

Causal Thinking

Usando conhecimento científico para gerar modelos estatísticos

Diogo Melo

Para que servem os modelos?


Previsão vs Inferência

Porque correlação não implica
causalidade?

**CORRELATION
IMPLIES
CAUSATION**

**CORRELATION
DOES NOT
IMPLY CAUSATION**

**CAUSATION
DOES NOT
IMPLY CORRELATION**





A dramatic scene from a monster movie. On the left, a large, dark, spiky lizard怪兽 is shown in profile, its mouth open as if roaring or breathing fire. On the right, another large lizard怪兽, this one tan and yellow with a long neck, is also in profile, facing the first lizard. They appear to be engaged in a fierce battle. In the background, a city skyline is visible, with numerous buildings engulfed in flames and smoke, suggesting a scene of destruction and chaos.

Causal Inference

Representando modelos com Grafos

- Podemos usar um grafo para representar um modelo putativo
- Uma flecha ligando duas variáveis representa um possível efeito causal

$$x \longrightarrow y$$

Este é um grafo acíclico dirigido, um DAG

Elemental triads

- Todo DAG pode ser decomposto em 3 motivos básicos:
- O cano (pipe), a forquilha (fork) e o colisor (collider)
- Podemos usar esses motivos para sistematicamente informar a estrutura dos nossos modelos, dependendo da pergunta científica

The pipe:






The fork:



The collider:



Como uma variável Z influencia nossa inferência?




The fork

Simulando uma Causa Compartilhada

The Fork

- Todo DAG impõem uma relação causal entre as variáveis
- Podemos utilizar simulações para criar o modelo gerativo induzido pelo DAG:




Simulating a shared cause

Math

$$y \sim Normal(\mu = 1 + 0.5x + 2z, \sigma = 1)$$

$$x \sim Normal(\mu = 1 + z, \sigma = 1)$$

$$z \sim Bernoulli(p = 0.5)$$



R Code


```
N = 200
z = rbinom(N, 1, 0.5)          # z ~ bernoulli(0.5)
x = rnorm(N, 1 + z)            # x ~ normal(1 + z, 1)
y = rnorm(N, 1 + 0.5*x + 2*z) # y ~ normal(1 + 0.5x + 2z, 1)
```

Modelo estatístico sem a variável de confusão Z



Code

$x \rightarrow y$

```
N = 200
z = rbinom(N, 1, 0.5)
x = rnorm(N, 1 + z)
y = rnorm(N, 1 + 0.5*x + 2*z)
m1 = lm(y ~ x)
```



Modelo estatístico sem a variável de confusão Z



Estimativas sem a Variável de confusão

```
> (pm1 = precis(m1))
      mean   sd 5.5% 94.5%
(Intercept) 1.18 0.16 0.93  1.43
x            0.94 0.08 0.82  1.06
```

x → **y**


Estimativas sem a Variável de confusão

```
> (pm1 = precis(m1))
      mean   sd 5.5% 94.5%
(Intercept) 1.18 0.16 0.93  1.43
x            0.94 0.08 0.82  1.06
```



Simulation R code

```
N = 200
z = rbinom(N, 1, 0.5)
x = rnorm(N, 1 + z)
y = rnorm(N, 1 + 0.5*x + 2*z)
```




Estimativas sem a Variável de confusão

```
> (pm1 = precis(m1))
      mean   sd 5.5% 94.5%
(Intercept) 1.18 0.16 0.93  1.43
x            0.94 0.08 0.82  1.06
```



Simulation R code

```
N = 200
z = rbinom(N, 1, 0.5)
x = rnorm(N, 1 + z)
y = rnorm(N, 1 + 0.5*x + 2*z)
```




Estimativas sem a Variável de confusão

```
> (pm1 = precis(m1))
      mean   sd 5.5% 94.5%
(Intercept) 1.18 0.16 0.93 1.43
x            0.94 0.08 0.82 1.06
```





Simulation R code

```
N = 200
z = rbinom(N, 1, 0.5)
x = rnorm(N, 1 + z)
y = rnorm(N, 1 + 0.5*x + 2*z)
```



Estimativa do efeito de x em y sem a variável de confusão z


X → y



Incluindo a causa compartilhada no modelo

Usando uma regressão múltipla para estratificar por z


```
> m2 = lm(y ~ x + z)
> (pm2 = precis(m2))
      mean    sd 5.5% 94.5%
(Intercept) 0.92  0.12  0.73   1.12
x            0.48  0.07  0.37   0.60
z            2.03  0.17  1.75   2.31
```



