



HAL
open science

A SAS macro to estimate Average Treatment Effects with Matching Estimators

Nicolas Moreau

► **To cite this version:**

Nicolas Moreau. A SAS macro to estimate Average Treatment Effects with Matching Estimators. 2018. hal-01691489

HAL Id: hal-01691489

<https://hal.science/hal-01691489>

Preprint submitted on 24 Jan 2018

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

A SAS macro to estimate Average Treatment Effects with Matching Estimators

Nicolas Moreau¹

<http://cemoi.univ-reunion.fr/publications/>

**Centre d'Economie et de Management de l'Océan Indien
Université de La Réunion**

October 2016

Abstract

This paper presents a SAS macro to estimate the Average Treatment Effect (ATE) and the Average Treatment Effect for the Treated (ATET) with nearest-neighbor matching.

JEL : C210

¹ E-mail: nicolas.moreau@univ-reunion.fr

Introduction

In this paper, we present the SAS macro *nn_matching*. *nn_matching* estimates nearest neighbor matching with replacement for the average treatment effect (ATE) and average treatment effect for the treated (ATET). In this respect, we draw heavily on Abadie et al. (2004) and Abadie and Imbens (2002, 2011). We refer the reader to these articles for a clear and comprehensive presentation of the matching estimator.

Following these authors, *nn_matching* provides the simple and bias-corrected matching estimators. Variance estimation is conducted by assuming homoscedasticity of the conditional variance or allowing for heteroscedasticity of the conditional variance. The source code is available at <http://cemoi.univ-reunion.fr>.

Syntax of *nn_matching*

The syntax is `%nn_matching(data=,y=,w=,x=,M=,scaling=,covarbias=)`;

where *data* specifies the data set, *y* the outcome variable, *w* the binary variable treatment indicator, *x* the list of covariates to be used in the matching, and *M* the number of matches to be made per observation. *M* could be any integer between 1 and the minimum of the number of treated units and controls in the sample.

If there are ties and if different matched pairs (i,j) and (i,l) lead to the same distance $d_{ij} = d_{il}$, then the number of matches per unit is greater than *M*.

Scaling specifies the metric for measuring the distance between two vectors of covariates. Following Abadie et al. (2004), the default is the diagonal matrix of the inverses of the sample variances of each covariate in *x* when scaling is not specified by the user. If *scaling*=1, the Mahalabonis metric is used; it is the inverse of the sample covariance matrix of the covariates. If *scaling*=2, the identity matrix is used instead. *Covarbias* specifies the list of covariates to be used to compute the bias-corrected matching estimator. The default list is *x* when *covarbias* is not specified by the user.

Note that all variables in *y*, *x*, *w* and *covarbias* must be numeric.

Results presentation and output data files

ATE and ATET are automatically computed. For each estimated parameter, estimated standard errors that assume homoscedasticity of the conditional variance or allow for heteroscedasticity of the conditional variance are supplied.

The bias-corrected matching estimator developed in Abadie and Imbens (2002, 2011) is automatically computed if the number of “continuous” covariates in *x* is greater than 1. In *nn_matching*, all variables that are not binary are considered as continuous.

The first two output tables summarize the model specification and estimation options. The third table provides summary statistics, such as the number of treated units, the number of controls matched to treated units, and so on. The fourth and final table shows the main results. The “Estimate” column reports the estimated ATE and ATET. The next column shows the corresponding robust standard errors. “z” corresponds to the z-statistics to test whether ATE or ATET are 0; these are computed as the estimated parameters divided by their corresponding standard error. The “P-value” column reports the p-values for the z-statistics for a two-sided test.

The last two columns show the lower and upper bounds of the 95% confidence interval for the z-statistics.

To assess the validity of the balancing hypothesis, *nn matching* provides normalized differences (see Abadie and Imbens, 2011; Austin, 2009) so as box-plots and empirical distribution functions to compare the covariate distributions between treatment groups before and after matching. These plots are edited for continuous variables alone. For binary variables, contingency tables are provided.

Two temporary output data files are created, which need to be stored in a specific folder with a libname statement to become permanent.

Outdata1 includes an internal identification number for observation i created by the program that is based on the original sort order and called `_id_`. *nbelements* specifies the number of matches for unit i . *count* is the number of times unit i is used as a match. *km_i* specifies the number of times unit i is used as a match for any observation j of the opposite treatment group weighted by the total number of matches for the given observation j . *Outdata1* also includes the outcome variable y , covariates x , and treatment group indicator w .

Outdata2 includes the list of indices for the M closest matches for unit i . *id* is the internal identification number for observation i and *idM* the corresponding identification number of i 's closest matches in the opposite treatment group. For each *id*, there is one row per match. For instance, if unit 3 is matched with units 5, 6, and 10, there are three rows in *outdata2* that correspond to *id* =3, the first with *idM*=5, the second with *idM*=6, and the last with *idM*=10. For each matched pair (i,j) , the distance (as an absolute value) between unit i and unit j of the opposite treatment group is stored as unit j 's outcome value.

