

# Defining and estimating causal direct and indirect effects when setting the mediator to specific values is not feasible

JUDITH J. LOK\*

Department of Biostatistics,  
Harvard T.H. Chan School of Public Health,  
655 Huntington Avenue, Boston, MA 02115, USA;  
jlok@hsph.harvard.edu

December 21, 2021

## Abstract

Natural direct and indirect effects decompose the effect of a treatment into the part that is mediated by a covariate (the mediator) and the part that is not. Their definitions rely on the concept of outcomes under treatment with the mediator “set” to its value without treatment. Typically, the mechanism through which the mediator is set to this value is left unspecified, and in many applications it may be challenging to fix the mediator to particular values for each unit or individual. Moreover, how one sets the mediator may affect the distribution of the outcome. This article introduces “organic” direct and indirect effects, which can be defined and estimated without relying on setting the mediator to specific values. Organic direct and indirect effects can be applied for example to estimate how much of the effect of some treatments for HIV/AIDS on mother-to-child transmission of HIV-infection is mediated by the effect of the treatment on the HIV viral load in the blood of the mother.

Causal inference, Direct and indirect effect, HIV/AIDS, Mediation, Observational study, Organic direct and indirect effect.

# 1 Introduction

Researchers are often interested in investigating the mechanisms behind effective treatments or exposures. The topic of which part of the effect of a treatment is “mediated” by a covariate is of particular importance. The mediated part of a treatment effect is due to treatment induced changes in a “mediator” covariate  $M$ . This is the so-called indirect effect; as opposed to the so-called direct effect, not mediated by covariate  $M$ . Mediation analysis has gained much prominence in methodological and empirical research in recent years. Mediation analysis is particularly popular in the health sciences, like epidemiology and psychology. In June 2015, Baron and Kenny (1986) has over 52.000 citations in Google Scholar, many of them after 2010. Therefore, clarifying the assumptions required for mediation analysis is paramount.

A recent literature has provided a rigorous theoretical framework for the definition and estimation of causal direct and indirect effects, see e.g. Robins and Greenland (1992), Pearl (2001, 2011), Imai *and others* (2010), VanderWeele (2009), Robins and Richardson (2010), Tchetgen-Tchetgen (2011). In this literature, the controlled direct effect is the effect of a treatment had the mediator been set to a pre-determined value. The natural direct effect is the effect of a treatment had the mediator been set to the value that it would have taken without treatment. Thus, the natural direct effect for a particular unit or patient can be represented by  $Y_{1,M_0} - Y_0$ : the difference between the unit’s outcome  $Y_{1,M_0}$  under treatment had the mediator been set to the value  $M_0$  it would have taken without treatment and the unit’s outcome  $Y_0$  without treatment. Notice that the mediator is kept constant at  $M_0$ , so this is the natural direct effect not mediated by  $M$ . Similarly, the natural indirect effect can be represented by  $Y_1 - Y_{1,M_0}$ , where  $Y_1$  is the outcome under treatment. It has been argued that to study the causal mechanisms by which particular treatments are effective, natural direct and indirect effects are more relevant than controlled direct effects (Pearl (2001), VanderWeele (2009)). Pearl (2001) also notes that controlled indirect effects are not defined.

As seen from the definition of natural direct and indirect effects, one needs “cross-worlds” quantities in order to define natural direct and indirect effects. In particular,  $Y_{1,M_0}$  is the outcome under treatment but with the mediator set to the value,  $M_0$ , it would have taken without treatment. In practice, it may be rare that mediators take the same value with treatment,  $M_1$ , as without treatment,  $M_0$ . Even if this happened for specific sample units (e.g., patients; from now on: units), it would be impossible to identify those units. Under treatment, the value of the mediator without treatment is not observed, so it is unclear to which value the

mediator should be set for any particular unit. In addition, identification of natural direct and indirect effects relies on assumptions about the outcomes  $Y_{a,m}$  of a unit under all combinations of the treatment and the mediator (Pearl (2001, 2011), VanderWeele (2009), Imai *and others* (2010), Tchetgen-Tchetgen (2011)). This is a problem in many practical applications: setting the mediator to particular values is often not feasible if the mediator is not a treatment itself. If setting the mediator to a particular value  $m$  is not feasible, the interpretation of the  $Y_{a,m}$  is unclear. However, the common approaches to causal mediation analysis all rely on the existence of all  $Y_{a,m}$  (Robins and Richardson (2010)).

To overcome these problems, this article proposes instead to base mediation analysis on newly defined “organic” interventions ( $I$ ) on the mediator. Organic interventions  $I$  cause the mediator to have a specific distribution: the distribution of the mediator without treatment, given pre-treatment common causes of mediator and outcome. An organic intervention could be an additional treatment that affects the distribution of the mediator. Theorem 4.4 shows that organic direct and indirect effects are often generalizations of natural direct and indirect effects and the direct and indirect effects introduced in Didelez *and others* (2006). Like the current article, Geneletti (2007) considers interventions on the mediator, but does not condition on common causes  $C$  of mediator and outcome, unless the interest is in effects conditional on  $C$  or in effects when  $C$  is manipulated. Robins and Greenland (1992), Pearl (2001), and, for organic interventions, Section 4 argue that ignoring  $C$  can produce invalid estimators. Also Section 5 on uniqueness of organic direct and indirect effects requires that  $C$  is taken into account.

Most of the causal inference literature on mediation has adopted the so-called cross-worlds assumption, an assumption involving the joint distribution of counterfactuals under different values of the treatment (Pearl (2001, 2011), VanderWeele (2009), Imai *and others* (2010), Tchetgen-Tchetgen (2011)). An issue with this assumption is that it can never be tested or imposed by design, not even in a clinical trial where the treatment and the mediator can both be set to any desired value by the experimenter. In contrast, whether “setting the mediator” is an organic intervention can be tested in such a clinical trial.

The theory in this article turns out to lead to the same numerical results as introduced by other authors, Baron and Kenny (1986) and, more recently, e.g. Pearl (2001, 2011), VanderWeele (2009), Imai *and others* (2010), Tchetgen-Tchetgen and Shpitser (2012), and Didelez *and others* (2006). This article thus provides an interpretation of existing numerical results when the mediator cannot be set.

Proofs can be found in Web-appendix A. I illustrate the usefulness of organic

direct and indirect effects as opposed to natural direct and indirect effects in two examples: 1. the smoking and low birth weight paradox, see Web-appendix B and 2. the effect of AZT, a drug used for the treatment of HIV, on mother-to-child transmission of HIV-infection. I investigate how much of the effect of AZT is mediated by the HIV viral load, the amount of HIV-virus in the blood of the mother.

