

The Logic of Counterfactuals and the Epistemology of Causal Inference

Hanti Lin

University of California, Davis

ika@ucdavis.edu

Abstract

The 2021 Nobel Prize in Economics recognized a theory of causal inference, which deserves more attention from philosophers. To that end, I develop a dialectic that extends the Lewis-Stalnaker debate on a logical principle called *Conditional Excluded Middle* (CEM). I first play the good cop for CEM, and give a new argument for it: a Quine-Putnam indispensability argument based on the Nobel-Prize winning theory. But then I switch sides and play the bad cop: I undermine that argument with a new theory of causal inference that preserves the success of the original theory but dispenses with CEM.

1 Introduction

This is an invitation to the *Rubin causal model* (Rubin 1974), a framework for causal inference that has been very influential in health and social sciences but is somewhat under-recognized in philosophy. To make more philosophers interested, I will explain how the Rubin causal model is related to some familiar ideas and issues in philosophy, such as causal Bayes nets, intertheory relations, the Quine-Putnam indispensability argument, the revisability of deductive logic, and the controversy over a logical principle called:

CONDITIONAL EXCLUDED MIDDLE

It must be that

- either B would be the case if A were the case,
- or B would *not* be the case if A were the case.

To make all this more fun, a dialectic will be developed. I will first give a new argument for Conditional Excluded Middle, using the Rubin causal model and its Nobel-Prize winning applications (section 3). But then I will challenge that argument with a new theory of causal inference, following the good cop/bad cop approach sketched in the abstract. Before all that, I will begin with a tutorial on the Rubin causal model (next section). Let's dive in.

2 The Rubin Causal Model with a Card Game

To have a vivid picture of how the Rubin causal model works, imagine that everyone in the population has such a card:

Card #1: What If You Took the Treatment?

Nature gives every individual a card of this form: the back is printed with '*if Take = 1*', and the face is printed with '*Cured = 1*' or '*Cured = 0*'.

The former case means that this person would be cured if they took the treatment; the latter means that this person would *not* be cured if they took the treatment. So this setting builds in Conditional Excluded Middle. Any card given to a person is face down initially and will be flipped to reveal the (medical) result only when the if-clause actually holds of that person. Similarly, there is also

Card #2: What If You Didn't Take the Treatment?

Nature also gives every individual a second card, whose face takes the same form '*Cured = ...*' but the back is printed with '*if Take = 0*' instead.

Each person's cards #1 and #2 define that person's *individual treatment effect* (ITE): the value of binary variable *Cured* on card #1 minus that on card #2. So there are

three possible cases:

$$\text{ITE} = \begin{cases} 1 & (= 1 - 0) & \text{i.e. improvement,} \\ 0 & (= 1 - 1 \text{ or } 0 - 0) & \text{i.e. no difference,} \\ -1 & (= 0 - 1) & \text{i.e. deterioration.} \end{cases}$$

The *average treatment effect* (ATE) in a population is defined as the average of the individual treatment effects of all individuals in the population. A bit of algebra shows that the ATE is equal to the difference between two proportions:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{ATE} = & \text{(i) the proportion of 'Cured = 1' cards among all cards of the kind \#1} \\ & - \text{(ii) the proportion of 'Cured = 1' cards among all cards of the kind \#2.} \end{aligned}$$

Term (i) can be estimated by randomly choosing a group of people in the population, *forcing* them to flip their first cards, and registering the proportion of the results that have 'Cured = 1'. Term (ii) can be estimated similarly. This estimation procedure is the idea behind randomized controlled trials, but the problem is that it is often ethically impermissible.

A Nobel-winning solution works as follows. Randomly select people and flip a coin to assign them to the treatment or the control group. Anyone in the treatment group is offered the treatment for free—they decide whether to take it. This creates a new kind of card:

Card #3: What If You Were Assigned to the Treatment Group?

