

# Controlling the False Discovery Proportion in Matched Observational Studies

Mengqi Lin and Colin Fogarty  
Department of Statistics, University of Michigan

## Abstract

We provide an approach to exploratory data analysis in matched observational studies with a single intervention and multiple endpoints. In such settings, the researcher would like to explore evidence for actual treatment effects among these variables while accounting not only for the possibility of false discoveries, but also for the potential impact of unmeasured confounding. For any candidate subset of hypotheses about these outcomes, we provide sensitivity sets for the proportion of the hypotheses within the subset which are actually true. The resulting sensitivity statements are valid simultaneously over all possible choices for the rejected set, allowing the researcher to search for promising subsets of hypotheses that maintain a large estimated fraction of true discoveries even if hidden bias is present. The approach is well suited to sensitivity analysis, as conclusions that some fraction of outcomes are affected by the treatment exhibit larger robustness to unmeasured confounding than findings that any particular outcome is affected. We show how a sequence of integer programs, in tandem with screening steps, facilitate the efficient computation of the required sensitivity sets. We illustrate the practical utility of our method through both simulation studies and a data example on the long-term impacts of childhood abuse.

*Keywords:* Causal Inference; Sensitivity Analysis; Exploratory Data Analysis; Closed Testing; Randomization Inference; Simultaneous Inference

# 1 Introduction

In observational studies, lack of control over the assignment of interventions leaves causal conclusions susceptible to bias from unobserved covariates. A sensitivity analysis identifies the strength of unmeasured confounding that would be required to overturn the findings of the study. Observational studies can vary considerably in their robustness to hidden bias; see, for instance, Table 4.10 of [Rosenbaum \(2002\)](#). At one extreme, the study of smoking and lung cancer by [Hammond \(1964\)](#) produced evidence of a causal effect that may only be reversed by unmeasured confounders with such a large impact on the chances of smoking as to be viewed implausible in practice. More common however are studies where any particular finding can be overturned by a strength of hidden bias that is harder to dismiss out of hand. In short, small treatment effects cannot generally be distinguished from small amounts of hidden bias. This inspires both the development of informative inferential targets which may exhibit improved robustness to hidden bias; and the provision of techniques allowing practitioners to actively search for robust findings.

The false discovery proportion (FDP) for a set of hypotheses  $R$  is the fraction of hypotheses within  $R$  that are actually true ([Benjamini and Hochberg, 1995](#)). Methods controlling the false discovery rate (FDR) provide procedures for choosing the set  $R$  such that the FDP is controlled at a pre-specified rate in expectation. [Goeman and Solari \(2011\)](#) provide an alternative notion of control tied to the FDP more closely aligned with exploratory research. Rather than prescribing a particular approach for choosing the set of hypotheses  $R$ , they instead describe how one can provide simultaneously valid confidence sets for the FDP of *any* chosen subset of hypotheses  $R$  based upon the output of a closed testing procedure ([Marcus et al., 1976](#)). Their approach, and the simultaneous error control it provides, allows researchers to actively search for promising sets of hypotheses where the upper confidence limit for the FDP is small (equivalently, where the lower confidence bound for the number of false hypotheses in the set is large).

In this work, we develop simultaneously valid sensitivity sets for the false discovery proportion in the presence of multiple hypotheses on treatment effects while allowing for unmeasured confounding of varying strengths. For any given set of hypotheses  $R$ , the changepoint levels produced in the sensitivity analysis quantify how strong the hidden bias would need to be before upper confidence sets on the fraction of null effects exceeds a given threshold. This allow researchers to assess the robustness of the finding that certain fraction of hypotheses are false among *any* chosen subset  $R$ . As will be discussed, findings that a given fraction of hypotheses are false are more robust to hidden bias than the finding that any particular hypothesis is false. This can be useful for several reasons. For instance, if one was looking at the impact of childhood abuse on risk-seeking behavior as an adult, knowing that the finding that half of the outcomes reflective of risk-seeking behavior were affected is robust to hidden bias would still be valuable even if one could not identify which particular outcomes were affected. Furthermore, simultaneously valid sensitivity sets also facilitate the strategic selection of subsets of outcomes that are resilient to unmeasured confounding for further investigation. If one was using an existing observational data set to choose primary endpoints for a future clinical trial, a researcher may use the observational dataset as a pilot to probe multiple sets of outcome variables and identify sets for which the finding that a large fraction are affected by the treatment is most robust to hidden bias before committing resources to a more expensive or invasive randomized study.

At the heart of the statistical appeal of simultaneous FDP control within a sensitivity analysis is the natural occurrence of *non-consonant rejections* where intersections of hypotheses may be rejected without rejecting any individual hypothesis. [Goeman and Solari \(2011\)](#) illustrate how non-consonant rejections, often viewed as wasteful when using closed testing methods for familywise error control, provide additional information in the context of FDP control. As we will show, such rejections arise frequently in sensitivity analysis, a fact that has been leveraged to improve the power for testing individual hypotheses in

the existing literature on sensitivity analysis with multiple endpoints ([Rosenbaum, 2016](#); [Fogarty and Small, 2016](#)). In the presence of non-consonant rejections, although we cannot pinpoint exactly which hypotheses are false, focusing on the FDP allows us to determine how many of hypotheses are false at a given confidence level. This enables us to extract valuable information that would otherwise be lost if we focused solely on individual hypotheses.

## 1.1 Motivating example: long-term impacts of childhood abuse

Childhood physical and emotional abuse (CPEA) has been linked in the literature to a broad range of adverse adult outcomes including psychosocial well-being ([Herrenkohl et al., 2012](#)) and personality ([Lee and Song, 2017](#)), mental health ([Edwards et al., 2003](#)) such as anxiety ([Lindert et al., 2014](#)) and anger ([Maneta et al., 2012](#)), health behaviors such as drinking ([Caetano et al., 2003](#); [Anne Lown et al., 2011](#)) and smoking ([Kristman-Valente et al., 2013](#)), physical health such as obesity ([Danese and Tan, 2014](#)), interpersonal relationships ([Maneta et al., 2012](#); [Paradis and Boucher, 2019](#)), and socio-economic attainment ([Bunting et al., 2018](#)). Datasets such as the Wisconsin Longitudinal Study (WLS), which collect information across many of these domains, offer an opportunity to explore which combinations of adverse outcomes are most plausibly causally affected by CPEA.

Exploring and discovering causal effects among these outcome variables introduces two main challenges. First, even if the data were the result of a randomized experiment, testing multiple outcomes simultaneously risks inflating the false discoveries if not properly controlled. Second, while many methods exist to adjust for observed covariates, seemingly relevant confounders remain unobserved in this study. For instance, a parents unreported mental health condition or history of arrests may influence both the likelihood of childhood abuse and outcomes in adulthood for their children, raising the possibility of unmeasured confounding. Our proposal provides simultaneous confidence sets for the proportion of outcomes that are truly affected by childhood abuse for any subset of outcomes, and quantifies

how robust these confidence statements are to varying strengths of hidden bias. Researchers can thus explore which collections of outcomes maintain a small FDP while allowing for hidden bias. As we demonstrate in Section 6, we remain confident that within certain combinations of outcomes such as alcohol, closeness to spouse, anger and agreeableness, at least half of them are affected by the treatment at larger degrees of hidden bias than is required to overturn the findings on any of the particular outcomes. This evidence can help researchers prioritize these outcomes for further investigation, with greater confidence that they reflect true impacts of CPEA even in the presence of moderate unmeasured confounding.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we introduce the notation and framework of a matched observational study with multiple outcomes, including the formal definition of the false discovery proportion and a model for unmeasured confounding. We then present our main methodological contributions, showing how to construct simultaneously valid sensitivity sets for the FDP in Section 3. Computational strategies and improvements are discussed in Section 4. Simulation studies reflective of the many uses of our proposal are presented in Section 5, while Section 6 applies our techniques to the CPEA example.

## 2 Matched observational studies with multiple causal hypotheses

### 2.1 A finely stratified design with multiple outcomes

In this work we focus on observational studies using matching to adjust for overt biases. Suppose that  $B$  independent strata are formed based on matching algorithms (Ming and Rosenbaum, 2000; Hansen, 2004; Stuart, 2010) performed on the pre-treatment covariates, each corresponding to a matched set. The  $i$ -th stratum contains  $n_i$  2 individuals, resulting in  $N = \sum_{i=1}^B n_i$  total individuals. For notational convenience, we assume that within each

stratum, there is one treated unit and  $n_i - 1$  control units. Extension to full matching, where multiple treated units are allowed, are immediate; See [Rosenbaum \(2002, Chapter 4, Problem 12\)](#).