## 2 Setting and notation

For ease of exposition, I first consider randomized treatments. Section 7 extends the analysis to non-randomized treatments. For each unit, observables include the following quantities.  $A$  is the randomized treatment, which is 1 for the treated and 0 for the untreated.  $C$  are pre-treatment common causes of the mediator and the outcome. As noted by Robins and Greenland (1992), Pearl (2001), and others, these variables  $C$  have to be taken into account in order to identify the natural direct and indirect effect, even if the treatment is randomized. As will become clear later, pre-treatment common causes  $C$  also have to be taken into account to identify the organic direct and indirect effect. Like most of the literature on mediation, this article assumes that there are no post-treatment common causes of the mediator and the outcome.  $M$  is the observed value of the mediator.  $Y$  is the observed outcome.  $Y_0$  is the (counterfactual) outcome without treatment, and  $Y_1$  is the (counterfactual) outcome under treatment. Obviously, for each unit either  $Y_1$  or  $Y_0$  is observed, but not both. Similarly,  $M_0$  is the mediator without treatment, and  $M_1$  is the mediator under treatment. I assume that  $C$  is observed first, then  $A$ , then  $M$ , and then  $Y$ . The Directed Acyclic Graph (DAG) of Figure 1 describes the set-up. In all of this article, it is assumed that observations and counterfactuals for the different units are independent and identically distributed.

## 3 Natural direct and indirect effects: an overview

Natural direct and indirect effects, introduced in Robins and Greenland (1992) and Pearl (2001), are based on the outcome  $Y_{1,M_0}$  under treatment with the mediator set to the value it would have taken without treatment,  $M_0$ . The natural direct effect is defined as  $Y_{1,M_0} - Y_0$ . The natural direct effect is not affected by changes in the value of the mediator induced by the treatment, because for both  $Y_{1,M_0}$  and  $Y_0$  the mediator is equal to  $M_0$ . The natural indirect effect is defined as  $Y_1 -$

$Y_{1,M_0}$ . This is the mediated part: the only difference between these quantities is the change in the value of the mediator,  $M_1$  versus  $M_0$ .

To identify natural direct and indirect effects, previous authors (e.g. Pearl (2001, 2011), Robins and Greenland (1992), VanderWeele (2009), Imai *and others* (2010) and Tchetgen-Tchetgen (2011)) assume the existence of counterfactual outcomes under all possible combinations of the treatment and the mediator,  $Y_{a,m}$ . In the words of Robins and Richardson (2010), there has to be “reasonable agreement” as to what is the “closest possible world” in which the mediator has a specific value, a value which is different from the one that was observed. There are cases where reasonable agreement may exist. For example, Pearl (2001) describes a setting where the mediator is a treatment, aspirin, in which case the mediator could be set to specific values. However, in many practical situations the mediator of interest is not a treatment, and there is no known way in which one can set the mediator to a specific value. Then, the quantities  $Y_{1,M_0}$  and  $Y_{a,m}$  are not clearly defined. Cole and Frangakis (2009) provide a nice example: “there are many competing ways to assign (hypothetically) a body mass index of 25 kg/m<sup>2</sup> to an individual, and each of them may have a different causal effect on the outcome”.

The cross-worlds or mediator-randomization assumption that is generally used to identify natural direct and indirect effects states that

$$Y_{a',m} \perp\!\!\!\perp M_a \mid C = c, A = a. \quad (1)$$

In words: for a unit with treatment  $A = a$  and pre-treatment covariates  $C$ , the mediator under treatment  $a$  ( $M_a$ ), should be independent of the outcome under any other treatment-mediator combination ( $Y_{a',m}$ , the outcome under treatment  $a'$  had the mediator been set to  $m$ ). Identification of natural direct and indirect effects thus involves assumptions about cross-worlds quantities. Suppose for now that the  $Y_{a',m}$  are all well-defined: there is reasonable agreement about how to set the mediator to a specific value. Then (1) is similar to the classical assumption of no unmeasured confounding in causal inference (e.g., Robins *and others* (1992)). To understand (1), notice that “nature” determines the values of the mediators  $M_a$  and the outcomes  $Y_{a',m}$ , based on  $C$  and possibly other factors. Equation (1) thus states that given  $C$ , the  $Y_{a',m}$  do not help to predict  $M_a$ ; or, nature did not have more information on the potential outcomes  $Y_{a',m}$  to determine the value of the mediator  $M_a$  than recorded in  $C$ . In other words, all common causes of mediator

and outcome have to be recorded in  $C$ . Then, under a consistency assumption,

$$E(Y_{1,M_0}) = \int_{(c,m)} E[Y | M = m, C = c, A = 1] f_{M|C=c,A=0}(m) f_C(c) dm dc; \quad (2)$$

the “mediation formula”, see e.g. Pearl (2001, 2011), VanderWeele (2009), and Imai *and others* (2010).

Under certain conditions (strong parametric assumptions, linear models and no exposure-mediator interaction), the estimators for the natural direct and indirect effects resulting from (2) are the same as the estimators in Baron and Kenny (1986), the founding article on direct and indirect effects. The causal inference literature on natural direct and indirect effects thus generalizes the approach of Baron and Kenny (1986) and adds a causal interpretation to their estimators.

## 4 Definitions of organic intervention and organic direct and indirect effects

This section defines organic direct and indirect effects. Analogously to natural direct and indirect effects, this article focuses on interventions  $I$  that cause the mediator under treatment  $A = 1$  and intervention  $I$ ,  $M_{1,I=1}$ , to have the same distribution as  $M_0$ , given the pre-treatment common causes  $C$  of mediator and outcome. However, for individual units,  $M_{1,I=1}$  does not need to be exactly the value the mediator would have had without treatment,  $M_0$ . This is a considerable relaxation, especially because this distribution can be estimated from the observed data (provided  $C$  has been measured), while individual values of  $M_0$  are not observed under treatment. Hence, it is possible to imagine an intervention that leads to this distribution. I term this type of interventions organic because they depend on the entire distribution of  $M_0$ , the mediator without treatment, rather than on individual values of  $M_0$ . Write  $Y_{1,I=1}$  for the outcome under treatment  $A = 1$  and intervention  $I$ . Then,

**Definition 4.1** (Organic intervention). *An intervention  $I$  is an organic intervention with respect to  $C$  if*

$$M_{1,I=1} | C = c \sim M_0 | C = c \quad (3)$$

$$Y_{1,I=1} | M_{1,I=1} = m, C = c \sim Y_1 | M_1 = m, C = c, \quad (4)$$

both hold, where  $\sim$  indicates having the same distribution.

