

Inverse probability of censoring weighting (IPCW) for linear regression

Brice Ozenne

August 4, 2021

1 Principle

Inverse probability of censoring weighting (IPCW) is a method able to handle informative drop-out. Intuitively, in presence of informative drop-out a complete case analysis is a biased approach as individuals with complete data are not representative of the population. However with an appropriate re-weighting of the individuals with complete data, we can "re-balance" our sample and make it representative of the population. To do so, we divide the population into sub-populations and attribute weights to individuals who did not drop-out inversely proportional to the frequency of the drop-out in the sub-population. Thanks to the weights, individuals who did not drop-out "represent" the individuals who dropped-out. Thus, overall, the weighted sample is representative of the population.

2 Illustrative example

Consider a study where we follow depressed individual over time. They have a baseline measurement, then are given a treatment, and then have a follow-up measurement. We would like to assess the treatment effect in term of depression score ¹. The population of interest contain severely and moderately depressed individuals; the treatment may work differently in each sub-population. Unfortunately, some study participants dropped-out and it seems that they are more likely to drop-out when they are severely depressed.

¹:To simplify, there is no control group - we assume that without treatment the depression score would be constant.

We can simulate such a dataset using the following function:

```
simTrial <- function(n, rho, dmU, pC){
  require(mvtnorm)
  require(data.table)
  ## simulate data
  Sigma <- 10^2*matrix(c(1,rho,rho,1),2,2)
  ## gather into dataset
  M.Ym <- rmvnorm(n, mean = c(50, 50-dmU[1]), sigma = Sigma)
  M.Ys <- rmvnorm(n, mean = c(75, 75-dmU[2]), sigma = Sigma)
  dtL <- rbind(
    data.table(id = 1:n, mdd = "moderate", time = "T1", Y = M.Ym[,1]),
    data.table(id = 1:n, mdd = "moderate", time = "T2", Y = M.Ym[,2]),
    data.table(id = n+(1:n), mdd = "severe", time = "T1", Y = M.Ys[,1]),
    data.table(id = n+(1:n), mdd = "severe", time = "T2", Y = M.Ys[,2])
  )
  dtL$probaD0 <- 0
  dtL[time=="T2", probaD0 := ifelse(.SD$mdd=="moderate",pC[1],pC[2])]
  dtL[,dropout := rbinom(.N,prob=probaD0,size=1)]
  dtL[,Yobs:=Y]
  dtL[dropout==1,Yobs:=NA]
  dtL$probaD0 <- NULL
  return(dtL)
}
set.seed(11)
dtL <- simTrial(n = 1000, rho = 0.8, dmU = c(25,50), pC = c(0.2,0.7))
print(dtL)
```

	id	mdd	time	Y	dropout	Yobs
1:	1	moderate	T1	44.83259	0	44.83259
2:	2	moderate	T1	30.34157	0	30.34157
3:	3	moderate	T1	56.36308	0	56.36308
4:	4	moderate	T1	64.63341	0	64.63341
5:	5	moderate	T1	45.10048	0	45.10048

3996:	1996	severe	T2	30.59793	1	NA
3997:	1997	severe	T2	18.97725	1	NA
3998:	1998	severe	T2	29.80266	1	NA
3999:	1999	severe	T2	30.26518	0	30.26518
4000:	2000	severe	T2	39.15797	0	39.15797

Here we have simulated a two sub-populations of 1000, with a correlation of 0.5 between baseline and follow-up . The treatment effect is twice bigger for the severely depressed population but individuals from this population are also much more likely to drop-out. Overall the expected treatment effect is:

```
(-25-50)/2
```

```
[1] -37.5
```

Without drop-out, we could use a simple linear model to carry-out the analysis:

```
dtW.oracle <- dcast(dtL, formula = id ~ time, value.var = "Y")
dtW.oracle$diff <- dtW.oracle$T2-dtW.oracle$T1
e.oracle <- lm(diff~1, data = dtW.oracle)
summary(e.oracle)$coef
```

```
              Estimate Std. Error   t value Pr(>|t|)
(Intercept) -37.35098   0.3141814 -118.8835      0
```

leading to an estimate quite close to the true value.

With drop-out, a complete case analysis would lead to a biased estimator. In this example, we can "see" that the estimated value is far away from the true one (even when accounting for the uncertainty):

```
dtW <- dcast(dtL, formula = id + mdd ~ time, value.var = "Yobs")
dtW$diff <- dtW$T2-dtW$T1
dtW.CC <- dtW[!is.na(diff)]
e.CC <- lm(diff~1, data = dtW.CC)
summary(e.CC)$coef
```

```
              Estimate Std. Error   t value Pr(>|t|)
(Intercept) -31.42356   0.3909029 -80.38713      0
```

An alternative approach would be to use a linear mixed model (i.e. full information):

```
require(nlme)
e.FI <- lme(Yobs~time, random = ~1|id, data = dtL, na.action = na.omit)
summary(e.FI)$tTable
```

```
              Value Std.Error   DF   t-value p-value
(Intercept)  62.59128 0.3239587 1999 193.20760      0
timeT2       -33.76472 0.3855964 1068 -87.56494      0
```

which is better than the complete case analysis still biased when the drop-out mechanism depends on variables other than the baseline value.

A better approach is to use IPCW. First we model the probability of not dropping out at follow-up:

```
dtW$observed <- !is.na(dtW$T2)
e.glmW.oracle <- glm(observed ~ mdd, data = dtW,
  family = binomial(link = "logit"))
```

and then compute the weights for observations with full data:

```
dtW$weight.oracle <- 1/predict(e.glmW.oracle, newdata = dtW, type = "
  response")
dtW[observed == TRUE, sum(weight.oracle)]
```

```
[1] 2000
```

Note that the weights sum to the total sample size. We then perform the complete case analysis with these weights:

```
dtW.CC <- dtW[!is.na(diff)]
e.IPCWoracle <- lm(diff~1, data = dtW.CC, weights = dtW.CC$weight.oracle)
summary(e.IPCWoracle)$coef
```

```
              Estimate Std. Error  t value Pr(>|t|)
(Intercept) -36.89889   0.4251421 -86.7919      0
```

which gives a result much closer to the true value. A more feasible IPCW would use the baseline score to define the weights:

```
e.glmW <- glm(observed ~ T1, data = dtW,
  family = binomial(link = "logit"))
dtW$weight <- 1/predict(e.glmW, newdata = dtW, type = "response")
dtW[observed == TRUE, sum(weight)]
```

```
[1] 2015.739
```

We then perform the complete case analysis with these new weights:

```
dtW.CC <- dtW[!is.na(diff)]
e.IPCW <- lm(diff~1, data = dtW.CC, weights = dtW.CC$weight)
summary(e.IPCW)$coef
```

```
              Estimate Std. Error  t value Pr(>|t|)
(Intercept) -35.47206   0.423423 -83.77453      0
```

3 Simulation study

The quality of the previous estimators is compared using a simulation study. The results are summarized by [Figure 1](#).




Figure 1: Results of the simulation study for a sample size of 1000 using 100 datasets.