Nature also gives every individual a card of this form: the back is printed with '*if Assign = 1*' (where 1 means the treatment group), and the face is printed with '*Take = 1*' or '*Take = 0*'.

This determines whether the individual would, or would not, take the treatment if assigned to the treatment group. Similarly:

Card #4: What If You Were Assigned to the Control Group?

Nature gives every individual a card of this form: the back is printed with '*if Assign = 0*' (where 0 means the control group), and the face is printed with '*Take = 1*' or '*Take = 0*'.

While seemingly unnecessary here, this card is crucial in Angrist's (1990) classic study on the Vietnam War. There, "assignment" is the draft lottery, "treatment" is military

service, and the “medical result” is lifetime earnings. The fourth card is needed to define volunteers.

More generally, let’s distinguish four subpopulations, depending on whether one would (or would not) take the treatment if assigned to the treatment group (or the control group):

1. *Compliers*: those who would take the treatment if assigned to the treatment group, and would not if assigned to the control group—namely, those whose card #3 and card #4 are printed with ‘*Take = 1*’ and ‘*Take = 0*’ respectively.
2. *Defiers*: those who would do the opposite to what compliers would do.
3. *Always-Takers*: those who would take the treatment anyway.
4. *Never-Takers*: those who would not take the treatment anyway.

By Conditional Excluded Middle, those four subpopulations exhaust the entire population.

An important result in econometrics implies that, in the present scenario and the like, if there are *no defiers*, which seems to be plausible to assume here, then we can nicely estimate a local average treatment effect (LATE), defined as the average of the individual treatment effects of just the *compliers* in the population. Specifically, we have this classic result:

Theorem 1 (Imbens & Angrist 1994). *Suppose that, in the present card-playing scenario, the following assumptions hold:*

1. (CEM) *The logical principle Conditional Excluded Middle is valid.*
2. (CONSISTENCY) *The logical principle Consistency (known as Centering in philosophy) is valid: it must be that, if a counterfactual has a true antecedent, the truth value of this entire counterfactual is equivalent to the truth value of its consequent.*
3. (RANDOMIZATION) *Individuals in the population are randomly chosen with equal chances, before the chosen ones are randomly assigned to the treatment or control group with a constant bias (by, say, flipping a fair coin).*
4. (INSTRUMENTALITY) *The true causal structure is as depicted in figure 1, so that the assignment to the treatment/control group is probabilistically independent of*

the contents of the four cards that the randomly chosen person has (i.e. probabilistically independent of the truth values of the relevant counterfactuals for the randomly chosen person).




Figure 1: The causal structure for the instrumentality assumption

5. (NO DEFIERS) *There are no defiers in the population.*

Then the LATE in the compliers can be expressed solely by probabilities over the three observable variables—*Assign*, *Take*, and *Cured*—without counterfactuals. Specifically, the LATE can be expressed as follows:

$$\text{LATE} = \frac{\Pr(\text{Cured} = 1 \mid \text{Assign} = 1) - \Pr(\text{Cured} = 1 \mid \text{Assign} = 0)}{\Pr(\text{Take} = 1 \mid \text{Assign} = 1) - \Pr(\text{Take} = 1 \mid \text{Assign} = 0)}.$$

The first conditional probability on the right-hand side, $\Pr(\text{Cured} = 1 \mid \text{Assign} = 1)$, is defined standardly as a ratio: the probability of drawing an individual from the population who ends up being assigned to the treatment group ($\text{Assign} = 1$) and then getting cured ($\text{Cured} = 1$), divided by the probability of drawing one who ends up being assigned to the treatment group. Thanks to elementary statistics, this probability has a nice¹ estimator: just estimate it by the proportion of the cured in the treatment group. The other conditional probabilities on the right are also defined standardly and can be similarly estimated by the observed proportions. This procedure for estimating the right side, and thus the left side, is called *instrumental variable estimation*, with *Assign* being the *instrumental variable*.

