Bayesian Regression Discontinuity Design With unknown cutoff

Julia Kowalska, Amsterdam Causality Meeting 23.11.2023







The team



Stéphanie van der Pas



Mark van de Wiel



Regression Discontinuity Design Why?

- First time applied in the 60's to assess effect of receiving certificate of merit on students future academic career
- Problem: Intervention assigned based on cutoff criterion → no overlap between groups with scores below and above the cutoff

Regression Discontinuity Design Why?

- First time applied in the 60's to assess effect of receiving certificate of merit on students future academic career
- Problem: Intervention assigned based on cutoff criterion → no overlap between groups with scores below and above the cutoff

X - score

X - score variable (age, blood pressure, exam score)



X - score

X - score variable (age, blood pressure, exam score)

Score is assigned to each unit (patients, student)



- X score variable (age, blood pressure, exam score)
- Score is assigned to each unit (patients, student)
- **c** cutoff point



- X score variable (age, blood pressure, exam score)
- Score is assigned to each unit (patients, student)
- c cutoff point
- Units with scores above c get treatment, units with scores below c don't get treatment
- T treatment allocation



- X score variable (age, blood pressure, exam score)
- Score is assigned to each unit (patients, student)
- c cutoff point
- Units with scores above c get treatment, units with scores below c don't get treatment
- T treatment allocation
- Y outcome variable



- X score variable (age, blood pressure, exam score)
- Score is assigned to each unit (patients, student)
- **c** cutoff point





- X score variable (age, blood pressure, exam score)
- Score is assigned to each unit (patients, student)
- **c** cutoff point

Units with score above c have significantly higher probability of getting treatment than units with scores below c





- X score variable (age, blood pressure, exam score)
- Score is assigned to each unit (patients, student)
- c cutoff point

Units with score above c <u>have</u> <u>significantly higher probability</u> of getting treatment than units with scores below c





- X score variable (age, blood pressure, exam score)
- Score is assigned to each unit (patients, student)
- c cutoff point

Units with score above c <u>have</u> <u>significantly higher probability</u> of getting treatment than units with scores below c





Nevertakers



- X score variable (age, blood pressure, exam score)
- Score is assigned to each unit (patients, student)
- **c** cutoff point

Units with score above c have significantly higher probability of getting treatment than units with scores below c



- X score variable (age, blood pressure, exam score)
- Score is assigned to each unit (patients, student)
- **c** cutoff point

Units with score above c have significantly higher probability of getting treatment than units with scores below c



- X score variable (age, blood pressure, exam score)
- Score is assigned to each unit (patients, student)
- c cutoff point

Units with score above c <u>have</u> <u>significantly higher probability</u> of getting treatment than units with scores below c

RDD - fuzzy model, example **Hlabisa HIV Treatment and Care Programme**



Source:Bor J,et.al. Effect of eliminating CD4-count thresholds on HIV treatment initiation in South Africa: An empirical modeling study. PLoS One. 2017 Jun 15;12(6):e0178249. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0178249. PMID: 28617805; PMCID: PMC5472329.

Impact on immediate antiretroviral therapy (ART) on retention in care.

- X CD4 count
- c 350 cells/ml
- **T** ART initiation

Y - binary outcome: 1 if evidence for retention in care



Idea behind RDD:

Units close to the cutoff are similar

- 'local randomised experiment'



Idea behind RDD: Units close to the cutoff are similar - 'local randomised experiment'

$$\mathbb{E}\left[Y^{(1)} - Y^{(0)} \mid X = c\right]$$

 $Y^{(1)}, Y^{(0)}$ - potential outcome under treatment/ no treatment





Idea behind RDD: Units close to the cutoff are similar - 'local randomised experiment'

$$\mathbb{E}\left[Y^{(1)} - Y^{(0)} | X = c\right]$$

 $Y^{(1)}, Y^{(0)}$ - potential outcome under treatment/ no treatment





$\tau = \lim \mathbb{E}[Y | X = x] - \lim \mathbb{E}[Y | X = x]$ $X \downarrow C$ $X \uparrow C$

