

# Does Rerandomization Help Beyond Covariate Adjustment?

## A Review and Guide for Theory and Practice

Antônio Carlos Herling Ribeiro Junior\*

Zach Branson\*

Rerandomization is a modern experimental design technique that repeatedly randomizes treatment assignments until covariates are deemed balanced between treatment groups. This enhances the precision and coherence of causal effect estimators, mitigates false discoveries from p-hacking, and increases statistical power. Recent work suggests that balancing covariates via rerandomization does not alter the asymptotic precision of covariate-adjusted estimators, thereby making it unclear whether rerandomization is worthwhile if adjusted estimators are used. However, these results have two key caveats. First, these results are asymptotic, leaving finite sample performance unknown. Second, these results focus on precision, while other potential benefits, such as increased coherence among flexible estimators, remain understudied. Hence, in this paper we provide three main contributions: (i) a comprehensive review of the rerandomization literature, covering historical foundations, theoretical developments, and recent methodological advancements, (ii) an extensive simulation study examining finite-sample performance, and (iii) a practical guide for practitioners. Our study compares precision, coherence, power, and coverage of various estimators under rerandomization versus complete randomization. We find rerandomization to be a complementary design strategy that enhances the precision, robustness, and reliability of causal effect estimators, especially for smaller sample sizes.

## 1 Introduction

Randomized experiments are considered the “gold standard” for estimating causal effects in a wide range of disciplines, such as education ([Mosteller, 2002](#); [Raudenbush and Schwartz, 2020](#)), economics ([Athey and Imbens, 2017](#); [List, 2024](#)), political science ([Druckman et al., 2012](#); [Gerber and Green, 2012](#)), and medicine ([Rosenberger and Lachin, 2002](#); [Carlin et al., 2007](#)), because covariates are balanced on average and thus many causal effect estimators are unbiased, including the simple difference in mean outcomes. However, chance alone can result in covariate imbalance between treated and control units. Hence, conditional on this imbalance, estimators may become biased and lose precision, thus weakening the validity of statistical inference ([Ding, 2021](#)).

To address covariate imbalance, one could consider alternative randomized experimental designs, such as blocking or stratified randomization. These designs involve grouping units with similar covariate values into strata or blocks and then assigning treatment at random, thus ensuring more comparable treatment groups within each block and ultimately increasing precision of causal effect estimators ([Fisher, 1935](#); [Imai, 2008](#); [Miratrix et al., 2013](#); [Pashley and Miratrix, 2021](#); [Bai, 2022](#); [Pashley and Miratrix, 2022](#); [Tabord-Meehan, 2022](#)). However, these designs depend on

---

\*Department of Statistics and Data Science, Carnegie Mellon University

discretized covariates, and it can be unclear how to implement blocking when covariates are continuous or high-dimensional. Instead of discretizing covariates, units could first be organized into matched pairs, and then treatment could be randomized within pairs (Imai, 2008; Bai et al., 2022; Bai, 2022). If units are observed sequentially, one option to address covariate imbalance is adaptive randomization designs (Hu and Rosenberger, 2006; Rosenberger and Lachin, 2002). These designs change treatment allocation probability sequentially to maintain balanced treatment groups. Another alternative to address covariate imbalance, which is the one we focus on in this paper, is rerandomized designs.

Rerandomization repeatedly randomizes treatment assignment until a prespecified covariate balance criterion is met. Although the concept of rerandomization has been commented about at least as soon as the 1950s (Grundy and Healy, 1950; Jones, 1958; Savage, 1962), and informally used by many practitioners for decades (Bruhn and McKenzie, 2009), it was novelly formalized in Morgan and Rubin (2012) as randomizing treatment assignment until the Mahalanobis distance between treatment and control covariate means is small. It has since been extended to a variety of experimental design settings such as  $2^K$  factorial, stratified, sequential, survey, cluster, and split-plot (Branson et al., 2016; Li et al., 2020; Zhou et al., 2018; Wang et al., 2021; Yang et al., 2021; Lu et al., 2023; Shi et al., 2024). Since rerandomization ensures comparable treatment groups not just in expectation but also in realization, a common result in the literature is that rerandomization increases precision and retains unbiasedness of causal effect estimators.

On the other hand, practitioners can also address covariate imbalance in the analysis stage using covariate-adjusted estimators (Fisher, 1935; Rosenbaum, 2002). In randomized experiments, it is well-known that covariate-adjusted estimators can increase precision while retaining unbiasedness (Lin, 2013; Li and Ding, 2020; Ding, 2024; Wang and Li, 2024). Thus, results have been developed that account for covariate imbalance either in the design, analysis, or both stages of an experiment. If all covariates used for rerandomization in the design stage are also used for adjustment in the analysis stage, then adjusted estimators’ marginal distributions are the same under complete randomization or rerandomization (Li and Ding, 2020; Wang and Li, 2024). At first, this equality seems to suggest that rerandomizing in the design stage is not necessary as long as one adjusts for covariates in the analysis stage. However, this equality only holds asymptotically, only considers the marginal distributions of estimators, and depends on the amount of covariates available in the design and analysis stage. Thus, several works have conjectured that rerandomization may still improve precision for adjusted estimators in finite samples (Yang et al., 2021; Zhu et al., 2024; Wang and Li, 2024). Furthermore, rerandomization may yield other potential benefits beyond increased precision.

For example, rerandomization has also been shown to increase the statistical power of hypothesis tests (Branson et al., 2024), thus lowering the sample size needed to achieve high-powered experiments. Furthermore, rerandomization makes different linearly adjusted causal estimators asymptotically more similar or “coherent” with each other, in the sense that they tend to yield similar point estimates, thereby reducing sensitivity to model specification (Zhao and Ding, 2024a). This increased coherence implies that rerandomization can help mitigate p-hacking, as the choice of estimator and covariates becomes less consequential for inference (Lu and Ding, 2025). That said, these other potential benefits from rerandomization have also focused on asymptotic results, as well as difference-in-means or linear regression estimators.

To clarify whether rerandomization is helpful for various settings and estimators, we make three contributions. First, we provide a comprehensive review of the rerandomization literature and its

open problems, such that researchers can understand the directions and statistical tools needed to make further contributions in the literature. Second, we provide practical guidance on each step of the rerandomization process, such that practitioners can better understand how to leverage rerandomization for their own experiments. Third, we conduct several simulation studies to assess the performance and relationship among parametric and nonparametric estimators under rerandomization in finite samples. We find that rerandomization (i) improves the precision of adjusted estimators in finite samples and (ii) decreases sensitivity to model choices in the analysis stage (e.g., parametric versus nonparametric specifications, or the use of covariate selection procedures) by increasing the coherence among estimators.

We structure the remainder of this review as follows. In Section 2 we situate rerandomization within its historical context, and contrast it with classical randomized and deterministic experimental designs. In Sections 3 and 4, we establish the formal notation and detail the rerandomization algorithm itself. In Section 5, we review the key theoretical properties of rerandomized experiments. In Section 6, we present our simulation studies, where we consider the precision and coherence gains for parametric and nonparametric estimators from rerandomization in finite samples. In Section 7, we provide a practical guide for how to implement rerandomization, including how to address computational difficulties, issues of missing data, and other real-data challenges. In Section 8, we conclude with a discussion of recommendations and open problems for rerandomization.

## 2 History

The idea of improving the quality of randomized experiments by selectively choosing among randomizations has a long history and has sparked substantial debate over the decades (Gosset, 1938; Yates, 1939; Greenberg, 1951; Kiefer, 1959; Taves, 1974; Harville, 1975; Arnold, 1986; Kempthorne, 1986; Treasure and MacRae, 1998). While early designs, such as those advocated by Fisher (1926), emphasized randomization as essential for ensuring unbiasedness and valid inference, there was also an implicit recognition that some randomizations could lead to more desirable covariate balance than others. This led some researchers to advocate for procedures that deterministically minimized an imbalance measure (Taves, 1974; Treasure and MacRae, 1998); for instance, Treasure and MacRae (1998) suggested that if randomization is the gold standard, a platinum standard would be based on the *minimization* of the covariate differences between treatment and control groups. However, such deterministic approaches can lack robustness to imbalance in unmeasured variables and may invalidate the assumptions underlying standard statistical inference, which relies on a known, random-assignment mechanism (Yates, 1939; Harshaw et al., 2024).

The foundational tension between randomized designs and optimally balanced designs continues to provoke debate and recent contributions have revisited this issue from theoretical and empirical perspectives (Kasy, 2016; Kallus, 2018; Banerjee et al., 2020; Kapelner et al., 2020; Kallus, 2021; Johansson et al., 2021; Kapelner et al., 2022; Wang and Li, 2022; Jerzak and Goldstein, 2023; Harshaw et al., 2024). While the purpose of this paper is not to settle this debate, we will focus on *rerandomized* designs that sit in between random and deterministic designs.

The work of Morgan and Rubin (2012) formally defined rerandomization as a procedure in which units are repeatedly randomized until a prespecified criterion for covariate balance is met. Their framework brought rigor to the informal practice of discarding “bad” randomizations, while preserving the validity of statistical inference under certain conditions. Thus, rerandomized experiments act as a deterministic design by discarding clearly imbalanced randomizations while also

being able to conduct randomization-based inference as randomized designs. This sparked interest in extending rerandomization to many settings, including but not limited to, different experimental designs (Zhou et al., 2018; Branson and Shao, 2021; Wang et al., 2021; Lu et al., 2023; Zhang et al., 2023; Zhao and Ding, 2024b), theoretical properties of rerandomization in general (Li et al., 2018; Li and Ding, 2020; Wang and Li, 2024; Branson et al., 2024; Zhao and Ding, 2024a; Wang and Li, 2025), and other covariate balance criteria (Morgan and Rubin, 2015; Zhao and Ding, 2024a; Schindl and Branson, 2024; Zhang et al., 2024).

In this paper, we review recent developments on rerandomization so that others can understand how to leverage its benefits and contribute further to this literature.

### 3 Setup and Notation

For ease of exposition, we focus on two-arm randomized experiments involving a treatment and control group. In Section 7.5, we discuss multi-arm experiments; however, it is still unclear how to conduct rerandomization over continuous treatments, such as dose-response.

Consider an experiment with  $n$  units, from which  $n_1$  units are randomly assigned to treatment and the remaining  $n_0$  to control. We observe a  $n \times k$  covariate matrix  $X = (X_1, \dots, X_n)'$ , from which  $d$  covariates denoted by  $X^{\text{rr}} \subseteq X$  are considered for rerandomization in the design stage, and  $p$  covariates denoted by  $X^{\text{adj}} \subseteq X$  are considered for covariate adjustment in the analysis stage. Let  $Z = (Z_1, \dots, Z_n)'$  be the vector of treatment assignments, where  $Z_i = 1$  indicates treatment and  $Z_i = 0$  control for unit  $i$ . We use the potential outcomes framework of Rubin (1974) to define causal effects, with  $Y(1) = (Y_1(1), \dots, Y_n(1))'$  and  $Y(0) = (Y_1(0), \dots, Y_n(0))'$  being the potential outcomes under treatment and control. We consider a finite-population setting where  $X, Y(1), Y(0)$  are fixed and the sole source of randomness is in the treatment assignment.

Once treatments are assigned the observed outcome for unit  $i$  is defined as  $Y_i = Y_i(1)Z_i + Y_i(0)(1 - Z_i)$ , and the vector of observed outcomes  $Y = (Y_1, \dots, Y_n)'$ . This notation assumes no interference, meaning that one unit's outcome does not depend on another unit's treatment. Although there are experimental designs that allow for interference (Rosenbaum, 2007; Aronow and Samii, 2017; Basse and Feller, 2018; Basse et al., 2024; Choi, 2023), to our knowledge interference has not been considered for rerandomized experiments. In the end, the observed data is  $(X, Y, Z)$ . This setup follows most of the literature assuming that there is no missingness in covariates nor outcomes. See Section 7.3 for a discussion and practical recommendations when there is missing data.

So far, we have described the setup for a two-arm, completely randomized experiment, where a fixed number of subjects are assigned to treatment and control. Thus, in what follows, we will compare rerandomization to a completely randomized design, which is the typical comparison in the literature. That said, rerandomization can be applied to other settings, such as  $2^K$  factorial designs, sequential designs, stratified experiments, survey experiments, clustered designs, and split-plot designs (Branson et al., 2016; Li et al., 2020; Zhou et al., 2018; Wang et al., 2021; Yang et al., 2021; Lu et al., 2023; Shi et al., 2024).

The overarching goal of rerandomization is to determine how we can randomize  $Z$  such that causal effects can be well-estimated. By far the most common estimand in the literature is the

average treatment effect (ATE), defined as:

$$\tau = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n Y_i(1) - Y_i(0) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \tau_i. \quad (1)$$

As one exception, [Wang and Li \(2024\)](#) consider a more general set of estimands: those defined by any function of average potential outcomes,  $f[\mathbb{E}(Y(1)), \mathbb{E}(Y(0))]$ . Thus, [Wang and Li \(2024\)](#) consider a super-population setting, where covariates and potential outcomes are also considered random ([Ding et al., 2017](#)). In this case, the ATE would be defined as  $\tau = \mathbb{E}[Y(1) - Y(0)]$ . Although this super-population ATE differs slightly from the finite-population ATE in Equation (1), the results in [Wang and Li \(2024\)](#) are analogous to other rerandomization results that focus on a finite-population framework, as we discuss in the next section. On the other hand, it is still an open problem on how to design and analyze rerandomized experiments when other estimands are of interest, such as quantile effects and conditional average treatment effects.

## 4 Rerandomization

In general, rerandomization involves collecting covariate data  $X$ , and then randomizing the treatment  $Z$  until some covariate balance criterion (based on  $X$  and  $Z$ ) is fulfilled. Thus, rerandomization methods are uniquely characterized by (1) the balance criterion, and (2) how treatment is randomized to ensure the criterion is fulfilled. We discuss these two characteristics below.

### 4.1 Covariate balance criteria

Prior to conducting the experiment, we need to define a measure  $\varphi$  of the covariate balance between treated and control units, where

$$\varphi(X, Z) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } Z \text{ is an acceptable randomization,} \\ 0, & \text{if } Z \text{ is **not** an acceptable randomization.} \end{cases}$$

To ensure that estimators are unbiased after rerandomization, this measure must be symmetric in  $Z$ , meaning  $\varphi(X, Z) = \varphi(X, 1 - Z)$ . The set of randomizations that have  $\varphi(X, Z) = 1$  will be deemed acceptable to run the experiment, formally  $\mathcal{A} = \{Z : \varphi(X, Z) = 1\}$ .

Although  $\varphi$  can be defined in various ways, which we explore in Section 7.1, we focus on the most common measure chosen in the literature, which depends on the Mahalanobis distance,

$$M = \hat{\tau}'_{X^{rr}} \Sigma^{-1} \hat{\tau}_{X^{rr}}, \quad (2)$$

where,

$$\hat{\tau}_{X^{rr}} = \bar{X}_1^{rr} - \bar{X}_0^{rr} = \frac{1}{n_1} \left( X^{rr'} Z \right) - \frac{1}{n_0} \left( X^{rr'} (1_n - Z) \right),$$

$1_n \in \mathbb{R}^n$  is a vector whose coefficients are all equal to one, and  $\Sigma = \text{cov}(\hat{\tau}_{X^{rr}})$  is the  $d \times d$  covariance matrix for the vector of covariates' difference-in-means under complete randomization. Note that the only random variable in this covariance is the treatment assignment  $Z$ . As shown by [Morgan and Rubin \(2012\)](#), under complete randomization,  $\Sigma = \frac{n}{n_1 n_0} S_X^2$ , where  $S_X^2$  is the sample covariance matrix of the covariates.

For the Mahalanobis distance, we define the set of acceptable randomizations as those that have  $M < a$ , where  $a > 0$  is a pre-specified threshold, i.e.  $\mathcal{A} = \{Z : M < a\}$ . The most common way to define the threshold  $a$  is based on the proportion  $p_a$  of randomizations to be considered acceptable,  $p_a = \mathbb{P}(M < a)$ . Although there is no definitive method to set  $p_a$ , some common choices are  $p_a = 0.01$  and  $p_a = 0.001$  (Li et al., 2018; Branson and Shao, 2021; Zhang et al., 2024; Schindl and Branson, 2024). We provide a more practical discussion on the choice of  $p_a$  in Section 7.1.2. However, it is important to point out that a small  $p_a$  leads to more balanced randomizations, but it reduces the number of accepted randomizations. The extreme case where  $\mathcal{A}$  comprises a single treatment allocation is analogous to a deterministic design and thus makes randomization-based inference impossible.

## 4.2 Randomization of treatment allocation

Despite its theoretical appeal and intuitive simplicity, rerandomization often faces practical limitations due to its computational demands for randomly drawing acceptable randomizations. The classical rerandomization scheme, as introduced by Morgan and Rubin (2012), relies on acceptance-rejection sampling: treatment allocations are generated at random and only accepted as long as a prespecified covariate balance criterion is satisfied.

The computational burden is amplified in randomization-based inference, where balanced treatment assignments must be repeatedly sampled to approximate the null distribution of the test statistic. Recognizing this challenge, recent work has focused on developing computationally efficient alternatives to rejection sampling. These include methods that, given a randomization, switches units from the treatment groups until balance is achieved (e.g., pair-switching algorithms (Zhu and Liu, 2023)) or avoid rejection sampling entirely (e.g., importance sampling (Branson and Bind, 2019) or integer programming approaches (Lu et al., 2025)). We return to these computational strategies in depth in Section 7.

Recently, Wang and Li (2025) proposed to generate a number of randomizations, such that the amount of randomizations generated is sufficiently smaller than the sample size, and accepting the most balanced randomization, thereby reducing the computational demands of rejection sampling. This new procedure has similar theoretical results to the usual rerandomization procedure, which we review now.

## 5 Theoretical Developments

In this section, we review the theoretical properties of three causal effect estimators based on a rerandomization scheme using the Mahalanobis distance, defined in Equation (2), based on covariates  $X^{\text{rr}}$ .

The first estimator we consider is the difference-in-means estimator,

$$\hat{\tau}_{\text{D}} = \frac{1}{n_1} \sum_{i=1}^n Y_i Z_i - \frac{1}{n_0} \sum_{i=1}^n Y_i (1 - Z_i), \quad (3)$$

which is by far the most common estimator in the rerandomization literature (Morgan and Rubin, 2012, 2015; Li et al., 2018; Li and Ding, 2020; Branson and Shao, 2021; Zhu and Liu, 2023; Branson et al., 2024; Zhang et al., 2024; Schindl and Branson, 2024; Wang and Li, 2025; Lu et al., 2025).