Equation (3) says that  $I$  “holds the mediator at its distribution under no treatment”: given  $C$ , there is no difference in the distribution of the mediator under treatment  $A = 1$  combined with intervention  $I$  and the distribution of the mediator under no treatment. Rather than the cross-worlds assumption of equation (1), I assume equation (4). Equation (4) intuitively states that  $I$  “has no direct effect on the outcome”: for units with pre-treatment common causes of mediator and outcome fixed at  $C = c$ , the prognosis of units under treatment “with mediator  $M_{1,I=1}$  being equal to  $m$  under intervention  $I$ ” is the same as the prognosis of units under treatment “with mediator  $M_1$  being equal to  $m$  without  $I$ ”. In other words, given  $C$ , treated units with mediator equal to  $m$  ( $M_1 = m$ ) without intervention  $I$  are representative of treated units with  $M_{1,I=1} = m$  under intervention  $I$ . Equation (4) could be relaxed by assuming instead that  $E[Y_{1,I=1} | M_{1,I=1} = m, C = c] = E[Y_1 | M_1 = m, C = c]$ . If the intervention  $I$  on the mediator has a direct effect on the outcome, equation (4) fails to hold. Equation (4) is related to the assumption of “partial exchangeability” in Robins and Greenland (1992) and can be discussed with subject matter experts (Web-appendix E may also help).

**Example 4.2**  $A = 1$  could be a blood pressure lowering medicine,  $M$  blood pressure, and  $Y$  the occurrence of a heart attack. To investigate whether  $A = 1$  also has a direct effect on heart attacks, one could do mediation analysis. Suppose that  $M_0 = \alpha_0^{(0)} + \alpha_1 C + e_0$ , and  $M_1 = \alpha_0^{(1)} + \alpha_1 C + e_1$ , and suppose that  $e_0 \sim e_1$ ,  $e_0$  and  $e_1$  are random error terms in  $\mathbb{R}$  independent of  $C$ , and  $\alpha_0^{(0)}, \alpha_0^{(1)}, \alpha_1 \in \mathbb{R}$ . Thus, treatment  $A = 1$  shifts the distribution of the blood pressure by  $\alpha_0^{(1)} - \alpha_0^{(0)}$  without changing its shape. Suppose an intervention  $I$  leads to  $M_{1,I=1} = \alpha_0^{(2)} + \alpha_1 C + e_{1,I=1}$ . Then,  $I$  satisfies equation (3) if 1.  $\alpha_0^{(2)} = \alpha_0^{(0)}$  (that is,  $I = 1$  shifts the distribution of the blood pressure, in the treated, by  $\alpha_0^{(0)} - \alpha_0^{(1)}$  without changing its shape) and 2.  $e_{1,I=1} \sim e_0$  is independent of  $C$ . Then,  $M_{1,I=1} \sim M_0$ , leading to (3). Intervention  $I$  could for example be salt in a (possibly random) dosage depending on  $C$ . The effect of salt on heart attacks is believed to be through its effect on blood pressure (see for example the CDC website, <http://www.cdc.gov/vitalsigns/Sodium/index.html>), making equation (4) and thus Definition 4.1 plausible for this intervention. For natural direct and indirect effects, one would need to be able to shift the distribution of  $M$  by  $\alpha_0^{(0)} - \alpha_0^{(1)}$  without changing its shape, but additionally set  $e_{1,I=1} = e_0$ , resulting in  $M_{1,I=1} = M_0$ . For the direct and indirect effects introduced in Didelez and others (2006), one would randomize  $e_1^I \sim e_0$  independent of  $C$ , and then need to set the mediator to  $M_{1,I=1} = \alpha_0^{(0)} + \alpha_1 C + e_{1,I=1}$ . Didelez and others (2006) avoid the use of coun-

terfactuals altogether using graphical models. Of the three interventions above, obviously,  $e_1^I = e_0$  places the strongest restriction. It is related to the assumption of rank preservation sometimes made in the causal inference literature. Rank preservation also implies that two units with the same observed data have the same counterfactual data.

In this example, one could replace the fully parametric models by  $M_0 = g(C, e_0)$  and  $M_1 = g(C, e_1) + \beta$ , with  $g$  some function of  $C$  and elements in  $\mathbb{R}$ . Then,  $I$  needs to shift the distribution of  $M_1$  given  $C$  by  $-\beta$ . Or, one could have  $M_0 = g(C, e_0)$  and  $M_1 = g(C, e_1) + \beta_0 + \beta_1 C$ , where now  $I$  needs to shift the distribution of  $M_1$  given  $C$  by  $-\beta_0 - \beta_1 C$ .

If a pre-treatment common cause  $\tilde{C}$  of mediator and outcome has not been observed, equation (4) without  $\tilde{C}$  is unlikely to hold. The reason is that the predictive value of the mediator having a specific value under intervention  $I$  is not the same as the predictive value of the mediator having a specific value without intervention. The mediator  $M_1$  under treatment is predicted by the common cause  $\tilde{C}$ . However, if  $\tilde{C}$  is not included, under intervention  $I$  the mediator  $M_{1,I=1}$  is not necessarily predicted by  $\tilde{C}$ . So, the mediator  $M_1$  carries information on the common cause  $\tilde{C}$ , but the mediator under intervention  $I$ ,  $M_{1,I=1}$ , may not. Even if  $M_{1,I=1}$  carries information on  $\tilde{C}$ , then the information on  $\tilde{C}$  from  $M_{1,I=1} = m$  may be different than the information on  $\tilde{C}$  from  $M_1 = m$ , because  $M_{1,I=1}$  and  $M_1$  have a different distribution. As a consequence, the prognosis under treatment of units with  $M_1 = m$  is different from the prognosis under treatment of units with  $M_{1,I=1} = m$ , violating equation (4). Web-appendix B has a detailed example of the consequences of ignoring a pre-treatment common cause  $\tilde{C}$  of mediator and outcome.

When there is a post-treatment common cause  $C'$  of the mediator and the outcome, equation (4) is also unlikely to hold. Assuming that the intervention  $I$  does not affect  $C'$ , the reason is the same as for unobserved pre-treatment common causes. If the intervention  $I$  also changes  $C'$ , basing mediation analysis on  $I$  results in estimating the effect mediated by  $(C', M)$ .

If an intervention  $I$  satisfying equation (3) is feasible, which can be tested, equation (4) or its relaxation could be tested as well, by comparing the distributions of  $Y_{1,I=1}$  given  $(M_{1,I=1}, C)$  to the distribution of  $Y_1$  given  $(M_1, C)$ . In order to test this, an experiment must be carried out with three arms: “do not treat”, “treat”, and “treat under intervention  $I$ ”. This is in contrast with the existing literature on natural direct and indirect effects, the assumptions of which can never be tested because they involve the joint distribution of counterfactuals under different

treatments, which can never be jointly observed.

