

STA640 Homework 4

Fan Bu

10/20/2020

First create a data frame object `dat` to represent the data.

```
library(tidyverse)
dat = data.frame(Z = c(rep(0,185+123+9+41), rep(1, 37+20+26+96)),
                  W = c(rep(0,185+123), rep(1, 9+41),
                        rep(0,37+20), rep(1, 26+96)),
                  Y = c(rep(0,185), rep(1,123), rep(0,9), rep(1,41),
                        rep(0,37), rep(1,20), rep(0,26), rep(1,96)))
```

Problem 1

The ITT estimate is simply

$$\frac{\sum_{i=1}^n Z_i Y_i}{\sum_{i=1}^n Z_i} - \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n (1 - Z_i) Y_i}{\sum_{i=1}^n (1 - Z_i)},$$

and I'll estimate the standard error via bootstrap.

```
# estimate
ITTy = mean(dat$Y[dat$Z == 1]) - mean(dat$Y[dat$Z == 0])

# SE via bootstrap
set.seed(42)
B = 1000
N = nrow(dat)
ITT.boot = sapply(1:B, function(i){
  dat.boot = dat %>% slice(sample(1:N, N, replace = T))
  mean(dat.boot$Y[dat.boot$Z == 1]) - mean(dat.boot$Y[dat.boot$Z == 0])
})

cat('ITT estimate:', ITTy, '\nStandard error:', sd(ITT.boot), '\n')
```

```
## ITT estimate: 0.1899441
## Standard error: 0.04495113
```

Problem 2

The 4 possible pre-assignment groups are

- $W(0) = 0, W(1) = 0$, “never-takers”: people who would not take physiotherapy no matter whether or not they receive the discount.
- $W(0) = 0, W(1) = 1$, “compliers”; people who would take physiotherapy if offered a discount, but wouldn't otherwise.
- $W(0) = 1, W(1) = 0$, “defiers”; people who would take physiotherapy if **not** offered a discount, but wouldn't do so if offered a discount.
- $W(0) = 1, W(1) = 1$, “always-takers”; people who would always take physiotherapy no matter whether or not they receive the discount.

Problem 3

0. Randomness (this is already implied by Z_i being a randomizer)

1. Existence of compliers (Z has direct effect on received treatment)

$$Pr(W_i = 1 \mid Z_i = 1) > 0 \text{ and } Pr(W_i = 0 \mid Z_i = 0) > 0 \quad \text{for all } i.$$

This assumption is plausible and this should be true in almost all randomized trials (we would expect at least some people to comply)

2. Exclusion Restriction for non-compliers (Z doesn't have direct effects on the outcomes).

$$Y_i(0) = Y_i(1), \quad \text{for all } i \in S_i = n, a.$$

This is plausible, as for never-takers and always-takers, their treatment assignment doesn't affect if they actually receive the treatment, and so the potential outcomes would be the same.

(Note: we don't actually need the strong monotonicity assumption for Z_i to be an instrument technically, so it's not stated here; but strong monotonicity will be assumed in following parts to ensure identifiability.)

Problem 4

We need the “random assignment” assumption (which is implicitly assumed in **problem 3**), and also the **monotonicity** assumption, which is assumption 1 above plus $W_i(1) \geq W_i(0)$ (no defiers).

Since we assume there is no defiers, we only need to estimate π_c, π_n, π_a as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{\pi}_a &= \frac{\sum_i W_i(1 - Z_i)}{\sum_i (1 - Z_i)}; \\ \hat{\pi}_n &= \frac{\sum_i (1 - W_i)Z_i}{\sum_i Z_i} = 1 - \frac{\sum_i W_i Z_i}{\sum_i Z_i}; \\ \hat{\pi}_c &= 1 - \hat{\pi}_a - \hat{\pi}_n = \frac{\sum_i W_i Z_i}{\sum_i Z_i} - \frac{\sum_i W_i(1 - Z_i)}{\sum_i (1 - Z_i)}.\end{aligned}$$

Again, standard errors are estimated via bootstrap.

```
get_prop_est <- function(d){
  est = numeric(3)
  # pi_a:
  est[1] = mean(d$W[d$Z==0])
  # pi_n:
  est[2] = 1 - mean(d$W[d$Z==1])
  # pi_c:
  est[3] = 1 - est[1] - est[2]

  est
}

# bootstrap
set.seed(42)
B = 1000
N = nrow(dat)
props.boot = sapply(1:B, function(i){
  dat.boot = dat %>% slice(sample(1:N, N, replace = T))
  get_prop_est(dat.boot)
})

Est = get_prop_est(dat)
SEs = apply(props.boot, 1, sd)
```

```
res = data.frame(Group = c('always-taker', 'never-taker', 'complier'),
                  Est.prop = Est,
                  SE = SEs)
knitr::kable(res, digits = 4)
```

Group	Est.prop	SE
always-taker	0.1397	0.0187
never-taker	0.3184	0.0355
complier	0.5419	0.0401