For individual  $j$  in stratum  $i$ , let  $Z_{ij}$  denote the individual's treatment assignment indicator. Suppose there are  $K$  outcomes of interest, let  $\mathbf{r}_{Tij} = (r_{Tij1}, r_{Tij2}, \dots, r_{TijK}) \in \mathbb{R}^K$  and  $\mathbf{r}_{Cij} = (r_{Cij1}, r_{Cij2}, \dots, r_{CijK}) \in \mathbb{R}^K$  be the  $K$ -dimensional vectors of potential outcomes under treatment and control; the observed outcome vector is  $\mathbf{R}_{ij} = \mathbf{r}_{Tij}Z_{ij} + \mathbf{r}_{Cij}(1 - Z_{ij})$  ([Neyman, 1923](#); [Rubin, 1974](#)). The pre-treatment observed covariates used to form strata are denoted by  $\mathbf{x}_{ij} \in \mathbb{R}^P$  for some integer  $P$ . While multiple unmeasured factors may exist, [Rosenbaum \(2020\)](#) describes how these can be aggregated into a single variable  $u_{ij} \in [0, 1]$ , the probability of assignment to treatment given  $\mathbf{x}_{ij}, r_{Tij}, r_{Cij}$  ensuring that treatment assignment is strongly ignorable once we condition on both  $\mathbf{x}_{ij}$  and  $u_{ij}$ . In this sense,  $u_{ij}$  serves as a dimension-reducing summary of all relevant unmeasured confounders that affect the treatment assignment, making it sufficient to identify the causal effects of the treatment on the outcomes of interest. Following [Rosenbaum \(2020\)](#), we refer to this single unobserved variable as the *principal unobserved covariate*. Let  $\mathbf{Z} = (Z_{11}, Z_{12}, \dots, Z_{Bn_B})$  be the  $N$ -dimensional binary vector of treatment assignment for all individuals, similarly let  $\mathbf{R}, \mathbf{r}_T$ , and  $\mathbf{r}_C$  be the  $N \times K$  matrices of observed outcomes and potential outcomes; use  $\mathbf{x}$  and  $\mathbf{u}$  to denote the  $N \times P$  matrix of observed covariates and the  $N$ -dimensional vector of the principal unobserved covariate for all individuals.

Let  $\Omega$  be the set of all possible treatment assignments  $\mathbf{Z}$  under the given stratification, that is,  $\Omega = \{\mathbf{Z} \in \{0, 1\}^N \mid \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} Z_{ij} = 1 \text{ for all } i = 1, \dots, B\}$ , and abbreviate the event  $\mathbf{Z} \in \Omega$  as  $Z$ . The total number of possible treatment assignments is  $|\Omega| = \prod_{i=1}^B n_i$ . Let  $F = \{\mathbf{r}_C, \mathbf{r}_T, \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}\}$  be the set of potential outcomes along with the measured and unmeasured covariates. Throughout this work, we consider finite population inference, which conditions upon  $F$ . Quantities in  $F$  are thus treated as fixed, and the randomness is modeled solely through the treatment

assignment  $\mathbf{Z}$  (Fisher, 1935).

## 2.2 The false discovery proportion with multiple sharp null hypotheses

For each outcome  $k$ , we consider Fisher’s sharp null hypothesis of no causal effect:

$$H_k : r_{Tijk} = r_{Cijk} \quad \forall i, j. \quad (1)$$

Extensions to other types of hypotheses can be obtained; see Rosenbaum (2002, Section 5) and Rosenbaum (2010, Sections 2.4-2.5) for an overview. We refer to these individual hypotheses  $H_k$  as *elementary hypotheses*. Letting  $[K]$  denote the set  $\{1, \dots, K\}$ , we further define the intersection null hypothesis for any set  $I \subseteq [K]$ , denoted by  $H_I$ , as  $H_I = \bigcap_{k \in I} H_k$ .

Let  $H_0$  denote the set of true null hypotheses, defined as  $H_0 = \{k : H_k \text{ is true}\}$ . For any given subset  $R \subseteq [K]$  with cardinality  $|R|$ , let  $V(R) = |R \cap H_0|$  denote the number of true null hypotheses within  $R$ . Then the fraction  $V(R)/(|R| + 1)$  represents the proportion of true null hypotheses within  $R$ . When  $R$  is the rejection set of a given multiple testing procedure, this fraction is known as the false discovery proportion (FDP; Benjamini and Hochberg, 1995). While we maintain this nomenclature throughout, we note that forthcoming inferential techniques will provide simultaneously valid confidence statements across all possible choices of  $R$ , rather than those arising from a pre-specified procedure.

## 2.3 A model for unmeasured confounding

In the idealized experiment which matching seeks to mimic, each individual within the same matched set would be equally likely to receive treatment, we have  $P(Z_{ij} = 1 | F, Z) = 1/n_i$  for all  $j \in [n_i]$ , and  $\mathbf{Z}$  being uniformly distributed over  $\mathcal{Z}$ :  $P(\mathbf{Z} = \mathbf{z} | F, Z) = 1/|\mathcal{Z}|$  for all  $\mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{Z}$ . In observational studies, unmeasured confounders may bias the distribution of treatment assignments. To assess the impact of unmeasured confounding, we consider the

sensitivity model of Rosenbaum (1987); see also Chapter 4 of Rosenbaum (2002). The model assumes that, prior to matching, individuals receive treatment independently with probabilities  $\pi_{ij} = P(Z_{ij} = 1 | F)$ . Even after matching on observed covariates, differences of unobserved factors might still result in different assignment probabilities. The model bounds how different these assignment probabilities can be as follows: for any two individuals  $j$  and  $j'$  within the same set  $i$ , the odds of receiving the treatment can differ by at most a factor of  $\gamma_i$ :

$$\frac{\pi_{ij}}{\pi_{ij'}} \leq \gamma_i, \quad i, j, j'. \quad (2)$$

A value of  $\gamma_i = 1$  implies  $\pi_{ij} = \pi_{ij'}$  for all  $j, j'$ , indicating no hidden bias and returning to the scenario where treatment assignment behaves as if it were in an idealized experiment, as described above. Values of  $\gamma_i > 1$  quantify the maximum degree of departure from the experimental ideal.

Let  $\pi_{ij} = P(Z_{ij} = 1 | F, Z)$  denote the conditional probability of receiving the treatment given the matched design, and let  $\boldsymbol{\pi} = (\pi_{11}, \pi_{12}, \dots, \pi_{Bn_B})$  be the vector of these probabilities. The model in Equation (2) is equivalent to characterizing the set of all allowable  $\boldsymbol{\pi}$ , which we denote by  $P$ , as those  $\boldsymbol{\pi}$  satisfying: (1)  $\pi_{ij} \geq 0$ ; (2)  $\sum_{j=1}^{n_i} \pi_{ij} = 1$ ; (3)  $\pi_{ij} / \pi_{ij'} \leq \gamma_i$ . Since for a given  $\boldsymbol{\pi}$ , we have  $P(\mathbf{Z} = \mathbf{z} | F, Z) = \prod_{i=1}^B \prod_{j=1}^{n_i} \pi_{ij}^{z_{ij}}$ , this model also characterizes the distributional space for  $\mathbf{Z}$ . As  $\gamma_i$  increases, the bounds on  $\pi_{ij}$  widen and the set  $P$  expands. Consequently, the allowable distributional space for  $\mathbf{Z}$  also broadens, permitting greater deviations from the idealized scenario of no hidden bias.

## 2.4 Sensitivity analysis for a single outcome

In practice, the probability assignment  $\boldsymbol{\pi}$  is unknown due to its dependence on the unknown principal unobserved covariate  $\mathbf{u}$ . A sensitivity analysis for a given bias level of  $\gamma$ , proceeds by finding the *worst-case* probability assignment  $\boldsymbol{\pi} \in P$  that most challenges the statistical conclusion. By incrementally increasing  $\gamma$ , there exists a  $\gamma^*$ , called *sensitivity value* (Zhao, 2019),



at which the statistical conclusion changes. This sensitivity value serves as a measure of the robustness of the findings to hidden bias: a larger indicates greater resilience to hidden bias, whereas a smaller indicates that a modest strength of hidden bias would suffice to overturn the observed results.

