Comparison of approaches to adjust for confounding

A simplified example with dichotomous treatment *A*, dichotomous confounder *L*, continuous outcome *Y*, and ignoring censoring.

| Approach | Estimand | Models we fit Note: Product terms shown below are optional, based on whether you think there is effect modification. | Interpretation: The mean weight gain would have been X kg higher had everyone quit smoking compared with had no one quit smoking | To consistently estimate the average causal effect in the population, are you forced to make any assumption(s) about effect modification? |
|--|---|---|--|---|
| Outcome regression on confounders, L | $E[Y^{a=1} L]$ - $E[Y^{a=0} L]$ Conditional | Outcome model: $E[Y A,L] = \beta_0 + \beta_1 A + \beta_2 L + \beta_3 A^*L$ | $\underline{\text{conditional}}$ on the confounders L . | Yes |
| Outcome regression on propensity score, PS | $\mathbb{E}[Y^{a=1} PS]$ - $\mathbb{E}[Y^{a=0} PS]$ Conditional | Propensity score model: logit $Pr[A=1 L] = \beta_0 + \beta_1 L$ Outcome model: $E[Y A,PS] = \beta_0 + \beta_1 A + \beta_2 PS + \beta_3 A^*PS$ | conditional on the PS. | |
| Standardization | $E[Y^{a=1}] - E[Y^{a=0}]$ $Marginal$ If interested: $E[Y^{a=1} L] - E[Y^{a=0} L]$ $Conditional$ | Outcome model: $E[Y A,L] = \beta_0 + \beta_1 A + \beta_2 L + \beta_3 A^*L$ or $E[Y A,PS] = \beta_0 + \beta_1 A + \beta_2 PS + \beta_3 A^*PS$ | . (marginal interpretation) | No |
| Inverse probability weighting | $E[Y^{a=1}]$ - $E[Y^{a=0}]$ $Marginal$ If interested: $E[Y^{a=1} V]$ - $E[Y^{a=0} V]$ $Conditional$ | Model for weights: logit $Pr[A=1 L] = \beta_0 + \beta_1 L$ Outcome model (fit to pseudopopulation): $E[Y A] = \beta_0 + \beta_1 A$ or, if interested: Outcome model (fit to pseudopopulation): $E[Y A,V] = \beta_0 + \beta_1 A + \beta_2 V + \beta_3 A^*V$ | | |
| G-estimation | $\mathbb{E}[Y^{a=1} \mathbb{L}]$ - $\mathbb{E}[Y^{a=0} \mathbb{L}]$ Conditional | Model for $H(\psi)$ for the grid search method: logit $Pr[A=1 H(\psi),L]=\beta_0+\beta_1H(\psi)+\beta_2L$ | $\overline{\text{conditional}}$ on the confounders L . | Yes |

| Instrumental variable | $E[Y^{a=1}] - E[Y^{a=0}]$ | Using the ratio method: | . (marginal interpretation) | Yes |
|-----------------------|--|--|-----------------------------|-----|
| estimation | Marginal (under the | Model for the numerator: | | |
| | homogeneity | $E[Y Z] = \beta_0 + \beta_1 Z$ | or | |
| | assumption) | | | |
| | | Model for the denominator: | among the compliers. | |
| | $E[Y^{a=1} A^{z=1}=1, A^{z=0}=0]$ - | $E[A Z] = \beta_0 + \beta_1 Z$ | | |
| | $E[Y^{a=0} A^{z=1}=1, A^{z=0}=0]$ | | | |
| | Effect among the | <u>Using two-stage-least-squares regression:</u> | | |
| | compliers (under the | First-stage treatment model: | | |
| | monotonicity | $E[A Z] = \beta_0 + \beta_1 Z$ | | |
| | assumption) | | | |
| | | Second-stage outcome model: | | |
| | | $E[Y Z] = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \hat{E}[A Z]$ | | |
| | | | | |
| | If interested: | | | |
| | $E[Y^{a=1} L] - E[Y^{a=0} L]$ | | | |
| | Conditional | | | |
| | | | | |
| | $E[Y^{a=1} A^{z=1}=1, A^{z=0}=0, L]$ - | | | |
| | $E[Y^{a=0} A^{z=1}=1, A^{z=0}=0, L]$ | | | |
| | Conditional effect among | | | |
| | the compliers | | | |