covariates and acceptance probability for rerandomization.** Below we consider some practical strategy to choose the covariates and imbalance threshold for the design of rerandomization in practice. From Corollary 1, if the sample size is large and the asymptotic approximation works well, then rerandomization can reduce the MSE of the difference-in-means estimator by  $100(1 - v_{K_n, a_n})R_n^2$  percent, or equivalently the standardized MSE is approximately  $1 - (1 - v_{K_n, a_n})R_n^2$ . On the contrary, from Appendix A1.1, with a finite sample size, the worst-case MSE of the difference-in-means estimator under rerandomization is no less than that under the CRE, and their ratio is the square of the quantity in (A1.3). Obviously, there is a trade-off for the choice of covariates and imbalance threshold. First, when the threshold (or equivalently the acceptance probability) decreases and the

covariates are fixed, the asymptotic percentage reduction in MSE will increase (due to the decreasing  $v_{K_n, a_n}$ ), while the finite-sample worst-case MSE is likely to increase. When the number of covariates increases and the acceptance probability is fixed, the asymptotic percentage reduction in MSE may increase or decrease (due to the increasing  $v_{K_n, a_n}$  and  $R_n^2$ ), while the finite-sample worst-case MSE is likely to increase.

Inspired by the above trade-off, we propose the following measure for the choice of covariates  $\mathbf{X}$  and acceptance probability  $p$  for rerandomization, which takes a geometric mean of the standardized MSEs in the worst case and the best case (in which the asymptotics works well):

$$(A1.4) \quad c(\mathbf{X}, p) \equiv \widetilde{\text{MSE}}(\mathbf{X}, p) \times \{1 - (1 - v_{K,a})R_{\mathbf{X}}^2\};$$

other possible measures taking into account the best- and worst-case MSEs can also be considered for practical diagnosis. In (A1.4),  $\widetilde{\text{MSE}}(\mathbf{X}, p)$  denotes the worst-case standardized MSE under rerandomization with covariates  $\mathbf{X}$  and acceptance probability  $p$ ,  $K$  is the dimension of covariates,  $a$  is the  $p$ -th quantile of the chi-squared distribution with degrees of freedom  $K$ , and  $R_{\mathbf{X}}^2$  denotes the squared multiple correlation between potential outcomes and covariates  $\mathbf{X}$ . We can then use (A1.4) as a measure for comparing different rerandomization designs, and can choose the one with minimum value of (A1.4) for the actual implementation of the experiment. Note that  $R_{\mathbf{X}}^2$  in (A1.4) depends on the potential outcomes and is thus unknown in the design stage of experiments. In practice, we can use some domain knowledge or some prior (pilot) studies to estimate  $R_{\mathbf{X}}^2$ .

Below we illustrate the use of the measure in (A1.4) using the dataset from the Student Achievement and Retention (STAR) Project (STAR, Angrist, Lang and Oreopoulos, 2009), a randomized evaluation of academic services and incentives conducted at a Canadian university. We focus on the treatment group where the students were offered some academic support (including peer-advising service) and scholarships for meeting targeted grades, and the control group receiving neither of these. Similar to Li, Ding and Rubin (2018), we dropped the students with missing covariates, resulting a treated group of size  $n_1 = 118$  and  $n_0 = 856$ . We generate 200 covariates for each unit, where the first five are from the STAR project, i.e., high-school GPA, age, gender and indicators for whether lives at home and whether rarely puts off studying for tests, and the rest 195 are drawn independently from the  $t$  distribution with degrees of freedom 2; once generated, these covariates are kept fixed, mimicking the finite population inference. We consider rerandomization with the first  $K = 5, 10, 50, 100, 200$  covariates, and consider acceptance probability  $p = 0.001, 0.05, 0.01, 0.1, 0.5$ . The left half of Table A1 shows the worst-case MSEs, standardized by that under the CRE, under various choices of  $(K, p)$ , where each worst-case MSE is estimated based on at least about  $10^5$  randomly generated treatment assignments from each design. It shows that the worst-case MSE generally increases as the number of covariates increases and the acceptance probability decreases. We further hypothesize that  $R_{\mathbf{X}}^2$  takes values 0.4, 0.5, 0.6, 0.7, 0.8, respectively, when  $K$  increases from 5 to 200. Intuitively, this implies that the additional gain from including more covariates decreases with the number of included covariates. The right half of Table A1 shows the value of the measure in (A1.4), which suggests to use rerandomization with  $K = 5$  covariates and acceptance probability  $p = 0.01$ .

**A1.3. A simulation study.** We now conduct a simulation study to demonstrate the potential gain from trimming, as well as investigating the inference for rerandomization in finite samples. We use again the dataset from the STAR project, and consider in total nine rerandomization designs for the  $n_1 + n_0 = 974$  units, with number of covariates  $K$  ranging from 0 to 200 and acceptance probability fixed at  $p = 0.001$ , where the covariates are generated in the same way as in Appendix A1.2. Note that when  $K = 0$ , rerandomization without any

TABLE A1

The worst-case mean squared error (standardized by that under the CRE) and the measure in (A1.4) for choosing and diagnosing rerandomization designs under various choices of covariates (whose number is denoted by  $K$ ) and acceptance probability (denoted by  $p$ ).

| $K \backslash p$ | worst-case mean squared error |       |       |       |       | The measure in (A1.4) |       |       |              |       |
|------------------|-------------------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-----------------------|-------|-------|--------------|-------|
|                  | 0.5                           | 0.1   | 0.05  | 0.01  | 0.001 | 0.5                   | 0.1   | 0.05  | 0.01         | 0.001 |
| 5                | 1.012                         | 1.025 | 1.033 | 1.068 | 1.216 | 0.819                 | 0.704 | 0.685 | <b>0.674</b> | 0.744 |
| 10               | 1.015                         | 1.095 | 1.147 | 1.264 | 1.414 | 0.839                 | 0.754 | 0.752 | 0.762        | 0.792 |
| 50               | 1.023                         | 1.340 | 1.523 | 1.935 | 2.477 | 0.925                 | 1.083 | 1.188 | 1.411        | 1.676 |
| 100              | 1.029                         | 1.448 | 1.684 | 2.225 | 2.96  | 0.948                 | 1.212 | 1.367 | 1.702        | 2.114 |
| 200              | 1.038                         | 1.495 | 1.752 | 2.356 | 3.189 | 0.972                 | 1.294 | 1.479 | 1.892        | 2.417 |

TABLE A2

Properties of rerandomization with fixed acceptance probability  $p_a = 0.001$  and varying number of covariates  $K$ . The 1st column shows the number of covariates for each design, the 2nd column shows the corresponding value of  $1 - v_{K,a}$ . The 3rd to 6th columns show the maximum standardized bias and mean squared error in (A1.2) and (A1.3), the summation of leverages to the power of  $3/2$ , and the maximum leverage over all units. The 7th–10th columns show the analogous quantities for the design using trimmed covariates. The 11th and 12th columns show the minimum possible values of  $\sum_{i=1}^n H_{ii}^{3/2}$  (which equals  $K^{3/2}/\sqrt{n}$ ) and  $\max_i H_{ii}$  (which equals  $K_n/n$ ) for each  $K$ .

| $K$ | $1 - v_{K,a}$ | Covariates without trimming |      |                             |                 | Trimmed covariates |      |                             |                 | Minimal                     |                 |
|-----|---------------|-----------------------------|------|-----------------------------|-----------------|--------------------|------|-----------------------------|-----------------|-----------------------------|-----------------|
|     |               | Bias                        | RMSE | $\sum_{i=1}^n H_{ii}^{3/2}$ | $\max_i H_{ii}$ | Bias               | RMSE | $\sum_{i=1}^n H_{ii}^{3/2}$ | $\max_i H_{ii}$ | $\sum_{i=1}^n H_{ii}^{3/2}$ | $\max_i H_{ii}$ |
| 0   | 0             | 0.10                        | 1.10 | NA                          | NA              | 0.10               | 1.10 | NA                          | NA              | NA                          | NA              |
| 5   | 0.97          | 0.13                        | 1.10 | 0.39                        | 0.02            | 0.11               | 1.10 | 0.39                        | 0.02            | 0.36                        | 0.01            |
| 9   | 0.90          | 0.76                        | 1.18 | 1.78                        | 0.66            | 0.16               | 1.10 | 0.94                        | 0.03            | 0.87                        | 0.01            |
| 15  | 0.80          | 0.91                        | 1.25 | 3.48                        | 0.66            | 0.20               | 1.10 | 1.97                        | 0.05            | 1.86                        | 0.02            |
| 24  | 0.70          | 1.28                        | 1.46 | 8.00                        | 0.98            | 0.23               | 1.11 | 3.92                        | 0.06            | 3.77                        | 0.02            |
| 37  | 0.60          | 1.33                        | 1.52 | 12.71                       | 0.98            | 0.25               | 1.11 | 7.41                        | 0.09            | 7.21                        | 0.04            |
| 60  | 0.50          | 1.47                        | 1.62 | 23.45                       | 0.98            | 0.27               | 1.11 | 15.13                       | 0.13            | 14.89                       | 0.06            |
| 100 | 0.41          | 1.56                        | 1.72 | 43.87                       | 0.98            | 0.29               | 1.12 | 32.33                       | 0.16            | 32.04                       | 0.10            |
| 200 | 0.30          | 1.62                        | 1.79 | 104.57                      | 0.99            | 0.31               | 1.13 | 91.01                       | 0.28            | 90.63                       | 0.21            |

covariate essentially reduces to the CRE. We then simulate  $10^5$  treatment assignments from each of these designs.

Table A2 reports the simulation results. The first column shows the number of covariates involved in the nine rerandomization designs, and the second column shows the value of  $1 - v_{K,a}$  under various values of  $K$  and fixed acceptance probability  $p = 0.001$ . From Corollary 1, if the additional covariates do not increase the squared multiple correlation  $R^2$  between potential outcomes and covariates by a relatively large amount, the improvement from rerandomization may decrease as the number of covariates increases. The 3rd–6th columns in Table A2 show the maximum absolute bias in (A1.2), the maximum root MSE in (A1.3), the summation of leverages to the power of  $3/2$  as in (18) and the maximum leverage over all units, where the first two are estimated based on the  $10^5$  simulated assignments from each of these designs. Note that when  $K = 0$ , the design is the CRE, and from the discussion after Proposition A1, the maximum mean is 0 and the maximum root MSE is 1. Thus, there is some variability for estimating the maximum mean and MSE; in practice, we may increase the number of simulated assignments to improve the precision. Nevertheless, the 3rd–6th columns in Table A2 show the trend that, as the number of covariates increases, the maximum bias and MSE under rerandomization will increase, which may render our treatment effect estimation inaccurate, and the leverages will increase as well, which may make the asymptotic approximation less accurate as discussed shortly. We further perform trimming on the covariates, as suggested in Section 7.2. Specifically, we trim each covariate at both its 2.5% and 97.5% quantiles. From the 7th–10th columns in Table A2, trimming significantly

reduces the maximum biases, maximum MSEs and leverages. Moreover, compared to the 11th and 12th columns, the values of  $\sum_{i=1}^n H_{ii}^{3/2}$  and  $\max_i H_{ii}$  after trimming become quite close to their minimal possible values. This agrees with the suggestion we gave in Section 7.2.

TABLE A3

*Asymptotic approximation and coverage property under the nine rerandomization designs in Table A2. The top half uses the first-year GPA from the STAR dataset as the potential outcomes, and the bottom half use the average propensity score from the nine design without trimming, after a quantile transformation using  $t$  distribution with degree of freedom 3, as the potential outcomes. The  $K$  column shows the number of covariates in each design, Bias column shows the absolute empirical bias standardized by  $V_{\tau\tau}^{1/2}$ , Ratio column shows the ratio between empirical and asymptotic mean squared errors, and HCO–3 columns show the coverage probabilities in percent of the 95% confidence intervals using the methods HCO–3 described in Section 6.*

| $K$ | Covariates without trimming |       |      |      |      |      | Trimmed covariates |       |      |      |      |      |
|-----|-----------------------------|-------|------|------|------|------|--------------------|-------|------|------|------|------|
|     | Bias                        | Ratio | HC0  | HC1  | HC2  | HC3  | Bias               | Ratio | HC0  | HC1  | HC2  | HC3  |
| 0   | 0.001                       | 1.00  | 97.5 | 97.5 | 97.5 | 97.5 | 0.000              | 1.00  | 97.4 | 97.4 | 97.4 | 97.4 |
| 5   | 0.002                       | 1.00  | 97.3 | 97.5 | 97.5 | 97.8 | 0.000              | 1.00  | 97.2 | 97.4 | 97.5 | 97.7 |
| 9   | 0.012                       | 1.01  | 96.9 | 97.3 | 97.3 | 97.8 | 0.004              | 1.01  | 97.0 | 97.5 | 97.5 | 97.9 |
| 15  | 0.012                       | 1.02  | 96.9 | 97.5 | 97.5 | 98.1 | 0.011              | 1.02  | 96.7 | 97.3 | 97.3 | 97.9 |
| 24  | 0.018                       | 1.02  | 96.7 | 97.4 | 97.4 | 98.2 | 0.006              | 1.01  | 96.5 | 97.3 | 97.4 | 98.0 |
| 37  | 0.003                       | 1.03  | 96.2 | 97.3 | 97.3 | 98.0 | 0.006              | 1.02  | 96.1 | 97.2 | 97.2 | 97.9 |
| 60  | 0.012                       | 1.04  | 95.5 | 97.1 | 97.2 | 97.7 | 0.020              | 1.04  | 95.3 | 97.1 | 97.1 | 97.6 |
| 100 | 0.008                       | 1.05  | 94.4 | 96.8 | 96.8 | 97.4 | 0.014              | 1.04  | 94.3 | 96.8 | 96.8 | 97.3 |
| 200 | 0.006                       | 1.07  | 93.9 | 94.0 | 94.0 | 94.4 | 0.015              | 1.06  | 93.7 | 93.8 | 93.8 | 93.9 |
| 0   | 0.005                       | 0.99  | 97.5 | 97.5 | 97.5 | 97.5 | 0.002              | 1.00  | 97.5 | 97.5 | 97.5 | 97.5 |
| 5   | 0.013                       | 1.01  | 97.2 | 97.3 | 97.3 | 97.4 | 0.003              | 1.00  | 97.2 | 97.4 | 97.4 | 97.4 |
| 9   | 0.346                       | 1.03  | 93.2 | 93.9 | 94.3 | 95.0 | 0.021              | 1.01  | 96.6 | 97.0 | 97.1 | 97.5 |
| 15  | 0.513                       | 1.16  | 89.5 | 90.9 | 91.5 | 92.6 | 0.032              | 1.02  | 96.1 | 96.8 | 96.8 | 97.4 |
| 24  | 0.838                       | 1.57  | 79.2 | 82.1 | 83.4 | 86.0 | 0.048              | 1.02  | 95.6 | 96.5 | 96.6 | 97.4 |
| 37  | 0.923                       | 1.73  | 74.9 | 79.0 | 80.4 | 83.1 | 0.056              | 1.03  | 95.1 | 96.4 | 96.4 | 97.4 |
| 60  | 1.022                       | 1.92  | 68.8 | 74.9 | 76.1 | 78.7 | 0.062              | 1.03  | 94.6 | 96.4 | 96.5 | 97.3 |
| 100 | 1.094                       | 2.11  | 62.7 | 70.8 | 71.5 | 74.5 | 0.054              | 1.04  | 93.4 | 96.0 | 96.0 | 96.8 |
| 200 | 1.065                       | 2.11  | 63.1 | 63.6 | 64.1 | 68.3 | 0.067              | 1.07  | 92.5 | 92.6 | 92.6 | 92.8 |

We then consider the asymptotic approximation and coverage probabilities of confidence intervals under these rerandomization designs with different numbers of covariates. We first consider the case where both potential outcomes are the same as the observed first year GPA from the STAR dataset. The top half of Table A3 shows the absolute empirical bias standardized by  $V_{\tau\tau}^{1/2}$ , the ratio between empirical MSE and the corresponding asymptotic variance, and the empirical coverage probabilities of 95% confidence intervals using methods HCO–3 described in Section 6. Note that when  $K = 200$ , the number of covariates are greater than the size of treated group, under which we can only perform HC1–3 for the control group. From Table A3, under all the nine designs, the biases are close to 0, the ratios between empirical and asymptotic MSEs are close to 1, and the coverage probabilities are close to the nominal level, all of which indicate that the asymptotic approximation for rerandomization works quite well. These in some sense show the robustness of rerandomization. To illustrate the potential drawback of rerandomization with a large number of covariates, we also consider potential outcomes constructed in the following way: we first estimate the propensity scores for all units under these nine designs, then calculate the average of them for each unit, and finally take a quantile transformation using the  $t$  distribution with degrees of freedom 3 to get both potential outcomes. The bottom half of Table A3 shows analogously the standardized absolute empirical bias, the ratio between empirical and asymptotic MSEs and the coverage probabilities of 95% confidence intervals using HCO–3. From Table A3, as  $K$  increases, the



standardized biases increases, the ratio becomes further from 1, and the coverage probabilities become much smaller than the nominal level, all of which indicates poor asymptotic approximation under rerandomization with a large number of covariates. Comparing Tables A2 and A3, we can find that the ratio and the coverage probabilities become further off from their ideal values as the maximum standardized bias and root MSE in Table A2 get larger, which indicates that (A1.2) and (A1.3) can be used as viable tools to help assist the design of ReM in practice. Finally, we also consider rerandomization with trimmed covariates for both cases. From the right half of Table A3, trimming helps improve the finite-sample performance of rerandomization in terms of both point and interval estimates. Moreover, compared to HC0, HC1–3 help improve the coverage probabilities of the confidence intervals, especially when the number of covariates is relatively large.

**A2. Regression adjustment under rerandomization.** Regression adjustment is a popular approach to adjusting for covariate imbalance between two treatment groups after the experiments were conducted. Below we consider linearly regression adjusted estimator after ReM, which can be particularly useful when the analyzer is able to observe more covariate information after conducting the experiment. Let  $\mathbf{W}_i \in \mathbb{R}^{J_n}$  denote the available covariate vector for unit  $i$  in analysis, and  $\hat{\tau}_{\mathbf{W}}$  denote the corresponding difference-in-means of covariates between treatment and control groups. Following Li and Ding (2020), a general linearly regression adjusted estimator has the following form:

$$(A2.5) \quad \begin{aligned} \hat{\tau}(\beta_1, \beta_0) &= \frac{1}{n_1} \sum_{i=1}^n Z_i \{Y_i - \beta_1^\top (\mathbf{W}_i - \bar{\mathbf{W}})\} - \frac{1}{n_0} \sum_{i=1}^n (1 - Z_i) \{Y_i - \beta_0^\top (\mathbf{W}_i - \bar{\mathbf{W}})\} \\ &= \hat{\tau} - (r_0 \beta_1 + r_1 \beta_0)^\top \hat{\tau}_{\mathbf{W}}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\beta_1$  and  $\beta_0$  are the covariate adjustment coefficients. From (A2.5), the regression adjusted estimator  $\hat{\tau}(\beta_1, \beta_0)$  is essentially the difference-in-means estimator with adjusted treatment and control potential outcomes  $Y_i(1) - \beta_1^\top (\mathbf{W}_i - \bar{\mathbf{W}})$ 's and  $Y_i(0) - \beta_0^\top (\mathbf{W}_i - \bar{\mathbf{W}})$ 's. Therefore, its asymptotic property can be similarly derived as Theorems 3 and 5. Below we focus on a specific regression adjusted estimator  $\hat{\tau}(\tilde{\beta}_1, \tilde{\beta}_0)$ , which enjoys certain optimalities (see, e.g., Lin, 2013; Li and Ding, 2020) and uses the following least squares coefficients for covariate adjustment:

$$\tilde{\beta}_z = \arg \min_{\beta} \sum_{i=1}^n \{Y_i(z) - \bar{Y}(z) - \beta_z^\top (\mathbf{W}_i - \bar{\mathbf{W}})\}^2 = (\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{W}}^2)^{-1} \mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{W},z}, \quad (z = 0, 1)$$

where  $\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{W}}^2$  and  $\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{W},z}$  denote the finite population covariance matrices for covariates and potential outcomes.

For each unit  $i$  and  $z = 0, 1$ , let  $\tilde{e}_i(z) = Y_i(z) - \tilde{\beta}_z^\top (\mathbf{W}_i - \bar{\mathbf{W}})$  denote the adjusted potential outcome, and  $\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_i = (r_0 \tilde{e}_i(1) + r_1 \tilde{e}_i(0), \mathbf{X}_i^\top)^\top$ . Define  $\tilde{\gamma}_n$  and  $\tilde{\Delta}_n$  analogously as (7) and (8), but with  $Y_i(z)$  replaced by  $\tilde{e}_i(z)$ ,  $\mathbf{u}_i$  replaced by  $\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_i$  and  $\hat{\tau}$  replaced by  $\hat{\tau}(\tilde{\beta}_1, \tilde{\beta}_0)$ . Analogous to (5), we define  $\tilde{R}_n^2$  as the squared multiple correlation between adjusted potential outcomes and covariates  $\mathbf{X}_i$ 's, and  $\rho_n^2$  as the squared multiple correlation between original (unadjusted) potential outcomes and covariates  $\mathbf{W}_i$ 's. We first invoke the following regularity condition, which essentially assumes Conditions 1 and 2 for the adjusted potential outcomes.

CONDITION A1. Conditions 1 and 2 hold with  $\gamma_n$  and  $\Delta_n$  replaced by  $\tilde{\gamma}_n$  and  $\tilde{\Delta}_n$ .

Note that both adjustment coefficients  $\tilde{\beta}_1$  and  $\tilde{\beta}_0$  depend on all potential outcomes and are thus unknown. In practice, we can estimate them using the sampling analogues  $\hat{\beta}_z = (\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{W}}^2)^{-1} \mathbf{s}_{z, \mathbf{W}}$  for  $z = 0, 1$ , where  $\mathbf{s}_{z, \mathbf{W}}$  is the sample covariance between observed outcomes and covariates for units under treatment arm  $z$ , and use the regression adjusted estimator  $\hat{\tau}(\hat{\beta}_1, \hat{\beta}_0)$  with the estimated coefficients. We then invoke the following regularity condition, which ensures that the regression adjusted estimators with true and estimated coefficients have the same asymptotic distribution.

CONDITION A2. As  $n \rightarrow \infty$ ,

$$\frac{\max_{z \in \{0,1\}} \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} |Y_i(z) - \bar{Y}(z)|}{\sqrt{V_{\tau\tau}(1 - \rho_n^2)\{1 - \tilde{R}_n^2\}}} \cdot J_n \cdot \frac{\max\{1, \log J_n, -\log p_n\}}{nr_1^2 r_0^2} \rightarrow 0.$$

We summarize the asymptotic distribution of  $\hat{\tau}(\hat{\beta}_1, \hat{\beta}_0)$  under ReM in the theorem below.

THEOREM A1. Under ReM and Conditions A1 and A2, as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ ,

$$\sup_{c \in \mathbb{R}} \left| \mathbb{P} \left\{ \frac{\hat{\tau}(\hat{\beta}_1, \hat{\beta}_0) - \tau}{\sqrt{V_{\tau\tau}(1 - \rho_n^2)}} \leq c \mid M \leq a_n \right\} - \mathbb{P} \left\{ \sqrt{1 - \tilde{R}_n^2} \varepsilon_0 + \sqrt{\tilde{R}_n^2} L_{K_n, a_n} \leq c \right\} \right| \rightarrow 0;$$

If further Condition 3 holds and  $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{R}_n^2 < 1$ , then

$$\sup_{c \in \mathbb{R}} \left| \mathbb{P} \left\{ \frac{\hat{\tau}(\hat{\beta}_1, \hat{\beta}_0) - \tau}{\sqrt{V_{\tau\tau}(1 - \rho_n^2)}} \leq c \mid M \leq a_n \right\} - \mathbb{P} \left\{ \sqrt{1 - \tilde{R}_n^2} \varepsilon_0 \leq c \right\} \right| \rightarrow 0.$$

Theorem A1 implies that we can still perform covariate adjustment under ReM with diminishing covariate imbalance threshold as well as diverging numbers of covariates in both design and analysis, which extends the discussion in Li and Ding (2020) with fixed threshold and fixed numbers of covariates. Moreover, with covariate imbalance diminishing at a proper rate, the regression adjusted estimator becomes asymptotically Gaussian distributed, and its improvement over the CRE is nondecreasing in  $\tilde{R}_n^2$ .

### A3. Berry–Esseen-type Bound for Finite Population Central Limit Theorem in Simple Random Sampling.

#### A3.1. Main theorem.

THEOREM A2. Consider any finite population  $\{\mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{u}_2, \dots, \mathbf{u}_N\}$  with  $\mathbf{u}_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$ , with  $\bar{\mathbf{u}} = N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{u}_i$  and  $\mathbf{S}^2 = (N-1)^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N (\mathbf{u}_i - \bar{\mathbf{u}})(\mathbf{u}_i - \bar{\mathbf{u}})^\top$  denoting the finite population average and covariance matrix. Let  $(Z_1, Z_2, \dots, Z_N)$  denote the indicators for a simple random sample of size  $m$ , i.e., the probability that  $\mathbf{Z}$  takes a particular value  $\mathbf{z} = (z_1, \dots, z_N) \in \{0, 1\}^N$  is  $m!(N-m)!/N!$  if  $\sum_{i=1}^N z_i = m$  and zero otherwise,  $f \equiv m/N$  be the fraction of sampled units, and

$$\mathbf{W} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{Nf(1-f)}} \mathbf{S}^{-1} \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^N Z_i \mathbf{u}_i - m\bar{\mathbf{u}} \right\}.$$

Let  $\varepsilon \sim \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{I}_d)$  denote a  $d$ -dimensional standard Gaussian random vector, and define

$$\gamma \equiv \frac{1}{\sqrt{Nf(1-f)}} \frac{d^{1/4}}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \|\mathbf{S}^{-1}(\mathbf{u}_i - \bar{\mathbf{u}})\|_2^3.$$

(i) There exists  $C_d$  that depends only on  $d$  such that for any  $N \geq 2$ ,  $f \in (0, 1)$ , any finite population  $\{\mathbf{u}_i : 1 \leq i \leq N\}$  with nonsingular finite population covariance  $\mathbf{S}^2$ , and any measurable convex set  $\mathcal{Q} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ ,

$$|\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{W} \in \mathcal{Q}) - \mathbb{P}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \in \mathcal{Q})| \leq C_d \gamma$$

(ii) If the theorem in [Raič \(2015\)](#) holds, then there exists a universal constant  $C$  such that for any  $N \geq 2$ ,  $d \geq 1$ ,  $f \in (0, 1)$ , any finite population  $\{\mathbf{u}_i : 1 \leq i \leq N\}$  with nonsingular finite population covariance  $\mathbf{S}^2$ , and any measurable convex set  $\mathcal{Q} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ ,

$$|\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{W} \in \mathcal{Q}) - \mathbb{P}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \in \mathcal{Q})| \leq C \gamma$$

(iii) For any  $N \geq 2$ ,  $d \geq 1$ ,  $f \in (0, 1)$ , any finite population  $\{\mathbf{u}_i : 1 \leq i \leq N\}$  with nonsingular finite population covariance  $\mathbf{S}^2$ , and any measurable convex set  $\mathcal{Q} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ ,

$$|\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{W} \in \mathcal{Q}) - \mathbb{P}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \in \mathcal{Q})| \leq 174\gamma + 3 \cdot 2^{2/3} \frac{d^{1/2}}{\{Nf(1-f)\}^{1/6}} \leq 174\gamma + 7\gamma^{1/3}.$$

(iv) For any  $N \geq 2$ ,  $d \geq 1$ ,  $f \in (0, 1)$ , any finite population  $\{\mathbf{u}_i : 1 \leq i \leq N\}$  with nonsingular finite population covariance  $\mathbf{S}^2$ , and any measurable convex set  $\mathcal{Q} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ ,

$$|\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{W} \in \mathcal{Q}) - \mathbb{P}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \in \mathcal{Q})| \leq 180\gamma + \frac{3(\log N)^{3/4} d^{3/4}}{N^{1/4} \sqrt{f(1-f)}} \cdot \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \left\| (\mathbf{S}_u^2)^{-1/2} (\mathbf{u}_i - \bar{\mathbf{u}}) \right\|_\infty.$$

(v) For any  $N \geq 2$ ,  $d \geq 1$ ,  $f \in (0, 1)$ , any finite population  $\{\mathbf{u}_i : 1 \leq i \leq N\}$  with nonsingular finite population covariance  $\mathbf{S}^2$ , any  $\iota \geq 2$ , and any measurable convex set  $\mathcal{Q} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ ,

$$|\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{W} \in \mathcal{Q}) - \mathbb{P}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \in \mathcal{Q})| \leq 174\gamma + \frac{C_\iota d^{3\iota/\{4(\iota+1)\}}}{N^{\iota/\{4(\iota+1)\}} \{f(1-f)\}^{\iota/2}} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \left\| (\mathbf{S}_u^2)^{-1/2} (\mathbf{u}_i - \bar{\mathbf{u}}) \right\|_\iota,$$

where  $C_\iota$  is a universal constant depending only on  $\iota$ .

A3.2. *Proof of Theorem A2(i) and (ii) based on combinatorial central limit theorem.* To prove Theorem A2(i), we need the following lemma, which follows immediately from [Bolthausen and Götze \(1993, Theorem 1\)](#).

LEMMA A1. Consider any integer  $N \geq 1$  and any constant vector  $\mathbf{a}(i, j) \in \mathbb{R}^d$  for all  $1 \leq i, j \leq N$  satisfying that

(A3.6)

$$\sum_{j=1}^N \mathbf{a}(i, j) = \mathbf{0}, 1 \leq i \leq N \text{ and } \frac{1}{N-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^N \mathbf{a}(i, j) \mathbf{a}(i, j)^\top - \frac{1}{N(N-1)} \sum_{j=1}^N \mathbf{b}(j) \mathbf{b}(j)^\top = \mathbf{I}_d,$$

where  $\mathbf{b}(j) \equiv \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{a}(i, j)$ . Let  $\pi$  denote a uniformly distributed random permutation of  $\{1, 2, \dots, N\}$ ,  $\mathbf{W} = \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{a}(i, \pi(i))$ , and  $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \sim \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{I}_d)$  denote a  $d$ -dimensional standard Gaussian random vector. Then there exists a constant  $C_d$  that depends only on  $d$  such that for any  $N \geq 2$ , any  $\{\mathbf{a}(i, j) : 1 \leq i, j \leq N\}$  satisfying (A3.6), and any measurable convex set  $\mathcal{Q} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ ,

$$|\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{W} \in \mathcal{Q}) - \mathbb{P}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \in \mathcal{Q})| \leq C_d \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^N \|\mathbf{a}(i, j)\|_2^3.$$

**Proof of Theorem A2(i).** Let  $\mathbf{S}$  denote the positive definite square root of  $\mathbf{S}^2$ , and define

$$\mathbf{a}(i, j) = \begin{cases} \{m(1-f)\}^{-1/2} \mathbf{S}^{-1} (1-f) (\mathbf{u}_i - \bar{\mathbf{u}}), & \text{if } 1 \leq j \leq m, \\ -\{m(1-f)\}^{-1/2} \mathbf{S}^{-1} f (\mathbf{u}_i - \bar{\mathbf{u}}), & \text{if } m < j \leq N, \end{cases} \quad (1 \leq i \leq N).$$

We can then verify that

$$\sum_{j=1}^N \mathbf{a}(i, j) = \{m(1-f)\}^{-1/2} \mathbf{S}^{-1} \cdot \{m(1-f) - (N-m)f\} (\mathbf{u}_i - \bar{\mathbf{u}}) = \mathbf{0}, \quad (1 \leq i \leq N)$$

$$\mathbf{b}(j) \equiv \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{a}(i, j) = \mathbf{0}, \quad (1 \leq j \leq N)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{N-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^N \mathbf{a}(i, j) \mathbf{a}(i, j)^\top - \frac{1}{N(N-1)} \sum_{j=1}^N \mathbf{b}(j) \mathbf{b}(j)^\top \\ &= \frac{m}{N-1} \frac{(1-f)^2}{m(1-f)} \mathbf{S}^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N (\mathbf{u}_i - \bar{\mathbf{u}}) (\mathbf{u}_i - \bar{\mathbf{u}})^\top \mathbf{S}^{-1} + \frac{N-m}{N-1} \frac{f^2}{m(1-f)} \mathbf{S}^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N (\mathbf{u}_i - \bar{\mathbf{u}}) (\mathbf{u}_i - \bar{\mathbf{u}})^\top \mathbf{S}^{-1} \\ &= (1-f) \mathbf{S}^{-1} \mathbf{S}^2 \mathbf{S}^{-1} + f \mathbf{S}^{-1} \mathbf{S}^2 \mathbf{S}^{-1} = \mathbf{I}_d, \end{aligned}$$

i.e.,  $\{\mathbf{a}(i, j) : 1 \leq i, j \leq N\}$  satisfies the conditions in (A3.6). Besides,  $\sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^N |\mathbf{a}(i, j)|^3$  simplifies to

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^N \|\mathbf{a}(i, j)\|_2^3 &= m \frac{(1-f)^3}{\{m(1-f)\}^{3/2}} \sum_{i=1}^N \|\mathbf{S}^{-1} (\mathbf{u}_i - \bar{\mathbf{u}})\|_2^3 + (N-m) \frac{f^3}{\{m(1-f)\}^{3/2}} \sum_{i=1}^N \|\mathbf{S}^{-1} (\mathbf{u}_i - \bar{\mathbf{u}})\|_2^3 \\ &= \frac{(1-f)^2 + f^2}{\sqrt{m(1-f)}} \sum_{i=1}^N \|\mathbf{S}^{-1} (\mathbf{u}_i - \bar{\mathbf{u}})\|_2^3 \leq \frac{\{f + (1-f)\}^2}{\sqrt{Nf(1-f)}} \sum_{i=1}^N \|\mathbf{S}^{-1} (\mathbf{u}_i - \bar{\mathbf{u}})\|_2^3 \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{Nf(1-f)}} \sum_{i=1}^N \|\mathbf{S}^{-1} (\mathbf{u}_i - \bar{\mathbf{u}})\|_2^3 = \frac{N}{d^{1/4}} \gamma, \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality holds by definition.

Let  $\pi$  denote a uniformly distributed random permutation of  $\{1, 2, \dots, N\}$ , and  $\tilde{\mathbf{W}} = \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{a}(i, \pi(i))$ . Then, by definition,

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mathbf{W}} &= \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{1}(\pi(i) \leq m) \{m(1-f)\}^{-1/2} \mathbf{S}^{-1} (1-f) \mathbf{u}_i - \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{1}(\pi(i) > m) \{m(1-f)\}^{-1/2} \mathbf{S}^{-1} f \mathbf{u}_i \\ &= \{m(1-f)\}^{-1/2} \mathbf{S}^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \{\mathbb{1}(\pi(i) \leq m) - f\} \mathbf{u}_i = \frac{1}{\sqrt{Nf(1-f)}} \mathbf{S}^{-1} \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{1}(\pi(i) \leq m) \mathbf{u}_i - m \bar{\mathbf{u}} \right\} \\ &\sim \frac{1}{\sqrt{Nf(1-f)}} \mathbf{S}^{-1} \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^N Z_i \mathbf{u}_i - m \bar{\mathbf{u}} \right\} = \mathbf{W}, \end{aligned}$$

where the last  $\sim$  holds because  $(\mathbb{1}(\pi(1) \leq m), \mathbb{1}(\pi(2) \leq m), \dots, \mathbb{1}(\pi(N) \leq m))$  follows the same distribution as  $(Z_1, Z_2, \dots, Z_N)$ . Applying Lemma A1, we can know that there

exists  $C_d$  that depends only on  $d$  such that, for any measurable convex set  $\mathcal{Q} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ ,

$$|\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{W} \in \mathcal{Q}) - \mathbb{P}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \in \mathcal{Q})| \leq C_d \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^N \|\mathbf{a}(i, j)\|_2^3 = C_d d^{-1/4} \cdot \gamma.$$

This immediately implies that Theorem A2(i) holds.  $\square$

To prove Theorem A2(ii), we need the following lemma from Raič (2015). However, the author did not provide a formal proof there.

**LEMMA A2.** *Consider the same setting as in Lemma A1. There exists a universal constant  $C$  such that for any  $N \geq 2$ , any  $d \geq 1$ , any  $\{\mathbf{a}(i, j) : 1 \leq i, j \leq N\}$  satisfying (A3.6), and any measurable convex set  $\mathcal{Q} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ ,*

$$|\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{W} \in \mathcal{Q}) - \mathbb{P}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \in \mathcal{Q})| \leq C d^{1/4} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^N |\mathbf{a}(i, j)|^3.$$

**Proof of Theorem A2(ii).** Theorem A2(ii) follows from Lemma A2, by almost the same logic as the proof of Theorem A2(i). Therefore, we omit its proof here.  $\square$

### A3.3. Proof of Theorem A2(iii) based on Hájek coupling.

**A3.3.1. Technical lemmas.** To prove Theorem A2(iii), we need the following eight lemmas.

**LEMMA A3.** *Consider a finite population  $\{\mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{u}_2, \dots, \mathbf{u}_N\}$  for  $N$  units, where  $\mathbf{u}_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$  for all  $i$ . Let  $\bar{\mathbf{u}} = N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{u}_i$  denote the finite population average. There must exist a pair of random vectors  $\mathbf{Z}$  and  $\mathbf{T}$  in  $\{0, 1\}^N$  such that*

- (i)  $\mathbf{Z} = (Z_1, Z_2, \dots, Z_N)$  is an indicator vector for a simple random sample of size  $m$ , i.e., the probability that  $\mathbf{Z}$  takes a particular value  $\mathbf{z} = (z_1, \dots, z_N) \in \{0, 1\}^N$  is  $m!(N-m)!/N!$  if  $\sum_{i=1}^N z_i = m$  and zero otherwise;
- (ii)  $\mathbf{T} = (T_1, T_2, \dots, T_N) \in \{0, 1\}^N$  is an indicator vector for a Bernoulli random sample with equal probability  $m/N$  for all units, i.e.,  $T_i \stackrel{i.i.d.}{\sim} \text{Bern}(m/N)$ ;
- (iii) the covariances for  $\mathbf{A} \equiv \sum_{i=1}^N Z_i \mathbf{u}_i$ ,  $\mathbf{B} \equiv \sum_{i=1}^N T_i (\mathbf{u}_i - \bar{\mathbf{u}}) + m\bar{\mathbf{u}}$  and their difference satisfy  $\text{Cov}(\mathbf{B}) = (1 - N^{-1}) \cdot \text{Cov}(\mathbf{A})$  and

$$\text{Cov}^{-1/2}(\mathbf{B}) \cdot \mathbb{E}\{(\mathbf{B} - \mathbf{A})(\mathbf{B} - \mathbf{A})^\top\} \cdot \text{Cov}^{-1/2}(\mathbf{B}) \leq \sqrt{\frac{1}{m} + \frac{1}{N-m}} \cdot \mathbf{I}_d.$$

**LEMMA A4 (Raič (2019)).** *Let  $\boldsymbol{\xi}_1, \dots, \boldsymbol{\xi}_N$  be  $N$  independent  $d$ -dimensional random vectors, satisfying  $\mathbb{E}\boldsymbol{\xi}_i = \mathbf{0}$  for all  $1 \leq i \leq N$  and  $\sum_{i=1}^N \text{Cov}(\boldsymbol{\xi}_i) = \mathbf{I}_d$ , and  $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \sim \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{I}_d)$  be a  $d$ -dimensional standard Gaussian random vector. Define  $\mathbf{W} = \sum_{i=1}^N \boldsymbol{\xi}_i$ . Then for any measurable convex set  $\mathcal{Q} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ ,*

$$|\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{W} \in \mathcal{Q}) - \mathbb{P}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \in \mathcal{Q})| \leq 58d^{1/4} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{E}\|\boldsymbol{\xi}_i\|_2^3.$$

**LEMMA A5.** *Let  $\{\mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{u}_2, \dots, \mathbf{u}_N\}$  be a finite population of  $N$  units, with  $\mathbf{u}_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$  for all  $i$ , and  $\mathbf{T} = (T_1, T_2, \dots, T_N) \in \{0, 1\}^N$  be an indicator vector for a Bernoulli random sample*

with equal probability  $f \equiv m/N$  for all units, i.e.,  $T_i \stackrel{i.i.d.}{\sim} \text{Bern}(f)$ . Define  $\bar{\mathbf{u}} = N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{u}_i$ ,  $\mathbf{S}^2 = (N-1)^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N (\mathbf{u}_i - \bar{\mathbf{u}})(\mathbf{u}_i - \bar{\mathbf{u}})^\top$ , and  $\mathbf{B} \equiv \sum_{i=1}^N T_i (\mathbf{u}_i - \bar{\mathbf{u}}) + m\bar{\mathbf{u}}$ . Let  $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}$  be a  $d$ -dimensional standard Gaussian random vector. Then for any  $N \geq 2$ ,  $d \geq 1$ ,  $f \in (0, 1)$ , and any finite population  $\{\mathbf{u}_i : 1 \leq i \leq N\}$  with nonsingular finite population covariance  $\mathbf{S}^2$ , we have, for any measurable convex set  $\mathcal{Q} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ ,

$$|\mathbb{P}\{\text{Cov}^{-1/2}(\mathbf{B}) \cdot (\mathbf{B} - \mathbb{E}\mathbf{B}) \in \mathcal{Q}\} - \mathbb{P}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \in \mathcal{Q})| \leq \frac{165}{\sqrt{Nf(1-f)}} \frac{d^{1/4}}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \|\mathbf{S}^{-1}(\mathbf{u}_i - \bar{\mathbf{u}})\|_2^3.$$

LEMMA A6. Let  $\mathcal{Q} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$  be a convex set in  $\mathbb{R}^d$ .