Techniques for testing  $H_k$ , the null hypothesis for a particular outcome  $k$ , are well-established for statistics of the form

$$T_k(\mathbf{Z}, \mathbf{q}_k) = \mathbf{Z}\mathbf{q}_k = \sum_{i=1}^B \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} Z_{ij} q_{ijk}, \quad (3)$$

where  $\mathbf{q}_k = [q_{11k}, \dots, q_{Bn_Bk}]$  and  $q_{ijk}$  is some function of  $\mathbf{R}_k$ . This form of test statistic covers a wide range of test statistics as special cases, see [Rosenbaum \(2002\)](#) for more detailed choices of  $q_{ijk}$  and test statistics. Under  $H_k$ ,  $\mathbf{q}_k$  becomes a function of  $\mathbf{r}_{Ck}$ , and is thus a fixed quantity across randomizations. Under probability assignment and  $H_k$ , the distribution of  $T_k(\mathbf{Z}, \mathbf{q}_k)$  is:

$$P(T_k(\mathbf{Z}, \mathbf{q}_k) \leq a \mid F, Z; H_k) = \sum_{\mathbf{z}} \mathbf{1}\{T_k(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{q}_k) \leq a\} P(\mathbf{Z} = \mathbf{z} \mid F, Z), \quad (4)$$

from which we see that the distribution of  $\mathbf{Z}$  determines the distribution of the test statistic. By evaluating the tail probability at the observed test statistic, we obtain the  $p$ -value  $p_k$ , under this probability assignment. Sensitivity analysis at a given in this scenario finds the worst-case  $p$ -value by maximizing  $p_k$ , over all  $P$ :

$$p_{k,} = \max_P p_{k,}. \quad (5)$$

For a given significance level  $\alpha$ , the sensitivity value  $s_k$  corresponds to the smallest  $\alpha$  at which the worst-case  $p$ -value exceeds  $\alpha$ :  $s_k = \inf \{ \alpha \mid p_{k,} > \alpha \}$ .

### 3 Sensitivity sets for the false discovery proportion

#### 3.1 Confidence sets with known assignment probabilities

Suppose for the purpose of illustration that the probability assignment is known. Then, it is straightforward to implement the method of [Goeman and Solari \(2011\)](#) to provide simultaneous confidence sets for the false discovery proportion. Their method makes direct use of a *closed testing procedure* ([Marcus et al., 1976](#)). Closed testing requires the specification of a level- test for each intersection null hypothesis  $H_I$ , called the *local test* for  $H_I$ . The closed testing procedure rejects  $H_I$  if and only if all  $H_J$  with which  $J \supset I$  are rejected by their corresponding local tests. For a given  $\alpha$ , we can obtain a local test for each  $H_I$  through (4). We denote rejection by this local test, which depends on  $\alpha$ , as  $1_{I,\alpha}$ , and further denote the rejection of  $H_I$  in the closed testing procedure under  $\alpha$  by  $\bar{1}_{I,\alpha}$ , then  $\bar{1}_{I,\alpha} = \min_{J \supset I} 1_{J,\alpha}$ . Based on this, [Goeman and Solari \(2011\)](#) proposed a  $100(1 - \alpha)\%$  confidence set for the FDP of any given set  $R$ :

$$\left\{0, \frac{1}{|R|}, \dots, \frac{v(R)}{|R|}\right\}, \quad (6)$$

where the quantity  $v(R)$  (with its dependence on  $\alpha$  suppressed) is defined as the size of the largest subset of  $R$  for which the corresponding intersection null hypothesis is *not* rejected in the closed testing procedure:

$$v(R) = \max_{I \subset R} |I| (1 - \bar{1}_{I,\alpha}), \quad (7)$$

where  $1 - \bar{1}_{I,\alpha}$  indicates the failure of rejection of  $H_I$  in the closed testing procedure.

The ease with which  $v(R)$  may be computed is determined in part by whether or not the closed testing procedure is *consonant*. A closed testing procedure is consonant if any rejection of an intersection null hypothesis  $H_I$  leads to the rejection of at least one elementary hypothesis  $H_k$  within  $I$ , i.e. any  $H_I$  for which  $\bar{1}_{I,\alpha} = 1$  implies the existence of at least one  $k \in I$  such that  $\bar{1}_{k,\alpha} = 1$ . For consonant procedures,  $v(R)$  can be easily obtained by counting

the number of elementary hypotheses in  $R$  that are not rejected:

$$v(R) = \sum_{k \in R} (1 - p_k). \quad (8)$$

In such cases, it suffices to determine the rejections of elementary hypotheses, which can be done efficiently for many closed testing procedures. In contrast, if the closed testing procedure is non-consonant, computing  $v(R)$  generally requires access to the rejections of the entire closed testing tree, which includes all intersection null hypotheses; see Section 3.4.2 for additional discussion.

As an illustration, consider a Bonferroni-based closed testing procedure where the local tests reject  $H_I$  if the smallest  $p$ -value in the set  $I$  is less than  $\alpha/|I|$ . Under a given  $\alpha$ , we may therefore first compute the  $p$ -values  $p_k$ , for each elementary hypothesis  $H_k$  using Equation (4) and obtain the local test:

$$\phi_I = \mathbf{1} \left\{ \min_{k \in I} p_k, \frac{\alpha}{|I|} \right\}. \quad (9)$$

The procedure based on these local tests is consonant. Therefore, obtaining  $v(R)$  for any  $R$  requires only the rejections of the elementary hypotheses, which can be efficiently determined using the Holm-Bonferroni procedure (Holm, 1979).

### 3.2 The generalized sensitivity value

As noted in Section 2.4, knowing  $\alpha$  is unrealistic due to the potential presence of hidden bias. We next turn to the sensitivity analysis tool to assess the robustness of confidence sets produced by the method of Goeman and Solari (2011) against unmeasured confounding. Since a larger value of  $v(R)$  represents more potential false discoveries, the sensitivity analysis at a given  $\alpha$ , in this context, seeks to find the largest value of  $v(R)$  over all allowable probability assignments  $\mathbf{p} \in P$ . We denote this worst-case quantity as  $v(R) = \max_{\mathbf{p} \in P} v(R)$ . Based on  $v(R)$ , the set

$$\left\{ 0, \frac{1}{|R|}, \dots, \frac{v(R)}{|R|} \right\}$$

thus provides the most conservative confidence set for FDP over all allowable  $P$ , which accounts for the most adverse unmeasured confounding effects permissible under the specified level of hidden bias  $\gamma$ . We refer to this set as *sensitivity set*.


As  $\gamma$  increases, allowing for higher levels of hidden bias,  $v(R)$  is a non-decreasing, piecewise constant function of  $\gamma$ . In other words, increasing  $\gamma$  can never result in a smaller upper bound on the number of false discoveries in the context of sensitivity analysis, and may increase this upper bound. Since  $v(R)$  takes integer values in  $\{0, 1, \dots, |R|\}$ , for each integer  $r \in \{0, 1, \dots, |R| - 1\}$ , there exists a critical value of  $\gamma$  at which  $v(R)$  increases from  $r$  to  $r+1$ . Denote this changepoint value by  $(R, r)$ , then

$$(R, r) = \inf \{ \gamma \mid v(R) > r \}, \quad \text{for } r \in \{0, 1, \dots, |R| - 1\}. \quad (10)$$

We refer to  $(R, r)$  as the *generalized sensitivity value* for  $R$  at candidate number  $r$  of true null hypotheses. This definition generalizes the sensitivity value in Zhao (2019), which was defined for a single outcome, to any subset of outcomes. It provides a measure of the robustness of subset  $R$  against unmeasured confounding. Specifically,  $(R, r)$  represents the minimum level of hidden bias required to claim that there are at least  $r + 1$  true nulls in  $R$ , i.e., the number of true discoveries (false nulls) in  $R$  is less than  $|R| - (r + 1)$ . A larger value of  $(R, r)$  indicates that a higher level of hidden bias is necessary to assert the existence of at least  $r + 1$  true nulls in set  $R$ , thereby demonstrating greater robustness of  $R$  against unmeasured confounding.

To illustrate this concept, consider Figure 1. As  $\gamma$  increases,  $v(R)$  increases in a stepwise manner. Each changepoint  $(R, r)$  marks the smallest  $\gamma$  at which the number of true nulls in set  $R$  we are confident about increases from  $r$  to  $r + 1$ . For instance,  $\gamma = (R, 0) = 2$ , as the point where  $v(R)$  increases from 0 to 1, indicates that in order to claim confidently that there exists at least one true null in  $R$ ,  $\gamma$  has to be greater than 2, i.e., the odds of treatment assignment for any two individuals within the same matched set can differ by at least a

factor of 2.



**Figure 1:**  $v(R)$  as a function of  $R$ .

We now provide two practical applications of the generalized sensitivity value.

**Application 1: quantifying robustness of subsets of hypotheses.** By evaluating the generalized sensitivity value  $(R, r)$  for a given subset of outcomes  $R$ , researchers can quantify the robustness of their findings regarding the number of true discoveries within the subset. For instance, consider setting  $r$  as  $r = |R|/2$ . The corresponding  $(R, r)$  quantifies the minimum level of hidden bias required to result in more than half of the outcomes in  $R$  being designated null effects, or equivalently, to cause the upper confidence limit on the FDP to exceed 50% for the subset  $R$ .