Upshot: In the present scenario, the causal effect defined as the LATE (on the left side) can be *identified* in terms of some probabilities (on the right) that, in turn, can be

¹Namely, unbiased and (statistically) consistent.

nicely estimated with a simple statistical procedure—despite the fact that causation cannot be defined in purely statistical terms. This is known as an *identification* result. This result and the like underly one half of the 2021 Nobel Prize in Economics, awarded to Joshua D. Angrist and Guido W. Imbens.

For the proof of Theorem 1, see the textbook by Hernán & Robins (2020: Technical Point 16.6). But I include appendix A to explain the role of Conditional Excluded Middle in the proof. In a nutshell, the proof presupposes that the population is exhausted by the four subpopulations defined above, and that in turn presupposes Conditional Excluded Middle, which brings us to:

3 The Lewis-Stalnaker Debate on CEM

Conditional Excluded Middle (CEM) sparks debate in philosophy of language—embraced by Stalnaker (1968) and rejected by Lewis (1973).

To quickly review an influential argument against CEM (Lewis 1973, HáJew MS), consider the following pair of sentences:

- (A) If i had taken the treatment, i would have been cured.
- (B) If i had taken the treatment, i would not have been cured.

CEM says that $(A) \vee (B)$ is true in every possible world. To find a counterexample, think about an indeterministic world in which the following holds:

- (C) If i had taken the treatment, i would have had a (probabilistic) chance p to be cured and a chance $1 - p$ to be not cured, where p lies strictly between 0 and 1.

Then argue as follows that the truth of (C) implies the falsity of both (A) and (B):

INDETERMINIST ARGUMENT AGAINST CEM

1. By (C), if i had taken the treatment, i would have had a nonzero chance to be cured and a nonzero chance to be not cured.
2. So, by (1), if i had taken the treatment, i could have been cured and could have been not cured.
3. Then (A) is false, for it contradicts (2).
4. Similarly, (B) is also false, for it contradicts (2).

5. So, by (3) and (4), disjunction $(A) \vee (B)$ is false.

Hence a counterexample to CEM in such an indeterministic world—or so the Lewisian concludes.

The above is round one. The next round will feature responses from defenders of CEM, such as Williams (2010), and I think they should explore a new argument in their favor:

INDISPENSABILITY ARGUMENT FOR CEM

CEM is assumed, and seems to be indispensable, in our best theory of causal inference in health and social sciences—the theory that led to one half of the 2021 Nobel Prize in Economics. Indeed, the assumption of this logical principle has been made since the early days of this theoretical framework (Rubin 1974). Moreover, if we take a close look at the proof strategy for Theorem 1 as presented in appendix A, it does seem that the assumption of CEM is essential. So, it seems that we should accept CEM.

This argument is patterned after the Quine-Putnam indispensability argument for the existence of certain mathematical objects: the ones that are indispensably posited in our best scientific theories.²

So I have finished my second task: helping proponents of CEM see that they have a new argument to explore in their favor—an indispensability argument from the 2021 Nobel Prize in Economics. To further the dialectic, it is time for me to switch sides and help Lewisians undermine that argument.

4 The DATE: A Expansion Pack to the Card Game

I think that the above theory of causal inference can be reformulated and even generalized in a way that dispenses with CEM. Let me explain.

In the original game, everyone is only given a *single* card printed with ‘*if Take = 1*’, whose face determines whether that person would, or would not, be cured if taking the treatment. But imagine that you are given not just one card printed with ‘*if Take = 1*’ but a *deck* of such cards, in which 80% of the cards are printed with ‘*Cured = 1*’ on their faces and the remaining 20% are printed with ‘*Cured = 0*’. Let this deck be

²Quine (1948), Putnam (1971).

well-shuffled, all faces down initially. Suppose that you took the treatment. Then you would *randomly* draw a card from this deck and flip it to reveal the medical result, and hence you would have an exactly 80% chance to be cured. So you could be cured and could be not cured—and thus it is not the case that you would be cured, nor is it the case that you would not be cured. CEM is then rendered invalid, or so the Lewisians would argue. If randomly drawing a card from a deck does not sound chancy enough, replace it by measuring an observable in a quantum-mechanical system.