Idea behind RDD: Units close to the cutoff are similar - 'local randomised experiment'

$$\mathbb{E}\left[Y^{(1)} - Y^{(0)} | X = c\right]$$

 $Y^{(1)}, Y^{(0)}$ - potential outcome under treatment/ no treatment





$\tau = \lim \mathbb{E}[Y | X = x] - \lim \mathbb{E}[Y | X = x]$ $X \downarrow C$ $X \uparrow C$

Idea behind RDD: Units close to the cutoff are similar - 'local randomised experiment'

$$\mathbb{E}\left[Y^{(1)} - Y^{(0)} | X = c\right]$$

 $Y^{(1)}, Y^{(0)}$ - potential outcome under treatment/ no treatment



RDD - fuzzy model Causal treatment effect estimand



We can only estimate treatment effect for compliers at the cutoff:

$$\mathbb{E}\left[Y^{(1)} - Y^{(0)} | X = c, ct = C\right]$$

 $Y^{(1)}, Y^{(0)}$ - potential outcome under treatment/ no treatment

RDD - fuzzy model Causal treatment effect estimand



 $\tau = \frac{\lim_{x \downarrow c} \mathbb{E}}{\lim_{x \downarrow c} \mathbb{P}[T]}$

We can only estimate treatment effect for compliers at the cutoff:

$$\mathbb{E}\left[Y^{(1)} - Y^{(0)} | X = c, ct = C\right]$$

 $Y^{(1)}, Y^{(0)}$ - potential outcome under treatment/ no treatment

$$E[Y|X = x] - \lim_{x \uparrow c} \mathbb{E}[Y|X = x]$$
$$= 1 |X = x] - \lim_{x \uparrow c} \mathbb{P}[T = 1 |X = x]$$

$$\tau = \frac{\lim_{x \downarrow c} \mathbb{E}[Y | X = x] - \lim_{x \uparrow c} \mathbb{E}[Y | X = x]}{\lim_{x \downarrow c} \mathbb{P}[T = 1 | X = x] - \lim_{x \uparrow c} \mathbb{P}[T = 1 | X = x]}$$

We don't want the denominator to be small:

- Mathematical problem: analysis is unstable

Philosophical problem: there is almost no compliance so it puts the whole design into question



$$\tau = \frac{\lim_{x \downarrow c} \mathbb{E}[Y | X = x] - \lim_{x \uparrow c} \mathbb{E}[Y | X = x]}{\lim_{x \downarrow c} \mathbb{P}[T = 1 | X = x] - \lim_{x \uparrow c} \mathbb{P}[T = 1 | X = x]}$$

We don't want the denominator to be small:

- Mathematical problem: analysis is unstable

experiment design perspective

Guideline imposed through a policy

Philosophical problem: there is almost no compliance so it puts the whole design into question

Cutoff

mathematical perspective

Point with a significant jump in the treatment probability



Common assumption: they are the same Cutoff is unknown if and only if the guideline is unknown Compliance assessed at the cutoff



Common assumption: they are the same Cutoff is unknown if and only if the guideline is unknown Compliance assessed at the cutoff



Common assumption: they are the same Cutoff is unknown if and only if the guideline is unknown Compliance assessed at the cutoff



RDD - fuzzy model, example revisited

c = 350 cells/ml is not the cutoff!

RDD - fuzzy model, example revisited c = 350 cells/ml is not the cutoff!