To illustrate this, imagine an epidemiological study investigating the impact of air pollution exposure on multiple health outcomes, such as respiratory diseases, cardiovascular conditions, and cognitive impairments. Suppose the researcher has identified a subset  $R$  of outcomes where air pollution appears to have a significant adverse effect. Using our method, the researcher can calculate  $(R, r)$  for  $r = |R|/2$  to assess the robustness of their findings. If  $(R, r)$  is large, this indicates that a relatively strong bias from unmeasured factors would be necessary to reduce the number of true effects to less than half of the outcomes in  $R$ . This provides confidence that air pollution has a robust detrimental effect on multiple health outcomes, even if one is not able to pinpoint which particular outcomes are negatively impacted. Conversely, if  $(R, r)$  is small, even a weak unmeasured confounder could overturn the con-

clusions, suggesting that the findings may not be robust. Similarly, in behavioral sciences, a researcher might study the impact of a particular habit (e.g., exercise, dietary changes) on various psychological or physiological measures. Calculating  $(R, r)$  allows the researcher to find subsets of measures for which evidence that a large fraction are affected is robust to hidden bias.

**Application 2: selecting robust subsets of outcomes.** When planning a future clinical trial, a researcher often faces the challenge of deciding which outcome variables to designate as primary. Including too many primary endpoints can reduce statistical power. One practical solution would be to use an existing observational dataset to guide the choice of endpoints. The generalized sensitivity value enables researchers to compare different subsets of outcomes and select the subset most resilient to unmeasured confounding.

Specifically, suppose a researcher aims to select a subset of size  $R$  out of  $K$  total outcomes, resulting in  $\binom{K}{R}$  possible subsets. By setting a tolerance  $r$  for the number of null effects within the subset, the researcher compares  $(R, r)$  across all candidate subsets  $R$ . Selecting the subset with the largest  $(R, r)$  ensures that the outcomes chosen are most robust to unmeasured confounding, while ensuring that at least  $R - r$  of the outcomes have true effects. This approach not only helps identify the most robust subset of outcomes but also uses the observational study effectively to inform the subsequent randomized clinical trial.

### 3.3 A naive approach to controlling the false discovery proportion

A seemingly natural approach to calculate  $v(R)$  would be to first compute the worst-case  $p$ -values for each hypothesis individually and then apply the method to these worst-case  $p$ -values. Specifically, for a given  $I$ , we compute the worst-case  $p$ -values  $p_k$ , for  $k \in [K]$ , as described in Equation (5). When using the Bonferroni test for the local tests, we have:

$$I,^{\text{naive}} = \mathbf{1} \left\{ \min_{k \in I} p_k, \frac{1}{|I|} \right\}.$$

Then, the closed testing procedure based on these local tests is consonant, and Holm-Bonferroni can be used to determine which elementary hypotheses are rejected, allowing us to compute  $v(R)$  for any set  $R$  via Equation (8).

While this approach provides a valid FDP confidence set for any  $R$ , it is generally conservative, often dramatically so. This conservativeness arises because the worst-case  $p$ -values  $p_k$ , are computed separately for each hypothesis  $k$ , and the worst-case probability assignments that maximize these  $p$ -values are allowed to vary across hypotheses. While the probability assignments are unknown, there is a common vector of probability assignments across the outcome variables. To see the potential for improvements, consider instead finding a single probability assignment vector that most challenges the rejection of  $H_I$  though minimizing  $I$ , over all allowable , resulting in

$$I, = \min_P I, = \mathbf{1} \left\{ \max_P \min_{kI} p_k, \frac{1}{|I|} \right\}. \quad (11)$$

This provides a uniform improvement on the  $I,^{\text{naive}}$  due to the minimax inequality (Fogarty and Small, 2016):

$$I,^{\text{naive}} = \mathbf{1} \left\{ \min_{kI} \max_P p_k, \frac{1}{|I|} \right\} \mathbf{1} \left\{ \max_P \min_{kI} p_k, \frac{1}{|I|} \right\} = I,. \quad (12)$$

Interestingly, as will be shown in Section 3.4, exploiting the improved sensitivity analysis for each local test on the right hand side of Equation (11) turns out to be sufficient to obtain the exact quantity  $v(R)$ . However, perhaps surprisingly, this comes with the price of moving away from a consonant closed testing procedure, even for Bonferroni-based procedures, as we will illustrate in Section 3.4.2.

### 3.4 More powerful false discovery control

#### 3.4.1 Deriving $v(R)$ through closed sensitivity analysis

To improve power over the naive approach, we return to the definition of  $v(R) = \max_P v(R)$ , from which we see that we should directly target in finding the single  $P$  that gives the largest value of  $v(R)$  (we suppress dependence of  $v(R)$  on  $\alpha$ ). According to Equation (7), this quantity is determined by identifying the  $R$  that yields the largest size of the subset  $I \subseteq R$  for which the corresponding  $H_I$  is not rejected in the closed testing procedure; see the web-based supporting material for a formal derivation. This occurs when there exists some superset  $J \supseteq I$  where we fail to reject  $H_J$  when performing a sensitivity analysis for the local test for  $H_J$ , as demonstrated by the following equation:

$$I, = \min_P \min_{JI} J, = \min_{JI} \min_P J, = \min_{JI} J, \quad (13)$$

Therefore, obtaining the sensitivity analyses for all the local tests is sufficient to construct sensitivity sets for the FDP for any  $R$ . We refer to the closed testing procedure based on these local tests  $I,$  as a *closed sensitivity analysis*.


#### 3.4.2 Non-consonance in the closed sensitivity analysis

While the closed sensitivity analysis provides the exact sensitivity analysis for Bonferroni-based sensitivity sets for the method of [Goeman and Solari \(2011\)](#), it necessitates moving away from a consonant closed testing procedure. That is, *non-consonant rejections* are inevitable in the closed sensitivity analysis. A rejection of an intersection null hypothesis  $H_I$  is non-consonant if none of the elementary hypotheses  $H_k$  for  $k \in I$  are rejected.


To illustrate, consider performing a Bonferroni-based closed sensitivity analysis on three elementary hypotheses,  $H_1, H_2$ , and  $H_3$ , at a given significance level  $\alpha$  and a sensitivity level  $\gamma > 1$ . Figure 2 (adapted from Figure 1 of [Goeman and Solari 2011](#))) displays the results, where nodes with crosses indicate rejected intersection hypotheses. The rejection of  $H_2 \cap H_3$ ,



marked with a dashed cross, represents a non-consonant rejection as it occurs despite neither  $H_2$  nor  $H_3$  being individually rejected. Such non-consonant rejections are impossible in the conventional Bonferroni-based closed testing procedure for a particular value of  $\alpha$ , which is consonant by design.



**Figure 2:** Closed sensitivity analysis for  $H_1$ ,  $H_2$ ,  $H_3$ :  $H_I$  with a cross indicates  $\alpha_I = 1$ , the dashed cross of  $H_2$   $H_3$  indicates a non-consonant rejection.



**Figure 3:** Venn diagram for  $P = P^1 P^2 P^3$  for the non-consonant rejection in Figure 2:  $P^2$  and  $P^3$  indicate retention of  $H_2$  and  $H_3$  in closed sensitivity analysis, respectively.

To explain how non-consonance arises in a Bonferroni-based procedure, note that  $\alpha_{\{2,3\}} = 1$  implies that for all  $P$ , we have  $\min\{p_2, p_3\} \geq \alpha/2$ . Therefore,  $P$  can be partitioned into three disjoint subsets:  $P^1 = \{p_2, \alpha/2, p_3, \alpha/2\}$ ,  $P^2 = \{p_2, > \alpha/2, p_3, \alpha/2\}$ , and  $P^3 = \{p_3, > \alpha/2, p_2, \alpha/2\}$ . Within  $P^2$  and  $P^3$ , we further define subsets:

$$P^2 = \{P^2, p_2, > \alpha/2\} = \{P^2, \alpha_{\{2\}}, = 0\},$$

$$P^3 = \{P^3, p_3, > \alpha/2\} = \{P^3, \alpha_{\{3\}}, = 0\}.$$

See the Venn diagram in Figure 3 for this visualization. When  $P^2$  and  $P^3$ , meaning that there exists  $\alpha$  where  $p_2$  and  $p_3$  exceed  $\alpha/2$ , we therefore fail to reject  $H_2$  and  $H_3$  individually in sensitivity analyses. However, for those  $P^2$ , we have  $p_3, \alpha/2$ , and for those  $P^3$ , we have  $p_2, \alpha/2$ , therefore we can still reject  $H_2$   $H_3$ . This occurs when for each hypothesis, there exists a pattern of hidden bias which can force the test to fail to reject, yet where there does not exist a *single* pattern of hidden bias for which all of the rejections of hypotheses within an intersection null are overturned.

Figure 2 highlights how the proposal of [Goeman and Solari \(2011\)](#) can extract useful

information from non-consonant rejections which is typically discarded in conventional uses of closed testing for familywise error control. For the closed testing tree in Figure 2, the sensitivity set for the FDP at  $\alpha$  is  $\{0, 1/2\}$  for the set  $R = \{2, 3\}$ . That is, even though  $H_2$  and  $H_3$  could not be rejected, the sensitivity set at  $\alpha$  suggests that at least one of these two hypotheses must be false. In the presence of non-consonant rejections, we cannot rely solely on the rejections of elementary hypotheses as in Equation (8) to determine  $v(R)$ . Instead, we must examine the rejections of higher-level intersection hypotheses within the closed testing tree. This increases computational complexity and necessitates the development of efficient algorithms for computing  $v(R)$ .