Problem 5

The intent-to-treat effect for true compliers is defined as

$$\begin{aligned} ITT_c &= \mathbb{E}(Y_i(1) - Y_i(0) \mid S_i = c) \\ &= \mathbb{E}(Y_i(1) - Y_i(0) \mid W_i(0) = 0, W_i(1) = 1). \end{aligned}$$

Under the assumptions in problems 3 (and 4), we have

$$ITT = \pi_c ITT_c,$$

which means we can estimate ITT_c by

$$\hat{\tau}_c = \hat{\tau}_y / \hat{\pi}_c,$$

where $\hat{\tau}_y$ is the estimate for ITT and $\hat{\pi}_c$ is the estimated proportion. Same as before, I'll use bootstrap to estimate the standard error.

```
get_ITTc_est <- function(d){
  # 1. ITT estimate
  ITTy = mean(d$Y[d$Z == 1]) - mean(d$Y[d$Z == 0])

  # 2. pi_c
  pi_c = mean(d$W[d$Z==1]) - mean(d$W[d$Z==0])

  # 3. ITT_c
  ITTc = ITTy/pi_c

  ITTc
}

# SE via bootstrap
set.seed(42)
B = 1000
N = nrow(dat)
ITTc.boot = sapply(1:B, function(i){
  dat.boot = dat %>% slice(sample(1:N, replace = T))
  get_ITTc_est(dat.boot)
})

cat('For true compliers,\nITT estimate:', get_ITTc_est(dat),
    '\nStandard error:', sd(ITTc.boot), '\n')
```

```
## For true compliers,
## ITT estimate: 0.3505155
## Standard error: 0.07652557
```

Problem 6

The estimate in (5) is really about the clinical **efficacy** of the treatment, as it represents the effect of actually taking physiotherapy. This estimate provides more meaningful clinical implications.

However, the estimate in (1) is more about the **effectiveness** of the treatment for a general population, as it represents the effect of “promoting physiotherapy”. This estimate provides more meaningful health policy implications.

Problem 7

Since whether or not a patient is still reachable at six months after surgery is self-selected (either by death or self-choices), and the probability of dropout may depend (a lot) on the principal strata (the compliance types), ignoring the compliance data and only estimating ITT on those still-reachable patients may lead to severe bias.

In other words, the missing data mechanism at six months could be highly dependent on the compliance types, and adjusting for compliance types can reduce bias when estimating ITT.

Problem 8

Let the parameters θ consist of

$$p_{s,z} = Pr(Y_i = 1 \mid Z_i = z, S_i = s)$$

$$\pi_s = Pr(S_i = s)$$

for $s \in \{a, n, c, d\}$ and $z \in \{0, 1\}$.

Then the likelihood contribution of the i th individual (assuming we know S_i) can be written as

$$p(Y_i^{obs}, S_i \mid Z_i, \theta)$$

$$= p(Y_i^{obs} \mid S_i, Z_i, \theta) p(S_i \mid \theta)$$

$$= p_{S_i, Z_i}^{Y_i^{obs}} (1 - p_{S_i, Z_i})^{1 - Y_i^{obs}} \pi_{S_i}.$$

And then the likelihood would be

$$\prod_{i=1}^n p(Y_i^{obs}, S_i \mid Z_i, \theta)$$

$$= \prod_{i=1}^n [p_{S_i, Z_i}^{Y_i^{obs}} (1 - p_{S_i, Z_i})^{1 - Y_i^{obs}} \pi_{S_i}]$$

$$= \prod_{i: S_i=a, Z_i=1} [p_{a,1}^{Y_i^{obs}} (1 - p_{a,1})^{1 - Y_i^{obs}} \pi_a]$$

$$\times \prod_{i: S_i=a, Z_i=0} [p_{a,0}^{Y_i^{obs}} (1 - p_{a,0})^{1 - Y_i^{obs}} \pi_a]$$

$$\times \prod_{i: S_i=n, Z_i=1} [p_{n,1}^{Y_i^{obs}} (1 - p_{n,1})^{1 - Y_i^{obs}} \pi_n]$$

$$\times \prod_{i: S_i=n, Z_i=0} [p_{n,0}^{Y_i^{obs}} (1 - p_{n,0})^{1 - Y_i^{obs}} \pi_n]$$

$$\times \prod_{i: S_i=c, Z_i=1} [p_{c,1}^{Y_i^{obs}} (1 - p_{c,1})^{1 - Y_i^{obs}} \pi_c]$$

$$\times \prod_{i: S_i=c, Z_i=0} [p_{c,0}^{Y_i^{obs}} (1 - p_{c,0})^{1 - Y_i^{obs}} \pi_c]$$

$$\times \prod_{i: S_i=d, Z_i=1} [p_{d,1}^{Y_i^{obs}} (1 - p_{d,1})^{1 - Y_i^{obs}} \pi_d]$$

$$\times \prod_{i: S_i=d, Z_i=0} [p_{d,0}^{Y_i^{obs}} (1 - p_{d,0})^{1 - Y_i^{obs}} \pi_d].$$

Problem 9

Under the assumptions in **problem 3**, we have $\pi_d = 0$ and that $p_{n,1} = p_{n,0} = p_n$ and $p_{a,1} = p_{a,0} = p_a$.