- (i) For any  $c > 0$ ,  $\overline{\mathcal{Q}}_c \equiv \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d : \exists \mathbf{x}' \in \mathcal{Q} \text{ s.t. } \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}'\|_2 < c\}$  is a convex set in  $\mathbb{R}^d$ .
- (ii) For any  $c > 0$ ,  $\underline{\mathcal{Q}}_c \equiv \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d : \|\mathbf{x}' - \mathbf{x}\|_2 \geq c \forall \mathbf{x}' \notin \mathcal{Q}\}$  is a convex set in  $\mathbb{R}^d$ .
- (iii) For any matrix  $\boldsymbol{\Delta} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ ,  $\tilde{\mathcal{Q}} \equiv \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d : \boldsymbol{\Delta}\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{Q}\}$  is a convex set in  $\mathbb{R}^d$ .

LEMMA A7. For any set  $\mathcal{Q} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$  and any  $c > 0$ , define

$$\overline{\mathcal{Q}}_c \equiv \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d : \exists \mathbf{x}' \in \mathcal{Q} \text{ s.t. } \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}'\|_2 < c\}, \quad \underline{\mathcal{Q}}_c \equiv \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d : \|\mathbf{x}' - \mathbf{x}\|_2 \geq c \forall \mathbf{x}' \notin \mathcal{Q}\}.$$

- (i) For any set  $\mathcal{Q} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$  and any positive  $c, h$ ,  $(\overline{\mathcal{Q}}_c)_h = \overline{\mathcal{Q}}_{c+h}$ .
- (ii) For any set  $\mathcal{Q} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$  and any  $c > 0$ ,  $(\underline{\mathcal{Q}}_c)^c = \overline{\mathcal{B}}_c$ , where  $\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{Q}^c$ .
- (iii) For any set  $\mathcal{Q} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$  and any positive  $c, h$ ,  $(\underline{\mathcal{Q}}_c)_h = \underline{\mathcal{Q}}_{c+h}$ .

LEMMA A8. Let  $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}$  be a  $d$ -dimensional standard Gaussian random variable,  $\phi_d(\cdot)$  be the probability density function of  $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}$ , and  $\mathcal{C}_d$  be the collection of convex sets in  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . We have that

$$\sup_{c>0, \mathcal{Q} \in \mathcal{C}_d} \frac{\int_{\overline{\mathcal{Q}}_c \setminus \mathcal{Q}} \phi_d(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}) d\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}}{c} \leq 4d^{1/4}$$

and

$$\sup_{c>0, \mathcal{Q} \in \mathcal{C}_d} \frac{\int_{\mathcal{Q} \setminus \underline{\mathcal{Q}}_c} \phi_d(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}) d\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}}{c} \leq 4d^{1/4}.$$

LEMMA A9. Let  $\mathbf{B}$  and  $\mathbf{A}$  be two  $d$ -dimensional random vectors with equal means  $\mathbb{E}\mathbf{B} = \mathbb{E}\mathbf{A}$  and nonsingular covariance matrices  $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\mathbf{B}}$  and  $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\mathbf{A}}$ , and  $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}$  be a  $d$ -dimensional standard Gaussian random vector. Let  $\mathcal{C}_d$  denote the collection of convex sets in  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . If  $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\mathbf{B}} = (1-l)^2 \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\mathbf{A}}$  for some  $l \in (0, 1)$ ,

$$\sup_{\mathcal{Q} \in \mathcal{C}_d} |\mathbb{P}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\mathbf{B}}^{-1/2}(\mathbf{B} - \mathbb{E}\mathbf{B}) \in \mathcal{Q}) - \mathbb{P}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \in \mathcal{Q})| \leq a \quad \text{for some finite } a > 0$$

and

$$\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\mathbf{B}}^{-1/2} \cdot \mathbb{E}\{(\mathbf{B} - \mathbf{A})(\mathbf{B} - \mathbf{A})^\top\} \cdot \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\mathbf{B}}^{-1/2} \leq b^2 \mathbf{I}_d \quad \text{for some } b \in (0, 1),$$

then for any positive constants  $c$  and  $h$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{\mathcal{Q} \in \mathcal{C}_d} |\mathbb{P}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\mathbf{A}}^{-1/2}(\mathbf{A} - \mathbb{E}\mathbf{A}) \in \mathcal{Q}) - \mathbb{P}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \in \mathcal{Q})| \\ & \leq 4d^{1/4}(c+h) + 2d \cdot \exp\left(-\frac{h^2}{2dl^2}\right) + a + \mathbb{P}(\|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\mathbf{A}}^{-1/2}(\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{B})\|_2 \geq c) \\ & \leq 4d^{1/4}(c+h) + 2d \cdot \exp\left(-\frac{h^2}{2dl^2}\right) + a + \frac{(1-l)^2 b^2 d}{c^2}. \end{aligned}$$

LEMMA A10. *Under the same setting as in Theorem A2,*

- (i)  $\sum_{i=1}^N \|\mathbf{S}^{-1}(\mathbf{u}_i - \bar{\mathbf{u}})\|_2^2 = (N-1)d$ ;
- (ii)  $N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \|\mathbf{S}^{-1}(\mathbf{u}_i - \bar{\mathbf{u}})\|_2^3 \geq (d/2)^{3/2}$ ;
- (iii)  $\gamma$  defined in Theorem A2 satisfies that

$$\gamma \equiv \frac{1}{\sqrt{Nf(1-f)}} \frac{d^{1/4}}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \|\mathbf{S}^{-1}(\mathbf{u}_i - \bar{\mathbf{u}})\|_2^3 \geq \frac{d^{7/4}}{2^{3/2} \sqrt{Nf(1-f)}}.$$

### A3.3.2. Proofs of the lemmas.

PROOF OF LEMMA A3. Let  $\mathbf{T} = (T_1, T_2, \dots, T_N) \in \{0, 1\}^N$  be an indicator vector for a Bernoulli random sample with equal probability  $n/N$  for all units. Below we construct the indicator vector  $\mathbf{Z}$  for a simple random sample of size  $n$  based on  $\mathbf{T}$ . We consider the following three different cases depending on the size  $\tilde{m}$  of the set  $\mathcal{T} \equiv \{i : T_i = 1, 1 \leq i \leq N\}$ , i.e.,  $\tilde{m} \equiv |\mathcal{T}|$ .

- (i) If  $\tilde{m} = m$  by accident, we define  $\mathbf{Z} = \mathbf{T}$ ;
- (ii) If  $\tilde{m} > m$ , we introduce a set  $\mathcal{D}$  to be a simple random sample of size  $\tilde{m} - m$  from  $\mathcal{T}$ , and define  $Z_i = 1$  if  $i \in \mathcal{T} \setminus \mathcal{D}$  and 0 otherwise;
- (iii) If  $\tilde{m} < m$ , we introduce a set  $\mathcal{D}$  to be a simple random sample of size  $m - \tilde{m}$  from  $\{1, 2, \dots, N\} \setminus \mathcal{T}$ , and define  $Z_i = 1$  if  $i \in \mathcal{T} \cup \mathcal{D}$  and 0 otherwise.

We can verify that  $\mathbf{Z}$  must be an indicator vector for a simple random sample of size  $m$ . This is essentially the coupling between simple random sampling and Bernoulli random sampling used in Hájek (1960).

By definition,  $\mathbf{B} - \mathbf{A} = \sum_{i=1}^N (T_i - Z_i)(\mathbf{u}_i - \bar{\mathbf{u}})$ . By the construction of  $\mathbf{T}$  and  $\mathbf{Z}$ , conditioning on  $\tilde{m}$ , the difference between  $\mathbf{B}$  and  $\mathbf{A}$  is essentially the summation of a simple random sample of size

(A3.7)

$$\begin{cases} \tilde{m} - m \text{ from the population } \{\mathbf{u}_1 - \bar{\mathbf{u}}, \mathbf{u}_2 - \bar{\mathbf{u}}, \dots, \mathbf{u}_N - \bar{\mathbf{u}}\}, & \text{if } \tilde{m} \geq m; \\ m - \tilde{m} \text{ from the population } \{-(\mathbf{u}_1 - \bar{\mathbf{u}}), -(\mathbf{u}_2 - \bar{\mathbf{u}}), \dots, -(\mathbf{u}_N - \bar{\mathbf{u}})\}, & \text{if } \tilde{m} < m. \end{cases}$$

Let  $\Delta = |\tilde{m} - m|$ . By the property of simple random sampling, this difference satisfies  $\mathbb{E}(\mathbf{B} - \mathbf{A} \mid \tilde{m}) = \mathbf{0}$  and

$$\text{Cov}(\mathbf{B} - \mathbf{A} \mid \tilde{m}) = \frac{\Delta}{N} \cdot \frac{N - \Delta}{N - 1} \sum_{i=1}^N (\mathbf{u}_i - \bar{\mathbf{u}})(\mathbf{u}_i - \bar{\mathbf{u}})^\top \leq \frac{\Delta}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N (\mathbf{u}_i - \bar{\mathbf{u}})(\mathbf{u}_i - \bar{\mathbf{u}})^\top.$$

By the law of total expectation and total variance, and the fact that  $\{\mathbb{E}(\Delta)\}^2 \leq \mathbb{E}(\Delta^2) = \text{Var}(\tilde{m})$ , we have  $\mathbb{E}(\mathbf{B} - \mathbf{A}) = \mathbb{E}\{\mathbb{E}(\mathbf{B} - \mathbf{A} \mid \tilde{m})\} = \mathbf{0}$ , and

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Cov}(\mathbf{B} - \mathbf{A}) &= \mathbb{E}\{\text{Cov}(\mathbf{B} - \mathbf{A} \mid \tilde{m})\} + \text{Cov}\{\mathbb{E}(\mathbf{B} - \mathbf{A} \mid \tilde{m})\} \leq \frac{\mathbb{E}(\Delta)}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N (\mathbf{u}_i - \bar{\mathbf{u}})(\mathbf{u}_i - \bar{\mathbf{u}})^\top \\ &\leq \frac{\sqrt{\text{Var}(\tilde{m})}}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N (\mathbf{u}_i - \bar{\mathbf{u}})(\mathbf{u}_i - \bar{\mathbf{u}})^\top \\ \text{(A3.8)} \quad &= \sqrt{N \frac{m}{N} \left(1 - \frac{m}{N}\right)} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N (\mathbf{u}_i - \bar{\mathbf{u}})(\mathbf{u}_i - \bar{\mathbf{u}})^\top. \end{aligned}$$

By the property of bernoulli sampling and simple random sampling, we can derive that

$$(A3.9) \quad \text{Cov}(\mathbf{B}) = \frac{m}{N} \left(1 - \frac{m}{N}\right) \sum_{i=1}^N (\mathbf{u}_i - \bar{\mathbf{u}})(\mathbf{u}_i - \bar{\mathbf{u}})^\top.$$

and

$$\text{Cov}(\mathbf{A}) = \frac{m(N-m)}{N(N-1)} \sum_{i=1}^N (\mathbf{u}_i - \bar{\mathbf{u}})(\mathbf{u}_i - \bar{\mathbf{u}})^\top = \frac{N}{N-1} \text{Cov}(\mathbf{B}).$$

(A3.8), (A3.9) and the fact that  $\mathbb{E}(\mathbf{B} - \mathbf{A}) = \mathbf{0}$  immediately imply that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Cov}^{-1/2}(\mathbf{B}) \cdot \mathbb{E}\{(\mathbf{B} - \mathbf{A})(\mathbf{B} - \mathbf{A})^\top\} \cdot \text{Cov}^{-1/2}(\mathbf{B}) &= \text{Cov}^{-1/2}(\mathbf{B}) \cdot \text{Cov}(\mathbf{B} - \mathbf{A}) \cdot \text{Cov}^{-1/2}(\mathbf{B}) \\ &\leq \sqrt{\frac{1}{m} + \frac{1}{N-m}} \cdot \mathbf{I}_d. \end{aligned}$$

From the above, Lemma A3 holds.  $\square$

PROOF OF LEMMA A4. Lemma A4 follows immediately from Raič (2019, Theorem 1.1).  $\square$

PROOF OF LEMMA A5. By definition, we can derive that

$$\text{Cov}^{-1/2}(\mathbf{B}) \cdot (\mathbf{B} - \mathbb{E}\mathbf{B}) = \text{Cov}^{-1/2}(\mathbf{B}) \cdot \sum_{i=1}^N T_i (\mathbf{u}_i - \bar{\mathbf{u}}) = \text{Cov}^{-1/2}(\mathbf{B}) \sum_{i=1}^N (T_i - f) (\mathbf{u}_i - \bar{\mathbf{u}}),$$

where the last equality holds due to the centering of the  $\mathbf{u}_i$ 's. Define  $\boldsymbol{\xi}_i = (T_i - f) \text{Cov}^{-1/2}(\mathbf{B}) \cdot (\mathbf{u}_i - \bar{\mathbf{u}})$ . We can verify that  $\boldsymbol{\xi}_i$ 's satisfy the condition in Lemma A4. Thus, from Lemma A4, for any measurable convex set  $\mathcal{Q} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ ,

$$(A3.10) \quad |\mathbb{P}\{\text{Cov}^{-1/2}(\mathbf{B}) \cdot (\mathbf{B} - \mathbb{E}\mathbf{B}) \in \mathcal{Q}\} - \mathbb{P}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \in \mathcal{Q})| \leq 58d^{1/4} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{E}\|\boldsymbol{\xi}_i\|_2^3.$$

By definition,  $\mathbb{E}\{|T_i - f|^3\} = f(1-f)\{f^2 + (1-f)^2\}$ . From (A3.9),  $\text{Cov}(\mathbf{B}) = f(1-f)(N-1)\mathbf{S}^2$ . We can then simplify  $\sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{E}\|\boldsymbol{\xi}_i\|_2^3$  as

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{E}\|\boldsymbol{\xi}_i\|_2^3 &= \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{\mathbb{E}\{|T_i - f|^3\}}{\{f(1-f)(N-1)\}^{3/2}} \|\mathbf{S}^{-1}(\mathbf{u}_i - \bar{\mathbf{u}})\|_2^3 = \frac{f^2 + (1-f)^2}{(N-1)^{3/2} \sqrt{f(1-f)}} \sum_{i=1}^N \|\mathbf{S}^{-1}(\mathbf{u}_i - \bar{\mathbf{u}})\|_2^3 \\ &\leq \frac{2^{3/2}}{\sqrt{Nf(1-f)}} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \|\mathbf{S}^{-1}(\mathbf{u}_i - \bar{\mathbf{u}})\|_2^3, \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality holds because  $f^2 + (1-f)^2 \leq \{f + (1-f)\}^2 = 1$  and  $N-1 \geq N/2$ . From (A3.10), we then have, for any measurable convex set  $\mathcal{Q} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathbb{P}\{\text{Cov}^{-1/2}(\mathbf{B}) \cdot (\mathbf{B} - \mathbb{E}\mathbf{B}) \in \mathcal{Q}\} - \mathbb{P}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \in \mathcal{Q})| &\leq 58d^{1/4} \frac{2^{3/2}}{\sqrt{Nf(1-f)}} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \|\mathbf{S}^{-1}(\mathbf{u}_i - \bar{\mathbf{u}})\|_2^3 \\ &\leq \frac{165}{\sqrt{Nf(1-f)}} \frac{d^{1/4}}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \|\mathbf{S}^{-1}(\mathbf{u}_i - \bar{\mathbf{u}})\|_2^3 \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, Lemma A5 holds.  $\square$



PROOF OF LEMMA A6. We first prove (i). Consider any  $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \overline{\mathcal{Q}}_c$  and any  $\lambda \in (0, 1)$ . By definition, there must exist  $\mathbf{x}', \mathbf{y}' \in \mathcal{Q}$  such that  $\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}'\|_2 < c$  and  $\|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{y}'\|_2 < c$ . Because  $\mathcal{Q}$  is convex,  $\lambda\mathbf{x}' + (1 - \lambda)\mathbf{y}' \in \mathcal{Q}$ . Moreover, by the triangle inequality,

$$\|\lambda\mathbf{x} + (1 - \lambda)\mathbf{y} - \{\lambda\mathbf{x}' + (1 - \lambda)\mathbf{y}'\}\|_2 \leq \lambda\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}'\|_2 + (1 - \lambda)\|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{y}'\|_2 < c.$$

Thus, we must have  $\lambda\mathbf{x} + (1 - \lambda)\mathbf{y} \in \overline{\mathcal{Q}}_c$ . Therefore,  $\overline{\mathcal{Q}}_c$  must be a convex set.

We then prove (ii). Consider any  $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \underline{\mathcal{Q}}_c$  and any  $\lambda \in (0, 1)$ . We prove that  $\mathbf{z} \equiv \lambda\mathbf{x} + (1 - \lambda)\mathbf{y} \in \underline{\mathcal{Q}}_c$  by contradiction. Suppose that  $\mathbf{z} \notin \underline{\mathcal{Q}}_c$ . By definition, there must exist  $\mathbf{z}' \notin \mathcal{Q}$  such that  $\|\mathbf{z} - \mathbf{z}'\|_2 < c$ . Define  $\mathbf{x}' = \mathbf{x} + \mathbf{z}' - \mathbf{z}$  and  $\mathbf{y}' = \mathbf{y} + \mathbf{z}' - \mathbf{z}$ . Because  $\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}'\|_2 = \|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{y}'\|_2 = \|\mathbf{z} - \mathbf{z}'\|_2 < c$  and  $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \underline{\mathcal{Q}}_c$ , by definition, we must have  $\mathbf{x}', \mathbf{y}' \in \mathcal{Q}$ . Due to the convexity of  $A$ , this further implies that  $\lambda\mathbf{x}' + (1 - \lambda)\mathbf{y}' \in \mathcal{Q}$ . By some algebra, we can show that  $\mathbf{z}' = \lambda\mathbf{x}' + (1 - \lambda)\mathbf{y}' \in \mathcal{Q}$ , which contradicts with  $\mathbf{z}' \notin \mathcal{Q}$ . Therefore, we must have  $\mathbf{z} = \lambda\mathbf{x} + (1 - \lambda)\mathbf{y} \in \underline{\mathcal{Q}}_c$ . Consequently,  $\underline{\mathcal{Q}}_c$  is a convex set.

Finally, we prove (iii). Consider any  $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \tilde{\mathcal{Q}}$  and any  $\lambda \in (0, 1)$ . By definition,  $\Delta\mathbf{x}, \Delta\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{Q}$ . By the convexity of  $\mathcal{Q}$ , this implies that  $\Delta\{\lambda\mathbf{x} + (1 - \lambda)\mathbf{y}\} = \lambda\Delta\mathbf{x} + (1 - \lambda)\Delta\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{Q}$ . Consequently,  $\lambda\mathbf{x} + (1 - \lambda)\mathbf{y} \in \tilde{\mathcal{Q}}$ . Therefore,  $\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}$  must be a convex set.

From the above, Lemma A6 holds.  $\square$

PROOF OF LEMMA A7. We first prove (i). We first prove  $\overline{(\overline{\mathcal{Q}}_c)_h} \subset \overline{\mathcal{Q}}_{c+h}$ . For any  $\mathbf{x} \in \overline{(\overline{\mathcal{Q}}_c)_h}$ , by definition, there exists  $\mathbf{x}' \in \overline{\mathcal{Q}}_c$  such that  $\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}'\|_2 < h$ . By the same logic, there exists  $\mathbf{x}'' \in \mathcal{Q}$  such that  $\|\mathbf{x}' - \mathbf{x}''\|_2 < c$ . By the triangle inequality,  $\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}''\|_2 \leq \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}'\|_2 + \|\mathbf{x}' - \mathbf{x}''\|_2 < c + h$ , which then implies that  $\mathbf{x} \in \overline{\mathcal{Q}}_{c+h}$ . Therefore, we must have  $\overline{(\overline{\mathcal{Q}}_c)_h} \subset \overline{\mathcal{Q}}_{c+h}$ . We then prove  $\overline{(\overline{\mathcal{Q}}_c)_h} \supset \overline{\mathcal{Q}}_{c+h}$ . For any  $\mathbf{x} \in \overline{\mathcal{Q}}_{c+h}$ , by definition, there exists  $\mathbf{x}' \in \mathcal{Q}$  such that  $\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}'\|_2 < c + h$ . Let  $\lambda = c/(c + h)$ , and  $\mathbf{x}'' = \mathbf{x}' + \lambda(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}')$ . We then have  $\|\mathbf{x}' - \mathbf{x}''\|_2 = \lambda\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}'\|_2 < c$ , and  $\|\mathbf{x}'' - \mathbf{x}\|_2 = (1 - \lambda)\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}'\|_2 < h$ . Consequently,  $\mathbf{x}'' \in \overline{\mathcal{Q}}_c$ , and  $\mathbf{x} \in \overline{(\overline{\mathcal{Q}}_c)_h}$ . Therefore, we must have  $\overline{\mathcal{Q}}_{c+h} \subset \overline{(\overline{\mathcal{Q}}_c)_h}$ . From the above, we have  $\overline{(\overline{\mathcal{Q}}_c)_h} = \overline{\mathcal{Q}}_{c+h}$ .

We then prove (ii). By definition,

$$\begin{aligned} (\underline{\mathcal{Q}}_c)^{\mathcal{G}} &= \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d : \|\mathbf{x}' - \mathbf{x}\|_2 \geq c \forall \mathbf{x}' \notin \mathcal{Q}\}^{\mathcal{G}} = \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d : \|\mathbf{x}' - \mathbf{x}\|_2 \geq c \forall \mathbf{x}' \in \mathcal{B}\}^{\mathcal{G}} \\ &= \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d : \exists \mathbf{x}' \in \mathcal{B} \text{ s.t. } \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}'\|_2 < c\} = \overline{\mathcal{B}}_c. \end{aligned}$$

Finally, we prove (iii) using (i) and (ii). From (ii), we have  $(\underline{\mathcal{Q}}_c)_h^{\mathcal{G}} = (\overline{\mathcal{D}}_h)^{\mathcal{G}}$ , where  $\mathcal{D} = (\underline{\mathcal{Q}}_c)^{\mathcal{G}}$ . By the same logic,  $\mathcal{D} = (\underline{\mathcal{Q}}_c)^{\mathcal{G}} = \overline{\mathcal{B}}_c$ , where  $\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{Q}^{\mathcal{G}}$ . Consequently, using (i) and (ii), we have

$$(\underline{\mathcal{Q}}_c)_h^{\mathcal{G}} = (\overline{\mathcal{D}}_h)^{\mathcal{G}} = \left(\overline{(\overline{\mathcal{B}}_c)_h}\right)^{\mathcal{G}} = (\overline{\mathcal{B}}_{c+h})^{\mathcal{G}} = \underline{\mathcal{Q}}_{c+h}.$$

From the above, Lemma A7 holds.  $\square$

PROOF OF LEMMA A8. This is a direct consequence of (1.3)-(1.4) of Bentkus (2005). See also (Ball, 1993; Nazarov, 2003)  $\square$

PROOF OF LEMMA A9. Let  $\zeta \equiv \Sigma_B^{-1/2}(A - B)$  and  $\Delta \equiv \Sigma_A^{-1/2}\Sigma_B^{1/2} = (1 - l)I_d$ . Then, by definition,  $\mathbb{E}(\zeta\zeta^\top) \leq b^2I_d$ , and

$$\Sigma_A^{-1/2}(A - \mathbb{E}A) = \Delta\Sigma_B^{-1/2}\{B - \mathbb{E}B + (A - B)\} = \Delta\Sigma_B^{-1/2}(B - \mathbb{E}B) + \Delta\zeta.$$

First, for any convex set  $\mathcal{Q} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$  and any  $c > 0$ , define

$$\overline{\mathcal{Q}}_c \equiv \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d : \exists \mathbf{x}' \in \mathcal{Q} \text{ s.t. } \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}'\|_2 < c\} \quad \text{and} \quad \underline{\mathcal{Q}}_c \equiv \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d : \|\mathbf{x}' - \mathbf{x}\|_2 \geq c \forall \mathbf{x}' \notin \mathcal{Q}\}.$$

Intuitively,  $\overline{\mathcal{Q}}(c)$  contains all the points whose distance from  $\mathcal{Q}$  is at most  $c$ , and  $\underline{\mathcal{Q}}(c)$  contains all the points whose distance from  $\mathcal{Q}^c$  is at least  $c$ . Then, by definition,

$$(A3.11) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\{\Sigma_{\mathbf{A}}^{-1/2}(\mathbf{A} - \mathbb{E}\mathbf{A}) \in \mathcal{Q}\} &\leq \mathbb{P}\{\Sigma_{\mathbf{A}}^{-1/2}(\mathbf{A} - \mathbb{E}\mathbf{A}) \in \mathcal{Q}, \|\Delta\zeta\|_2 < c\} + \mathbb{P}(\|\Delta\zeta\|_2 \geq c) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}\{\Delta\Sigma_{\mathbf{B}}^{-1/2}(\mathbf{B} - \mathbb{E}\mathbf{B}) \in \overline{\mathcal{Q}}_c\} + \mathbb{P}(\|\Delta\zeta\|_2 \geq c), \end{aligned}$$

and

$$(A3.12) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\{\Sigma_{\mathbf{A}}^{-1/2}(\mathbf{A} - \mathbb{E}\mathbf{A}) \in \mathcal{Q}\} &\geq \mathbb{P}\{\Sigma_{\mathbf{A}}^{-1/2}(\mathbf{A} - \mathbb{E}\mathbf{A}) \in \mathcal{Q}, \|\Delta\zeta\|_2 < c\} \\ &\geq \mathbb{P}\{\Delta\Sigma_{\mathbf{B}}^{-1/2}(\mathbf{B} - \mathbb{E}\mathbf{B}) \in \underline{\mathcal{Q}}_c, \|\Delta\zeta\|_2 < c\} \\ &\geq \mathbb{P}\{\Delta\Sigma_{\mathbf{B}}^{-1/2}(\mathbf{B} - \mathbb{E}\mathbf{B}) \in \underline{\mathcal{Q}}_c\} - \mathbb{P}(\|\Delta\zeta\|_2 \geq c). \end{aligned}$$

From Lemma A6 and the condition in Lemma A9, these imply that

$$\mathbb{P}\{\Sigma_{\mathbf{A}}^{-1/2}(\mathbf{A} - \mathbb{E}\mathbf{A}) \in \mathcal{Q}\} \leq \mathbb{P}(\Delta\varepsilon \in \overline{\mathcal{Q}}_c) + a + \mathbb{P}(\|\Delta\zeta\|_2 \geq c),$$

and

$$\mathbb{P}\{\Sigma_{\mathbf{A}}^{-1/2}(\mathbf{A} - \mathbb{E}\mathbf{A}) \in \mathcal{Q}\} \geq \mathbb{P}(\Delta\varepsilon \in \underline{\mathcal{Q}}_c) - a - \mathbb{P}(\|\Delta\zeta\|_2 \geq c).$$

Second, by definition,  $\|(\Delta - \mathbf{I}_d)\varepsilon\|_2 = l\|\varepsilon\|_2$ . By the Gaussian tail bound, for any  $h > 0$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\{\|(\Delta_N - \mathbf{I}_d)\varepsilon\|_2 \geq h\} &\leq \mathbb{P}\{l\|\varepsilon\|_2 \geq h\} = \mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{k=1}^d \varepsilon_k^2 \geq \frac{h^2}{l^2}\right) \leq \sum_{k=1}^d \mathbb{P}\left(\varepsilon_k^2 \geq \frac{h^2}{d \cdot l^2}\right) \\ &= 2d \cdot \mathbb{P}\left(\varepsilon_k \geq \frac{h}{d^{1/2} \cdot l}\right) \leq 2d \cdot \exp\left(-\frac{h^2}{2dl^2}\right). \end{aligned}$$

By the same logic as (A3.11) and using Lemma A7,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\Delta\varepsilon \in \overline{\mathcal{Q}}_c) &\leq \mathbb{P}(\Delta\varepsilon \in \overline{\mathcal{Q}}_c, \|(\Delta - \mathbf{I}_d)\varepsilon\|_2 < h) + \mathbb{P}(\|(\Delta - \mathbf{I}_d)\varepsilon\|_2 \geq h) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}(\varepsilon \in \overline{\mathcal{Q}}_{c+h}) + 2d \cdot \exp\left(-\frac{h^2}{2dl^2}\right), \end{aligned}$$

and by the same logic as (A3.12) and using Lemma A7,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\Delta_N\varepsilon \in \underline{\mathcal{Q}}_c) &\geq \mathbb{P}(\Delta\varepsilon \in \underline{\mathcal{Q}}_c, \|(\Delta - \mathbf{I}_d)\varepsilon\|_2 < h) \geq \mathbb{P}(\varepsilon \in \underline{\mathcal{Q}}_{c+h}, \|(\Delta - \mathbf{I}_d)\varepsilon\|_2 < h) \\ &\geq \mathbb{P}(\varepsilon \in \underline{\mathcal{Q}}_{c+h}) - \mathbb{P}(\|(\Delta - \mathbf{I}_d)\varepsilon\|_2 \geq h) \\ &\geq \mathbb{P}(\varepsilon \in \underline{\mathcal{Q}}_{c+h}) - 2d \cdot \exp\left(-\frac{h^2}{2dl^2}\right). \end{aligned}$$

These imply that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\{\Sigma_{\mathbf{A}}^{-1/2}(\mathbf{A} - \mathbb{E}\mathbf{A}) \in \mathcal{Q}\} &\leq \mathbb{P}(\Delta\varepsilon \in \overline{\mathcal{Q}}_c) + a + \frac{b^2d}{c^2(1-b)^2} \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}(\varepsilon \in \overline{\mathcal{Q}}_{c+h}) + 2d \cdot \exp\left(-\frac{h^2}{2dl^2}\right) + a + \mathbb{P}(\|\Delta\zeta\|_2 \geq c), \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\{\Sigma_{\mathbf{A}}^{-1/2}(\mathbf{A} - \mathbb{E}\mathbf{A}) \in \mathcal{Q}\} &\geq \mathbb{P}(\Delta\varepsilon \in \underline{\mathcal{Q}}_c) - a - \frac{b^2d}{c^2(1-b)^2} \\ &\geq \mathbb{P}(\varepsilon \in \underline{\mathcal{Q}}_{c+h}) - 2d \cdot \exp\left(-\frac{h^2}{2dl^2}\right) - a - \mathbb{P}(\|\Delta\zeta\|_2 \geq c). \end{aligned}$$

Third, from Lemma A8, we have

$$\mathbb{P}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \in \overline{\mathcal{Q}}_{c+h}) \leq \mathbb{P}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \in \mathcal{Q}) + 4d^{1/4}(c+h) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{P}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \in \underline{\mathcal{Q}}_{c+h}) \geq \mathbb{P}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \in \mathcal{Q}) - 4d^{1/4}(c+h).$$

From the above, we must have that, for any  $\mathcal{Q} \in \mathcal{C}_d$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \mathbb{P}\{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_A^{-1/2}(\mathbf{A} - \mathbb{E}\mathbf{A}) \in \mathcal{Q}\} - \mathbb{P}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \in \mathcal{Q}) \right| \\ & \leq 4d^{1/4}(c+h) + 2d \cdot \exp\left(-\frac{h^2}{2dl^2}\right) + a + \mathbb{P}(\|\boldsymbol{\Delta}\boldsymbol{\zeta}\|_2 \geq c). \end{aligned}$$

By Chebyshev's inequality, we can bound the tail probability of  $\boldsymbol{\Delta}\boldsymbol{\zeta} = \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_A^{-1/2}(\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{B})$  by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\|\boldsymbol{\Delta}\boldsymbol{\zeta}\|_2 \geq c) &= \mathbb{P}\{(1-l)\|\boldsymbol{\zeta}\|_2 \geq c\} \leq \frac{(1-l)^2}{c^2} \mathbb{E}(\boldsymbol{\zeta}^\top \boldsymbol{\zeta}) = \frac{(1-l)^2}{c^2} \text{tr}\{\mathbb{E}(\boldsymbol{\zeta}\boldsymbol{\zeta}^\top)\} \\ &\leq \frac{(1-l)^2 b^2 d}{c^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, Lemma A9 holds.  $\square$

PROOF OF LEMMA A10. By definition and some algebra, we can verify that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^N \|\mathbf{S}^{-1}(\mathbf{u}_i - \bar{\mathbf{u}})\|_2^2 &= \sum_{i=1}^N (\mathbf{u}_i - \bar{\mathbf{u}})^\top \mathbf{S}^{-2}(\mathbf{u}_i - \bar{\mathbf{u}}) = \text{tr}\left(\sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{S}^{-2}(\mathbf{u}_i - \bar{\mathbf{u}})(\mathbf{u}_i - \bar{\mathbf{u}})^\top\right) \\ &= \text{tr}(\mathbf{S}^{-2} \cdot (N-1)\mathbf{S}^2) = \text{tr}((N-1)\mathbf{I}_d) = (N-1)d. \end{aligned}$$

By Hölder's inequality,

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \|\mathbf{S}^{-1}(\mathbf{u}_i - \bar{\mathbf{u}})\|_2^3 \geq \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \|\mathbf{S}^{-1}(\mathbf{u}_i - \bar{\mathbf{u}})\|_2^2\right)^{3/2} \frac{(N-1)^{3/2} d^{3/2}}{N^{3/2}} \geq (d/2)^{3/2},$$

where the last inequality holds because  $(N-1)/N \geq 1/2$ . Consequently, we have

$$\gamma \equiv \frac{1}{\sqrt{Nf(1-f)}} \frac{d^{1/4}}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \|\mathbf{S}^{-1}(\mathbf{u}_i - \bar{\mathbf{u}})\|_2^3 \geq \frac{d^{1/4}}{\sqrt{Nf(1-f)}} \frac{d^{3/2}}{2^{3/2}} = \frac{d^{7/4}}{2^{3/2} \sqrt{Nf(1-f)}}.$$

Therefore, Lemma A10 holds.  $\square$

### A3.3.3. Proof of Theorem A2(iii).

**Proof of Theorem A2(iii).** Let  $\mathbf{Z}$  and  $\mathbf{T}$  be the pair of indicator vectors for simple random sampling and Bernoulli sampling satisfying Lemma A3. Recall that  $\mathbf{A} \equiv \sum_{i=1}^N Z_i \mathbf{u}_i$  and  $\mathbf{B} \equiv \sum_{i=1}^N T_i (\mathbf{u}_i - \bar{\mathbf{u}}) + m\bar{\mathbf{u}}$ , and define further  $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_A = \text{Cov}(\mathbf{A})$  and  $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_B = \text{Cov}(\mathbf{B})$ . By definition, we can verify that  $\mathbf{W} = \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_A^{-1/2}(\mathbf{A} - \mathbb{E}\mathbf{A})$ .

First, from Lemma A3,  $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_B = (1-l)^2 \cdot \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_A$  with  $l = 1 - \sqrt{1 - N^{-1}}$ , and

$$\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_B^{-1/2} \cdot \mathbb{E}\{(\mathbf{B} - \mathbf{A})(\mathbf{B} - \mathbf{A})^\top\} \cdot \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_B^{-1/2} \leq b^2 \mathbf{I}_d$$

with  $b^2 = \sqrt{1/m + 1/(N-m)} = 1/\sqrt{Nf(1-f)}$ .

Second, from Lemma A5,

$$\sup_{\mathcal{Q} \in \mathcal{C}_d} \left| \mathbb{P}\{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_B^{-1/2} \cdot (\mathbf{B} - \mathbb{E}\mathbf{B}) \in \mathcal{Q}\} - \mathbb{P}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \in \mathcal{Q}) \right| \leq a \equiv \frac{165}{\sqrt{Nf(1-f)}} \frac{d^{1/4}}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \|\mathbf{S}^{-1}(\mathbf{u}_i - \bar{\mathbf{u}})\|_2^3 = 165\gamma,$$

where the last equality follows from the definition of  $\gamma$  in Theorem A2.

Third, let

$$c = \left\{ \frac{1}{2} (1-l)^2 b^2 d^{3/4} \right\}^{1/3}, \quad \text{and } h = \{dl^2 \cdot \log N\}^{1/2}.$$

From Lemma A9, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{\mathcal{Q} \in \mathcal{C}_d} |\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{W} \in \mathcal{Q}) - \mathbb{P}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \in \mathcal{Q})| \\ & \leq 4d^{1/4}(c+h) + 2d \cdot \exp\left(-\frac{h^2}{2dl^2}\right) + a + \frac{(1-l)^2 b^2 d}{c^2} \\ & = a + \left\{ 4d^{1/4}c + \frac{(1-l)^2 b^2 d}{c^2} \right\} + 2d \cdot \exp\left(-\frac{h^2}{2dl^2}\right) + 4d^{1/4}h \\ & = a + 3 \cdot 2^{2/3} (1-l)^{2/3} d^{1/2} b^{2/3} + 2dN^{-1/2} + 4d^{3/4}l \cdot \sqrt{\log N}. \end{aligned}$$

Fourth, from Lemma A10 and by definition, we have

$$\left\{ 3 \cdot 2^{2/3} (1-l)^{2/3} d^{1/2} b^{2/3} \right\}^3 = 108(1-l)^2 d^{3/2} b^2 \leq \frac{108d^{3/2}}{\sqrt{Nf(1-f)}} \leq 108 \cdot 2^{3/2} \gamma \leq 7^3 \gamma,$$

$$2dN^{-1/2} \leq \frac{d}{\sqrt{N/4}} \leq \frac{d^{7/4}}{\sqrt{Nf(1-f)}} = 2^{3/2} \gamma,$$

$$4d^{3/4}l \cdot \sqrt{\log N} = 4d^{3/4} \frac{N^{-1}}{1 + \sqrt{1 - N^{-1}}} \cdot \sqrt{\log N} \leq \frac{2d^{7/4}}{\sqrt{Nf(1-f)}} \sqrt{\frac{\log N}{N}} \leq 2^{5/2} \gamma$$

These then imply that

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{\mathcal{Q} \in \mathcal{C}_d} |\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{W} \in \mathcal{Q}) - \mathbb{P}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \in \mathcal{Q})| & \leq 165\gamma + 2^{3/2}\gamma + 2^{5/2}\gamma + 3 \cdot 2^{2/3} (1-l)^{2/3} d^{1/2} b^{2/3} \\ & \leq 174\gamma + 3 \cdot 2^{2/3} \frac{d^{1/2}}{\{Nf(1-f)\}^{1/6}} \\ & \leq 174\gamma + 7\gamma^{1/3}. \end{aligned}$$

From the above, Theorem A2(iii) holds.  $\square$

A3.4. *Proof of Theorem A2(iv).* To prove Theorem A2(iv), we need the following two lemmas.

LEMMA A11. *Let  $\mathcal{X} \equiv \{x_i\}_{i=1}^N$  be  $N$  zero-centered real valued quantities; and let  $X_1, \dots, X_m$  be  $m$  random sample drawn without replacement from  $\mathcal{X}$ , then for all  $\varepsilon > 0$ ,*

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\left|\sum_{i=1}^m X_i\right| \geq \varepsilon\right) \leq 2 \exp\left(-\frac{2\varepsilon^2}{m(\max_{1 \leq i \leq N} x_i - \min_{1 \leq i \leq N} x_i)^2}\right)$$

PROOF OF LEMMA A11. Lemma A11 follows immediately from [Bardenet and Maillard \(2015, Proposition 1.2\)](#).  $\square$

LEMMA A12. Let  $\mathbf{Z}$  and  $\mathbf{T}$  be the pair of random vectors constructed as in Lemma A3. For any  $c, t > 0$ ,

$$\mathbb{P} \left\{ \left\| \text{Cov}^{-1/2}(\mathbf{A}) \cdot (\mathbf{B} - \mathbf{A}) \right\|_2 \geq c \right\} \leq 2d \exp \left( -\frac{c^2 f(1-f)\sqrt{N}}{2td\xi^2} \right) + 2 \exp(-2t^2),$$

where  $f = m/N$  and  $\xi = \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \left\| (\mathbf{S}_u^2)^{-1/2} (\mathbf{u}_i - \bar{\mathbf{u}}) \right\|_\infty$ .