An example

Following Abadie et al. (2004), we use the particular data set constructed by Dehejia and Wahba (1999) from Lalonde (1986) to examine the effect of participation in a job-training program on individuals' earnings in 1978.

```
re78: individual earnings in 1978
treat = 1 if the individual participates to the job-training program, 0 otherwise
educ: years of education
black=1 if Afro-American, 0 otherwise
hisp=1 if Hispanic, 0 otherwise
married=1 if married, 0 otherwise
re74 (re75): individual earnings in 1974 (1975)
u74 (u75)=1 if unemployed in 1974 (1975), 0 otherwise.
```

The macro statement:

```
%nn_matching(data=lib.lalonde,y=re78,w=treat,x=age educ black hisp married re74 re75 u74
u75,M=4,scaling=,covarbias=);
```

replicate Abadie et al. (2004)'s results apart from the standard error of ATET with bias-correction under homoscedasticity of the conditional variance which is larger in Abadie et al. (2004). The results are presented below.

Model specification

Outcome variable: re78

Binary treatment: Treat

Matching variables: age educ black hisp married re74 re75 u74 u75

Estimation options

Number of matches requested: 4

Scaling matrix used: Inverse variances

Covariates used for bias correction: age educ black hisp married re74 re75 u74 u75

Summary statistics

Number of observations: 445

Number of control units: 260

Number of treated units: 185

Number of treated units matched to controls: 174

Number of control units matched to treated: 239

Number of times a treated unit is used as a match (MIN): 1

Number of times a treated unit is used as a match (MAX): 21

Number of times a control unit is used as a match (MIN): 1

Number of times a control unit is used as a match (MAX): 11

Estimation results assuming homoscedasticity of the conditional variance

	Estimate	Std.Error	z	P-value	L. bound 95% CI	U. bound 95% CI
Average Treatment Effect (ATE)	1903.326	720.215	2.643	0.008	491.731	3314.921
ATE with bias correction	1717.726	720.341	2.385	0.017	305.883	3129.569
Average Treatment Effect for the Treated (ATET)	1994.622	712.729	2.799	0.005	597.699	3391.544
ATET with bias correction	1838.424	712.824	2.579	0.01	441.314	3235.534

Estimation results allowing for heteroscedasticity of the conditional variance

	Estimate	Std.Error	z	P-value	L. bound 95% CI	U. bound 95% CI
Average Treatment Effect (ATE)	1903.326	745.421	2.553	0.011	442.328	3364.324
ATE with bias correction	1717.726	745.421	2.304	0.021	256.729	3178.724

Estimation results allowing for heteroscedasticity of the conditional variance

	Estimate	Std.Error	z	P-value	L. bound 95% CI	U. bound 95% CI
Average Treatment Effect for the Treated (ATET)	1994.622	752.634	2.65	0.008	519.486	3469.757
ATET with bias correction	1838.424	752.634	2.443	0.015	363.289	3313.56

Normalized covariate mean differences are presented in the following table:

**Normalized covariate mean differences between
treated and controls**

	Unmatched Samples	Matched samples (T)	Matched samples (C)
AGE	0.107	0.115	0.06
EDUC	0.141	0.097	0.105
BLACK	0.044	-0.029	0.081
HISP	-0.175	-0.079	-0.16
MARRIED	0.094	0.091	0.05
RE74	-0.002	0.057	-0.012
RE75	0.084	0.095	0.096
U74	-0.094	-0.092	-0.084
U75	-0.177	-0.154	-0.182


Note: 'Matched samples (T)' is for normalized mean differences between all sample treated and their matches, 'Matched samples (C)' for normalized mean differences between all sample controls and their matches.

Comparing binary covariate distributions between treatment groups before and after matching


		SampleType			
		All treated	All controls	Matched controls	Matched treated
black					
0	Distribution in %	15.68	17.31	14.37	14.64
1	Distribution in %	84.32	82.69	85.63	85.36
hisp					
0	Distribution in %	94.05	89.23	93.68	92.05
1	Distribution in %	5.95	10.77	6.32	7.95
married					
0	Distribution in %	81.08	84.62	82.76	84.52
1	Distribution in %	18.92	15.38	17.24	15.48
u74					

	0	Distribution in %	29.19	25.00	28.74	25.10
	1	Distribution in %	70.81	75.00	71.26	74.90
u75	0	Distribution in %	40.00	31.54	40.23	32.64
	1	Distribution in %	60.00	68.46	59.77	67.36


Visual diagnostic to assess the validity of the balancing hypothesis for continuous variables is then provided:





Checking balance: visual diagnostic for continuous variables





Checking balance: visual diagnostic for continuous variables




Checking balance: visual diagnostic for continuous variables







Empirical Distribution for re75




Empirical Distribution for age




Empirical Distribution for educ




Empirical Distribution for re74




Empirical Distribution for re75




Empirical Distribution for age




Empirical Distribution for educ



Empirical Distribution for re74





References

Abadie A., Drukker D., Leber Herr J. and Imbens G. W. (2004), "Implementing matching estimators for average treatment effects in Stata", *The Stata Journal*, vol. 4, n°3: 290-311.

Abadie A., and Imbens G. W. (2002), "Simple and bias-corrected matching estimators for average treatment effects", NBER Technical Working Paper 283.

Abadie A., and Imbens G. W. (2011), "Bias-Corrected Matching Estimators for Average Treatment Effects", *Journal of Business and Economic Statistics*, vol. 29, n°1: 1-11.

Austin P. C. (2009), "Balance diagnostics for comparing the distribution of baseline covariates between treatment group in propensity-score matched samples", *Statistics in Medicine*, vol. 28: 3083–3107.

Dehehia R. H., and Wabba S. (1999), "Causal effects in non-experimental studies: Re-evaluation of the evaluation of training programs", *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, vol. 94: 1053-1062.

Lalonde R. J. (1986), "Evaluating the econometric evaluations of training programs", *American Economic Review*, vol. 74, n°4: 604-620.