Now the organic direct and indirect effect of a treatment on the outcome can be defined:

**Definition 4.3** (Organic direct and indirect effect). *Consider an organic intervention  $I$ . The organic direct effect of a treatment  $A$  based on  $I$  is  $E(Y_{1,I=1}) - E(Y_0)$ . The organic indirect effect of a treatment  $A$  based on  $I$  is  $E(Y_1) - E(Y_{1,I=1})$ .*

Because the treatment is the same for both  $Y_1$  and  $Y_{1,I=1}$ ,  $E(Y_1) - E(Y_{1,I=1})$  is the organic indirect effect, or mediated part of the effect. It is the effect of the organic intervention on the mediator,  $I$ , under  $A = 1$ . If the distribution of the mediator does not depend on  $A$ ,  $I$  could be "no intervention on  $M$ ", and the organic indirect effect is 0. The organic indirect effect is also 0 if the intervention on the mediator does not affect the outcome. Because the mediator has the same distribution for both  $Y_{1,I=1}$  and  $Y_0$ ,  $E(Y_{1,I=1}) - E(Y_0)$  is the organic direct effect. The direct effect is the effect of treatment combined with an organic intervention as compared to no treatment. Very loosely, the direct effect is the effect of a treatment that 1. has the same direct effect as treatment  $A = 1$ : the dependence of  $Y_{1,I=1}$  on the covariates  $C$  and on the mediator is the same as that of  $Y_1$ , but 2. has no indirect effect through the mediator (see (3)). Notice that  $E(Y_1) - E(Y_0) = (E(Y_1) - E(Y_{1,I=1})) + (E(Y_{1,I=1}) - E(Y_0))$ . Thus, like for natural direct and indirect effects, organic direct and indirect effects add up to the total effect of a treatment. Organic direct and indirect effects often generalize natural direct and indirect effects:

**Theorem 4.4** *Under equation (1), natural direct and indirect effects and the direct and indirect effects defined in Didelez and others (2006) are special cases of organic direct and indirect effects.*

## 5 Uniqueness of organic direct and indirect effects

Definition 4.3 of organic direct and indirect effects depends on the organic intervention  $I$  and on the choice of baseline common causes of mediator and outcome  $C$ . Although the definitions of natural direct and indirect effects also depend on the intervention (the mediator is set to a specific value), this has not usually been made explicit. I argued that  $C$  has to include all common causes of mediator and outcome for equation (4) to be plausible, and thus for an intervention  $I$  to be organic. This section formalizes the notion of common causes of mediator and

outcome, and argues that the organic direct and indirect effects do not depend on (a) for given  $C$ , the choice of organic intervention  $I$  or (b) on the choice of common causes  $C$  of mediator and outcome, even if more than one set of common causes exists.

Define a common cause of mediator and outcome given  $C$  as follows:

**Definition 5.1** (common cause).  $X$  is not a common cause of mediator and outcome given  $C$  if either equation (5) or equation (6) holds:

$$X \perp\!\!\!\perp M_0 \mid C \quad \text{and} \quad X \perp\!\!\!\perp M_1 \mid C \quad (5)$$

$$X \perp\!\!\!\perp Y_1 \mid M_1, C. \quad (6)$$

That is,  $X$  is *not* a common cause if, given  $C$ , either  $X$  does not predict the mediator, or, given the mediator,  $X$  does not predict the outcome. In graphical language:  $X$  is *not* a common cause of outcome and mediator if in a DAG that has  $C$ ,  $X$ ,  $M$ , and  $Y$ , there either is no arrow from  $X$  to  $M$ , or there is no direct arrow from  $X$  to  $Y$ . This definition is in line with, for example, Pearl (2000). If (all given  $C$ )  $X$  predicts the mediator and, given the mediator,  $X$  predicts the outcome, it is a common cause of mediator and outcome, and usually needs to be included in  $C$  for equation (4) to hold with  $C$  (see the discussion below Definition 4.1). The following theorem is proved in Web-appendix A:

**Theorem 5.2** For given  $C$ , the organic direct and indirect effect do not depend on the choice of organic intervention  $I$  with respect to  $C$ . Furthermore, if  $C$  and  $\tilde{C}$  are different sets of common causes of mediator and outcome,  $C$  is not a common cause of mediator and outcome given  $\tilde{C}$ , and  $\tilde{C}$  is not a common cause of mediator and outcome given  $C$ , then the organic direct and indirect effect do not depend on whether the intervention is organic with respect to  $C$  or organic with respect to  $\tilde{C}$ .

Thus, if we restrict ourselves to interventions that are organic with respect to “complete” common causes  $C$  (given  $C$ , any other pre-treatment covariate  $X$  is not a common cause), organic direct and indirect effects are unique, and one can speak of “the” organic direct and indirect effect.

## 6 Identifiability and estimation of organic direct and indirect effects

When the treatment is randomized,  $E(Y_1)$  and  $E(Y_0)$  can simply be estimated by the averages of  $Y_1$  and  $Y_0$  among units receiving treatment and not receiving treatment, respectively. Therefore, in order to estimate the organic direct and indirect effects of a randomized treatment, this section focuses on estimating the expectation of  $Y_{1,I=1}$ . The following theorem is the main result of this article:

**Theorem 6.1** (Organic direct and indirect effects: the mediation formula for randomized experiments). *Under randomized treatment and Definition of organic interventions 4.1, the following holds for an intervention  $I$  that is organic with respect to  $C$ :*

$$E(Y_{1,I=1}) = \int_{(c,m)} E[Y | M = m, C = c, A = 1] f_{M|C=c,A=0}(m) f_C(c) dm dc.$$

Notice that to estimate  $E(Y_{1,I=1})$ , only the distribution of  $M$  under  $A = 0$  and of  $Y$  under  $A = 1$  are needed. Thus, Theorem 6.1 can be used both in the absence and in the presence of treatment-mediator interaction (where the expectation of  $Y$  depends on  $M$  differently with or without treatment). Theorem 6.1 provides the same mediation formula as the previous literature (see Section 3). This formula depends on observable quantities only, and can be estimated using standard models. The contribution of the current article is to show that the definition and thus the interpretation of direct and indirect effects, as well as the conditions under which estimators for these effects are meaningful, can be considerably relaxed.