The second estimator, considered in [Lin \(2013\)](#); [Li and Ding \(2020\)](#), is a linearly adjusted estimator

$$\hat{\tau}_L = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left( \hat{\mu}_1 \left( X_i^{\text{adj}} \right) - \hat{\mu}_0 \left( X_i^{\text{adj}} \right) \right), \quad (4)$$

where  $X_i^{\text{adj}}$  are the covariates used for adjustment in the linear outcome model  $\hat{\mu}_z(X_i) = \hat{\mathbb{E}}(Y_i | X_i, Z_i = z) = \hat{\beta}_{0z} + \hat{\beta}_{1z}X_i$ , for  $z \in \{0, 1\}$ .<sup>1</sup>

Lastly, we consider the doubly-robust estimator studied in [Wang and Li \(2024\)](#),

$$\hat{\tau}_{\text{DR}} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left( \hat{\eta}_1 \left( X_i^{\text{adj}} \right) - \hat{\eta}_0 \left( X_i^{\text{adj}} \right) \right) \quad (5)$$

with

$$\hat{\eta}_z(X_i) = \frac{\mathbb{1}(Z_i = z)}{\pi^z(1 - \pi)^{1-z}} (Y_i - \hat{\mu}_z(X_i)) + \hat{\mu}_z(X_i),$$

where  $\hat{\mu}_z(X_i)$  is any (possibly nonparametric) estimator of  $\mathbb{E}[Y_i(z) | X_i]$  for  $z = 0, 1$ ,  $\pi = n_1/n$  is the propensity score, and  $\mathbb{1}$  is the indicator function.

Treatment effect estimation through  $\hat{\tau}_{\text{DR}}$  can suffer from bias due to overfitting. This occurs when estimation of the nuisance parameter  $\mu_z$  and computation of  $\hat{\eta}_z$ , for  $z \in \{0, 1\}$ , happen on the same dataset. One way to mitigate this bias is through cross-fitting. This technique separates data into independent folds, in which all but one fold are used to estimate  $\mu_z$  and the remaining fold is used to compute  $\hat{\eta}_z$ , thereby decoupling the dependency between estimation of  $\mu_z$  and computation of  $\hat{\eta}_z$ . Moreover, since this is a randomized experiment, the true propensity score  $\pi$  is known. However, in observational studies, the outcome models  $\mu_z$  and propensity score  $\pi$  are nuisance parameters that must be estimated. Therefore, to avoid bias from overfitting, the estimation of  $\pi$  is also considered in the cross-fitting procedure. More details on cross-fitting and how to apply it for  $\hat{\tau}_{\text{DR}}$  are discussed in [Appendix B](#).

Now we explore the main theoretical developments for these three estimators under rerandomization. In particular, we discuss two aspects that make rerandomization a promising approach. First, we discuss the asymptotic distributions of the above estimators, which justifies confidence intervals that can be used for inference and are narrower than analogous confidence intervals under complete randomization, hence increasing statistical power of hypothesis testing. Second, we discuss the extent that rerandomization increases the coherence of different estimators, in the sense that they yield similar point estimates, thereby reducing sensitivity to model specification. We end this section with a discussion of an ongoing debate and open problems about the equality between rerandomization and covariate adjustment. The simulation study in [Section 6](#) is meant to address some of those open problems.

## 5.1 Asymptotic Distributions

To start, under completely randomized experiments, we have that

$$\sqrt{n}(\hat{\tau}_* - \tau) \xrightarrow{d} \sqrt{V_{\tau\tau,*}}\epsilon,$$

---

<sup>1</sup>Some papers use the notation based on R code, see [Lin \(2013\)](#); [Zhao et al. \(2024\)](#); [Zhao and Ding \(2024a,b\)](#); [Lu and Ding \(2025\)](#). In this case,  $\hat{\tau}_L$  is numerically the same as the coefficient of  $Z$  in  $\text{lm}(Y_i \sim 1 + Z_i + \tilde{X}_i + \tilde{X}_i Z_i)$ , with  $\tilde{X}_i = (X_i - \bar{X})$ .

where  $\epsilon \sim N(0, 1)$ , and  $*$  = D, L, DR, refer to the difference-in-means, linear regression, and doubly robust estimators in Equations (3), (4), and (5), respectively. The asymptotic normality of  $\hat{\tau}_D$  was proven in [Splawa-Neyman et al. \(1990\)](#), and later extended for  $\hat{\tau}_L$  and  $\hat{\tau}_{DR}$  ([Lin, 2013](#); [Li and Ding, 2020](#); [Wang and Li, 2024](#)). Here,  $V_{\tau\tau,D} = \frac{S_{Y(1)}^2}{n_1} + \frac{S_{Y(0)}^2}{n_0} - S_\tau^2$  such that  $S_{Y(z)}^2$  are the finite population variances of the outcomes in treatment and control and  $S_\tau^2$  is the finite-population variance of the individual treatment effects. The variances  $S_{Y(z)}^2$  can be unbiasedly estimated with sample analogs, whereas the treatment effect heterogeneity term  $S_\tau^2$  can typically not be estimated, although it can be bounded ([Ding et al., 2018](#)). The variances of  $\hat{\tau}_L$  and  $\hat{\tau}_{DR}$  are similar to  $V_{\tau\tau,D}$  but after accounting for adjustment on  $X^{\text{adj}}$ . See Appendix B for the exact definition of  $V_{\tau\tau,*}$  for  $*$  = L, DR and estimators for the three variances.

[Morgan and Rubin \(2012\)](#) established two main properties for  $\hat{\tau}_D$  under rerandomization and when the number of treated and control units is the same, i.e.  $n_1 = n_0$ . First, the estimator is unbiased under finite samples. Second, under additional assumptions of additive treatment effect and normality of covariates and outcome means, then the finite-sample variance of the estimator is reduced by  $1 - (1 - v_{d,a})R_{D,X^{\text{rr}}}^2$ . Here,  $v_{d,a} = \mathbb{P}(\chi_{d+2}^2 \leq a)/\mathbb{P}(\chi_d^2 \leq a) \leq 1$ , which gets closer to 1 as  $d$  and  $a$  increase. Intuitively, this means that if we attempt to balance many covariates at once, or if we are not strict in our acceptance criterion, rerandomization will not provide much precision improvements compared to complete randomization. On the other hand,  $R_{D,X^{\text{rr}}}^2$  denotes the proportion of the potential outcomes' variance that can be explained by a linear projection on  $\hat{\tau}_{X^{\text{rr}}}$ , formally defined as:

$$R_{D,X^{\text{rr}}}^2 = \frac{\frac{n_1}{n} S_{Y(1)|X^{\text{rr}}}^2 + \frac{n_0}{n} S_{Y(0)|X^{\text{rr}}}^2 - S_{\tau|X^{\text{rr}}}^2}{\frac{n_1}{n} S_{Y(1)}^2 + \frac{n_0}{n} S_{Y(0)}^2 - S_\tau^2},$$

where  $S_{Y(z)|X^{\text{rr}}}^2, z = 0, 1$  and  $S_{\tau|X^{\text{rr}}}^2$  are the finite population variance of the linear projections of the potential outcomes and individual treatment effects on the covariates used for rerandomization. Their mathematical definitions are presented in Appendix A. Notice that  $R_{D,X^{\text{rr}}}^2$  has the same interpretation as  $R^2$  in linear regression models, however  $\hat{\tau}_D$  does not fit a linear model and there is no assumption that the covariates and potential outcomes follow a linear model. Moreover, when  $d$  decreases,  $R_{D,X^{\text{rr}}}^2$  also decreases, meaning that the precision benefits of rerandomization diminish. This is the opposite consequence observed for  $v_{d,a}$ , therefore there is a trade-off on the amount of covariates one should choose so that it maximizes  $R_{D,X^{\text{rr}}}^2$  while minimizing  $v_{d,a}$ . We discuss how to choose the set of covariates in more depth in Section 7.

Assuming that the finite-population variance and covariance of the potential outcomes, individual treatment effects, and covariates are well-defined and have finite limiting values, [Li et al. \(2018\)](#); [Li and Ding \(2020\)](#); [Wang and Li \(2024\)](#) extend these results by deriving the asymptotic distribution of  $\hat{\tau}_D$ ,  $\hat{\tau}_L$ , and  $\hat{\tau}_{DR}$ , respectively. We leave the mathematical definition of these assumptions in Appendix A. These works established that the asymptotic distributions of these estimators after rerandomization follow a mixture of a normal and a truncated normal distribution:

$$\sqrt{n}(\hat{\tau}_* - \tau)|\mathcal{A} \xrightarrow{d} \sqrt{V_{\tau\tau,*}} \left( \sqrt{1 - R_{*,X^{\text{rr}}}^2} \epsilon + \sqrt{R_{*,X^{\text{rr}}}^2} L_{d,a} \right), \quad (6)$$

where  $\mathcal{A}$  indicates that the distribution is conditioned on balanced randomizations,  $L_{d,a} \sim Q_1 | Q'Q \leq a$ , with  $Q = (Q_1, \dots, Q_d)' \sim N(0, I_d)$ , is a truncated normal distribution centered at 0 with  $\text{Var}(L_{d,a}) = v_{d,a}$ . Intuitively,  $R_{L,X^{\text{rr}}}^2$  and  $R_{DR,X^{\text{rr}}}^2$  are analogous to  $R_{D,X^{\text{rr}}}^2$ , but they apply to



residuals of the potential outcomes after adjusting for  $X^{\text{adj}}$  through a linear regression model or a more flexible regression model, respectively. Thus,  $R_{*,X^{\text{rr}}}^2$  also depends on the covariates  $X^{\text{adj}}$  used for adjustment in the linear regression or doubly robust estimator. See Appendix B for the mathematical definition of  $R_{*,X^{\text{rr}}}^2$ ,  $*$  = L, DR, and their respective estimators.

Since both  $\epsilon$  and  $L_{d,a}$  are symmetric and unimodal at zero, their linear combination is also symmetric and centered at zero. Hence the estimator  $\hat{\tau}_*$  is asymptotically unbiased and consistent for the ATE. Furthermore, the mixture distribution is more “peaked” than a normal distribution, resulting in a tighter variance and more precise estimators. In fact, the precision gain for the estimators is given by

$$\frac{\text{Var}(\hat{\tau}_*|\mathcal{A})}{\text{Var}(\hat{\tau}_*)} = 1 - (1 - v_{d,a})R_{*,X^{\text{rr}}}^2,$$

for  $*$  = D, L, DR. Li et al. (2018) presents more details on the geometry, shape, and peakedness of the resulting distribution. This increased precision in the estimators’ distributions improves statistical power, meaning that tests in rerandomized experiments typically require fewer subjects than completely randomized experiments to achieve the same power (Branson et al., 2024). In other words, the confidence intervals for estimators under rerandomization are narrower. For instance, a  $(1 - \alpha)$ -level confidence interval is given by

$$\hat{\tau}_* \pm n\hat{v}_{1-\alpha/2} \left( \hat{R}_{*,X^{\text{rr}}}^2 \right) \hat{V}_{\tau\tau,*},$$

where  $*$  = D, L, DR and  $v_{1-\alpha/2} \left( R_{*,X^{\text{rr}}}^2 \right)$  is the  $(1 - \alpha/2)$ -quantile of the asymptotic distribution in Equation (6). This quantile can be estimated through rejection sampling, that is, by generating random draws from  $\mathbf{Q}'\mathbf{Q}$  and retaining only those that satisfy  $\mathbf{Q}'\mathbf{Q} \leq a$ , then approximating the desired quantile of the mixture distribution using these accepted values. In Section 7.2.2 we detail the rejection sampling algorithm to estimate the quantile of the asymptotic distribution of  $\hat{\tau}_*$  and construct confidence intervals.

## 5.2 Dependence of the asymptotic distributions in terms of $X^{\text{rr}}$ and $X^{\text{adj}}$

Depending on the covariates used for the analysis and design stages, there exists clear and intuitive relationships between the marginal distributions of estimators under complete randomization and rerandomization. Li and Ding (2020) cover the relationship between  $\hat{\tau}_D$  and  $\hat{\tau}_L$  while Wang and Li (2024) cover the relationship between  $\hat{\tau}_D$  and  $\hat{\tau}_{DR}$ . We summarize them now.

*First scenario:* if the same covariates are used in the design and analysis stages,  $X^{\text{rr}} = X^{\text{adj}}$ , rerandomization can be viewed as linear covariate adjustment in the design stage,

$$\sqrt{n}(\hat{\tau}_D - \tau)|\mathcal{A} \sim \sqrt{n}(\hat{\tau}_L - \tau)$$

when  $a \rightarrow 0$ . We use the tilde with a dot to denote two sequences of random vectors converging weakly to the same distribution. In other words, for sufficiently small threshold  $a$ , the difference-in-means estimator after rerandomization is asymptotically equivalent to the linear regression estimator after complete randomization.

*Second scenario:* if the design stage covariates (and possibly other covariates) are adjusted for in the analysis stage,  $X^{\text{rr}} \subseteq X^{\text{adj}}$ , then  $R_{*,X^{\text{rr}}}^2 = 0$ , for  $*$  = L, DR, and the asymptotic distribution of adjusted estimators under rerandomization and complete randomization are the same,

$$\sqrt{n}(\hat{\tau}_* - \tau)|\mathcal{A} \sim \sqrt{n}(\hat{\tau}_* - \tau),$$

for  $*$  = L, DR. This scenario can happen if only a subset of covariates are used when randomizing, or if additional baseline covariates are gathered after the experiment.

*Third scenario:* if at least as much covariates are used in the design stage as in the analysis stage,  $X^{\text{rr}} \supseteq X^{\text{adj}}$ , rerandomization provides precision gains based on the variance of  $\hat{\tau}_*$  that can be explained by  $X^{\text{rr}}$  and is not explained by  $X^{\text{adj}}$ , hence  $R_{*,X^{\text{rr}}}^2 \geq 0$  for  $*$  = L, DR in Equation (6) (Li and Ding, 2020; Wang and Li, 2024). On top of that, Li and Ding (2020) show that we can more explicitly rewrite

$$R_{L,X^{\text{rr}}}^2 = \frac{R_{D,X^{\text{rr}}}^2 - R_{D,X^{\text{adj}}}^2}{1 - R_{D,X^{\text{adj}}}^2}.$$

However, there is no clear form to rewrite  $R_{\text{DR},X^{\text{rr}}}^2$  since the projection on  $X^{\text{adj}}$  is non-linear (Wang and Li, 2024).

This scenario can happen if, for instance, a variable selection procedure is performed in the analysis stage such that only a subset of  $X^{\text{rr}}$  are selected for adjustment, or if units' privacy is a concern after the experiment, such that only some covariates are available.

*Fourth scenario:* in more general scenarios, in which neither  $X^{\text{rr}}$  nor  $X^{\text{adj}}$  are a subset of the other, there are no simple formulae or interpretation to relate the asymptotic distributions of  $\hat{\tau}_D$  and  $\hat{\tau}_L$ ,  $\hat{\tau}_{\text{DR}}$  (Li and Ding, 2020; Wang and Li, 2024). The  $R^2$  term in the asymptotic distribution would depend on the covariance structure of  $X^{\text{rr}}$  and  $X^{\text{adj}}$ , as well as the amount of overlap between  $X^{\text{rr}}$  and  $X^{\text{adj}}$ .

All these scenarios and their results are summarized in Table 1.





Scenario	Key Asymptotic Result
1. 	Rerandomization is equivalent to linear adjustment. $\sqrt{n}(\hat{\tau}_D - \tau)   \mathcal{A} \sim \sqrt{n}(\hat{\tau}_L - \tau).$
2. 	Rerandomization provides no additional asymptotic gain for adjusted estimators. $\sqrt{n}(\hat{\tau}_* - \tau)   \mathcal{A} \sim \sqrt{n}(\hat{\tau}_* - \tau), * = \text{L, DR}.$
3. 	Rerandomization provides additional asymptotic gain for adjusted estimators. $R_{*,X^{\text{rr}}}^2 \geq 0$ , for $*$ = L, DR.
4. 	No simple formulae or interpretation to relate the asymptotic distributions of $\hat{\tau}_D$ and $\hat{\tau}_L$ , $\hat{\tau}_{\text{DR}}$ .

Table 1: Summary of asymptotic relationships between estimators under complete randomization and rerandomization. We categorize these relationships according to how the sets of covariates used for rerandomization ( $X^{\text{rr}}$ ) and for adjustment ( $X^{\text{adj}}$ ) overlap. For each scenario, we summarize (i) which covariate set is larger or whether they coincide, (ii) the resulting asymptotic distribution of the difference-in-means ( $\hat{\tau}_D$ ), linear adjusted ( $\hat{\tau}_L$ ), and doubly robust ( $\hat{\tau}_{\text{DR}}$ ) estimators, and (iii) the theoretical implications for estimator precision from rerandomization.

Although these results are about the marginal distributions of each estimator, the results sug-

gest, for instance, that the difference-in-means estimator is more similar to the linear estimator when rerandomization is applied in the design stage. This similarity is formalized by the concept of “coherence”, defined in [Zhao and Ding \(2024a\)](#). We now dive into coherence.

### 5.3 Coherence

Coherence was first mentioned and defined in [Zhao and Ding \(2024a\)](#). It measures how coherent, or similar two estimators  $\hat{\tau}_*$  and  $\hat{\tau}_{**}$  are. Formally, the coherence between two estimators under complete randomization and rerandomization are defined as

$$\mathbb{E} \{ (\hat{\tau}_* - \hat{\tau}_{**})^2 \} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{E} \{ (\hat{\tau}_* - \hat{\tau}_{**})^2 | \mathcal{A} \}.$$

The smaller the mean squared difference is, the more coherent the estimators are.

[Zhao and Ding \(2024a\)](#) derives that asymptotically, with  $X^{\text{rr}} = X^{\text{adj}}$ , and under rerandomization based on the Mahalanobis distance, the estimators  $\hat{\tau}_D, \hat{\tau}_L$  are more coherent under rerandomization, more specifically

$$\frac{\mathbb{E} \{ (\hat{\tau}_D - \hat{\tau}_L)^2 | \mathcal{A} \}}{\mathbb{E} \{ (\hat{\tau}_D - \hat{\tau}_L)^2 \}} = v_{d,a}.$$

Contrary to the precision results, this result does not depend on any  $R_{*,X^{\text{rr}}}^2$ ,  $*$  = D, L.

Coherence is directly related to p-hacking, which refers to practices researchers may use to obtain more significant p-values ([Simmons et al., 2011](#); [Brodeur et al., 2020](#)). One example of p-hacking involves estimating linear regression models across various subsets of available covariates and reporting only those specifications that yield the desired p-values for the average treatment effect. In principle, if multiple regression specifications were coherent with one another—that is, if they produced similar point estimates regardless of which covariates were included—then the choice of model specification would be inconsequential for inference. Under such coherence, different covariate adjustments would converge to the same estimate, rendering results more robust to modeling choices.

Building on this, [Lu and Ding \(2025\)](#) extend the idea of coherence between estimators to study p-hacking within rerandomization. They show that strategically selecting covariates for regression adjustment after rerandomization does not significantly distort p-values due to the higher coherence between the resulting estimators.