PROOF OF LEMMA A12. For  $1 \leq i \leq N$  and  $1 \leq k \leq d$ , let  $\mathbf{v}_i \equiv (\mathbf{S}_u^2)^{-1/2} (\mathbf{u}_i - \bar{\mathbf{u}})$ , and  $v_{ik}$  denote the  $k$ -th coordinate of  $\mathbf{v}_i$ . From the proof of Lemma A3, we then have

$$(A3.13) \quad \text{Cov}^{-1/2}(\mathbf{A}) \cdot (\mathbf{B} - \mathbf{A}) = \sqrt{\frac{1}{f(1-f)N}} \cdot \sum_{i=1}^N (T_i - Z_i) \mathbf{v}_i.$$

We first consider bounding the tail probability of  $\sum_{i=1}^N (T_i - Z_i) \mathbf{v}_i$ . By definition,  $2\xi = 2 \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \|\mathbf{v}_i\|_\infty \geq 2 \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} |v_{ik}| \geq \max_i v_{ik} - \min_i v_{ik}$  for  $1 \leq k \leq d$ . From (A3.7) and Lemma A11, we then have, for  $1 \leq k \leq d$  and any  $c > 0$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P} \left( \left| \sum_{i=1}^n (T_i - Z_i) v_{ik} \right| \geq c \mid \tilde{m} \right) &\leq 2 \exp \left( -\frac{2c^2}{|\tilde{m} - m| (\max_{1 \leq i \leq N} v_{ik} - \min_{1 \leq i \leq N} v_{ik})^2} \right) \\ &\leq 2 \exp \left( -\frac{c^2}{2|\tilde{m} - m| \xi^2} \right), \end{aligned}$$

where  $c^2/(2|\tilde{m} - m|\xi^2)$  is defined to be infinity when  $\tilde{m} = m$ . This further implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P} \left( \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n (T_i - Z_i) \mathbf{v}_i \right\|_2 \geq c \mid \tilde{m} \right) &\leq \sum_{k=1}^d \mathbb{P} \left( \left| \sum_{i=1}^n (T_i - Z_i) v_{ik} \right| \geq \frac{c}{\sqrt{d}} \mid \tilde{m} \right) \\ &\leq 2d \exp \left( -\frac{c^2}{2|\tilde{m} - m| d \xi^2} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Note that, by Hoeffding's inequality, for any  $t > 0$ ,  $\mathbb{P}(|\tilde{m} - m| \geq t) \leq 2 \exp(-2t^2/N)$ . From the above, we can know that, for any  $c, t > 0$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{P} \left( \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n (T_i - Z_i) \mathbf{v}_i \right\|_2 \geq c \right) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P} \left( \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n (T_i - Z_i) \mathbf{v}_i \right\|_2 \geq c \mid |\tilde{m} - m| < t\sqrt{N} \right) + \mathbb{P}(|\tilde{m} - m| \geq t\sqrt{N}) \\ &\leq 2d \exp \left( -\frac{c^2}{2td\xi^2\sqrt{N}} \right) + 2 \exp(-2t^2). \end{aligned}$$

Consequently, for any  $c, t > 0$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P} \left\{ \left\| \text{Cov}^{-1/2}(\mathbf{A}) \cdot (\mathbf{B} - \mathbf{A}) \right\|_2 \geq c \right\} &= \mathbb{P} \left\{ \left\| \sum_{i=1}^N (T_i - Z_i) \mathbf{v}_i \right\|_2 \geq c\sqrt{f(1-f)N} \right\} \\ &\leq 2d \exp \left( -\frac{c^2 f(1-f)\sqrt{N}}{2td\xi^2} \right) + 2 \exp(-2t^2). \end{aligned}$$

From the above, Lemma A12 holds.  $\square$

**Proof of Theorem A2(iv).** Let  $\mathbf{Z}$  and  $\mathbf{T}$  be the pair of indicator vectors for simple random sampling and Bernoulli sampling satisfying Lemma A3, and adopt the same notation from the proof of Theorem A2(iii). From the proof of Lemma A9 and Theorem A2(iii), for any  $c, h > 0$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{\mathcal{Q} \in \mathcal{C}_d} |\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{W} \in \mathcal{Q}) - \mathbb{P}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \in \mathcal{Q})| \\ & \leq 4d^{1/4}(c+h) + 2d \cdot \exp\left(-\frac{h^2}{2dl^2}\right) + a + \frac{(1-l)^2 b^2 d}{c^2} \\ & = a + \left\{ 2d \cdot \exp\left(-\frac{h^2}{2dl^2}\right) + 4d^{1/4}h \right\} + \left[ 4d^{1/4}c + \mathbb{P}\left\{ \left\| \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\mathbf{A}}^{-1/2}(\mathbf{B} - \mathbf{A}) \right\|_2 \geq c \right\} \right], \end{aligned}$$

where  $a = 165\gamma$  and  $l = 1 - \sqrt{1 - N^{-1}}$ . Letting  $h = \{dl^2 \cdot \log N\}^{1/2}$  and from the proof of Theorem A2(iii), we can know that, for any  $c > 0$ ,

$$\sup_{\mathcal{Q} \in \mathcal{C}_d} |\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{W} \in \mathcal{Q}) - \mathbb{P}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \in \mathcal{Q})| \leq 174\gamma + \left[ 4d^{1/4}c + \mathbb{P}\left\{ \left\| \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\mathbf{A}}^{-1/2}(\mathbf{B} - \mathbf{A}) \right\|_2 \geq c \right\} \right].$$

Applying Lemma A12 and letting

$$c = \left\{ \left( \frac{\log N}{N} \right)^{1/2} \frac{1}{f(1-f)} \frac{\log N}{2} d\xi^2 \right\}^{1/2}, \quad t = \left( \frac{\log N}{4} \right)^{1/2},$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned} 4d^{1/4}c + \mathbb{P}\left\{ \left\| \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\mathbf{A}}^{-1/2}(\mathbf{B} - \mathbf{A}) \right\|_2 \geq c \right\} & \leq 4d^{1/4}c + 2d \exp\left(-\frac{c^2 f(1-f)\sqrt{N}}{2td\xi^2}\right) + 2 \exp(-2t^2) \\ & = 2\sqrt{2} \frac{(\log N)^{3/4} d^{3/4}}{N^{1/4} \sqrt{f(1-f)}} \cdot \xi + 2dN^{-1/2} + 2N^{-1/2} \\ & \leq 3 \frac{(\log N)^{3/4} d^{3/4}}{N^{1/4} \sqrt{f(1-f)}} \cdot \xi + 4dN^{-1/2}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\xi = \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \left\| (\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{u}}^2)^{-1/2} (\mathbf{u}_i - \bar{\mathbf{u}}) \right\|_{\infty}$ . From Lemma A10 and the proof of Theorem A2(iii), we can know that  $4dN^{-1/2} \leq 2^{5/2}\gamma \leq 6\gamma$ . From the above,

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{\mathcal{Q} \in \mathcal{C}_d} |\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{W} \in \mathcal{Q}) - \mathbb{P}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \in \mathcal{Q})| & \leq 174\gamma + 3 \frac{(\log N)^{3/4} d^{3/4}}{N^{1/4} \sqrt{f(1-f)}} \cdot \xi + 6\gamma \\ & \leq 180\gamma + 3 \frac{(\log N)^{3/4} d^{3/4}}{N^{1/4} \sqrt{f(1-f)}} \cdot \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \left\| (\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{u}}^2)^{-1/2} (\mathbf{u}_i - \bar{\mathbf{u}}) \right\|_{\infty}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, Theorem A2(iv) holds.  $\square$

**A3.5. Proof of Theorem A2(v).** To prove Theorem A2(v), we need the following two lemmas.

**LEMMA A13.** *Let  $\mathcal{X} \equiv \{x_i\}_{i=1}^N$  be  $N$  zero-centered real valued quantities, and let  $X_1, \dots, X_m$  be  $m$  random sample drawn without replacement from  $\mathcal{X}$ . Then for any  $t > 0$  and  $\iota \geq 2$ , we have*

$$\mathbb{P}\left( \left| \sum_{i=1}^m X_i \right| \geq t \right) \leq R_{\iota} \frac{\left( f \sum_{i=1}^N x_i^2 \right)^{\iota/2} + f \sum_{i=1}^N |x_i|^{\iota}}{t^{\iota}},$$

where  $f = m/N$  and  $R_\iota$  is a universal constant depending only on  $\iota$ .

PROOF OF LEMMA A13. From Markov's inequality, for any  $\iota \geq 2$ ,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\left|\sum_{i=1}^m X_i\right| \geq t\right) = \mathbb{P}\left(\left|\sum_{i=1}^m X_i\right|^\iota \geq t^\iota\right) \leq \frac{\mathbb{E}|\sum_{i=1}^m X_i|^\iota}{t^\iota}.$$

From Hoeffding (1963, Theorem 4), we further have  $\mathbb{E}|\sum_{i=1}^m X_i|^\iota \leq \mathbb{E}|\sum_{i=1}^m \tilde{X}_i|^\iota$ , where  $\tilde{X}_1, \dots, \tilde{X}_m$  are i.i.d. random samples drawn with replacement from  $\mathcal{X}$ . From Rosenthal's inequality, we then have

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\left|\sum_{i=1}^m X_i\right| \geq t\right) \leq \frac{\mathbb{E}|\sum_{i=1}^m \tilde{X}_i|^\iota}{t^\iota} \leq R_\iota \frac{\left(\sum_{i=1}^m \mathbb{E}\tilde{X}_i^2\right)^{\iota/2} + \sum_{i=1}^m \mathbb{E}|\tilde{X}_i|^\iota}{t^\iota},$$

where  $R_\iota$  is a universal constant depending only on  $\iota$ . Note that  $\mathbb{E}\tilde{X}_i^2 = N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N x_i^2$  and  $\mathbb{E}|\tilde{X}_i|^\iota = N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N |x_i|^\iota$ . We can then derive Lemma A13.  $\square$

LEMMA A14. Let  $\mathbf{Z}$  and  $\mathbf{T}$  be the pair of random vectors constructed as in Lemma A3. For any  $\iota \geq 2$  and  $t > 0$ ,

$$\mathbb{P}\left\{\left\|\text{Cov}^{-1/2}(\mathbf{A}) \cdot (\mathbf{B} - \mathbf{A})\right\|_2 \geq c\right\} = \frac{C_\iota d^{\iota/2+1}}{c^\iota N^{\iota/4} \{f(1-f)\}^{\iota/2}} + \frac{C_\iota d^{\iota/2} \xi_\iota}{c^\iota N^{(\iota-1)/2} \{f(1-f)\}^{(\iota-1)/2}}$$

where  $C_\iota$  is a constant depending only on  $\iota$ , and  $\xi_\iota = N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \|(\mathbf{S}_\mathbf{u}^2)^{-1/2}(\mathbf{u}_i - \bar{\mathbf{u}})\|^\iota$ .

PROOF OF LEMMA A14. We construct  $\mathbf{Z}$  and  $\mathbf{T}$  in the same way as in the proof of Lemmas A3 and A12, and we adopt the same notation as in Lemma A12. We further define  $\xi_{k,\iota} = N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N |v_{ik}|^\iota$ .

We first consider bounding the tail probability of  $\|\sum_{i=1}^n (T_i - Z_i)\mathbf{v}_i\|_2$ . From Lemma A13, for any  $c > 0$  and  $1 \leq k \leq d$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\left(\left|\sum_{i=1}^n (T_i - Z_i)v_{ik}\right| \geq c \mid \tilde{m}\right) &\leq R_\iota \frac{\left(|\tilde{m} - m| \cdot N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N v_{ik}^2\right)^{\iota/2} + |\tilde{m} - m| \cdot N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N |v_{ik}|^\iota}{c^\iota} \\ &\leq R_\iota \frac{|\tilde{m} - m|^{\iota/2} + |\tilde{m} - m| \cdot \xi_{k,\iota}}{c^\iota}, \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality holds because  $N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N v_{ik}^2 = (N-1)/N \leq 1$ . This then implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\left(\left\|\sum_{i=1}^n (T_i - Z_i)\mathbf{v}_i\right\|_2 \geq c \mid \tilde{m}\right) &\leq \sum_{k=1}^d \mathbb{P}\left(\left|\sum_{i=1}^n (T_i - Z_i)v_{ik}\right| \geq c/\sqrt{d} \mid \tilde{m}\right) \\ &\leq R_\iota \sum_{k=1}^d \frac{|\tilde{m} - m|^{\iota/2} + |\tilde{m} - m| \cdot \xi_{k,\iota}}{c^\iota d^{-\iota/2}} = R_\iota d^{\iota/2} \cdot \frac{d|\tilde{m} - m|^{\iota/2} + |\tilde{m} - m| \cdot \sum_{k=1}^d \xi_{k,\iota}}{c^\iota}. \end{aligned}$$

By the law of iterated expectation,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\left(\left\|\sum_{i=1}^n (T_i - Z_i)\mathbf{v}_i\right\|_2 \geq c\right) &= \mathbb{E}\left\{\mathbb{P}\left(\left\|\sum_{i=1}^n (T_i - Z_i)\mathbf{v}_i\right\|_2 \geq c \mid \tilde{m}\right)\right\} \\ &\leq R_\iota d^{\iota/2} \cdot \frac{d \cdot \mathbb{E}\{|\tilde{m} - m|^{\iota/2}\} + \mathbb{E}\{|\tilde{m} - m|\} \cdot \sum_{k=1}^d \xi_{k,\iota}}{c^\iota}. \end{aligned}$$

We then consider bounding the moments of  $|\tilde{m} - m|$ . By Hoeffding's inequality, for any  $t > 0$ ,  $\mathbb{P}\{|\tilde{m} - m| \geq t\} \leq 2 \exp(-2t^2/N)$ . Using (Rigollet and Hütter, 2015, Lemma 1.4), this implies that

$$\mathbb{E}\{|\tilde{m} - m|^{\iota/2}\} \leq \left(\frac{N}{2}\right)^{\iota/4} \cdot (\iota/2) \cdot \Gamma(\iota/4).$$

Besides,  $\mathbb{E}\{|\tilde{m} - m|\} \leq \sqrt{\text{Var}(\tilde{m} - m)} = \sqrt{Nf(1-f)}$ .

Finally, we consider bounding the tail probability of  $\text{Cov}^{-1/2}(\mathbf{A}) \cdot (\mathbf{B} - \mathbf{A})$ . From (A3.13),

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\left\{\left\|\text{Cov}^{-1/2}(\mathbf{A}) \cdot (\mathbf{B} - \mathbf{A})\right\|_2 \geq c\right\} &= \mathbb{P}\left\{\left\|\sum_{i=1}^N (T_i - Z_i)\mathbf{v}_i\right\|_2 \geq c\sqrt{f(1-f)N}\right\} \\ &\leq R_\iota d^{\iota/2} \cdot \frac{d \cdot \mathbb{E}\{|\tilde{m} - m|^{\iota/2}\} + \mathbb{E}\{|\tilde{m} - m|\} \cdot \sum_{k=1}^d \xi_{k,\iota}}{c^\iota N^{\iota/2} \{f(1-f)\}^{\iota/2}} \\ &\leq \frac{R_\iota d^{\iota/2}}{c^\iota N^{\iota/2} \{f(1-f)\}^{\iota/2}} \left\{d \cdot \left(\frac{N}{2}\right)^{\iota/4} \cdot (\iota/2) \cdot \Gamma(\iota/4) + \sqrt{Nf(1-f)} \cdot \sum_{k=1}^d \xi_{k,\iota}\right\} \\ &\leq \frac{C_\iota d^{\iota/2}}{c^\iota N^{\iota/2} \{f(1-f)\}^{\iota/2}} \left\{d \cdot N^{\iota/4} + \sqrt{Nf(1-f)} \cdot N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \|\mathbf{v}_i\|_\iota^\iota\right\} \\ &= \frac{C_\iota d^{\iota/2+1}}{c^\iota N^{\iota/4} \{f(1-f)\}^{\iota/2}} + \frac{C_\iota d^{\iota/2}}{c^\iota N^{(\iota-1)/2} \{f(1-f)\}^{(\iota-1)/2}} \cdot \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \|\mathbf{v}_i\|_\iota^\iota. \end{aligned}$$

From the above, we can immediately derive Lemma A14.  $\square$

**Proof of Theorem A2(v).** Letting  $\mathbf{Z}$  and  $\mathbf{T}$  be the pair of indicator vectors for simple random sampling and Bernoulli sampling satisfying Lemma A3, and by the same logic as the proof of Theorem A2(iv), for any  $c > 0$ ,

$$\sup_{\mathcal{Q} \in \mathcal{C}_d} |\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{W} \in \mathcal{Q}) - \mathbb{P}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \in \mathcal{Q})| \leq 174\gamma + \left[4d^{1/4}c + \mathbb{P}\left\{\left\|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\mathbf{A}}^{-1/2}(\mathbf{B} - \mathbf{A})\right\|_2 \geq c\right\}\right].$$

Applying Lemma A12 and letting  $c = N^{-\iota/\{4(\iota+1)\}} \cdot d^{(2\iota-1)/\{4(\iota+1)\}}$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} &4d^{1/4}c + \mathbb{P}\left\{\left\|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\mathbf{A}}^{-1/2}(\mathbf{B} - \mathbf{A})\right\|_2 \geq c\right\} \\ &\leq 4d^{1/4}c + \frac{C_\iota d^{\iota/2+1}}{c^\iota N^{\iota/4} \{f(1-f)\}^{\iota/2}} + \frac{C_\iota d^{\iota/2} \xi_\iota}{c^\iota N^{(\iota-1)/2} \{f(1-f)\}^{(\iota-1)/2}} \\ &= 4 \frac{d^{3\iota/\{4(\iota+1)\}}}{N^{\iota/\{4(\iota+1)\}}} + \frac{C_\iota d^{3\iota/\{4(\iota+1)\}} \cdot d}{N^{\iota/\{4(\iota+1)\} \{f(1-f)\}^{\iota/2}} + \frac{C_\iota \cdot d^{3\iota/\{4(\iota+1)\}} \xi_\iota}{N^{(\iota^2-2)/\{4(\iota+1)\} \{f(1-f)\}^{(\iota-1)/2}} \\ &\leq 4 \frac{d^{3\iota/\{4(\iota+1)\}}}{N^{\iota/\{4(\iota+1)\}}} + \frac{C_\iota d^{3\iota/\{4(\iota+1)\}} \cdot (d + \xi_\iota)}{N^{\iota/\{4(\iota+1)\} \{f(1-f)\}^{\iota/2}} \leq \max\{4, C_\iota\} \cdot \frac{d^{3\iota/\{4(\iota+1)\}} \cdot (2d + \xi_\iota)}{N^{\iota/\{4(\iota+1)\} \{f(1-f)\}^{\iota/2}}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\xi_\iota = N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \left\|(\mathbf{S}_u^2)^{-1/2}(\mathbf{u}_i - \bar{\mathbf{u}})\right\|_\iota^\iota$ . Adopting the notation from the proof of Lemma A14,

$$\xi_\iota = N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{k=1}^d |v_{ik}|^\iota = \sum_{k=1}^d \left(N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N |v_{ik}|^\iota\right) \geq \sum_{k=1}^d \left(N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N v_{ik}^2\right)^{\iota/2} = \sum_{k=1}^d \left(\frac{N-1}{N}\right)^{\iota/2}$$



$$\geq 2^{-\iota/2} \cdot d.$$

From the above, we then have

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{\mathcal{Q} \in \mathcal{C}_d} \left| \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{W} \in \mathcal{Q}) - \mathbb{P}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \in \mathcal{Q}) \right| \\ & \leq 174\gamma + \max\{4, C_\iota\} \cdot \frac{d^{3\iota/\{4(\iota+1)\}} \cdot (1 + d + \xi_\iota)}{N^{\iota/\{4(\iota+1)\}} \{f(1-f)\}^{\iota/2}} \\ & \leq 174\gamma + \max\{4, C_\iota\} \cdot \frac{d^{3\iota/\{4(\iota+1)\}} \cdot (2^{\iota/2+1} + 1)\xi_\iota}{N^{\iota/\{4(\iota+1)\}} \{f(1-f)\}^{\iota/2}} \\ & \leq 174\gamma + C'_\iota \cdot \frac{d^{3\iota/\{4(\iota+1)\}}}{N^{\iota/\{4(\iota+1)\}} \{f(1-f)\}^{\iota/2}} \cdot \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \|(\mathbf{S}_i^2)^{-1/2} (\mathbf{u}_i - \bar{\mathbf{u}})\|_\iota, \end{aligned}$$

where  $C'_\iota = \max\{4, C_\iota\} \cdot (2^{\iota/2+1} + 1)$  is a universal constant depending only on  $\iota$ . Therefore, Theorem A2(v) holds.  $\square$

#### A4. Asymptotic Distributions in Completely Randomized and Rerandomized Experiments.

**Proof of Theorems 1 and 2.** Following the notation in Section 3.2 and from (6), the difference-in-means vector  $(\hat{\tau}, \hat{\boldsymbol{\tau}}_X^\top)^\top$  is essentially the sample total of a simple random sample of size  $n_1$  from the finite population of  $\{\mathbf{u}_i = (r_0 Y_i(1) + r_1 Y_i(0), \mathbf{X}_i^\top)^\top : i = 1, 2, \dots, n\}$ , up to some constant scaling and shifting. This then implies that

$$\Delta_n \equiv \sup_{\mathcal{Q} \in \mathcal{C}_{K+1}} \left| \mathbb{P} \left\{ \mathbf{V}^{-1/2} \begin{pmatrix} \hat{\tau} - \tau \\ \hat{\boldsymbol{\tau}}_X \end{pmatrix} \in \mathcal{Q} \right\} - \mathbb{P}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \in \mathcal{Q}) \right| = \sup_{\mathcal{Q} \in \mathcal{C}_{K+1}} \left| \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{W} \in \mathcal{Q}) - \mathbb{P}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \in \mathcal{Q}) \right|,$$

where  $\mathbf{W} = \text{Cov}^{-1/2}(\sum_{i=1}^n Z_i \mathbf{u}_i) \sum_{i=1}^n Z_i \mathbf{u}_i$  is the standardization of  $\sum_{i=1}^n Z_i \mathbf{u}_i$ . By the definition of  $\gamma_n$  in (7) and the definitions of  $r_1, r_0, K$ , Theorem 1 then follows immediately from Theorem A2 (i - iii); Theorem 2 follows from Theorem A2 (iv - v).  $\square$

**Proof of Theorem 3.** Under Condition 2, there must exist  $\underline{n} \geq 2$  such that  $p_n > \Delta_n$  for all  $n \geq \underline{n}$ . Let  $(\tilde{\tau}, \tilde{\boldsymbol{\tau}}_X^\top)^\top$  denote a Gaussian random vector with mean  $(\tau, \mathbf{0}_K^\top)$  and covariance matrix  $\mathbf{V}$  in (4). By the definition of  $\Delta_n$  in (8), we can know that, for any measurable convex set  $\mathcal{Q}$  in  $\mathbb{R}^{K+1}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \mathbb{P} \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} \hat{\tau} - \tau \\ \hat{\boldsymbol{\tau}}_X \end{pmatrix} \in \mathcal{Q} \right\} - \mathbb{P} \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{\tau} - \tau \\ \tilde{\boldsymbol{\tau}}_X \end{pmatrix} \in \mathcal{Q} \right\} \right| = \left| \mathbb{P} \left\{ \mathbf{V}^{-1/2} \begin{pmatrix} \hat{\tau} - \tau \\ \hat{\boldsymbol{\tau}}_X \end{pmatrix} \in \mathbf{V}^{-1/2} \mathcal{Q} \right\} - \mathbb{P}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \in \mathbf{V}^{-1/2} \mathcal{Q}) \right| \\ & \leq \Delta_n. \end{aligned}$$

This implies that,

$$\left| \mathbb{P} \left( \hat{\boldsymbol{\tau}}_X^\top \mathbf{V}_{xx}^{-1} \hat{\boldsymbol{\tau}}_X \leq a_n \right) - \mathbb{P} \left( \tilde{\boldsymbol{\tau}}_X^\top \mathbf{V}_{xx}^{-1} \tilde{\boldsymbol{\tau}}_X \leq a_n \right) \right| = \left| \mathbb{P}(M \leq a_n) - \mathbb{P}(\tilde{M} \leq a_n) \right| \leq \Delta_n,$$

and for any  $c \in \mathbb{R}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \mathbb{P} \left( \hat{\tau} - \tau \leq c, \hat{\boldsymbol{\tau}}_X^\top \mathbf{V}_{xx}^{-1} \hat{\boldsymbol{\tau}}_X \leq a_n \right) - \mathbb{P} \left( \tilde{\tau} - \tau \leq c, \tilde{\boldsymbol{\tau}}_X^\top \mathbf{V}_{xx}^{-1} \tilde{\boldsymbol{\tau}}_X \leq a_n \right) \right| \\ \text{(A4.14)} \quad & = \left| \mathbb{P}(\hat{\tau} - \tau \leq c, M \leq a_n) - \mathbb{P}(\tilde{\tau} - \tau \leq c, \tilde{M} \leq a_n) \right| \leq \Delta_n, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\tilde{M} \equiv \tilde{\tau}_X^\top \mathbf{V}_{\mathbf{x}\mathbf{x}}^{-1} \tilde{\tau}_X \sim \chi_{K_n}^2$ . By definition,  $p_n = \mathbb{P}(\tilde{M} \leq a_n)$ . Thus, for  $n \geq \underline{n}$ , we must have  $\mathbb{P}(M \leq a_n) \geq p_n - \Delta_n > 0$ , and consequently

$$(A4.15) \quad \frac{1}{p_n + \Delta_n} \leq \frac{1}{\mathbb{P}(M \leq a_n)} \leq \frac{1}{p_n - \Delta_n}.$$

From (A4.14) and (A4.15), we then have, for all  $n \geq \underline{n}$  and  $c \in \mathbb{R}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\hat{\tau} - \tau \leq c \mid M \leq a_n) &= \frac{\mathbb{P}(\hat{\tau} - \tau \leq c, M \leq a_n)}{\mathbb{P}(M \leq a_n)} \leq \frac{\mathbb{P}(\tilde{\tau} - \tau \leq c, \tilde{M} \leq a_n) + \Delta_n}{\mathbb{P}(\tilde{M} \leq a_n) - \Delta_n} \\ &= \frac{\mathbb{P}(\tilde{\tau} - \tau \leq c \mid \tilde{M} \leq a_n) + \Delta_n/p_n}{1 - \Delta_n/p_n} \\ &\leq \frac{\mathbb{P}(\tilde{\tau} - \tau \leq c \mid \tilde{M} \leq a_n)(1 - \Delta_n/p_n) + 2\Delta_n/p_n}{1 - \Delta_n/p_n} \\ &= \mathbb{P}(\tilde{\tau} - \tau \leq c \mid \tilde{M} \leq a_n) + \frac{2\Delta_n/p_n}{1 - \Delta_n/p_n}, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\hat{\tau} - \tau \leq c \mid M \leq a_n) &= \frac{\mathbb{P}(\hat{\tau} - \tau \leq c, M \leq a_n)}{\mathbb{P}(M \leq a_n)} \geq \frac{\mathbb{P}(\tilde{\tau} - \tau \leq c, \tilde{M} \leq a_n) - \Delta_n}{\mathbb{P}(\tilde{M} \leq a_n) + \Delta_n} \\ &= \frac{\mathbb{P}(\tilde{\tau} - \tau \leq c \mid \tilde{M} \leq a_n) - \Delta_n/p_n}{1 + \Delta_n/p_n} \\ &\geq \frac{\mathbb{P}(\tilde{\tau} - \tau \leq c \mid \tilde{M} \leq a_n)(1 + \Delta_n/p_n) - 2\Delta_n/p_n}{1 + \Delta_n/p_n} \\ &= \mathbb{P}(\tilde{\tau} - \tau \leq c \mid \tilde{M} \leq a_n) - \frac{2\Delta_n/p_n}{1 + \Delta_n/p_n}. \end{aligned}$$

These imply that, for all  $n \geq \underline{n}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} &\sup_{c \in \mathbb{R}} \left| \mathbb{P} \left\{ V_{\tau\tau}^{-1/2}(\hat{\tau} - \tau) \leq c \mid M \leq a_n \right\} - \mathbb{P} \left\{ V_{\tau\tau}^{-1/2}(\tilde{\tau} - \tau) \leq c \mid \tilde{M} \leq a_n \right\} \right| \\ &\leq \max \left\{ \frac{2\Delta_n/p_n}{1 - \Delta_n/p_n}, \frac{2\Delta_n/p_n}{1 + \Delta_n/p_n} \right\} \leq \frac{2\Delta_n/p_n}{1 - \Delta_n/p_n}. \end{aligned}$$

Under Condition 2, we then have, as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ ,

$$\sup_{c \in \mathbb{R}} \left| \mathbb{P} \left\{ V_{\tau\tau}^{-1/2}(\hat{\tau} - \tau) \leq c \mid M \leq a_n \right\} - \mathbb{P} \left\{ V_{\tau\tau}^{-1/2}(\tilde{\tau} - \tau) \leq c \mid \tilde{M} \leq a_n \right\} \right| \rightarrow 0.$$

Finally, from the proof of Li, Ding and Rubin (2018, Theorem 1), for any  $c \in \mathbb{R}$ ,

$$\mathbb{P} \left\{ V_{\tau\tau}^{-1/2}(\tilde{\tau} - \tau) \leq c \mid \tilde{M} \leq a_n \right\} = \mathbb{P} \left\{ \left( \sqrt{1 - R^2} \varepsilon_0 + \sqrt{R^2} L_{K_n, a_n} \right) \leq c \right\},$$

with  $\varepsilon_0$  and  $L_{K_n, a_n}$  defined as in Section 4. Therefore, we derive Theorem 3.  $\square$

**Comment on Condition 1 and regularity conditions in Li, Ding and Rubin (2018).** By the definition in (7),

$$\gamma_n \leq \frac{(K+1)^{1/4}}{\sqrt{nr_1 r_0}} \cdot \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \left\| \mathbf{S}_u^{-1}(\mathbf{u}_i - \bar{\mathbf{u}}) \right\|_2 \cdot \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left\| \mathbf{S}_u^{-1}(\mathbf{u}_i - \bar{\mathbf{u}}) \right\|_2^2$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \frac{(K+1)^{1/4}}{\sqrt{nr_1r_0}} \cdot \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \|\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{u}}^{-1}(\mathbf{u}_i - \bar{\mathbf{u}})\|_2 \cdot \frac{(n-1)(K+1)}{n} \\
&\leq \frac{(K+1)^{5/4}}{\sqrt{r_1r_0}} \cdot \|\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{u}}^{-1}\|_2 \cdot \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \|\mathbf{u}_i - \bar{\mathbf{u}}\|_2.
\end{aligned}$$

Note that

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{n} \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \|\mathbf{u}_i - \bar{\mathbf{u}}\|_2^2 &= \frac{1}{n} \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} [r_0\{Y_i(1) - \bar{Y}(1)\} + r_1\{Y_i(0) - \bar{Y}(0)\}]^2 + \frac{1}{n} \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \|\mathbf{X}_i - \bar{\mathbf{X}}\|_2^2 \\
\text{(A4.16)} \quad &\leq \frac{2}{n} \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \{Y_i(1) - \bar{Y}(1)\}^2 + \frac{2}{n} \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \{Y_i(0) - \bar{Y}(0)\}^2 + \frac{1}{n} \|\mathbf{X}_i - \bar{\mathbf{X}}\|_2^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Under [Li, Ding and Rubin \(2018, Condition 1\)](#), as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , both  $r_1$  and  $r_0$  have positive limits,  $\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{u}}^2$  has a limiting value (in particular, the limit of  $\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{X}}^2$  is nonsingular), and the quantities on the right hand side of (A4.16) converge to zero. If additionally the limit of  $R^2$  is less than 1, then the limit of  $\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{u}}^2$  will be invertible, and thus  $\gamma_n$  must converge to zero as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , i.e., [Condition 1](#) holds.  $\square$

**Proof of Corollary 1.** Corollary 1 follows by the same logic as [Li, Ding and Rubin \(2018, Corollaries 1–3\)](#).  $\square$

**Comments on the lower bound of  $\gamma_n$  in (9).** The lower bound of  $\gamma_n$  follows by the same logic as [Lemma A10](#).  $\square$

**Comments on the upper bound of  $\gamma_n$ .** By the definition in (7),

$$\begin{aligned}
\gamma_n &\equiv \frac{(K_n+1)^{1/4}}{\sqrt{nr_1r_0}} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \|\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{u}}^{-1}(\mathbf{u}_i - \bar{\mathbf{u}})\|_2^3 \leq \frac{(K_n+1)^{1/4}}{\sqrt{nr_1r_0}} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (K_n+1)^{3/2} \|\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{u}}^{-1}(\mathbf{u}_i - \bar{\mathbf{u}})\|_{\infty}^{3/2} \\
&\leq \frac{(K_n+1)^{7/4}}{\sqrt{nr_1r_0}} \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \|\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{u}}^{-1}(\mathbf{u}_i - \bar{\mathbf{u}})\|_{\infty}^{3/2}.
\end{aligned}$$

If the standardized finite population  $\{\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{u}}^{-1}(\mathbf{u}_i - \bar{\mathbf{u}}) : 1 \leq i \leq n\}$  is coordinate-wise bounded, and the proportions of treated and control units are bounded away from zero, then there exist finite positive constants  $c$  and  $C$  such that for all  $n$  and  $1 \leq i \leq n$ ,  $\|\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{u}}^{-1}(\mathbf{u}_i - \bar{\mathbf{u}})\|_{\infty} \leq C$  and  $\min\{r_1, r_0\} > c$ . Consequently,

$$\gamma_n \leq \frac{(K_n+1)^{7/4}}{\sqrt{nr_1r_0}} \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \|\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{u}}^{-1}(\mathbf{u}_i - \bar{\mathbf{u}})\|_{\infty}^{3/2} \leq \frac{(K_n+1)^{7/4}}{\sqrt{nc^2}} C^{3/2} = \left(\frac{K_n+1}{n^{2/7}}\right)^{7/4} \frac{C^{3/2}}{c},$$

under which  $K_n = o(n^{2/7})$  implies that  $\gamma_n = o(1)$ .  $\square$

**A5. Limiting Behavior of the Constrained Gaussian Random Variable.** In this section, we prove [Theorem 4](#) regarding the limiting behavior of the constrained Gaussian random variable  $L_{K_n, a_n}$ . We first give some technical lemmas in [Section A5.1](#), and then study the limiting behavior of  $L_{K_n, a_n}$  in [Sections A5.2–A5.5](#) under various relationship between  $\log(p_n^{-1})$  and  $K_n$ . [Sections A5.2–A5.5](#) essentially prove [Theorem 4\(i\)–\(iv\)](#) respectively, as briefly commented in [Section A5.6](#). For descriptive convenience, we introduce  $\chi_K^2$  to denote a random variable following the chi-square distribution with degrees of freedom  $K$ .

*A5.1. Technical lemmas and their proofs.*

A5.1.1. *Lemmas for the acceptance probability  $p = \mathbb{P}(\chi_K^2 \leq a)$ .*

LEMMA A15. *For any integer  $K \geq 1$ ,  $\sqrt{\pi K} \{K/(2e)\}^{K/2} \leq \Gamma(K/2+1) \leq 2\sqrt{\pi K} \{K/(2e)\}^{K/2}$ .*

PROOF OF LEMMA A15. We can numerically verify that Lemma A15 holds when  $K = 1$ . Below we consider only the case with  $K \geq 2$ . From Karatsuba (2001), the Gamma function can be bounded by

$$\sqrt{\pi} \left(\frac{K}{2e}\right)^{K/2} \left(K^3 + K^2 + \frac{K}{2} + \frac{1}{100}\right)^{1/6} \leq \Gamma(K/2+1) \leq \sqrt{\pi} \left(\frac{K}{2e}\right)^{K/2} \left(K^3 + K^2 + \frac{K}{2} + \frac{1}{30}\right)^{1/6},$$

$$1 \leq \left(1 + \frac{1}{K} + \frac{1}{2K^2} + \frac{1}{100K^3}\right)^{1/6} \leq \frac{\Gamma(K/2+1)}{\sqrt{\pi K} \{K/(2e)\}^{K/2}} \leq \left(1 + \frac{1}{K} + \frac{1}{2K^2} + \frac{1}{30K^3}\right)^{1/6} \leq 2.$$

From the above, Lemma A15 holds.  $\square$

LEMMA A16. *For any integer  $K \geq 1$  and  $a > 0$ , define  $p = \mathbb{P}(\chi_K^2 \leq a)$ . Then*

$$\frac{\log(p^{-1})}{K} \leq \frac{\log(4\pi K)}{2K} + \frac{1}{2} \left\{ \frac{a}{K} - 1 - \log\left(\frac{a}{K}\right) \right\}.$$

Moreover, if  $a/K < 1$ , then

$$\frac{\log(p^{-1})}{K} \geq \frac{1}{2} \left\{ \frac{a}{K} - 1 - \log\left(\frac{a}{K}\right) \right\} + \frac{\log(\pi K)}{2K} + \frac{1}{K} \log\left(1 - \frac{a}{K}\right).$$

PROOF OF LEMMA A16. By definition and using integration by parts, we have

$$p = \frac{1}{2^{K/2}\Gamma(K/2)} \int_0^a t^{K/2-1} e^{-t/2} dt = \frac{1}{2^{K/2}\Gamma(K/2)} \cdot \frac{t^{K/2}}{K/2} e^{-t/2} \Big|_0^a + \frac{1}{2^{K/2}\Gamma(K/2)} \cdot \int_0^a \frac{t^{K/2}}{K/2} e^{-t/2} \frac{1}{2} dt$$

(A5.17)

$$= \frac{a^{K/2} e^{-a/2}}{2^{K/2}\Gamma(K/2+1)} + \frac{1}{K} \frac{1}{2^{K/2}\Gamma(K/2)} \int_0^a t \cdot t^{K/2-1} e^{-t/2} dt$$

$$\leq \frac{a^{K/2} e^{-a/2}}{2^{K/2}\Gamma(K/2+1)} + \frac{a}{K} \frac{1}{2^{K/2}\Gamma(K/2)} \int_0^a t^{K/2-1} e^{-t/2} dt$$

$$= \frac{a^{K/2} e^{-a/2}}{2^{K/2}\Gamma(K/2+1)} + \frac{a}{K} p,$$

and

$$p = \frac{a^{K/2} e^{-a/2}}{2^{K/2}\Gamma(K/2+1)} + \frac{1}{K} \frac{1}{2^{K/2}\Gamma(K/2)} \int_0^a t \cdot t^{K/2-1} e^{-t/2} dt \geq \frac{a^{K/2} e^{-a/2}}{2^{K/2}\Gamma(K/2+1)}.$$

These implies that

$$\left(1 - \frac{a}{K}\right) p \leq \frac{a^{K/2} e^{-a/2}}{2^{K/2}\Gamma(K/2+1)} = \frac{(a/K \cdot e^{1-a/K})^{K/2}}{\sqrt{\pi K}} \frac{\sqrt{\pi K} \{K/(2e)\}^{K/2}}{\Gamma(K/2+1)} \leq p.$$

From Lemma A15, we then have

$$p \geq \frac{1}{2} \frac{(a/K \cdot e^{1-a/K})^{K/2}}{\sqrt{\pi K}} \quad \text{and} \quad \left(1 - \frac{a}{K}\right) p \leq \frac{(a/K \cdot e^{1-a/K})^{K/2}}{\sqrt{\pi K}}.$$

Consequently,

$$\frac{\log(p^{-1})}{K} \leq \frac{\log(4\pi K)}{2K} + \frac{1}{2} \left\{ \frac{a}{K} - 1 - \log\left(\frac{a}{K}\right) \right\}.$$

and, when  $a/K < 1$ ,

$$\frac{\log(p^{-1})}{K} \geq \frac{1}{2} \left\{ \frac{a}{K} - 1 - \log\left(\frac{a}{K}\right) \right\} + \frac{\log(\pi K)}{2K} + \frac{1}{K} \log\left(1 - \frac{a}{K}\right).$$

Therefore, Lemma A16 holds.  $\square$

#### A5.1.2. Lemmas for the variance of $L_{K,a}$ and its bounds.

LEMMA A17. For any integer  $K > 0$  and  $a > 0$ ,

- (i)  $\text{Var}(L_{K,a}) = K^{-1} \mathbb{E}(\chi_K^2 | \chi_K^2 \leq a) = \mathbb{P}(\chi_{K+2}^2 \leq a) / \mathbb{P}(\chi_K^2 \leq a)$ .
- (ii)  $\text{Var}(L_{K,a})$  is nondecreasing in  $a$  for any given fixed  $K \geq 1$ .