## 4 Computation

### 4.1 Computing $v(R)$ through integer programming

We assume in this section that the elementary hypotheses  $H_k$  for all  $k \in [K]$  have two-sided alternatives. For simplicity, we abbreviate  $T_k(\mathbf{Z}, \mathbf{q}_k) = \mathbf{Z}\mathbf{q}_k$  as  $T_k$ . Under probability assignment  $\mathbb{P}$  where  $T_k$  follows the distribution in Equation (4), we use  $\mu_k = E[T_k - F, Z; H_k]$  and  $\sigma_k^2 = \text{Var}(T_k - F, Z; H_k)$  to denote the expectation and variance of  $T_k$  under  $\mathbb{P}$ . Under suitable regularity conditions, we have the asymptotic normality for  $T_k$ :

$$\frac{T_k - \mu_k}{\sigma_k} \xrightarrow{d} N(0, 1), \quad (14)$$

and the squared deviate following a  $\chi^2_1$  distribution; see the web-based supporting materials for a description of sufficient conditions for this convergence in distribution. Therefore, for a given  $\alpha$ , and a parameter  $c \in (0, 1)$ , if we define

$$\chi^2_k(\alpha; c) = \left( T_k - \sum_{i=1}^B \mu_i^T \mathbf{q}_{ik} \right)^2 \sum_{i=1}^B \frac{1}{\sigma_i^2} \left( \mathbf{q}_{ik}^T \mathbf{q}_{ik} \right)^2, \quad (15)$$

where  $\chi^2_{1-c}$  is the  $1 - c$  quantile of a  $\chi^2_1$  distribution, the event that the  $p$ -value for outcome  $k$  satisfies  $p_k \leq c$  can be approximated by  $\mathbb{1}_{k(\cdot; c) \leq 0}$ . Similarly,  $I_c$  in Equation (9) can be approximated by:

$$I_c = \mathbb{1} \left\{ \min_P \max_{k \in I} k(\cdot; c) \leq 0 \right\}.$$

Therefore,  $v(R)$  can be computed through:

$$v(R) = \max_{I \subseteq R} \max_{J \supseteq I} |I| \mathbb{E} \mathbb{1} \left\{ \min_P \max_{k \in J} k(\cdot; c) \leq 0 \right\}.$$

Based on this formula and what we described in Section 3.4, in principle a brute-force enumeration of all subsets  $I \subseteq R$  and all supersets  $J \supseteq I$  would enable us to compute  $v(R)$  for any given  $R$ . However, such enumeration could be computationally prohibitive. Instead, we formulate an integer program which targets the computation of a quantity more closely aligned with the definition of  $v(R)$ . In particular, noticing that only the *size* of  $I$  matters in determining  $v(R)$ , rather than the specific subset  $I$  itself, we consider all subsets  $I \subseteq R$  of the same size in a single optimization, rather than separately evaluating each intersection null in different optimization programs.

The search starts with the largest possible value of  $|I|$  from  $|R|$  down to 0. For each  $r \in \{|R|, \dots, 1\}$ , all subsets  $I \subseteq R$  with cardinality  $r$  are considered simultaneously to see if any one of them where we could fail to reject in the closed testing procedure. In the integer program, we define binary variables  $x_k \in \{0, 1\}$  for each  $k \in R$ , indicating whether  $k$  is included in the candidate subset  $I$ . By enforcing the constraint  $\sum_{k \in R} x_k = r$ , all subsets of cardinality  $r$  are considered. Further, evaluating whether we could fail to reject a candidate subset  $I$  in the closed testing procedure involves considering all its supersets  $J$ . Since the rejection condition for each superset  $J$  depends on its cardinality through  $k(\cdot; c/|J|)$ , we consider all supersets of the same size together. That is, we introduce binary variables  $y_k \in \{0, 1\}$  for each  $k \in R$ , indicating whether  $k$  is included in the candidate superset  $J$ . By enforcing the constraint  $\sum_{k=1}^K y_k = v$ , we simultaneously consider all supersets of fixed size  $v$  in a single,

integrated step. This structured search is formalized as a quadratically constrained integer program, detailed explicitly in Algorithm 1.

---

**Algorithm 1** Integer program for computing  $v(R)$

---

**For**  $r = |R|, |R| - 1, \dots, 1$ :

**For**  $v = r, \dots, K$ :

$$\begin{aligned} & \min_{y, \mathbf{k}} y \\ & \text{s.t.} \quad \mathbf{k}_R = r, \quad \mathbf{k}_{[K]} = v, \\ & \quad y \leq \mathbf{k}(\cdot, /v) \quad \text{if } \mathbf{k} = 1, \\ & \quad y < 0, \\ & \quad \mathbf{k} \in \{0, 1\} \text{ for all } k, \quad P. \end{aligned}$$

**If** the problem is feasible **then return**  $r$ .

**Return** 0.

---

In this formulation, for each fixed subset size  $r$ , we iterate over superset cardinalities  $|J| = v$ , starting from the smallest value  $r$  up to the largest  $K$ . This ordering leverages the observation that failures are more frequent for smaller subsets in a sensitivity analysis. The auxiliary variable  $y$  is introduced to represent  $\max_{k \in J} \mathbf{k}(\cdot, /v)$ . By minimizing  $y$  and imposing  $y \leq \mathbf{k}(\cdot, /v)$  whenever  $\mathbf{k} = 1$ , we ensure that  $y$  is at least as large as the largest  $\mathbf{k}$  for  $k \in J$ . Consequently, the constraint  $y < 0$  enforces  $\max_{k \in J} \mathbf{k}(\cdot, /v) < 0$ , in line with the original condition for failing to reject the local test for  $H_J$ . The feasibility check—determining whether a solution that satisfies all constraints exists—identifies if there exists some  $P$  under which the local test for  $H_J$  fails to reject. If such a solution is found at  $r$ , we terminate the search and return  $v(R) = r$ . Otherwise, we continue the downward search for smaller  $r$ .

For other uses of integer programming in both the design and analysis phase of observational studies deploying matching, see [Zubizarreta \(2012\)](#); [Pimentel et al. \(2015\)](#); [Zhang et al. \(2024\)](#); [Heng and Shaw \(2025\)](#).

## 4.2 Screening rules

Algorithm 1 computes  $v(R)$  by iterating downward through possible subset sizes  $r$ , starting from  $|R|$  and, for each fixed  $r$ , incrementing superset cardinalities  $v$  from  $r$  to  $K$ . To reduce the computational complexity of this nested search, we propose simple yet effective *screening rules* based on individual worst-case  $p$ -values, which allow us to rule out certain values of  $r$  and  $v$ .

To provide intuition for these rules, consider  $R$  as a singleton containing exactly one outcome, for instance,  $R = \{k\}$ . In this scenario, the quantity of interest simplifies to  $v(\{k\}) = 1_{k,}$ , i.e. the indicator of whether  $H_k$  is rejected or not in the closed sensitivity analysis. Our screening rules examine the worst-case  $p$ -value  $p_{k,}$ , and seek to determine the rejection or failure of rejection of  $H_k$  using  $p_{k,}$  alone; see the web-based supporting material for the derivation of  $p_{k,}$  under a normal approximation, which can be accomplished without integer programming. The screening rule for a singleton  $\{k\}$  is

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{Reject } H_k, & \text{if } p_{k,} \leq \bar{\alpha}, \\ \text{Decision for } H_k = \{ & \text{Fail to reject } H_k, & \text{if } p_{k,} > \bar{\alpha}, \\ & \text{Proceed with Algorithm 1,} & \text{if } \bar{\alpha} < p_{k,}. \end{aligned} \tag{16}$$

When our goal is to obtain the decisions for all elementary hypotheses, this screening step would screen out hypotheses whose worst-case  $p$ -values are either below  $\bar{\alpha}/K$  or above  $\bar{\alpha}$ , leaving only the remaining hypotheses to be handled by the integer program.

The following theorem highlights the merits of screening using individual  $p$ -values. It shows that under mild regularity conditions, for fixed values of  $\bar{\alpha}$  this screening step alone suffices asymptotically to determine the sensitivity set for the FDP when considering singleton sets  $R$ .