Formally, define  $p_L = \min_{X^{\text{hack}} \subseteq X^{\text{adj}}} p_{L, X^{\text{hack}}}$  to be the smallest two-sided p-value obtained by searching across every subset of covariates  $X^{\text{hack}} \subseteq X^{\text{adj}}$  used for adjustment on  $\hat{\tau}_L$ . Then under the null hypothesis of zero average treatment effect,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}(p_L \leq \alpha) \geq \alpha,$$

where  $\alpha$  is the significance level. On the other hand, under rerandomization based on all available covariates and the same null hypothesis,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}(p_L \leq \alpha | \mathcal{A}) \leq \alpha,$$

as  $a \rightarrow 0$ . Hence, asymptotically, rerandomization controls the type I error rate, thus mitigating p-hacking. The intuition for this is that as  $a$  gets closer to 0, there is no remaining imbalance

for the linear estimator to adjust for, and hence prevents the practitioner from choosing the linear adjustment that yields the desired p-values.

In our simulation study, we aim to expand the coherence discussion to doubly-robust estimators and the finite sample setting.

## 5.4 Debates, Caveats, and Conjectures

To wrap up this section, we discuss key takeaways from the above results which have led to debates about whether rerandomization is helpful if adjusted estimators are used. However, this debate comes with important caveats, which have sparked conjectures about the benefits of rerandomization in practice.

Li et al. (2018); Li and Ding (2020) highlight the asymptotic equivalence between rerandomization and linear regression adjustment: both aim to exploit covariate information, one through design and the other through analysis. This raised a debate around a fundamental question: *Does rerandomization help beyond covariate adjustment in the analysis stage?*

To understand this debate, consider the implications of the asymptotic results in Scenarios 1 and 2 (discussed in Section 5.1). When all covariates from the design stage are adjusted for in the analysis stage, rerandomization provides no additional asymptotic precision gains for adjusted estimators. This suggests that rerandomization may be unnecessary if one simply uses adjusted estimators for inference.

However, this argument relies on asymptotic results. Thus, researchers have conjectured that rerandomization might still provide finite-sample benefits, even when asymptotic theory suggests equivalence (Yang et al., 2021; Zhu et al., 2024; Wang and Li, 2024), and hence rerandomization would act as a “safeguard” even if analysis-stage adjustment is performed (Li and Ding, 2020; Zhu et al., 2024; Wang and Li, 2024).

Building on this, we conjecture on the anticipated precision gains for adjusted estimators under rerandomization. We define precision gains as the ratio of an estimator’s variance under rerandomization to that under complete randomization  $\text{Var}(\hat{\tau}_*|\mathcal{A})/\text{Var}(\hat{\tau}_*)$ . Figure 1 illustrates the conjectured precision gains as a function of sample size. The key insight is that the precision gains we would anticipate in practice are bounded by two extremes. At the upper bound, the precision gain equals 1, indicating no benefit from rerandomization; this represents the asymptotic behavior of adjusted estimators when  $X^{\text{rr}} \subseteq X^{\text{adj}}$ . At the lower bound, represented by the dashed blue line, we have the asymptotic precision gains for  $\hat{\tau}_D$ , given by  $1 - (1 - v_{d,a})R_{D,X^{\text{rr}}}^2$ .

For adjusted estimators in finite samples, we would expect the precision gain to lie between these two bounds, gradually approaching 1 as the sample size increases. Importantly, the position of the lower bound—and thus the potential magnitude of finite-sample gains—depends on three factors: the number of covariates  $d$ , the coefficient  $R_{D,X^{\text{rr}}}^2$ , and the threshold  $a$ . As  $d$  increases,  $R_{D,X^{\text{rr}}}^2$  decreases, and  $a$  increases, the blue line rises closer to 1, narrowing the gap between the two bounds. Consequently, there is “less room” for rerandomization to help adjusted estimators in these scenarios. Conversely, as the number of covariates decrease, the covariates have a strong linear predictive power of the potential outcomes, and we enforce more balance on the covariates in the design stage, we conjecture that the potential finite-sample gains from rerandomization are larger.

Although most of the literature has focused on the precision gains (or lack thereof) for rerandomization, some recent works have shown that rerandomization can improve coherence of estimators and thus mitigate  $p$ -hacking (Zhao and Ding, 2024a; Lu and Ding, 2025). However, these theoretical




Figure 1: Bounds on the conjectured precision gains from adjusted estimators under rerandomization across sample sizes. Each plot illustrates the anticipated precision gain, defined as the ratio of an estimator’s variance under rerandomization versus complete randomization,  $\text{Var}(\hat{\tau}_*|\mathcal{A})/\text{Var}(\hat{\tau}_*)$ , as a function of sample size. The upper bound (solid bold black line at 1) represents the asymptotic variance ratio for covariate-adjusted estimators when all rerandomized covariates are used in adjustment, indicating no precision gain. The lower bound (blue dashed line) corresponds to the asymptotic precision gain for the unadjusted difference-in-means estimator, which depends on the number of covariates ( $d$ ), linear predictive strength ( $R^2_{D, X^{\text{rr}}}$ ), and the rerandomization threshold ( $a$ ). We conjecture, that in finite samples, adjusted estimators achieve precision gains between these two bounds. The left plot shows when the potential benefits from rerandomization are greater for smaller sample sizes, in this case the covariates are highly predictive of the potential outcomes (high  $R^2$ ) covariates are low-dimensional (low  $d$ ), and high balance is enforced in the randomization (low  $a$ ). The right plot shows when there are less potential benefits from rerandomization in finite sample sizes, in this case the covariates are not predictive of the potential outcomes (low  $R^2$ ), covariates are high-dimensional (high  $d$ ), and balance is barely enforced in the randomization (high  $a$ ).

results are again asymptotic and focus on the specific case where  $X^{\text{rr}} = X^{\text{adj}}$  and the comparison is between  $\hat{\tau}_D$  and  $\hat{\tau}_L$ . It remains an open question whether similar coherence gains extend to other estimators, such as  $\hat{\tau}_{\text{DR}}$  with different functional forms for the outcome model, or different sets of covariates used for adjustment. We conjecture that rerandomization improves the coherence among a broader set of adjusted estimators (e.g., doubly robust and nonparametric estimators), and that this coherence gain extends between the restrictive case where  $X^{\text{rr}} = X^{\text{adj}}$ .

To investigate these conjectures and address the limitations of asymptotic theory, we conduct a simulation study in Section 6. Based on the established rerandomization literature and our simulation study, we provide a practical guide in Section 7 on implementing rerandomization, including practical challenges like computational concerns and scenarios with missing data.

## 6 Simulations

As explored in Section 5, rerandomization and linear covariate adjustment are asymptotically equivalent; however, it is unknown what this relationship is under small sample sizes. On top of that,

the coherence between  $\hat{\tau}_D$  and  $\hat{\tau}_L$  is known when  $X^{\text{adj}} = X^{\text{rr}}$ , but no results explore  $\hat{\tau}_{\text{DR}}$  nor when  $X^{\text{adj}} \neq X^{\text{rr}}$ . Hence, to empirically investigate these open problems, we conduct a simulation study to assess the extent that rerandomization improves (i) the precision of adjusted estimators under finite samples, and (ii) the coherence among adjusted estimators (both parametric and nonparametric). We are particularly interested in how these properties behave when the amount of covariates in the design and analysis stages vary, as discussed in Section 5.1.

## 6.1 Initial Simulation Design

Our simulation design is adapted from the supplementary material of Li et al. (2018). For each sample size  $n \in \{100, 200, \dots, 1000\}$  we simulate one dataset with 10 covariates, and  $X \sim N(\mathbf{0}, 0.3\mathbf{1}_{10} + 0.7\mathbf{1}_{10}\mathbf{1}'_{10})$ , with  $\mathbf{1}_{10} = (1, \dots, 1)'_{10 \times 1}$ . We consider two settings for generating the potential outcomes:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Linear setting} & \begin{cases} Y_i(0) = \sum_{j=1}^{10} X_{ij} + \delta_i \\ Y_i(1) = 1 + Y_i(0) \end{cases} \\ \text{Non-linear setting} & \begin{cases} Y_i(0) = \sum_{j=1}^{10} g(X_{ij}) + \delta_i \\ Y_i(1) = 1 + Y_i(0) \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

with

$$g(x) = \begin{cases} x + 0.4, & x < -1 \\ x^2 - 1.6, & x < 1 \\ \sin(x) - 1.45, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

for  $i = 1, \dots, n$ , where  $\delta_i \sim \text{Normal}(0, \sigma^2)$ , where  $\sigma = \frac{1}{5}SD\left(\sum_{j=1}^{10} X_{ij}\right)$ , for the linear setting, and for the non-linear setting we define  $\sigma = \frac{1}{100}SD\left(\sum_{j=1}^{10} g(X_{ij})\right)$ , where  $SD$  is the standard deviation, and  $g$  is a somewhat complex regression that is not smooth for all  $x$ .

This choice of variance for the noise  $\delta$  in the linear and non-linear settings is to enable fair comparison between our estimators across both settings. We choose the variance of  $\delta$  so that the effect size, defined as  $\tau/SD(Y_i(0))$ , multiplied by  $R^2$  is approximately constant in both settings. We view this as an approximate measure of signal-to-noise ratio. In the linear setting, the effect size is approximately 0.1 with  $R^2 \approx 0.95$ , while in the nonlinear setting, it is approximately 0.4 with  $R^2 \approx 0.35$ . This ensures comparable signal-to-noise ratios for hypothesis testing even for linearly-adjusted estimators. Furthermore, by considering linear and nonlinear scenarios, we can examine how rerandomization affects estimators when models are well-specified versus misspecified.

For each dataset, we compare two experimental designs. First, we consider complete randomization (CR), for which we assign  $n_1 = n/2$  units to treatment and  $n_0 = n/2$  to control completely at random. This corresponds to a known propensity score of  $\pi = 0.5$ . Second, we consider rerandomization (RR), for which we use the Mahalanobis distance balance criterion with acceptance probability  $p_a = 0.01$ . To choose the threshold  $a$ , we choose the  $p_a$  quantile of a  $\chi_d^2$ , where  $d$  is the number of covariates used for rerandomization, because this is the asymptotic distribution of the Mahalanobis distance (Morgan and Rubin, 2012). Although this choice is based on asymptotics when we are studying finite samples, we found that results were similar when we instead picked the threshold using a finite-sample Monte Carlo approach, which we discuss in Section 7.1.2.



We examine four scenarios that are supposed to match the data availability scenarios defined in Section 5.2. First, all 10 covariates are available in both design and analysis stages,  $X^{\text{rr}} = X^{\text{adj}}$ . Second, only the first 6 covariates are available in the design stage,  $(X_1, \dots, X_6)' = X^{\text{rr}} \subseteq X^{\text{adj}} = X$ . Third, only the last 6 covariates are available in the analysis stage,  $X = X^{\text{rr}} \supseteq X^{\text{adj}} = (X_4, \dots, X_{10})'$ . Fourth, only the first (last) 6 covariates are available in the design (analysis) stage,  $X^{\text{rr}} = (X_1, \dots, X_6)'$  and  $X^{\text{adj}} = (X_4, \dots, X_{10})'$ . For each scenario, we generate 1000 randomizations under complete randomization and rerandomization.

We consider three estimators: the difference-in-means estimator  $\hat{\tau}_{\text{D}}$  from Equation (3), the linearly-adjusted estimator with linear outcome models  $\hat{\tau}_{\text{L}}$  from Equation (4), and the doubly-robust estimator  $\hat{\tau}_{\text{DR}}$  from Equation (5) where we set the outcome model estimator to be a 15-trees random forest model from the `scikit-learn` package.

We assess these estimators using two main metrics:

- Precision gain: We calculate the ratio of estimators' empirical variance under rerandomization and complete randomization

$$\frac{\text{Var}(\hat{\tau}_*|\mathcal{A})}{\text{Var}(\hat{\tau}_*)},$$

for  $*$  = D, L, DR. A ratio below 1 indicates that rerandomization makes the estimator more precise, compared to complete randomization.

- Pairwise coherence gain: We measure the ratio of estimators' mean squared difference under rerandomization versus complete randomization:

$$\frac{\mathbb{E}\{(\hat{\tau}_* - \hat{\tau}_{**})^2|\mathcal{A}\}}{\mathbb{E}\{(\hat{\tau}_* - \hat{\tau}_{**})^2\}},$$

for  $*, **$  = D, L, DR. A ratio below 1 indicates that rerandomization makes the point estimates from different analytical approaches more similar to each other, compared to complete randomization. We also consider an overall coherence metric as the average pairwise coherence.

- We also considered the power and coverage of the estimators under rerandomization and complete randomization. We leave these results in Appendix D since the estimators tend to have nominal coverage, and when the estimators are more precise under rerandomization, they also result in more power, following the results in the literature (Branson et al., 2024).

## 6.2 Results

Each panel in Figure 2 corresponds to one of the four scenarios for the design stage and analysis stage covariates under the linear setting. The y-axis shows the precision gain of  $\hat{\tau}_{\text{D}}$ ,  $\hat{\tau}_{\text{L}}$ , and  $\hat{\tau}_{\text{DR}}$ , where the closer the precision gain is to zero, the more precise the estimator is under rerandomization. The x-axis represents the sample size. The dashed lines represent the known asymptotic theoretical result, while the solid lines show the empirical result achieved. In this case, the empirical results for both  $\hat{\tau}_{\text{D}}$  and  $\hat{\tau}_{\text{L}}$  follow the asymptotic results, where  $\hat{\tau}_{\text{D}}$  has the most precision gain among the estimators, while  $\hat{\tau}_{\text{L}}$  has no precision gains. This is because  $\hat{\tau}_{\text{L}}$  is a well-specified model, and thus there can be no further improvement via rerandomization. Furthermore, because this is a well-specified model, the variance of the estimator is very small, such that the ratio of variances is unstable. On the other hand,  $\hat{\tau}_{\text{DR}}$  is more precise under rerandomization, especially for the smaller




Figure 2: Precision gain in the linear setting for the difference-in-means estimator ( $\hat{\tau}_D$ ), the difference in linear outcome models ( $\hat{\tau}_L$ ), the doubly-robust estimator with random forest outcome model ( $\hat{\tau}_{DR}$ ). The sample sizes are on the x-axis, while the y-axis shows the precision gains. Each panel considers a different combination of covariates available in the design and analysis stages. Compared to asymptotic theory, the  $\hat{\tau}_{DR}$  is benefited from rerandomization under these finite-sample sizes, especially for the smaller samples. On the other hand,  $\hat{\tau}_D$  and  $\hat{\tau}_L$  tend to follow asymptotic theory.

sample sizes. The precision gains tend to monotonically increase towards 1, which matches our conjecture in Section 5.4 and illustrated in Figure 1.

Figure 3 shows the same information as the previous figure, but for the non-linear setting. In this case, the empirical results  $\hat{\tau}_D$  and  $\hat{\tau}_L$  still follow the asymptotic theory, and since the  $R^2_{D, X^{rr}}$  is smaller under the non-linear setting, the precision benefits of rerandomization for  $\hat{\tau}_D$  diminish, while for  $\hat{\tau}_L$  there is no benefit. For  $\hat{\tau}_{DR}$  we still find some empirical precision improvements under smaller sample sizes in contrast to asymptotic theory, although the magnitude of these improvements are much more modest, compared to the linear setting.

Meanwhile, Figure 4 displays analogous results for coherence in the linear setting. The y-axis shows the coherence gains of the pairwise combination of  $\hat{\tau}_D$ ,  $\hat{\tau}_L$ , and  $\hat{\tau}_{DR}$ , and their overall coherence, where the closer the coherence gain is to zero, the more coherent the estimator is under rerandomization. The dashed lines represent the known asymptotic theoretical result, while the solid lines show the empirical result achieved. Note that the only known asymptotic result for coherence is between  $\hat{\tau}_D$  and  $\hat{\tau}_L$  when  $X^{adj} = X^{rr}$  (Scenario 1), which matches the empirical result we find. The highest coherence gains come when comparing  $\hat{\tau}_D$  with both  $\hat{\tau}_L$  and  $\hat{\tau}_{DR}$  suggesting that the unadjusted estimator is getting more similar to the adjusted estimators. On top of that,




Figure 3: Precision gain in the non-linear setting for the difference-in-means estimator ( $\hat{\tau}_D$ ), the difference in linear outcome models ( $\hat{\tau}_L$ ), the doubly-robust estimator with random forest outcome model ( $\hat{\tau}_{DR}$ ). The sample sizes are on the x-axis, while the y-axis shows the precision gains. Each panel considers a different combination of covariates available in the design and analysis stages. Compared to asymptotic theory, the  $\hat{\tau}_{DR}$  is benefited from rerandomization for the smaller sample sizes. On the other hand,  $\hat{\tau}_D$  and  $\hat{\tau}_L$  tend to follow asymptotic theory.

since the coherence between all estimators increased, this suggests that rerandomization decreases sensitivity to model specification.

Figure 5 shows the same information as the previous figure, but for the non-linear setting. In this case, the empirical result of the coherence between  $\hat{\tau}_D$  and  $\hat{\tau}_L$  on Scenario 1 seems to be converging to the asymptotic result, although the empirical coherence gains for smaller sample sizes are smaller than the expected asymptotic gains. In general, the estimators are overall more coherent with one another, although the benefits are again much more modest than those in the linear setting. Notice that the coherence gain of  $\hat{\tau}_D$  with  $\hat{\tau}_L$  and  $\hat{\tau}_{DR}$  is not the same anymore, with the coherence between  $\hat{\tau}_D$  and  $\hat{\tau}_L$  being the one with the most gains. This is due to the fact that  $\hat{\tau}_{DR}$  is able to explain more of the non-linearity between the covariates and potential outcomes, while  $\hat{\tau}_D$  after rerandomization and  $\hat{\tau}_L$  only capture the linear relationship between covariates and potential outcomes, hence  $\hat{\tau}_{DR}$  is more distant from the other estimators.

### 6.3 Simulation extensions

In Section 5.3 we connect the concept of coherence to p-hacking based on a single linear regression model that is used to adjust for different sets of covariates. In this case, rerandomization was




Figure 4: Coherence gains in the linear setting between the difference-in-means estimator ( $\hat{\tau}_D$ ), the difference in linear outcome models ( $\hat{\tau}_L$ ), and the doubly-robust estimator with random forest outcome model ( $\hat{\tau}_{DR}$ ). The overall coherence is the average of the pairwise coherences. The sample sizes are on the x-axis, while the y-axis shows the coherence gains. Each panel considers a different combination of covariates available in the design and analysis stages. The only known asymptotic result for coherence is between  $\hat{\tau}_D$  and  $\hat{\tau}_L$  when  $X^{adj} = X^{rr}$  (Scenario 1), which matches the empirical result we find. The highest coherence gains come when comparing  $\hat{\tau}_D$  with both  $\hat{\tau}_L$  and  $\hat{\tau}_{DR}$  suggesting that the unadjusted estimator gets more similar to the adjusted estimators. On top of that, since the coherence between all estimators increased, this suggests that rerandomization decreases the analysis’ sensitivity to model specification.

shown to asymptotically improve the coherence between the estimators, reducing the sensitivity to the choice of covariates used. Beyond the choice of covariates, one can also consider the choice of model used for adjustment.