Incluindo a causa compartilhada no modelo

Usando uma regressão múltipla para estratificar por z


```
> m2 = lm(y ~ x + z)
> (pm2 = precis(m2))
            mean      sd  5.5% 94.5%
(Intercept) 0.92  0.12  0.73  1.12
x           0.48  0.07  0.37  0.60
z           2.03  0.17  1.75  2.31
```



Incluindo a causa compartilhada no modelo




Usando uma regressão múltipla para estratificar por z

```
> m2 = lm(y ~ x + z)
> (pm2 = precis(m2))
            mean      sd  5.5% 94.5%
(Intercept) 0.92  0.12  0.73  1.12
x           0.48  0.07  0.37  0.60
z           2.03  0.17  1.75  2.31
```




Incluindo a variável de confusão z.

Usando uma regressão múltipla para estratificar por z




Mudança do efeito com a inclusão da variável de confusão

Efeito de x em y é criado por z




Efeito de x em y é oculto por z




Examples of forks or confounders

- A forquilha é a variável “controle” clássica
- A maioria das variáveis é incluída nos modelo sob a suposição de que são variáveis de confusão e precisam ter seus efeitos levados em consideração
- Condicionando em z, o efeito causal de x em y pode ser estimado de forma não-enviezada




Tabaco e Cancer

R. A. Fisher não estava convencido de que fumar causava câncer, e propôs que uma variável de propensão não observada causava tanto o câncer quanto o tabagismo.



Quantificando Viés por variáveis omitidas

- Mesmo sem conhecer as variáveis omitidas, podemos estimar quão intenso seu efeito precisaria ser para mascarar/causar o efeito observado
- Podemos comparar esse efeito não conhecido com efeitos conhecidos
- **Exemplo:** uma variável omitida precisaria ter um efeito 2x maior que fumar para causar o efeito observado



Making sense of sensitivity: extending omitted variable bias

Carlos Cinelli and Chad Hazlett


University of California, Los Angeles, USA

[Received August 2018. Final revision October 2019]

Summary. We extend the omitted variable bias framework with a suite of tools for sensitivity analysis in regression models that does not require assumptions on the functional form of the treatment assignment mechanism nor on the distribution of the unobserved confounders, naturally handles multiple confounders, possibly acting non-linearly, exploits expert knowledge to bound sensitivity parameters and can be easily computed by using only standard regression results. In particular, we introduce two novel sensitivity measures suited for routine reporting. The robustness value describes the minimum strength of association that unobserved confounding would need to have, both with the treatment and with the outcome, to change the research conclusions. The partial R^2 of the treatment with the outcome shows how strongly confounders explaining all the residual outcome variation would have to be associated with the treatment to eliminate the estimated effect. Next, we offer graphical tools for elaborating on problematic confounders, examining the sensitivity of point estimates and t -values, as well as ‘extreme scenarios’. Finally, we describe problems with a common ‘benchmarking’ practice and introduce a novel procedure to bound the strength of confounders formally on the basis of a comparison with observed covariates. We apply these methods to a running example that estimates the effect of exposure to violence on attitudes toward peace.


The pipe

Todo o efeito de x é mediado por z



```
N = 200
x = rnorm(N)                      # x ~ normal(0, 1)
z = rbinom(N, 1, inv_logit(x))    # z ~ bernoulli(invlogit(x))
y = rnorm(N, 1 + 2*z)              # y ~ normal(1 + 2z, 1)
```


Modelo sem o mediador





Incluindo o mediador

```
> m2 = lm(y ~ x + z)
> (pm2 = precis(m2))

            mean      sd    5.5% 94.5%
(Intercept) 1.04  0.11   0.87  1.21
x           -0.04  0.07  -0.16  0.07
z            2.09  0.15   1.84  2.33
```




Incluindo o mediador




Fork vs. Pipe

Estimador correto **com** o Z




Estimador correto **sem** o Z



Examples of pipes


Mediators or descendants

- Incluir um mediador em nossos modelos pode ter efeitos catastróficos.
- Um erro comum é incluir **variáveis pós-tratamento** no modelo.