## 7 Estimating organic direct and indirect effects in observational studies

So-far, treatment was randomized. This section extends the identification to non-randomized treatments  $A$ . As before,  $A$  is treatment, which is 1 for the treated and 0 for the untreated. I adopt the usual consistency assumption (see e.g. Robins *and others* (1992)) relating the observed to the counterfactual data:

**Assumption 7.1** (Consistency). *If  $A = 1$ ,  $M = M_1$  and  $Y = Y_1$ . If  $A = 0$ ,  $M = M_0$  and  $Y = Y_0$ .*

For observational data, I allow that there exist baseline covariates  $Z$  (beyond the common causes of mediator and outcome,  $C$ ) that need to be included in the analysis in order to eliminate confounding:

**Assumption 7.2** (No Unmeasured Confounding).

$$A \perp\!\!\!\perp (Y_1, M_1) \mid C, Z \quad \text{and} \quad A \perp\!\!\!\perp Y_0 \mid C, Z \quad \text{and} \quad A \perp\!\!\!\perp M_0 \mid C, Z.$$

Thus, given the measured pre-treatment covariates  $C$  and  $Z$ , treatment should not depend on the prognosis of the units with or without treatment. For Assumption 7.2 to hold, it is sufficient that  $(C, Z)$  includes all the common causes of the treatment, the mediator, and the outcome. This is a particular representation of the usual assumption of no unmeasured confounding in causal inference (see e.g. Robins *and others*, 1992). Assumption 7.2 cannot be tested statistically. Subject matter experts have to indicate whether they believe enough pre-treatment unit characteristics have been observed in order for Assumption 7.2 to be plausible.

Under Assumption 7.2, the expectation of  $Y_1$  and  $Y_0$  can be estimated using marginal structural models, the G-computation formula, or structural nested models. Thus, I focus on the expectation of  $Y_{1,I=1}$ . Section 4 argued that in order for an intervention to be organic with respect to  $C$ ,  $C$  usually has to include all common causes of outcome and mediator. Therefore, if an extra  $Z$  was necessary for Assumption 7.2 of no unmeasured confounding to hold, I will assume that given  $C$ ,  $Z$  is not a common cause of mediator and outcome, as defined in Definition 5.1. Then,

**Theorem 7.3** (Organic direct and indirect effects: the mediation formula for observational studies). *Assume No Unmeasured Confounding Assumption 7.2, Consistency Assumption 7.1, intervention  $I$  is organic with respect to  $C$  as in Definition 4.1, and given  $C$ ,  $Z$  is not a common cause of mediator and outcome as in Definition 5.1. Then*

$$E(Y_{1,I=1}) = \int_{(c,z,m)} E[Y \mid M = m, C = c, Z = z, A = 1] f_{M|C=c,Z=z,A=0}(m) f_{C,Z}(c, z) dm d(c, z).$$

The proof is in Web-appendix A. The resulting organic direct and indirect effects are similar to Theorem 6.1, in terms of observable quantities only, and can be estimated using standard methods.

## 8 Application: Mother-to-child transmission of HIV/AIDS

HIV-infection can be transmitted from an HIV-positive mother to her infant in utero, during birth, and by breast feeding. The rate of HIV-transmission can be lowered by avoiding breast feeding, as well as by treatments such as antiretroviral treatment (ART) and zidovudine (AZT). ART and AZT lower the amount of HIV-virus, the HIV viral load, in the blood of the mother. Sperling *and others* (1996) describe that the effect of AZT on mother-to-child transmission of HIV-infection is surprisingly large, given the limited effect of AZT on the HIV viral load in the blood of the mother. They estimated that less than 20% of the effect of AZT on mother-to-child transmission is due to the effect of AZT on the mother's HIV viral load, but their analysis was not based on current notions of direct and indirect effects.

This section describes how one could investigate how much of the effect of AZT on mother-to-child transmission is mediated by the effect of AZT on the HIV viral load in the blood of the mother (from now on, the HIV viral load). I argue that the organic direct and indirect effects defined in this article are well-defined and identified in this situation, whereas natural direct and indirect effect are undefined.

Suppose one would like to investigate the likely effect on mother-to-child transmission of a potential new treatment that has the same effect on HIV viral load as AZT but no direct effect on the child's HIV status. Potentially, a low dosage of some type of ART could be such treatment. Let  $I$  be an intervention that, without AZT treatment, causes the distribution of HIV viral load to be the same as under AZT treatment;  $I$  represents the potential new treatment. Here, in contrast to most of the literature on mediation analysis, which focuses on the effect of an intervention on the mediator under treatment, interest focuses on the effect of an intervention on the mediator under *no* treatment. In order to directly apply the method described in this article, we therefore re-code  $A = 0$  if a person was treated with AZT, and  $A = 1$  if a person was not treated with AZT. In the case of a linear model without treatment-mediator interaction,  $E[Y \mid M = m, A = a, C = c] = \beta_0 + \beta_1 m + \beta_2 a + \beta_3^T c$  (no term  $\beta_4 am$ ), both approaches lead to the same direct effect,  $\beta_2$ , and therefore also to the same indirect effect. In general, both approaches can lead to different results. VanderWeele (2009) and Web-appendix C discuss when each definition is most useful; this depends on the context of the investigation.

In this example, one would expect that if AZT has a direct effect on mother-to-child transmission, a mother's adherence to AZT treatment is a post-treatment

common cause of both HIV viral load  $M$  and mother-to-child transmission  $Y$ , because both  $M$  and  $Y$  will be reduced under better adherence. Thus, one seems to need the post-treatment covariate “adherence”,  $ad$ , in  $C$ . However, equation (4) seems reasonable without compliance: if all pre-treatment common causes are in  $C$ , so adherence is not a proxy for other confounders,  $ad \perp\!\!\!\perp (Y_1, M_1) | C$  (recall 1 indicates no treatment in this section). If adherence is not an issue for  $I$ ,  $ad \perp\!\!\!\perp (Y_{1,I=1}, M_{1,I=1}) | C$ . And if it is: because  $I$  does not have a direct effect on mother-to-child transmission,  $Y_{1,I=1} \perp\!\!\!\perp ad | M_{1,I=1}, C$ . Thus, if equation (4) holds with  $ad$  in the conditioning event and all pre-treatment common causes are in  $C$ , equation (4) will also hold without  $ad$ .