In order to understand the extent that rerandomization improves coherence among estimators that use different models for adjustment, we extend our analysis to consider two other doubly-robust estimators:  $\hat{\tau}_{Reg}$  with a linear outcome model, and  $\hat{\tau}_{Neural}$  with its outcome model defined by a neural network. For  $\hat{\tau}_{Neural}$  we use the `MLPRegressor` from the `scikit-learn` package with `max_iter = 100`. In what follows,  $\hat{\tau}_{Forest}$  denotes the doubly-robust estimator using random forest on the outcome model, as we had done previously.

We find that all these doubly robust estimators and  $\hat{\tau}_D$  are more coherent under rerandomization in the linear setting, see Figure 6. Hence, this reinforces that rerandomization increases robustness to model specification. The coherence between these estimators also increase under the non-linear setting but to a smaller extent, see Appendix D.




Figure 5: Coherence gains in the non-linear setting between the difference-in-means estimator ( $\hat{\tau}_D$ ), the difference in linear outcome models ( $\hat{\tau}_L$ ), and the doubly-robust estimator with random forest outcome model ( $\hat{\tau}_{DR}$ ). The overall coherence is the average of the pairwise coherences. The sample sizes are on the x-axis, while the y-axis shows the coherence gains. Each panel considers a different combination of covariates available in the design and analysis stages. The only known asymptotic result for coherence is between  $\hat{\tau}_D$  and  $\hat{\tau}_L$  when  $X^{\text{adj}} = X^{\text{rr}}$  (Scenario 1). In this case, the empirical results seems to be converging to the asymptotic result, although the empirical coherence gains for smaller sample sizes are smaller than the expected asymptotic gains. In general, the estimators are overall more coherent with one another, suggesting a decrease in sensitivity to model specification.

It can also be the case that covariates for adjustment are selected in a data-driven fashion. Hence, we compare (i) when all 10 covariates are used for adjustment, which we denote as **Full**, and (ii) when a **Stepwise** selection procedure is used to select covariates for the aforementioned estimators. For simplicity and ease of computation, we used a forward-direction selection procedure within a linear regression model, where at each step we added the covariate that minimized cross-validated prediction error, and we continued until prediction error could no longer be lowered by adding an additional covariate. In our simulations, this procedure selected on average 5 covariates to use in the analysis stage. For simplicity, we consider all 10 covariates were used for rerandomization.

Figure 7 shows the coherence gains in the linear setting for estimators that use all of the covariates (**Full**), and covariates chosen via the stepwise selection procedure (**Stepwise**). Similar to previous results, rerandomization increases the coherence among estimators, especially for small sample sizes. In Appendix D we also consider the nonlinear setting—again there are coherence gains, but they are more modest compared to the linear setting

In Appendix D we consider several other simulation scenarios, including (i) rerandomization




Figure 6: Coherence gains in the linear setting between the difference-in-means estimator ( $\hat{\tau}_D$ ), and the different doubly-robust estimators: linear outcome model ( $\hat{\tau}_{Reg}$ ), random forest outcome model ( $\hat{\tau}_{Forest}$ ), and neural network outcome model ( $\hat{\tau}_{Neural}$ ). The overall coherence is the average of the pairwise coherences. The sample sizes are on the x-axis, while the y-axis shows the coherence gains. Each panel considers a different combination of covariates available in the design and analysis stages. No asymptotic results are known in this case. Since the coherence between all estimators increase, this suggests that rerandomization decreases the analysis’ sensitivity to model specification.

based on Euclidean distance, and (ii) a high-dimensional (100 covariates) linear setting. Again, the results also suggest that rerandomization increases precision and coherence of the estimators. For the Euclidean balance criterion, we find higher precision gains, compared to the Mahalanobis distance rerandomization, due to the high correlation between covariates; in Section 7 we discuss why alternative balance metrics can be preferable in collinear settings. For the high-dimensional setting, we find precision gains that match our conjecture in Figure 1; specifically, because the precision benefits for the difference-in-means estimator are less in the high-dimensional setting, the precision benefits are also less for adjusted estimators.

In summary, under finite-samples, these results suggest that rerandomization decreases sensitivity to analysis choices (e.g., covariate selection or model specification). Moreover, if the variance of the potential outcomes can be well explained by a linear projection on the covariates, rerandomization can also improve the estimators precision, thereby improving their statistical power while maintaining nominal coverage level. That said, as the linear association decreases or the number of covariates increases, these benefits decrease. Therefore, rerandomization should be viewed as a complementary “safeguard” design strategy that enhances robustness and reliability of causal effect estimators while having the possibility to increase precision.






Figure 7: Coherence gains in the linear setting between different scenarios of data availability in the analysis stage. We consider the difference in linear outcome models ( $\hat{\tau}_L$ ), and the different doubly-robust estimators: linear outcome model ( $\hat{\tau}_{Reg}$ ), random forest outcome model ( $\hat{\tau}_{Forest}$ ), and neural network outcome model ( $\hat{\tau}_{Neural}$ ). While all covariates were used in the design stage, **Stepwise** is when covariate selection is done before conducting the analysis, and **Full** the scenario when all covariates are used for analysis. We consider the coherence within each estimator when estimated considering the two different scenarios. The sample sizes are on the x-axis, while the y-axis shows the coherence gains. No asymptotic results are known in this case. Since the coherence between all estimators increased, this suggests that rerandomization decreases the analysis' sensitivity to covariate selection.

## 7 A Guide for Practitioners

In this section we discuss practical considerations involved in rerandomized experiments, such as how to choose the balance criterion, how to conduct inference, how to deal with missing data, and the computational challenges that arise when implementing rerandomization. Although this section primarily acts as a guide for practitioners, we believe these details also illustrate interesting methodological problems that arise at the intersection of theory and practice for randomized experiments.

### 7.1 Covariate balance criterion

#### 7.1.1 Metrics

Rerandomization under the Mahalanobis distance provides an equal but diminishing balance improvement for each covariate as the number of covariates increases (Morgan and Rubin, 2012). If prior information on the relationship between covariates and potential outcomes is available, then it can be used to define a more specialized balance metric. For example, Morgan and Rubin (2015) recommend organizing covariates into tiers of importance, and then specifying thresholds separately for each tier or one single threshold for a linear combination of the covariates in each tier. Alternatively, Liu et al. (2025) demonstrate how prior information on the covariates’ linear association with potential outcomes can be incorporated into a Bayesian criterion for rerandomization.

However, it can be difficult to specify the relative importance of a large number of covariates. Hence, Branson and Shao (2021) suggest to add a ridge parameter in the Mahalanobis distance, which emphasizes balance in the top principal components of the covariate space. In a similar vein, Zhang et al. (2024) proposed running rerandomization using only the top principal components within a Mahalanobis distance

All of these metrics are based on the Mahalanobis distance or an adaptation of it. More generally, these are all special cases of quadratic forms (Lu et al., 2023; Schindl and Branson, 2024), formally  $(\bar{X}_1^{\text{rr}} - \bar{X}_0^{\text{rr}})' A (\bar{X}_1^{\text{rr}} - \bar{X}_0^{\text{rr}})$  where  $A$  is a positive semi-definite matrix chosen by the practitioner. While Lu et al. (2023) consider quadratic forms for cluster rerandomization, Schindl and Branson (2024) derive general results for these rerandomization schemes and provides guidance on how to choose the appropriate matrix  $A$  for the quadratic form given the covariates at hand. For example, Schindl and Branson (2024) demonstrate that the Euclidean distance is minimax optimal, in the sense that the variance reduction using the Euclidean distance is never “too far” from the reduction achieved by the optimal quadratic form

Outside of quadratic forms, Gerber and Green (2012) empirically recommended rerandomizing until all the  $p$ -values from significance tests of the difference between covariate means of the treatment groups are insignificant (e.g.,  $p$ -values from two-samples  $t$ -tests or a logistic regression of treatment onto covariates). Zhao and Ding (2024a) showed that rerandomizing with these  $p$ -value based metrics is asymptotically equivalent to Mahalanobis distance rerandomization, and Lu and Ding (2025) used this rerandomization scheme to study how rerandomization can mitigate issues of  $p$ -hacking.

All of the aforementioned balance criteria balance linear functions of the covariates. In order to balance non-linear functions of the covariates, one option is to incorporate such functions in the calculation of the Mahalanobis distance, at the cost of increasing the dimension size (Morgan and Rubin, 2012). Other options, for instance, would be to balance on the density of the covariates, or

the estimated propensity score (Cytrynbaum, 2025). However, it is still unclear how to effectively balance non-linear functions of the covariates without significantly increasing the dimension size.

### 7.1.2 Threshold definition

As defined in Section 4.1, for a measure  $\varphi$ , the set of acceptable randomizations is  $\mathcal{A} = \{Z : \varphi(X, Z) = 1\}$ . For the metrics discussed in the previous section, we can rewrite the set of acceptable randomizations more specifically as  $\mathcal{A} = \{Z : \phi(X, Z) \leq a\}$ , where  $a$  is the pre-specified threshold and  $\phi(X, Z)$  is a non-negative metric of covariate imbalance such that  $\phi(X, Z) = 0$  indicates perfect balance, and as  $\phi(X, Z)$  increases the more imbalance there is.

The most common way to define the threshold  $a$  is based on the proportion  $p_a$  of randomizations deemed acceptable, i.e.  $p_a = \mathbb{P}(\varphi(X, Z) = 1) = \mathbb{P}(\phi(X, Z) \leq a)$ . As mentioned before, some common choices are between  $p_a = 0.01$  and  $p_a = 0.001$ , however it has been shown that the marginal precision gains of causal estimators are decreasing in  $a$ . This means that there is not much additional benefit — at least in terms of precision — in reducing  $p_a$  even further once it is already small (Morgan and Rubin, 2012).

If the chosen covariate balance metric is the Mahalanobis distance, then asymptotically  $M \sim \chi_d^2$ , and  $a$  is the  $p_a$ -quantile of the  $\chi_d^2$  distribution. For a general  $\phi$ , its  $p_a$ -quantile can be estimated by Monte Carlo simulations. More specifically, one could generate  $B \gg 0$  randomizations and for each randomization  $Z^{(1)}, \dots, Z^{(B)}$  calculate  $\phi(X, Z^{(1)}), \dots, \phi(X, Z^{(B)})$ , then take the  $p_a$ -quantile to be the value of  $a$ .

## 7.2 Inference

Morgan and Rubin (2012) first hinted on randomization-based inference for rerandomized experiments, and later work developed the asymptotic distributions for some causal effect estimators. In this subsection, we outline how practitioners can analyze rerandomized experiments using either randomization-based inference (which does not require large samples for valid inference) or confidence intervals based on asymptotic results.

### 7.2.1 Randomization-based inference

Let the observed dataset be defined as  $\{(X_i^{\text{obs}}, Z_i^{\text{obs}}, Y_i^{\text{obs}})\}_{i=1}^n$ . To conduct inference we proceed as follows:

1. Define the sharp null hypothesis of no treatment effect  $H_0 : Y_i(0) = Y_i(1)$  for all  $i = 1, \dots, n$ .
2. Calculate a test statistic with the observed data  $T^{\text{obs}}$ . For instance  $T^{\text{obs}} = \hat{\tau}_D^{\text{obs}}$  is the  $\hat{\tau}_D$  estimator applied on the observed data.
3. Generate  $B \gg 0$  balanced randomizations  $(Z^{(1)}, \dots, Z^{(B)})$ , meaning  $Z^{(j)}$  is such that  $\varphi(X, Z^{(j)}) = 1$ , for  $j = 1, \dots, B$ .
4. Define the datasets  $\{(X_i^{\text{obs}}, Z_i^{(j)}, Y_i^{\text{obs}})\}_{i=1}^n$ , for  $j = 1, \dots, B$ , and calculate the test statistics  $(T^{(1)}, \dots, T^{(B)})$  using each dataset, assuming the null hypothesis  $H_0$  is true.

5. Calculate the p-value as the proportion of test statistics in the rerandomized distribution that are at least as extreme as the observed statistic

$$p = \frac{1}{B+1} \left[ 1 + \sum_{j=1}^B \mathbf{I} \left( |T^{(j)}| > |T^{\text{obs}}| \right) \right].$$

A key advantage of this approach is its finite-sample validity, however it has a few limitations. First, this only tests the sharp null hypothesis of no treatment effect for any subject. Second, to generate one acceptable randomization it takes an average of  $1/p_a$  generated randomizations, hence to generate  $B$  accepted randomizations it takes on average  $B/p_a$ . Constructing confidence intervals is even more computationally demanding, since it requires inverting the hypothesis test for a range of hypothesized treatment effects. In this case, it is often assumed that the treatment effect is additive. Although not studied in the rerandomization literature, extensions to allow for non-additive treatment effects have been studied in [Caughey et al. \(2023\)](#). In Section 7.4 we discuss recent tools to address the computational burden of generating acceptable randomizations.

### 7.2.2 Confidence interval construction

An alternative is to use the asymptotic distribution of the causal effect estimators. Asymptotically, the estimators follow a mixture of a normal distribution and a truncated normal distribution, vide Section 5.1. Hence,  $(1 - \alpha)$ -level confidence intervals would be given by

$$\hat{\tau}_* \pm n\hat{v}_{1-\alpha/2} \left( \hat{R}_{*,X^{\text{rr}}}^2 \right) \hat{V}_{\tau\tau,*}$$

where  $*$  = D,L,DR and  $v_{1-\alpha/2} \left( \hat{R}_{*,X^{\text{rr}}}^2 \right)$  is the  $(1 - \alpha/2)$ -quantile of the asymptotic distribution of  $\hat{\tau}_*$ , but using the estimate  $\hat{R}_{*,X^{\text{rr}}}^2$ . In Appendix B we provide the estimators for  $V_{\tau\tau,*}$  and  $R_{*,X^{\text{rr}}}^2$ .

To estimate  $v_{1-\alpha/2} \left( \hat{R}_{*,X^{\text{rr}}}^2 \right)$ , one needs to generate  $B \gg 0$  samples from the distribution

$$\sqrt{1 - \hat{R}_{*,X^{\text{rr}}}^2} \epsilon + \sqrt{\hat{R}_{*,X^{\text{rr}}}^2} L_{d,a}.$$

Generating samples from  $\epsilon \sim N(0, 1)$  is straightforward. On the other hand, to generate samples from  $L_{d,a}$  we use the following equivalence

$$L_{d,a} \sim \chi_{d,a} S \sqrt{\beta_d}$$

presented by [Li et al. \(2018\)](#), where  $\chi_{d,a} \sim \chi_d | \chi_d \leq a$  is a truncated  $\chi$  distribution.  $S$  is a random sign taking  $\pm 1$  with probability  $1/2$ ,  $\beta_d \sim \text{Beta}(1/2, (d-1)/2)$  is a Beta distribution degenerating to a point mass at 1 when  $d = 1$ .

To generate samples of  $\chi_{d,a}$  one should generate samples from  $\chi_d^2$ , take the square root, and only accept the ones that are less than  $a$ . Hence, to generate samples of  $L_{d,a}$ , one just needs to generate samples from  $\chi_{d,a}$ ,  $S$ , and  $\beta_d$ , and multiply their values.

Finally, after generating the  $B$  samples  $(\epsilon^{(1)}, \dots, \epsilon^{(B)})$ ,  $(L_{d,a}^{(1)}, \dots, L_{d,a}^{(B)})$ , and estimating  $R_{*,X^{\text{rr}}}^2$ , one will have

$$\sqrt{1 - \hat{R}_{*,X^{\text{rr}}}^2} \epsilon^{(i)} + \sqrt{\hat{R}_{*,X^{\text{rr}}}^2} L_{d,a}^{(i)}$$

for  $i = 1, \dots, B$ , and take the  $1 - \alpha/2$  quantile of these values as an estimate for  $v_{1-\alpha/2} \left( \hat{R}_{*,X^{\text{rr}}}^2 \right)$ .

### 7.3 Missing data

In practice, data is often subject to missingness due to various reasons such as attrition, nonresponse, or data recording errors. Thus, a recent literature addresses how to account for covariate imbalance in completely randomized experiments with missing data, where the missingness can be on the covariates and/or outcomes. Some of these results can be applied for rerandomization, and we explore them here.

First, one possibility is that all outcomes are observed but covariates are missing. This scenario was considered in [Zhao and Ding \(2024b\)](#), and they studied five different strategies to account for missing covariates. Under these strategies, they prove analogous results for  $\hat{\tau}_L$  as the ones presented in Section 5.1, for complete randomization. From all the five strategies, the authors suggest the *missingness-indicator* method. For this strategy, the covariate matrix is augmented with indicators denoting whether or not a covariate is missing. Then, missing values are imputed with some fixed value (e.g., zero); the choice of imputed value is not consequential, at least for linear models, because the missingness indicator accounts for the fact that these observations are missing. Once the updated covariate matrix is defined, all the rerandomization results explored in this paper hold. One caveat, however, is that augmenting by the missingness indicators can make the covariate matrix large, thus a balance metric that accounts for this high-dimensionality may be preferable.

Alternatively, it may be the case that all covariates are observed, but some outcomes are missing at random. In this case, to the best of our knowledge, the only known result in rerandomization is for  $\hat{\tau}_L$  and  $\hat{\tau}_{DR}$  ([Wang and Li, 2024](#)). While the rerandomization procedure remains the same, the results discussed in Section 5 hold with minor changes on the estimator definition. For instance, we change  $\hat{\eta}_z(X_i)$  in  $\hat{\tau}_{DR}$  to be

$$\hat{\eta}_z(X_i) = \frac{\mathbb{1}(Z_i = z)}{\pi^z(1 - \pi)^{1-z}} \frac{R_i}{\widehat{\mathbb{E}}(R_i(z)|X_i)} (Y_i - \hat{\mu}_z(X_i)) + \hat{\mu}_z(X_i),$$

for  $z \in \{0, 1\}$ , where  $R_i$  is an indicator variable that the outcome of unit  $i$  is observed ([Wang and Li, 2024](#)).

Finally, it may be the case that both outcomes and covariates are missing. Under this setting, one can combine the *missingness-indicator* approach for handling missing covariates, and reweighting each observed unit by its probability of observing the outcome ([Zhao et al., 2024](#); [Zhao and Ding, 2024b](#)). However, no work in the rerandomization literature has explicitly studied this scenario.

### 7.4 Computational Burden

Inference on rerandomized experiments usually depends on rejective sampling to generate acceptable randomizations, thus making it computationally troublesome. Hence, some improvements and alternatives have recently been proposed in the literature.

Most of the measures for covariate balance criterion are symmetric, i.e.  $\varphi(X, Z) = \varphi(X, 1 - Z)$ , thus the number of generated treatment allocations can be halved. This is the first strategy defined in [Johansson and Schultzberg \(2020\)](#), named *mirror allocations*. They extend this idea to a rank-based balance measure, based on the tiers of covariates defined in [Morgan and Rubin \(2015\)](#).