Variáveis pós tratamento

Por exemplo, num experimento que procura entender o efeito de um tratamento antifúngico no crescimento de uma planta



Post-treatment variables



How Conditioning on Posttreatment Variables Can Ruin Your Experiment and What to Do about It



Jacob M. Montgomery Washington University in St. Louis

Brendan Nyhan Dartmouth College

Michelle Torres Washington University in St. Louis

Abstract: *In principle, experiments offer a straightforward method for social scientists to accurately estimate causal effects. However, scholars often unwittingly distort treatment effect estimates by conditioning on variables that could be affected by their experimental manipulation. Typical examples include controlling for posttreatment variables in statistical models, eliminating observations based on posttreatment criteria, or subsetting the data based on posttreatment variables. Though these modeling choices are intended to address common problems encountered when conducting experiments, they can bias estimates of causal effects. Moreover, problems associated with conditioning on posttreatment variables remain largely unrecognized in the field, which we show frequently publishes experimental studies using these practices in our discipline's most prestigious journals. We demonstrate the severity of experimental posttreatment bias analytically and document the magnitude of the potential distortions it induces using visualizations and reanalyses of real-world data. We conclude by providing applied researchers with recommendations for best practice.*

Post-treatment variables


Table 1. Posttreatment Conditioning in Experimental Studies

Category	Prevalence
Engages in posttreatment conditioning	46.7%
Controls for/interacts with a posttreatment variable	21.3%
Drops cases based on posttreatment criteria	14.7%
Both types of posttreatment conditioning present	10.7%
No conditioning on posttreatment variables	52.0%
Insufficient information to code	1.3%


Note: The sample consists of 2012–14 articles in the *American Political Science Review*, the *American Journal of Political Science*, and the *Journal of Politics* including a survey, field, laboratory, or lab-in-the-field experiment (n = 75).

Collider

Nenhum efeito de x em y, mas ambos afetam Z



Nenhum efeito de x em y, mas ambos afetam Z



Math

$$y \sim Normal(0, 1)$$

$$x \sim Normal(0, 1)$$



$$z \sim Bernoulli(\text{logit}^{-1}(2x + 2y - 2))$$

Nenhum efeito de x em y, mas ambos afetam Z

```
set.seed(1)
N = 200
x = rnorm(N)
y = rnorm(N)
z = rbinom(N, 1, inv_logit(2*x + 2*y - 2))

m1 = lm(y ~ x)

> (pm1 = precis(m1))
      mean    sd  5.5% 94.5%
(Intercept) 0.04  0.07 -0.07  0.16
x           -0.02  0.08 -0.15  0.10
```





Nenhum efeito de x em y, mas ambos afetam Z


```
set.seed(1)
N = 200
x = rnorm(N)
y = rnorm(N)
z = rbinom(N, 1, inv_logit(2*x + 2*y - 2))

m1 = lm(y ~ x)

> (pm1 = precis(m1))
      mean    sd  5.5% 94.5%
(Intercept) 0.04  0.07 -0.07  0.16
x            -0.02  0.08 -0.15  0.10
```




Agora, o modelo com o collider z incluído




```
> m2 = lm(y ~ x + z)


> (pm2 = precis(m2))
      mean     sd   5.5% 94.5%
(Intercept) -0.29  0.08 -0.41 -0.17
x            -0.23  0.07 -0.35 -0.12
z            1.13  0.15  0.90  1.37
```




Agora, o modelo com o collider z incluído



```
> m2 = lm(y ~ x + z)  
  
> (pm2 = precis(m2))  
            mean      sd    5.5% 94.5%  
(Intercept) -0.29  0.08  -0.41  -0.17  
x             -0.23  0.07  -0.35  -0.12  
z              1.13  0.15   0.90   1.37
```



E o p-valor?!?



```
> summary(m1)
```

Call:

```
lm(formula = y ~ x)
```

Residuals:

Min	1Q	Median	3Q	Max
-2.93275	-0.54273	-0.02523	0.66833	2.58615

Coefficients:

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)
(Intercept)	0.04146	0.07168	0.578	0.564
x	-0.02308	0.07729	-0.299	0.766

E o p-valor?

```
> summary(m2)
```

Call:


```
lm(formula = y ~ x + z)
```

Residuals:


Min	1Q	Median	3Q	Max
-2.84828	-0.48711	0.02999	0.59867	1.89105

Coefficients:

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)
(Intercept)	-0.29123	0.07672	-3.796	0.000196 ***
x	-0.23391	0.07347	-3.184	0.001689 **
z	1.13392	0.14858	7.632	9.72e-13 ***



No modelo enviezado pelo collider,
dois preditores são significativos!