PROOF OF LEMMA A17. Lemma A17 follows immediately from Morgan and Rubin (2012, Theorem 3.1) and Li, Ding and Rubin (2018, Lemma A5).  $\square$

LEMMA A18. For any integer  $K \geq 1$  and  $a \geq 0$ , it holds that

$$\min \left\{ \frac{a}{4K}, \frac{K-2}{4K} \right\} \leq \text{Var}(L_{K,a}) \leq \frac{a}{K}.$$

PROOF OF LEMMA A18. The upper bound of  $\text{Var}(L_{K,a})$  is a direct consequence of Lemma A17(i). The lower bound of  $\text{Var}(L_{K,a})$  holds obviously when  $a = 0$  or  $K \leq 2$ . Below we consider only the lower bound of  $\text{Var}(L_{K,a})$  when  $a > 0$  and  $K \geq 3$ . Define  $\tilde{a} = \min\{a, K-2\}$ . By the property of chi-square distribution, the density function of  $\chi_K^2$  is monotonically increasing on the interval  $[0, K-2] \supset [0, \tilde{a}]$ . This implies that  $\mathbb{P}(\chi_K^2 \leq \tilde{a}/2) \leq \mathbb{P}(\tilde{a}/2 \leq \chi_K^2 \leq \tilde{a})$  and

$$(A5.18) \quad \mathbb{P}(\tilde{a}/2 \leq \chi_K^2 \leq \tilde{a} | \chi_K^2 \leq \tilde{a}) = \frac{\mathbb{P}(\tilde{a}/2 \leq \chi_K^2 \leq \tilde{a})}{\mathbb{P}(\chi_K^2 \leq \tilde{a}/2) + \mathbb{P}(\tilde{a}/2 \leq \chi_K^2 \leq \tilde{a})} \geq 1/2.$$

Consequently, from Lemma A17, the variance of  $L_{K,a}$  multiplied by  $K$  can be bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} K \text{Var}(L_{K,a}) &\geq K \text{Var}(L_{K,\tilde{a}}) = \mathbb{E}[\chi_K^2 | \chi_K^2 \leq \tilde{a}] \geq \mathbb{P}(\tilde{a}/2 \leq \chi_K^2 \leq \tilde{a} | \chi_K^2 \leq \tilde{a}) \cdot \mathbb{E}[\chi_K^2 | \tilde{a}/2 \leq \chi_K^2 \leq \tilde{a}] \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2} \cdot \frac{\tilde{a}}{2} = \frac{\min\{a, K-2\}}{4} \end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality holds because  $a \geq \tilde{a}$  and the last inequality holds due to (A5.18). From the above, Lemma A18 holds.  $\square$

LEMMA A19. For any integer  $K > 0$  and  $a > 0$ , with  $p = \mathbb{P}(\chi_K^2 \leq a)$ ,

$$-\log \{1 - \text{Var}(L_{K,a})\} \geq \frac{K}{2} \left\{ \frac{a}{K} - 1 - \log\left(\frac{a}{K}\right) - \frac{2 \log(p^{-1})}{K} + \frac{\log(\pi K)}{K} \right\}.$$

PROOF OF LEMMA A19. From (A5.17),

$$p = \mathbb{P}(\chi_K^2 \leq a) = \frac{a^{K/2} e^{-a/2}}{2^{K/2} \Gamma(K/2 + 1)} + \frac{1}{K} \frac{1}{2^{K/2} \Gamma(K/2)} \int_0^a t^{K/2} e^{-t/2} dt$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \frac{a^{K/2}e^{-a/2}}{2^{K/2}\Gamma(K/2+1)} + \frac{1}{2^{(K+2)/2}\Gamma((K+2)/2)} \int_0^a t^{(K+2)/2-1} e^{-t/2} dt \\
&= \frac{a^{K/2}e^{-a/2}}{2^{K/2}\Gamma(K/2+1)} + \mathbb{P}(\chi_{K+2}^2 \leq a).
\end{aligned}$$

From Lemmas A15 and A17, this implies that

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{(A5.19)} \quad 1 - \text{Var}(L_{K,a}) &= 1 - \frac{\mathbb{P}(\chi_{K+2}^2 \leq a)}{\mathbb{P}(\chi_K^2 \leq a)} = \frac{a^{K/2}e^{-a/2}}{2^{K/2}\Gamma(K/2+1)} \cdot \frac{1}{p} \leq \frac{a^{K/2}e^{-a/2}}{2^{K/2}\sqrt{\pi K}\{K/(2e)\}^{K/2}} \cdot \frac{1}{p} \\
&= \frac{(a/K)^{K/2}e^{(K-a)/2}}{p\sqrt{\pi K}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Consequently,

$$\begin{aligned}
-\log\{1 - \text{Var}(L_{K,a})\} &\geq -\frac{K}{2} \log\left(\frac{a}{K}\right) - \frac{K-a}{2} + \log(p) + \frac{1}{2} \log(\pi K) \\
&= \frac{K}{2} \left\{ \frac{a}{K} - 1 - \log\left(\frac{a}{K}\right) - \frac{2\log(p^{-1})}{K} + \frac{\log(\pi K)}{K} \right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, Lemma A19 holds.  $\square$

LEMMA A20. For any  $K > 2$ ,  $a \in (0, K-2]$  and  $\zeta \in (0, 1)$ ,

$$-\log\{1 - \text{Var}(L_{K,a})\} \geq -\log(2) + \log(K\zeta) - \frac{\zeta}{2(1-\zeta)} \{a\zeta + (K-2-a)\}.$$

PROOF OF LEMMA A20. From (A5.19),

$$\begin{aligned}
1 - \text{Var}(L_{K,a}) &= \frac{a^{K/2}e^{-a/2}}{2^{K/2}\Gamma(K/2+1)} \cdot \frac{1}{\mathbb{P}(\chi_K^2 \leq a)} = \frac{a^{K/2}e^{-a/2}}{2^{K/2}\Gamma(K/2+1)} \cdot \frac{2^{K/2}\Gamma(K/2)}{\int_0^a t^{K/2-1} e^{-t/2} dt} \\
&= \frac{2}{K} \frac{a^{K/2}e^{-a/2}}{\int_0^a t^{K/2-1} e^{-t/2} dt}.
\end{aligned}$$

By the property of chi-square distribution,  $t^{K/2-1}e^{-t/2}$  is nondecreasing in  $t \in [0, K-2] \supset [0, a]$ , which implies that

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_0^a t^{K/2-1} e^{-t/2} dt &\geq \int_{(1-\zeta)a}^a t^{K/2-1} e^{-t/2} dt \geq \zeta a \cdot \{(1-\zeta)a\}^{K/2-1} e^{-(1-\zeta)a/2} \\
&= \zeta(1-\zeta)^{K/2-1} a^{K/2} e^{-(1-\zeta)a/2}.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$1 - \text{Var}(L_{K,a}) = \frac{2}{K} \frac{a^{K/2}e^{-a/2}}{\int_0^a t^{K/2-1} e^{-t/2} dt} \leq \frac{2}{K} \frac{a^{K/2}e^{-a/2}}{\zeta(1-\zeta)^{K/2-1} a^{K/2} e^{-(1-\zeta)a/2}} = \frac{2}{K} \frac{e^{-\zeta a/2}}{\zeta(1-\zeta)^{K/2-1}},$$

and consequently

$$-\log\{1 - \text{Var}(L_{K,a})\} \geq -\log(2) + \log(K\zeta) + \frac{\zeta a}{2} + \left(\frac{K}{2} - 1\right) \log(1-\zeta).$$

Using the inequality that  $\log(1+x) \geq x/(1+x)$  for all  $x > -1$ , we have  $\log(1-\zeta) \geq -\zeta/(1-\zeta)$ , and thus

$$\begin{aligned} & -\log\{1 - \text{Var}(L_{K,a})\} \\ & \geq -\log(2) + \log(K\zeta) + \frac{\zeta a}{2} - \left(\frac{K}{2} - 1\right) \frac{\zeta}{1-\zeta} = -\log(2) + \log(K\zeta) + \frac{\zeta}{2(1-\zeta)} \{a - a\zeta - (K-2)\} \\ & = -\log(2) + \log(K\zeta) - \frac{\zeta}{2(1-\zeta)} \{a\zeta + (K-2-a)\}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, Lemma A20 holds.  $\square$

A5.2. *Limiting behavior when  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \log(p_n^{-1})/K_n = \infty$ .*

LEMMA A21. *As  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , if  $\log(p_n^{-1})/K_n \rightarrow \infty$ , then  $a_n/K_n \rightarrow 0$  and  $\text{Var}(L_{K_n, a_n}) \rightarrow 0$ .*

PROOF OF LEMMA A21. From Lemma A18, it suffices to show that  $a_n/K_n \rightarrow 0$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . We prove this by contradiction. If  $a_n/K_n$  does not converge to zero, then there must exist a positive constant  $c > 0$  and a subsequence  $\{n_j : j = 1, 2, \dots\}$  such that  $a_{n_j}/K_{n_j} \geq c$  for all  $j \geq 1$ . Thus, for any  $j \geq 1$ ,  $p_{n_j} = \mathbb{P}(\chi_{K_{n_j}}^2 \leq a_{n_j}) \geq \mathbb{P}(\chi_{K_{n_j}}^2 \leq cK_{n_j})$ . From Lemma A16, this then implies that

$$\frac{\log(p_{n_j}^{-1})}{K_{n_j}} \leq \frac{\log\{\mathbb{P}(\chi_{K_{n_j}}^2 \leq cK_{n_j})^{-1}\}}{K_{n_j}} \leq \frac{\log(4\pi K_{n_j})}{2K_{n_j}} + \frac{c-1-\log(c)}{2} \leq \frac{\log(4\pi)}{2} + \frac{c-1-\log(c)}{2},$$

where the last inequality holds because  $\log(4\pi K)/(2K)$  is decreasing in  $K$  for  $K \geq 1$ . However, this contradicts the fact that  $\log(p_n^{-1})/K_n \rightarrow \infty$ . Therefore, we must have  $a_n/K_n \rightarrow 0$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . From the above, Lemma A21 holds.  $\square$

A5.3. *Limiting behavior when  $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \log(p_n^{-1})/K_n < \infty$ .*

LEMMA A22. *If  $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \log(p_n^{-1})/K_n < \infty$ , then  $\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} a_n/K_n > 0$  and  $\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \text{Var}(L_{K_n, a_n}) > 0$ .*

PROOF OF LEMMA A22. We first prove  $\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} a_n/K_n > 0$  by contradiction. If  $\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} a_n/K_n = 0$ , then there exists a subsequence  $\{n_j : j = 1, 2, \dots\}$  such that  $a_{n_j}/K_{n_j} \rightarrow 0$  as  $j \rightarrow \infty$  and  $a_{n_j}/K_{n_j} < 1$  for all  $j$ . From Lemma A16, we then have, for any  $j \geq 1$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\log(p_{n_j}^{-1})}{K_{n_j}} & \geq \frac{1}{2} \left\{ \frac{a_{n_j}}{K_{n_j}} - 1 - \log\left(\frac{a_{n_j}}{K_{n_j}}\right) \right\} + \frac{\log(\pi K_{n_j})}{2K_{n_j}} + \frac{1}{K_{n_j}} \log\left(1 - \frac{a_{n_j}}{K_{n_j}}\right) \\ & \geq -\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2} \log\left(\frac{a_{n_j}}{K_{n_j}}\right) + \log\left(1 - \frac{a_{n_j}}{K_{n_j}}\right), \end{aligned}$$

which converges to infinity as  $j \rightarrow \infty$ . However, this contradicts with the fact that  $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \log(p_n^{-1})/K_n < \infty$ . Thus, we must have  $\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} a_n/K_n > 0$ .

Second, we prove that  $\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \text{Var}(L_{K_n, a_n}) > 0$  by contradiction. If  $\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \text{Var}(L_{K_n, a_n}) = 0$ , then there exists a subsequence  $\{n_j : j = 1, 2, \dots\}$  such that  $\text{Var}(L_{K_{n_j}, a_{n_j}}) \rightarrow 0$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  and  $\text{Var}(L_{K_{n_j}, a_{n_j}}) < 1/12$  for all  $j$ . Below we consider two cases, depending on whether  $\limsup_{j \rightarrow \infty} K_{n_j}$  is greater than or equal to 3. If  $\limsup_{j \rightarrow \infty} K_{n_j} \geq 3$ , then there exists a further subsequence  $\{m_1, m_2, \dots\} \subset \{n_1, n_2, \dots\}$  such that  $K_{m_j} \geq 3$  for all  $j$ .

Because  $(K_{m_j} - 2)/(4K_{m_j}) \geq 1/12$ , from Lemma A18, we must have  $\text{Var}(L_{K_{m_j}, a_{m_j}}) \geq a_{m_j}/(4K_{m_j})$ . This then implies that

$$0 = \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \text{Var}(L_{K_{m_j}, a_{m_j}}) \geq \liminf_{j \rightarrow \infty} a_{m_j}/(4K_{m_j}) \geq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} a_n/(4K_n) > 0,$$

a contradiction. If  $\limsup_{j \rightarrow \infty} K_{n_j} < 3$ , then there exists a further subsequence  $\{m_1, m_2, \dots\} \subset \{n_1, n_2, \dots\}$  such that  $K_{m_j} \leq 2$  for all  $j$ . Because

$$0 < \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} a_n/(4K_n) \leq \liminf_{j \rightarrow \infty} a_{m_j}/(4K_{m_j}) \leq \liminf_{j \rightarrow \infty} a_{m_j}/4,$$

there must exist a positive constant  $\underline{a} > 0$  such that  $a_{m_j} > \underline{a}$  for all  $j$ . From Lemma A17, this then implies that

$$0 = \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \text{Var}(L_{K_{m_j}, a_{m_j}}) \geq \liminf_{j \rightarrow \infty} \text{Var}(L_{K_{m_j}, \underline{a}}) \geq \min\{\text{Var}(L_{1, \underline{a}}), \text{Var}(L_{2, \underline{a}})\} > 0,$$

a contradiction. Therefore, we must have  $\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \text{Var}(L_{K_n, a_n}) > 0$ , i.e., Lemma A22 holds.  $\square$

#### A5.4. Limiting behavior when $\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \log(p_n^{-1})/K_n > 0$ .

LEMMA A23. *If  $\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \log(p_n^{-1})/K_n > 0$ , then*

- (i) *for any subsequence  $\{n_j : j = 1, 2, \dots\}$  with  $\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} K_{n_j} = \infty$ ,  $\limsup_{j \rightarrow \infty} a_{n_j}/K_{n_j} < 1$ .*
- (ii)  $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \text{Var}(L_{K_n, a_n}) < 1$ .

PROOF OF LEMMA A23. First, we prove (i) by contradiction. Suppose that there exists a subsequence  $\{n_j : j = 1, 2, \dots\}$  such that  $K_{n_j} \rightarrow \infty$  as  $j \rightarrow \infty$  and  $\limsup_{j \rightarrow \infty} a_{n_j}/K_{n_j} \geq 1$ . Then there exists a further subsequence  $\{m_j : j = 1, 2, \dots\} \subset \{n_j : j = 1, 2, \dots\}$  such that  $\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} a_{m_j}/K_{m_j} \geq 1$ . Define  $\tilde{a}_{m_j} = \min\{1, a_{m_j}/K_{m_j}\} \cdot K_{m_j}$ . We can then verify that  $\tilde{a}_{m_j} \leq a_{m_j}$  and  $\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{a}_{m_j}/K_{m_j} = 1$ . From Lemma A16, for any  $j \geq 1$ ,

$$\frac{\log(p_{m_j}^{-1})}{K_{m_j}} \leq \frac{\log\{\mathbb{P}(\chi_{K_{m_j}}^2 \leq \tilde{a}_{m_j})^{-1}\}}{K} \leq \frac{\log(4\pi K_{m_j})}{2K_{m_j}} + \frac{1}{2} \left\{ \frac{\tilde{a}_{m_j}}{K_{m_j}} - 1 - \log\left(\frac{\tilde{a}_{m_j}}{K_{m_j}}\right) \right\},$$

where the right hand side converges to 0 as  $j \rightarrow \infty$ . Consequently,  $\log(p_{m_j}^{-1})/K_{m_j} \rightarrow 0$  as  $j \rightarrow \infty$ . However, this contradicts with the fact that  $\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \log(p_n^{-1})/K_n > 0$ . Therefore, for any subsequence  $\{n_j : j = 1, 2, \dots\}$  with  $\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} K_{n_j} = \infty$ , we must have  $\limsup_{j \rightarrow \infty} a_{n_j}/K_{n_j} < 1$ .

Second, we prove (ii) by contradiction. If  $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \text{Var}(L_{K_n, a_n}) = 1$ , then there exists a subsequence  $\{n_j : j = 1, 2, \dots\}$  such that  $\text{Var}(L_{K_{n_j}, a_{n_j}}) \rightarrow 1$  as  $j \rightarrow \infty$ . Below we consider two cases, depending on whether  $\limsup_{j \rightarrow \infty} K_{n_j}$  is finite. If  $\limsup_{j \rightarrow \infty} K_{n_j} = \infty$ , then there exists a further subsequence  $\{m_j : j = 1, 2, \dots\} \subset \{n_j : j = 1, 2, \dots\}$  such that  $K_{m_j} \rightarrow \infty$  as  $j \rightarrow \infty$ . From Lemma A18 and the discussion before, we have

$$1 > \limsup_{j \rightarrow \infty} a_{m_j}/K_{m_j} \geq \limsup_{j \rightarrow \infty} \text{Var}(L_{K_{m_j}, a_{m_j}}) = 1,$$

a contradiction. If  $\limsup_{j \rightarrow \infty} K_{n_j} < \infty$ , then there exists a finite integer  $\bar{K}$  such that  $K_{n_j} \leq \bar{K}$  for all  $j$ . Because  $\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \log(p_n^{-1})/K_n > 0$ , there must exist a positive constant  $c > 0$  such that  $\log(p_n^{-1})/K_n \geq c$  for all  $n$ . This immediately implies that  $\log(p_n^{-1}) \geq c$  and  $p_n \leq e^{-c}$  for all  $n$ . Consequently, for all  $j$ , we have  $a_{n_j} = F_{K_{n_j}}^{-1}(p_{n_j}) \leq F_{K_{n_j}}^{-1}(e^{-c}) \leq$



$\max_{1 \leq K \leq \bar{K}} F_K^{-1}(e^{-c}) \equiv \bar{a}$ , where  $F_K^{-1}(\cdot)$  denotes the quantile function for the chi-square distribution with degrees of freedom  $K$ . From Lemma A17, we then have

$$1 = \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \text{Var}(L_{K_{n_j}, a_{n_j}}) \leq \limsup_{j \rightarrow \infty} \text{Var}(L_{K_{n_j}, \bar{a}}) \leq \max_{1 \leq K \leq \bar{K}} \text{Var}(L_{K, \bar{a}}) < 1,$$

a contradiction. Therefore, we must have  $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \text{Var}(L_{K_n, a_n}) < 1$ .

From the above, Lemma A23 holds.  $\square$

A5.5. *Limiting behavior when  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \log(p_n^{-1})/K_n = 0$ .*

LEMMA A24. *If  $\log(p_n^{-1})/K_n \rightarrow 0$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , then  $\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} a_n/K_n \geq 1$ .*

PROOF OF LEMMA A24. We prove the lemma by contradiction. Assume that  $\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} a_n/K_n < 1$ . Then there must exist a subsequence  $\{n_j : j = 1, 2, \dots\}$  such that  $a_{n_j}/K_{n_j} < 1$  and  $a_{n_j}/K_{n_j}$  converges to some  $c \in [0, 1)$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . From Lemma A16, for any  $j \geq 1$ ,

$$\frac{\log(p_{n_j}^{-1})}{K_{n_j}} \geq \frac{1}{2} \left\{ \frac{a_{n_j}}{K_{n_j}} - 1 - \log\left(\frac{a_{n_j}}{K_{n_j}}\right) \right\} + \frac{\log(\pi K_{n_j})}{2K_{n_j}} + \frac{1}{K_{n_j}} \log\left(1 - \frac{a_{n_j}}{K_{n_j}}\right).$$

If  $\limsup_{j \rightarrow \infty} K_{n_j} = \infty$ , then there exists a further subsequence  $\{m_j : j = 1, 2, \dots\}$  such that  $K_{m_j} \rightarrow \infty$  as  $j \rightarrow \infty$ , under which we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\log(p_{m_j}^{-1})}{K_{m_j}} &\geq \frac{1}{2} \left\{ \frac{a_{m_j}}{K_{m_j}} - 1 - \log\left(\frac{a_{m_j}}{K_{m_j}}\right) \right\} + \frac{\log(\pi K_{m_j})}{2K_{m_j}} + \frac{1}{K_{m_j}} \log\left(1 - \frac{a_{m_j}}{K_{m_j}}\right) \\ &\rightarrow \frac{1}{2} (c - 1 - \log(c)) > 0. \end{aligned}$$

However, this contradicts with  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \log(p_n^{-1})/K_n = 0$ . If  $\limsup_{j \rightarrow \infty} K_{n_j} < \infty$ , then there exists a finite  $\bar{K} < \infty$  such that  $K_{n_j} \leq \bar{K}$  for all  $j$ . Thus,  $a_{n_j} = a_{n_j}/K_{n_j} \cdot K_{n_j} \leq \bar{K}$  for all  $j$ , under which we have

$$p_{n_j} = \mathbb{P}(\chi_{K_{n_j}}^2 \leq a_{n_j}) \leq \mathbb{P}(\chi_{K_{n_j}}^2 \leq \bar{K}) \leq \max_{1 \leq K \leq \bar{K}} \mathbb{P}(\chi_K^2 \leq \bar{K}),$$

and

$$\frac{\log(p_{n_j}^{-1})}{K_{n_j}} \geq \frac{\log(p_{n_j}^{-1})}{\bar{K}} \geq \frac{1}{\bar{K}} \log\left\{ \frac{1}{\max_{1 \leq K \leq \bar{K}} \mathbb{P}(\chi_K^2 \leq \bar{K})} \right\} > 0.$$

However, this contradicts with  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \log(p_n^{-1})/K_n = 0$ . From the above, Lemma A24 holds.  $\square$

LEMMA A25. *If  $\log(p_n^{-1})/K_n \rightarrow 0$ , then  $\text{Var}(L_{K_n, a_n}) \rightarrow 1$ .*

PROOF OF LEMMA A25. We prove the lemma by contradiction. Assume  $\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \text{Var}(L_{K_n, a_n}) < 1$ . Then there exist a constant  $c \in [0, 1)$  and a subsequence  $\{n_j : j = 1, 2, \dots\}$  such that  $\text{Var}(L_{K_{n_j}, a_{n_j}}) \leq c$  for all  $j$ . Below we consider several cases, depending on the values of  $\liminf_{j \rightarrow \infty} K_{n_j}$ ,  $\limsup_{j \rightarrow \infty} a_{n_j}/K_{n_j}$  and  $\liminf_{j \rightarrow \infty} (K_{n_j} - a_{n_j})/\sqrt{K_{n_j}}$ .

First, we consider the case in which  $\liminf_{j \rightarrow \infty} K_{n_j} < \infty$ . Then there exist a finite constant  $\bar{K} < \infty$  and a subsequence  $\{m_j : j = 1, 2, \dots\} \subset \{n_j : j = 1, 2, \dots\}$  such that  $K_{m_j} \leq \bar{K}$ . Thus, for any  $j \geq 1$ , we have

$$\min_{1 \leq K \leq \bar{K}} \log\left\{ \frac{1}{\mathbb{P}(\chi_K^2 \leq a_{m_j})} \right\} \leq \log\left\{ \frac{1}{\mathbb{P}(\chi_{K_{m_j}}^2 \leq a_{m_j})} \right\} = \log(p_{m_j}^{-1}) \leq \bar{K} \frac{\log(p_{m_j}^{-1})}{K_{m_j}} \rightarrow 0,$$

which must implies that  $a_{m_j} \rightarrow \infty$  as  $j \rightarrow \infty$ . Consequently, from Lemma A17,

$$1 > c \geq \text{Var}(L_{K_{m_j}, a_{m_j}}) \geq \min_{1 \leq K \leq \bar{K}} \text{Var}(L_{K, a_{m_j}}) = \min_{1 \leq K \leq \bar{K}} \frac{\mathbb{P}(\chi_{K+2}^2 \leq a_{m_j})}{\mathbb{P}(\chi_K^2 \leq a_{m_j})} \rightarrow 1,$$

a contradiction.

Second, we consider the case in which  $\liminf_{j \rightarrow \infty} K_{n_j} = \infty$  and  $\limsup_{j \rightarrow \infty} a_{n_j}/K_{n_j} > 1$ . Then there exist a constant  $\delta > 1$  and a further subsequence  $\{m_j : j = 1, 2, \dots\} \subset \{n_j : j = 1, 2, \dots\}$  such that  $a_{m_j}/K_{m_j} > \delta$  and  $K_{m_j} \geq 3$  for all  $j$ . Note that the function  $x - 1 - \log(x)$  is increasing in  $x \in [1, \infty)$  and takes positive value when  $x > 1$ . From Lemma A19, we then have

$$\begin{aligned} -\frac{2 \log(1-c)}{K_{m_j}} &\geq -\frac{2 \log\{1 - \text{Var}(L_{K_{m_j}, a_{m_j}})\}}{K_{m_j}} \geq \frac{a_{m_j}}{K_{m_j}} - 1 - \log\left(\frac{a_{m_j}}{K_{m_j}}\right) - \frac{2 \log(p_{m_j}^{-1})}{K_{m_j}} + \frac{\log(\pi K_{m_j})}{K_{m_j}} \\ &\geq \delta - 1 - \log \delta - \frac{2 \log(p_{m_j}^{-1})}{K_{m_j}} + \frac{\log(\pi K_{m_j})}{K_{m_j}} \rightarrow \delta - 1 - \log \delta > 0. \end{aligned}$$

However, as  $j \rightarrow \infty$ ,  $K_{m_j} \rightarrow \infty$  and thus  $-2 \log(1-c)/K_{m_j} \rightarrow 0$ , a contradiction.

Third, we consider the case in which  $\liminf_{j \rightarrow \infty} K_{n_j} = \infty$  and  $\liminf_{j \rightarrow \infty} (K_{n_j} - a_{n_j})/\sqrt{K_{n_j}} < \infty$ . Then there exists a finite constant  $\beta$  and a subsequence  $\{m_j : j = 1, 2, \dots\} \subset \{n_j : j = 1, 2, \dots\}$  such that  $(K_{m_j} - a_{m_j})/\sqrt{K_{m_j}} \leq \beta$ . By the central limit theorem,

$$p_{m_j} = \mathbb{P}(\chi_{K_{m_j}}^2 \leq a_{m_j}) = \mathbb{P}\left(\frac{\chi_{K_{m_j}}^2 - K_{m_j}}{\sqrt{2K_{m_j}}} \leq -\frac{K_{m_j} - a_{m_j}}{\sqrt{2K_{m_j}}}\right) \geq \mathbb{P}\left(\frac{\chi_{K_{m_j}}^2 - K_{m_j}}{\sqrt{2K_{m_j}}} \leq -\frac{\beta}{\sqrt{2}}\right) \rightarrow \Phi\left(-\frac{\beta}{\sqrt{2}}\right),$$

which implies that  $\limsup_{j \rightarrow \infty} \log(p_{m_j}^{-1}) < \infty$ . From Lemma A19 and the inequality  $x - 1 - \log(x) \geq 0$  for all  $x > 0$ , we then have

$$\begin{aligned} -\log(1-c) &\geq -\log\{1 - \text{Var}(L_{K_{m_j}, a_{m_j}})\} \geq \frac{K_{m_j}}{2} \left\{ \frac{a_{m_j}}{K_{m_j}} - 1 - \log\left(\frac{a_{m_j}}{K_{m_j}}\right) \right\} - \log(p_{m_j}^{-1}) + \frac{\log(\pi K_{m_j})}{2} \\ &\geq -\log(p_{m_j}^{-1}) + \frac{\log(\pi K_{m_j})}{2} \rightarrow \infty, \end{aligned}$$

a contradiction.

Finally, we consider the case in which  $\liminf_{j \rightarrow \infty} K_{n_j} = \infty$ ,  $\limsup_{j \rightarrow \infty} a_{n_j}/K_{n_j} \leq 1$  and  $\liminf_{j \rightarrow \infty} (K_{n_j} - a_{n_j})/\sqrt{K_{n_j}} = \infty$ . From Lemma A24,  $\liminf_{j \rightarrow \infty} a_{n_j}/K_{n_j} \geq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} a_n/K_n \geq 1$ , which implies that  $a_{n_j}/K_{n_j} \rightarrow 1$  as  $j \rightarrow \infty$ . Moreover, there exists a finite  $\underline{j}$  such that  $a_{n_j} < K_{n_j} - 3$  for all  $j \geq \underline{j}$ . For any  $j \geq \underline{j}$ , define  $\Delta_{n_j} = (K_{n_j} - 2 - a_{n_j})/K_{n_j}$  and  $\zeta_{n_j} = \min\{\Delta_{n_j}^{-1/2}/K_{n_j}, K_{n_j}^{-3/4}\} \in (0, 1)$ . We can then verify that, as  $j \rightarrow \infty$ ,  $\Delta_{n_j} \rightarrow 0$ ,  $\zeta_{n_j} \rightarrow 0$ ,  $K_{n_j} \zeta_{n_j} = \min\{\Delta_{n_j}^{-1/2}, K_{n_j}^{1/4}\} \rightarrow \infty$ , and

$$a_{n_j} \zeta_{n_j}^2 \leq a_{n_j} K_{n_j}^{-3/2} = K_{n_j}^{-1/2} \frac{a_{n_j}}{K_{n_j}} \rightarrow 0, \quad \zeta_j (K_{n_j} - 2 - a_{n_j}) \leq \Delta_{n_j}^{-1/2} \frac{K_{n_j} - 2 - a_{n_j}}{K_{n_j}} = \Delta_{n_j}^{1/2} \rightarrow 0.$$

From Lemma A20, this further implies that, for any  $j \geq \underline{j}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} -\log(1-c) &\geq -\log\{1 - \text{Var}(L_{K_{n_j}, a_{n_j}})\} \geq -\log(2) + \log(K_{n_j} \zeta_{n_j}) - \frac{a_{n_j} \zeta_{n_j}^2 + \zeta_{n_j} (K_{n_j} - 2 - a_{n_j})}{2(1 - \zeta_{n_j})} \\ &\rightarrow \infty, \end{aligned}$$

a contradiction.

From the above, Lemma A25 holds.  $\square$

A5.6. *Proof of Theorem 4 and an additional proposition .*

**Proof of Theorem 4.** (i) is a direct consequence of Lemma A21. (ii) is a direct consequence of Lemma A22. (iii) is a direct consequence of Lemma A23. (iv) is a direct consequence of Lemma A25.  $\square$

The following proposition establishes the equivalence between convergence in probability and convergence of variance for the constrained Gaussian random variable discussed in Section 5.1.

PROPOSITION A2. As  $n \rightarrow \infty$ ,  $L_{K_n, a_n} \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} 0$  if and only if  $\text{Var}(L_{K_n, a_n}) \rightarrow 0$ .

PROOF OF PROPOSITION A2. The “if” is a direct consequence of Chebyshev’s inequality. Below we focus on the “only if” direction. Suppose that  $L_{K_n, a_n} \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} 0$ . Note that when  $a_n = \infty$ ,  $L_{K_n, a_n} \sim \varepsilon$ , a standard Gaussian random variable. From Lemma A17, for all  $n \geq 1$ ,  $\mathbb{E}(L_{K_n, a_n}^2) = \text{Var}(L_{K_n, a_n}) \leq \text{Var}(L_{K_n, \infty}) = \text{Var}(\varepsilon) = 1$ . From Durrett (2019, Theorem 4.6.3), to prove that  $\text{Var}(L_{K_n, a_n}) = \mathbb{E}(L_{K_n, a_n}^2) \rightarrow 0$ , it suffices to show that  $\{L_{K_n, a_n}^2 : n \geq 1\}$  is uniformly integrable. From Li, Ding and Rubin (2018, Lemma A5),  $|L_{K_n, a_n}|$  is stochastically smaller than or equal to  $|\varepsilon|$ . Because  $x\mathbb{1}(x > c)$  is a nondecreasing function of  $x \in [0, \infty)$  for any given  $c > 0$ , by the property of stochastic ordering, we have  $\mathbb{E}\{L_{K_n, a_n}^2 \mathbb{1}(L_{K_n, a_n}^2 > c)\} \leq \mathbb{E}\{\varepsilon^2 \mathbb{1}(\varepsilon^2 > c)\}$ . By the dominated convergence theorem, this further implies that

$$\lim_{c \rightarrow \infty} \left( \sup_{n \geq 1} \mathbb{E}\{L_{K_n, a_n}^2 \mathbb{1}(L_{K_n, a_n}^2 > c)\} \right) \leq \lim_{c \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}\{\varepsilon^2 \mathbb{1}(\varepsilon^2 > c)\} = 0,$$

i.e.,  $\{L_{K_n, a_n}^2 : n \geq 1\}$  is uniformly integrable. From the above, Proposition A2 holds.  $\square$

**A6. Asymptotics for Optimal Rerandomization.**

LEMMA A26. For any two random variables  $\psi$  and  $\tilde{\psi}$ , and any constant  $\delta > 0$ ,

$$\sup_{c \in \mathbb{R}} |\mathbb{P}(\tilde{\psi} \leq c) - \mathbb{P}(\psi \leq c)| \leq \mathbb{P}(|\tilde{\psi} - \psi| > \delta) + \sup_{b \in \mathbb{R}} \mathbb{P}(b < \psi \leq b + \delta)$$

PROOF OF LEMMA A26. For any  $c \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $\delta > 0$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\psi \leq c) &= \mathbb{P}(\psi \leq c - \delta) + \mathbb{P}(c - \delta < \psi \leq c) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}(\psi \leq c - \delta, |\tilde{\psi} - \psi| \leq \delta) + \mathbb{P}(|\tilde{\psi} - \psi| > \delta) + \mathbb{P}(c - \delta < \psi \leq c) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}(\tilde{\psi} \leq c) + \mathbb{P}(|\tilde{\psi} - \psi| > \delta) + \mathbb{P}(c - \delta < \psi \leq c) \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\psi \leq c) &= \mathbb{P}(\psi \leq c + \delta) - \mathbb{P}(c < \psi \leq c + \delta) \geq \mathbb{P}(\psi \leq c + \delta, |\tilde{\psi} - \psi| \leq \delta) - \mathbb{P}(c < \psi \leq c + \delta) \\ &\geq \mathbb{P}(\tilde{\psi} \leq c, |\tilde{\psi} - \psi| \leq \delta) - \mathbb{P}(c < \psi \leq c + \delta) \\ &\geq \mathbb{P}(\tilde{\psi} \leq c) - \mathbb{P}(|\tilde{\psi} - \psi| > \delta) - \mathbb{P}(c < \psi \leq c + \delta). \end{aligned}$$

These imply that

$$|\mathbb{P}(\tilde{\psi} \leq c) - \mathbb{P}(\psi \leq c)| \leq \mathbb{P}(|\tilde{\psi} - \psi| > \delta) + \sup_{b \in \mathbb{R}} \mathbb{P}(b < \psi \leq b + \delta).$$

Taking supremum over  $c$ , we then derive Lemma A26.  $\square$

LEMMA A27. Let  $\{\psi_n\}$  and  $\{\tilde{\psi}_n\}$  be two sequence of random variables satisfying that  $\psi_n = \beta_n \varepsilon_0 + \zeta_n$  and  $\psi_n - \tilde{\psi}_n = o_{\mathbb{P}}(\beta_n)$ , where  $\{\beta_n\}$  is a sequence of positive constants,  $\{\zeta_n\}$  is a sequence of random variables independent of  $\varepsilon_0$ , and  $\varepsilon_0$  is a random variable with bounded density. Then we have, as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ ,  $\sup_{c \in \mathbb{R}} |\mathbb{P}(\tilde{\psi}_n \leq c) - \mathbb{P}(\psi_n \leq c)| \rightarrow 0$ .

PROOF OF LEMMA A27. For any constant  $\eta > 0$ , using Lemma A26 with  $\delta = \beta_n \eta$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{c \in \mathbb{R}} |\mathbb{P}(\tilde{\psi}_n \leq c) - \mathbb{P}(\psi_n \leq c)| &\leq \mathbb{P}(|\tilde{\psi}_n - \psi_n| > \beta_n \eta) + \sup_{b \in \mathbb{R}} \mathbb{P}(b < \psi_n \leq b + \beta_n \eta) \\ (A6.20) \qquad \qquad \qquad &= \mathbb{P}(|\tilde{\psi}_n - \psi_n|/\beta_n > \eta) + \sup_{b \in \mathbb{R}} \mathbb{P}(b < \psi_n/\beta_n \leq b + \eta). \end{aligned}$$

Below we consider the two terms in (A6.20), separately. First, by the fact that  $\psi_n - \tilde{\psi}_n = o_{\mathbb{P}}(\beta_n)$ , the first term in (A6.20) satisfies that  $\mathbb{P}(|\tilde{\psi}_n - \psi_n|/\beta_n > \eta) \rightarrow 0$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . Second, let  $C$  be the upper bound of the density of  $\varepsilon_0$ . For any  $b \in \mathbb{R}$ , we then have,

$$\mathbb{P}(b < \psi_n/\beta_n \leq b + \eta \mid \zeta_n) = \mathbb{P}(b - \zeta_n/\beta_n < \varepsilon_0 \leq b - \zeta_n/\beta_n + \eta \mid \zeta_n) \leq C\eta,$$

and thus, by the law of iterated expectation,

$$\mathbb{P}(b < \psi_n/\beta_n \leq b + \eta) = \mathbb{E}\{\mathbb{P}(b < \psi_n/\beta_n \leq b + \eta \mid \zeta_n)\} \leq C\eta.$$

Consequently, we have  $\sup_{b \in \mathbb{R}} \mathbb{P}(b < \psi_n/\beta_n \leq b + \eta) \leq C\eta$ .

From the above, for any constant  $\eta > 0$ ,

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{c \in \mathbb{R}} |\mathbb{P}(\tilde{\psi}_n \leq c) - \mathbb{P}(\psi_n \leq c)| \leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}(|\tilde{\psi}_n - \psi_n|/\beta_n > \eta) + C\eta \leq C\eta.$$

Because the above inequality holds for any  $\eta > 0$ , we must have  $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{c \in \mathbb{R}} |\mathbb{P}(\tilde{\psi}_n \leq c) - \mathbb{P}(\psi_n \leq c)| = 0$ . Therefore, Lemma A27 holds.  $\square$

**Proof of Theorem 5.** From Theorem 4(i) and Proposition A2, under Condition 3, we must have  $L_{K_n, a_n} = o_{\mathbb{P}}(1)$ . From Condition 4, we can know that for sufficiently large  $n$ ,  $1 - R_n^2$  is greater than certain positive constant, and  $\sqrt{R_n^2} L_{K_n, a_n} = o_{\mathbb{P}}(\sqrt{1 - R_n^2})$ . Using Lemma A27 with  $\psi_n = \sqrt{1 - R_n^2} \varepsilon_0$  and  $\tilde{\psi}_n = \sqrt{1 - R_n^2} \varepsilon_0 + \sqrt{R_n^2} L_{K_n, a_n}$ , we then have

$$\sup_{c \in \mathbb{R}} \left| \mathbb{P}\left(\sqrt{1 - R_n^2} \varepsilon_0 \leq c\right) - \mathbb{P}\left\{\left(\sqrt{1 - R_n^2} \varepsilon_0 + \sqrt{R_n^2} L_{K_n, a_n}\right) \leq c\right\} \right| \rightarrow 0.$$

From Theorem 3, as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} &\sup_{c \in \mathbb{R}} \left| \mathbb{P}\left\{V_{\tau\tau}^{-1/2}(\hat{\tau} - \tau) \leq c \mid M \leq a_n\right\} - \mathbb{P}\left\{\sqrt{1 - R_n^2} \varepsilon_0 \leq c\right\} \right| \\ &\leq \sup_{c \in \mathbb{R}} \left| \mathbb{P}\left\{V_{\tau\tau}^{-1/2}(\hat{\tau} - \tau) \leq c \mid M \leq a_n\right\} - \mathbb{P}\left\{\left(\sqrt{1 - R_n^2} \varepsilon_0 + \sqrt{R_n^2} L_{K_n, a_n}\right) \leq c\right\} \right| \\ &+ \sup_{c \in \mathbb{R}} \left| \mathbb{P}\left\{\sqrt{1 - R_n^2} \varepsilon_0 \leq c\right\} - \mathbb{P}\left\{\left(\sqrt{1 - R_n^2} \varepsilon_0 + \sqrt{R_n^2} L_{K_n, a_n}\right) \leq c\right\} \right| \\ &\rightarrow 0. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, Theorem 5 holds.  $\square$

**Proof of Theorem 6.** Note that Condition 2 is that  $p_n/\Delta_n \rightarrow \infty$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , and Condition 3 is that  $\log(p_n^{-1})/K_n \rightarrow \infty$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . Below we prove Theorem 6(i)–(iv) respectively.