Let's generalize. In the original game, every individual is given four cards that answer four what-if questions, respectively:

- (Q_1) What if one took the treatment?
- (Q_2) What if one didn't take the treatment?
- (Q_3) What if one were assigned to the treatment group?
- (Q_4) What if one were assigned to the control group?

Now, let everyone's four cards be replaced by four decks, which answer the four what-if questions in this form: 'If individual i were ..., then i would have a probabilistic chance p to be'

So now we have an expansion pack to the original card game. Can it be developed to reproduce the success of the identification result for the LATE? Yes, thanks to a new theorem to be presented below.

First, key concepts in Theorem 1 need to be generalized. Each individual i still has an individual treatment effect (ITE), but now defined as the difference between two proportions:

- $$\text{ITE}_i =_{\text{df}} \begin{array}{l} \text{(i) the proportion of 'Cured} = 1\text{' cards in } i\text{'s deck for 'if Take} = 1\text{'} \\ \text{– (ii) the proportion of 'Cured} = 1\text{' cards in } i\text{'s deck for 'if Take} = 0\text{'}. \end{array}$$

In the limiting case where each deck contains only one card, the ITE just defined reduces to the ITE defined earlier. Every individual i now has a *degree of compliance* DC_i , defined by how one's chance of taking the treatment would change if one switched from the control group to the treatment group:

- $$\text{DC}_i =_{\text{df}} \begin{array}{l} \text{(a) the proportion of 'Take} = 1\text{' cards in } i\text{'s deck for 'if Assign} = 1\text{'} \\ \text{– (b) the proportion of 'Take} = 1\text{' cards in } i\text{'s deck for 'if Assign} = 0\text{'}. \end{array}$$

A degree of compliance can be positive, zero, or negative, corresponding to three sub-populations:

- If $DC_i > 0$, then one is called a *complier* (in the general sense).
- If $DC_i < 0$, then one is called a *defier* (in the general sense).
- If $DC_i = 0$, then one is called an *indifferent-taker* (with two special cases: an *always-taker* has $(a) = (b) = 100\%$, and a *never-taker* has $(a) = (b) = 0\%$).

The LATE is replaced by a more general concept: a weighted average of the individual treatment effects, in which everyone's weight w_i is proportional to that person's degree of compliance DC_i . So it is called the *degree-of-compliance-weighted average treatment effect* in the entire population, or DATE for short:

$$\text{DATE} \stackrel{\text{df}}{=} \sum_i w_i \text{ITE}_i$$

$$w_i \stackrel{\text{df}}{=} \frac{DC_i}{\sum_j DC_j}$$

The denominator $\sum_j DC_j$ is a normalizing factor, introduced only to ensure that the weights sum to 1.

Defiers, if any, have *negative* weights, which make it hard to interpret the weighted average. But let's follow the classic result in assuming that there are no defiers, so the DATE receives no contributions from defiers. The DATE also receives no contributions from indifferent-takers, who carry zero weights by definition. It follows that only compliers make contributions to the DATE. The more compliant one is, the more weight one carries. In the limiting case where all decks contain only one card, we get back the original card game, and the DATE degenerates to the LATE as a special case. It is time to state the new identification result:

Theorem 2. *Suppose that the following assumptions hold:*

1. (RANDOMIZATION) *Individuals in the population are randomly chosen with equal chances, before the chosen ones are randomly assigned to the treatment or control group with a constant bias (by, say, flipping a fair coin).*
2. (INSTRUMENTALITY*) *The true causal model is a causal Bayes net with the causal structure in figure 1 (same as the causal structure assumed in Theorem 1), where the confounding variable U is the most fined-grained possible, denoting the individual randomly drawn.*
3. (NO DEFIERS*) *There are no defiers in the population, in the sense that everyone’s degree of compliance is nonnegative.*