**Theorem 1.** *Suppose that the test statistics  $T_k$  obey univariate central limit theorems for  $k = 1, \dots, K$ , and let  $\mu_k = E[T_k - F, Z]$ . For any  $\bar{\alpha} > 0$ , let  $\mu_{k,}$  be the worst-case expectation for*

$T_k$  when testing the sharp null with a two-sided alternative. Suppose that  $K = o(\exp\{B\})$  and that  $\liminf_B \min_{k=1,\dots,K} |k|/B = \delta$  for some  $\delta > 0$ . Then, as  $B \rightarrow \infty$ ,

$$P\left(\sum_{k=1}^K \frac{|k|}{K} < p_k\right) \rightarrow 0.$$

That is, the probability of invoking the integer program when evaluating all possible singleton sets  $R$  converges to zero.

See the web-based supporting information for a proof, along with primitive conditions under which the required univariate central limit theorems will hold. For details of the screening rules for general  $R$  to reduce the search of the values for both  $r$  and  $v$  in the integer program, see the web-based supporting materials. We provide an implementation in Python using Gurobi, which combines the integer program and these computational enhancements. In Section 5.3 and Section 5.4, we further provide simulation studies to demonstrate the efficiency of our integer program and the screening rules.

## 5 Simulation study

### 5.1 Simulation setup

Throughout the simulation studies presented in this section, we consider matched-pairs designs. Let  $B$  denote the number of matched pairs and  $K$  be the number of outcomes of interest. For each pair  $i \in \{1, \dots, B\}$  and individual  $j \in \{1, 2\}$  within that pair, we generate potential outcomes under treatment,  $\mathbf{r}_{Tij} \in \mathbb{R}^K$ , and under control,  $\mathbf{r}_{Cij} \in \mathbb{R}^K$ , via

$$\mathbf{r}_{Cij} \stackrel{\text{i.i.d.}}{\sim} N(\mathbf{0}, \Sigma), \quad \mathbf{r}_{Tij} = \mathbf{r}_{Cij} + \boldsymbol{\tau}, \quad (17)$$

where  $\Sigma$  is the covariance matrix and  $\tau$  is the treatment-effect vector. We will use the following two values for  $\tau$ :

$$\tau^{(1)} = (\text{linspace}(0.15, 0.35, K)) \quad \text{and} \quad \tau^{(2)} = (0.3, \dots, 0.3, 0, \dots, 0). \quad (18)$$

$K/2$   $K/2$

The first  $\tau$  increases linearly from 0.15 to 0.35 across its  $K$  components, while the second assigns a treatment effect of 0.3 to the first half of the outcomes and 0 to the remaining half.

Two covariance matrices will be used:

$$\Sigma^{(1)} = \mathbf{I}_K \quad \text{and} \quad \Sigma^{(2)} = (1 - \rho) \mathbf{I}_K + \rho \mathbf{1}_K \mathbf{1}_K', \quad \text{where } \rho = 0.2. \quad (19)$$

The first one indicates independence among all outcomes, whereas the second one uses equicorrelation structure, with correlation  $\rho = 0.2$ . For all sections besides Section 5.5,  $Z_{ij}$  is generated with no unmeasured confounding present; see the web-based supporting material for the generative model used in Section 5.5. For each outcome  $k$ , we choose Huber's M-statistic (Huber, 1981; Rosenbaum, 2007) with inner trimming constant 2.5 as our test statistic.

## 5.2 Improved power over the naive approach

This section presents a simulation study to demonstrate the power of our exact approach in Section 3.4 over the naive approach in Section 3.3 through comparing the values of  $v(R)$ , the number of true nulls within  $R$ , obtained by the two approaches.

We set  $B = 500$  and consider  $K = 4$  outcomes. We use  $\tau^{(1)}$  in Equation (18) as the treatment-effect vector and use both  $\Sigma^{(1)}$  and  $\Sigma^{(2)}$  in Equation (19) to simulate data. For each setting, we generate 1,000 datasets. For each dataset, we apply both the naive and exact approaches to compute  $v(R)$  for  $R = [K]$  under varying values of  $\rho \in \{1, 1.25, 1.5, 1.75\}$ . We compare the proportion of times that  $v(R)$  takes the values in  $\{0, 1, 2, 3, 4\}$  for the two methods over the 1,000 Monte-Carlo iterations.

Method		Proportions of $v(R)$ values									
		(1)					(2)				
		0	1	2	3	4	0	1	2	3	4
1.0	Exact	0.590	0.333	0.076	0.001	0.000	0.576	0.331	0.091	0.002	0.000
1.0	Naive	0.590	0.333	0.076	0.001	0.000	0.576	0.331	0.091	0.002	0.000
1.25	Exact	0.008	0.125	0.496	0.343	0.028	0.018	0.124	0.393	0.387	0.078
1.25	Naive	0.004	0.087	0.384	0.418	0.107	0.015	0.089	0.339	0.413	0.143
1.5	Exact	0.000	0.000	0.043	0.528	0.429	0.000	0.001	0.031	0.331	0.636
1.5	Naive	0.000	0.000	0.006	0.215	0.779	0.000	0.001	0.012	0.202	0.785
1.75	Exact	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.097	0.903	0.000	0.000	0.002	0.029	0.969
1.75	Naive	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.013	0.987	0.000	0.000	0.001	0.011	0.988

**Table 1:** Distributions of  $v(R)$  under the exact and naive approaches for two .

Table 1 presents the results. We see that for both values of , the two methods are equivalent at  $\gamma = 1$  where no unmeasured confounding exists, yielding identical distributions for  $v(R)$ . For  $\gamma > 1$ , the exact approach produces values of  $v(R)$  that are at most those of the naive approach, reflecting the power gains of our exact approach discussed in Section 3.3. As we see, the distribution for  $v(R)$  using the naive approach stochastically dominates that under the exact approach for  $\gamma > 1$ , indicating that the sensitivity intervals for the false discovery proportion produced by the naive method are wider. For instance, at  $\gamma = 1.5$  and  $\alpha = 0.05$ , the naive approach reports that all four of the outcomes are unaffected by the treatment in 77.9% of simulations, while this percentage is only 42.9% for our method.

### 5.3 Runtime comparison

We now demonstrate the computational efficiency of Algorithm 1 over an enumerative approach based upon Fogarty and Small (2016). This competitor method produces the same sensitivity sets as our method (so it has the same statistical properties), but differs in how the sets are determined. This method uses the same screening steps as our approach, but when the screening steps are inconclusive it computes the exact sensitivity sets for the FDP through brute-force enumeration of the required components of closed testing tree. That




is, it directly performs a sensitivity analysis for intersection null hypothesis directly, rather than addressing all intersection nulls of a given cardinality in one step as our approach does.

We set  $B = 500$  and consider  $K \in \{10, 20\}$  number of outcomes. For each  $K$ , we use both <sup>(1)</sup> and <sup>(2)</sup> in Equation (18) and both <sup>(1)</sup> and <sup>(2)</sup> in Equation (19) to simulate data. For each pair of  $(\cdot, \cdot)$ , we generate 1,000 datasets and conduct the closed sensitivity analyses for all outcomes under  $\{1.25, 1.5, 1.75\}$ . This yields 12 simulation settings in total for each  $K$ , as arranged in Table 2.

	(1)						(2)					
	(1)			(2)			(1)			(2)		
	1.25	1.5	1.75	1.25	1.5	1.75	1.25	1.5	1.75	1.25	1.5	1.75
Setting	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12

**Table 2:** The 12 simulation settings.

For each setting, we record the runtime needed to perform closed sensitivity analyses for all outcomes using both our proposal and the enumerative approach. To reiterate, we apply our screening rules to both approaches. The approaches thus differ solely in the efficiency with which they evaluate the components of the closed testing tree which screening cannot account for. Figure 4 compares the average runtimes. Across all the simulation settings, we observe reductions in computation time from our proposal ranging from 5-fold to 300-fold. Notably, in settings 1 and 7 with  $K = 20$  and  $B = 500$ , enumerative closed testing takes roughly 3 hours to complete, whereas our proposal finishes in only a few minutes.



**Figure 4:** Runtime comparison (in minutes) of 12 settings in Table 2.

## 5.4 Effectiveness of screening rules

In this section we explore the benefits of the screening rules developed in (16) for varying sample sizes, as considered by Theorem 1. We set  $K = 10$  and consider increasing sample sizes  $B \in \{500, 1000, 2000, 5000, 10000\}$ . We use <sup>(2)</sup> and <sup>(1)</sup> to generate the data. For each  $B$ , we generate 1,000 datasets. For each dataset, we perform the closed sensitivity analysis for each outcome using sensitivity parameters  $\{1.25, 1.5, 1.75, 2.0\}$  and record (1) whether the screening step alone suffices to determine the rejections of all hypotheses, i.e., if the integer program is triggered at least once (2) the frequency the integer programs are invoked across  $K$  outcomes.