Motivated by the Metropolis-Hastings algorithm, [Zhu and Liu \(2023\)](#) propose a pair-switching rerandomization (PSRR) strategy that improves on the greedy pair-switching algorithm proposed

by Krieger et al. (2019). PSRR changes the treatment status of two randomly selected units—one from treatment and one from control—until an acceptable assignment is found. They find that PSRR is around 20x faster than rejective sampling. Finally, they extend PSRR to sequential experiments.

Although PSRR improves the efficiency of rejective sampling rerandomization, Lu et al. (2025) show empirically that PSRR scales with the dimension of the covariates, thus being inefficient for high-dimensional covariates. Lu et al. (2025) consider the treatment allocation problem from a constrained optimization perspective rather than sampling, and proposes the balanced randomization via interger programming (BRAIN) approach that does not scale with sample size  $n$ , covariates dimension  $d$ , nor threshold  $a$ . Instead of using sampling, the BRAIN algorithm reformulates the problem of generating a balanced treatment assignment as a constrained optimization problem, thus being able to use combinatorial optimization techniques. Moreover, it is expandable for more structured experiments, such as stratified and clustered experiments.

On the other hand, the only available result for both BRAIN and PSRR is that, under these rerandomization approaches,  $\hat{\tau}_D$  is unbiased and is more precise than under complete randomization. These results assume (i)  $n_1 = n_0 = n/2$ , (ii) normality of  $\hat{\tau}_D$  and normality of the difference in covariates means, and (iii) additive treatment effect. No results on the asymptotic distribution, coherence, or statistical power of  $\hat{\tau}_D$ ,  $\hat{\tau}_L$ , and  $\hat{\tau}_{DR}$  are available under the proposed rerandomization algorithms.

Another option that avoids rejection sampling would be to use importance sampling. Although not developed for rerandomization, Branson and Bind (2019) derive an importance-sampling approach for computing randomization-based  $p$ -values for Bernoulli trial experiments that condition on summary statistics (e.g., the number of treated units). Thus, this approach could be extended to rerandomization, where covariate balance is used as the conditioning statistic. Although the resulting randomization test  $p$ -values are biased, the size of this bias is inversely related to the number of complete randomization draws, which are computationally cheap to generate.

We leave a list of available software for conducting rerandomized experiments in Appendix C.

## 7.5 Multi-arm experiments

While the preceding discussion focuses on two-arm experiments, rerandomization can be extended to multi-arm settings. The two-arm setup with a single treatment assignment vector  $Z \in \{0, 1\}^n$  generalizes directly: In a multi-arm experiment with  $K$  treatments, the assignment vector takes values in  $\{0, 1, \dots, K-1\}^n$ . The balance criterion can be applied by checking balance across all  $\binom{K}{2}$  groups, though computational costs increase with the number of pairwise comparisons.

Another option would be to balance only the most scientifically important treatment comparisons or use an omnibus balance criterion across all arms. However, general results for multi-arm rerandomized experiments remain underdeveloped, and further research is needed to determine which omnibus balance metrics would be most promising for a multi-arm experiment. That said, some work has been done on multi-arm experiments with specific structures, such as  $2^K$  factorial experiments.

In the  $2^K$  factorial design,  $K$  binary factors are studied simultaneously. Branson et al. (2016) proposed a computationally efficient approach that exploits the factorial structure: rather than balancing all  $2^K$  treatment combinations jointly, they balance covariates with respect to each factor marginally. Specifically, for each factor  $k = 1, \dots, K$ , compute the Mahalanobis distance  $M_k$  between units receiving levels 0 and 1 of that factor, and accept the randomization only if  $M_k < a$  for all  $k$ . This requires only  $2^K - 1$  balance checks rather than  $\binom{2^K}{2}$ . Li et al. (2020) extend the



asymptotic theory to this setting, showing that factorial rerandomization preserves unbiasedness while reducing variance of main effect and interaction estimators.

## 8 Conclusion

Rerandomization is a simple experimental design strategy that ensures covariate balance prior to conducting experiments. Given its simplicity, rerandomization has been used for many years by practitioners (Bruhn and McKenzie, 2009), but statistical inference after rerandomization has only recently been studied (Morgan and Rubin, 2012). Rerandomization improves the precision of the difference-in-means estimator, thereby acting as a design stage analog to linear covariate adjustment. That said, theoretical results have found that rerandomization does not improve the asymptotic precision of adjusted estimators, as long as the covariates used for rerandomization are also used for adjustment (Li and Ding, 2020; Wang and Li, 2024). This has raised doubts about whether rerandomization is needed if covariates are adjusted for in the analysis stage. That said, these results come with several important caveats. In particular, these results are asymptotic and focus on the marginal distribution of estimators after rerandomization. Although some works have conjectured that rerandomization may still improve the precision of adjusted estimators in finite samples (Yang et al., 2021; Zhu et al., 2024; Wang and Li, 2024) and considered rerandomization’s ability to improve estimators’ joint behavior, such as their coherence (Zhao and Ding, 2024a), these topics have received less attention in the literature.

In this paper, we first provided a comprehensive review of rerandomization, including properties of the difference-in-means, linear regression, and nonparametric doubly robust estimators after rerandomization using the Mahalanobis distance. If more covariates are used in the design stage than the analysis stage, then the asymptotic distribution of these estimators follows a mixture of a normal and a truncated normal, resulting in greater precision compared to complete randomization. On the other hand, if the same or more covariates are used in the analysis stage, then rerandomization does not alter the asymptotic distribution of these estimators. Nonetheless, estimators’ joint behavior is affected: For example, the difference-in-means and linear regression estimators become more coherent with each other after rerandomization.

Second, we conduct several simulation studies to assess the performance and relationship among parametric and nonparametric estimators under rerandomization in finite samples. We found that rerandomization improves the precision of adjusted estimators in finite samples, especially when the number of covariates is small, the covariates have a linear association with the potential outcomes, and a stringent rerandomization threshold is used. We also found that rerandomization decreases sensitivity to model choices (e.g., parametric versus nonparametric specifications, or the use of covariate selection procedures) in the analysis stage by increasing the coherence among estimators. To complement our review and simulation study, we provided a practical guide for practitioners who want to run rerandomized experiments. For example, we discussed how researchers can choose balance criteria, how to handle missing data, and how to construct confidence intervals for the unique asymptotic distribution of estimators after rerandomization.

That said, several important limitations and avenues for future research remain. Although we discussed the idea that rerandomization can mitigate  $p$ -hacking—i.e., the analyst has less ability to alter the treatment effect  $p$ -value via model specification (Lu and Ding, 2025)—, our simulation study focused on precision and coherence, hence a more direct empirical investigation on  $p$ -hacking after rerandomization is warranted. Furthermore, we focused on binary treatments. While reran-

domization can be extended to multi-valued treatments, the theoretical properties and practical considerations in this setting, particularly concerning the choice of balance metrics, deserve deeper investigation. Future work should also explore whether rerandomization can improve the estimation of other estimands, such as quantile treatment effects, or how to implement rerandomization when common causal assumptions are violated, such as no interference.

## References

- Gregory C. Arnold. *The Fascination of Statistics*, chapter Randomization: A historic controversy. CRC Press, 1986.
- P. M. Aronow and C. Samii. Estimating average causal effects under general interference, with application to a social network experiment. *Annals of Applied Statistics*, 11:1912–1947, 2017. doi: 10.1214/16-AOAS1005.
- S. Athey and G. W. Imbens. Chapter 3 - the econometrics of randomized experiments. *Handbook of Economic Field Experiments*, 1:73–140, 2017. doi: 10.1016/bs.hefe.2016.10.003.
- Yuehao Bai. Optimality of matched-pair designs in randomized controlled trials. *American Economic Review*, 112:3911–3940, 2022. doi: 10.1257/aer.20201856.
- Yuehao Bai, Joseph P. Romano, and Azeem M. Shaikh. Inference in experiments with matched pairs. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 117:1726–1737, 2022. doi: 10.1080/01621459.2021.1883437.
- Abhijit V. Banerjee, Sylvain Chassang, Sergio Montero, and Erik Snowberg. A theory of experimenters: Robustness, randomization, and balance. *American Economic Review*, 110:1206–30, 2020. doi: 10.1257/aer.20171634.
- G. Basse and A. Feller. Analyzing Two-Stage Experiments in the Presence of Interference. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 113:41–55, 2018. doi: 10.1080/01621459.2017.1323641.
- G. Basse, P. Ding, A. Feller, and P. Toulis. Randomization Tests for Peer Effects in Group Formation Experiments. *Econometrica*, 92:567–590, 2024. doi: 10.3982/ECTA20134.
- Zach Branson and Marie-Abèle Bind. Randomization-based inference for Bernoulli trial experiments and implications for observational studies. *Statistical Methods in Medical Research*, 28:1378–1398, 2019. doi: 10.1177/0962280218756689.
- Zach Branson and Stephane Shao. Ridge rerandomization: An experimental design strategy in the presence of covariate collinearity. *Journal of Statistical Planning and Inference*, 211:287–314, 2021. doi: 10.1016/j.jspi.2020.07.002.
- Zach Branson, Tirthankar Dasgupta, and Donald B. Rubin. Improving covariate balance in  $2^K$  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, 2016. doi: 10.1214/16-AOAS959.
- Zach Branson, Xinran Li, and Peng Ding. Power and sample size calculations for rerandomization. *Biometrika*, 111:355–363, 2024. doi: 10.1093/biomet/asad027.

- Abel Brodeur, Nikolai Cook, and Anthony Heyes. Methods Matter: p-Hacking and Publication Bias in Causal Analysis in Economics. *American Economic Review*, 110:3634–3660, 2020. doi: 10.1257/aer.20190687.
- Miriam Bruhn and David McKenzie. In pursuit of balance: Randomization in practice in development field experiments. *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics*, 1:200–232, 2009. doi: 10.1257/app.1.4.200.
- B. P. Carlin, T. D. Cook, J. J. Faraway, J. Zidek, M. A. Tanner, and D. L. DeMets. *Introduction to Statistical Methods for Clinical Trials*. Chapman & Hall/CRC, 2007.
- D. Caughey, A. Dafoe, X. Li, and L. Miratrix. Randomisation inference beyond the sharp null: bounded null hypotheses and quantiles of individual treatment effects. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B: Statistical Methodology*, 85:1471–1491, 2023. doi: 10.1093/jrsssb/qkad080.
- D. Choi. New Estimands for Experiments with Strong Interference. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 119:2670–2679, 2023. doi: 10.1080/01621459.2023.2271205.
- Max Cytrynbaum. Finely Stratified Rerandomization Designs. *preprint*, 2025. arXiv:2407.03279.
- P. Ding, A. Feller, and L. Miratrix. Decomposing Treatment Effect Variation. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 114:304–317, 2018. doi: 10.1080/01621459.2017.1407322.
- Peng Ding. Two seemingly paradoxical results in linear models: the variance inflation factor and the analysis of covariance. *Journal of Causal Inference*, 9, 2021. doi: 10.1515/jci-2019-0023.
- Peng Ding. *A First Course in Causal Inference*. Chapman and Hall/CRC, 2024.
- Peng Ding, Xinran Li, and Luke W. Miratrix. Bridging finite and super population causal inference. *Journal of Causal Inference*, 5, 2017. doi: 10.1515/jci-2016-0027.
- J. N. Druckman, D. P. Green, J. H. Kuklinski, and A. Lupia. *Cambridge Handbook of Experimental Political Science*. Cambridge University Press, 2012.
- R. A. Fisher. The arrangement of field experiments. *Journal of the Ministry of Agriculture*, 33: 503–515, 1926. doi: 10.23637/rothamsted.8v61q.
- R. A. Fisher. *The Design of Experiments*. Oliver & Boyd, 1935.
- Alan S. Gerber and Donald P. Green. *Field experiments: design, analysis, and interpretation*. W. W. Norton, 2012.
- Rebecca Goldstein, Connor T. Jerzak, Aniket Kamat, and Fucheng Warren Zhu. fastrerandomize: Fast rerandomization using accelerated computing. *preprint*, 2025. arXiv:2501.07642.
- J. W. Gosset. Comparison between balanced and random arrangements of field plots. *Biometrika*, 29:363–378, 1938. doi: 10.2307/2332011.
- B. G. Greenberg. Why randomize? *Biometrics*, 7:309–322, 1951. doi: 10.2307/3001653.

- P. M. Grundy and M. J. R. Healy. Restricted randomization and quasi-latin squares. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series B (Methodological)*, 12:286–291, 1950. doi: 10.1111/j.2517-6161.1950.tb00062.x.
- Christopher Harshaw, Fredrik Sävje, Daniel A. Spielman, and Peng Zhang. Balancing covariates in randomized experiments with the gram–schmidt walk design. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 119, 2024. doi: 10.1080/01621459.2023.2285474.
- D. A. Harville. Experimental randomization: Who needs it? *The American Statistician*, 29:27–31, 1975. doi: 10.2307/2683676.
- Feifang Hu and William F. Rosenberger. *The Theory of Response-Adaptive Randomization in Clinical Trials*. John Wiley & Sons, 2006.
- Kosuke Imai. Variance identification and efficiency analysis in randomized experiments under the matched-pair design. *Statistics in Medicine*, 27:4857–4873, 2008. doi: 10.1002/sim.3337.
- Connor T. Jerzak and Rebecca Goldstein. Degrees of randomness in rerandomization procedures. *preprint*, 2023. arXiv:2310.00861.
- Per Johansson and Mårten Schultzberg. Rerandomization strategies for balancing covariates using pre-experimental longitudinal data. *Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics*, 29:798–813, 2020. doi: 10.1080/10618600.2020.1753531.
- Per Johansson, Donald B. Rubin, and Mårten Schultzberg. On optimal rerandomization designs. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B: Statistical Methodology*, 83:395–403, 2021. doi: 10.1111/rssb.12417.
- H. L. Jones. Inadmissible samples and confidence limits. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 53:482–490, 1958. doi: 10.1080/01621459.1958.10501453.
- Nathan Kallus. Optimal a priori balance in the design of controlled experiments. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B: Statistical Methodology*, 80:85–112, 2018. doi: 10.1111/rssb.12240.
- Nathan Kallus. On the optimality of randomization in experimental design: How to randomize for minimax variance and design-based inference. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B: Statistical Methodology*, 83:404–409, 2021. doi: 10.1111/rssb.12412.
- A. Kapelner, A. M. Krieger, M. Sklar, U. Shalit, and D. Azriel. Harmonizing optimized designs with classic randomization in experiments. *The American Statistician*, 75:195–206, 2020. doi: 10.1080/00031305.2020.1717619.
- Adam Kapelner, Abba M. Krieger, Michael Sklar, and David Azriel. Optimal rerandomization designs via a criterion that provides insurance against failed experiments. *Journal of Statistical Planning and Inference*, 219:63–84, 2022. doi: 10.1016/j.jspi.2021.11.005.
- Maximilian Kasy. Why experimenters might not always want to randomize, and what they could do instead. *Political Analysis*, 24:324–338, 2016. doi: 10.1093/pan/mpw012.
- O. Kempthorne. Randomization ii. *Encyclopedia of Statistical Sciences*, 7:519–524, 1986.

- J. Kiefer. Optimum experimental designs. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series B (Methodological)*, 21:272–319, 1959.
- A. M. Krieger, D. Azriel, and A. Kapelner. Nearly random designs with greatly improved balance. *Biometrika*, 106:695–701, 2019. doi: 10.1093/biomet/asz026.
- Xinran Li and Peng Ding. Rerandomization and regression adjustment. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B: Statistical Methodology*, 82:241–268, 2020. doi: 10.1111/rssb.12353.
- Xinran Li, Peng Ding, and Donald B. Rubin. Asymptotic theory of rerandomization in treatment–control experiments. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.*, 115:9157–9162, 2018. doi: 10.1073/pnas.1808191115.
- Xinran Li, Peng Ding, and Donald B. Rubin. Rerandomization in  $2^K$  factorial experiments. *The Annals of Statistics*, 48:43–63, 2020. doi: 10.1214/18-AOS1790.
- Winston Lin. Agnostic notes on regression adjustments to experimental data: Reexamining freedman’s critique. *The Annals of Applied Statistics*, 7:295–318, 2013. doi: 10.1214/12-AOAS583.
- J. A. List. *Experimental Economics: Theory and Practice*. The University of Chicago Press, 2024.
- Zhaoyang Liu, Tingxuan Han, Donald B. Rubin, and Ke Deng. A Bayesian Criterion for Rerandomization. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, pages 1–22, 2025. doi: 10.1080/01621459.2025.2507432.
- Jiuyao Lu, Daogao Liu, Zhanran Lin, and Xiaomeng Wang. Fast rerandomization via the brain. *preprint*, 2025. arXiv:2312.17230.
- Xin Lu and Peng Ding. Rerandomization for covariate balance mitigates p-hacking in regression adjustment. *preprint*, 2025. arXiv:2505.01137.
- Xin Lu, Tianle Liu, Hanzhong Liu, and Peng Ding. Design-based theory for cluster rerandomization. *Biometrika*, 110:467–483, 2023. doi: 10.1093/biomet/asac045.
- Luke W. Miratrix, Jasjeet S. Sekhon, and Bin Yu. Adjusting treatment effect estimates by post-stratification in randomized experiments. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B: Statistical Methodology*, 75:369–396, 2013. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9868.2012.01048.x.
- Kari Lock Morgan and Donald B. Rubin. Rerandomization to improve covariate balance in experiments. *Annals of Statistics*, 40:1263–1282, 2012. doi: 10.1214/12-AOS1008.
- Kari Lock Morgan and Donald B. Rubin. Rerandomization to balance tiers of covariates. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 110:1412–1421, 2015. doi: 10.1080/01621459.2015.1079528.
- F. Mosteller. *Evidence Matters: Randomized Trials in Education Research*. Brookings Institution Press, 2002.
- Nicole E. Pashley and Luke W. Miratrix. Insights on variance estimation for blocked and matched pairs designs. *Journal of Educational and Behavioral Statistics*, 46:271–296, 2021. doi: 10.3102/10769982.