Our estimand is

$$ITT_c = p_{c,1} - p_{c,0}.$$

Then the likelihood is simplified to

$$\begin{aligned} & \prod_{i=1}^n p(Y_i^{obs}, S_i | Z_i, \theta) \\ &= \prod_{i:S_i=a} [p_a^{Y_i^{obs}} (1 - p_a)^{1-Y_i^{obs}} \pi_a] \\ & \quad \times \prod_{i:S_i=n} [p_n^{Y_i^{obs}} (1 - p_n)^{1-Y_i^{obs}} \pi_n] \\ & \quad \times \prod_{i:S_i=c, Z_i=1} [p_{c,1}^{Y_i^{obs}} (1 - p_{c,1})^{1-Y_i^{obs}} \pi_c] \\ & \quad \times \prod_{i:S_i=c, Z_i=0} [p_{c,0}^{Y_i^{obs}} (1 - p_{c,0})^{1-Y_i^{obs}} \pi_c]. \end{aligned}$$

Note that in reality we don't observe the true S_i but only $W_i^{obs} = W_i(Z_i)$. Adopting flat priors for the parameters θ , we can draw samples of S_i and $p_a, p_n, p_{c,1}, p_{c,0}, \pi_a, \pi_n, \pi_c$ via the following Gibbs sampler:

For $r = 1 : R$, do:

1. Draw $S_i^{(r)}$ for each person i :
 - if $Z_i = 0, W_i^{obs} = 1$, i is definitely an always-taker, so set $S_i^{(r)} = a$ (no need to update or redraw);
 - if $Z_i = 1, W_i^{obs} = 0$, i is definitely a never-taker, so set $S_i^{(r)} = n$ (no need to update or redraw);
 - if $Z_i = 0, W_i^{obs} = 0$, draw $S_i^{(r)} \in \{n, c\}$ where

$$\begin{aligned} Pr(S_i = n | \text{everything else}) &\propto p_n^{(r-1)Y_i^{obs}} (1 - p_n^{(r-1)})^{1-Y_i^{obs}} \pi_n^{(r-1)} \\ Pr(S_i = c | \text{everything else}) &\propto p_{c,0}^{(r-1)Y_i^{obs}} (1 - p_{c,0}^{(r-1)})^{1-Y_i^{obs}} \pi_n^{(r-1)}. \end{aligned}$$

- if $Z_i = 1, W_i^{obs} = 1$, draw $S_i^{(r)} \in \{a, c\}$ where

$$\begin{aligned} Pr(S_i = n | \text{everything else}) &\propto p_a^{(r-1)Y_i^{obs}} (1 - p_a^{(r-1)})^{1-Y_i^{obs}} \pi_a^{(r-1)} \\ Pr(S_i = c | \text{everything else}) &\propto p_{c,1}^{(r-1)Y_i^{obs}} (1 - p_{c,1}^{(r-1)})^{1-Y_i^{obs}} \pi_n^{(r-1)}. \end{aligned}$$

2. Draw $\pi_a^{(r)}, \pi_n^{(r)}, \pi_c^{(r)}$ from

$$(\pi_a^{(r)}, \pi_n^{(r)}, \pi_c^{(r)}) \sim Dir((N_a^{(r)}, N_n^{(r)}, N_c^{(r)})),$$

where $N_s^{(r)} = \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{1}(S_i^{(r)} = s)$ for each $s \in \{a, n, c\}$.

3. Draw $p_a^{(r)}, p_n^{(r)}, p_{c,1}^{(r)}, p_{c,0}^{(r)}$ via

$$\begin{aligned} p_a^{(r)} &\sim Beta(\sum_{i:S_i^{(r)}=a} Y_i^{obs}, N_a^{(r)} - \sum_{i:S_i^{(r)}=a} Y_i^{obs}) \\ p_n^{(r)} &\sim Beta(\sum_{i:S_i^{(r)}=n} Y_i^{obs}, N_n^{(r)} - \sum_{i:S_i^{(r)}=n} Y_i^{obs}) \\ p_{c,1}^{(r)} &\sim Beta(\sum_{i:S_i^{(r)}=c, Z_i=1} Y_i^{obs}, \sum_{i:S_i^{(r)}=c} Z_i - \sum_{i:S_i^{(r)}=c, Z_i=1} Y_i^{obs}) \\ p_{c,0}^{(r)} &\sim Beta(\sum_{i:S_i^{(r)}=c, Z_i=0} Y_i^{obs}, \sum_{i:S_i^{(r)}=c} (1 - Z_i) - \sum_{i:S_i^{(r)}=c, Z_i=0} Y_i^{obs}). \end{aligned}$$

Then after running the Gibbs sampler to obtain R samples of S_i 's and θ , the posterior distribution of ITT_c is approximated by the set of samples

$$\{p_{c,1}^{(r)} - p_{c,0}^{(r)}\}_{r=1}^R.$$