

Practical Exercises Discussion

Propensity Score

2. CRUDE EFFECT

Perform a t-test to estimate the mean LDL among drinkers and non-drinkers

```
ttest LDL, by(drinkany)
```

Two-sample t test with equal variances

Variable	Obs	Mean	Std. Err.	Std. Dev.	[95% Conf. Interval]	
no	1675	146.3786	.9487574	38.82957	144.5178	148.2395
yes	1075	142.9931	1.100692	36.0886	140.8334	145.1529
combined	2750	145.0552	.7210321	37.81124	143.6414	146.469
diff		3.385511	1.476521		.4903076	6.280714
diff = mean(no) - mean(yes)				t =	2.2929	
Ho: diff = 0				degrees of freedom =	2748	
Ha: diff < 0		Ha: diff != 0		Ha: diff > 0		
Pr(T < t) = 0.9890		Pr(T > t) = 0.0219		Pr(T > t) = 0.0110		

The mean is 3.4 mg/dL lower among drinkers than among non-drinkers (+0.5 to -6.3), $p = 0.02$. This is completely unadjusted so it could be susceptible to differences due to confounders. This is what we attempt to address using propensity scores.

4. OVERLAP

Overlap, requires that we have a good number of drinkers and non-drinkers at the levels of the propensity.

What does the table for overlap indicate?

```
tabulate drinkany group, col
```

any current alcohol consumptio n	5 quantiles of out					Total
	1	2	3	4	5	
no	421	337	320	323	275	1,676
	76.41	61.05	58.08	58.51	50.00	60.81
yes	130	215	231	229	275	1,080
	23.59	38.95	41.92	41.49	50.00	39.19
Total	551	552	551	552	550	2,756
	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

This is very good overlap with an adequate sample size in each group. We note that the group with the most imbalance is the first quintile with 130 v. 421 which means even in the first quintile there is a good sample size in the smaller group.

5. DRINKING BY PROPENSITY INTERACTION

Perform the likelihood ratio test for interaction.

```
.lrtest A
```

```
Likelihood-ratio test  
(Assumption: . nested in A)
```

```
LR chi2(4) = 4.45  
Prob > chi2 = 0.3484
```

What is the null hypothesis of this test? Is the null hypothesis rejected? Does there appear to be an interaction?

The null hypothesis is that the adjusted mean difference in LDL between drinkers and non-drinkers is the same across the quintile of the propensity score. The null hypothesis is not rejected which tells us there is not convincing evidence that the effect of drinking across quintiles of the propensity scores.

This can be further seen by examining the mean LDL by drinking and propensity quintile and we do see a range of mean effects of LDL of -7.7 in the first quartile to +0.7 in the second quartile. It seems that a degree of subject matter knowledge would be required to have a firm opinion about whether this is a clinical meaningful degree of variation.

table drinkany group, c(mean LDL)

any current alcohol consumption	5 quantiles of out				
	1	2	3	4	5
no	151.0268	143.6577	145.5313	144.705	145.7033
yes	143.3246	144.3502	142.927	138.6176	145.492

6. QUINTILE ANALYSIS

What is the estimated average causal effect of drinking on LDL using the quintile?

. reg LDL i. drinkany i.group

Source	SS	df	MS	Number of obs =	2745
Model	20460.8981	5	4092.17962	F(5, 2739) =	2.87
Residual	3903721.59	2739	1425.23607	Prob > F =	0.0137
Total	3924182.49	2744	1430.09566	R-squared =	0.0052
				Adj R-squared =	0.0034
				Root MSE =	37.752

LDL	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf. Interval]	
drinkany						
yes	-2.937299	1.499656	-1.96	0.050	-5.877869	.0032715
group						
2	-4.83042	2.290844	-2.11	0.035	-9.322376	-.3384641
3	-4.225933	2.294728	-1.84	0.066	-8.725505	.2736395
4	-6.493949	2.294933	-2.83	0.005	-10.99392	-1.993974
5	-2.832651	2.313238	-1.22	0.221	-7.368519	1.703217
_cons	149.8964	1.651472	90.77	0.000	146.6582	153.1347

The mean difference between drinkers and non-drinkers is -2.9 with a 95% confidence interval from -5.9 to +0.0, $p = 0.05$

Use the margins command to estimate the causal mean LDL if the entire population was drinkers v. non-drinkers.

```
margins drinkany
```

```
Predictive margins                                Number of obs   =       2745
Model VCE      : OLS

Expression     : Linear prediction, predict()
```

	Delta-method		t	P> t	[95% Conf. Interval]	
	Margin	Std. Err.				
drinkany						
no	146.2183	.9292405	157.35	0.000	144.3962	148.0404
yes	143.281	1.163017	123.20	0.000	141.0005	145.5615

It is important to note (1) what quantities these numbers are meant to represent, (2) how they are calculated and (3) why they are unconfounded.