For ease of exposition, suppose that AZT treatment is randomized (the approach can be generalized to observational studies as in Section 7). I now illustrate how to use the identification result of Section 6 to estimate the indirect effect of AZT on mother-to-child transmission. Suppose that  $M_1 \sim M_0 + \beta_1 + \beta_3^T C | C$  holds for  $M$  equal to log HIV viral load. Suppose in addition that the probability of mother-to-child transmission without treatment follows a logistic regression model of the form  $\text{logit}(Y = 1 | M = m, C = c, A = 1) = \theta_0 + \theta_1^T M + \theta_2^T C$ . Notice that one only needs such a model for mother-to-child transmission under  $A = 1$  (no treatment in this case). Then, by Web-appendix D, it follows that

$$E(Y_{1,I=1}) = E [1 / (1 + \exp(-\theta_0 - \theta_1(M - \beta_1 - \beta_3^T C) - \theta_2^T C)) | A = 1]. \quad (7)$$

This expression can be estimated as indicated in Web-appendix D. This leads to an estimator for the indirect effect that does not use data on the outcomes for treated mothers.

In contrast to the organic direct and indirect effects, the natural direct and indirect effects are undefined in this application. They involve  $Y_{1,M_0}$ , whether or not a newborn is infected without AZT but with the HIV viral load of the mother set to the value it would have had under AZT ( $A = 0$  here). How one could set the mediator to the value under AZT is unclear. One can imagine treatments, for example low-dose ART, that have the same effect on HIV viral load as AZT, as needed for organic direct and indirect effects. However, it is unlikely that such a treatment would, for all mothers, set the HIV viral load to the exact same value it would have had under AZT. If AZT were a combination of substances, some combination of a substance that affects HIV viral load and another substance that might directly affect mother-to-child transmission, one could imagine setting the HIV viral load to involve only the substance that affected HIV viral load. However, like many treatments, AZT is just one substance. I therefore conclude that

for a treatment like AZT, the organic direct and indirect effects are more natural than their natural counterparts.

## 9 Discussion

This article shows that, in contrast to the assumptions behind natural direct and indirect effects, cross-worlds quantities and setting the mediator are not necessary to define causal direct and indirect effects. This leads to newly defined organic direct and indirect effects. Furthermore, this article proves that, in contrast to natural direct and indirect effects, identification of organic direct and indirect effects does not rely on the existence of counterfactual outcomes under all combinations of the treatment and the mediator. For identifiability of organic direct and indirect effects, a distributional assumption linking the distribution of the outcome under an organic intervention to the data replaces the cross-worlds assumption which identifies natural direct and indirect effects. This article focuses on organic interventions  $I$ , which cause the distribution of the mediator given  $C$  to be the same as  $M_0$ , rather than setting the mediator value to  $M_0$ , as in natural direct and indirect effects. In applications in the health or social sciences, like epidemiology or psychology, one often wants to consider which part of the effect of a treatment is mediated through some covariate or trait. For example, one may want to investigate how much of the effect of antiretroviral treatment, ART, on AIDS-defining events and death is mediated by the CD4 count. In this example, it is easier to envision an intervention that causes the CD4 count to have a particular distribution rather than setting the CD4 count to a specific value for each patient. If interventions on the mediator are inconceivable, both natural and organic direct and indirect effects are undefined.

I have shown that the proposed organic direct and indirect effects are identified by the same expressions as developed previously in the literature for natural direct and indirect effects. The contribution of this article is to show that these mediation formulas hold in substantially more generality. As a consequence, estimators based on the mediation formulas have a much broader causal interpretation than previously shown. The new definitions introduced in this article are easy to interpret and can therefore be easily discussed with subject matter experts. For an intervention  $I$  to be organic it has to be that, given pre-treatment characteristics  $C$ , the outcome under treatment “for a unit with  $M_1 = m$  under treatment” is representative of the outcome under treatment “if the organic intervention  $I$  caused  $M_{1,I=1} = m$ ”. This can be interpreted as that, under treatment, the organic

intervention has no direct effect on the outcome.

An organic intervention  $I$  is a considerable relaxation of  $M_{1,I=1} = M_0$ . Still, it may be difficult to find an organic intervention. Notice, however, that if there is an intervention  $\tilde{I}$  such that equation (4) holds, then in some cases it may be possible to construct an organic intervention  $I$  by adapting the dosage of  $\tilde{I}$  as a function of  $C$  (deterministically or randomly) in a way such that equation (3) holds. If there is interest in figuring out what might be the benefit of an intervention with only a direct or only an indirect effect, if such an intervention would be developed in a lab, organic direct and indirect effects are of interest. In any case, being able to actually carry out organic interventions is not necessary to identify and estimate organic direct and indirect effects. Rather, organic interventions can be employed as thought experiments useful to frame the analysis and define the parameters of interest.

Natural direct and indirect effects are defined at the individual level as well as the population level, whereas organic direct and indirect effects are defined only at the population level. This reflects that an organic intervention does not set the mediator to a pre-specified value for each unit.

In related work, the appendix of VanderWeele (2012) considers interventions that cause the mediator to have the same distribution as without treatment, conditional on  $C$ . However, for identification he still assumes existence of all  $Y_{a,m}$  and  $Y_{a,m} \perp\!\!\!\perp M \mid A, C, L$ , where  $L$  is a post-treatment common cause of mediator and outcome. This is problematic if one cannot set the mediator to particular values.

Following the previous literature, this article studies interventions that do not affect pre-treatment common causes of mediators and outcomes. For example, inherited risk factors are thought to be common causes of low birth weight and infant mortality. For equation (4) to be plausible, such common causes of mediators and outcomes have to be taken into account. The consequences of ignoring common causes are illustrated in Web-appendix B for the direct effect of smoking on infant mortality, not mediated by low birth weight. The importance of observing common causes was also noted in e.g. Imai *and others* (2010).

Robins and Richardson (2010) argue that the natural direct effect, which they call pure direct effect, “is non-manipulable relative to  $A$ ,  $M$  and  $Y$  in the sense that, in the absence of assumptions, the pure direct effect does not correspond to a contrast between treatment regimes of any randomized experiment performed via interventions on  $A$ ,  $M$  and  $Y$ .” Organic direct and indirect effects are not subject to that caveat. If there exists an organic intervention  $I$  (not necessarily  $M_{1,I=1} = M_0$ ), then the organic direct and indirect effect induced by  $I$  are identified from the experiments “do not treat”, “treat”, and “treat under intervention  $I$ .” Both

conditions for  $I$  to be organic can be tested on the basis of these experiments, and the organic direct and indirect effects do not depend on the choice of organic intervention  $I$ .

Under an agnostic model, which does not assume the existence of counterfactual outcomes, the natural direct and indirect effects are obviously not defined: they are based on the cross-worlds counterfactuals  $Y_{1,M_0}$ . In contrast, if an organic intervention  $I$  exists, the organic direct and indirect effects could have been equivalently defined without counterfactual outcomes, because they can be defined on the basis of interventions; see Web-appendix F for details.