- Nicole E. Pashley and Luke W. Miratrix. Block what you can, except when you shouldn't. *Journal of Educational and Behavioral Statistics*, 47, 2022. doi: 10.3102/10769986211027240.
- S. W. Raudenbush and D. Schwartz. Randomized experiments in education, with implications for multilevel causal inference. *Annual Review of Statistics and Its Application*, 7:177–208, 2020. doi: 10.1146/annurev-statistics-031219-041205.
- P. R. Rosenbaum. Covariance adjustment in randomized experiments and observational studies. *Statistical Science*, 17:286–327, 2002. doi: 10.1214/ss/1042727942.
- P. R. Rosenbaum. Interference between units in randomized experiments. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 102:191–200, 2007. doi: 10.1198/016214506000001112.
- William F. Rosenberger and John M. Lachin. *Randomization in Clinical Trials: Theory and Practice*. John Wiley & Sons, 2002.
- Donald B. Rubin. Estimating causal effects of treatments in randomized and nonrandomized studies. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 66:688–701, 1974. doi: 10.1037/h0037350.
- L. J. Savage. *The Foundations of Statistical Inference*. John Wiley & Sons Inc., 1962.
- Kyle Schindl and Zach Branson. A unified framework for rerandomization using quadratic forms. *preprint*, 2024. arXiv:2403.12815.
- Wenqi Shi, Anqi Zhao, and Hanzhong Liu. Rerandomization and Covariate Adjustment in Split-Plot Designs. *Journal of Business & Economic Statistics*, pages 1–22, 2024. doi: 10.1080/07350015.2024.2429464.
- Joseph P. Simmons, Leif D. Nelson, and Uri Simonsohn. False-positive psychology: undisclosed flexibility in data collection and analysis allows presenting anything as significant. *Psychological Science*, 22:1359–1366, 2011. doi: 10.1177/0956797611417632.
- Jerzy Splawa-Neyman, D. M. Dabrowska, and T. P. Speed. On the application of probability theory to agricultural experiments. essay on principles. section 9. *Statistical Science*, 5:465–472, 1990. doi: 10.1214/ss/1177012031.
- Max Tabord-Meehan. Stratification trees for adaptive randomization in randomized controlled trials. arxiv:1806.05127, 2022.
- D. R. Taves. Minimization: A new method of assigning patients to treatment and control groups. *Clinical Pharmacology and Therapeutics*, 15:443–453, 1974. doi: 10.1002/cpt1974155443.
- T Treasure and K. D. MacRae. Minimisation: the platinum standard for trials? randomisation doesn't guarantee similarity of groups; minimisation does. *BMJ*, 317:362–362, 1998. doi: 10.1136/bmj.317.7155.362.
- Bingkai Wang and Fan Li. Asymptotic inference with flexible covariate adjustment under rerandomization and stratified rerandomization. arXiv:2406.02834, 2024.
- Yuhao Wang and Xinran Li. Rerandomization with diminishing covariate imbalance and diverging number of covariates. *The Annals of Statistics*, 50:3439–3465, 2022. doi: 10.1214/22-AOS2235.



- Yuhao Wang and Xinran Li. Asymptotic theory of the best-choice rerandomization using the Mahalanobis distance. *Journal of Econometrics*, 251, 2025. doi: 10.1016/j.jeconom.2025.106049.
- Zinhe Wang, Tingyu Wang, and Hanzhong Liu. Rerandomization in stratified randomized experiments. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 118:1295–1304, 2021. doi: 10.1080/01621459.2021.1990767.
- Zihao Yang, Tianyi Qu, and Xinran Li. Rejective Sampling, Rerandomization, and Regression Adjustment in Survey Experiments. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 118(542): 1207–1221, 2021. doi: 10.1080/01621459.2021.1984926.
- F. Yates. The comparative advantages of systematic and randomized arrangements in the design of agricultural and biological experiments. *Biometrika*, 30:440–466, 1939. doi: 10.1093/biomet/30.3-4.440.
- Hengtao Zhang, Wen Su, and Guosheng Yin. Quasi-rerandomization for observational studies. *BMC Medical Research Methodology*, 23, 2023. doi: 10.1186/s12874-023-01977-7.
- Hengtao Zhang, Guosheng Yin, and Donald B. Rubin. PCA rerandomization. *The Canadian Journal of Statistics*, 52:5–25, 2024. doi: 10.1002/cjs.11765.
- Anqi Zhao and Peng Ding. No star is good news: A unified look at rerandomization based on p-values from covariate balance tests. *Journal of Econometrics*, 241, 2024a. doi: 10.1016/j.jeconom.2024.105724.
- Anqi Zhao and Peng Ding. To adjust or not to adjust? estimating the average treatment effect in randomized experiments with missing covariates. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 119:450–460, 2024b. doi: 10.1080/01621459.2022.2123814.
- Anqi Zhao, Peng Ding, and Fan Li. Covariate adjustment in randomized experiments with missing outcomes and covariates. *Biometrika*, 111:1413–1420, 2024. doi: 10.1093/biomet/asae017.
- Quan Zhou, Philip A. Ernst, Kari Lock Morgan, Donald B. Rubin, and Anru Zhang. Sequential rerandomization. *Biometrika*, 105:745–752, 2018. doi: 10.1093/biomet/asy031.
- Ke Zhu and Hanzhong Liu. Pair-switching rerandomization. *Biometrics*, 79:2127–2142, 2023. doi: 10.1111/biom.13712.
- Ke Zhu, Hanzhong Liu, and Yuehan Yang. Design-based theory for lasso adjustment in randomized block experiments and rerandomized experiments. *Journal of Business & Economic Statistics*, pages 1–12, 2024. doi: 10.1080/07350015.2024.2403381.

## A Finite-Population Quantities Needed to Characterize the Estimators

Here we define several summary statistics of covariates and potential outcomes within a finite-population framework, which are needed to characterize the distributions of estimators after complete randomization or rerandomization. Furthermore, we formalize the assumptions needed so that asymptotic distributions of estimators after rerandomization are well-defined.

The behavior of estimators after complete randomization or rerandomization depends on the finite-population of covariates and potential outcomes. Recall that  $X^{\text{rr}}$  denotes the  $n \times d$  covariate matrix used for rerandomization, and  $X_i^{\text{rr}}$  denotes the  $d$ -length vector of covariates for subject  $i$ . Meanwhile,  $Y_i(z)$  denotes the potential outcomes for subject  $i$ , where  $z \in \{0, 1\}$ . Given this notation, the finite-population mean, variances and covariances of the covariates and potential outcomes are defined as:

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{X}^{\text{rr}} &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n X_i^{\text{rr}}, & \bar{Y}(z) &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n Y_i(z), \\ S_{X^{\text{rr}}}^2 &= \frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (X_i^{\text{rr}} - \bar{X}^{\text{rr}})(X_i^{\text{rr}} - \bar{X}^{\text{rr}})', \\ S_{Y(z)}^2 &= \frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (Y_i(z) - \bar{Y}(z))^2, \\ S_{Y(z), X^{\text{rr}}} &= \frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (Y_i(z) - \bar{Y}(z)) (X_i^{\text{rr}} - \bar{X}^{\text{rr}})',\end{aligned}$$

with  $S_{X^{\text{rr}}, Y(z)} = S_{Y(z), X^{\text{rr}}}'$ . Meanwhile, recall that  $\tau_i = Y_i(1) - Y_i(0)$  denotes the individual treatment effect for subject  $i$ , and  $\tau$  denotes the average treatment effect across the  $n$  subjects. Then, the finite-population variance of the individual treatment effects is defined as

$$S_{\tau}^2 = \frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (\tau_i - \tau)^2.$$

Moreover, the finite-population variance of the linear projection of the potential outcomes  $Y(z)$  into the covariates  $X^{\text{rr}}$  is defined as

$$S_{Y(z)|X^{\text{rr}}}^2 \equiv S_{Y(z), X^{\text{rr}}} (S_{X^{\text{rr}}}^2)^{-1} S_{X^{\text{rr}}, Y(z)}$$

and similarly define  $S_{\tau|X^{\text{rr}}}^2$  as the finite-population slope between individual treatment effects and covariates. These slopes are also referred to as the variance of the linear projection of the potential outcomes (or treatment effects) on covariates, to emphasize that they do not assume a linear regression model in order to be defined.

Furthermore, we can define the finite-population covariance between  $X^{\text{rr}}$  and  $X^{\text{adj}}$  as

$$S_{X^{\text{rr}}, X^{\text{adj}}} = \frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (X_i^{\text{rr}} - \bar{X}^{\text{rr}})(X_i^{\text{adj}} - \bar{X}^{\text{adj}})',$$

and similarly define all finite-population variances and covariances with respect to the covariates used in the analysis stage,  $S_{X^{\text{adj}}}^2, S_{Y(z), X^{\text{adj}}}, S_{Y(z)|X^{\text{adj}}}^2, S_{\tau|X^{\text{adj}}}^2$ .

These are all finite-population quantities, which can be estimated by their respective sample quantities. We denote the sample quantities for the variances and covariances with a lower-case  $s$ .

Note that since we do not observe individual treatment effects in our sample,  $S_{\tau}^2$  can typically not be consistently estimated. That said, a consistent estimator for  $S_{\tau|X^{\text{rr}}}^2$  that is commonly used in the literature to estimate  $S_{\tau}^2$  is

$$s_{\tau|X^{\text{rr}}}^2 = (s_{Y(1), X^{\text{rr}}} - s_{Y(0), X^{\text{rr}}})(S_{X^{\text{rr}}}^2)^{-1}(s_{X^{\text{rr}}, Y(1)} - s_{X^{\text{rr}}, Y(0)})$$

Although  $s_{\tau|X^{\text{rr}}}^2$  is a consistent estimator for  $S_{\tau|X^{\text{rr}}}^2$ , it consistently under-estimates  $S_{\tau}^2$ , in the sense that its asymptotic limit is less than  $S_{\tau}^2$  (Li et al., 2018; Li and Ding, 2020). Thus, using  $s_{\tau|X^{\text{rr}}}^2$  as an estimator for  $S_{\tau}^2$  yields conservative inference, which we discuss in the next section.

For the asymptotic results in Section 5, we need that as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , for  $z \in \{0, 1\}$ ,

- $n_z/n$ , the proportion of units under treatment and control, have a positive limit;
- the finite population variances and covariances  $S_{Y(z)}^2, S_{\tau}^2, S_{X^{\text{rr}}}^2, S_{Y(z), X^{\text{rr}}}, S_{X^{\text{adj}}}^2, S_{Y(z), X^{\text{adj}}}$  are well-defined, have finite limiting values, and  $S_{X^{\text{rr}}}^2, S_{X^{\text{adj}}}^2$  need to be nonsingular;
- control over the behavior of the tail of the distribution of the potential outcomes and covariates, meaning  $\frac{1}{n} \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} |Y_i(z) - \bar{Y}(z)|^2 \rightarrow 0$ ,  $\frac{1}{n} \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \|X_i^{\text{rr}} - \bar{X}^{\text{rr}}\|^2 \rightarrow 0$ , and  $\frac{1}{n} \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \|X_i^{\text{adj}} - \bar{X}^{\text{adj}}\|^2 \rightarrow 0$ .

## B Estimators of $V_{\tau\tau,*}$ and $R_{*,X^{\text{rr}}}^2$

In Section 5 we defined the difference-in-means estimator ( $\hat{\tau}_D$ ) in Equation (3), the linearly adjusted estimator ( $\hat{\tau}_L$ ) in Equation (4), and the doubly-robust estimator ( $\hat{\tau}_{DR}$ ) in Equation (5). For each estimator, we provided their asymptotic distribution under complete randomization and rerandomization in Section 5.1. These distributions depend on a variance term  $V_{\tau\tau,*}$ , and a linear projection term  $R_{*,X^{\text{rr}}}^2$ , which we define and provide estimators for below.

### Estimator $\hat{\tau}_D$

The variance of  $\hat{\tau}_D$  is given by

$$V_{\tau\tau,D} = \frac{n}{n_1} S_{Y(1)}^2 + \frac{n}{n_0} S_{Y(0)}^2 - S_{\tau}^2$$

To estimate  $V_{\tau\tau,D}$ , two options are

$$\hat{V}_{\tau\tau,D} = \frac{n}{n_1} s_{Y(1)}^2 + \frac{n}{n_0} s_{Y(0)}^2$$

and

$$\hat{V}_{\tau\tau,D} = \frac{n}{n_1} s_{Y(1)}^2 + \frac{n}{n_0} s_{Y(0)}^2 - s_{\tau|X^{\text{rr}}}^2.$$

The estimator  $s_{\tau|X^{\text{rr}}}^2$  asymptotically under-estimates  $S_{\tau}^2$ , in the sense that  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} s_{\tau|X^{\text{rr}}}^2 \leq S_{\tau}^2$ . Thus, both estimators above asymptotically over-estimate the true variance  $V_{\tau\tau,D}$ , thereby yielding

conservative inference. However, the second estimator can yield more precise inference, compared to the first, and hence is preferred in the literature (Li et al., 2018; Li and Ding, 2020).

Furthermore,  $R_{D,X^{rr}}^2$  is defined as

$$R_{D,X^{rr}}^2 = \frac{\frac{n_1}{n} S_{Y(1)|X^{rr}}^2 + \frac{n_0}{n} S_{Y(0)|X^{rr}}^2 - S_{\tau|X^{rr}}^2}{\frac{n_1}{n} S_{Y(1)}^2 + \frac{n_0}{n} S_{Y(0)}^2 - S_{\tau}^2}$$

which can be estimated by

$$\widehat{R}_{D,X^{rr}}^2 = \frac{\frac{n_1}{n} s_{Y(1)|X^{rr}}^2 + \frac{n_0}{n} s_{Y(0)|X^{rr}}^2 - s_{\tau|X^{rr}}^2}{\frac{n_1}{n} s_{Y(1)}^2 + \frac{n_0}{n} s_{Y(0)}^2 - s_{\tau}^2}.$$

Because the denominator for  $\widehat{R}_{D,X^{rr}}^2$  asymptotically over-estimates the true denominator in  $R_{D,X^{rr}}^2$ , the estimator  $\widehat{R}_{D,X^{rr}}^2$  asymptotically under-estimates the true  $R_{D,X^{rr}}^2$ . This will in turn yield conservative inference.

### Estimator $\widehat{\tau}_L$

Considering the linear model  $\mu_z(X_i) = \mathbb{E}(Y_i|X_i, Z_i = z) = \beta_{0z} + \beta_{1z}X_i$ , we define  $Y_i(z; \beta) \equiv Y_i(z) - \mu_z(X_i^{\text{adj}})$  for  $z = 0, 1$  to be the linear residual of the potential outcomes,  $\tau_i(\beta) \equiv \tau_i - \left[ \mu_1(X_i^{\text{adj}}) - \mu_0(X_i^{\text{adj}}) \right]$  the linear residual of the individual treatment effect, and  $\tau(\beta) \equiv \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \tau_i(\beta)$  the average linear residual treatment effect.

Thereby, we can define the finite-population variances of  $Y_i(z; \beta)$  and its linear projection on  $X_i^{\text{rr}}$  and  $X_i^{\text{adj}}$  as  $S_{Y(z; \beta)}^2$ ,  $S_{Y(z; \beta)|X^{\text{rr}}}^2$ , and  $S_{Y(z; \beta)|X^{\text{adj}}}^2$ , respectively. Moreover, we similarly define the finite-population variances of  $\tau_i(\beta)$  and its linear projection on  $X_i^{\text{rr}}$  and  $X_i^{\text{adj}}$  as  $S_{\tau(\beta)}^2$ ,  $S_{\tau(\beta)|X^{\text{rr}}}^2$ , and  $S_{\tau(\beta)|X^{\text{adj}}}^2$ , respectively. As before, we define their respective sample estimates with lower case  $s$ .

The variance of  $\widehat{\tau}_L$  is given by

$$V_{\tau\tau, L} = \frac{n}{n_1} S_{Y(1; \beta)}^2 + \frac{n}{n_0} S_{Y(0; \beta)}^2 - S_{\tau(\beta)}^2$$

and its estimator following Equation (20) of Li and Ding (2020),

$$\widehat{V}_{\tau\tau, L} = \frac{n}{n_1} s_{Y(1; \beta)}^2 + \frac{n}{n_0} s_{Y(0; \beta)}^2 - s_{\tau(\beta)|X^{\text{adj}}}^2$$

where

$$s_{\tau(\beta)|X^{\text{adj}}}^2 = (s_{Y(1; \beta), X^{\text{adj}}} - s_{Y(0; \beta), X^{\text{adj}}})(S_{X^{\text{adj}}}^2)^{-1}(s_{X^{\text{adj}}, Y(1; \beta)} - s_{X^{\text{adj}}, Y(0; \beta)})$$

while  $R_{L,X^{\text{rr}}}^2$  is

$$R_{L,X^{\text{rr}}}^2 = \frac{\frac{n_1}{n} S_{Y(1; \beta)|X^{\text{rr}}}^2 + \frac{n_0}{n} S_{Y(0; \beta)|X^{\text{rr}}}^2 - S_{\tau(\beta)|X^{\text{rr}}}^2}{\frac{n_1}{n} S_{Y(1; \beta)}^2 + \frac{n_0}{n} S_{Y(0; \beta)}^2 - S_{\tau(\beta)}^2}$$

and one estimator follows directly as

$$\widehat{R}_{L,X^{\text{rr}}}^2 = \frac{\frac{n_1}{n} s_{Y(1; \beta)|X^{\text{rr}}}^2 + \frac{n_0}{n} s_{Y(0; \beta)|X^{\text{rr}}}^2 - s_{\tau(\beta)|X^{\text{rr}}}^2}{\frac{n_1}{n} s_{Y(1; \beta)}^2 + \frac{n_0}{n} s_{Y(0; \beta)}^2 - s_{\tau(\beta)|X^{\text{adj}}}^2},$$

where

$$s_{\tau(\beta)|X^{rr}}^2 = (s_{Y(1;\beta),X^{rr}} - s_{Y(0;\beta),X^{rr}})(S_{X^{rr}}^2)^{-1}(s_{X^{rr},Y(1;\beta)} - s_{X^{rr},Y(0;\beta)})$$

which is the estimator proposed by [Li and Ding \(2020\)](#) in Equation (21).

Again, because  $s_{\tau(\beta)|X^{adj}}^2$  asymptotically over-estimates  $S_{\tau(\beta)}^2$ , the estimators  $\widehat{V}_{\tau\tau,L}$  and  $\widehat{R}_{L,X^{rr}}^2$  over-estimate and under-estimate their true estimands, respectively. This yields conservative inference.

### Estimator $\widehat{\tau}_{DR}$

The doubly-robust estimator is considered in [Wang and Li \(2024\)](#), where the authors assume a super-population setting. Thereby, the formulations of  $V_{\tau\tau,DR}$  and  $R_{DR,X^{rr}}^2$  change slightly from  $V_{\tau\tau,*}$  and  $R_{*,X^{rr}}^2$ ,  $*$  = D, L, but the intuition is analogous. The formulations in this case are based on efficient influence functions (EIF). For general models  $\mu_z(X_i) = \mathbb{E}(Y_i|X_i, Z_i = z)$ , the true EIF values for subject  $i$  in treatment group  $z \in \{0, 1\}$  are

$$\text{EIF}_i(z) = \frac{\mathbb{1}(Z_i = z)}{\pi^z(1-\pi)^{1-z}} \left( Y_i - \mu_z(X_i^{\text{adj}}) \right) + \mu_z(X_i^{\text{adj}}) - \bar{\eta}_z$$

where  $\bar{\eta}_z$  is

$$\bar{\eta}_z = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left[ \frac{\mathbb{1}(Z_i = z)}{\pi^z(1-\pi)^{1-z}} \left( Y_i - \mu_z(X_i^{\text{adj}}) \right) + \mu_z(X_i^{\text{adj}}) \right],$$

$\text{EIF}_i = \text{EIF}_i(1) - \text{EIF}_i(0)$ , and  $\pi = n_1/n$ .