$B$	Called at least once					Average frequency				
	500	1000	2000	5000	10000	500	1000	2000	5000	10000
1.25	0.848	0.601	0.042	0.000	0.000	0.161	0.081	0.004	0.000	0.000
1.50	0.473	0.639	0.827	0.821	0.314	0.060	0.093	0.147	0.142	0.037
1.75	0.047	0.017	0.008	0.000	0.000	0.005	0.002	0.001	0.000	0.000
2.00	0.001	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000

**Table 3:** Proportion of datasets that call the integer program at least once (left) and the average frequency of integer program calls per dataset (right).

Table 3 presents the results. We see that as  $B$  increases, both the proportion of times when we need to run the integer program at all and the fraction of outcomes for which the integer program runs decrease, aligning with Theorem 1. This shows that the screening rules alone are typically sufficient to determine the rejections of all outcomes in the closed sensitivity analysis, thereby improving computational efficiency in large observational studies.

## 5.5 Selecting robust subsets of outcomes

We now demonstrate how the generalized sensitivity value could be used to identify promising subsets of outcomes. Consider a scenario involving  $K = 4$  outcomes, of which two genuinely exhibit treatment effects and two are unaffected by the treatment yet display spurious effects in observed data due to unmeasured confounding. A researcher, blind to

this, aims to select two outcomes reflecting which are actually affected by the treatment for subsequent investigation (for instance, in a follow-up clinical trial). A common strategy would choose promising outcome variables solely based on the smallest observed  $p$ -values at  $\alpha = 1$ , implicitly assuming the absence of unmeasured confounding; we refer to this method as the *naive selector*. In contrast, the generalized sensitivity valuebased methods explicitly account for potential unmeasured confounding by selecting the subset  $R$  that maximizes the value  $(R, 1)$  among all  $\binom{4}{2} = 6$  candidate subsets of size 2. In words, this approach finds the subset of size 2 for which the finding that at least one outcome is affected by the treatment is the most robust to hidden bias. We refer to this selector as the  $(R, 1)$  *selector*.

In our simulation setup, we fix  $B = 500$  matched pairs. The first two outcomes are generated with a true positive treatment effect, while the last two outcomes have no true effect. We denote by  $\{0.2, 0, 0.2\}$  the correlation between outcomes 1 and 2, whereas the correlation between outcomes 3 and 4 is fixed at 0.2. Unmeasured confounding is present, and treatment assignment  $Z_{ij}$  is biased based upon the potential outcomes for outcomes 3 and 4 so that individuals with higher values on these outcomes are more likely to be treated. Consequently, even outcomes without true effects exhibit positive treated-minus-control differences in the observed data. The treatment effect parameter is adjusted to ensure all outcomes have similar average treated-minus-control differences, making it difficult to separate true effects from spurious ones. Additional details on this data-generating process can be found in the web-based supporting material.

To assess performance, we define a selector as *successful* if it selects at least one outcome that is actually affected by the treatment. We generate 1,000 datasets for each value of  $\alpha$  and record the proportion of successes. Table 4 presents these proportions for each value of  $\alpha$ . In all cases, the  $(R, 1)$  selector outperforms the naive selector. These results clearly demonstrate that using  $(R, r)$  to guide subset selection more reliably identifies outcomes with genuine treatment effects, whereas the naive approach is more likely to select spurious

signals.

	Naive selector	$(R, 1)$ selector
0.2	0.810	0.896
0	0.781	0.857
0.2	0.829	0.906

**Table 4:** Proportion of successful selections by two selectors.

## 6 Application: Effects of CPEA exposure in the Wisconsin Longitudinal Study

The Wisconsin Longitudinal Study (WLS) is a long-term investigation of individuals who graduated from Wisconsin high schools in 1957, with data collected in multiple follow-up waves. For this analysis, we focus on respondents who participated in the 20042005 round, at which point they were approximately 65 years old. After excluding individuals with missing data on key covariates and outcomes, our working sample comprises  $N = 3469$  individuals. We investigate a total of 21 outcomes spanning multiple domains outlined in the motivating example in Section 1.1, and employ a full matching procedure (Hansen, 2004) to reduce bias from 13 observable confounders. See the web-based supporting material for the construction of the CPEA exposure indicator, the outcome variables, and the quality of the produced matched sets. We test Fisher’s sharp null of no effect for each outcome variable. We use the MantelHaenszel statistic (Mantel and Haenszel, 1959) for binary outcomes, and for continuous endpoints we use Hubers type M-statistic (Huber, 1981) with inner trimming constant 2.5 as our test statistic.

As a demonstration of the explorations enabled by our procedure, we first consider a *post-hoc* selection strategy to identify a promising subset of the  $K = 21$  outcome variables for which the finding that half of them are actually affected by the treatment is robust to hidden bias. Once this subset of outcomes is identified, we can leverage the simultaneity

property of our procedure to provide a valid sensitivity interval for the FDP within the chosen subset. To proceed, we first compute the conventional  $p$  values for each of the 21 original outcome variables assuming no hidden bias ( $\alpha = 1$ ), and select those with  $p \leq 0.05$ . Denote this preliminary set by  $R^0$ , which contains 13 outcomes in our data. We next apply closed sensitivity analysis to the outcomes within  $R^0$ , computing the generalized sensitivity values  $(R, |R|/2)$  for every subset  $R \subseteq R^0$ ; note that while effective as a way to choose a promising subset, the sensitivity values themselves will not be valid as they were not computed using all 21 outcomes. We found that the subset  $R_1 = \{\text{alcohol, closeness to spouse, anger and agreeableness}\}$  exhibits a relatively large sensitivity value. To then attain a valid sensitivity value for  $R_1$ , we apply our procedure using the original  $K = 21$  variables to this chosen subset. This yields a sensitivity value of  $(R_1, |R_1|/2) = 1.46$ . This means that in order for us to believe that more than half of the outcomes  $\{\text{alcohol, closeness to spouse, anger and agreeableness}\}$  are unaffected by childhood abuse, the odds of treatment assignment for any two individuals within the same matched set must differ by at least 1.46.

To demonstrate the improved power of our method over the naive approach described in Section 3.3, we compare the generalized sensitivity values calculated using both methods for all subsets of size four. Across all subsets examined, our approach yielded larger generalized sensitivity values, aligning with our theoretical discussions in Section 3.3. For instance, subset  $R_1$  described above has a naive generalized sensitivity value of 1.42, which is 0.04 smaller than its exact value. For the subset  $R_2 = \{\text{neuroticism, closeness to spouse, anger and agreeableness}\}$ , there is an even more notable gain in reported robustness to hidden bias: increasing from  $(R_2, |R_2|/2) = 1.32$  for the naive approach to 1.41 under our exact approach. This improvement implies that our method can sustain the conclusion that at least half the outcomes in  $R_2$  are true discoveries (i.e. truly affected by the treatment), even if hidden bias inflates the odds of differential treatment assignment within matched sets up to a factor of 1.41, compared to only 1.32 for the naive approach.

To evaluate overall computational efficiency, we focus on two key aspects: the contribution of our screening step (Section 4.2) and the performance of our approach compared with the enumerative method described in Section 5.3. We record the runtime required to obtain decisions of each elementary hypothesis within subsets  $R_1$  and  $R_2$  in closed sensitivity analyses under various values of  $\alpha$  using both methods with the same screening steps deployed. Table 5 summarizes these runtime comparisons separately for each subset. Short runtimes (less than 2 seconds) indicate cases where the screening step alone fully determined the rejections, yielding similar runtimes for both methods. In contrast, longer runtimes reflect scenarios where some outcomes require further evaluation using either our approach or the enumerative approach. To illustrate, consider subset  $R_1$  across increasing values of  $\alpha$ . When  $\alpha$  is small (e.g., 1.1), the worst-case  $p$ -values remain small enough that the screening step alone determines all rejections. However, as  $\alpha$  increases to 1.4, the worst-case  $p$ -values increase and the screening step can only determine the rejections of two outcomes, leaving the other two needing proper evaluation through closed testing. In such cases, we clearly see the substantial runtime benefit of our method over the enumerative approach, with runtime reductions ranging from fivefold to tenfold. Further increasing  $\alpha$  to 1.7, the screening stage determines that all four outcomes must fail to reject, eliminating the need for further computation entirely.

		1.1	1.2	1.3	1.4	1.5	1.6	1.7
$R_1$	Our approach	0.96	0.98	0.90	990	580	460	0.98
	Enumerative	0.97	0.99	0.90	6940	3510	2140	0.98
$R_2$	Our approach	0.96	200	1.54	1010	760	0.91	1.01
	Enumerative	0.97	1100	1.07	6990	4230	0.91	1.03

**Table 5:** Runtime comparisons for our approach versus the enumerative approach (seconds).

## 7 Discussion

We provide simultaneously valid sensitivity sets for the false discovery proportion in matched observational studies while allowing for unmeasured confounding of varying degrees. By formulating the problem as a sequence of quadratically constrained integer programs, we showed that it is possible to efficiently compute sensitivity sets for the FDP even in large samples with many outcome variables. Through simulation studies and an empirical application investigating the effects of childhood abuse, we demonstrated that our method provides greater statistical power, improved robustness to hidden biases, and significant computational advantages relative to naive or enumerative alternatives.

