

Variable Selection Methods Comparison

Hongjie Liu, Jiajun Tao, Shaohan Chen

2023-02-27

Motivation

- ▶ Identifying the effect of a treatment, exposure, or intervention is one of the most fundamental tasks we encounter as biostatisticians. . .
- ▶ . . . but outside of a randomized control trial (RCT), confounding variables can bias our estimates of treatment effects.
- ▶ Propensity score matching (PSM) is a tool that can help us mitigate the effects of confounders. . .
- ▶ . . . but there is no consensus on the best way to estimate standard errors when using the PSM algorithm.
- ▶ How can we assess which procedures reliably estimate standard errors?

Motivation

A simulation study!

A (Yet) Quick(er) Foray into Propensity Score Matching

- (1) We start with an unmatched dataset.
- (2) We estimate the propensity score - the probability of treatment given some set of covariates - according to some pre-specified model fitting (e.g., logistic regression).
- (3) We pair treated and untreated individuals who have similar propensity scores according to some pre-specified matching algorithm (e.g., nearest neighbors).
- (4) We end with a matched dataset.

Enter the Bootstrap

- ▶ Bootstrapping is one of the most common procedures for estimating standard errors.
- ▶ The PSM algorithm intakes an unmatched dataset and outputs a matched one.
- ▶ **Primary Research Question:** When do we execute the bootstrap - before the match or after it?
- ▶ Let's try both!

Data Generation - Continuous Outcome

For each individual $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, we consider covariates $L_{1i}, L_{2i}, L_{3i} \sim N(0, 1)$. Treatments are distributed according to law $A_i \sim B(\pi_i)$, where π_i - the true propensity to be treated - is subject to the data-generating process

$$\log \left(\frac{\pi_i}{1 - \pi_i} \right) = \alpha_0 + \alpha_1 L_{1i} + \alpha_2 L_{2i}.$$

Given this, we further define the data-generating process of our continuous outcome via

$$Y_i = \beta_1 A_i + \beta_2 L_{2i} + \beta_3 L_{3i} + \varepsilon_i,$$

where ε_i denotes random error. Because L_{2i} effects both A_i and Y_i , it acts as a confounder in estimating the treatment effect.

Data Generation - Binary Outcome

For each individual $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, we consider covariates $L_{1i}, L_{2i}, L_{3i} \sim N(0, 1)$. Treatments are distributed according to law $A_i \sim B(\pi_i)$, where π_i - the true propensity to be treated - is subject to the data-generating process

$$\log \left(\frac{\pi_i}{1 - \pi_i} \right) = \alpha_0 + \alpha_1 L_{1i} + \alpha_2 L_{2i}.$$

Given this, we further define the data-generating process of our binary outcome via $Y_i \sim B(\tau_i)$ where

$$\log \left(\frac{\tau_i}{1 - \tau_i} \right) = \beta_0 + \beta_1 A_i + \beta_2 L_{2i} + \beta_3 L_{3i}.$$

Observe that we have omitted a random error term, as realizations of our binary Y_i are innately subject to noise.

Data Generation - Random Number Generation (Binary Outcome)

```
set.seed(20220217)
seed_vec <- runif(100000, min, max)
for (i in 1:n) {
  set.seed(seeds[i])
  long_rnorm <- rnorm(size*3, mean = 0, sd = 1)
  long_runif <- runif(size*2)
  beta_error <- rnorm(size, mean = 0, sd = 0.25)
  L1 <- long_rnorm[1:size]
  L2 <- long_rnorm[(size + 1):(2*size)]
  L3 <- long_rnorm[(2*size + 1):(3*size)]

  comp_pA = long_runif[1:size]
  A = (prob_A > comp_pA)
  # function continues...
}
```


Parameters of Interest

- ▶ The sample size of each dataset $n_{\text{sample}} \in \{100, 1000\}$
- ▶ The population proportion of treated individuals $\pi \in \{0.113, 0.216, 0.313\}$
- ▶ The true average treatment effect $\beta_1 \in \{0.15, 0.30\}$ for binary data; $\beta_1 \in \{-1, 1\}$ for continuous data

Other Parameters

- ▶ The number of datasets $m_{\text{sample}} = 100$
- ▶ The number of bootstrap re-samples $m_{\text{boot}} = 500$
- ▶ The sample size of bootstrap re-samples $n_{\text{simple}} = n_{\text{complex}} = n_{\text{sample}} \times \pi$
- ▶ Strength of covariate effect on treatment $\alpha_1 = \log(1.25), \alpha_2 = \log(1.75)$
- ▶ Strength of covariate effect on outcome $\beta_2 = \log(1.75), \beta_3 = \log(1.25)$

Evaluation Metrics

Define true predictors as positive and null predictors as negative.

Signal Identification

- ▶ **Sensitivity:** $\frac{TP}{TP+FN}$
- ▶ **Specificity:** $\frac{TN}{TN+FP}$
- ▶ **F1-Score:** $\frac{2 \cdot \text{sensitivity} \cdot \text{precision}}{\text{sensitivity} + \text{precision}}$
- ▶ **Accuracy:** $\frac{TP+TN}{TP+TN+FP+FN}$

Parameter Estimation

- ▶ **MSE:** $\frac{1}{p} \sum_{i=1}^p (\hat{\beta}_i - \beta_i)^2$

Signal Identification Performance

- ▶ **Sensitivity**

Signal Identification Performance

- ▶ **Specificity**

Signal Identification Performance

- ▶ **F1-Score**

Signal Identification Performance

- ▶ **Accuracy**

Parameter Estimation Performance

► **MSE**

Missing Weak Predictors Analysis

dddd

Summary of Results

- ▶ For binary outcomes, the simple bootstrap tended to underestimate the standard error
- ▶ Larger standard error estimates from complex bootstrap in binary and continuous settings
- ▶ Differences between simple and complex bootstrap were smaller for larger sample sizes
- ▶ Complex bootstrap not as reliable in small sample sizes

Limitations

- ▶ Sample size / treatment (or exposure) prevalence
- ▶ Small number of initial samples, limited in detecting significant differences in coverage rate

Future Work

- ▶ Larger number of initial samples, narrower coverage window
- ▶ Increased sample size, changes in bootstrap performance?
- ▶ Changes in treatment propensity model
- ▶ Non-normal distributions of covariates