Talvez com comparação de modelos?
Nosso salvador?!!?



```
> AIC(m1, m2)
   df      AIC
m1  3  576.7421
m2  4  526.9382
```

$$\begin{aligned}m1 : y &\sim x \\m2 : y &\sim x + z\end{aligned}$$

Modelo com enviezado pelo collider tem AIC menor!

Colliders naturais podem afetar nossas amostras!


Dados coletáveis são frequentemente poluídos por colliders



What now?!

Usando DAGs para construir nossos modelos

- Se representarmos nossas relações causais usando DAGs, temos um conjunto de regras que nos diz quais variáveis precisamos incluir no modelo para calcular um determinado efeito, ou determinar se o efeito pode ser estimado
 - Esse é um formalismo chamado **do-calculus**
 - Existem MODELOS mais complicados, como Structural Equation Modeling ou **Full-Luxury Bayesian Inference**:
 - Regression, Fire, and Dangerous Things (1/3)



CAUSAL INFERENCE IN STATISTICS

A Primer


Judea Pearl
Madelyn Glymour
Nicholas P. Jewell

WILEY

Caminhos abertos e Fechados

- Caminhos com forks ou pipes **não controlados** estão abertos
- Caminhos com colliders **estão bloqueados**, mas ficam abertos se **incluirmos o collider** no modelo.
- Para estimar o efeito causal de x em y , nós precisamos que todos os caminhos **não causais** estejam bloqueados

Identifique todos os caminhos entre x e y



Back door criterion

Para estimar o efeito causal de X sobre Y , identifique um conjunto de variáveis de **controle** de modo que nenhum descendente de X esteja no conjunto de controle, e todos os caminhos entre X e Y que contenham uma seta para X estejam bloqueados.

Nem Toda estimativa é equivalente

The Table 2 Fallacy: Presenting and Interpreting Confounder and Modifier Coefficients FREE

Daniel Westreich , Sander Greenland  Author Notes

American Journal of Epidemiology, Volume 177, Issue 4, 15 February 2013, Pages 292–298,
<https://doi.org/10.1093/aje/kws412>

Published: 30 January 2013 Article history ▾



PDF

Split View

Cite

Permissions

Share ▾

Abstract

It is common to present multiple adjusted effect estimates from a single model in a single table. For example, a table might show odds ratios for one or more exposures and also for several confounders from a single logistic regression. This can lead to mistaken interpretations of these estimates. We use causal diagrams to display the sources of the problems. Presentation of exposure and confounder effect estimates from a single model may lead to several interpretative difficulties, inviting confusion of direct-effect estimates with total-effect estimates for covariates in the model. These effect estimates may also be confounded even though the effect estimate for the main exposure is not confounded. Interpretation of these effect estimates is further complicated by heterogeneity (variation, modification) of the exposure effect measure across covariate levels. We offer suggestions to limit potential misunderstandings when multiple effect estimates are presented, including precise distinction between total and direct effect measures from a single model, and use of multiple models tailored to yield total-effect estimates for covariates.

Nem Toda estimativa é equivalente

The Table 2 Fallacy: Presenting and Interpreting Confounder and Modifier Coefficients FREE

Daniel Westreich , Sander Greenland  Author Notes

American Journal of Epidemiology, Volume 177, Issue 4, 15 February 2013, Pages 292–298,

<https://doi.org/10.1093/aje/kws412>

Published: 30 January 2013 Article history ▾

 PDF  Split View  Cite  Permissions  Share ▾

Abstract

It is common to present multiple adjusted effect estimates from a single model in a single table. For example, a table might show odds ratios for one or more exposures and also for several confounders from a single logistic regression. This can lead to mistaken interpretations of these estimates. We use causal diagrams to display the sources of the problems. Presentation of exposure and confounder effect estimates from a single model may lead to several interpretative difficulties, inviting confusion of direct-effect estimates with total-effect estimates for covariates in the model. These effect estimates may also be confounded even though the effect estimate for the main exposure is not confounded. Interpretation of these effect estimates is further complicated by heterogeneity (variation, modification) of the exposure effect measure across covariate levels. We offer suggestions to limit potential misunderstandings when multiple effect estimates are presented, including precise distinction between total and direct effect measures from a single model, and use of multiple models tailored to yield total-effect estimates for covariates.