First, we prove (i). Consider first the “only if” part. If both Conditions 2 and 3 hold for some sequence  $\{p_n\}$ , then we must have, for sufficiently large  $n$ ,  $\log(\Delta_n^{-1})/K_n = \log(p_n^{-1})/K_n + \log(p_n/\Delta_n)/K_n \geq \log(p_n^{-1})/K_n$ , which must imply that  $\log(\Delta_n^{-1})/K_n \rightarrow \infty$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . Consider then the “if” part. Because  $\log(\Delta_n^{-1})/K_n \rightarrow \infty$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , we can construct a sequence  $\{p_n\}$  such that, as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ ,  $\Delta_n/p_n \rightarrow 0$ , and  $\log(\Delta_n/p_n)/K_n + \log(\Delta_n^{-1})/K_n \rightarrow \infty$ . For such a choice of  $\{p_n\}$ , Condition 2 holds obviously, and  $\log(p_n^{-1})/K_n = \log(\Delta_n/p_n)/K_n + \log(\Delta_n^{-1})/K_n \rightarrow \infty$ , i.e., Condition 3 holds.

Second, we prove (ii). For any sequence  $\{p_n\}$  such that Condition 2 holds, we have

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log(p_n^{-1})}{K_n} \leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log(\Delta_n/p_n)}{K_n} + \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log(\Delta_n^{-1})}{K_n} \leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log(\Delta_n^{-1})}{K_n} < \infty.$$

From Theorem 4(ii), this further implies that  $\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} v_{K_n, a_n} > 0$ .

Third, we prove (iii). Because Condition 1 holds, from Theorem 1, we can construct a sequence  $\{p_n\}$  such that  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} p_n/\Delta_n = \infty$  and  $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \log(p_n/\Delta_n)/\log(\Delta_n^{-1}) < 1 - c$  for some  $c > 0$ . This then implies that

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log(p_n^{-1})}{K_n} = \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left[ \frac{\log(\Delta_n^{-1})}{K_n} \{1 - \log(p_n/\Delta_n)/\log(\Delta_n^{-1})\} \right] \geq c \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log(\Delta_n^{-1})}{K_n} > 0.$$

From Theorem 4(iii), we then have  $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} v_{K_n, a_n} < 1$ .

Fourth, we prove (iv). For any sequence  $\{p_n\}$  such that Condition 2 holds, we have

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log(p_n^{-1})}{K_n} \leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log(\Delta_n/p_n)}{K_n} + \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log(\Delta_n^{-1})}{K_n} \leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log(\Delta_n^{-1})}{K_n} = 0.$$

From Theorem 4(iv), this further implies that  $v_{K_n, a_n} \rightarrow 0$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ .  $\square$

## A7. Asymptotic Validity of Confidence Intervals.

A7.1. *Technical lemmas.* For descriptive convenience, throughout this section, we define  $a/b$  as  $+\infty$  when  $a > 0$  and  $b = 0$ .

LEMMA A28. *Let  $\{u_i \in \mathbb{R} : i = 1, 2, \dots, n\}$  be a finite population of  $N > 0$  units, with  $\bar{u} = N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N u_i$  and  $\sigma_u^2 = N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N (u_i - \bar{u})^2$ . Let  $(Z_1, \dots, Z_N)$  denote a sampling indicator vector for a simple random sample of size  $m > 0$ , and  $\hat{u} = m^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N Z_i u_i$  denote the corresponding sample average. Define  $f = m/N$ . Then for any  $t > 0$ ,*

$$\mathbb{P}(|\hat{u} - \bar{u}| \geq t) \leq 2 \exp\left(-\frac{70^2 N f^2 t^2}{71^2 \sigma_u^2}\right).$$

LEMMA A29. *Let  $\{(u_i, w_i) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : i = 1, 2, \dots, N\}$  be a finite population of  $N \geq 2$  units, with finite population averages and covariance  $\bar{u} \equiv N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N u_i$ ,  $\bar{w} = N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N w_i$  and  $S_{uw} = (N-1)^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N (u_i - \bar{u})(w_i - \bar{w})$ . Let  $(Z_1, \dots, Z_N)$  denote a sampling indicator vector for a simple random sample of size  $m \geq 2$ , with corresponding sample averages and covariance  $\hat{u} = m^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N Z_i u_i$ ,  $\hat{w} = m^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N Z_i w_i$  and  $s_{uw} = (m-1)^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N Z_i (u_i - \hat{u})(w_i - \hat{w})$ . Define  $f = m/N$ ,*

$$\Delta_u = \hat{u} - \bar{u}, \quad \Delta_w = \hat{w} - \bar{w}, \quad \Delta_{uw} = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^N Z_i (u_i - \bar{u})(w_i - \bar{w}) - \frac{N-1}{N} S_{uw},$$

and

$$\sigma_u^2 = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N (u_i - \bar{u})^2, \quad \sigma_w^2 = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N (w_i - \bar{w})^2, \quad \sigma_{u \times w}^2 = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \left\{ (u_i - \bar{u})(w_i - \bar{w}) - \frac{N-1}{N} S_{uw} \right\}^2.$$

Then  $|s_{uw} - S_{uw}| \leq 2|\Delta_{u \times w}| + 2|\Delta_u||\Delta_w| + 2(1-f)|S_{uw}|/m$ , and for any  $t > 0$ ,

$$\mathbb{P}(|\Delta_u| \geq t) \leq 2 \exp\left(-\frac{70^2 N f^2 t^2}{71^2 \sigma_u^2}\right), \quad \mathbb{P}(|\Delta_w| \geq t) \leq 2 \exp\left(-\frac{70^2 N f^2 t^2}{71^2 \sigma_w^2}\right),$$

$$\mathbb{P}(|\Delta_{u \times w}| \geq t) \leq 2 \exp\left(-\frac{70^2 N f^2 t^2}{71^2 \sigma_{u \times w}^2}\right).$$

LEMMA A30. Let  $\{(u_i, \mathbf{w}_i^\top) \in \mathbb{R}^{1+K} : i = 1, 2, \dots, N\}$  be a finite population of  $N \geq 2$  units, with  $\mathbf{w}_i = (w_{1i}, w_{2i}, \dots, w_{Ki})^\top$  and finite population averages and covariance  $\bar{u} \equiv N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N u_i$ ,  $\bar{\mathbf{w}} = (\bar{w}_1, \dots, \bar{w}_K)^\top = N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{w}_i$  and  $\mathbf{S}_{uw} = (S_{uw_1}, \dots, S_{uw_K}) = (N-1)^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N (u_i - \bar{u})(\mathbf{w}_i - \bar{\mathbf{w}})^\top$ . Let  $(Z_1, \dots, Z_N)$  denote a sampling indicator vector for a simple random sample of size  $m \geq 2$ , with corresponding sample averages and covariance  $\hat{u} = m^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N Z_i u_i$ ,  $\hat{\mathbf{w}} = m^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N Z_i \mathbf{w}_i$  and  $\mathbf{s}_{uw} = (s_{uw_1}, \dots, s_{uw_K}) = (m-1)^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N Z_i (u_i - \hat{u})(\mathbf{w}_i - \hat{\mathbf{w}})^\top$ . Let  $f = m/N$ , and for  $1 \leq k \leq K$ , define

$$\Delta_u = \hat{u} - \bar{u}, \quad \Delta_{w_k} = \hat{w}_k - \bar{w}_k, \quad \Delta_{uw_k} = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^N Z_i (u_i - \bar{u})(w_{ki} - \bar{w}_k) - \frac{N-1}{N} S_{uw_k},$$

and

$$\sigma_u^2 = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N (u_i - \bar{u})^2, \quad \sigma_{w_k}^2 = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N (w_{ki} - \bar{w}_k)^2, \quad \sigma_{u \times w_k}^2 = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \left\{ (u_i - \bar{u})(w_{ki} - \bar{w}_k) - \frac{N-1}{N} S_{uw_k} \right\}^2.$$

Then

$$\|\mathbf{s}_{uw} - \mathbf{S}_{uw}\|_2^2 \leq 12 \sum_{k=1}^K \Delta_{u \times w_k}^2 + 12 \Delta_u^2 \sum_{k=1}^K \Delta_{w_k}^2 + \frac{12(1-f)^2}{m^2} \sum_{k=1}^K S_{uw_k}^2,$$

and for any  $t > 0$ ,

$$\mathbb{P}(\Delta_u^2 \geq t) \leq 2 \exp\left(-\frac{70^2 N f^2 t}{71^2 \sigma_u^2}\right), \quad \mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{k=1}^K \Delta_{w_k}^2 \geq t\right) \leq 2K \exp\left(-\frac{70^2 N f^2 t}{71^2 \sum_{k=1}^K \sigma_{w_k}^2}\right),$$

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{k=1}^K \Delta_{u \times w_k}^2 \geq t\right) \leq 2K \exp\left(-\frac{70^2 N f^2 t}{71^2 \sum_{k=1}^K \sigma_{u \times w_k}^2}\right).$$

LEMMA A31. Consider the same setting as in Lemma A30 and any event  $\mathbf{Z} \in \mathcal{E} \subset \{0, 1\}^N$  with positive probability  $p = \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{Z} \in \mathcal{E})$ . Define

$$\xi = \frac{\max\{1, \log K, -\log p\}}{N f^2} \sum_{k=1}^K \sigma_{u \times w_k}^2 + \frac{\max\{1, -\log p\} \cdot \max\{1, \log K, -\log p\}}{N^2 f^4} \sigma_u^2 \sum_{k=1}^K \sigma_{w_k}^2$$

$$+ \frac{(1-f)^2}{N^2 f^2} \sum_{k=1}^K S_{uw_k}^2.$$

Then for any  $t \geq 3 \cdot 71^2 / 70^2$ ,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\|\mathbf{s}_{uw} - \mathbf{S}_{uw}\|_2^2 > 36t^2 \xi \mid \mathbf{Z} \in \mathcal{E}\right) \leq 6 \exp\left(-\frac{1}{3} \frac{70^2}{71^2} t\right).$$

LEMMA A32. Under ReM with threshold  $a_n$ , along the sequence of finite populations with increasing sample size  $n$ , if  $\min\{n_1, n_0\} \geq 2$  when  $n$  is sufficiently large, then the estimators  $\hat{V}_{\tau\tau}$  and  $\hat{R}^2$  satisfy that

$$\hat{V}_{\tau\tau} - V_{\tau\tau} - n^{-1}S_{\tau \setminus \mathbf{X}}^2 = O_{\mathbb{P}} \left( \frac{\xi_{11}^{1/2}}{n_1} + \frac{\xi_{00}^{1/2}}{n_0} + \frac{\xi_{1\mathbf{w}} + \xi_{0\mathbf{w}}}{n} + \|S_{1\mathbf{w}} - S_{0\mathbf{w}}\|_2 \frac{\xi_{1\mathbf{w}}^{1/2} + \xi_{0\mathbf{w}}^{1/2}}{n} \right),$$

and

$$\hat{V}_{\tau\tau} \hat{R}_n^2 - V_{\tau\tau} R_n^2 = O_{\mathbb{P}} \left( \frac{\xi_{1\mathbf{w}}}{n_1} + \frac{\xi_{0\mathbf{w}}}{n_0} + \|S_{1\mathbf{w}}\|_2 \frac{\xi_{1\mathbf{w}}^{1/2}}{n_1} + \|S_{0\mathbf{w}}\|_2 \frac{\xi_{0\mathbf{w}}^{1/2}}{n_1} + \|S_{1\mathbf{w}} - S_{0\mathbf{w}}\|_2 \frac{\xi_{1\mathbf{w}}^{1/2} + \xi_{0\mathbf{w}}^{1/2}}{n} \right),$$

where  $\mathbf{w}_i = (w_{1i}, \dots, w_{K_n i})^\top = \mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{X}}^{-1}(\mathbf{X}_i - \bar{\mathbf{X}})$  is the standardized covariates,  $S_{z\mathbf{w}} = (S_{zw_1}, \dots, S_{zw_{K_n}})$  is the finite population covariance between  $Y(z)$  and  $\mathbf{w}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \xi_{zz} &= \frac{\max\{1, -\log \tilde{p}_n\}}{nr_z^2} \sigma_{z \times z}^2 + \frac{\max\{1, (-\log \tilde{p}_n)^2\}}{n^2 r_z^4} \sigma_z^4 + \frac{(1-r_z)^2}{n^2 r_z^2} S_z^4, \\ \xi_{z\mathbf{w}} &= \frac{\max\{1, \log K_n, -\log \tilde{p}_n\}}{nr_z^2} \sum_{k=1}^K \sigma_{z \times w_k}^2 + \frac{\max\{1, -\log \tilde{p}_n\} \cdot \max\{1, \log K_n, -\log \tilde{p}_n\}}{n^2 r_z^4} \sigma_u^2 \sum_{k=1}^{K_n} \sigma_{w_k}^2 \\ &\quad + \frac{(1-r_z)^2}{n^2 r_z^2} \sum_{k=1}^{K_n} S_{zw_k}^2, \end{aligned}$$

$\tilde{p}_n = \mathbb{P}(M \leq a_n)$  is the actual acceptance probability under ReM, and

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_z^2 &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \{Y_i(z) - \bar{Y}(z)\}^2 = \frac{n-1}{n} S_z^2, \quad \sigma_{w_k}^2 = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (w_{ki} - \bar{w}_k)^2 = \frac{n-1}{n}, \\ \sigma_{z \times z}^2 &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left[ \{Y_i(z) - \bar{Y}(z)\}^2 - \sigma_z^2 \right]^2, \quad \sigma_{z \times w_k}^2 = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left[ \{Y_i(z) - \bar{Y}(z)\} (w_{ki} - \bar{w}_k) - \frac{n-1}{n} S_{zw_k} \right]^2. \end{aligned}$$

LEMMA A33. Under the same setting as Lemma A32, if  $\max\{1, \log K_n, -\log \tilde{p}_n\} = O(nr_1^2 r_0^2)$ , then

$$\begin{aligned} &\max \left\{ |\hat{V}_{\tau\tau} - V_{\tau\tau} - n^{-1}S_{\tau \setminus \mathbf{X}}^2|, |\hat{V}_{\tau\tau} \hat{R}_n^2 - V_{\tau\tau} R_n^2| \right\} \\ &= \max_{z \in \{0,1\}} \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \{Y_i(z) - \bar{Y}(z)\}^2 \cdot O_{\mathbb{P}} \left( \max\{K_n, 1\} \cdot \frac{\sqrt{\max\{1, \log K_n, -\log \tilde{p}_n\}}}{n^{3/2} r_1^2 r_0^2} \right). \end{aligned}$$

LEMMA A34. Under the same setting as Lemmas A32 and A33,

- (i) if Condition 2 holds, then  $\max\{1, -\log \tilde{p}_n\} = O(\max\{1, -\log p_n\})$ , recalling that  $\tilde{p}_n = \mathbb{P}(M \leq a_n)$  is the actually acceptance probability under ReM, while  $p_n = \mathbb{P}(\chi_{K_n}^2 \leq a_n)$  is the approximate acceptance probability;
- (ii)  $\max_{z \in \{0,1\}} \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \{Y_i(z) - \bar{Y}(z)\}^2 / (r_0 S_{1 \setminus \mathbf{X}}^2 + r_1 S_{0 \setminus \mathbf{X}}^2) \geq 1/2$ ;
- (iii) if Conditions 2 and 5 hold, then,  $\max\{1, \log K_n, -\log \tilde{p}_n\} = o(nr_1^2 r_0^2)$ .

A7.2. Proofs of the lemmas.

PROOF OF LEMMA A28. When  $\sigma_u^2 = 0$ ,  $u_1 = \dots = u_N = \bar{u}$ , and thus  $\hat{u} - \bar{u}$  must be a constant zero, under which Lemma A28 holds obviously. Below we consider only the case where  $\sigma_u^2 > 0$ . From Bloniarz et al. (2016, Lemma S1), for any  $t > 0$ ,

$$\mathbb{P}(|\hat{u} - \bar{u}| \geq t) = \mathbb{P}(\hat{u} - \bar{u} \geq t) + \mathbb{P}\{(-\hat{u}) - (-\bar{u}) \geq t\} \leq 2 \exp\left(-\frac{f m t^2}{(1+c)^2 \sigma_u^2}\right),$$

where  $c \equiv \min\{1/70, (3f)^2/70, (3-3f)^2/70\} \leq 1/70$ . This then implies that for any  $t > 0$ ,

$$\mathbb{P}(|\hat{u} - \bar{u}| \geq t) \leq 2 \exp\left(-\frac{f m t^2}{(1+c)^2 \sigma_u^2}\right) \leq 2 \exp\left(-\frac{70^2 N f^2 t^2}{71^2 \sigma_u^2}\right),$$

i.e., Lemma A28 holds.  $\square$

PROOF OF LEMMA A29. First, by definition, the sample covariance between  $u$  and  $w$  has the following equivalent forms:

$$\begin{aligned} s_{uw} &= \frac{1}{m-1} \sum_{i=1}^N Z_i(u_i - \hat{u})(w_i - \hat{w}) = \frac{m}{m-1} \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^N Z_i(u_i - \bar{u})(w_i - \bar{w}) - \frac{m}{m-1} (\hat{u} - \bar{u})(\hat{w} - \bar{w}) \\ &= \frac{m}{m-1} \left\{ \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^N Z_i(u_i - \bar{u})(w_i - \bar{w}) - \frac{N-1}{N} S_{uw} \right\} - \frac{m}{m-1} (\hat{u} - \bar{u})(\hat{w} - \bar{w}) + \frac{m(N-1)}{(m-1)N} S_{uw}. \end{aligned}$$

Consequently, we can bound the difference between  $s_{uw}$  and  $S_{uw}$  by

$$\begin{aligned} &|s_{uw} - S_{uw}| \\ &= \left| \frac{m}{m-1} \left\{ \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^N Z_i(u_i - \bar{u})(w_i - \bar{w}) - \frac{N-1}{N} S_{uw} \right\} - \frac{m}{m-1} (\hat{u} - \bar{u})(\hat{w} - \bar{w}) + \frac{1-f}{m-1} S_{uw} \right| \\ &\leq 2 |\Delta_{u \times w}| + 2 |\Delta_u| |\Delta_w| + \frac{2(1-f)}{m} |S_{uw}|, \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality holds because  $m/(m-1) \leq 2$ .

Second, applying Lemma A28 to the finite populations of  $\{u_i\}_{i=1}^n$ ,  $\{w_i\}_{i=1}^n$  and  $\{(u_i - \bar{u})(w_i - \bar{w})\}_{i=1}^n$ , we can immediately derive the probability bounds for  $\Delta_u$ ,  $\Delta_w$  and  $\Delta_{u \times w}$ .

From the above, Lemma A29 holds.  $\square$

PROOF OF LEMMA A30. First, we consider the bound for  $\|s_{uw} - S_{uw}\|_2^2$ . From Lemma A29 and the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} \|s_{uw} - S_{uw}\|_2^2 &= \sum_{k=1}^K (s_{uw_k} - S_{uw_k})^2 \leq 4 \sum_{k=1}^K (|\Delta_{u \times w_k}| + |\Delta_u| |\Delta_{w_k}| + (1-f) |S_{uw_k}|/m)^2 \\ &\leq 12 \sum_{k=1}^K (\Delta_{u \times w_k}^2 + \Delta_u^2 \Delta_{w_k}^2 + (1-f)^2 S_{uw_k}^2/m^2) \\ &= 12 \sum_{k=1}^K \Delta_{u \times w_k}^2 + 12 \Delta_u^2 \sum_{k=1}^K \Delta_{w_k}^2 + \frac{12(1-f)^2}{m^2} \sum_{k=1}^K S_{uw_k}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Second, the probability bound for  $\Delta_u^2$  follows immediately from Lemma A29.

Third, we consider the probability bound for  $\sum_{k=1}^K \Delta_{w_k}^2$ . We consider two cases separately, depending on whether  $\sum_{j=1}^K \sigma_{w_j}^2$  is positive. When  $\sum_{j=1}^K \sigma_{w_j}^2 > 0$ , we introduce



$a_k = \sigma_{w_k}^2 / \sum_{j=1}^K \sigma_{w_j}^2$  for  $1 \leq k \leq K$ . Obviously,  $a_k \geq 0$  for all  $k$  and  $\sum_{k=1}^K a_k = 1$ . Note that if  $a_k = 0$  for some  $1 \leq k \leq K$ , then it follows from Lemma A28 that the corresponding  $\Delta_{w_k}$  is a constant zero. With this in mind, from Lemma A29, we have that for any  $t > 0$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P} \left( \sum_{k=1}^K \Delta_{w_k}^2 \geq t \right) &= \mathbb{P} \left( \sum_{k:a_k>0} \Delta_{w_k}^2 \geq \sum_{k:a_k>0} a_k t \right) \leq \sum_{k:a_k>0} \mathbb{P} (\Delta_{w_k}^2 \geq a_k t) \leq 2 \sum_{k:a_k>0} \exp \left( -\frac{70^2 N f^2 a_k t}{71^2 \sigma_{w_k}^2} \right) \\ &= 2 \sum_{k:a_k>0} \exp \left( -\frac{70^2 N f^2 t}{71^2 \sum_{j=1}^K \sigma_{w_j}^2} \right) \leq 2K \exp \left( -\frac{70^2 N f^2 t}{71^2 \sum_{k=1}^K \sigma_{w_k}^2} \right). \end{aligned}$$

When  $\sum_{j=1}^K \sigma_{w_j}^2 = 0$ ,  $\sum_{k=1}^K \Delta_{w_k}^2$  is a constant zero, under which the above probability bound holds obviously.

Fourth, we consider the probability bound for  $\sum_{k=1}^K \Delta_{u \times w_k}^2$ . By the same logic as the proof above for the probability bound of  $\sum_{k=1}^K \Delta_{w_k}^2$ , we can derive that, for any  $t > 0$ ,

$$\mathbb{P} \left( \sum_{k=1}^K \Delta_{u \times w_k}^2 \geq t \right) \leq 2K \exp \left( -\frac{70^2 N f^2 t}{71^2 \sum_{k=1}^K \sigma_{u \times w_k}^2} \right).$$

From the above, Lemma A30 holds.  $\square$

PROOF OF LEMMA A31. From Lemma A30, we have that for any  $t > 0$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{P} \left( \|s_{uw} - S_{uw}\|_2^2 > 36t^2 \xi \mid \mathbf{Z} \in \mathcal{E} \right) \\ &\leq \frac{\mathbb{P} \left( \|s_{uw} - S_{uw}\|_2^2 > 36t^2 \xi \right)}{\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{Z} \in \mathcal{E})} \leq \frac{1}{p} \mathbb{P} \left( 12 \sum_{k=1}^K \Delta_{u \times w_k}^2 + 12 \Delta_u^2 \sum_{k=1}^K \Delta_{w_k}^2 + \frac{12(1-f)^2}{N^2 f^2} \sum_{k=1}^K S_{uw_k}^2 > 36t^2 \xi \right) \\ (A7.21) \quad &\leq \frac{1}{p} \mathbb{P} \left( \sum_{k=1}^K \Delta_{u \times w_k}^2 > t^2 \xi \right) + \frac{1}{p} \mathbb{P} \left( \Delta_u^2 \sum_{k=1}^K \Delta_{w_k}^2 > t^2 \xi \right) + \frac{1}{p} \mathbb{P} \left( \frac{(1-f)^2}{N^2 f^2} \sum_{k=1}^K S_{uw_k}^2 > t^2 \xi \right). \end{aligned}$$

Below we consider the three terms in (A7.21) separately.

First, we prove that, for any  $t^2 \geq 3 \cdot 71^2 / 70^2$ ,

$$(A7.22) \quad \frac{1}{p} \mathbb{P} \left( \sum_{k=1}^K \Delta_{u \times w_k}^2 > t^2 \xi \right) \leq 2 \exp \left( -\frac{1}{3} \frac{70^2}{71^2} t^2 \right).$$

Note that if  $\sum_{k=1}^K \sigma_{u \times w_k}^2 = 0$ , then  $\sum_{k=1}^K \Delta_{u \times w_k}^2$  is a constant zero and the above inequality holds obviously. Below we consider only the case where  $\sum_{k=1}^K \sigma_{u \times w_k}^2 > 0$ . By definition, for any  $t^2 \geq 3 \cdot 71^2 / 70^2$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{70^2 N f^2 t^2 \xi}{71^2 \sum_{k=1}^K \sigma_{u \times w_k}^2} - \log K + \log p &\geq \frac{70^2}{71^2} t^2 \max\{1, \log K, -\log p\} - \log K + \log p \\ &\geq \frac{70^2}{71^2} t^2 \frac{1 + \log K - \log p}{3} - \log K + \log p \\ &\geq \frac{1}{3} \frac{70^2}{71^2} t^2. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, from Lemma A30, for any  $t^2 \geq 3 \cdot 71^2/70^2$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{p} \mathbb{P} \left( \sum_{k=1}^K \Delta_{u \times w_k}^2 > t^2 \xi \right) &\leq 2 \frac{K}{p} \exp \left( -\frac{70^2}{71^2} \frac{N f^2 t^2 \xi}{\sum_{k=1}^K \sigma_{u \times w_k}^2} \right) = 2 \exp \left( -\frac{70^2}{71^2} \frac{N f^2 t^2 \xi}{\sum_{k=1}^K \sigma_{u \times w_k}^2} + \log K - \log p \right) \\ &\leq 2 \exp \left( -\frac{1}{3} \frac{70^2}{71^2} t^2 \right). \end{aligned}$$

Second, we prove that, for any  $t \geq 3 \cdot 71^2/70^2$ ,

$$(A7.23) \quad \frac{1}{p} \mathbb{P} \left( \Delta_u^2 \sum_{k=1}^K \Delta_{w_k}^2 > t^2 \xi \right) \leq 4 \exp \left( -\frac{1}{3} \frac{70^2}{71^2} t \right).$$

Note that if  $\sigma_u^2 = 0$  or  $\sum_{k=1}^K \sigma_{w_k}^2 = 0$ , then  $\Delta_u^2 \sum_{k=1}^K \Delta_{w_k}^2$  is a constant zero and the above inequality holds obviously. Below we consider only the case where both  $\sigma_u^2$  and  $\sum_{k=1}^K \sigma_{w_k}^2$  are positive. By definition, for any  $t > 0$ ,

$$t^2 \xi \geq t \frac{\max\{1, -\log p\}}{N f^2} \sigma_u^2 \cdot t \frac{\max\{1, \log K, -\log p\}}{N f^2} \sum_{k=1}^K \sigma_{w_k}^2.$$

From Lemma A30, this implies that, for any  $t > 0$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} (A7.24) \quad &\frac{1}{p} \mathbb{P} \left( \Delta_u^2 \sum_{k=1}^K \Delta_{w_k}^2 > t^2 \xi \right) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{p} \mathbb{P} \left( \Delta_u^2 > t \frac{\max\{1, -\log p\}}{N f^2} \sigma_u^2 \right) + \frac{1}{p} \mathbb{P} \left( \sum_{k=1}^K \Delta_{w_k}^2 > t \frac{\max\{1, \log K, -\log p\}}{N f^2} \sum_{k=1}^K \sigma_{w_k}^2 \right) \\ &\leq \frac{2}{p} \exp \left( -\frac{70^2}{71^2} t \max\{1, -\log p\} \right) + \frac{2K}{p} \exp \left( -\frac{70^2}{71^2} t \max\{1, \log K, -\log p\} \right) \\ &= 2 \exp \left( -\frac{70^2}{71^2} t \max\{1, -\log p\} - \log p \right) + 2 \exp \left( -\frac{70^2}{71^2} t \max\{1, \log K, -\log p\} + \log K - \log p \right). \end{aligned}$$

Note that when  $t \geq 2 \cdot 71^2/70^2$ ,

$$\frac{70^2}{71^2} t \max\{1, -\log p\} + \log p \geq \frac{70^2}{71^2} t \frac{1 - \log p}{2} + \log p \geq \frac{1}{2} \frac{70^2}{71^2} t,$$

and when  $t \geq 3 \cdot 71^2/70^2$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} (A7.25) \quad &\frac{70^2}{71^2} t \max\{1, \log K, -\log p\} - \log K + \log p \geq \frac{70^2}{71^2} t \frac{1 + \log K - \log p}{3} - \log K + \log p \\ &\geq \frac{1}{3} \frac{70^2}{71^2} t. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, when  $t \geq 3 \cdot 71^2/70^2$ , we have

$$\frac{1}{p} \mathbb{P} \left( \Delta_u^2 \sum_{k=1}^K \Delta_{w_k}^2 > t^2 \xi \right) \leq 2 \exp \left( -\frac{1}{2} \frac{70^2}{71^2} t \right) + 2 \exp \left( -\frac{1}{3} \frac{70^2}{71^2} t \right) \leq 4 \exp \left( -\frac{1}{3} \frac{70^2}{71^2} t \right).$$

Third, by definition, when  $t \geq 1$ ,  $t^2\xi \geq \xi \geq (1-f)^2/(N^2f^2) \cdot \sum_{k=1}^K S_{uw_k}^2$ . This immediately implies that, when  $t \geq 1$ ,

$$(A7.26) \quad \frac{1}{p} \mathbb{P} \left( \frac{(1-f)^2}{N^2 f^2} \sum_{k=1}^K S_{uw_k}^2 > t^2 \xi \right) = 0.$$

From (A7.21)–(A7.26), we can know that, when  $t \geq 3 \cdot 71^2/70^2$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P} \left( \|s_{uw} - S_{uw}\|_2^2 > 36t^2\xi \mid \mathbf{Z} \in \mathcal{E} \right) \\ & \leq \frac{1}{p} \mathbb{P} \left( \sum_{k=1}^K \Delta_{u \times w_k}^2 > t^2\xi \right) + \frac{1}{p} \mathbb{P} \left( \Delta_u^2 \sum_{k=1}^K \Delta_{w_k}^2 > t^2\xi \right) + \frac{1}{p} \mathbb{P} \left( \frac{(1-f)^2}{N^2 f^2} \sum_{k=1}^K S_{uw_k}^2 > t^2\xi \right) \\ & \leq 2 \exp \left( -\frac{1}{3} \frac{70^2}{71^2} t^2 \right) + 4 \exp \left( -\frac{1}{3} \frac{70^2}{71^2} t \right) \leq 6 \exp \left( -\frac{1}{3} \frac{70^2}{71^2} t \right). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, Lemma A31 holds.  $\square$

PROOF OF LEMMA A32. By definition, Lemma A31 immediately implies that, under ReM,

$$|s_z^2 - S_z^2| = O_{\mathbb{P}} \left( \xi_{zz}^{1/2} \right), \quad \|s_{zw} - S_{zw}\|_2 = O_{\mathbb{P}} \left( \xi_{zw}^{1/2} \right).$$

This implies that, for  $z = 0, 1$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \|s_{zw}\|_2^2 - \|S_{zw}\|_2^2 \right| &= \left| (s_{zw} - S_{zw})(s_{zw} - S_{zw} + 2S_{zw})^{\top} \right| = \left| \|s_{zw} - S_{zw}\|_2^2 + 2(s_{zw} - S_{zw})S_{zw}^{\top} \right| \\ &\leq \|s_{zw} - S_{zw}\|_2^2 + 2\|s_{zw} - S_{zw}\|_2 \|S_{zw}\|_2 = O_{\mathbb{P}} \left( \xi_{zw} + \|S_{zw}\|_2 \xi_{zw}^{1/2} \right). \end{aligned}$$

By the same logic,

$$\begin{aligned} \left| s_{\tau|\mathbf{X}}^2 - S_{\tau|\mathbf{X}}^2 \right| &= \left| \|(s_{1w} - s_{0w}) - (S_{1w} - S_{0w})\|_2^2 + 2\{(s_{1w} - s_{0w}) - (S_{1w} - S_{0w})\}(S_{1w} - S_{0w})^{\top} \right| \\ &\leq 2 \left( \|s_{1w} - S_{1w}\|_2^2 + \|s_{0w} - S_{0w}\|_2^2 \right) + 2\|S_{1w} - S_{0w}\|_2 \{ \|s_{1w} - S_{1w}\|_2 + \|s_{0w} - S_{0w}\|_2 \} \\ &= O_{\mathbb{P}} \left( \xi_{1w} + \xi_{0w} + \|S_{1w} - S_{0w}\|_2 \xi_{1w}^{1/2} + \|S_{1w} - S_{0w}\|_2 \xi_{0w}^{1/2} \right). \end{aligned}$$

From the above and by definition, we then have

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \hat{V}_{\tau\tau} - V_{\tau\tau} - n^{-1} S_{\tau|\mathbf{X}}^2 \right| &\leq n_1^{-1} |s_1^2 - S_1^2| + n_0^{-1} |s_0^2 - S_0^2| + n^{-1} |s_{\tau|\mathbf{X}}^2 - S_{\tau|\mathbf{X}}^2| \\ &= O_{\mathbb{P}} \left( \frac{\xi_{11}^{1/2}}{n_1} + \frac{\xi_{00}^{1/2}}{n_0} + \frac{\xi_{1w} + \xi_{0w}}{n} + \|S_{1w} - S_{0w}\|_2 \frac{\xi_{1w}^{1/2} + \xi_{0w}^{1/2}}{n} \right), \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \hat{V}_{\tau\tau} \hat{R}_n^2 - V_{\tau\tau} R_n^2 \right| \\ &= \left| n_1^{-1} \|s_{1w}\|_2^2 + n_0^{-1} \|s_{0w}\|_2^2 - n^{-1} s_{\tau|\mathbf{X}}^2 - \left( n_1^{-1} \|S_{1w}\|_2^2 + n_0^{-1} \|S_{0w}\|_2^2 - n^{-1} S_{\tau|\mathbf{X}}^2 \right) \right| \\ &\leq n_1^{-1} \left| \|s_{1w}\|_2^2 - \|S_{1w}\|_2^2 \right| + n_0^{-1} \left| \|s_{0w}\|_2^2 - \|S_{0w}\|_2^2 \right| + n^{-1} \left| s_{\tau|\mathbf{X}}^2 - S_{\tau|\mathbf{X}}^2 \right| \\ &= O_{\mathbb{P}} \left( \frac{\xi_{1w}}{n_1} + \|S_{1w}\|_2 \frac{\xi_{1w}^{1/2}}{n_1} + \frac{\xi_{0w}}{n_0} + \|S_{0w}\|_2 \frac{\xi_{0w}^{1/2}}{n_0} + \frac{\xi_{1w} + \xi_{0w}}{n} + \|S_{1w} - S_{0w}\|_2 \frac{\xi_{1w}^{1/2} + \xi_{0w}^{1/2}}{n} \right) \end{aligned}$$

$$= O_{\mathbb{P}} \left( \frac{\xi_{1w}}{n_1} + \frac{\xi_{0w}}{n_0} + \|S_{1w}\|_2 \frac{\xi_{1w}^{1/2}}{n_1} + \|S_{0w}\|_2 \frac{\xi_{0w}^{1/2}}{n_0} + \|S_{1w} - S_{0w}\|_2 \frac{\xi_{1w}^{1/2} + \xi_{0w}^{1/2}}{n} \right).$$

Therefore, Lemma A32 holds.  $\square$

**PROOF OF LEMMA A33.** First, we consider bounding some finite population quantities. For descriptive convenience, we introduce  $\psi = \max_{z \in \{0,1\}} \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \{Y_i(z) - \bar{Y}(z)\}^2$ . By definition, for  $z = 0, 1$  and  $1 \leq k \leq K$ ,

(A7.27)

$$\sigma_z^2 = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \{Y_i(z) - \bar{Y}(z)\}^2 \leq \psi, \quad S_z^2 = \frac{n}{n-1} \sigma_z^2 \leq 2\psi, \quad \sigma_{w_k}^2 = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (w_{ki} - \bar{w}_k)^2 = \frac{n-1}{n} \leq 1.$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_{z \times z}^2 &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left[ \{Y_i(z) - \bar{Y}(z)\}^2 - \sigma_z^2 \right]^2 \leq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \{Y_i(z) - \bar{Y}(z)\}^4 \leq \psi^2, \\ \sigma_{z \times w_k}^2 &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left[ \{Y_i(z) - \bar{Y}(z)\} (w_{ki} - \bar{w}_k) - \frac{n-1}{n} S_{zw_k} \right]^2 \leq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \{Y_i(z) - \bar{Y}(z)\}^2 (w_{ki} - \bar{w}_k)^2 \\ &\leq \psi \cdot \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (w_{ki} - \bar{w}_k)^2 \leq \psi. \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, by the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} S_{zw_k}^2 &= \left[ \frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \{Y_i(z) - \bar{Y}(z)\} (w_{ki} - \bar{w}_k) \right]^2 \leq \frac{1}{(n-1)^2} \sum_{i=1}^n \{Y_i(z) - \bar{Y}(z)\}^2 \cdot \sum_{i=1}^n (w_{ki} - \bar{w}_k)^2 \\ &= \frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \{Y_i(z) - \bar{Y}(z)\}^2 \leq 2\psi. \end{aligned}$$

Second, we consider the bounds on  $\xi_{zz}$  and  $\xi_{zw}$  for  $z = 0, 1$ . For descriptive convenience, we introduce  $b_n = \max\{1, -\log \tilde{p}_n\}$  and  $c_n = \max\{1, \log K_n, -\log \tilde{p}_n\}$ . By definition and from the bounds we derived above, for  $z = 0, 1$ ,

$$\xi_{zz} = \frac{b_n}{nr_z^2} \sigma_{z \times z}^2 + \frac{b_n^2}{n^2 r_z^4} \sigma_z^4 + \frac{(1-r_z)^2}{n^2 r_z^2} S_z^4 \leq \psi^2 \left( \frac{b_n}{nr_z^2} + \frac{b_n^2}{n^2 r_z^4} + \frac{4}{n^2 r_z^2} \right) \leq \psi^2 \left( \frac{2b_n}{nr_z^2} + \frac{b_n^2}{n^2 r_z^4} \right)$$

where the last inequality holds because  $b_n \geq 1$  and  $n \geq 4$ . From the condition in Lemma A33,  $b_n \leq c_n = O(nr_1^2 r_0^2)$ , and thus

$$\xi_{zz} = \psi^2 \frac{b_n}{nr_z^2} \left( 2 + \frac{b_n}{nr_z^2} \right) = O \left( \psi^2 \frac{b_n}{nr_z^2} \right).$$

Similarly, we can derive that, for  $z = 0, 1$ ,

(A7.28)

$$\begin{aligned} \xi_{zw} &= \frac{c_n}{nr_z^2} \sum_{k=1}^{K_n} \sigma_{z \times w_k}^2 + \frac{b_n c_n}{n^2 r_z^4} \sigma_z^2 \sum_{k=1}^{K_n} \sigma_{w_k}^2 + \frac{(1-r_z)^2}{n^2 r_z^2} \sum_{k=1}^{K_n} S_{zw_k}^2 \leq \psi K_n \left( \frac{c_n}{nr_z^2} + \frac{b_n c_n}{n^2 r_z^4} + \frac{2}{n^2 r_z^2} \right) \\ &\leq \psi K_n \left( 2 \frac{c_n}{nr_z^2} + \frac{b_n c_n}{n^2 r_z^4} \right) = \psi K_n \frac{c_n}{nr_z^2} \left( 2 + \frac{b_n}{nr_z^2} \right) = O \left( \psi K_n \frac{c_n}{nr_z^2} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Third, we consider the probability bounds for  $\hat{V}_{\tau\tau} - V_{\tau\tau} - n^{-1}S_{\tau\setminus\mathbf{X}}^2$  and  $\hat{V}_{\tau\tau}\hat{R}_n^2 - V_{\tau\tau}R_n^2$ . From the bounds we derived before, for  $z = 0, 1$ ,

$$\|S_{z\mathbf{w}}\|_2 \leq \left( \sum_{k=1}^{K_n} S_{zw_k}^2 \right)^{1/2} \leq \sqrt{2K_n\psi}, \quad \|S_{1\mathbf{w}} - S_{0\mathbf{w}}\|_2 \leq \|S_{1\mathbf{w}}\|_2 + \|S_{0\mathbf{w}}\|_2 \leq 2\sqrt{2K_n\psi}.$$

Consequently, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\xi_{11}^{1/2}}{n_1} + \frac{\xi_{00}^{1/2}}{n_0} + \frac{\xi_{1\mathbf{w}} + \xi_{0\mathbf{w}}}{n} + \|S_{1\mathbf{w}} - S_{0\mathbf{w}}\|_2 \frac{\xi_{1\mathbf{w}}^{1/2} + \xi_{0\mathbf{w}}^{1/2}}{n} \\ &= \psi \cdot O \left( \frac{\sqrt{b_n}}{n^{3/2}r_1^2} + \frac{\sqrt{b_n}}{n^{3/2}r_0^2} + K_n \frac{c_n}{n^2r_1^2} + K_n \frac{c_n}{n^2r_0^2} + K_n \frac{\sqrt{c_n}}{n^{3/2}r_1} + K_n \frac{\sqrt{c_n}}{n^{3/2}r_0} \right) \\ &= \psi \cdot O \left( \frac{\sqrt{b_n}}{n^{3/2}r_1^2r_0^2} + K_n \frac{c_n}{n^2r_1^2r_0^2} + K_n \frac{\sqrt{c_n}}{n^{3/2}r_1r_0} \right) = \psi \cdot O \left\{ \frac{\sqrt{b_n}}{n^{3/2}r_1^2r_0^2} + K_n \frac{\sqrt{c_n}}{n^{3/2}r_1r_0} \left( 1 + \sqrt{\frac{c_n}{nr_1^2r_0^2}} \right) \right\} \\ &= \psi \cdot O \left( \frac{\sqrt{b_n}}{n^{3/2}r_1^2r_0^2} + K_n \frac{\sqrt{c_n}}{n^{3/2}r_1r_0} \right) = \psi \cdot O \left( \frac{\sqrt{b_n} + K_n\sqrt{c_n}}{n^{3/2}r_1^2r_0^2} \right). \end{aligned}$$

where the second last equality holds because  $c_n = O(nr_1^2r_0^2)$ . Similarly, we can derive that

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\xi_{1\mathbf{w}}}{n_1} + \frac{\xi_{0\mathbf{w}}}{n_0} + \|S_{1\mathbf{w}}\|_2 \frac{\xi_{1\mathbf{w}}^{1/2}}{n_1} + \|S_{0\mathbf{w}}\|_2 \frac{\xi_{0\mathbf{w}}^{1/2}}{n_0} + \|S_{1\mathbf{w}} - S_{0\mathbf{w}}\|_2 \frac{\xi_{1\mathbf{w}}^{1/2} + \xi_{0\mathbf{w}}^{1/2}}{n} \\ &= \psi \cdot O \left( K_n \frac{c_n}{n^2r_1^3} + K_n \frac{c_n}{n^2r_0^3} + K_n \frac{\sqrt{c_n}}{n^{3/2}r_1^2} + K_n \frac{\sqrt{c_n}}{n^{3/2}r_0^2} + K_n \frac{\sqrt{c_n}}{n^{3/2}r_1} + K_n \frac{\sqrt{c_n}}{n^{3/2}r_0} \right) \\ &= \psi \cdot O \left( K_n \frac{c_n}{n^2r_1^3r_0^3} + K_n \frac{\sqrt{c_n}}{n^{3/2}r_1^2r_0^2} \right) = \psi \cdot O \left\{ K_n \frac{\sqrt{c_n}}{n^{3/2}r_1^2r_0^2} \left( 1 + \sqrt{\frac{c_n}{nr_1^2r_0^2}} \right) \right\} \\ &= \psi \cdot O \left( K_n \frac{\sqrt{c_n}}{n^{3/2}r_1^2r_0^2} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Note that, by definition,  $b_n \leq c_n$ . Thus, we must have

$$\frac{\sqrt{b_n} + K_n\sqrt{c_n}}{n^{3/2}r_1^2r_0^2} \leq 2 \max\{K_n, 1\} \cdot \frac{\sqrt{c_n}}{n^{3/2}r_1^2r_0^2}, \quad K_n \frac{\sqrt{c_n}}{n^{3/2}r_1^2r_0^2} \leq \max\{K_n, 1\} \cdot \frac{\sqrt{c_n}}{n^{3/2}r_1^2r_0^2}.$$

From the above and Lemma A32, these then imply that

$$\max \left\{ \left| \hat{V}_{\tau\tau} - V_{\tau\tau} - n^{-1}S_{\tau\setminus\mathbf{X}}^2 \right|, \left| \hat{V}_{\tau\tau}\hat{R}_n^2 - V_{\tau\tau}R_n^2 \right| \right\} = \psi \cdot O_{\mathbb{P}} \left( \max\{K_n, 1\} \cdot \frac{\sqrt{c_n}}{n^{3/2}r_1^2r_0^2} \right).$$

Therefore, Lemma A33 holds.  $\square$

**PROOF OF LEMMA A34.** We first prove (i). By definition,  $|\tilde{p}_n - p_n| \leq \Delta_n$ . Because  $\Delta_n/p_n = o(1)$ , this implies that

$$-\log \tilde{p}_n \leq -\log(p_n - \Delta_n) = -\log p_n - \log(1 - \Delta_n/p_n) = -\log p_n + O(1) = O(\max\{1, -\log p_n\}).$$

Thus,  $\max\{1, -\log \tilde{p}_n\} = O(\max\{1, -\log p_n\})$ .