Then the DATE can be expressed solely by probabilities over the observable variables—Assign, Take, and Cured—without counterfactuals. Specifically, the DATE can be expressed as follows:

$$\text{DATE} = \frac{\Pr(\text{Cured} = 1 \mid \text{Assign} = 1) - \Pr(\text{Cured} = 1 \mid \text{Assign} = 0)}{\Pr(\text{Take} = 1 \mid \text{Assign} = 1) - \Pr(\text{Take} = 1 \mid \text{Assign} = 0)}.$$

See appendices B and C for a proof.

This new result has some highlights. First, the causal modeling in use generalizes the Rubin causal model. The reason is that the expansion pack allows any deck size, including the limiting case of one card. So the DATE subsumes the LATE as a special case, as seen above. Moreover, the expansion pack to the card game is formalized by the causal Bayes net mentioned in assumption 2 of this theorem, with technical details presented in appendix B. So, the causal Bayes net is to the Rubin causal model as the expanded game to the original game.

Second, given this more general approach to causal modeling, Lewisians would argue that the assumption of CEM is relaxed by replacing single cards with decks.

Thirdly, in this new theorem, the DATE equation’s right-hand side remains identical to the LATE’s in the classic result (Theorem 1). So, we can still use the same method of instrumental variable estimation designed originally for the LATE. But now we do this without assuming CEM—we are simply estimating the more general DATE.

The upshot is that this new theorem lets us preserve the Rubin causal model’s success in estimating the LATE while ditching the CEM principle. Medical and social scientists using the usual estimation method for the LATE under that logical principle

can now be reinterpreted as estimating the DATE with the same method, but without the assumption of that logical principle. This suggests that the CEM principle is dispensable for replicating the Nobel-worthy results.

This concludes my final task: helping Lewisians reject CEM by undermining the indispensability argument.

5 Closing

The Rubin causal model, with its underlying deductive logic and its ability to facilitate causal inference, warrants closer examination by philosophers. To this end, the previous discussion offered a card-game tutorial to introduce the model and then developed a dialectic to connect it to some familiar philosophical ideas. The focus was on the ongoing debate surrounding a logical principle: Conditional Excluded Middle (CEM). I delved into both sides of the debate, in turn. First, I explored how the Rubin causal model could be used to construct a new argument for CEM—a Quine-Putnam indispensability argument. I then shifted gears and challenged this new argument, using causal Bayes nets to give a new theorem that seems to render CEM dispensable.

Which side does my heart go to? Truthfully, that is beside the point. The real takeaway is how the dialectic highlights the intriguing potential of the Rubin causal model for philosophers. In fact, I see opportunities for both sides of the debate.

For proponents of CEM, the next step could be arguing that the very use of causal Bayes nets presupposes CEM after all. On the other hand, opponents of CEM can delve deeper into the potential of causal Bayes nets as a replacement or improvement for the Rubin causal model, going beyond the instrumental variable estimation as discussed above. If they can persuade health and social scientists to abandon CEM, it would represent a fascinating example of scientific inquiry driving revisions in deductive logic—precisely the kind of example Quine (1951) envisaged. This would demonstrate the possibility of logic revision close to the realm of everyday concerns, like medicine or social issues—a far more relatable scenario than Putnam’s (1968) case of quantum logic.

So much about deductive logic, but there is something for theorists of induction, too. When scientists justify inductive methods, they rely heavily on their context of inquiry, including background assumptions. Past discussions, such as Longino (1979), Christensen (1997), and Norton (2003), mostly focused on physical background as-

sumptions (how things are), rather than logical ones (deductive principles). But is the logical principle CEM, for instance, needed to justify instrumental variable estimation? The deductive background deserves attention from theorists of induction.