Table 1. Characteristics of the Patients at Baseline.*

Characteristic	Ivermectin (N=679)	Placebo (N=679)	Total (N=1358)
Age			
Median (IQR) — yr	49 (39–57)	49 (37–56)	49 (38–57)
Distribution — no. (%)			
≤50 yr	359 (52.9)	372 (54.8)	731 (53.8)
>50 yr	320 (47.1)	307 (45.2)	627 (46.2)
Female sex — no. (%)	383 (56.4)	408 (60.1)	791 (58.2)
Race — no. (%)†			
Mixed race	648 (95.4)	645 (95.0)	1293 (95.2)
White	6 (0.9)	6 (0.9)	12 (0.9)
Black	7 (1.0)	5 (0.7)	12 (0.9)
Other	1 (0.1)	0	1 (0.1)
Unknown	17 (2.5)	23 (3.4)	40 (2.9)
Body-mass index — no. (%)			
<30	347 (51.1)	336 (49.5)	683 (50.3)
≥30	332 (48.9)	343 (50.5)	675 (49.7)
Time since onset of symptoms — no. (%)			
0–3 days	302 (44.5)	295 (43.4)	597 (44.0)
4–7 days	377 (55.5)	384 (56.6)	761 (56.0)
Risk factors — no. (%)			
Chronic cardiac disease	14 (2.1)	10 (1.5)	24 (1.8)
Uncontrolled hypertension	55 (8.1)	59 (8.7)	114 (8.4)
Chronic pulmonary disease	18 (2.7)	23 (3.4)	41 (3.0)
Asthma	54 (8.0)	60 (8.8)	114 (8.4)
Chronic kidney disease	2 (0.3)	5 (0.7)	7 (0.5)
Type 1 diabetes mellitus	3 (0.4)	9 (1.3)	12 (0.9)
Type 2 diabetes mellitus	79 (12)	89 (13)	168 (12)
Autoimmune disease	2 (0.3)	2 (0.3)	4 (0.3)
Any other risk factor or coexisting condition	22 (3.2)	19 (2.8)	41 (3.0)

* Missingness in covariate data was handled with multiple imputation by chained equations.¹⁶ IQR denotes interquartile range.

† Race was reported by the patient.

Nem Toda estimativa é equivalente

The Table 2 Fallacy: Presenting and Interpreting Confounder and Modifier Coefficients FREE

Daniel Westreich  Sander Greenland  Author Notes

American Journal of Epidemiology, Volume 177, Issue 4, 15 February 2013, Pages 292–298,

<https://doi.org/10.1093/aje/kws412>

Published: 30 January 2013 Article history ▾

 PDF  Split View  Cite  Permissions  Share ▾

Abstract

It is common to present multiple adjusted effect estimates from a single model in a single table. For example, a table might show odds ratios for one or more exposures and also for several confounders from a single logistic regression. This can lead to mistaken interpretations of these estimates. We use causal diagrams to display the sources of the problems. Presentation of exposure and confounder effect estimates from a single model may lead to several interpretative difficulties, inviting confusion of direct-effect estimates with total-effect estimates for covariates in the model. These effect estimates may also be confounded even though the effect estimate for the main exposure is not confounded. Interpretation of these effect estimates is further complicated by heterogeneity (variation, modification) of the exposure effect measure across covariate levels. We offer suggestions to limit potential misunderstandings when multiple effect estimates are presented, including precise distinction between total and direct effect measures from a single model, and use of multiple models tailored to yield total-effect estimates for covariates.

