



Balance and SMD!



ehsan.karim@ubc.ca

Oct 7, 2020

SPPH 504/007



Illustrative example: Research question

Research Question: Whether or not adult patients with **rheumatoid arthritis** (RA) are at increased risk for heart attack (or **myocardial infarction**) in US.

Outcome (Y): heart attack (MI)

Exposure (A): rheumatoid arthritis (RA)

Comparison group: People without RA.


Exclusion criteria: Patients with

Osteoarthritis or other arthritis, young subjects (age < 20).



RCT

RCT



$$A = RA; Y = MI$$

RCT

RCT

	Non-arthritis	Rheumatoid
age (%)		
(0,50]	60 (30.9)	62 (32.0)
(50,70]	82 (42.3)	85 (43.8)
70+	52 (26.8)	47 (24.2)




age distribution
balanced in 2 groups

A = RA; Y = MI

Objectives. To determine the prevalence trends of osteoarthritis (OA), rheumatoid arthritis (RA), and other types of arthritis in the United States from 1999 to 2014. Methods. We analyzed data on 43 706 community-dwelling adults aged 20 years and older who participated in the 1999–2014 National Health and Nutrition Examination Surveys. We accounted for survey design and sampling weights so that estimates were nationally representative. We assessed temporal trends in age-standardized arthritis prevalence by ...

☆ 77 Cited by 5 Related articles All 11 versions Web of Science: 4 »

RA-MI example




relatively low prevalence
of RA; also chronic,


harder to do RCT

RCT vs. Observational study

RCT



Observational studies




L is not randomized anymore₆

Notations: confounder

A: Exposure status (1 = exposed; 0 = not)

Y: Outcome

L: Covariates




L could be restricted / matched / stratified / adjusted in regression to get unbiased treatment effect

RCT vs. Observational study

Is **age** really a confounder?

Observational studies

If **age distribution** in people with **rheumatoid arthritis** versus people **without arthritis** is the same, then age is not a confounder (loosely speaking).



RCT vs. Observational study

Is **age** really a confounder?

If **age distribution** in people with rheumatoid arthritis versus people without arthritis is the same, then age is not a confounder (loosely speaking).

age	arthritis.type	
	Non-arthritis	Rheumatoid arthritis
(0,50]	0.63	0.23
(50,70]	0.26	0.52
70+	0.11	0.25

Is that the case here?

Is the age distribution balanced in 2 groups?

Imbalance measure: **important concept!!**

- Balance checking is often revealing of variables that require adjustment (responsible for imbalance).

For a **continuous variable**, the standardized mean difference

$$SMD_{continuous} = \frac{\bar{l}_{RA} - \bar{l}_{NoArthritis}}{\sqrt{\frac{s_{RA}^2 + s_{NoArthritis}^2}{2}}}$$

For a **binary variable**, the standardized proportion difference

$$SMD_{binary} = \frac{\hat{p}_{RA} - \hat{p}_{NoArthritis}}{\sqrt{\frac{\hat{p}_{RA} \times (1 - \hat{p}_{RA}) + \hat{p}_{NoArthritis} \times (1 - \hat{p}_{NoArthritis})}{2}}}$$

Imbalance measure:



Table 1

Stratified
by RA

		Stratified by arthritis.type		
		Non-arthritis	Rheumatoid arthritis	SMD
##	n	4089	325	
##	gender = Female (%)	1960 (47.9)	194 (59.7)	0.238
##	diabetes = Yes (%)	358 (8.8)	87 (26.8)	0.485
##	smoke = Yes (%)	1796 (43.9)	177 (54.5)	0.212
##	age (%)			0.891
##	(0,50]	2577 (63.0)	74 (22.8)	
##	(50,70]	1046 (25.6)	169 (52.0)	
##	70+	466 (11.4)	82 (25.2)	

SMD = measure of distance between two group means/proportions. **SMD > .2**
means imbalance.

What to do if imbalance exists?

Logistic($Y \sim A$):

crude and potentially biased in the observational setting

crude OR = $E[Y(1) \text{ vs. } Y(0)] = 3.54$

Illustrative example: Potential Adjustment variables



Confounders and risk factors (L):

age, BMI, diabetes, smoking.

Demographic variables that could be confounders / risk factors (L):


sex, race, education,

marital status, income, origin.

Additional factors / potential confounders (L):

physical activity, access to medical services,

hypertension/high blood pressure and diet



What to do if imbalance exists? Regression

Logistic($Y \sim A + L1 + L2 + L3 + \dots Ln$): adjusted

adjusted OR = $E[Y(1) \text{ vs. } Y(0) \mid L] = 1.54$

Thanks!



ehsan.karim@ubc.ca



www.ehsankarim.com