In future work, I will show that in contrast to natural direct and indirect effects, organic direct and indirect effects can be extended to provide an identification result for the case where there are post-treatment mediator-outcome confounders. This will provide another alternative to the three quantities described in VanderWeele *and others* (2014).

The methodology in this article could also be applied to the study of the effects of future treatments based on prior data. Consider, for example, the effect of a future treatment to lower immune activation ( $M$  in the notation of this article) in HIV-positive patients. Suppose that this future treatment is aimed to eventually prevent clinical events ( $Y$ ). Assume that under the future treatment, patients would have a specific distribution of immune activation  $M_1$ , and the future treatment has no direct effect on the outcome  $Y$ : conditional on a set of covariates  $C$ , the prognosis of patients under the future treatment,  $Y_1$ , is the same as the prognosis  $Y$  of patients with the same immune activation in the observed data (compare with (4)). Then the mean outcome under the future treatment can be estimated using a sample counterpart of

$$E(Y_1) = \int_{(c,m)} E[Y | M = m, C = c] f_{M_1|C=c}(m) f_C(c) dm dc.$$

The proof follows the same lines as Theorem 6.1, but the interpretation is different because the future treatment does not necessarily cause immune activation to have the same distribution as some existing treatment  $A$ . Of course, since the identifying assumption of equation (4) cannot be verified without experimental data of the future treatment, an experiment with the future treatment would be necessary to confirm this result. This last formula also provides a mathematical underpinning of the application in Naimi *and others* (2014), who estimate the controlled direct effect of an intervention when "only a portion of the population's mediator is altered".

To conclude, this article introduces organic direct and indirect effects and provides identification and estimators for these effects. The assumptions are weaker than for natural direct and indirect effects.

## 10 Funding

This work was supported by the National Institutes of Health [grant number R01 AI100762]. The content is solely the responsibility of the author and does not necessarily represent the official views of the National Institutes of Health.

## Acknowledgements

The author thanks Eric Tchetgen Tchetgen and Tyler VanderWeele for sharing their drafts and comments, Victor DeGruttola for comments and for suggesting the mother-to-child HIV transmission example, and Alberto Abadie for extensive comments on this article.


## References

- BARON, R M AND KENNY, D A. (1986). The moderator-mediator variable distinction in social psychological research: conceptual, strategic, and statistical considerations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* **51**, 1173–1182.
- COLE, S R AND FRANGAKIS, C E. (2009). The consistency statement in causal inference: a definition or an assumption? *Epidemiology* **20**(1), 3–5.
- DAWID, A P. (1979). Conditional independence in statistical theory (with discussion). *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society* **B 41**, 1–31.
- DIDELEZ, V, DAWID, A P AND GENELETTI, S. (2006). Direct and Indirect Effects of Sequential Treatments. In: *Proceedings of the 22nd Annual Conference on Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence*. Arlington, VA: AUAI Press, pp. 138–146.
- GENELETTI, S. (2007). Identifying direct and indirect effects in a non-counterfactual framework. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series B (Statistical Methodology)* **69**(2), 199–215.

- HERNÁNDEZ-DIAZ, S, SCHISTERMAN, E F AND HERNÁN, M A. (2006). The birth weight "paradox" uncovered? *American Journal of Epidemiology* **164**, 1115–1120.
- IMAI, K, KEELE, L AND YAMAMOTO, T. (2010). Identification, inference and sensitivity analysis for causal mediation effects. *Statistical Science* **25**, 51–71.
- NAIMI, A I, MOODIE, E E M, AUGER, N AND KAUFMAN, J S. (2014). Stochastic mediation contrasts in epidemiologic research: interpregnancy interval and the educational disparity in preterm delivery. *American Journal of Epidemiology* **180**(4), 436–445.
- PEARL, J. (2000). *Causality. Models, reasoning, and inference*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- PEARL, J. (2001). Direct and indirect effects. In: *Proceedings of the 17th annual conference on uncertainty in artificial intelligence (UAI-01)*. San Francisco: Morgan Kaufmann, pp. 411–442.
- PEARL, J. (2011). The Mediation Formula: A guide to the assessment of causal pathways in nonlinear models. *Technical Report*, University of California, Los Angeles. <[http://ftp.cs.ucla.edu/pub/stat\\_ser/r379.pdf](http://ftp.cs.ucla.edu/pub/stat_ser/r379.pdf)>.
- ROBINS, J M, BLEVINS, D, RITTER, G AND WULFSOHN, M. (1992). G-estimation of the effect of prophylaxis therapy for pneumocystis carinii pneumonia on the survival of AIDS patients. *Epidemiology* **3**(4), 319–336.
- ROBINS, J M AND GREENLAND, S. (1992). Identifiability and exchangeability for direct and indirect effects. *Epidemiology* **3**, 143–155.
- ROBINS, J M AND RICHARDSON, T. (2010). Alternative Graphical Causal Models and the Identification of Direct Effects. *Technical Report*, Center for Statistics and the Social Sciences, University of Washington.
- SPERLING, R S, SHAPIRO, D E, COOMBS, R W, TODD, J A, HERMAN, S A, MCSHERRY, G D, O'SULLIVAN, M J, VANDYKE, R B, JIMINEZ, E, ROUZIOUX, C, FLYNN, P M and others. (1996). Maternal viral load, Zidovudine treatment, and the risk of transmission of Human Immunodeficiency Virus type 1 from mother to infant. *New England Journal of Medicine* **335**(22), 1621–1629.

- TCHETGEN-TCHETGEN, E J. (2011). On causal mediation analysis with a survival outcome. *The International Journal of Biostatistics* **7**(1), 1–38.
- TCHETGEN-TCHETGEN, E J AND SHPITSER, I. (2012). Semiparametric Theory for Causal Mediation Analysis: efficiency bounds, multiple robustness and sensitivity analysis. *The Annals of Statistics* **40**(3), 1816–1845.
- VALERI, L AND VANDERWEELE, T J. (2013). Mediation analysis allowing for exposure-mediator interaction and causal interpretation: theoretical assumptions and implementation with SAS and SPSS macros. *Psychological Methods* **18**(2), 137–150.
- VANDERWEELE, T J. (2009). Marginal Structural Models for the Estimation of Direct and Indirect Effects. *Epidemiology* **20**(1), 18–26.
- VANDERWEELE, T J. (2012). A three-way decomposition of a total effect into direct, indirect, and interactive effects. *Technical Report*, Harvard University, Boston.
- VANDERWEELE, T J, VANSTEELANDT, S AND ROBINS, J M. (2014). Effect decomposition in the presence of an exposure-induced mediator-outcome confounder. *Epidemiology* **25**(2), 300–306.