Independent variable	General Linear Model				Ordinary Least Squares	
	df	MS	F	p	β^a	SE
Age	1	44.7	1.8	.175	-.04	.024
Gender (male)	1	294.7	12.1	.001	.10	.391
Education	1	35.2	1.4	.229	.04	.052
Financial strain	1	687.9	28.3	.000	.14	.206
Volunteer work	1	95.9	3.9	.047	.05	.409
Social support	1	95.6	3.9	.048	.05	.021
Religious participation	1	264.4	10.9	.001	-.09	.168
Cognitive deficit	1	202.1	8.3	.004	.08	.074
Stressful life events	1	591.3	24.3	.000	-.13	.082
Health status	1	1145.1	47.1	.000	-.21	.103
Daily activity limitations	1	1508.2	62.1	.000	-.24	.045
Vision	3	66.5	2.74	.021	-.11	.175
Hearing	3	2.2	1.0	.965	-.04	.169
Vision \times Hearing	9	12.1	0.5	.876	.01	.160
Corrected model	26	577.9	23.8	.000		
R^2 (adjusted)					.376	

^aStandardized regression coefficients.

Nem Toda estimativa é equivalente

The Table 2 Fallacy: Presenting and Interpreting Confounder and Modifier Coefficients FREE

Daniel Westreich , Sander Greenland Author Notes

American Journal of Epidemiology, Volume 177, Issue 4, 15 February 2013, Pages 292–298,

<https://doi.org/10.1093/aje/kws412>

Published: 30 January 2013 Article history ▾

 PDF  Split View  Cite  Permissions  Share ▾


Abstract

It is common to present multiple adjusted effect estimates from a single model in a single table. For example, a table might show odds ratios for one or more exposures and also for several confounders from a single logistic regression. This can lead to mistaken interpretations of these estimates. We use causal diagrams to display the sources of the problems. Presentation of exposure and confounder effect estimates from a single model may lead to several interpretative difficulties, inviting confusion of direct-effect estimates with total-effect estimates for covariates in the model. These effect estimates may also be confounded even though the effect estimate for the main exposure is not confounded. Interpretation of these effect estimates is further complicated by heterogeneity (variation, modification) of the exposure effect measure across covariate levels. We offer suggestions to limit potential misunderstandings when multiple effect estimates are presented, including precise distinction between total and direct effect measures from a single model, and use of multiple models tailored to yield total-effect estimates for covariates.

Independent variable	df	MS	F	p	General Linear Model		Ordinary Least Squares	
					β^a	SE	β^a	SE
Age	1	44.7	1.8	.175	-.04	.024		
Gender (male)	1	294.7	12.1	.001	.10	.391		
Education	1	35.2	1.4	.229	.04	.052		
Financial strain	1	687.9	28.3	.000	.14	.206		
Volunteer work	1	95.9	3.9	.047	.05	.409		
Social support	1	95.6	3.9	.048	.05	.021		
Religious participation	1	264.4	10.9	.001	-.09	.168		
Cognitive deficit	1	202.1	8.3	.004	.08	.074		
Stressful life events	1	591.3	24.3	.000	-.13	.082		
Health status	1	1145.1	47.1	.000	-.21	.103		
Daily activity limitations	1	1508.2	62.1	.000	-.24	.045		
Vision	3	66.5	2.74	.021	-.11	.175		
Hearing	3	2.2	1.0	.965	-.04	.169		
Vision \times Hearing	9	12.1	0.5	.876	.01	.160		
Corrected model	26	577.9	23.8	.000				
R^2 (adjusted)					.376			

^aStandardized regression coefficients.

HIV e Aneurismas



Good and bad controls

Bons controles

- Bloqueiam caminhos não causais.
- Aumentam a precisão das estimativas.
- Permitem a inferência de efeitos causais.


Controles ruins

- Bloqueiam caminhos causais.
- Abrem caminhos não causais (colliders)
- Reduzem a precisão das estimativas.
- Levam a estimativas enviesadas de efeitos causais.

Summary

- A única maneira de responder perguntas causais sobre os nossos sistemas é pensar sobre eles cientificamente.
- Métodos estatísticos não conseguem diferenciar entre associações causais e não causais (só estamos medindo diferenças!)
- Comparação de modelos, significância e outras ferramentas estatísticas são úteis, mas não podem substituir o pensamento científico e o conhecimento de área.
- Use diagramas causais sempre para pensar nas relações que você está tentando medir.
- Use o **backdoor criteria** para decidir quais variáveis você deveria incluir no modelo, dependendo de qual pergunta você está tentando responder.
 - Qual efeito você quer estimar?
 - **Estimativas diferentes** podem precisar de **modelos diferentes**.

Quero saber mais!



CAUSAL INFERENCE IN STATISTICS

A Primer

Judea Pearl
Madelyn Glymour
Nicholas P. Jewell

WILEY