The mean value (143.281) which appears under drinking is an estimate of the mean LDL which would be predicted based on the regression model if everyone in the dataset was a drinker (but keep their confounder values and hence their propensity the same).

How would we calculate such a quantity? For people who were drinkers, we can use their values. For someone who is a non-drinker, we need to predict what their LDL would be if their confounders remained the same but they were a drinker. Confounders only exert their influence here through the propensity score - specifically, the propensity quintile. So, if a non-drinker was, say, in the first quintile of the propensity their estimated LDL if they drank would be 149.8964 (the first quintile is the reference group) -2.937299. This would be repeated for each non-drinker. The mean over all values in the data (actual values in the drinker and predicted values in non-drinkers) are what gives rise to the mean value for the drinkers. The mean for non-drinkers is defined analogously.

This strategy deals with confounding. Because the means are calculated over two populations with exactly the same distributions of potential confounders, confounding by these variables is eradicated. Here, the two identical populations are the full dataset (really one population compared under two conditions -- drinking and non-drinking).

Verify that the difference of these means corresponds to the coefficient in the above regression model.

The difference in means from the previous “margins” command is given by

```
margins, dydx(drinkany)
```

```
Average marginal effects      Number of obs   =      2745
Model VCE      : OLS
```

```
Expression      : Linear prediction, predict()
dy/dx w.r.t.    : 1.drinkany
```

		Delta-method		t	P> t	[95% Conf. Interval]	
		dy/dx	Std. Err.				
drinkany							
yes		-2.937299	1.499656	-1.96	0.050	-5.877869	.0032715

The mean difference between drinkers and non-drinkers is -2.9 with a 95% confidence interval from -5.9 to +0.0, $p = 0.05$. Note, this is exactly the difference of means of $146.2183 - 143.281$ and exactly equal to the coefficient from the regression model on which the margins are based. There is something useful here. Usually, we can only talk about the adjusted mean difference (-2.94) and people have trouble judging this because they can see the means in the two groups. The means from the t-test are potentially confounded) However, margins gives us adjusted means and the difference in the adjusted means is identical to the adjusted difference between the groups.

6. 20-LEVEL ANALYSIS

Create a 20 level split of the propensities to rule out the possibility of residual confounding in the quintile analysis

```
xtile group20 = out, nq(20)
```

```
reg LDL i.drinkany i.group20
```

```
. reg LDL i.drinkany i.group20
```

Source	SS	df	MS	Number of obs	=	2745
Model	58237.2186	20	2911.86093	F(20, 2724)	=	2.05
Residual	3865945.27	2724	1419.21632	Prob > F	=	0.0039
Total	3924182.49	2744	1430.09566	R-squared	=	0.0148
				Adj R-squared	=	0.0076
				Root MSE	=	37.672

	LDL	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf. Interval]	
drinkany							
yes		-2.914729	1.502084	-1.94	0.052	-5.860069	.03061
group20							
2		5.645777	4.560364	1.24	0.216	-3.296345	14.5879
3		-8.859952	4.565822	-1.94	0.052	-17.81278	.0928734
4		1.091636	4.574203	0.24	0.811	-7.877623	10.0609
5		-5.205367	4.5865	-1.13	0.257	-14.19874	3.788004
6		-9.4825	4.569481	-2.08	0.038	-18.4425	-.5225004
7		-2.816024	4.573241	-0.62	0.538	-11.7834	6.151347
8		-3.964823	4.588219	-0.86	0.388	-12.96156	5.031919
9		-7.204453	4.586245	-1.57	0.116	-16.19732	1.788417
10		-7.339405	4.580946	-1.60	0.109	-16.32189	1.643074
11		-1.108969	4.577644	-0.24	0.809	-10.08498	7.867037
12		-3.44955	4.577644	-0.75	0.451	-12.42556	5.526456
13		-9.140638	4.592145	-1.99	0.047	-18.14508	-.1361983
14		-7.401126	4.583478	-1.61	0.106	-16.38857	1.586319
15		-9.825125	4.575806	-2.15	0.032	-18.79753	-.8527237
16		-1.804003	4.576712	-0.39	0.693	-10.77818	7.170176
17		-3.92268	4.59361	-0.85	0.393	-12.92999	5.084633
18		2.807445	4.598797	0.61	0.542	-6.210039	11.82493
19		-3.364178	4.594766	-0.73	0.464	-12.37376	5.645401
20		-9.06596	4.591376	-1.97	0.048	-18.06889	-.0630281
_cons		150.4276	3.251559	46.26	0.000	144.0518	156.8034

margins drinkany

Predictive margins
Model VCE : OLS

Number of obs = 2745

Expression : Linear prediction, predict()

		Delta-method				[95% Conf. Interval]	
		Margin	Std. Err.	t	P> t		
drinkany							
no		146.2095	.9286607	157.44	0.000	144.3885	148.0304
yes		143.2947	1.163235	123.19	0.000	141.0138	145.5757

.How do these results compare to the quintile analysis

They are strikingly similar.