There is something even for those more interested in modeling rather than inference. Consider the interplay between three approaches to causal modeling:

- (1) nonparametric structural equation models (Pearl 2009),
- (2) Rubin causal models (Rubin 1974),
- (3) causal Bayes nets (Spirtes et al. 2000).

Pearl (2009) famously argues that the first two are basically equivalent and can produce everything that we get from the third approach—causal Bayes nets. But the new theorem suggests a different picture: that causal Bayes nets generalize the second approach, Rubin causal models, even with valuable additional results. So the questions remain: Which approach is more general? Which are equivalent, and in what sense? This would be a nice case study on intertheoretic relations.³

The Rubin causal model clearly presents a rich landscape for further exploration.

Appendix A: The Role of CEM in Theorem 1

To see the role that Conditional Excluded Middle (CEM) plays in the proof of Theorem 1, a more formal presentation is needed. A Rubin causal model is, mathematically speaking, a probability distribution over some ordinary variables and some *counterfactual variables*, such as $Take^{Assign=1}$, which is defined to have the value that $Take$ would have under the subjunctive supposition of $Assign = 1$. That is, it has value 1 (or 0) just in case the randomly chosen person would (or would not) take the treatment if assigned to the treatment group. Four counterfactual variables are involved in Theorem 1: $Take^{Assign=1}$, $Take^{Assign=0}$, $Cured^{Take=1}$, $Cured^{Take=0}$. They correspond to the four cards #1 to #4 that one has in the game. Now, define four propositions:

³For more on this, see Markus (2021) and Weinberger (2023).

- *Complier*: $(Take^{Assign=0} = 0 \wedge Take^{Assign=1} = 1)$,
which expresses the proposition that the randomly chosen person is a complier.
- *Defier*: $(Take^{Assign=0} = 1 \wedge Take^{Assign=1} = 0)$.
- *Always-Taker*: $(Take^{Assign=0} = Take^{Assign=1} = 1)$.
- *Never-Taker*: $(Take^{Assign=0} = Take^{Assign=1} = 0)$.

An important lemma relies on only three of the five assumptions in Theorem 1, formalized as follows:

- (CEM) If Y is a binary variable, $Y^{X=x}$ is a binary variable, too, and hence it must be that $(Y^{X=x} = 0 \vee Y^{X=x} = 1)$.
- (CONSISTENCY) It must be that $X = x \Rightarrow (Y^{X=x} = y \Leftrightarrow Y = y)$.
- (NO DEFIERS) There are no defiers in the population, so $\Pr(Defier) = 0$.

It follows that, in the control group, those who take the treatment must be exactly the always-takers, as stated in clause (i) of the following lemma:

Lemma. *Suppose that the three assumptions formalized above hold. If $Assign = 0$ (control group), then*

- (i) *Take = 1 is equivalent to Always-Taker,*
- (ii) *Take = 0 is equivalent to Complier \vee Never-Taker.*

If $Assign = 1$ (treatment group), then

- (iii) *Take = 0 is equivalent to Never-Taker,*
- (iv) *Take = 1 is equivalent to Complier \vee Always-Taker.*

Proof. Part (i) of the lemma can be proved as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \text{Assign} = 0 \wedge \text{Always-Taker} \\
\Leftrightarrow & \text{Assign} = 0 \wedge (\text{Always-Taker} \vee \text{Defier}) && \text{by No Defiers} \\
\Leftrightarrow & \text{Assign} = 0 \wedge \\
& \left[(\text{Take}^{\text{Assign}=0} = 1 \wedge \text{Take}^{\text{Assign}=1} = 1) \vee \right. \\
& \quad \left. (\text{Take}^{\text{Assign}=0} = 1 \wedge \text{Take}^{\text{Assign}=1} = 0) \right] && \text{by definitions} \\
\Leftrightarrow & \text{Assign} = 0 \wedge \\
& \left[\text{Take}^{\text{Assign}=0} = 1 \wedge \right. \\
& \quad \left. \underbrace{(\text{Take}^{\text{Assign}=1} = 1 \vee \text{Take}^{\text{Assign}=1} = 0)}_{\text{This is redundant by CEM!}} \right] && \text{by the De Morgan Rule} \\
\Leftrightarrow & \text{Assign} = 0 \wedge \text{Take}^{\text{Assign}=0} = 1 && \text{by CEM} \\
\Leftrightarrow & \text{Assign} = 0 \wedge \text{Take} = 1 && \text{by Consistency}
\end{aligned}$$