We then prove (ii). By definition,

$$\begin{aligned} r_0S_{1\setminus\mathbf{X}}^2 + r_1S_{0\setminus\mathbf{X}}^2 &\leq r_0S_1^2 + r_1S_0^2 \leq 2(r_0 + r_1) \max_{z \in \{0,1\}} \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \{Y_i(z) - \bar{Y}(z)\}^2 \\ &= 2 \max_{z \in \{0,1\}} \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \{Y_i(z) - \bar{Y}(z)\}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, (ii) holds.

Last, we prove (iii). From (i) and Condition 5, we can verify that

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\max_{z \in \{0,1\}} \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \{Y_i(z) - \bar{Y}(z)\}^2}{r_0 S_{1 \setminus \mathbf{X}}^2 + r_1 S_{0 \setminus \mathbf{X}}^2} \cdot \frac{\max\{K_n, 1\}}{r_1 r_0} \cdot \sqrt{\frac{\max\{1, \log K_n, -\log \tilde{p}_n\}}{n}} \\ &= O \left( \frac{\max_{z \in \{0,1\}} \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \{Y_i(z) - \bar{Y}(z)\}^2}{r_0 S_{1 \setminus \mathbf{X}}^2 + r_1 S_{0 \setminus \mathbf{X}}^2} \cdot \frac{\max\{K_n, 1\}}{r_1 r_0} \cdot \sqrt{\frac{\max\{1, \log K_n, -\log \tilde{p}_n\}}{n}} \right) \\ &= o(1). \end{aligned}$$

From (ii), this then implies that

$$\begin{aligned} o(1) &= \frac{\max_{z \in \{0,1\}} \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \{Y_i(z) - \bar{Y}(z)\}^2}{nr_1 r_0 V_{\tau\tau} (1 - R^2)} \cdot \frac{\max\{K_n, 1\}}{r_1 r_0} \cdot \sqrt{\frac{\max\{1, \log K_n, -\log \tilde{p}_n\}}{n}} \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2} \cdot \frac{\max\{K_n, 1\}}{r_1 r_0} \cdot \sqrt{\frac{\max\{1, \log K_n, -\log \tilde{p}_n\}}{n}} \geq \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{\frac{\max\{1, \log K_n, -\log \tilde{p}_n\}}{nr_1^2 r_0^2}}. \end{aligned}$$

Consequently, we must have  $\max\{1, \log K_n, -\log \tilde{p}_n\} = o(nr_1^2 r_0^2)$ , i.e., (iii) holds.  $\square$

### A7.3. Proofs of Theorems 7 and 8.

**Proof of Theorem 7(i).** From Lemmas A33 and A34, under ReM and Conditions 2 and 5, we must have

$$\begin{aligned} & \max \left\{ |\hat{V}_{\tau\tau} - V_{\tau\tau} - n^{-1} S_{\tau \setminus \mathbf{X}}^2|, |\hat{V}_{\tau\tau} \hat{R}_n^2 - V_{\tau\tau} R_n^2| \right\} \\ &= \max_{z \in \{0,1\}} \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \{Y_i(z) - \bar{Y}(z)\}^2 \cdot O_{\mathbb{P}} \left( \max\{K_n, 1\} \cdot \frac{\sqrt{\max\{1, \log K_n, -\log p_n\}}}{n^{3/2} r_1^2 r_0^2} \right) \\ &= \frac{\max_{z \in \{0,1\}} \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \{Y_i(z) - \bar{Y}(z)\}^2}{nr_1 r_0} \cdot O_{\mathbb{P}} \left( \frac{\max\{K_n, 1\}}{r_1 r_0} \cdot \sqrt{\frac{\max\{1, \log K_n, -\log p_n\}}{n}} \right) \\ &= \frac{r_0 S_{1 \setminus \mathbf{X}}^2 + r_1 S_{0 \setminus \mathbf{X}}^2}{nr_1 r_0} \cdot o_{\mathbb{P}}(1) = \left( n_1^{-1} S_{1 \setminus \mathbf{X}}^2 + n_0^{-1} S_{0 \setminus \mathbf{X}}^2 \right) \cdot o_{\mathbb{P}}(1). \end{aligned}$$

Note that, by definition,

$$\begin{aligned} V_{\tau\tau} (1 - R_n^2) + n^{-1} S_{\tau \setminus \mathbf{X}}^2 &= (n_1^{-1} S_1^2 + n_0^{-1} S_0^2 - n^{-1} S_{\tau}^2) - \left( n_1^{-1} S_{1|\mathbf{X}}^2 + n_0^{-1} S_{0|\mathbf{X}}^2 - n^{-1} S_{\tau|\mathbf{X}}^2 \right) + n^{-1} S_{\tau \setminus \mathbf{X}}^2 \\ (A7.29) \quad &= n_1^{-1} S_{1 \setminus \mathbf{X}}^2 + n_0^{-1} S_{0 \setminus \mathbf{X}}^2. \end{aligned}$$

From the above, Theorem 7(i) holds.  $\square$

To prove Theorem 7(ii), we need the following two lemmas.

**LEMMA A35.** *Let  $\{\psi_n\}$  and  $\{\tilde{\psi}_n\}$  be two sequences of continuous random variables such that, as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ ,  $\sup_{c \in \mathbb{R}} |\mathbb{P}(\psi_n \leq c) - \mathbb{P}(\tilde{\psi}_n \leq c)| \rightarrow 0$ . For any  $n$  and  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ , let  $q_n(\alpha)$  and  $\tilde{q}_n(\alpha)$  be the  $\alpha$ th quantile of  $\psi_n$  and  $\tilde{\psi}_n$ , respectively. Then for any  $0 < \alpha < \beta < 1$ ,  $\mathbb{1}\{\tilde{q}_n(\beta) \leq q_n(\alpha)\} \rightarrow 0$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ .*

PROOF OF LEMMA A35. From the condition and definition in Lemma A35,  $\mathbb{P}\{\psi_n \leq q_n(\alpha)\} = \alpha$ ,  $\mathbb{P}\{\tilde{\psi}_n \leq \tilde{q}_n(\beta)\} = \beta$ , and  $|\mathbb{P}\{\psi_n \leq \tilde{q}_n(\beta)\} - \mathbb{P}\{\tilde{\psi}_n \leq \tilde{q}_n(\beta)\}| \leq \sup_{c \in \mathbb{R}} |\mathbb{P}(\psi_n \leq c) - \mathbb{P}(\tilde{\psi}_n \leq c)| \rightarrow 0$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . These imply that  $\mathbb{P}\{\psi_n \leq \tilde{q}_n(\beta)\} \rightarrow \beta > \alpha$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . Below we prove Lemma A35 by contradiction.

Suppose that  $\mathbb{1}\{\tilde{q}_n(\beta) \leq q_n(\alpha)\}$  does not converge to zero as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . Then there exists a subsequence  $\{n_j\}$  such that  $\tilde{q}_{n_j}(\beta) \leq q_{n_j}(\alpha)$  for all  $j$ . This implies that, for all  $j$ ,  $\mathbb{P}\{\psi_{n_j} \leq \tilde{q}_{n_j}(\beta)\} \leq \mathbb{P}\{\psi_{n_j} \leq q_{n_j}(\alpha)\} = \alpha$ . Consequently, we must have  $\limsup_{j \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}\{\psi_{n_j} \leq \tilde{q}_{n_j}(\beta)\} \leq \alpha$ . However, this contradicts with the fact that  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}\{\psi_n \leq \tilde{q}_n(\beta)\} = \beta$ . From the above, Lemma A35 holds.  $\square$

LEMMA A36. Let  $\varepsilon_0 \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ , and  $L_{K_n, a_n}$  be the truncated Gaussian random variables defined as in Section 2.3, where  $\{K_n\}$  and  $\{a_n\}$  are sequences of positive integers and thresholds, and  $\varepsilon_0$  is independent of  $L_{K_n, a_n}$  for all  $n$ . Let  $\{A_n\}$ ,  $\{B_n\}$ ,  $\{\tilde{A}_n\}$  and  $\{\tilde{B}_n\}$  be sequences of nonnegative constants, and for each  $n$ , define  $\psi_n = A_n^{1/2} \cdot \varepsilon_0 + B_n^{1/2} \cdot L_{K_n, a_n}$  and  $\tilde{\psi}_n = \tilde{A}_n^{1/2} \cdot \varepsilon_0 + \tilde{B}_n^{1/2} \cdot L_{K_n, a_n}$ . For each  $n$  and  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ , let  $q_n(\alpha)$  and  $\tilde{q}_n(\alpha)$  be the  $\alpha$ th quantile of  $\psi_n$  and  $\tilde{\psi}_n$ , respectively. If  $\max\{|\tilde{A}_n - A_n|, |\tilde{B}_n - B_n|\} = o(A_n)$ , then for any  $0 < \alpha < \beta < 1$ , as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ ,  $\mathbb{1}\{\tilde{q}_n(\beta) \leq q_n(\alpha)\} \rightarrow 0$  and  $\mathbb{1}\{q_n(\beta) \leq \tilde{q}_n(\alpha)\} \rightarrow 0$ .

PROOF OF LEMMA A36. Because  $\text{Var}(L_{K_n, a_n}) \leq 1$ ,  $L_{K_n, a_n} = O_{\mathbb{P}}(1)$ . Using the inequality that  $|\sqrt{b} - \sqrt{c}| \leq \sqrt{|b - c|}$  for any  $b, c \geq 0$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\psi}_n - \psi_n &= (\tilde{A}_n^{1/2} - A_n^{1/2})\varepsilon_0 + (\tilde{B}_n^{1/2} - B_n^{1/2})L_{K_n, a_n} = |\tilde{A}_n - A_n|^{1/2} \cdot O_{\mathbb{P}}(1) + |\tilde{B}_n - B_n|^{1/2} \cdot O_{\mathbb{P}}(1) \\ &= A_n^{1/2} \cdot o_{\mathbb{P}}(1). \end{aligned}$$

From Lemma A27, this then implies that  $\sup_{c \in \mathbb{R}} |\mathbb{P}(\tilde{\psi}_n \leq c) - \mathbb{P}(\psi_n \leq c)| \rightarrow 0$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . From Lemma A35, this further implies that, for any  $0 < \alpha < \beta < 1$ ,  $\mathbb{1}\{\tilde{q}_n(\beta) \leq q_n(\alpha)\} \rightarrow 0$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . By symmetry, we also have  $\mathbb{1}\{q_n(\beta) \leq \tilde{q}_n(\alpha)\} \rightarrow 0$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . Therefore, Lemma A36 holds.  $\square$

**Proof of Theorem 7(ii).** For descriptive convenience, let  $\varepsilon_0$  and  $L_{K_n, a_n}$  be two independent standard and constrained Gaussian random variables defined as in Section 2.3, which are further constructed to be independent of the treatment assignment  $\mathbf{Z}$ . We then define

$$\begin{aligned} \theta_n &= \sqrt{V_{\tau\tau}(1 - R_n^2)} \cdot \varepsilon_0 + \sqrt{V_{\tau\tau}R_n^2} \cdot L_{K_n, a_n} \equiv A_n^{1/2} \cdot \varepsilon_0 + B_n^{1/2} \cdot L_{K_n, a_n}, \\ \tilde{\theta}_n &= \sqrt{V_{\tau\tau}(1 - R_n^2) + n^{-1}S_{\tau \setminus \mathbf{X}}^2} \cdot \varepsilon_0 + \sqrt{V_{\tau\tau}R_n^2} \cdot L_{K_n, a_n} \equiv \tilde{A}_n^{1/2} \cdot \varepsilon_0 + \tilde{B}_n^{1/2} \cdot L_{K_n, a_n}, \\ \hat{\theta}_n &= \sqrt{\hat{V}_{\tau\tau}(1 - \hat{R}_n^2)} \cdot \varepsilon_0 + \sqrt{\hat{V}_{\tau\tau}\hat{R}_n^2} \cdot L_{K_n, a_n} \equiv \hat{A}_n^{1/2} \cdot \varepsilon_0 + \hat{B}_n^{1/2} \cdot L_{K_n, a_n}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $A_n, \tilde{A}_n, \hat{A}_n$  and  $B_n, \tilde{B}_n, \hat{B}_n$  denote the squared coefficients of the standard and constrained Gaussian random variables, respectively. We introduce  $q_\alpha(A, B, K, a)$  to denote the  $\alpha$ th quantile of  $A^{1/2}\varepsilon_0 + B^{1/2}L_{K, a}$ , and further define  $\hat{q}_{n, \alpha} = q_\alpha(\hat{A}_n, \hat{B}_n, K_n, a_n)$ ,  $\tilde{q}_{n, \alpha} = q_\alpha(\tilde{A}_n, \tilde{B}_n, K_n, a_n)$  and  $q_{n, \alpha} = q_\alpha(A_n, B_n, K_n, a_n)$ .

First, we prove that  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}(\hat{q}_{n, \beta} \leq \tilde{q}_{n, \alpha} \mid M \leq a_n) = 0$  for any  $0 < \alpha < \beta < 1$ . From Theorem 7(i), under ReM,  $\max\{|\hat{A}_n - \tilde{A}_n|, |\hat{B}_n - \tilde{B}_n|\} = o_{\mathbb{P}}(\tilde{A}_n)$ . By Durrett (2019, Theorem 2.3.2), under ReM, for any subsequence  $\{n_j : j = 1, 2, \dots\}$ , there exists a further subsequence  $\{m_j : j = 1, 2, \dots\} \subset \{n_j : j = 1, 2, \dots\}$  such that  $|\hat{A}_{m_j} - \tilde{A}_{m_j}|/\tilde{A}_{m_j} \xrightarrow{a.s.} 0$  and  $|\hat{B}_{m_j} - \tilde{B}_{m_j}|/\tilde{A}_{m_j} \xrightarrow{a.s.} 0$  as  $j \rightarrow \infty$ . From Lemma A36, this immediately implies that, for any  $0 < \alpha < \beta < 1$ ,  $\mathbb{1}\{\hat{q}_{m_j, \beta} \leq \tilde{q}_{m_j, \alpha}\} \xrightarrow{a.s.} 0$  as  $n \rightarrow 0$ . From Durrett (2019, Theorem 2.3.2),

we can know that, under ReM, for any  $0 < \alpha < \beta < 1$ ,  $\mathbb{1}(\hat{q}_{n,\beta} \leq \tilde{q}_{n,\alpha}) \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} 0$  as  $n \rightarrow 0$ . Consequently, under ReM, for any  $0 < \alpha < \beta < 1$ , as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ ,

$$(A7.30) \quad \mathbb{P}(\hat{q}_{n,\beta} \leq \tilde{q}_{n,\alpha} \mid M \leq a_n) = \mathbb{E}\{\mathbb{1}(\hat{q}_{n,\beta} \leq \tilde{q}_{n,\alpha}) \mid M \leq a_n\} \rightarrow 0.$$

Second, we prove the asymptotic validity of the confidence interval  $\hat{\mathcal{C}}_\alpha$  for  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ . For any  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$  and  $\eta \in (0, (1 - \alpha)/2)$ , the coverage probability of the confidence interval  $\hat{\mathcal{C}}_\alpha$  can be bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\tau \in \hat{\mathcal{C}}_\alpha \mid M \leq a_n) &= \mathbb{P}\{|\hat{\tau} - \tau| \leq \hat{q}_{n,1-\alpha/2} \mid M \leq a_n\} \\ &\geq \mathbb{P}\{|\hat{\tau} - \tau| \leq \hat{q}_{n,1-\alpha/2}, \hat{q}_{n,1-\alpha/2} \geq \tilde{q}_{n,1-\alpha/2-\eta} \mid M \leq a_n\} \\ &\geq \mathbb{P}\{|\hat{\tau} - \tau| \leq \tilde{q}_{n,1-\alpha/2-\eta}, \hat{q}_{n,1-\alpha/2} \geq \tilde{q}_{n,1-\alpha/2-\eta} \mid M \leq a_n\} \\ &\geq \mathbb{P}\{|\hat{\tau} - \tau| \leq \tilde{q}_{n,1-\alpha/2-\eta} \mid M \leq a_n\} - \mathbb{P}\{\hat{q}_{n,1-\alpha/2} < \tilde{q}_{n,1-\alpha/2-\eta} \mid M \leq a_n\}. \end{aligned}$$

From (A7.30) and Theorem 3,  $\mathbb{P}\{\hat{q}_{n,1-\alpha/2} < \tilde{q}_{n,1-\alpha/2-\eta} \mid M \leq a_n\} = o(1)$ , and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\{|\hat{\tau} - \tau| \leq \tilde{q}_{n,1-\alpha/2-\eta} \mid M \leq a_n\} &= \mathbb{P}(|\theta_n| \leq \tilde{q}_{n,1-\alpha/2-\eta}) + o(1) \geq \mathbb{P}(|\tilde{\theta}_n| \leq \tilde{q}_{n,1-\alpha/2-\eta}) + o(1) \\ &= 1 - \alpha - 2\eta + o(1), \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows from Li and Ding (2020, Lemma A3). These then imply that

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}(\tau \in \hat{\mathcal{C}}_\alpha \mid M \leq a_n) \geq 1 - \alpha - 2\eta.$$

Because the above inequality holds for any  $\eta \in (0, (1 - \alpha)/2)$ , we must have  $\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}(\tau \in \hat{\mathcal{C}}_\alpha \mid M \leq a_n) \geq 1 - \alpha$ .

From the above, Theorem 7(ii) holds.  $\square$

**Proof of Theorem 7(iii).** For any  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$  and  $\eta \in (0, \alpha/2)$ , the coverage probability of the confidence interval  $\hat{\mathcal{C}}_\alpha$  can be bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{P}(\tau \in \hat{\mathcal{C}}_\alpha \mid M \leq a_n) \\ &= \mathbb{P}\{|\hat{\tau} - \tau| \leq \hat{q}_{n,1-\alpha/2} \mid M \leq a_n\} \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}\{|\hat{\tau} - \tau| \leq \hat{q}_{n,1-\alpha/2}, \hat{q}_{n,1-\alpha/2} \leq \tilde{q}_{n,1-\alpha/2+\eta} \mid M \leq a_n\} + \mathbb{P}\{\hat{q}_{n,1-\alpha/2} > \tilde{q}_{n,1-\alpha/2+\eta} \mid M \leq a_n\} \\ (A7.31) \quad &\leq \mathbb{P}\{|\hat{\tau} - \tau| \leq \tilde{q}_{n,1-\alpha/2+\eta} \mid M \leq a_n\} + \mathbb{P}\{\hat{q}_{n,1-\alpha/2} > \tilde{q}_{n,1-\alpha/2+\eta} \mid M \leq a_n\}. \end{aligned}$$

Below we consider the two terms in (A7.31), separately.

First, from Theorem 3,  $\mathbb{P}\{|\hat{\tau} - \tau| \leq \tilde{q}_{n,1-\alpha/2+\eta} \mid M \leq a_n\} = \mathbb{P}(|\theta_n| \leq \tilde{q}_{n,1-\alpha/2+\eta}) + o(1)$ . Because

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\theta}_n - \theta_n &= \left\{ \sqrt{V_{\tau\tau}(1 - R_n^2) + n^{-1}S_{\tau \setminus \mathbf{X}}^2} - \sqrt{V_{\tau\tau}(1 - R_n^2)} \right\} \cdot \varepsilon_0 = \sqrt{n^{-1}S_{\tau \setminus \mathbf{X}}^2} \cdot O_{\mathbb{P}}(1) \\ &= \sqrt{V_{\tau\tau}(1 - R_n^2)} \cdot o_{\mathbb{P}}(1), \end{aligned}$$

from Lemma A27, we must have  $\sup_{c \in \mathbb{R}} |\mathbb{P}(\theta_n \leq c) - \mathbb{P}(\tilde{\theta}_n \leq c)| \rightarrow 0$ . This then implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\{|\hat{\tau} - \tau| \leq \tilde{q}_{n,1-\alpha/2+\eta} \mid M \leq a_n\} &= \mathbb{P}(|\theta_n| \leq \tilde{q}_{n,1-\alpha/2+\eta}) + o(1) = \mathbb{P}(|\tilde{\theta}_n| \leq \tilde{q}_{n,1-\alpha/2+\eta}) + o(1) \\ &= 1 - \alpha + 2\eta + o(1). \end{aligned}$$



Second, by the same logic as the proof of (A7.30) in Theorem 7(ii), we can derive that, for any  $0 < \alpha < \beta < 1$ ,  $\mathbb{P}(\tilde{q}_{n,\beta} \leq \hat{q}_{n,\alpha} \mid M \leq a_n) = \mathbb{E}\{\mathbb{1}(\tilde{q}_{n,\beta} \leq \hat{q}_{n,\alpha}) \mid M \leq a_n\} \rightarrow 0$ . This immediately implies that

$$\mathbb{P}(\hat{q}_{n,1-\alpha/2} > \tilde{q}_{n,1-\alpha/2+\eta} \mid M \leq a_n) = o(1).$$

From the above, we can know that  $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}(\tau \in \hat{\mathcal{C}}_\alpha \mid M \leq a_n) \leq 1 - \alpha + 2\eta$ . Because this inequality holds for any  $\eta \in (0, \alpha/2)$ , we must have  $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}(\tau \in \hat{\mathcal{C}}_\alpha \mid M \leq a_n) \leq 1 - \alpha$ . From Theorem 7(ii), we then have  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}(\tau \in \hat{\mathcal{C}}_\alpha \mid M \leq a_n) = 1 - \alpha$ . Therefore, Theorem 7(iii) holds.  $\square$

To prove Theorem 8, we need the following lemma.

**LEMMA A37.** *Let  $\varepsilon_0 \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ , and  $L_{K_n, a_n}$  be the truncated Gaussian random variables defined as in Section 2.3, where  $\{K_n\}$  and  $\{a_n\}$  are sequences of positive integers and thresholds, and  $\varepsilon_0$  is independent of  $L_{K_n, a_n}$  for all  $n$ . Let  $\{A_n\}$ ,  $\{B_n\}$ ,  $\{\tilde{A}_n\}$  and  $\{\tilde{B}_n\}$  be sequences of nonnegative constants, and for each  $n$ , define  $\psi_n = A_n^{1/2} \cdot \varepsilon_0 + B_n^{1/2} \cdot L_{K_n, a_n}$  and  $\tilde{\psi}_n = \tilde{A}_n^{1/2} \cdot \varepsilon_0 + \tilde{B}_n^{1/2} \cdot L_{K_n, a_n}$ . For each  $n$  and  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ , let  $q_n(\alpha)$  and  $\tilde{q}_n(\alpha)$  be the  $\alpha$ th quantile of  $\psi_n$  and  $\tilde{\psi}_n$ , respectively. If  $L_{K_n, a_n} = o_{\mathbb{P}}(1)$ ,  $\tilde{A}_n - A_n = o(A_n)$  and  $\tilde{B}_n - B_n = O(A_n)$ , then for any  $0 < \alpha < \beta < 1$ , as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ ,  $\mathbb{1}\{\tilde{q}_n(\beta) \leq q_n(\alpha)\} \rightarrow 0$  and  $\mathbb{1}\{q_n(\beta) \leq \tilde{q}_n(\alpha)\} \rightarrow 0$ .*

**PROOF OF LEMMA A37.** Note that  $L_{K_n, a_n} = o_{\mathbb{P}}(1)$ . Using the inequality that  $|\sqrt{b} - \sqrt{c}| \leq \sqrt{|b - c|}$  for any  $b, c \geq 0$ , we then have

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\psi}_n - \psi_n &= (\tilde{A}_n^{1/2} - A_n^{1/2})\varepsilon_0 + (\tilde{B}_n^{1/2} - B_n^{1/2})L_{K_n, a_n} = |\tilde{A}_n - A_n|^{1/2} \cdot O_{\mathbb{P}}(1) + |\tilde{B}_n - B_n|^{1/2} \cdot o_{\mathbb{P}}(1) \\ &= A_n^{1/2} \cdot o_{\mathbb{P}}(1). \end{aligned}$$

From Lemma A27, this then implies that  $\sup_{c \in \mathbb{R}} |\mathbb{P}(\tilde{\psi}_n \leq c) - \mathbb{P}(\psi_n \leq c)| \rightarrow 0$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . Lemma A37 then follows immediately from Lemma A35.  $\square$

**Proof of Theorem 8.** Following the notation in the proof of Theorem 7(ii), we define additionally

$$\check{\theta}_n = \sqrt{\hat{V}_{\tau\tau}(1 - \hat{R}_n^2)} \cdot \varepsilon_0 + 0 \cdot L_{K_n, a_n} \equiv \check{A}_n^{1/2} \cdot \varepsilon_0 + \check{B}_n^{1/2} \cdot L_{K_n, a_n},$$

and  $\check{q}_{n,\alpha} = q_\alpha(\check{A}_n, \check{B}_n, K_n, a_n)$ , where  $\check{A}_n$  and  $\check{B}_n$  denote the squared coefficients of the standard and constrained Gaussian random variables, respectively. From Theorem 7(i) and Condition 4,  $|\check{A}_n - \tilde{A}_n| = |\hat{A}_n - \tilde{A}_n| = o_{\mathbb{P}}(\tilde{A}_n)$ , and, for sufficiently large  $n$ ,  $|\check{B}_n - \tilde{B}_n| = \sqrt{V_{\tau\tau} R_n^2} = \sqrt{V_{\tau\tau}} \cdot O(1) = \sqrt{V_{\tau\tau}(1 - R_n^2)} \cdot O(1) = O(\tilde{A}_n)$ . We can then prove Theorem 8 using almost the same steps as the proof of Theorem 7, where we will replace  $\hat{q}_{n,\alpha}$  by  $\check{q}_{n,\alpha}$  and use Lemma A37 instead of Lemma A36. For conciseness, we omit the detailed proof here.  $\square$

**A8. Regularity Conditions and Diagnoses for Rerandomization.** To prove Proposition 1, we need the following two lemmas.

**LEMMA A38.** *Let  $\mathbf{W}_1, \mathbf{W}_2, \dots$  be i.i.d. random vectors in  $\mathbb{R}^{K_n}$  with  $\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{W}_i] = \mathbf{0}$  and  $\text{Cov}(\mathbf{W}_i) = \mathbf{I}_{K_n}$ . Assume that*

$$\sup_{\nu \in \mathbb{R}^{K_n}: \nu^\top \nu = 1} \mathbb{E}|\nu^\top \mathbf{W}_i|^\delta = O(1) \quad \text{and} \quad \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \left| \|\mathbf{W}_i\|_2^2 - \mathbb{E}\|\mathbf{W}_i\|_2^2 \right| = O_{\mathbb{P}}(\omega(n, K_n)),$$

for some  $\delta > 2$  and some function  $\omega(n, K_n)$  increasing in  $n$  and  $K_n$ . If  $K_n = O(n^\beta)$  for some  $0 < \beta < 1$ , then when  $n$  is sufficiently large,

$$\|\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{W}}^2 - \mathbf{I}_{K_n}\|_{\text{op}} = O_{\mathbb{P}} \left( \frac{\omega(n, K_n)}{n} + \left( \frac{K_n}{n} \right)^{\frac{\delta-2}{\delta}} \log^4 \left( \frac{n}{K_n} \right) + \left( \frac{K_n}{n} \right)^{\frac{\min\{\delta-2, 2\}}{\min\{\delta, 4\}}} \right)$$

and

$$\max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \|(\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{W}}^2)^{-1/2} (\mathbf{W}_i - \bar{\mathbf{W}})\|_2^2 = O_{\mathbb{P}} \left( \omega(n, K_n) + \frac{K_n^{\frac{2\delta-2}{\delta}}}{n^{\frac{\delta-2}{\delta}}} \log^4 \left( \frac{n}{K_n} \right) + n \cdot \left( \frac{K_n}{n} \right)^{\frac{\min\{2\delta-2, 6\}}{\min\{\delta, 4\}}} + K_n \right),$$

where  $\bar{\mathbf{W}} = n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{W}_i$  and  $\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{W}}^2 = (n-1)^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (\mathbf{W}_i - \bar{\mathbf{W}})(\mathbf{W}_i - \bar{\mathbf{W}})^\top$ .

PROOF OF LEMMA A38. Lemma A38 follows immediately from Lei and Ding (2020, Lemma H.1). Let  $\tilde{\mathbf{W}} = (\mathbf{W}_1 - \bar{\mathbf{W}}, \dots, \mathbf{W}_n - \bar{\mathbf{W}})^\top$ , and  $\tilde{\mathbf{H}} = \tilde{\mathbf{W}} (\tilde{\mathbf{W}}^\top \tilde{\mathbf{W}})^{-1} \tilde{\mathbf{W}}^\top$ . We can verify that  $\tilde{\mathbf{W}}^\top \tilde{\mathbf{W}} = \sum_{i=1}^n (\mathbf{W}_i - \bar{\mathbf{W}})(\mathbf{W}_i - \bar{\mathbf{W}})^\top = (n-1) \mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{W}}^2$ , and the  $i$ th diagonal element of  $\tilde{\mathbf{H}}$  has the following equivalent forms:

$$\begin{aligned} H_{ii} &= (\mathbf{W}_i - \bar{\mathbf{W}})^\top (\tilde{\mathbf{W}}^\top \tilde{\mathbf{W}})^{-1} (\mathbf{W}_i - \bar{\mathbf{W}}) = (n-1)^{-1} (\mathbf{W}_i - \bar{\mathbf{W}})^\top (\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{W}}^2)^{-1} (\mathbf{W}_i - \bar{\mathbf{W}}) \\ &= (n-1)^{-1} \|(\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{W}}^2)^{-1/2} (\mathbf{W}_i - \bar{\mathbf{W}})\|_2^2. \end{aligned}$$

From Lei and Ding (2020, Lemma H.1), we can know that

$$\left\| n^{-1} \tilde{\mathbf{W}}^\top \tilde{\mathbf{W}} - \mathbf{I}_{K_n} \right\|_{\text{op}} = O_{\mathbb{P}} \left( \frac{\omega(n, K_n)}{n} + \left( \frac{K_n}{n} \right)^{\frac{\delta-2}{\delta}} \log^4 \left( \frac{n}{K_n} \right) + \left( \frac{K_n}{n} \right)^{\frac{\min\{\delta-2, 2\}}{\min\{\delta, 4\}}} \right),$$

and

$$\max_{1 \leq i \leq n} |H_{ii} - K_n/n| = O_{\mathbb{P}} \left( \frac{\omega(n, K_n)}{n} + \left( \frac{K_n}{n} \right)^{\frac{2\delta-2}{\delta}} \log^4 \left( \frac{n}{K_n} \right) + \left( \frac{K_n}{n} \right)^{\frac{\min\{2\delta-2, 6\}}{\min\{\delta, 4\}}} \right).$$

These immediately imply that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{W}}^2 - \mathbf{I}_{K_n}\|_{\text{op}} &= \left\| \frac{n}{n-1} \left( n^{-1} \tilde{\mathbf{W}}^\top \tilde{\mathbf{W}} - \mathbf{I}_{K_n} \right) + \frac{1}{n-1} \mathbf{I}_{K_n} \right\|_{\text{op}} \leq \frac{n}{n-1} \left\| n^{-1} \tilde{\mathbf{W}}^\top \tilde{\mathbf{W}} - \mathbf{I}_{K_n} \right\|_{\text{op}} + \frac{1}{n-1} \\ &\leq 2 \left\| n^{-1} \tilde{\mathbf{W}}^\top \tilde{\mathbf{W}} - \mathbf{I}_{K_n} \right\|_{\text{op}} + \frac{2}{n} \\ &= O_{\mathbb{P}} \left( \frac{\omega(n, K_n)}{n} + \left( \frac{K_n}{n} \right)^{\frac{\delta-2}{\delta}} \log^4 \left( \frac{n}{K_n} \right) + \left( \frac{K_n}{n} \right)^{\frac{\min\{\delta-2, 2\}}{\min\{\delta, 4\}}} \right), \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality holds because  $(K_n/n)^{\min\{\delta-2, 2\}/\min\{\delta, 4\}} \geq (K_n/n)^{1/2} \geq 1/n$  when  $n$  is sufficiently large, and

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \|(\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{W}}^2)^{-1/2} (\mathbf{W}_i - \bar{\mathbf{W}})\|_2^2 &= (n-1) \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} H_{ii} \leq n \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} |H_{ii} - K_n/n| + K_n \\ &= O_{\mathbb{P}} \left( \omega(n, K_n) + \frac{K_n^{\frac{2\delta-2}{\delta}}}{n^{\frac{\delta-2}{\delta}}} \log^4 \left( \frac{n}{K_n} \right) + n \left( \frac{K_n}{n} \right)^{\frac{\min\{2\delta-2, 6\}}{\min\{\delta, 4\}}} + K_n \right). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, Lemma A38 holds.  $\square$

LEMMA A39. Assume that  $\mathbf{W}_1, \mathbf{W}_2, \dots$  are i.i.d. random vectors in  $\mathbb{R}^{K_n}$  with  $\max_{1 \leq j \leq K_n} \mathbb{E}|W_{ij}|^\delta \leq M$  for some absolute constants  $M < \infty$  and  $\delta > 2$ , where  $W_{ij}$  is the  $j$ th coordinate of  $\mathbf{W}_i$ . Then

$$\max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \left| \|\mathbf{W}_i\|_2^2 - \mathbb{E}\|\mathbf{W}_i\|_2^2 \right| = O_{\mathbb{P}}(n^{2/\delta} K_n).$$

PROOF OF LEMMA A39. By Hölder's inequality, for  $1 \leq i \leq n$  and  $1 \leq j \leq K_n$ ,  $\{\mathbb{E}(W_{ij}^2)\}^{\delta/2} \leq \mathbb{E}|W_{ij}|^\delta$ ,

$$\frac{1}{K_n} \left| \|\mathbf{W}_i\|_2^2 - \mathbb{E}\|\mathbf{W}_i\|_2^2 \right| \leq \frac{1}{K_n} \sum_{j=1}^{K_n} |W_{ij}^2 - \mathbb{E}(W_{ij}^2)| \leq \left( \frac{1}{K_n} \sum_{j=1}^{K_n} |W_{ij}^2 - \mathbb{E}(W_{ij}^2)|^{\delta/2} \right)^{2/\delta},$$

and

$$\frac{1}{2} |W_{ij}^2 - \mathbb{E}(W_{ij}^2)| \leq \frac{1}{2} (W_{ij}^2 + \mathbb{E}(W_{ij}^2)) \leq \left[ \frac{1}{2} \left\{ |W_{ij}|^\delta + (\mathbb{E}(W_{ij}^2))^{\delta/2} \right\} \right]^{2/\delta}.$$