A natural extension would be to incorporate more flexible modeling of unmeasured confounding. Our current approach, which builds on the sensitivity analysis framework proposed by [Rosenbaum \(1987\)](#), assumes a uniform bound on hidden bias across all matched sets, as in (2). However, unmeasured confounding may exhibit considerable heterogeneity across matched sets in many practical settings. In such scenarios, imposing a single, uniform bound could be overly conservative. In contrast, the recent proposal by [Wu and Li \(2025\)](#) relaxes this assumption by bounding only a specified quantile of the matched sets hidden biases. This refinement can mitigate conservativeness by allowing for a few sets with extreme bias without inflating the overall sensitivity analysis. Incorporating such quantile-based constraints into our method would expand its applicability to settings where unmeasured confounding exhibits considerable heterogeneity across sets, potentially providing a more nuanced and less pessimistic gauge of robustness.

A second direction for future research is to explore more powerful test statistics for intersection null hypotheses beyond the Bonferroni-based approach we mainly focus here. Although the Bonferroni test facilitates efficient closed testing, it can be overly conservative as the outcomes are generally correlated through common treatment vector, thus reducing power. Recent work suggests leveraging richer linear combinations of test statistics ([Cohen](#)

et al., 2020), potentially yielding higher design sensitivity (Rosenbaum, 2004). However, incorporating such test statistics into our FDP-controlling method poses nontrivial computational challenges: each intersection null would require a distinct linear combination of correlated outcomes, complicating both the closed testing procedure and sensitivity analysis. Overcoming these hurdles while retaining computational feasibility remains an important avenue for future investigation.

A third promising direction is to extend our method to handle scenarios involving multiple interventions that jointly affect a single outcome. Such situations frequently arise in genetics and related fields, where numerous genes or genetic variants may collectively influence a specific trait. Extending our method to this multiple-intervention setting would enable researchers to quantify uncertainty regarding the proportion of interventions that truly influence an outcome.



## References

- Anne Lown, E., Nayak, M. B., Korcha, R. A., and Greenfield, T. K. (2011). Child physical and sexual abuse: A comprehensive look at alcohol consumption patterns, consequences, and dependence from the national alcohol survey. *Alcoholism: Clinical and Experimental Research*, 35(2):317–325.
- Benjamini, Y. and Hochberg, Y. (1995). Controlling the false discovery rate: a practical and powerful approach to multiple testing. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Methodological)*, 57(1):289–300.
- Bunting, L., Davidson, G., McCartan, C., Hanratty, J., Bywaters, P., Mason, W., and Steils, N. (2018). The association between child maltreatment and adult poverty—a systematic review of longitudinal research. *Child abuse & neglect*, 77:121–133.
- Caetano, R., Field, C. A., and Nelson, S. (2003). Association between childhood physical abuse, exposure to parental violence, and alcohol problems in adulthood. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 18(3):240–257.
- Cohen, P. L., Olson, M. A., and Fogarty, C. B. (2020). Multivariate one-sided testing in matched observational studies as an adversarial game. *Biometrika*, 107(4):809–825.
- Danese, A. and Tan, M. (2014). Childhood maltreatment and obesity: systematic review and meta-analysis. *Molecular psychiatry*, 19(5):544–554.
- Edwards, V. J., Holden, G. W., Felitti, V. J., and Anda, R. F. (2003). Relationship between multiple forms of childhood maltreatment and adult mental health in community respondents: results from the adverse childhood experiences study. *American journal of psychiatry*, 160(8):1453–1460.
- Fisher, R. A. (1935). *The Design of Experiments*. Oliver & Boyd.
- Fogarty, C. B. and Small, D. S. (2016). Sensitivity analysis for multiple comparisons in matched observational studies through quadratically constrained linear programming. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 111(516):1820–1830.

- Goeman, J. J. and Solari, A. (2011). Multiple Testing for Exploratory Research. *Statistical Science*, 26(4):584 – 597.
- Hammond, E. C. (1964). Smoking in relation to mortality and morbidity. Findings in first thirty-four months of follow-up in a prospective study started in 1959. *Journal of the National Cancer Institute*, 32(5):1161–1188.
- Hansen, B. B. (2004). Full matching in an observational study of coaching for the SAT. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 99(467):609–618.
- Heng, S. and Shaw, P. A. (2025). Sensitivity analysis for binary outcome misclassification in randomization tests via integer programming. *Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics*, pages 1–14.
- Herrenkohl, T. I., Klika, J. B., Herrenkohl, R. C., Russo, M. J., and Dee, T. (2012). A prospective investigation of the relationship between child maltreatment and indicators of adult psychological well-being. *Violence and victims*, 27(5):764–776.
- Holm, S. (1979). A simple sequentially rejective multiple test procedure. *Scandinavian Journal of Statistics*, 6(2):65–70.
- Huber, P. J. (1981). *Robust Statistics*. Springer, New York.
- Kristman-Valente, A. N., Brown, E. C., and Herrenkohl, T. I. (2013). Child physical and sexual abuse and cigarette smoking in adolescence and adulthood. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 53(4):533–538.
- Lee, M.-A. and Song, R. (2017). Childhood abuse, personality traits, and depressive symptoms in adulthood. *Child abuse & neglect*, 65:194–203.
- Lindert, J., von Ehrenstein, O. S., Grashow, R., Gal, G., Braehler, E., and Weisskopf, M. G. (2014). Sexual and physical abuse in childhood is associated with depression and anxiety over the life course: systematic review and meta-analysis. *International journal of public health*, 59:359–372.
- Maneta, E., Cohen, S., Schulz, M., and Waldinger, R. J. (2012). Links between childhood

- physical abuse and intimate partner aggression: The mediating role of anger expression. *Violence and victims*, 27(3):315–328.
- Mantel, N. and Haenszel, W. (1959). Statistical aspects of the analysis of data from retrospective studies of disease. *Journal of the National Cancer Institute*, 22(4):719–748.
- Marcus, R., Eric, P., and Gabriel, K. R. (1976). On closed testing procedures with special reference to ordered analysis of variance. *Biometrika*, 63(3):655–660.
- Ming, K. and Rosenbaum, P. R. (2000). Substantial gains in bias reduction from matching with a variable number of controls. *Biometrics*, 56(1):118–124.
- Neyman, J. (1923). On the application of probability theory to agricultural experiments. Essay on principles. Section 9 (in Polish). *Roczniki Nauk Rolniczych*, X:1–51. Reprinted in *Statistical Science*, 1990, 5:463–480.
- Paradis, A. and Boucher, S. (2019). Child maltreatment history and interpersonal problems in adult couple relationships. In *The Effect of Childhood Emotional Maltreatment on Later Intimate Relationships*, pages 139–158. Routledge.
- Pimentel, S. D., Kelz, R. R., Silber, J. H., and Rosenbaum, P. R. (2015). Large, sparse optimal matching with refined covariate balance in an observational study of the health outcomes produced by new surgeons. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 110(510):515–527.
- Rosenbaum, P. R. (1987). Sensitivity analysis for certain permutation inferences in matched observational studies. *Biometrika*, 74(1):13–26.
- Rosenbaum, P. R. (2002). *Observational Studies*. Springer, New York.
- Rosenbaum, P. R. (2004). Design sensitivity in observational studies. *Biometrika*, 91(1):153–164.
- Rosenbaum, P. R. (2007). Sensitivity analysis for M-estimates, tests, and confidence intervals in matched observational studies. *Biometrics*, 63(2):456–464.
- Rosenbaum, P. R. (2010). *Design of Observational Studies*. Springer, New York.

- Rosenbaum, P. R. (2016). Using Scheffé projections for multiple outcomes in an observational study of smoking and periodontal disease. *The Annals of Applied Statistics*, 10(3):1447–1471.
- Rosenbaum, P. R. (2020). Modern algorithms for matching in observational studies. *Annual Review of Statistics and Its Application*, 7(1):143–176.
- Rubin, D. B. (1974). Estimating causal effects of treatments in randomized and nonrandomized studies. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 66(5):688–701.
- Stuart, E. A. (2010). Matching methods for causal inference: A review and a look forward. *Statistical Science*, 25(1):1–21.
- Wu, D. and Li, X. (2025). Sensitivity analysis for quantiles of hidden biases in matched observational studies. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 120(551):1657–1668.
- Zhang, J., Small, D. S., and Heng, S. (2024). Sensitivity analysis for matched observational studies with continuous exposures and binary outcomes. *Biometrika*, 111(4):1349–1368.
- Zhao, Q. (2019). On sensitivity value of pair-matched observational studies. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 114(526):713–722.
- Zubizarreta, J. R. (2012). Using mixed integer programming for matching in an observational study of kidney failure after surgery. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 107(500):1360–1371.