The other parts, (ii)-(iv), can be proved with the same strategy. \square

With this lemma, CEM is no longer needed in the rest of the proof of Theorem 1. Moreover, this lemma is only used in the ways illustrated below:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \Pr(\text{Always-Taker} \mid \text{Assign} = 0) \\
& = \Pr(\text{Take} = 1 \mid \text{Assign} = 0) && \text{by Lemma 1.(i)} \\
& \Pr(\text{Cured}^{\text{Take}=1} = 1 \mid (\text{Complier} \vee \text{Always-Taker}), \text{Assign} = 1) \\
& = \Pr(\text{Cured}^{\text{Take}=1} = 1 \mid \text{Take} = 1, \text{Assign} = 1) && \text{by Lemma 1.(iv)} \\
& = \Pr(\text{Cured} = 1 \mid \text{Take} = 1, \text{Assign} = 1) && \text{by Consistency}
\end{aligned}$$

This pinpoints the role that CEM plays in the proof of Theorem 1.

Appendix B: The Causal Bayes Net in Theorem 2

The assumption of Instrumentality* in Theorem 2 implies that the true causal model is a causal Bayes net of the form depicted in figure 2, where the confounding variable U is the most fined-grained possible, denoting the individual randomly drawn, and N is




Figure 2: The causal Bayes net assumed in Theorem 2

the population size. The probability distributions over exogenous variables *Assign* and *U* follow from the assumption of Randomization. The conditional probabilities over endogenous variables *Take* and *Cured* given their respective parents (direct causes) have parameters $c_i, c_i^*, t_i,$ and t_i^* for each individual i , as shown in the figure. Those parameters can be understood in terms of the expanded card game:

- c_i is the proportion of the ‘*Cured* = 1’ cards in i ’s deck #1, i.e., the deck for ‘if *Take* = 1’.
- c_i^* is the proportion of the ‘*Cured* = 1’ cards in i ’s deck #2.
- t_i is the proportion of the ‘*Take* = 1’ cards in i ’s deck #3.
- t_i^* is the proportion of the ‘*Take* = 1’ cards in i ’s deck #4.

In the special case where those parameters are restricted to be 0 or 1, decks reduce to single cards and the expanded game shrinks back to the original one—the causal Bayes net then seems to degenerate to a Rubin causal model.

Appendix C: Proof of Theorem 2

Proof. Thanks to the background provided in the previous appendix, each individual i has an individual treatment effect

$$\text{ITE}_i = c_i - c_i^*$$

with a degree of compliance

$$\text{DC}_i = t_i - t_i^*.$$

Hence the DATE is given by:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{DATE} &= \sum_i \left(\underbrace{\frac{\text{DC}_i}{\sum_j \text{DC}_j}}_{= w_i} \right) \text{ITE}_i \\ &= \sum_i \left(\frac{t_i - t_i^*}{\sum_j (t_j - t_j^*)} \right) (c_i - c_i^*). \end{aligned}$$

The goal is to verify the following equation:

$$\text{DATE} \stackrel{?}{=} \frac{\Pr(\text{Cured} = 1 \mid \text{Assign} = 1) - \Pr(\text{Cured} = 1 \mid \text{Assign} = 0)}{\Pr(\text{Take} = 1 \mid \text{Assign} = 1) - \Pr(\text{Take} = 1 \mid \text{Assign} = 0)}.$$

