

# simulations\_confounding

Michael Cork

1/20/2022

## Count data

### Confounding

We now look to generate the exposure data using different specifications of the relationship between confounding and exposure based on work by Xiao. We generate  $E$  using six different specifications that rely on the function  $\gamma(\mathbf{C}) = -0.8 + (0.1, 0.1, -0.1, 0.2, 0.1, 0.1) \cdot \mathbf{C}$ . Specifically, 1)  $W = 9 \times \gamma(\mathbf{C}) + 17 + N(0, 5)$ ; 2)  $W = 15 \times \gamma(\mathbf{C}) + 22 + T(2)$ ; 3)  $W = 9 \times \gamma(\mathbf{C}) + 3/2C_3^2 + 15 + N(0, 5)$  4)  $W = 49 \times \frac{\exp(\gamma(\mathbf{C}))}{1 + \exp(\gamma(\mathbf{C}))} - 6 + N(0, 5)$ ; 22 5)  $W = 42 \times \frac{1}{1 + \exp(\gamma(\mathbf{C}))} - 18 + N(0, 5)$ ; 6)  $W = 7 \times \log(\gamma(\mathbf{C})) + 13 + N(0, 4)$ ;

One thing to note is that for 6), in actuality it is using  $W = 7 \times \log(|\gamma(\mathbf{C})|) + 13 + N(0, 4)$ . I then ran through three different iterations of the sample size (N = 200, 1000, 5000) and then fit the following outcome model:

$$Y|E, C \sim \text{Pois}(\mu(E, C))$$
$$\log(\mu(E, C)) = 2 + 0.1 * E - (0.2, 0.2, 0.3, -0.1, 0.2, 0.2) * C$$

| gps_mod | sample_size | model        | bias          | mse          |
|---------|-------------|--------------|---------------|--------------|
| 1       | 200         | linear_model | 2.733619e-01  | 1.992652e+00 |
| 1       | 200         | gam_model    | 2.359080e-02  | 4.262503e+00 |
| 1       | 1000        | linear_model | 4.400800e-03  | 5.115241e-01 |
| 1       | 1000        | gam_model    | 1.038210e-02  | 1.061761e+00 |
| 2       | 200         | linear_model | 1.021310e-01  | 4.367799e+01 |
| 2       | 200         | gam_model    | 9.081375e-01  | 1.051411e+02 |
| 2       | 1000        | linear_model | -6.659149e-01 | 4.484542e+01 |
| 2       | 1000        | gam_model    | -2.246836e-01 | 7.662117e+01 |
| 3       | 200         | linear_model | 2.161620e-02  | 2.323701e-01 |
| 3       | 200         | gam_model    | 1.039950e-01  | 1.510932e+00 |
| 3       | 1000        | linear_model | 1.871913e-01  | 4.872672e+00 |
| 3       | 1000        | gam_model    | 1.550040e-01  | 9.240206e+00 |
| 4       | 200         | linear_model | -1.119050e-02 | 7.605035e-01 |
| 4       | 200         | gam_model    | -2.094760e-02 | 1.519948e+00 |
| 4       | 1000        | linear_model | -8.931430e-02 | 6.154136e-01 |
| 4       | 1000        | gam_model    | -1.733474e-01 | 1.296533e+00 |
| 5       | 200         | linear_model | -1.640017e-01 | 1.177963e+00 |
| 5       | 200         | gam_model    | 1.460340e-02  | 7.029202e+00 |
| 5       | 1000        | linear_model | 2.937790e-02  | 2.662051e-01 |
| 5       | 1000        | gam_model    | -1.319360e-02 | 6.212679e-01 |
| 6       | 200         | linear_model | 3.202174e-01  | 4.202221e+00 |
| 6       | 200         | gam_model    | 9.662872e-01  | 5.947636e+01 |
| 6       | 1000        | linear_model | 1.478495e+00  | 1.775422e+03 |

| gps_mod | sample_size | model     | bias         | mse          |
|---------|-------------|-----------|--------------|--------------|
| 6       | 1000        | gam_model | 6.405137e+06 | 7.939458e+15 |

Questions: What other types of outcome model should I use to make sure nonlinear confounding is occurring?

## Types of confounding

### Count data with sublinear relationship

See equation above

## 5%

## 1.524179

## 95%

## 20.7137