To implement  $\widehat{\tau}_{DR}$ , cross-fitting is typically employed to decouple the estimation of nuisance parameters from treatment effect estimation via EIFs, thereby mitigating bias induced by overfitting. Specifically, it is assumed that, when implementing  $\widehat{\tau}_{DR}$ , the sample is split in  $K$  folds, where  $K-1$  folds are used to estimate  $\mu_z(X_i^{\text{adj}})$  for  $z \in \{0, 1\}$ , and the remaining fold is used to compute  $\widehat{\text{EIF}}_i(z)$ . Then, the procedure is repeated swapping the folds until  $\widehat{\text{EIF}}_i(z)$  is computed across all folds, and the resulting estimates are averaged to obtain  $\widehat{\tau}_{DR}$ . Commonly,  $K$  is chosen to be 2, 5, or 10.

Hence, the variance of  $\widehat{\tau}_{DR}$  is given by

$$V_{\tau\tau,DR} = \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K \frac{1}{|\mathcal{I}_k|} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \text{EIF}_i^2$$

and

$$R_{DR,X^{rr}}^2 = \frac{1}{V} C' (n\Sigma)^{-1} C$$

where  $\Sigma = \text{cov}(\widehat{\tau}_{X^{rr}})$ ,  $\mathcal{I}_k$  denotes the index set for the  $k$ -th fold from the cross-fitting procedure, and  $C = \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K \frac{1}{|\mathcal{I}_k|} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \frac{Z_i - \pi}{\pi(1-\pi)} \text{EIF}_i(X_i^{rr} - \overline{X^{rr}})$ .

Meanwhile the estimators are defined in the Appendix B.3 of [Wang and Li \(2024\)](#) in Equations (12) and (13),

$$\widehat{V}_{\tau\tau,DR} = \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K \frac{1}{|\mathcal{I}_k|} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \widehat{\text{EIF}}_i^2$$

and

$$\widehat{R}_{\text{DR}, X^{\text{rr}}}^2 = \frac{1}{V} \widehat{C}' \left( n \widehat{\Sigma} \right)^{-1} \widehat{C}$$

where  $\widehat{C} = \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K \frac{1}{|\mathcal{I}_k|} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \frac{Z_i - \pi}{\pi(1-\pi)} \widehat{\text{EIF}}_i \left( X_i^{\text{rr}} - \overline{X^{\text{rr}}} \right)$ , with

$$\widehat{\text{EIF}}_i(z) = \frac{\mathbb{1}(Z_i = z)}{\pi^z(1-\pi)^{1-z}} \left( Y_i - \widehat{\mu}_z \left( X_i^{\text{adj}} \right) \right) + \widehat{\mu}_z \left( X_i^{\text{adj}} \right) - \widehat{\eta}_z,$$

$$\widehat{\eta}_z = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left[ \frac{\mathbb{1}(Z_i = z)}{\pi^z(1-\pi)^{1-z}} \left( Y_i - \widehat{\mu}_z \left( X_i^{\text{adj}} \right) \right) + \widehat{\mu}_z \left( X_i^{\text{adj}} \right) \right],$$

and  $\widehat{\text{EIF}}_i = \widehat{\text{EIF}}_i(1) - \widehat{\text{EIF}}_i(0)$ .

## C Available software

There is still a lack of tailored software for rerandomized experiments. To our knowledge, there are only a few publicly available packages for specific applications of rerandomized experiments, all of which are in R. We briefly describe these packages below

**fastrerandomize:** [github](#)

Optimizes hardware usage to increase computational speed and better allocate memory to find balanced randomizations. Based on [Jerzak and Goldstein \(2023\)](#); [Goldstein et al. \(2025\)](#).

**rerandPower:** [CRAN](#)

Implements power and sample size calculations for  $\widehat{\tau}_{\text{D}}$  after Mahalanobis distance rerandomization. Based on [Branson et al. \(2024\)](#).

## D Additional simulation results

In addition to the simulation results in Section 6, we considered two other metrics:

- Coverage: We measure the coverage of each estimator under complete randomization and rerandomization:

$$\mathbb{P}(\tau \in \text{CI}(\widehat{\tau}_*; \alpha)) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{P}(\tau \in \text{CI}(\widehat{\tau}_*; \alpha) | \mathcal{A})$$

for  $*$  = D, L, DR, and significance level  $\alpha$ .

- Power: We measure the power of each estimator under complete randomization and rerandomization:

$$\mathbb{P}(\text{reject } H_0 | \tau \neq 0) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{P}(\text{reject } H_0 | \tau \neq 0, \mathcal{A})$$

where the null hypothesis is  $H_0 : \tau = 0$ .

Furthermore, we considered many other settings (e.g., estimators based on covariate selection, and estimators with different model specifications). In this section, we describe additional results for the following cases:

- Linear setting with 10 covariates ([D.1](#)), when varying model specification of the doubly robust estimator ([D.2](#)) or covariate selection ([D.3](#));

- Non-linear setting with 10 covariates (D.4), when varying model specification of the doubly robust estimator (D.5) or covariate selection (D.6);
- Linear setting with 100 covariates (D.7), when varying model specification of the doubly robust estimator (D.8) or covariate selection (D.9);
- Linear setting with 10 covariates but performing rerandomization based on the Euclidean distance (D.10).

## D.1 Linear setting with 10 covariates

In Section 6 we discussed the precision and coherence results of the linear setting with 10 covariates. Now we discuss coverage and power. Figures 8 and 9 show the results on coverage and power, respectively. All estimators are at least as powerful under rerandomization compared to complete randomization. Moreover, both adjusted estimators achieve nominal coverage level under rerandomization. On the other hand, the difference-in-means estimator has slight overcoverage when balancing on all covariates in the design stage (scenarios 1 and 3) and undercoverage when balancing on fewer covariates in the design stage (scenarios 2 and 4). The overcoverage is a known result in the literature (Li et al., 2018), but not the undercoverage. The intuition is based on the interplay between  $R_{D, X^{rr}}^2$  and  $v_{d,a}$  on the variance of  $\hat{\tau}_D$  under rerandomization. For this data generating process, the decrease in the number of covariates used for rerandomization from scenarios 1 and 3 to scenarios 2 and 4 does not change  $R_{D, X^{rr}}^2$  significantly, in fact it changes from approximately 0.99 to 0.95. However, the value of  $v_{d,a}$  changes significantly from approximately 0.21 to 0.11, thereby causing  $\hat{\tau}_D$  to have overcoverage and undercoverage across the scenarios.

## D.2 Doubly robust estimator model specification on the linear setting with 10 covariates

In Section 6.3 we discussed the coherence results when varying the specification of  $\mu_z$ , for  $z \in \{0, 1\}$ , within the doubly robust estimator in a linear setting with 10 covariates. We considered the following the doubly robust estimators:  $\hat{\tau}_{\text{Reg}}$  with a linear outcome model,  $\hat{\tau}_{\text{Neural}}$  with its outcome model defined by a neural network,  $\hat{\tau}_{\text{Forest}}$  with a random forest on the outcome model. Figures 10, 11 and 12 show the results on precision, coverage, and power, respectively. We find that  $\hat{\tau}_{\text{Neural}}$  and  $\hat{\tau}_{\text{Forest}}$  have significant finite-sample precision gains, while  $\hat{\tau}_{\text{Reg}}$  follow the asymptotic theory. All estimators achieve nominal coverage and they are at least as powerful under rerandomization compared to complete randomization.

## D.3 Covariate selection on the linear setting with 10 covariates

In Section 6.3 we discussed the coherence results when covariate selection is performed in the linear setting with 10 covariates. We compared (i) when all 10 covariates are used for adjustment, **Full**, and (ii) when a **Stepwise** selection procedure is used to select covariates. For both cases, we considered that all covariates were used for rerandomization. Figures 13, 14 and 15 show the results on precision, coverage, and power, respectively. We find that there are significant precision benefits when doing rerandomization for small sample sizes on all estimators. Moreover, all estimators achieve nominal coverage and they are at least as powerful under rerandomization compared to complete randomization.




Figure 8: Coverage comparison between the difference-in-means ( $\hat{\tau}_D$ ), difference-in-linear outcome models ( $\hat{\tau}_L$ ) and doubly-robust estimator with random forest outcome model ( $\hat{\tau}_{DR}$ ) for different sample sizes and covariates available for design and analysis under complete randomization (CR) and Mahalanobis-based rerandomization (RR) for the linear setting with 10 covariates. For all data availability scenarios both adjusted estimators achieve nominal coverage level. However, the difference-in-means estimator has slight overcoverage when balancing on all covariates in the design stage (scenarios 1 and 3), and undercoverage when balancing on less covariates in the design stage (scenarios 2 and 4). See [Li et al. \(2018\)](#) for a detailed discussion on this property. Under complete randomization, the unadjusted estimator achieves nominal coverage level.

#### D.4 Non-linear setting with 10 covariates

In Section 6 we discussed the precision and coherence results of the non-linear setting with 10 covariates. Now we discuss coverage and power. Figures 16 and 17 show the results on coverage and power, respectively. All estimators are at least as powerful under rerandomization compared to complete randomization and they achieve nominal coverage.

#### D.5 Doubly robust estimator model specification on the non-linear setting with 10 covariates

Figures 18, 19, 20 and 21 show the results on precision, coherence coverage, and power when varying the specification of  $\mu_z$ , for  $z \in \{0, 1\}$ , within the doubly robust estimator in a non-linear setting with 10 covariates. We find that there are significant finite-sample precision gains for  $\hat{\tau}_{\text{Neural}}$  in all scenarios. On the other hand, the finite-sample precision gains of  $\hat{\tau}_{\text{Reg}}$  and  $\hat{\tau}_{\text{Forest}}$






Figure 9: Power comparison between the difference-in-means ( $\hat{\tau}_D$ ), difference-in-linear outcome models ( $\hat{\tau}_L$ ) and doubly-robust estimator with random forest outcome model ( $\hat{\tau}_{DR}$ ) for different sample sizes and covariates available for design and analysis under complete randomization (CR) and Mahalanobis-based rerandomization (RR) for the linear setting with 10 covariates. All estimators are at least as powerful under rerandomization in comparison to complete randomization for all scenarios of data availability.

follow the asymptotic theory. In terms of coherence, there is significant improvement in the overall coherence among estimators, although it is less than under the linear setting. All estimators but  $\hat{\tau}_{\text{Neural}}$  achieve nominal coverage and are at least as powerful under rerandomization compared to complete randomization.  $\hat{\tau}_{\text{Neural}}$ , on the other hand, it has overcoverage, indicating wide confidence intervals because of underfitting, which is reinforced by its low power.

## D.6 Covariate selection on the non-linear setting with 10 covariates

Figures 22, 23, 24 and 25 show the results on precision, coherence coverage, and power when covariate selection is performed in a non-linear setting with 10 covariates. We find that there are significant finite-sample precision gains for  $\hat{\tau}_{\text{Neural}}$ . On the other hand, the precision of all other estimators is not improved under rerandomization. Analogously for coherence,  $\hat{\tau}_{\text{Neural}}$  is the only estimator benefited from rerandomization under finite samples in this case. Finally, all estimators, except  $\hat{\tau}_{\text{Neural}}$  achieve nominal coverage and are at least as powerful under rerandomization compared to complete randomization.  $\hat{\tau}_{\text{Neural}}$ , on the other hand, has overcoverage, indicating wide confidence intervals because of underfitting, which is reinforced by its low power. The precision and coherence gains for the  $\hat{\tau}_{\text{Neural}}$  may be explained by the underfitting of the model, meaning




Figure 10: Precision gain comparison between the doubly-robust estimator with linear outcome model ( $\hat{\tau}_{\text{Reg}}$ ), the doubly-robust estimator with random forest outcome model ( $\hat{\tau}_{\text{Forest}}$ ), the doubly-robust estimator with neural network outcome model ( $\hat{\tau}_{\text{Neural}}$ ) for different sample sizes and covariates available for design and analysis for the linear setting with 10 covariates. There is significant finite-sample precision gains for  $\hat{\tau}_{\text{Neural}}$  and  $\hat{\tau}_{\text{Forest}}$  under all scenarios. On the other hand, the finite-sample precision gains  $\hat{\tau}_{\text{Reg}}$  follow the asymptotic theory.

rerandomization is able to act as a “safeguard” and help misspecified models.

## D.7 Linear setting with 100 covariates

Figures 26, 27, 28 and 29 show the results on precision, coherence, coverage, and power for the linear setting with 100 covariates. Under small sample sizes, the adjusted estimators are unstable due to the high-dimensionality of the estimation problem. However,  $\hat{\tau}_{\text{DR}}$  benefits from rerandomization under small sample sizes since its empirical precision gains are greater than the asymptotic theory. Furthermore,  $\hat{\tau}_{\text{D}}$  and  $\hat{\tau}_{\text{L}}$  follow asymptotic theory. In terms of coherence, there is significant improvement in overall coherence, although in a lower magnitude than the low-dimensional linear setting. Under small sample sizes the adjusted estimators are unstable due to the high-dimensionality of the estimation problem, hence we find overcoverage for  $\hat{\tau}_{\text{DR}}$  and undercoverage for  $\hat{\tau}_{\text{L}}$ . Interestingly, all estimators seem to have their power decrease as the sample size increases. This is due to the high-dimensional estimation problem and the instability in the estimators.




Figure 11: Coverage comparison between the doubly-robust estimator with linear outcome model ( $\hat{\tau}_{\text{Reg}}$ ), the doubly-robust estimator with random forest outcome model ( $\hat{\tau}_{\text{Forest}}$ ), the doubly-robust estimator with neural network outcome model ( $\hat{\tau}_{\text{Neural}}$ ) for different sample sizes and covariates available for design and analysis under complete randomization (CR) and Mahalanobis-based rerandomization (RR) for the linear setting with 10 covariates. For all data availability scenarios all estimators achieve nominal coverage level.

## D.8 Doubly robust estimator model specification in the linear setting with 100 covariates

Figures 30, 31, 32 and 33 show the results on precision, coherence, coverage and power for the linear setting with 100 covariates when varying the specification of  $\mu_z$ , for  $z \in \{0, 1\}$ , within the doubly robust estimator. Although there is some instability on the estimators under small samples, there are finite-sample precision gains for all estimators, although they are less than in the low-dimensional setting. Overall coherence is also significantly improved under rerandomization. Under small sample sizes all estimators are unstable due to the high-dimensionality of the estimation problem, hence the overcoverage and lack of power.

## D.9 Covariate selection in the linear setting with 100 covariates

Figures 34, 35, 36 and 37 show the results on precision, coherence, coverage and power for the linear setting with 100 covariates when covariate selection is performed. Under small sample sizes, the adjusted estimators are unstable due to the high-dimensionality of the estimation problem. Nevertheless,  $\hat{\tau}_{\text{Neural}}$  has significant precision benefits from rerandomization under finite samples in this case. All other estimators precision gains follow asymptotic theory or show modest precision




Figure 12: Power comparison between the doubly-robust estimator with linear outcome model ( $\hat{\tau}_{\text{Reg}}$ ), the doubly-robust estimator with random forest outcome model ( $\hat{\tau}_{\text{Forest}}$ ), the doubly-robust estimator with neural network outcome model ( $\hat{\tau}_{\text{Neural}}$ ) for different sample sizes and covariates available for design and analysis under complete randomization (CR) and Mahalanobis-based rerandomization (RR) for the linear setting with 10 covariates. All estimators are at least as powerful under rerandomization in comparison to complete randomization for all scenarios of data availability.

gains. The same results are found for coherence. Interestingly, all estimators seem to have their power decrease as the sample size increases. This is due to the high-dimensional estimation problem and the instability in the estimators. This instability also causes the overcoverage.

#### D.10 Linear setting with 10 covariates but rerandomizing based on Euclidean distance

Figures 38, 39, 40 and 41 show the results on precision, coherence, coverage, and power for the linear setting with 10 covariates, and rerandomization is done based on the Euclidean distance. The dashed lines show the asymptotic theoretical results based on the Mahalanobis distance, while the solid lines show the empirical results based on Euclidean distance.

For  $\hat{\tau}_{\text{D}}$  rerandomizing under the Euclidean distance has more precision benefits than balancing over the Mahalanobis distance, this is because the Euclidean distance prioritizes balancing the top eigenvectors of the covariates (Schindl and Branson, 2024). As before, we notice that for the adjusted estimators, rerandomization improves precision especially under the smaller sample sizes. Coherence is also highly improved under rerandomization under Euclidean distance. Notice that




Figure 13: Precision gain comparison for the difference in linear outcome model ( $\hat{\tau}_L$ ), the doubly-robust estimator with linear outcome model ( $\hat{\tau}_{Reg}$ ), the doubly-robust estimator with random forest outcome model ( $\hat{\tau}_{Forest}$ ), the doubly-robust estimator with neural network outcome model ( $\hat{\tau}_{Neural}$ ) for different sample sizes in the linear setting with 10 covariates when different amounts of covariates are considered for adjustment in the analysis stage. **Stepwise** refers to when the covariate selection is done in the analysis stage prior to estimation, and **Full** refers to when the analysis is conducted using all covariates. When the covariate selection is done in the analysis stage (**Stepwise**), there is significant precision benefits when doing rerandomization for small sample sizes on all estimators. Moreover, both  $\hat{\tau}_{Forest}$  and  $\hat{\tau}_{Neural}$  are benefited by rerandomization on small sample sizes for all scenarios.

the coherence gains between  $\hat{\tau}_D$  and  $\hat{\tau}_L$  are also improved under Euclidean distance compared to Mahalanobis distance rerandomization. All estimators are at least as powerful under rerandomization compared to complete randomization. Moreover, both adjusted estimators achieve nominal coverage level under rerandomization. As in the case when rerandomizing based on the Mahalanobis distance, the difference-in-means estimator has slight overcoverage when balancing on all covariates in the design stage (scenarios 1 and 3) and undercoverage when balancing on less covariates in the design stage (scenarios 2 and 4). Again, the overcoverage result is known in the literature (Li et al., 2018), but not the undercoverage. The intuition is based on the interplay between  $R_{D, X^{rr}}^2$  and  $v_{d,a}$  on the variance of  $\hat{\tau}_D$  under rerandomization, just like we discussed in Appendix D.1.




Figure 14: Coverage for the difference in linear outcome model ( $\hat{\tau}_L$ ), the doubly-robust estimator with linear outcome model ( $\hat{\tau}_{Reg}$ ), the doubly-robust estimator with random forest outcome model ( $\hat{\tau}_{Forest}$ ), the doubly-robust estimator with neural network outcome model ( $\hat{\tau}_{Neural}$ ) for different sample sizes in the linear setting with 10 covariates when different amounts of covariates are considered for adjustment in the analysis stage. **Stepwise** refers to when the covariate selection is done in the analysis stage prior to estimation, and **Full** refers to when the analysis is conducted using all covariates. The comparison is between under complete randomization (CR) and Mahalanobis-based rerandomization (RR). All estimators achieve nominal coverage under both CR and RR.