These imply that

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left\{ \left| \|\mathbf{W}_i\|_2^2 - \mathbb{E}\|\mathbf{W}_i\|_2^2 \right|^{\delta/2} \right\} \\ &= K_n^{\delta/2} \mathbb{E} \left\{ \frac{1}{K_n^{\delta/2}} \left| \|\mathbf{W}_i\|_2^2 - \mathbb{E}\|\mathbf{W}_i\|_2^2 \right|^{\delta/2} \right\} \leq K_n^{\delta/2} \mathbb{E} \left( \frac{1}{K_n} \sum_{j=1}^{K_n} |W_{ij}^2 - \mathbb{E}(W_{ij}^2)|^{\delta/2} \right) \\ &= K_n^{\delta/2-1} 2^{\delta/2} \sum_{j=1}^{K_n} \mathbb{E} \left( \frac{1}{2^{\delta/2}} |W_{ij}^2 - \mathbb{E}(W_{ij}^2)|^{\delta/2} \right) \leq K_n^{\delta/2-1} 2^{\delta/2} \sum_{j=1}^{K_n} \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{1}{2} \left\{ |W_{ij}|^\delta + (\mathbb{E}(W_{ij}^2))^{\delta/2} \right\} \right] \\ &= K_n^{\delta/2-1} 2^{\delta/2-1} \sum_{j=1}^{K_n} \left\{ \mathbb{E}|W_{ij}|^\delta + (\mathbb{E}(W_{ij}^2))^{\delta/2} \right\} \leq K_n^{\delta/2-1} 2^{\delta/2} \sum_{j=1}^{K_n} \mathbb{E}|W_{ij}|^\delta \\ &\leq 2^{\delta/2} K_n^{\delta/2} M. \end{aligned}$$

Consequently,

$$\mathbb{E} \left\{ \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \left| \|\mathbf{W}_i\|_2^2 - \mathbb{E}\|\mathbf{W}_i\|_2^2 \right|^{\delta/2} \right\} \leq \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E} \left\{ \left| \|\mathbf{W}_i\|_2^2 - \mathbb{E}\|\mathbf{W}_i\|_2^2 \right|^{\delta/2} \right\} \leq 2^{\delta/2} M K_n^{\delta/2} n.$$

By the Markov's inequality,  $\max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \left| \|\mathbf{W}_i\|_2^2 - \mathbb{E}\|\mathbf{W}_i\|_2^2 \right| = O_{\mathbb{P}}(K_n n^{2/\delta})$ , i.e., Lemma A39 holds.  $\square$

**Proof of Proposition 1.** By the same logic as Lemma A10, we can bound  $\gamma_n$  by

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_n &\equiv \frac{(K_n + 1)^{1/4}}{\sqrt{nr_1 r_0}} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left\| (\mathbf{S}_u^2)^{-1/2} (\mathbf{u}_i - \bar{\mathbf{u}}) \right\|_2^3 \\ &\leq \frac{(K_n + 1)^{1/4}}{\sqrt{nr_1 r_0}} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left\| (\mathbf{S}_u^2)^{-1/2} (\mathbf{u}_i - \bar{\mathbf{u}}) \right\|_2^2 \cdot \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \left\| (\mathbf{S}_u^2)^{-1/2} (\mathbf{u}_i - \bar{\mathbf{u}}) \right\|_2 \\ &= \frac{(K_n + 1)^{1/4}}{\sqrt{nr_1 r_0}} \frac{(n-1)(K_n + 1)}{n} \cdot \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \left\| (\mathbf{S}_u^2)^{-1/2} (\mathbf{u}_i - \bar{\mathbf{u}}) \right\|_2 \\ \text{(A8.32)} \quad &= \frac{(K_n + 1)^{5/4}}{\sqrt{nr_1 r_0}} \frac{n-1}{n} \cdot \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \left\| (\mathbf{S}_\xi^2)^{-1/2} (\xi_i - \bar{\xi}) \right\|_2, \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality holds because the quantity  $\|(\mathbf{S}_u^2)^{-1/2}(\mathbf{u}_i - \bar{\mathbf{u}})\|_2$  is invariant under a non-singular linear transformation of  $\mathbf{u}_i$ 's. Under Condition 6 and the fact that  $K_n + 1 = O(n^\beta)$  for some  $\beta \in (0, 1)$ , from Lemmas A38 and A39, we can know that

$$\begin{aligned} & \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \|(\mathbf{S}_\xi^2)^{-1/2}(\xi_i - \bar{\xi})\|_2^2 \\ &= O_{\mathbb{P}} \left( n^{2/\delta} (K_n + 1) + \frac{(K_n + 1)^{\frac{2\delta-2}{\delta}}}{n^{\frac{\delta-2}{\delta}}} \log^4 \left( \frac{n}{K_n + 1} \right) + n \cdot \left( \frac{K_n + 1}{n} \right)^{\frac{\min\{2\delta-2, 6\}}{\min\{\delta, 4\}}} + K_n + 1 \right). \end{aligned}$$

Note that as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ ,  $(K_n + 1)/n = o(1)$ ,

$$\frac{1}{n^{2/\delta} (K_n + 1)} \frac{(K_n + 1)^{\frac{2\delta-2}{\delta}}}{n^{\frac{\delta-2}{\delta}}} \log^4 \left( \frac{n}{K_n + 1} \right) = \frac{1}{(K_n + 1)^{2/\delta}} \frac{K_n + 1}{n} \log^4 \left( \frac{n}{K_n + 1} \right) = o(1),$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{n^{2/\delta} (K_n + 1)} n \cdot \left( \frac{K_n + 1}{n} \right)^{\frac{\min\{2\delta-2, 6\}}{\min\{\delta, 4\}}} \\ &= \mathbb{1}(\delta \leq 4) \frac{1}{n^{2/\delta} (K_n + 1)} n \cdot \left( \frac{K_n + 1}{n} \right)^{2-2/\delta} + \mathbb{1}(\delta > 4) \frac{1}{n^{2/\delta} (K_n + 1)} n \cdot \left( \frac{K_n + 1}{n} \right)^{3/2} \\ & \text{(A8.33)} \\ &= \mathbb{1}(\delta \leq 4) \frac{(K_n + 1)^{1-2/\delta}}{n} + \mathbb{1}(\delta > 4) \frac{(K_n + 1)^{1/2}}{n^{2/\delta+1/2}} = o(1). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we must have

$$\max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \|(\mathbf{S}_\xi^2)^{-1/2}(\xi_i - \bar{\xi})\|_2^2 = O_{\mathbb{P}} \left( n^{2/\delta} (K_n + 1) \right).$$

From (A8.32), this then implies that

$$\gamma_n = \frac{(K_n + 1)^{5/4}}{\sqrt{nr_1 r_0}} \frac{n-1}{n} \cdot O_{\mathbb{P}} \left( \sqrt{n^{2/\delta} (K_n + 1)} \right) = O_{\mathbb{P}} \left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{r_1 r_0}} \frac{(K_n + 1)^{7/4}}{n^{1/2-1/\delta}} \right).$$

Therefore, Proposition 1 holds.  $\square$

**Proof of Corollary 2(i).** When Condition 6 holds,  $r_z^{-1} = O(1)$  and  $K_n = o(n^{2/7-4/(7\delta)})$ , from Proposition 1, we have

$$\gamma_n = O_{\mathbb{P}} \left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{r_1 r_0}} \frac{(K_n + 1)^{7/4}}{n^{1/2-1/\delta}} \right) = \frac{\{n^{2/7-4/(7\delta)}\}^{7/4}}{n^{1/2-1/\delta}} \cdot o_{\mathbb{P}}(1) = o_{\mathbb{P}}(1).$$

Therefore, Corollary 2(i) holds.  $\square$

To prove Corollary 2(ii), we need the following two lemmas.

LEMMA A40. *The squared multiple correlation  $R_n^2$  defined as in (5) can be equivalently written as*

$$R_n^2 = \frac{\mathbf{S}_{r_0 Y(1)+r_1 Y(0), \mathbf{X}} (\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{X}}^2)^{-1} \mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{X}, r_0 Y(1)+r_1 Y(0)}}{S_{r_0 Y(1)+r_1 Y(0)}^2},$$

where  $S_{r_0 Y(1)+r_1 Y(0)}^2$  denotes the finite population variance of  $r_0 Y(1) + r_1 Y(0)$  and  $\mathbf{S}_{r_0 Y(1)+r_1 Y(0), \mathbf{X}}$  denotes the finite population covariance between  $r_0 Y(1) + r_1 Y(0)$  and  $\mathbf{X}$ .

PROOF OF LEMMA A40. Let  $S_{10}$  be the finite population covariance between  $Y(1)$  and  $Y(0)$ . By some algebra,  $S_{r_0Y(1)+r_1Y(0)}^2$  has the following equivalent forms:

$$\begin{aligned} S_{r_0Y(1)+r_1Y(0)}^2 &= r_0^2 S_1^2 + r_1^2 S_0^2 + 2r_1 r_0 S_{10} = (r_0^2 + r_1 r_0) S_1^2 + (r_1^2 + r_1 r_0) S_0^2 - r_1 r_0 (S_1^2 + S_0^2 - 2S_{10}) \\ (A8.34) \quad &= r_0 S_1^2 + r_1 S_0^2 - r_1 r_0 S_{10}^2 = nr_1 r_0 (n_1^{-1} S_1^2 + n_0^{-1} S_0^2 - n^{-1} S_{10}^2) = nr_1 r_0 V_{\tau\tau}. \end{aligned}$$

By the same logic, we have

$$\mathbf{S}_{r_0Y(1)+r_1Y(0), \mathbf{X}} (\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{X}}^2)^{-1} \mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{X}, r_0Y(1)+r_1Y(0)} = nr_1 r_0 (n_1^{-1} S_{1|X}^2 + n_0^{-1} S_{0|X}^2 - n^{-1} S_{\tau|X}^2).$$

Lemma A40 then follows from the definition in (5).  $\square$

LEMMA A41. *For any sequence of positive integers  $\{K_n\}$  and any sequence of matrices  $\mathbf{A}_n \in \mathbb{R}^{K_n}$ , if  $\|\mathbf{A}_n - \mathbf{I}_{K_n}\|_{op} = o_{\mathbb{P}}(1)$ , then  $\|\mathbf{A}_n^{-1} - \mathbf{I}_{K_n}\|_{op} = o_{\mathbb{P}}(1)$ .*

PROOF OF LEMMA A41. Note that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{A}_n^{-1} - \mathbf{I}_{K_n}\|_{op} &= \|\mathbf{A}_n^{-1}(\mathbf{A}_n - \mathbf{I}_{K_n})\|_{op} \leq \|\mathbf{A}_n^{-1}\|_{op} \cdot \|\mathbf{A}_n - \mathbf{I}_{K_n}\|_{op} \\ &= \|\mathbf{I}_{K_n} + (\mathbf{A}_n^{-1} - \mathbf{I}_{K_n})\|_{op} \cdot \|\mathbf{A}_n - \mathbf{I}_{K_n}\|_{op} \\ &\leq (\|\mathbf{I}_{K_n}\|_{op} + \|\mathbf{A}_n^{-1} - \mathbf{I}_{K_n}\|_{op}) \cdot \|\mathbf{A}_n - \mathbf{I}_{K_n}\|_{op} \\ &\leq \|\mathbf{A}_n - \mathbf{I}_{K_n}\|_{op} + \|\mathbf{A}_n - \mathbf{I}_{K_n}\|_{op} \cdot \|\mathbf{A}_n^{-1} - \mathbf{I}_{K_n}\|_{op}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, when  $\|\mathbf{A}_n - \mathbf{I}_{K_n}\|_{op} < 1$ , we have  $\|\mathbf{A}_n^{-1} - \mathbf{I}_{K_n}\|_{op} \leq \|\mathbf{A}_n - \mathbf{I}_{K_n}\|_{op} / (1 - \|\mathbf{A}_n - \mathbf{I}_{K_n}\|_{op})$ . By the property of convergence in probability (e.g., Durrett, 2019, Theorem 2.3.2), we can immediately derive Lemma A41.  $\square$

**Proof of Corollary 2(ii).** We first prove that  $\|\mathbf{S}_{\xi}^2 - \mathbf{I}_{K_n+1}\|_{op} = o_{\mathbb{P}}(1)$ . Under Condition 6, from Lemmas A38 and A39,

$$\|\mathbf{S}_{\xi}^2 - \mathbf{I}_{K_n+1}\|_{op} = O_{\mathbb{P}} \left( \frac{n^{2/\delta}(K_n+1)}{n} + \left( \frac{K_n+1}{n} \right)^{\frac{\delta-2}{\delta}} \log^4 \left( \frac{n}{K_n+1} \right) + \left( \frac{K_n+1}{n} \right)^{\frac{\min\{\delta-2, 2\}}{\min\{\delta, 4\}}} \right).$$

We can verify that  $2/7 - 4/(7\delta) < 1 - 2/\delta$  for  $\delta > 2$ . Thus, we must have  $(K_n+1)/n^{1-2/\delta} = o(1)$ , which further implies that  $\|\mathbf{S}_{\xi}^2 - \mathbf{I}_{K_n+1}\|_{op} = o_{\mathbb{P}}(1)$ .

We then prove that  $R_n^2 - R_{\text{sup},n}^2 = o_{\mathbb{P}}(1)$ . By definition,

$$\begin{aligned} \left( \begin{array}{c} r_0 Y_i(1) + r_1 Y_i(0) - \mathbb{E}\{r_0 Y_i(1) + r_1 Y_i(0)\} \\ \mathbf{X}_i - \mathbb{E}(\mathbf{X}_i) \end{array} \right) &= \mathbf{u}_i = \text{Cov}(\mathbf{u})^{1/2} \boldsymbol{\xi}_i = \begin{pmatrix} (1, \mathbf{0}_{K_n}^{\top}) \text{Cov}(\mathbf{u})^{1/2} \boldsymbol{\xi}_i \\ (\mathbf{0}_{K_n}, \mathbf{I}_{K_n}) \text{Cov}(\mathbf{u})^{1/2} \boldsymbol{\xi}_i \end{pmatrix} \\ &\equiv \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{a}^{\top} \boldsymbol{\xi}_i \\ \mathbf{B}^{\top} \boldsymbol{\xi}_i \end{pmatrix}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\mathbf{a}^{\top} = (1, \mathbf{0}_{K_n}^{\top}) \text{Cov}(\mathbf{u})^{1/2} \in \mathbb{R}^{1 \times (K_n+1)}$  and  $\mathbf{B}^{\top} = (\mathbf{0}_{K_n}, \mathbf{I}_{K_n}) \text{Cov}(\mathbf{u})^{1/2} \in \mathbb{R}^{K_n \times (K_n+1)}$ . We can then verify that

$$\text{Var}\{r_0 Y(1) + r_1 Y(0)\} = \mathbf{a}^{\top} \mathbf{a}, \quad \text{Var}(\mathbf{X}_i) = \mathbf{B}^{\top} \mathbf{B}, \quad \text{Cov}\{r_0 Y(1) + r_1 Y(0), \mathbf{X}\} = \mathbf{a}^{\top} \mathbf{B}.$$

Consequently, the super population squared multiple correlation between  $r_0 Y_i(1) + r_1 Y_i(0)$  and  $\mathbf{X}_i$  has the following equivalent forms:

$$R_{\text{sup},n}^2 = \frac{\text{Cov}\{r_0 Y(1) + r_1 Y(0), \mathbf{X}_i\} \{\text{Var}(\mathbf{X})\}^{-1} \text{Cov}\{\mathbf{X}, r_0 Y(1) + r_1 Y(0)\}}{\text{Var}\{r_0 Y(1) + r_1 Y(0)\}} = \frac{\mathbf{a}^{\top} \mathbf{B} (\mathbf{B}^{\top} \mathbf{B})^{-1} \mathbf{B}^{\top} \mathbf{a}}{\mathbf{a}^{\top} \mathbf{a}}.$$

From Lemma A40, the finite population squared multiple correlation  $R_n^2$  satisfies that

$$S_{r_0Y(1)+r_1Y(0)}^2 R_n^2 = \mathbf{S}_{r_0Y(1)+r_1Y(0), \mathbf{X}} (\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{X}}^2)^{-1} \mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{X}, r_0Y(1)+r_1Y(0)} = \mathbf{a}^\top \mathbf{S}_\xi^2 \mathbf{B} \left( \mathbf{B}^\top \mathbf{S}_\xi^2 \mathbf{B} \right)^{-1} \mathbf{B}^\top \mathbf{S}_\xi^2 \mathbf{a}.$$

Let  $\tilde{\mathbf{a}} = \mathbf{a} / \sqrt{\mathbf{a}^\top \mathbf{a}}$  and  $\mathbf{B} = \mathbf{Q} \mathbf{C} \mathbf{T}^\top$  be the singular value decomposition of  $\mathbf{B}$ , where  $\mathbf{Q} \in \mathbb{R}^{(K_n+1) \times K_n}$ ,  $\mathbf{Q}^\top \mathbf{Q} = \mathbf{I}_{K_n}$ ,  $\mathbf{C} \in \mathbb{R}^{K_n \times K_n}$  is a diagonal matrix, and  $\mathbf{T} \in \mathbb{R}^{K_n \times K_n}$  is an orthogonal matrix. We then have

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{S_{r_0Y(1)+r_1Y(0)}^2}{\text{Var}\{r_0Y(1) + r_1Y(0)\}} R_n^2 - R_{\text{sup}}^2 \\ &= \tilde{\mathbf{a}}^\top \mathbf{S}_\xi^2 \mathbf{B} \left( \mathbf{B}^\top \mathbf{S}_\xi^2 \mathbf{B} \right)^{-1} \mathbf{B}^\top \mathbf{S}_\xi^2 \tilde{\mathbf{a}} - \tilde{\mathbf{a}}^\top \mathbf{B} (\mathbf{B}^\top \mathbf{B})^{-1} \mathbf{B}^\top \tilde{\mathbf{a}} = \tilde{\mathbf{a}}^\top \mathbf{S}_\xi^2 \mathbf{Q} \left( \mathbf{Q}^\top \mathbf{S}_\xi^2 \mathbf{Q} \right)^{-1} \mathbf{Q}^\top \mathbf{S}_\xi^2 \tilde{\mathbf{a}} - \tilde{\mathbf{a}}^\top \mathbf{Q} \mathbf{Q}^\top \tilde{\mathbf{a}} \\ &= \tilde{\mathbf{a}}^\top \mathbf{S}_\xi^2 \mathbf{Q} \left\{ \left( \mathbf{Q}^\top \mathbf{S}_\xi^2 \mathbf{Q} \right)^{-1} - \mathbf{I}_{K_n} \right\} \mathbf{Q}^\top \mathbf{S}_\xi^2 \tilde{\mathbf{a}} + \tilde{\mathbf{a}}^\top (\mathbf{S}_\xi^2 - \mathbf{I}_{K_n}) \mathbf{Q} \mathbf{Q}^\top \mathbf{S}_\xi^2 \tilde{\mathbf{a}} + \tilde{\mathbf{a}}^\top \mathbf{Q} \mathbf{Q}^\top (\mathbf{S}_\xi^2 - \mathbf{I}_{K_n}) \tilde{\mathbf{a}}. \end{aligned}$$

By the property of operator norm and the fact that  $\tilde{\mathbf{a}}^\top \tilde{\mathbf{a}} = 1$  and  $\mathbf{Q}^\top \mathbf{Q} = \mathbf{I}_{K_n}$ , we then have

$$\left| \frac{S_{r_0Y(1)+r_1Y(0)}^2 R_n^2}{\text{Var}\{r_0Y(1) + r_1Y(0)\}} - R_{\text{sup}}^2 \right| \leq \left\| \left( \mathbf{Q}^\top \mathbf{S}_\xi^2 \mathbf{Q} \right)^{-1} - \mathbf{I}_{K_n} \right\|_{\text{op}} \|\mathbf{S}_\xi^2\|_{\text{op}}^2 + \|\mathbf{S}_\xi^2 - \mathbf{I}_{K_n}\|_{\text{op}} \left( \|\mathbf{S}_\xi^2\|_{\text{op}} + 1 \right).$$

Note that  $\|\mathbf{S}_\xi^2 - \mathbf{I}_{K_n}\|_{\text{op}} = o_{\mathbb{P}}(1)$ ,  $\|\mathbf{S}_\xi^2\|_{\text{op}} \leq \|\mathbf{S}_\xi^2 - \mathbf{I}_{K_n}\|_{\text{op}} + \|\mathbf{I}_{K_n}\|_{\text{op}} = 1 + o_{\mathbb{P}}(1)$ , and  $\|\mathbf{Q}^\top \mathbf{S}_\xi^2 \mathbf{Q} - \mathbf{I}_{K_n}\|_{\text{op}} = \|\mathbf{Q}^\top (\mathbf{S}_\xi^2 - \mathbf{I}_{K_n}) \mathbf{Q}\|_{\text{op}} \leq \|\mathbf{S}_\xi^2 - \mathbf{I}_{K_n}\|_{\text{op}} = o_{\mathbb{P}}(1)$ . From Lemma A41, we can then derive that  $\left\| \left( \mathbf{Q}^\top \mathbf{S}_\xi^2 \mathbf{Q} \right)^{-1} - \mathbf{I}_{K_n} \right\|_{\text{op}} = o_{\mathbb{P}}(1)$ ,  $S_{r_0Y(1)+r_1Y(0)}^2 / \text{Var}\{r_0Y(1) + r_1Y(0)\} \cdot R_n^2 - R_{\text{sup}}^2 = o_{\mathbb{P}}(1)$ ,

$$\left| \frac{S_{r_0Y(1)+r_1Y(0)}^2}{\text{Var}\{r_0Y(1) + r_1Y(0)\}} - 1 \right| = \left| \tilde{\mathbf{a}}^\top \mathbf{S}_\xi^2 \tilde{\mathbf{a}} - 1 \right| = \left| \tilde{\mathbf{a}}^\top (\mathbf{S}_\xi^2 - \mathbf{I}_{K_n}) \tilde{\mathbf{a}} \right| \leq \|\mathbf{S}_\xi^2 - \mathbf{I}_{K_n}\|_{\text{op}} = o_{\mathbb{P}}(1).$$

Consequently,

$$R_n^2 - R_{\text{sup},n}^2 = \frac{S_{r_0Y(1)+r_1Y(0)}^2}{\text{Var}\{r_0Y(1) + r_1Y(0)\}} R_n^2 - R_{\text{sup}}^2 - \left( \frac{S_{r_0Y(1)+r_1Y(0)}^2}{\text{Var}\{r_0Y(1) + r_1Y(0)\}} - 1 \right) R_n^2 = o_{\mathbb{P}}(1).$$

From the above, Corollary 2(ii) holds.  $\square$

**Proof of Corollary 2(iii).** First, from (A7.29) and (A8.34), we can know that

$$\begin{aligned} r_0 S_{1 \setminus \mathbf{X}}^2 + r_1 S_{0 \setminus \mathbf{X}}^2 &= nr_1 r_0 (n_1^{-1} S_{1 \setminus \mathbf{X}}^2 + n_0^{-1} S_{0 \setminus \mathbf{X}}^2) = nr_1 r_0 \{V_{\tau\tau} (1 - R_n^2) + n^{-1} S_{\tau \setminus \mathbf{X}}^2\} \\ &\geq nr_1 r_0 V_{\tau\tau} (1 - R_n^2) = S_{r_0Y(1)+r_1Y(0)}^2 (1 - R_n^2). \end{aligned}$$

From Corollary 2(ii) and its proof, and by the conditions in Corollary 2(iii), we can know that  $S_{r_0Y(1)+r_1Y(0)}^2 = \text{Var}(r_0Y_i(1) + r_1Y_i(0)) \cdot (1 + o_{\mathbb{P}}(1))$  and  $1 - R_n^2 = 1 - R_{\text{sup},n}^2 + o_{\mathbb{P}}(1) = (1 - R_{\text{sup},n}^2) \cdot (1 + o_{\mathbb{P}}(1))$ . These imply that the quantity on the left hand side of (16) satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\max_{z \in \{0,1\}} \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \{Y_i(z) - \bar{Y}(z)\}^2}{r_0 S_{1 \setminus \mathbf{X}}^2 + r_1 S_{0 \setminus \mathbf{X}}^2} \cdot \frac{\max\{K_n, 1\}}{r_1 r_0} \cdot \sqrt{\frac{\max\{1, \log K_n, -\log p_n\}}{n}} \\ &= \frac{\max_{z \in \{0,1\}} \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \{Y_i(z) - \bar{Y}(z)\}^2}{\text{Var}(r_0Y_i(1) + r_1Y_i(0)) \cdot (1 - R_{\text{sup},n}^2)} \cdot \frac{\max\{K_n, 1\} \cdot \sqrt{\max\{1, \log K_n, -\log p_n\}}}{n^{1/2}} \cdot O_{\mathbb{P}}(1) \\ &= \frac{\max_{z \in \{0,1\}} \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \{Y_i(z) - \bar{Y}(z)\}^2}{\text{Var}(r_0Y_i(1) + r_1Y_i(0))} \cdot \frac{\max\{K_n, 1\} \cdot \sqrt{\max\{1, \log K_n, -\log p_n\}}}{n^{1/2}} \cdot O_{\mathbb{P}}(1), \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality follows from the condition on  $R_{\text{sup},n}^2$ .

Second, by some algebra, for  $1 \leq i \leq n$ ,

$$|Y_i(z) - \bar{Y}(z)| \leq |Y_i(z) - \mathbb{E}(Y(z))| + |\bar{Y}(z) - \mathbb{E}(Y(z))| \leq 2 \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} |Y_i(z) - \mathbb{E}(Y(z))|$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} |Y_i(z) - \mathbb{E}(Y(z))|^b &\leq \sum_{i=1}^n |Y_i(z) - \mathbb{E}(Y(z))|^b = n \cdot \mathbb{E}\{|Y(z) - \mathbb{E}(Y(z))|^b\} \cdot O_{\mathbb{P}}(1) \\ &= n \cdot \mathbb{E}\left\{\left|\frac{Y(z) - \mathbb{E}(Y(z))}{\sqrt{\text{Var}(Y(z))}}\right|^b\right\} \cdot \{\text{Var}(Y(z))\}^{b/2} \cdot O_{\mathbb{P}}(1) \\ &= n\{\text{Var}(Y(z))\}^{b/2} \cdot O_{\mathbb{P}}(1). \end{aligned}$$

These imply that  $\max_{1 \leq i \leq n} |Y_i(z) - \mathbb{E}(Y(z))|^2 = n^{2/b} \text{Var}(Y(z)) \cdot O_{\mathbb{P}}(1)$ . Consequently, we can further bound the quantity on the left hand side of (16) by

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{\max_{z \in \{0,1\}} \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \{Y_i(z) - \bar{Y}(z)\}^2}{r_0 S_{1 \setminus \mathbf{X}}^2 + r_1 S_{0 \setminus \mathbf{X}}^2} \cdot \frac{\max\{K_n, 1\}}{r_1 r_0} \cdot \sqrt{\frac{\max\{1, \log K_n, -\log p_n\}}{n}} \\ &= \frac{\max_{z \in \{0,1\}} \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \{Y_i(z) - \bar{Y}(z)\}^2}{\text{Var}(r_0 Y_i(1) + r_1 Y_i(0))} \cdot \frac{\max\{K_n, 1\} \cdot \sqrt{\max\{1, \log K_n, -\log p_n\}}}{n^{1/2}} \cdot O_{\mathbb{P}}(1) \\ &= \frac{n^{2/b} \{\text{Var}(Y(1)) + \text{Var}(Y(0))\}}{\text{Var}(r_0 Y_i(1) + r_1 Y_i(0))} \cdot \frac{\max\{K_n, 1\} \cdot \sqrt{\max\{1, \log K_n, -\log p_n\}}}{n^{1/2}} \cdot O_{\mathbb{P}}(1) \\ &= \frac{\max\{K_n, 1\} \cdot \sqrt{\max\{1, \log K_n, -\log p_n\}}}{n^{1/2-2/b}} \cdot O_{\mathbb{P}}(1) \\ &= \frac{\max\{K_n, 1\} \cdot \sqrt{\max\{1, \log K_n\}}}{n^{1/2-2/b}} \cdot O_{\mathbb{P}}(1) + \frac{\max\{K_n, 1\} \cdot \sqrt{-\log p_n}}{n^{1/2-2/b}} \cdot O_{\mathbb{P}}(1). \end{aligned}$$

Third, because  $K_n = O(n^c)$  for some  $c < 1/2 - 2/b$ , we have

$$\frac{\max\{K_n, 1\} \cdot \sqrt{\max\{1, \log K_n\}}}{n^{1/2-2/b}} = \frac{\log n}{n^{1/2-2/b-c}} \cdot O(1) = o(1),$$

and

$$\frac{\max\{K_n, 1\} \cdot \sqrt{-\log p_n}}{n^{1/2-2/b}} = \frac{\sqrt{-\log p_n}}{n^{1/2-2/b-c}} \cdot O(1) = \sqrt{\frac{-\log p_n}{n^{1-4/b-2c}}} = o(1),$$

where the last condition holds by the condition on  $p_n$ .

From the above, we can know that Corollary 2 holds.  $\square$

**Proof of Corollary 3.** We choose  $p_n \propto n^{-h}$  for some  $0 < h < (1/2 - 1/\delta)/3$ . Below we verify that Conditions 1–4 holds with high probability.

First, from Proposition 1,  $\gamma_n = o_{\mathbb{P}}(1)$ . Second, from Theorem 1 and Proposition 1, and by the construction of  $p_n$ ,

$$\frac{\Delta_n}{p_n} = \frac{\gamma_n + \gamma_n^{1/3}}{p_n} \cdot O(1) = \frac{(\log n)^{(7/12)}}{n^{(1/2-1/\delta)/3}} \cdot n^h \cdot o_{\mathbb{P}}(1) = \frac{(\log n)^{(7/12)}}{n^{(1/2-1/\delta)/3-h}} \cdot o_{\mathbb{P}}(1) = o_{\mathbb{P}}(1).$$

Third,  $K_n / \log(p_n^{-1}) = K_n / \log(n^h) \cdot O(1) = h^{-1} K_n / \log(n) = o(1)$ . Fourth, from Corollary 2(ii),  $R_n^2 = R_{\text{sup},n}^2 + o_{\mathbb{P}}(1) \leq 1 - c + o_{\mathbb{P}}(1)$ .

Therefore, by the property of convergence in probability (e.g., Durrett, 2019, Theorem 2.3.2), Corollary 3 follows from Theorem 5.  $\square$

**Comments on the equivalent form of  $\gamma_n$  and its bounds in Section 7.2.** We first prove the equivalent form of  $\gamma_n$ . Because  $(e_i, \mathbf{X}_i)$  is a non-singular linear transformation of  $\mathbf{u}_i$ , and the finite population covariance between  $e_i$  and  $\mathbf{X}_i$  is zero, we can equivalently write  $(\mathbf{u}_i - \bar{\mathbf{u}})^\top \mathbf{S}_u^{-2}(\mathbf{u}_i - \bar{\mathbf{u}})$  as

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathbf{u}_i - \bar{\mathbf{u}})^\top \mathbf{S}_u^{-2}(\mathbf{u}_i - \bar{\mathbf{u}}) &= (e_i, (\mathbf{X}_i - \bar{\mathbf{X}})^\top) \begin{pmatrix} S_e^{-2} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & S_{\mathbf{X}}^{-2} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} e_i \\ \mathbf{X}_i - \bar{\mathbf{X}} \end{pmatrix} \\ &= e_i^2 + (\mathbf{X}_i - \bar{\mathbf{X}})^\top \mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{X}}^{-2}(\mathbf{X}_i - \bar{\mathbf{X}}) = e_i^2 + (n-1)H_{ii}, \end{aligned}$$

where the second last equality holds since the finite population variance of  $e_i$ ,  $S_e^2$  equals 1, and the last equality follows from the definition of  $H_{ii}$ 's. This then implies that

$$\gamma_n = \frac{(K_n + 1)^{1/4}}{\sqrt{nr_1 r_0}} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left\| (\mathbf{S}_u^2)^{-1/2} (\mathbf{u}_i - \bar{\mathbf{u}}) \right\|_2^3 = \frac{(K_n + 1)^{1/4}}{\sqrt{nr_1 r_0}} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (e_i^2 + (n-1)H_{ii})^{3/2}.$$

We then prove the bounds for  $\gamma_n$ . By Hölder's inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} (e_i^2 + (n-1)H_{ii})^{3/2} &= 2^{3/2} \left( \frac{e_i^2 + (n-1)H_{ii}}{2} \right)^{3/2} \leq 2^{3/2} \frac{|e_i|^3 + (n-1)^{3/2} H_{ii}^{3/2}}{2} \\ &\leq \sqrt{2} (|e_i|^3 + n^{3/2} H_{ii}^{3/2}). \end{aligned}$$

This immediately implies that  $\gamma_n \leq \sqrt{2} \tilde{\gamma}_n$ . Note that

$$\begin{aligned} 2(e_i^2 + (n-1)H_{ii})^{3/2} &\geq (e_i^2)^{3/2} + \{(n-1)H_{ii}\}^{3/2} \geq |e_i|^3 + \frac{n^{3/2}}{2^{3/2}} H_{ii}^{3/2} \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2^{3/2}} (|e_i|^3 + n^{3/2} H_{ii}^{3/2}). \end{aligned}$$

This immediately implies that  $\gamma_n \geq \tilde{\gamma}_n / 2^{5/2} = \tilde{\gamma}_n / (4\sqrt{2})$ .  $\square$

**Comment on  $\sum_{i=1}^n H_{ii}^{3/2}$ .** Because  $H_{ii}$ 's are the diagonal elements of a projection matrix of rank  $K_n$ , we have  $\sum_{i=1}^n H_{ii} = K_n$ . By Hölder's inequality, we then have

$$\sum_{i=1}^n H_{ii}^{3/2} = n \cdot \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n H_{ii}^{3/2} \geq n \cdot \left( \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n H_{ii} \right)^{3/2} = \frac{K_n^{3/2}}{\sqrt{n}}.$$

$\square$

**Comments on the first two moments of  $\hat{\tau} - \tau$  under any design.** From (6) and by definition,

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\tau} - \tau &= \frac{n}{n_1 n_0} \sum_{i=1}^n Z_i y_i - \frac{n}{n_0} \bar{Y}(0) - \bar{Y}(1) + \bar{Y}(0) = \frac{n}{n_1 n_0} \sum_{i=1}^n Z_i y_i - \frac{n}{n_0} \{r_1 \bar{Y}(0) + r_0 \bar{Y}(1)\} \\ &= \frac{n}{n_1 n_0} \sum_{i=1}^n Z_i y_i - \frac{n}{n_0} \bar{y} = \frac{n}{n_1 n_0} \sum_{i=1}^n Z_i y_i - \frac{n}{n_1 n_0} \sum_{i=1}^n Z_i \bar{y} = \frac{n}{n_1 n_0} \sum_{i=1}^n Z_i (y_i - \bar{y}) \\ &= \frac{n}{n_1 n_0} \sum_{i=1}^n \left( Z_i - \frac{n_1}{n} \right) (y_i - \bar{y}) = \frac{n}{n_1 n_0} (\mathbf{Z} - r_1 \mathbf{1}_n)^\top \tilde{\mathbf{y}}. \end{aligned}$$

Consequently,

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{D}}(\hat{\tau} - \tau) = \frac{n}{n_1 n_0} (\mathbb{E} \mathbf{Z} - r_1 \mathbf{1}_n)^\top \tilde{\mathbf{y}} = \frac{1}{nr_1 r_0} (\boldsymbol{\pi} - r_1 \mathbf{1}_n)^\top \tilde{\mathbf{y}},$$



and

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{D}}\{(\hat{\tau} - \tau)^2\} &= \left(\frac{n}{nr_1r_0}\right)^2 \tilde{\mathbf{y}}^\top \mathbb{E}\left\{(\mathbf{Z} - r_1\mathbf{1}_n)(\mathbf{Z} - r_1\mathbf{1}_n)^\top\right\} \tilde{\mathbf{y}} \\
&= \frac{1}{(nr_1r_0)^2} \tilde{\mathbf{y}}^\top \left\{\text{Var}_{\mathcal{D}}(\mathbf{Z}) + (\mathbb{E}\mathbf{Z} - r_1\mathbf{1}_n)(\mathbb{E}\mathbf{Z} - r_1\mathbf{1}_n)^\top\right\} \tilde{\mathbf{y}} \\
\text{(A8.35)} \quad &= \frac{1}{(nr_1r_0)^2} \tilde{\mathbf{y}}^\top \left\{\boldsymbol{\Omega} + (\boldsymbol{\pi} - r_1\mathbf{1}_n)(\boldsymbol{\pi} - r_1\mathbf{1}_n)^\top\right\} \tilde{\mathbf{y}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, (A1.1) holds.  $\square$

**Proof of Proposition A1.** From (A8.34), we can know that

$$V_{\tau\tau} = \frac{1}{nr_1r_0} S_{r_0Y(1)+r_1Y(0)}^2 = \frac{1}{nr_1r_0} \frac{1}{n-1} \tilde{\mathbf{y}}^\top \tilde{\mathbf{y}}.$$

This implies that

$$V_{\tau\tau}^{-1/2} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{D}}(\hat{\tau} - \tau) = \sqrt{\frac{n-1}{nr_1r_0}} \cdot \frac{(\boldsymbol{\pi} - r_1\mathbf{1}_n)^\top \tilde{\mathbf{y}}}{\|\tilde{\mathbf{y}}\|_2},$$

and

$$V_{\tau\tau}^{-1/2} \sqrt{\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{D}}\{(\hat{\tau} - \tau)^2\}} = \sqrt{\frac{n-1}{nr_1r_0}} \sqrt{\frac{\tilde{\mathbf{y}}^\top \{\boldsymbol{\Omega} + (\boldsymbol{\pi} - r_1\mathbf{1}_n)(\boldsymbol{\pi} - r_1\mathbf{1}_n)^\top\} \tilde{\mathbf{y}}}{\tilde{\mathbf{y}}^\top \tilde{\mathbf{y}}}}.$$

By some matrix properties, we can know that

$$\max_{\tilde{\mathbf{y}} \neq \mathbf{0}} V_{\tau\tau}^{-1/2} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{D}}(\hat{\tau} - \tau) = \sqrt{\frac{n-1}{nr_1r_0}} \cdot \|\boldsymbol{\pi} - r_1\mathbf{1}_n\|_2 \geq 0,$$

and

$$\max_{\tilde{\mathbf{y}} \neq \mathbf{0}} V_{\tau\tau}^{-1/2} \sqrt{\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{D}}\{(\hat{\tau} - \tau)^2\}} = \sqrt{\frac{n-1}{nr_1r_0}} \cdot \lambda_{\max}^{1/2} \left( \boldsymbol{\Omega} + (\boldsymbol{\pi} - r_1\mathbf{1}_n)(\boldsymbol{\pi} - r_1\mathbf{1}_n)^\top \right).$$

Below we prove the inequality on the right hand side of (A1.3). Let  $\boldsymbol{\Psi} = \boldsymbol{\Omega} + (\boldsymbol{\pi} - r_1\mathbf{1}_n)(\boldsymbol{\pi} - r_1\mathbf{1}_n)^\top$ . From (A8.35),  $\boldsymbol{\Psi} = \mathbb{E}\{(\mathbf{Z} - r_1\mathbf{1}_n)(\mathbf{Z} - r_1\mathbf{1}_n)^\top\}$ . Because  $\mathbf{1}_n^\top(\mathbf{Z} - r_1\mathbf{1}_n) = \sum_{i=1}^n Z_i - nr_1 = 0$ , we must have  $\mathbf{1}_n^\top \boldsymbol{\Psi} \mathbf{1}_n = 0$ . This implies that  $\boldsymbol{\Psi}$  has at most  $n-1$  positive eigenvalues. Consequently,

$$\begin{aligned}
&(n-1)\lambda_{\max}(\boldsymbol{\Psi}) \\
&\geq \text{tr}(\boldsymbol{\Psi}) = \mathbb{E}\left[\text{tr}\left((\mathbf{Z} - r_1\mathbf{1}_n)(\mathbf{Z} - r_1\mathbf{1}_n)^\top\right)\right] = \mathbb{E}\left[\text{tr}\left((\mathbf{Z} - r_1\mathbf{1}_n)^\top(\mathbf{Z} - r_1\mathbf{1}_n)\right)\right] \\
&= \mathbb{E}\left\{\text{tr}\left(\mathbf{Z}^\top \mathbf{Z} - 2r_1\mathbf{1}_n^\top \mathbf{Z} + r_1^2 \mathbf{1}_n^\top \mathbf{1}_n\right)\right\} = \mathbb{E}(n_1 - 2r_1n_1 + r_1^2n) = nr_1r_0,
\end{aligned}$$

i.e.,  $\lambda_{\max}(\boldsymbol{\Psi}) \geq nr_1r_0/(n-1)$ . This immediately implies the inequality on the right hand side of (A1.3).

From the above, Proposition A1 holds.  $\square$

**A9. Asymptotic analysis of regression adjustment under rerandomization.** To prove Theorem A1, we need the following four lemmas.