The terms on the right-hand side are to be calculated in turn. I will leverage a defining feature of the causal Bayes net, the *Causal Markov Assumption*: every variable is probabilistically independent of its non-descendants (non-effects) given its parents

(direct causes). Start with the first term in the numerator:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \Pr(Cured = 1 \mid Assign = 1) \\
&= \sum_{i,j} \left(\Pr(Cured = 1 \mid Take = j, U = i, Assign = 1) \right. \\
&\quad \times \Pr(Take = j \mid U = i, Assign = 1) \\
&\quad \left. \times \Pr(U = i \mid Assign = 1) \right) \quad \text{by Chain Rule} \\
&= \sum_{i,j} \left(\Pr(Cured = 1 \mid Take = j, U = i, \cancel{Assign = 1}) \right. \\
&\quad \times \Pr(Take = j \mid U = i, Assign = 1) \\
&\quad \left. \times \Pr(U = i \mid \cancel{Assign = 1}) \right) \quad \text{by Causal Markov} \\
&= \sum_i \left(\Pr(Cured = 1 \mid Take = 1, U = i) \right. \\
&\quad \times \Pr(Take = 1 \mid U = i, Assign = 1) \\
&\quad \left. \times \Pr(U = i) \right) \\
&\quad + \sum_i \left(\Pr(Cured = 1 \mid Take = 0, U = i) \right. \\
&\quad \times \Pr(Take = 0 \mid U = i, Assign = 1) \\
&\quad \left. \times \Pr(U = i) \right) \\
&= \sum_i \left(c_i t_i \frac{1}{N} \right) + \sum_i \left(c_i^* (1 - t_i) \frac{1}{N} \right) \\
&= \frac{1}{N} \sum_i \left(c_i t_i + c_i^* (1 - t_i) \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly for the second term in the numerator:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \Pr(Cured = 1 \mid Assign = 0) \\
&= \frac{1}{N} \sum_i \left(c_i t_i^* + c_i^* (1 - t_i^*) \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Now calculate the first term in the denominator:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \Pr(\text{Take} = 1 \mid \text{Assign} = 1) \\
&= \sum_i \left(\Pr(\text{Take} = 1 \mid U = i, \text{Assign} = 1) \cdot \Pr(U = i \mid \text{Assign} = 1) \right) \\
&\quad \text{by Causal Markov} \\
&= \sum_i t_i \frac{1}{N} \\
&= \frac{1}{N} \sum_i t_i.
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly for the second term in the denominator:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \Pr(\text{Take} = 1 \mid \text{Assign} = 0) \\
&= \frac{1}{N} \sum_i t_i^*.
\end{aligned}$$

To finish off, plug the four terms just calculated into the following:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{\Pr(\text{Cured} = 1 \mid \text{Assign} = 1) - \Pr(\text{Cured} = 1 \mid \text{Assign} = 0)}{\Pr(\text{Take} = 1 \mid \text{Assign} = 1) - \Pr(\text{Take} = 1 \mid \text{Assign} = 0)} \\
&= \frac{\frac{1}{N} \sum_i (c_i t_i + c_i^* (1 - t_i)) - \frac{1}{N} \sum_i (c_i t_i^* + c_i^* (1 - t_i^*))}{\frac{1}{N} \sum_i t_i - \frac{1}{N} \sum_i t_i^*} \\
&= \frac{\sum_i (t_i - t_i^*) (c_i - c_i^*)}{\sum_j (t_j - t_j^*)} \\
&= \sum_i \left(\frac{t_i - t_i^*}{\sum_j (t_j - t_j^*)} \right) (c_i - c_i^*) \\
&= \text{DATE},
\end{aligned}$$

as desired. □

This proof makes no use of the assumption of No Defiers*, which only serves to make the weights nonnegative and, thus, interpretable as weights in a weighted average.