Figure 15: Power for the difference in linear outcome model ( $\hat{\tau}_L$ ), the doubly-robust estimator with linear outcome model ( $\hat{\tau}_{Reg}$ ), the doubly-robust estimator with random forest outcome model ( $\hat{\tau}_{Forest}$ ), the doubly-robust estimator with neural network outcome model ( $\hat{\tau}_{Neural}$ ) for different sample sizes in the linear setting with 10 covariates when different amounts of covariates are considered for adjustment in the analysis stage. **Stepwise** refers to when the covariate selection is done in the analysis stage prior to estimation, and **Full** refers to when the analysis is conducted using all covariates. The comparison is between under complete randomization (CR) and Mahalanobis-based rerandomization (RR). All estimators are at least as powerful under RR in comparison to CR for all scenarios.






Figure 16: Coverage comparison between the difference-in-means ( $\hat{\tau}_D$ ), difference-in-linear outcome models ( $\hat{\tau}_L$ ) and doubly-robust estimator with random forest outcome model ( $\hat{\tau}_{DR}$ ) for different sample sizes and covariates available for design and analysis under complete randomization (CR) and Mahalanobis-based rerandomization (RR) for the non-linear setting with 10 covariates. All estimators achieve nominal coverage under both CR and RR.




Figure 17: Power comparison between the difference-in-means ( $\hat{\tau}_D$ ), difference-in-linear outcome models ( $\hat{\tau}_L$ ) and doubly-robust estimator with random forest outcome model ( $\hat{\tau}_{DR}$ ) for different sample sizes and covariates available for design and analysis under complete randomization (CR) and Mahalanobis-based rerandomization (RR) for the non-linear setting with 10 covariates. All estimators are at least as powerful under RR in comparison to CR for all scenarios of data availability.




Figure 18: Precision gain comparison between the doubly-robust estimator with linear outcome model ( $\hat{\tau}_{Reg}$ ), the doubly-robust estimator with random forest outcome model ( $\hat{\tau}_{Forest}$ ), the doubly-robust estimator with neural network outcome model ( $\hat{\tau}_{Neural}$ ) for different sample sizes and covariates available for design and analysis for the non-linear setting with 10 covariates. There is significant finite-sample precision gains for  $\hat{\tau}_{Neural}$  under all scenarios. On the other hand, the finite-sample precision gains  $\hat{\tau}_{Reg}$  and  $\hat{\tau}_{Forest}$  follow the asymptotic theory.




Figure 19: Coherence gain comparison between the difference-in-means estimator ( $\hat{\tau}_D$ ), the doubly-robust estimator with linear outcome model ( $\hat{\tau}_{Reg}$ ), the doubly-robust estimator with random forest outcome model ( $\hat{\tau}_{Forest}$ ), the doubly-robust estimator with neural network outcome model ( $\hat{\tau}_{Neural}$ ) for different sample sizes and covariates available for design and analysis for the non-linear setting with 10 covariates. There is significant improvement in the overall coherence across all data availability scenarios. The biggest increases in coherence are for the  $\hat{\tau}_{Neural}$  and  $\hat{\tau}_D$  estimators, since these estimators are the more unstable ones,  $\hat{\tau}_D$  because it doesn't adjust for covariates and  $\hat{\tau}_{Neural}$  is underfitting. Hence, they are get more similar to the other estimators under rerandomization.




Figure 20: Coverage comparison between the doubly-robust estimator with linear outcome model ( $\hat{\tau}_{Reg}$ ), the doubly-robust estimator with random forest outcome model ( $\hat{\tau}_{Forest}$ ), the doubly-robust estimator with neural network outcome model ( $\hat{\tau}_{Neural}$ ) for different sample sizes and covariates available for design and analysis under complete randomization (CR) and Mahalanobis-based rerandomization (RR) for the non-linear setting with 10 covariates. For all data availability scenarios  $\hat{\tau}_{Reg}$  and  $\hat{\tau}_{Forest}$  achieve nominal coverage level.  $\hat{\tau}_{Neural}$ , on the other hand, achieves overcoverage, indicating wide confidence intervals because of underfitting.




Figure 21: Power comparison between the doubly-robust estimator with linear outcome model ( $\hat{\tau}_{Reg}$ ), the doubly-robust estimator with random forest outcome model ( $\hat{\tau}_{Forest}$ ), the doubly-robust estimator with neural network outcome model ( $\hat{\tau}_{Neural}$ ) for different sample sizes and covariates available for design and analysis under complete randomization (CR) and Mahalanobis-based rerandomization (RR) for the non-linear setting with 10 covariates. All estimators are at least as powerful under rerandomization in comparison to complete randomization for all scenarios of data availability.  $\hat{\tau}_{Neural}$  has small power under RR and CR, indicating wide confidence intervals because of underfitting.




Figure 22: Precision gain comparison for the difference in linear outcome model ( $\hat{\tau}_L$ ), the doubly-robust estimator with linear outcome model ( $\hat{\tau}_{Reg}$ ), the doubly-robust estimator with random forest outcome model ( $\hat{\tau}_{Forest}$ ), the doubly-robust estimator with neural network outcome model ( $\hat{\tau}_{Neural}$ ) for different sample sizes in the non-linear setting with 10 covariates when different amounts of covariates are considered for adjustment in the analysis stage. **Stepwise** refers to when the covariate selection is done in the analysis stage prior to estimation, and **Full** refers to when the analysis is conducted using all covariates.  $\hat{\tau}_{Neural}$  is the only estimator benefited from rerandomization under finite samples in this case. On the other hand, the precision of all other estimators is not improved under rerandomization.






Figure 23: Coherence gain comparison for the difference in linear outcome model ( $\hat{\tau}_L$ ), the doubly-robust estimator with linear outcome model ( $\hat{\tau}_{Reg}$ ), the doubly-robust estimator with random forest outcome model ( $\hat{\tau}_{Forest}$ ), the doubly-robust estimator with neural network outcome model ( $\hat{\tau}_{Neural}$ ) for different sample sizes in the non-linear setting with 10 covariates when different amounts of covariates are considered for adjustment in the analysis stage. **Stepwise** refers to when the covariate selection is done in the analysis stage prior to estimation, and **Full** refers to when the analysis is conducted using all covariates.  $\hat{\tau}_{Neural}$  is the only estimator benefited from rerandomization under finite samples in this case.




Figure 24: Coverage for the difference in linear outcome model ( $\hat{\tau}_L$ ), the doubly-robust estimator with linear outcome model ( $\hat{\tau}_{Reg}$ ), the doubly-robust estimator with random forest outcome model ( $\hat{\tau}_{Forest}$ ), the doubly-robust estimator with neural network outcome model ( $\hat{\tau}_{Neural}$ ) for different sample sizes in the linear setting with 10 covariates when different amounts of covariates are considered for adjustment in the analysis stage. **Stepwise** refers to when the covariate selection is done in the analysis stage prior to estimation, and **Full** refers to when the analysis is conducted using all covariates. The comparison is between under complete randomization (CR) and Mahalanobis-based rerandomization (RR). All estimators achieve nominal coverage under both CR and RR.




Figure 25: Power for the difference in linear outcome model ( $\hat{\tau}_L$ ), the doubly-robust estimator with linear outcome model ( $\hat{\tau}_{Reg}$ ), the doubly-robust estimator with random forest outcome model ( $\hat{\tau}_{Forest}$ ), the doubly-robust estimator with neural network outcome model ( $\hat{\tau}_{Neural}$ ) for different sample sizes in the linear setting with 10 covariates when different amounts of covariates are considered for adjustment in the analysis stage. **Stepwise** refers to when the covariate selection is done in the analysis stage prior to estimation, and **Full** refers to when the analysis is conducted using all covariates. The comparison is between under complete randomization (CR) and Mahalanobis-based rerandomization (RR).  $\hat{\tau}_{Neural}$  has small power under RR and CR, indicating wide confidence intervals because of underfitting. However,  $\hat{\tau}_{Neural}$  is at least as powerful under RR in comparison to CR.




Figure 26: Precision gain comparison between the difference-in-means estimator ( $\hat{\tau}_D$ ), the difference in linear outcome models ( $\hat{\tau}_L$ ), the doubly-robust estimator with random forest outcome model ( $\hat{\tau}_{DR}$ ) for different sample sizes and covariates available for design and analysis for the linear setting with 100 covariates. Under small sample sizes the adjusted estimators are unstable due to the high-dimensionality of the estimation problem, and the linear model is well-specified. Regardless,  $\hat{\tau}_{DR}$  is benefited from rerandomization under small sample sizes since its empirical precision gains are bigger than the asymptotic theory. On the other hand,  $\hat{\tau}_D$  and  $\hat{\tau}_L$  follow asymptotic theory.




Figure 27: Coherence gain comparison between the difference-in-means estimator ( $\hat{\tau}_D$ ), the difference in linear outcome models ( $\hat{\tau}_L$ ), the doubly-robust estimator with random forest outcome model ( $\hat{\tau}_{DR}$ ) for different sample sizes and covariates available for design and analysis for the linear setting with 100 covariates. Under small sample sizes the adjusted estimators are unstable due to the high-dimensionality of the estimation problem, hence the instability in coherence values from sample sizes below 500. Other than that, there is significant improvement in the overall coherence across all data availability scenarios. The biggest increases in coherence is for  $\hat{\tau}_D$ . Thereby, the difference-in-means estimator get more similar to the adjusted estimators under rerandomization.




Figure 28: Coverage comparison between the difference-in-means ( $\hat{\tau}_D$ ), difference-in-linear outcome models ( $\hat{\tau}_L$ ) and doubly-robust estimator with random forest outcome model ( $\hat{\tau}_{DR}$ ) for different sample sizes and covariates available for design and analysis under complete randomization (CR) and Mahalanobis-based rerandomization (RR) for the linear setting with 100 covariates. Under small sample sizes the adjusted estimators are unstable due to the high-dimensionality of the estimation problem, hence the overcoverage for  $\hat{\tau}_{DR}$  and the undercoverage for  $\hat{\tau}_L$ . Nevertheless,  $\hat{\tau}_L$  is aided by rerandomization to achieve nominal coverage when the adjustment is done in fewer covariates (scenarios 3 and 4), thereby a more stable adjusted estimator.




Figure 29: Power comparison between the difference-in-means ( $\hat{\tau}_D$ ), difference-in-linear outcome models ( $\hat{\tau}_L$ ) and doubly-robust estimator with random forest outcome model ( $\hat{\tau}_{DR}$ ) for different sample sizes and covariates available for design and analysis under complete randomization (CR) and Mahalanobis-based rerandomization (RR) for the linear setting with 100 covariates. All estimators have small power due to high-dimensional estimation problem and the instability in the estimators.






Figure 30: Precision gain comparison between the doubly-robust estimator with linear outcome model ( $\hat{\tau}_{Reg}$ ), the doubly-robust estimator with random forest outcome model ( $\hat{\tau}_{Forest}$ ), the doubly-robust estimator with neural network outcome model ( $\hat{\tau}_{Neural}$ ) for different sample sizes and covariates available for design and analysis for the linear setting with 100 covariates. Although there is some instability on the estimators under small samples, there is finite-sample precision gains for all estimators under all scenarios, and especially scenarios 3 and 4, i.e. when the adjustment is done on a subset of covariates.




Figure 31: Coherence gain comparison between the difference-in-means estimator ( $\hat{\tau}_D$ ), the doubly-robust estimator with linear outcome model ( $\hat{\tau}_{Reg}$ ), the doubly-robust estimator with random forest outcome model ( $\hat{\tau}_{Forest}$ ), the doubly-robust estimator with neural network outcome model ( $\hat{\tau}_{Neural}$ ) for different sample sizes and covariates available for design and analysis for the linear setting with 100 covariates. Although there is some instability on the estimators under small samples, there is significant improvement in the overall coherence across all data availability scenarios.




Figure 32: Coverage comparison between the doubly-robust estimator with linear outcome model ( $\hat{\tau}_{Reg}$ ), the doubly-robust estimator with random forest outcome model ( $\hat{\tau}_{Forest}$ ), the doubly-robust estimator with neural network outcome model ( $\hat{\tau}_{Neural}$ ) for different sample sizes and covariates available for design and analysis under complete randomization (CR) and Mahalanobis-based rerandomization (RR) for the linear setting with 100 covariates. Under small sample sizes all estimators are unstable due to the high-dimensionality of the estimation problem, hence the overcoverage.




Figure 33: Power comparison between the doubly-robust estimator with linear outcome model ( $\hat{\tau}_{Reg}$ ), the doubly-robust estimator with random forest outcome model ( $\hat{\tau}_{Forest}$ ), the doubly-robust estimator with neural network outcome model ( $\hat{\tau}_{Neural}$ ) for different sample sizes and covariates available for design and analysis under complete randomization (CR) and Mahalanobis-based rerandomization (RR) for the linear setting with 100 covariates. All estimators have small power due to high-dimensional estimation problem and the instability in the estimators.




Figure 34: Precision gain comparison for the difference in linear outcome model ( $\hat{\tau}_L$ ), the doubly-robust estimator with linear outcome model ( $\hat{\tau}_{Reg}$ ), the doubly-robust estimator with random forest outcome model ( $\hat{\tau}_{Forest}$ ), the doubly-robust estimator with neural network outcome model ( $\hat{\tau}_{Neural}$ ) for different sample sizes in the linear setting with 100 covariates when different amounts of covariates are considered for adjustment in the analysis stage. **Stepwise** refers to when the covariate selection is done in the analysis stage prior to estimation, and **Full** refers to when the analysis is conducted using all covariates. Although there is some instability on the estimators under small samples,  $\hat{\tau}_{Neural}$  is the only estimator benefited from rerandomization under finite samples in this case. All other estimators precision gains follow asymptotic theory.




Figure 35: Coherence gain comparison for the difference in linear outcome model ( $\hat{\tau}_L$ ), the doubly-robust estimator with linear outcome model ( $\hat{\tau}_{Reg}$ ), the doubly-robust estimator with random forest outcome model ( $\hat{\tau}_{Forest}$ ), the doubly-robust estimator with neural network outcome model ( $\hat{\tau}_{Neural}$ ) for different sample sizes in the linear setting with 100 covariates when different amounts of covariates are considered for adjustment in the analysis stage. **Stepwise** refers to when the covariate selection is done in the analysis stage prior to estimation, and **Full** refers to when the analysis is conducted using all covariates. Although there is some instability on the estimators under small samples,  $\hat{\tau}_{Neural}$  is the only estimator benefited from rerandomization under finite samples in this case. For all other estimators, the coherence of each of them estimated in a different set of covariates is not significantly impacted under rerandomization.




Figure 36: Coverage for the difference in linear outcome model ( $\hat{\tau}_L$ ), the doubly-robust estimator with linear outcome model ( $\hat{\tau}_{Reg}$ ), the doubly-robust estimator with random forest outcome model ( $\hat{\tau}_{Forest}$ ), the doubly-robust estimator with neural network outcome model ( $\hat{\tau}_{Neural}$ ) for different sample sizes in the linear setting with 100 covariates when different amounts of covariates are considered for adjustment in the analysis stage. **Stepwise** refers to when the analysis does covariate selection prior to estimation, and **Full** refers to when the analysis is conducted using all covariates. The comparison is between under complete randomization (CR) and Mahalanobis-based rerandomization (RR). Under small sample sizes all estimators are unstable due to the high-dimensionality of the estimation problem, hence the overcoverage.




Figure 37: Power for the difference in linear outcome model ( $\hat{\tau}_L$ ), the doubly-robust estimator with linear outcome model ( $\hat{\tau}_{Reg}$ ), the doubly-robust estimator with random forest outcome model ( $\hat{\tau}_{Forest}$ ), the doubly-robust estimator with neural network outcome model ( $\hat{\tau}_{Neural}$ ) for different sample sizes in the linear setting with 100 covariates when the analysis uses different amounts of covariates in the estimators. **Stepwise** refers to when the analysis has covariate selection prior to estimation, and **Full** refers to when the analysis uses all covariates. The comparison is between under complete randomization (CR) and Mahalanobis-based rerandomization (RR). Under small sample sizes all estimators are unstable due to the high-dimensionality of the estimation problem, hence the lack of power.






Figure 38: Precision gain comparison between the difference-in-means estimator ( $\hat{\tau}_D$ ), the difference in linear outcome models ( $\hat{\tau}_L$ ), the doubly-robust estimator with random forest outcome model ( $\hat{\tau}_{DR}$ ) for different sample sizes and covariates available for design and analysis for the linear setting with 10 covariates and rerandomization is done based on the Euclidean distance. The dashed lines show the asymptotic theoretical results based on the Mahalanobis distance, while the solid lines show the empirical results based on Euclidean distance. For  $\hat{\tau}_D$  rerandomizing under the Euclidean distance has more precision benefits than balancing over the Mahalanobis distance, this is because the Euclidean distance takes into account the correlation between the covariates (Schindl and Branson, 2024). Meanwhile, for the adjusted estimators, rerandomization improves precision especially under the smaller sample sizes.




Figure 39: Coherence gain comparison between the difference-in-means estimator ( $\hat{\tau}_D$ ), the difference in linear outcome models ( $\hat{\tau}_L$ ), the doubly-robust estimator with random forest outcome model ( $\hat{\tau}_{DR}$ ) for different sample sizes and covariates available for design and analysis for the linear setting with 10 covariates and rerandomization is done based on the Euclidean distance. The dashed lines show the asymptotic theoretical results based on the Mahalanobis distance, while the solid lines show the empirical results based on Euclidean distance. Overall, the coherence among the estimators is significantly improved. Furthermore, the coherence gains between  $\hat{\tau}_D$  and  $\hat{\tau}_L$  are also improved under Euclidean distance compared to Mahalanobis distance rerandomization.




Figure 40: Coverage comparison between the difference-in-means ( $\hat{\tau}_D$ ), difference-in-linear outcome models ( $\hat{\tau}_L$ ) and doubly-robust estimator with random forest outcome model ( $\hat{\tau}_{DR}$ ) for different sample sizes and covariates available for design and analysis under complete randomization (CR) and Euclidean-based rerandomization (RR) for the linear setting with 10 covariates. For all data availability scenarios both adjusted estimators achieve nominal coverage level. However, the difference-in-means estimator has slight overcoverage when balancing on all covariates in the design stage (scenarios 1 and 3), and undercoverage when balancing on less covariates in the design stage (scenarios 2 and 4). Under complete randomization, the unadjusted estimator achieves nominal coverage level.




Figure 41: Power comparison between the difference-in-means ( $\hat{\tau}_D$ ), difference-in-linear outcome models ( $\hat{\tau}_L$ ) and doubly-robust estimator with random forest outcome model ( $\hat{\tau}_{DR}$ ) for different sample sizes and covariates available for design and analysis under complete randomization (CR) and Euclidean-based rerandomization (RR) for the linear setting with 10 covariates. All estimators are at least as powerful under rerandomization in comparison to complete randomization for all scenarios of data availability.