LEMMA A42. *Under ReM and Condition A1, as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ ,*

$$\sup_{c \in \mathbb{R}} \left| \mathbb{P} \left\{ V_{\tau\tau}^{-1/2} (1 - \rho_n^2)^{-1/2} \{ \hat{\tau}(\tilde{\beta}_1, \tilde{\beta}_0) - \tau \} \leq c \mid M \leq a_n \right\} \right. \\ \left. - \mathbb{P} \left( \sqrt{1 - R_n^2(\tilde{\beta}_1, \tilde{\beta}_0)} \varepsilon_0 + \sqrt{R_n^2(\tilde{\beta}_1, \tilde{\beta}_0)} L_{K_n, a_n} \leq c \right) \right| \rightarrow 0.$$

PROOF OF LEMMA A42. Define  $V_{\tau\tau}(\tilde{\beta}_1, \tilde{\beta}_0)$  analogously as  $V_{\tau\tau}$  in (4), but using the adjusted potential outcomes with adjustment coefficients  $\tilde{\beta}_1$  and  $\tilde{\beta}_0$ . From Li and Ding (2020, Proof of Theorem 5),  $V_{\tau\tau}(\tilde{\beta}_1, \tilde{\beta}_0) = V_{\tau\tau}(1 - \rho_n^2)$ . Lemma A42 then follows immediately from Theorem 3.  $\square$

LEMMA A43. *Consider the same setting as in Lemma A30 and any event  $\mathbf{Z} \in \mathcal{E} \subset \{0, 1\}^N$  with positive probability  $p \equiv \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{Z} \in \mathcal{E})$ . Then for any  $t \geq 3 \cdot 71^2/70^2$ ,*

$$\mathbb{P} \left( \sum_{k=1}^K \Delta_{w_k}^2 > t \frac{\max\{1, \log K, -\log p\}}{N f^2} \sum_{k=1}^K \sigma_{w_k}^2 \mid \mathbf{Z} \in \mathcal{E} \right) \leq 2 \exp \left( -\frac{1}{3} \frac{70^2}{71^2} t \right).$$

PROOF OF LEMMA A43. If  $\sum_{k=1}^K \sigma_{w_k}^2 = 0$ , then  $\sum_{k=1}^K \Delta_{w_k}^2$  is constant zero, and Lemma A43 holds obviously. Below we consider only the case in which  $\sum_{k=1}^K \sigma_{w_k}^2 > 0$ . From Lemma A30, for any  $t > 0$ ,

$$\mathbb{P} \left( \sum_{k=1}^K \Delta_{w_k}^2 > t \frac{\max\{1, \log K, -\log p\}}{N f^2} \sum_{k=1}^K \sigma_{w_k}^2 \mid \mathbf{Z} \in \mathcal{E} \right) \\ \leq 2 \frac{K}{p} \exp \left( -\frac{70^2}{71^2} t \max\{1, \log K, -\log p\} \right) \\ = 2 \exp \left( -\frac{70^2}{71^2} t \max\{1, \log K, -\log p\} + \log K - \log p \right).$$

From (A7.25), when  $t \geq 3 \cdot 71^2/70^2$ , we then have

$$\mathbb{P} \left( \sum_{k=1}^K \Delta_{w_k}^2 > t \frac{\max\{1, \log K, -\log p\}}{N f^2} \sum_{k=1}^K \sigma_{w_k}^2 \mid \mathbf{Z} \in \mathcal{E} \right) \leq 2 \exp \left( -\frac{1}{3} \frac{70^2}{71^2} t \right).$$

Therefore, Lemma A43 holds.  $\square$

LEMMA A44. *Under ReM with actual acceptance probability  $\tilde{p}_n = \mathbb{P}(M \leq a_n)$ , if  $\min\{n_1, n_0\} \geq 2$  when  $n$  is sufficiently large, and  $\max\{1, \log J_n, -\log \tilde{p}_n\} = O(nr_1^2 r_0^2)$ , then*

$$\{r_0(\hat{\beta}_1 - \tilde{\beta}_1) + r_1(\hat{\beta}_0 - \tilde{\beta}_0)\}^\top \hat{\tau}_{\mathbf{W}} \\ = O_{\mathbb{P}} \left( \max_{z \in \{0,1\}} \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} |Y_i(z) - \bar{Y}(z)| \cdot J_n \frac{\max\{1, \log J_n, -\log \tilde{p}_n\}}{nr_1^2 r_0^2} \right).$$

PROOF OF LEMMA A44. First, we bound the Euclidean norms of  $r_0(\hat{\beta}_1 - \tilde{\beta}_1)^\top \hat{\tau}_{\mathbf{W}}$  and  $r_1(\hat{\beta}_0 - \tilde{\beta}_0)^\top \hat{\tau}_{\mathbf{W}}$ . By definition,

$$\hat{\tau}_{\mathbf{W}} = \bar{\mathbf{W}}_1 - \bar{\mathbf{W}}_0 = \frac{n}{n_1 n_0} \sum_{i=1}^n Z_i (\mathbf{W}_i - \bar{\mathbf{W}}).$$

We then have

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| r_0(\hat{\beta}_1 - \tilde{\beta}_1)^\top \hat{\tau}_{\mathbf{W}} \right\|_2 &= \left\| (\mathbf{s}_{1,\mathbf{W}} - \mathbf{S}_{1,\mathbf{W}})^\top (\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{W}}^2)^{-1} \frac{1}{n_1} \sum_{i=1}^n Z_i(\mathbf{W}_i - \bar{\mathbf{W}}) \right\|_2 \\ &= \left\| (\mathbf{s}_{1,w} - \mathbf{S}_{1,w})^\top (\bar{\mathbf{w}}_1 - \bar{\mathbf{w}}) \right\|_2 \leq \|\mathbf{s}_{1,w} - \mathbf{S}_{1,w}\|_2 \|\bar{\mathbf{w}}_1 - \bar{\mathbf{w}}\|_2, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| r_1(\hat{\beta}_0 - \tilde{\beta}_0)^\top \hat{\tau}_{\mathbf{W}} \right\|_2 &= \left\| (\mathbf{s}_{0,\mathbf{W}} - \mathbf{S}_{0,\mathbf{W}})^\top (\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{W}}^2)^{-1} \frac{1}{n_0} \sum_{i=1}^n Z_i(\mathbf{W}_i - \bar{\mathbf{W}}) \right\|_2 \\ &= \left\| (\mathbf{s}_{0,\mathbf{W}} - \mathbf{S}_{0,\mathbf{W}})^\top (\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{W}}^2)^{-1} \frac{1}{n_0} \sum_{i=1}^n (1 - Z_i)(\mathbf{W}_i - \bar{\mathbf{W}}) \right\|_2 \\ &= \left\| (\mathbf{s}_{0,w} - \mathbf{S}_{0,w})^\top (\bar{\mathbf{w}}_0 - \bar{\mathbf{w}}) \right\|_2 \leq \|\mathbf{s}_{0,w} - \mathbf{S}_{0,w}\|_2 \|\bar{\mathbf{w}}_0 - \bar{\mathbf{w}}\|_2, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\mathbf{w}_i = (\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{W}}^2)^{-1/2}(\mathbf{W}_i - \bar{\mathbf{W}})$  denotes the standardized covariate vector for  $1 \leq i \leq n$ .

Second, from Lemma A31 and by the same logic as the proof of Lemma A33 (in particular, (A7.28)), we can know that, for  $z = 0, 1$ ,

$$\|\mathbf{s}_{z,w} - \mathbf{S}_{z,w}\|_2^2 = \max_{z \in \{0,1\}} \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \{Y_i(z) - \bar{Y}(z)\}^2 \cdot J_n \frac{\max\{1, \log J_n, -\log \tilde{p}_n\}}{nr_z^2} \cdot O_{\mathbb{P}}(1).$$

Third, from Lemma A43, for  $z = 0, 1$ ,

$$\|\bar{\mathbf{w}}_z - \bar{\mathbf{w}}\|_2^2 = J_n \frac{\max\{1, \log J_n, -\log \tilde{p}_n\}}{nr_z^2} \cdot O_{\mathbb{P}}(1).$$

From the above, for  $z = 0, 1$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| r_{1-z}(\hat{\beta}_z - \tilde{\beta}_z)^\top \hat{\tau}_{\mathbf{W}} \right\|_2 &\leq \|\mathbf{s}_{z,w} - \mathbf{S}_{z,w}\|_2 \|\bar{\mathbf{w}}_z - \bar{\mathbf{w}}\|_2 \\ &= \max_{z \in \{0,1\}} \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} |Y_i(z) - \bar{Y}(z)| \cdot J_n \frac{\max\{1, \log J_n, -\log \tilde{p}_n\}}{nr_z^2} \cdot O_{\mathbb{P}}(1) \\ &= \max_{z \in \{0,1\}} \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} |Y_i(z) - \bar{Y}(z)| \cdot J_n \frac{\max\{1, \log J_n, -\log \tilde{p}_n\}}{nr_1^2 r_0^2} \cdot O_{\mathbb{P}}(1). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, Lemma A44 holds.  $\square$

LEMMA A45. Under ReM with actual acceptance probability  $\tilde{p}_n = \mathbb{P}(M \leq a_n)$ ,

- (i) if Condition A1 holds, then  $\max\{1, -\log \tilde{p}_n\} = O(\max\{1, -\log p_n\})$ , recalling that  $p_n = \mathbb{P}(\chi_{K_n}^2 \leq a_n)$  is the approximate acceptance probability;
- (ii) if Conditions A1 and A2 hold, then,  $\max\{1, \log K_n, -\log \tilde{p}_n\} = o(nr_1^2 r_0^2)$ .

PROOF OF LEMMA A45. In Lemma A45, (i) follows by the same logic as Lemma A34, and below we focus only on the proof of (ii). From the proof of Lemma A34,  $2 \max_{z \in \{0,1\}} \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} |Y_i(z) - \bar{Y}(z)|^2 \geq r_0 S_1^2 + r_1 S_0^2 \geq nr_1 r_0 V_{\tau\tau}$ . Consequently, from Condition A2,

$$o(1) = \frac{\max_{z \in \{0,1\}} \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} |Y_i(z) - \bar{Y}(z)|}{\sqrt{V_{\tau\tau}(1 - \rho_n^2)\{1 - R_n^2(\tilde{\beta}_1, \tilde{\beta}_0)\}}} \cdot J_n \cdot \frac{\max\{1, \log J_n, -\log p_n\}}{nr_1^2 r_0^2}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\geq \frac{2^{-1/2} \sqrt{nr_1 r_0 V_{\tau\tau}}}{\sqrt{V_{\tau\tau}}} \cdot J_n \cdot \frac{\max\{1, \log J_n, -\log p_n\}}{nr_1^2 r_0^2} \\
&\geq 2^{-1/2} \cdot \sqrt{nr_1 r_0} \cdot \frac{\max\{1, \log J_n, -\log p_n\}}{nr_1^2 r_0^2} \geq \frac{2^{-1/2}}{\sqrt{nr_1 r_0}}.
\end{aligned}$$

This implies that  $1 = o(\sqrt{nr_1 r_0})$ , and thus  $\max\{1, \log K_n, -\log \tilde{p}_n\} = o(nr_1^2 r_0^2)$ . From the above, Lemma A45 holds.  $\square$

**Proof of Theorem A1(i).** Below we prove the first part of Theorem A1. Define

$$\tilde{\psi}_n = V_{\tau\tau}^{-1/2} (1 - \rho_n^2)^{-1/2} \{\hat{\tau}(\tilde{\beta}_1, \tilde{\beta}_0) - \tau\}, \quad \hat{\psi}_n = V_{\tau\tau}^{-1/2} (1 - \rho_n^2)^{-1/2} \{\hat{\tau}(\hat{\beta}_1, \hat{\beta}_0) - \tau\},$$

$$\psi_n = \sqrt{1 - \tilde{R}_n^2} \varepsilon_0 + \sqrt{\tilde{R}_n^2} L_{K_n, a_n}.$$

Note that Conditions A1 and A2 hold. From Lemma A42,  $n \rightarrow \infty$ ,

$$\sup_{c \in \mathbb{R}} |\mathbb{P}(\tilde{\psi}_n \leq c \mid M \leq a_n) - \mathbb{P}(\psi_n \leq c)| \rightarrow 0.$$

From Lemmas A44 and A45, under ReM,

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{\psi}_n - \hat{\psi}_n &= \frac{\hat{\tau}(\tilde{\beta}_1, \tilde{\beta}_0) - \hat{\tau}(\hat{\beta}_1, \hat{\beta}_0)}{V_{\tau\tau}^{1/2} (1 - \rho_n^2)^{1/2}} = \frac{\{r_0(\hat{\beta}_1 - \tilde{\beta}_1) + r_1(\hat{\beta}_0 - \tilde{\beta}_0)\}^\top \hat{\tau} \mathbf{w}}{V_{\tau\tau}^{1/2} (1 - \rho_n^2)^{1/2}} \\
&= \sqrt{1 - \tilde{R}_n^2} \cdot o_{\mathbb{P}}(1).
\end{aligned}$$

For any  $\eta > 0$ , define  $\delta_n = \sqrt{1 - \tilde{R}_n^2} \cdot \eta$ . From Lemma A26,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sup_{c \in \mathbb{R}} |\mathbb{P}(\hat{\psi}_n \leq c \mid M \leq a_n) - \mathbb{P}(\tilde{\psi}_n \leq c \mid M \leq a_n)| \\
&\leq \mathbb{P}(|\hat{\psi}_n - \tilde{\psi}_n| > \delta_n \mid M \leq a_n) + \sup_{b \in \mathbb{R}} \mathbb{P}(b < \tilde{\psi}_n \leq b + \delta_n \mid M \leq a_n) \\
&\leq \mathbb{P}(|\hat{\psi}_n - \tilde{\psi}_n| > \delta_n \mid M \leq a_n) + \sup_{b \in \mathbb{R}} \mathbb{P}(b < \psi_n \leq b + \delta_n) \\
&\quad + 2 \sup_{c \in \mathbb{R}} |\mathbb{P}(\tilde{\psi}_n \leq c \mid M \leq a_n) - \mathbb{P}(\psi_n \leq c)|
\end{aligned}$$

Letting  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , from the discussion before, we have

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{c \in \mathbb{R}} |\mathbb{P}(\hat{\psi}_n \leq c \mid M \leq a_n) - \mathbb{P}(\tilde{\psi}_n \leq c \mid M \leq a_n)| \leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{b \in \mathbb{R}} \mathbb{P}(b < \psi_n \leq b + \delta_n).$$

By definition, for any  $b \in \mathbb{R}$ , we have, with  $b' = b/\sqrt{1 - \tilde{R}_n^2}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{P}(b < \psi_n \leq b + \delta_n) \\
&= \mathbb{P}\left(b' < \varepsilon_0 + \sqrt{\frac{\tilde{R}_n^2}{1 - \tilde{R}_n^2}} L_{K_n, a_n} \leq b' + \eta\right) \\
&= \mathbb{E}\left\{\mathbb{P}\left(b' < \varepsilon_0 + \sqrt{\frac{\tilde{R}_n^2}{1 - \tilde{R}_n^2}} L_{K_n, a_n} \leq b' + \eta \mid L_{K, a}\right)\right\} \\
&\leq \mathbb{E}\left(\eta/\sqrt{2\pi}\right) = \eta/\sqrt{2\pi},
\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality holds because the density of  $\varepsilon_0$  is bounded by  $1/\sqrt{2\pi}$ . This then implies that

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{c \in \mathbb{R}} |\mathbb{P}(\hat{\psi}_n \leq c \mid M \leq a_n) - \mathbb{P}(\tilde{\psi}_n \leq c \mid M \leq a_n)| \leq \eta/\sqrt{2\pi}.$$

Because the above inequality holds for any  $\eta > 0$ , we must have, as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ ,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{c \in \mathbb{R}} |\mathbb{P}(\hat{\psi}_n \leq c \mid M \leq a_n) - \mathbb{P}(\tilde{\psi}_n \leq c \mid M \leq a_n)| = 0.$$

From the discussion before, as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{c \in \mathbb{R}} |\mathbb{P}(\hat{\psi}_n \leq c \mid M \leq a_n) - \mathbb{P}(\psi_n \leq c)| \\ & \leq \sup_{c \in \mathbb{R}} |\mathbb{P}(\tilde{\psi}_n \leq c \mid M \leq a_n) - \mathbb{P}(\psi_n \leq c)| + \sup_{c \in \mathbb{R}} |\mathbb{P}(\hat{\psi}_n \leq c \mid M \leq a_n) - \mathbb{P}(\tilde{\psi}_n \leq c \mid M \leq a_n)| \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, the first part of Theorem A1 holds.  $\square$

**Proof of Theorem A1(ii).** Because Condition 3 holds and  $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{R}_n^2 < 1$ , by the same logic as the proof of Theorem 5, we can know that, as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ ,

$$\sup_{c \in \mathbb{R}} \left| \mathbb{P} \left\{ \sqrt{1 - \tilde{R}_n^2} \varepsilon_0 + \sqrt{\tilde{R}_n^2} L_{K_n, a_n} \leq c \right\} - \mathbb{P} \left\{ \sqrt{1 - \tilde{R}_n^2} \varepsilon_0 \leq c \right\} \right| \rightarrow 0.$$

From the first part of Theorem A1, we can immediately derive the second part of the theorem.  $\square$

## A10. Connection with optimal designs.

A10.1. *Optimal design via minimizing Mahalanobis distance.* In this section, we show that, under certain model assumptions, the optimal design that tries to minimize the mean squared error (MSE) of the difference-in-means estimator will seek the assignment minimizing the Mahalanobis distance for covariate imbalance between the two treatment groups. For more detailed discussion of optimally balanced designs, we refer the readers to Kasy (2016) and Kallus (2018).

Suppose that the potential outcomes satisfy the following model:

$$(A10.36) \quad Y_i(z) = \alpha_z + \beta_z^\top \mathbf{X}_i + e_i(z), \quad (z = 0, 1; i = 1, 2, \dots, n),$$

where  $(e_i(1), e_i(0))$ 's are mutually independent across all units, and  $e_i(z)$ 's have mean zero and the same variance  $\sigma_z^2$  across all units for  $z = 0, 1$ . Throughout the discussion in this section, the covariates  $\mathbf{X}_1, \dots, \mathbf{X}_n$  are fixed constants or equivalently being conditioned on. Under model (A10.36), the expected treatment effect for each unit  $i$  is then

$$\tau_i^* = \mathbb{E}\{\tau_i\} = \mathbb{E}\{Y_i(1) - Y_i(0)\} = \alpha_1 - \alpha_0 + (\beta_1 - \beta_0)^\top \mathbf{X}_i, \quad (i = 1, 2, \dots, n)$$

and its average over all units is

$$\tau^* = \mathbb{E}\{\tau\} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \tau_i^* = \alpha_1 - \alpha_0 + (\beta_1 - \beta_0)^\top \bar{\mathbf{X}}.$$

We are interested in estimating the average treatment effect  $\tau^*$  using the difference-in-means estimator  $\hat{\tau}$ . Moreover, we will write the difference-in-means estimator as  $\hat{\tau}(\mathbf{Z})$ , to emphasize its dependence on the treatment assignment. For any fixed treatment assignment

$\mathbf{z}$ , the MSE of the corresponding difference-in-means estimator under model (A10.36) has the following decomposition:

$$(A10.37) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\{\hat{\tau}(\mathbf{z}) - \tau^*\}^2] &= [\mathbb{E}\{\hat{\tau}(\mathbf{z}) - \tau^*\}]^2 + \text{Var}\{\hat{\tau}(\mathbf{z}) - \tau^*\} \\ &= \{\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^\top \hat{\boldsymbol{\tau}}_{\mathbf{X}}(\mathbf{z})\}^2 + \frac{\sigma_1^2}{n_1} + \frac{\sigma_0^2}{n_0}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}} = r_0\boldsymbol{\beta}_1 + r_1\boldsymbol{\beta}_0$  and  $\hat{\boldsymbol{\tau}}_{\mathbf{X}}(\mathbf{z})$  is the difference-in-means of covariates under the treatment assignment  $\mathbf{z}$ . From (A10.37), the optimal assignment minimizing the MSE is equivalently the one minimizing the squared bias of  $\hat{\tau}$ . Since  $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$  is unknown, similar to Kallus (2018, Section 2.3.3), we consider the worst-case squared bias after some standardization. Specifically, let  $\mu_i \equiv r_0\mathbb{E}\{Y_i(1)\} + r_1\mathbb{E}\{Y_i(0)\}$  be a certain weighted average of expected potential outcomes for each unit  $i$ . The finite population variance of  $\mu_i$ 's across all units can be equivalently written as  $S_\mu^2 = \tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^\top \mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{X}}^2 \tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ . We then consider the worst-case squared bias of  $\hat{\tau}$  standardized by  $S_\mu^2$ , which has the following equivalent forms:

$$(A10.38) \quad \sup_{\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}} \neq \mathbf{0}} \frac{\{\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^\top \hat{\boldsymbol{\tau}}_{\mathbf{X}}(\mathbf{z})\}^2}{S_\mu^2} = \sup_{\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}} \neq \mathbf{0}} \frac{\{\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^\top \hat{\boldsymbol{\tau}}_{\mathbf{X}}(\mathbf{z})\}^2}{\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^\top \mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{X}}^2 \tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}} = \hat{\boldsymbol{\tau}}_{\mathbf{X}}(\mathbf{z})^\top \mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{X}}^{-2} \hat{\boldsymbol{\tau}}_{\mathbf{X}}(\mathbf{z}) = \frac{n}{n_1 n_0} M(\mathbf{z}),$$

where  $M(\mathbf{z})$  is the Mahalanobis distance of covariate means in two treatment groups under the treatment assignment  $\mathbf{z}$ , as defined in Section 2.2. Consequently, the assignment minimizing the Mahalanobis distance is equivalently the one that minimizes worst-case standardized squared bias. Therefore, under the proposed model and criterion, minimizing the Mahalanobis distance leads to the optimal design.

*A10.2. Model-based efficiency of rerandomization.* We now briefly discuss the efficiency of rerandomization under the proposed model in (A10.36). In short, we will show that, under ReM with properly diminishing threshold for covariate imbalance, the design can asymptotically achieve the optimal efficiency.

To gain some intuition, beyond the equal variance assumption, we further assume that  $e_i(\mathbf{z})$ 's are i.i.d. across all units, for  $\mathbf{z} = 0, 1$ ; the i.i.d. assumption will be relaxed later. We can verify that the difference-in-means estimator has the following decomposition:

$$(A10.39) \quad \hat{\tau} - \tau^* = \tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^\top \hat{\boldsymbol{\tau}}_{\mathbf{X}} + \left\{ \frac{1}{n_1} \sum_{i=1}^{n_1} Z_i e_i(1) - \frac{1}{n_0} \sum_{i=1}^n (1 - Z_i) e_i(0) \right\} \equiv \tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^\top \hat{\boldsymbol{\tau}}_{\mathbf{X}} + \hat{\tau}_e,$$

where  $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}} = r_0\boldsymbol{\beta}_1 + r_1\boldsymbol{\beta}_0$  is defined the same as before and  $\hat{\tau}_e$  is the difference-in-means for the residual potential outcomes. For treatment assignment mechanisms depending only on the covariates, such as rerandomization based on  $\mathbf{X}_i$ 's,  $\hat{\boldsymbol{\tau}}_{\mathbf{X}}$  and  $\hat{\tau}_e$  must be mutually independent, with  $\hat{\boldsymbol{\tau}}_{\mathbf{X}}$  following its randomization distribution and

$$(A10.40) \quad \hat{\tau}_e \sim \frac{1}{n_1} \sum_{i=1}^{n_1} e_i(1) - \frac{1}{n_0} \sum_{i=n_1+1}^n e_i(0).$$

This is because the conditional distribution of  $\hat{\tau}_e$  given  $\mathbf{Z}$  must follow the distribution on the right hand side of (A10.40). By the standard central limit theorem, when  $e_i(1)$ 's and  $e_i(0)$ 's have finite second moments, and the proportions of treated and control units  $r_1$  and  $r_0$  have positive limits as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ ,  $\sqrt{n}\hat{\tau}_e$  will asymptotically converge to a Gaussian distribution with mean zero and variance  $r_1^{-1}\sigma_1^2 + r_0^{-1}\sigma_0^2$ . By Slutsky's theorem, as long as  $\sqrt{n}\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^\top \hat{\boldsymbol{\tau}}_{\mathbf{X}} = o_{\mathbb{P}}(1)$ ,  $\sqrt{n}(\hat{\tau} - \tau^*)$  will converge to the same asymptotic distribution as  $\sqrt{n}\hat{\tau}_e$ , which is actually the optimal efficiency that we can expect, as implied by (A10.37).

Below we rigorously study the asymptotic efficiency of rerandomization under model (A10.36). First, we allow the residuals  $e_i(z)$ 's to be non-identically distributed for  $z = 0, 1$ , but require them to have bounded third absolute moments.

CONDITION A3. There exists some finite constant  $C_e$  such that, for all  $n$ ,

$$\max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \mathbb{E}[|e_i(1)|^3] \leq C_e, \quad \& \quad \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \mathbb{E}[|e_i(0)|^3] \leq C_e.$$

Second, to conduct the optimal rerandomization with diminishing covariate imbalance, we invoke similar regularity conditions as Conditions 1–3. Because here we care only the difference-in-means of covariates, we redefine the quantiles in the main paper by excluding the potential outcomes there. Specifically, analogous to  $\gamma_n$  and  $\Delta_n$  in (7) and (8), define

$$\gamma_n^* \equiv \frac{K_n^{1/4}}{\sqrt{nr_1r_0}} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \|\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{X}}^{-1}(\mathbf{X}_i - \bar{\mathbf{X}})\|_2^3, \quad \Delta_n^* \equiv \sup_{\mathcal{Q} \in \mathcal{C}_{K_n}} \left| \mathbb{P}\left(\mathbf{V}_{\mathbf{xx}}^{-1/2} \hat{\boldsymbol{\tau}}_{\mathbf{X}} \in \mathcal{Q}\right) - \mathbb{P}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}^* \in \mathcal{Q}) \right|,$$

where  $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}^* \sim \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{I}_{K_n})$ . We then invoke the following regularity condition.

CONDITION A4. Conditions 1–3, with  $\gamma_n$  and  $\Delta_n$  replaced by  $\gamma_n^*$  and  $\Delta_n^*$ , hold.

Third, we assume the following condition on model (A10.36) and proportions of treated and control units.

CONDITION A5. As the sample size  $n$  increases,

- (i) the residual variances  $\sigma_1^2$  and  $\sigma_0^2$  do not vary, and at least one of them is positive;
- (ii) the proportions of treated and control units satisfy  $\sqrt{n} \min\{r_1, r_0\} \rightarrow \infty$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ ;
- (iii) the weighted average of expected potential outcomes has bounded finite population variance, i.e.,  $S_\mu^2 = \tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^\top \mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{X}}^2 \tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}} \leq C_\mu$  for all  $n$  and some finite constant  $C_\mu$ .

Under the above conditions,  $\sqrt{n} \tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^\top \hat{\boldsymbol{\tau}}_{\mathbf{X}}$  will converge in probability to zero. This implies that, asymptotically, rerandomization will achieve the optimal efficiency (or equivalently be the optimal design) under model (A10.36). We summarize the results in the following theorem.

THEOREM A3. Under ReM and Conditions A3–A5, as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ ,

$$\frac{\hat{\tau} - \tau^*}{\sqrt{\sigma_1^2/n_1 + \sigma_0^2/n_0}} \mid M \leq a_n \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(0, 1).$$

Theorem A3 shows that, under model (A10.36), ReM with properly diminishing threshold can asymptotically achieve the optimal efficiency as implied by (A10.37). Both Theorem 5 and Theorem A3 show the optimality of ReM with properly diminishing covariate imbalance threshold. However, their justification is quite different. First, the two theorems rely on different sources of randomness. Theorem 5 views all the potential outcomes as fixed constant (or equivalently conditioning on all the potential outcomes), and the randomness comes solely from the treatment assignment; while Theorem A3 assumes additionally that the potential outcomes are random following model (A10.37). Second, due to the aforementioned difference, the estimands for average treatment effects have different forms in the two theorems. Theorem 5 focuses on  $\tau = n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \{Y_i(1) - Y_i(0)\}$ , while Theorem A3 focuses on  $\tau^* = \mathbb{E}(\tau) = n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}\{Y_i(1) - Y_i(0)\}$  under model (A10.37).

A10.3. *Technical details.*

ADDITIONAL DETAILS FOR (A10.37)–(A10.39). First, we prove the decomposition of  $\hat{\tau} - \tau^*$  in (A10.39). By some algebra,

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{\tau} - \tau^* &= \frac{1}{n_1} Z_i Y_i(1) - \frac{1}{n_0} Z_i Y_i(0) - \{\alpha_1 - \alpha_0 + (\beta_1 - \beta_0)^\top \bar{\mathbf{X}}\} \\ &= \alpha_1 + \beta_1^\top \bar{\mathbf{X}}_1 + \bar{e}_1 - \alpha_0 - \beta_0^\top \bar{\mathbf{X}}_0 - \bar{e}_0 - \{\alpha_1 - \alpha_0 + (\beta_1 - \beta_0)^\top (r_1 \bar{\mathbf{X}}_1 + r_0 \bar{\mathbf{X}}_0)\} \\ &= \beta_1^\top r_0 (\bar{\mathbf{X}}_1 - \bar{\mathbf{X}}_0) + \beta_0^\top r_1 (\bar{\mathbf{X}}_1 - \bar{\mathbf{X}}_0) + \bar{e}_1 - \bar{e}_0 \\ &= (r_0 \beta_1 + r_1 \beta_0)^\top \hat{\tau}_{\mathbf{X}} + \hat{\tau}_e = \tilde{\beta}^\top \hat{\tau}_{\mathbf{X}} + \hat{\tau}_e,\end{aligned}$$

where  $\bar{e}_z$  denotes the average of residual potential outcomes  $e_i(z)$ 's for units under treatment arm  $z$ .

Second, we prove the decomposition of the model-based MSE in (A10.37). From the decomposition in (A10.39) and the property of model (A10.36),  $\mathbb{E}\{\hat{\tau}(z) - \tau^*\} = \tilde{\beta}^\top \hat{\tau}_{\mathbf{X}}$ , and  $\text{Var}\{\hat{\tau}(z) - \tau^*\} = \text{Var}\{\hat{\tau}_e(z)\} = \sigma_1^2/n_1 + \sigma_0^2/n_0$ , where we use  $\hat{\tau}_e(z)$  to emphasize that it is the difference-in-means of residual potential outcomes under the treatment assignment  $z$ . These then immediately imply the decomposition in (A10.37).

Third, we prove (A10.38). By the definition of matrix norm, letting  $\check{\beta} = \mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{X}} \tilde{\beta}$ , we have

$$\sup_{\tilde{\beta} \neq \mathbf{0}} \frac{\{\tilde{\beta}^\top \hat{\tau}_{\mathbf{X}}(z)\}^2}{\tilde{\beta}^\top \mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{X}}^2 \tilde{\beta}} = \sup_{\check{\beta} \neq \mathbf{0}} \frac{\|\hat{\tau}_{\mathbf{X}}(z)^\top \mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{X}}^{-1} \check{\beta}\|_2^2}{\check{\beta}^\top \check{\beta}} = \|\hat{\tau}_{\mathbf{X}}(z)^\top \mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{X}}^{-1}\|_2^2 = \hat{\tau}_{\mathbf{X}}(z)^\top \mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{X}}^{-2} \hat{\tau}_{\mathbf{X}}(z).$$

This immediately implies (A10.38).  $\square$

PROOF OF THEOREM A3. Below we consider the two terms in the decomposition (A10.39) separately.

First, we consider the limiting distribution of  $\tilde{\beta}^\top \hat{\tau}_{\mathbf{X}}$ . By the same logic as the proof of Theorem 1, under Condition A4, as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ ,

$$\sup_{c \in \mathbb{R}} \left| \mathbb{P}\left(\sqrt{n} \tilde{\beta}^\top \hat{\tau}_{\mathbf{X}} \leq c \mid M \leq a_n\right) - \mathbb{P}\left(\sqrt{n} \tilde{\beta}^\top \tilde{\tau}_{\mathbf{X}} \leq c \mid \tilde{M} \leq a_n\right) \right| \rightarrow 0,$$

By the same logic as the proof of Li, Ding and Rubin (2018, Theorem 1),

$$\sqrt{n} \tilde{\beta}^\top \tilde{\tau}_{\mathbf{X}} \mid \tilde{M} \leq a_n \sim \sqrt{n} \tilde{\beta}^\top \mathbf{V}_{\mathbf{xx}}^{1/2} \varepsilon^* \mid (\varepsilon^*)^\top \varepsilon^* \leq a_n \sim \sqrt{n} \|\mathbf{V}_{\mathbf{xx}}^{1/2} \tilde{\beta}\|_2 L_{K_n, a_n},$$

recalling that  $\varepsilon^* \sim \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{I}_{K_n})$ . From Conditions A4 and A5 and using Theorem 4(i) and Proposition A2,

$$\sqrt{n} \|\mathbf{V}_{\mathbf{xx}}^{1/2} \tilde{\beta}\|_2 L_{K_n, a_n} = \sqrt{(r_1 r_0)^{-1} \tilde{\beta}^\top \mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{X}}^2 \tilde{\beta}} L_{K_n, a_n} = O(1) \cdot o_{\mathbb{P}}(1) = o_{\mathbb{P}}(1).$$

From the above, we can derive that  $\sqrt{n} \tilde{\beta}^\top \hat{\tau}_{\mathbf{X}} = o_{\mathbb{P}}(1)$ .

Second, we consider the limiting of  $\hat{\tau}_e$ . For any fixed acceptable assignment  $z$  under ReM, from the standard univariate Berry–Esseen theorem (Esseen, 1942), there exists a universal constant  $C$  such that

$$\begin{aligned}& \sup_{c \in \mathbb{R}} |\mathbb{P}\{\text{Var}(\hat{\tau}_e)^{-1/2} \hat{\tau}_e \leq c \mid \mathbf{Z} \equiv z\} - \mathbb{P}(\varepsilon_0 \leq c)| \\ & \leq C \frac{n_1^{-2} \mathbb{E}|e_i^3(1)| + n_0^{-2} \mathbb{E}|e_i^3(0)|}{(n_1^{-1} \sigma_1^2 + n_0^{-1} \sigma_0^2)^{3/2}} \leq \frac{C}{\sqrt{n}} \frac{(1/r_1 + 1/r_0) C_e}{(\sigma_1^2/r_1 + \sigma_0^2/r_0)^{3/2}} \leq \frac{C}{\sqrt{n}} \frac{2C_e / \min\{r_1, r_0\}}{(\sigma_1^2 + \sigma_0^2)^{3/2}} \\ & \leq \frac{2CC_e(\sigma_1^2 + \sigma_0^2)^{-3/2}}{\sqrt{n} \min\{r_1, r_0\}}.\end{aligned}$$



where  $\varepsilon_0 \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ . This then implies that, for any  $c \in \mathbb{R}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} & |\mathbb{P}\{\text{Var}(\hat{\tau}_e)^{-1/2}\hat{\tau}_e \leq c \mid M \leq a_n\} - \mathbb{P}(\varepsilon_0 \leq c)| \\ &= |\mathbb{E}[\mathbb{P}\{\text{Var}(\hat{\tau}_e)^{-1/2}\hat{\tau}_e \leq c \mid \mathbf{Z}\} \mid M \leq a_n] - \mathbb{P}(\varepsilon_0 \leq c)| \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}[|\mathbb{P}\{\text{Var}(\hat{\tau}_e)^{-1/2}\hat{\tau}_e \leq c \mid \mathbf{Z}\} - \mathbb{P}(\varepsilon_0 \leq c)| \mid M \leq a_n] \\ &\leq \frac{2CC_e(\sigma_1^2 + \sigma_0^2)^{-3/2}}{\sqrt{n} \min\{r_1, r_0\}}, \end{aligned}$$

i.e.,

$$(A10.41) \quad \sup_{c \in \mathbb{R}} |\mathbb{P}\{\text{Var}(\hat{\tau}_e)^{-1/2}\hat{\tau}_e \leq c \mid M \leq a_n\} - \mathbb{P}(\varepsilon_0 \leq c)| \leq \frac{2CC_e(\sigma_1^2 + \sigma_0^2)^{-3/2}}{\sqrt{n} \min\{r_1, r_0\}}.$$

Finally, we study the limiting distribution of  $\tilde{\beta}^\top \hat{\tau}_{\mathbf{X}} + \hat{\tau}_e$ . From Lemma A26, for any constant  $\delta > 0$ ,

$$(A10.42) \quad \begin{aligned} & \sup_{c \in \mathbb{R}} \left| \mathbb{P} \left\{ \frac{\tilde{\beta}^\top \hat{\tau}_{\mathbf{X}} + \hat{\tau}_e}{\text{Var}(\hat{\tau}_e)^{1/2}} \leq c \mid M \leq a_n \right\} - \mathbb{P} \left\{ \frac{\hat{\tau}_e}{\text{Var}(\hat{\tau}_e)^{1/2}} \leq c \mid M \leq a_n \right\} \right| \\ & \leq \mathbb{P} \left\{ \left| \frac{\tilde{\beta}^\top \hat{\tau}_{\mathbf{X}}}{\text{Var}(\hat{\tau}_e)^{1/2}} \right| > \delta \mid M \leq a_n \right\} + \sup_{b \in \mathbb{R}} \mathbb{P} \left\{ b < \frac{\hat{\tau}_e}{\text{Var}(\hat{\tau}_e)^{1/2}} \leq b + \delta \mid M \leq a_n \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Because  $\sqrt{n}\tilde{\beta}^\top \hat{\tau}_{\mathbf{X}} = o_{\mathbb{P}}(1)$  and  $n\text{Var}(\hat{\tau}_e) = \sigma_1^2/r_1 + \sigma_0^2/r_0 \geq \sigma_1^2 + \sigma_0^2 > 0$ ,  $\tilde{\beta}^\top \hat{\tau}_{\mathbf{X}}/\text{Var}(\hat{\tau}_e)^{1/2} = o_{\mathbb{P}}(1)$ , and thus the first term in (A10.42) converges to zero as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . From (A10.41),

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{b \in \mathbb{R}} \mathbb{P} \left\{ b < \frac{\hat{\tau}_e}{\text{Var}(\hat{\tau}_e)^{1/2}} \leq b + \delta \mid M \leq a_n \right\} &\leq \sup_{b \in \mathbb{R}} \mathbb{P}(b < \varepsilon_0 \leq b + \delta) + \frac{4CC_e(\sigma_1^2 + \sigma_0^2)^{-3/2}}{\sqrt{n} \min\{r_1, r_0\}} \\ &\leq \frac{\delta}{2\pi} + \frac{4CC_e(\sigma_1^2 + \sigma_0^2)^{-3/2}}{\sqrt{n} \min\{r_1, r_0\}}, \end{aligned}$$

where, from Condition A5, the upper bound converges to  $\delta/(2\pi)$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . From the above, for any constant  $\delta > 0$ ,

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{c \in \mathbb{R}} \left| \mathbb{P} \left\{ \frac{\tilde{\beta}^\top \hat{\tau}_{\mathbf{X}} + \hat{\tau}_e}{\text{Var}(\hat{\tau}_e)^{1/2}} \leq c \mid M \leq a_n \right\} - \mathbb{P} \left\{ \frac{\hat{\tau}_e}{\text{Var}(\hat{\tau}_e)^{1/2}} \leq c \mid M \leq a_n \right\} \right| \leq \frac{\delta}{2\pi}.$$

This immediately implies that, as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ ,

$$\sup_{c \in \mathbb{R}} \left| \mathbb{P} \left\{ \frac{\tilde{\beta}^\top \hat{\tau}_{\mathbf{X}} + \hat{\tau}_e}{\text{Var}(\hat{\tau}_e)^{1/2}} \leq c \mid M \leq a_n \right\} - \mathbb{P} \left\{ \frac{\hat{\tau}_e}{\text{Var}(\hat{\tau}_e)^{1/2}} \leq c \mid M \leq a_n \right\} \right| \rightarrow 0.$$

From (A10.41) and Condition A5, we further have

$$\sup_{c \in \mathbb{R}} \left| \mathbb{P} \left\{ \frac{\tilde{\beta}^\top \hat{\tau}_{\mathbf{X}} + \hat{\tau}_e}{\text{Var}(\hat{\tau}_e)^{1/2}} \leq c \mid M \leq a_n \right\} - \mathbb{P}\{\varepsilon_0 \leq c\} \right| \rightarrow 0,$$

i.e.,

$$\frac{\hat{\tau} - \tau^*}{\sqrt{\sigma_1^2/n_1 + \sigma_0^2/n_0}} \mid M \leq a_n \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(0, 1).$$

Therefore, Theorem A3 holds.  $\square$