7. STANDARD ADJUSTED ANALYSIS

In a standard adjusted analysis we would do a linear regression on LDL with drinking adjusting for the potential confounders.

```
reg LDL i.drinkany smoking nonwhite age BMI
```

Source	SS	df	MS	Number of obs = 2745		
Model	42279.1877	5	8455.83753	F(5, 2739)	=	5.97
Residual	3881903.3	2739	1417.27028	Prob > F	=	0.0000
Total	3924182.49	2744	1430.09566	R-squared	=	0.0108
				Adj R-squared	=	0.0090
				Root MSE	=	37.647

LDL	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf. Interval]	
drinkany						
yes	-2.722354	1.498854	-1.82	0.069	-5.661352	.2166445
smoking	4.750738	2.210391	2.15	0.032	.4165362	9.08494
nonwhite	5.219436	2.323673	2.25	0.025	.6631079	9.775764
age	-.1897166	.1130776	-1.68	0.094	-.4114427	.0320095
BMI	.3591038	.1341047	2.68	0.007	.0961472	.6220605
_cons	147.3153	9.256449	15.91	0.000	129.165	165.4656

What is the estimated effect of drinking on LDL in the standard regression?

It is a difference of -2.7 mg/dL with a 95% confidence interval (-5.6 mg/dL to +0.2 mg/dL) with p-value 0.069.

What are the estimated mean LDL for drinkers and non-drinkers? How to these results compare to the propensity analysis?

```
margins drinkany
```

```
Predictive margins                                Number of obs = 2745
Model VCE      : OLS
Expression     : Linear prediction, predict()
```

	Delta-method					
	Margin	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf. Interval]	
drinkany						
no	146.1342	.9274793	157.56	0.000	144.3156	147.9528
yes	143.4119	1.161385	123.48	0.000	141.1346	145.6891

They are very similar even through the p-values are significant in one case and not the other.

8. HIGH DIMENSIONAL PROPENSITY MODEL

Fit a very rich propensity model which includes splines and interactions.

```
mkspline agesp = age, nknots(5) cubic
mkspline bmisp = BMI, nknots(5) cubic
```

```
logit drinkany smoking nonwhite smoking##c.agesp* smoking##c.b-
misp* nonwhite##c.agesp* nonwhite##c.bmisp*
(the above needs to be written on one line)
```

```
predict outsp, p
```

```
xtile groupsp = outsp, nq(5)
```

Assess the overlap of the quintile groups “groupsp” based on the richer model and estimate the average causal effect based on it. Have your conclusions changed?

any current alcohol consumptio n	5 quantiles of outsp					Total
	1	2	3	4	5	
no	419 76.04	363 65.76	318 57.71	302 54.71	274 49.82	1,676 60.81
yes	132 23.96	189 34.24	233 42.29	250 45.29	276 50.18	1,080 39.19
Total	551 100.00	552 100.00	551 100.00	552 100.00	550 100.00	2,756 100.00

Note, there was an error in the lab. The command for the quintile should have been “xtile groupsp = outsp, nq(5)”. Note, the correction in red. Overall, the overlap as well the as major result is quite similar to the less rich propensity model

```
reg LDL i.drinkany i.groupsp
```

Source	SS	df	MS	Number of obs =	2745
Model	23582.7607	5	4716.55214	F(5, 2739) =	3.31
Residual	3900599.73	2739	1424.09629	Prob > F =	0.0055
Total	3924182.49	2744	1430.09566	R-squared =	0.0060
				Adj R-squared =	0.0042
				Root MSE =	37.737

LDL	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf. Interval]	
drinkany						
yes	-2.962454	1.502953	-1.97	0.049	-5.90949	-.0154188

groupsp						
2	-5.716826	2.282945	-2.50	0.012	-10.19329	-1.240358
3	-6.96432	2.295057	-3.03	0.002	-11.46454	-2.464103
4	-4.611981	2.299049	-2.01	0.045	-9.120026	-.1039359
5	-2.834642	2.315005	-1.22	0.221	-7.373975	1.70469
_cons	150.2571	1.651605	90.98	0.000	147.0186	153.4956

margins drinkany

Predictive margins
Model VCE : OLS

Number of obs = 2745

Expression : Linear prediction, predict()

	Delta-method					
	Margin	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf. Interval]	
drinkany						
no	146.2282	.9298323	157.26	0.000	144.4049	148.0514
yes	143.2657	1.164414	123.04	0.000	140.9825	145.5489