Posterior probability - cutoff location



- Misleading clustering:
 - * Points on the two sides of the cutoff clustered together
- Misleading calculations:
 - * Continuity assumptions violated
- Probable cutoff at c=355 close to the guideline









Assumptions:

- Function is increasing
- Convex/concave on each side of the cutoff



Assumptions:

- Function is increasing
- Convex/concave on each side of the cutoff

$$T|_{X=x} \sim ber(p(x))$$

 p(x): two connected linear functions on each side of the cutoff





Assumptions:

- Function is increasing
- Convex/concave on each side of the cutoff

$$\left. \Gamma \right|_{X=x} \sim ber(p(x))$$

- p(x): two connected linear functions on each side of the cutoff
- Additional requirement: minimal jump size





 $a_{0,l}, b_{0,l}, a_{1,l}, b_{1,l}, a_{0,r}, b_{0,r}, a_{1,r}, b_{1,r}, j, c$

Uniform priors

Uniform prior

Informative prior

Assumptions:

- Function is increasing
- Convex/concave on each side of the cutoff

$$T|_{X=x} \sim ber(p(x))$$

- p(x): two connected linear functions on each side of the cutoff
- Additional requirement: minimal jump size





Problem: Bayesian model fits function to the whole data.





Problem: Bayesian model fits function to the whole data.



$$Y(X) = \mathcal{N}(0,\sigma^2) + \begin{cases} a_{0,r} + a_{1,r}(X-k) \\ a_{0,r} + a_{1,r}(X-k) + a_{2,r}(X-k) \end{cases}$$

Problem: Bayesian model fits function to the whole data.

for $c \le X < k$ $k_2)^2 + a_{3,r}(X - k)^3$ for $c < k \le X$



$$Y(X) = \mathcal{N}(0,\sigma^2) + \begin{cases} a_{0,r} + a_{1,r}(X-k) & \text{for } c \le X < k \\ a_{0,r} + a_{1,r}(X-k) + a_{2,r}(X-k_2)^2 + a_{3,r}(X-k)^3 & \text{for } c < k \le X \end{cases}$$

Problem: Bayesian model fits function to the whole data.

Idea: turn a disadvantage into an advantage.

More information, less uncertainty.



$$Y(X) = \mathcal{N}(0,\sigma^2) + \begin{cases} a_{0,l} + a_{1,l}(X - k_1) & \text{for } k_1 < X < c \\ a_{0,l} + a_{1,l}(X - k_1) + a_{2,l}(X - k_1)^2 + a_{3,l}(X - k_1)^3 & \text{for } X \le k_1 < c \\ a_{0,r} + a_{1,r}(X - k_2) & \text{for } c \le X < k_2 \\ a_{0,r} + a_{1,r}(X - k_2) + a_{2,r}(X - k_2)^2 + a_{3,r}(X - k_2)^3 & \text{for } c < k_2 \le X \end{cases}$$

Problem: Bayesian model fits function to the whole data.

Idea: turn a disadvantage into an advantage.

More information, less uncertainty.

How to combine the two models?

Cut posterior approach: first sample cutoff location, then treatment effect

Joint model: sample all parameters jointly, feedback between the outcome function and probability function

How to combine the two models?

Gut posterior approach. first sample outoff location, then treatment effect

Joint model: sample all parameters jointly, feedback between the outcome function and probability function

Simulation results Lee function



4th degree polynomial Small jump of 0.04

$X \sim 2beta(2,4) - 1$

Simulation results Treatment effect = 0.04, 100 simulations, 500 data points

	Local linear regression
Absolute error	61
95% CI length	0.25
95% CI coverage	0.89

Localised Cubic	Cubic
46	0.09
0.15	0.2
0.93	0.59

Simulation results Let's add fuzziness





Simulation results Treatment effect approx 0.07, j=0.55, 50 simulations

	Local linear regression
Absolute error	0.14
95% CI length	0.81
95% CI coverage	0.96

Localised Cubic Known c	Localised Cubic Unknown c
0.1	0.11
0.34	0.37
0.92	0.92

Simulation results Treatment effect approx 0.07, j=0.25, 50 simulations

	Local linear regression
Absolute error	0.2335484
95% CI length	1.636036
95% CI coverage	0.96

Localised Cubic Known c	Localised Cubic Unknown c
0.1683406	0.5739337
0.5632158	2.852051
0.96	0.94

Reach out! j.m.kowalska@amsterdamumc.nl

Coming up: arXiv manuscript, r package

Do you have some interesting dataset?