Figure 1: DAG summarizing the data.



Because treatment  $A$  is randomized, the pre-treatment covariate  $C$  is not a cause of  $A$  in the DAG.

## A Web-appendix A: Proofs

**Proof of Theorem 4.3:** (4.3) is trivial for  $M_{1,I=1} = M_0$ . (4.3) also follows immediately if  $M_{1,I=1}$  is a random draw of  $M_0$  given  $C$ . Furthermore, it is easy to see that for  $M_{1,I=1} = M_0$ , and if all  $Y_{a,m}$  are well-defined, then cross-worlds Assumption (3.1) implies equation (4.4): for  $M_{1,I=1} = M_0$ , equation (4.4) states  $Y_{1,m} | M_0 = m, C = c \sim Y_{1,m} | M_1 = m, C = c$ , and under equation (3.1) for randomized treatment  $A$ ,  $Y_{1,m}$  depends, for given  $C$ , neither on  $M_0$  nor on  $M_1$ . For  $M_{1,I=1}$  a random draw, equation (4.4) states  $Y_{1,m} | M_{1,I=1} = m, C = c \sim Y_{1,m} | M_1 = m, C = c$ , and under equation (3.1) for randomized treatment  $A$ ,  $Y_{1,m}$  depends, for given  $C$ , not on any mediators.

**Proof of Theorem 5.2:** First, let  $I$  be an intervention that is organic with respect to  $C$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} E(Y_{1,I=1}) &= E(E[Y_{1,I=1} | M_{1,I=1}, C]) \\ &= \int_{(c,m)} E[Y_{1,I=1} | M_{1,I=1} = m, C = c] f_{M_{1,I=1}|C=c}(m) dm f_C(c) dc \\ &= \int_{(c,m)} E[Y_1 | M_1 = m, C = c] f_{M_0|C=c}(m) dm f_C(c) dc. \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

In this proof, the first two equalities follow from the definition of conditional expectation. The third equality follows from Definition 4.1, (4.3) and (4.4). Thus, the choice of  $I$  does not influence the direct and indirect effect, as long as it is organic with respect to  $C$ .

Next, let  $I^C$  be an intervention that is organic with respect to  $C$  and  $I^{\tilde{C}}$  and intervention that is organic with respect to  $\tilde{C}$ . I assumed that  $C$  is not a common cause of mediator and outcome given  $\tilde{C}$ , and  $\tilde{C}$  is not a common cause of mediator and outcome given  $C$ ; hence there are 4 different cases, with either (5.5) or (5.6) holding for  $C$  and  $\tilde{C}$ , respectively. I will show that under any of the 4 different cases,

$$E\left(Y_1^{I^{\tilde{C}}}\right) = \int_{(\tilde{c}, m, c)} E\left[Y_1 | M_1 = m, \tilde{C} = \tilde{c}, C = c\right] f_{M_0|\tilde{C}=\tilde{c}, C=c}(m) f_{\tilde{C}, C}(\tilde{c}, c) d\tilde{c} dm dc.$$

Since the conditions and the result are symmetric in  $C, \tilde{C}$ , it follows that also

$$E\left(Y_1^{I^C}\right) = \int_{(\tilde{c}, m, c)} E\left[Y_1 | M_1 = m, \tilde{C} = \tilde{c}, C = c\right] f_{M_0|\tilde{C}=\tilde{c}, C=c}(m) f_{\tilde{C}, C}(\tilde{c}, c) d\tilde{c} dm dc.$$

But then,  $E\left(Y_1^{I^{\tilde{C}}}\right) = E\left(Y_1^{I^C}\right)$ .

Suppose first that  $C \perp\!\!\!\perp M_0 \mid \tilde{C}$  and  $C \perp\!\!\!\perp M_1 \mid \tilde{C}$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned}
& E\left(Y_1^{I^{\tilde{C}}}\right) \\
&= \int_{(\tilde{c}, m)} E\left[Y_1 \mid M_1 = m, \tilde{C} = \tilde{c}\right] f_{M_0|\tilde{C}=\tilde{c}}(m) f_{\tilde{C}}(\tilde{c}) dm d\tilde{c} \\
&= \int_{(\tilde{c}, m, c)} E\left[Y_1 \mid M_1 = m, \tilde{C} = \tilde{c}, C = c\right] f_{C|M_1=m, \tilde{C}=\tilde{c}}(c) f_{M_0|\tilde{C}=\tilde{c}}(m) f_{\tilde{C}}(\tilde{c}) dm d\tilde{c} \\
&= \int_{(\tilde{c}, m, c)} E\left[Y_1 \mid M_1 = m, \tilde{C} = \tilde{c}, C = c\right] f_{C|\tilde{C}=\tilde{c}}(c) f_{M_0|\tilde{C}=\tilde{c}, C=c}(m) f_{\tilde{C}}(\tilde{c}) dc dm d\tilde{c} \\
&= \int_{(\tilde{c}, m, c)} E\left[Y_1 \mid M_1 = m, \tilde{C} = \tilde{c}, C = c\right] f_{M_0|\tilde{C}=\tilde{c}, C=c}(m) f_{\tilde{C}, C}(\tilde{c}, c) dc dm d\tilde{c}.
\end{aligned}$$

The first line follows from equation (8). The second line conditions on  $C$ . In the third line I changed the order of integration and used  $C \perp\!\!\!\perp M_0 \mid \tilde{C}$  and  $C \perp\!\!\!\perp M_1 \mid \tilde{C}$ .

Alternatively, suppose that  $C \perp\!\!\!\perp Y_1 \mid M_1, \tilde{C}$ . Then,

$$\begin{aligned}
& E\left(Y_1^{I^{\tilde{C}}}\right) \\
&= \int_{(\tilde{c}, m)} E\left[Y_1 \mid M_1 = m, \tilde{C} = \tilde{c}\right] f_{M_0|\tilde{C}=\tilde{c}}(m) f_{\tilde{C}}(\tilde{c}) dm d\tilde{c} \\
&= \int_{(\tilde{c}, m)} E\left[Y_1 \mid M_1 = m, \tilde{C} = \tilde{c}\right] \int_c f_{M_0|\tilde{C}=\tilde{c}, C=c}(m) f_{C|\tilde{C}=\tilde{c}}(c) f_{\tilde{C}}(\tilde{c}) dm d\tilde{c} \\
&= \int_{(\tilde{c}, m), c} E\left[Y_1 \mid M_1 = m, \tilde{C} = \tilde{c}\right] f_{M_0|\tilde{C}=\tilde{c}, C=c}(m) f_{C|\tilde{C}=\tilde{c}}(c) f_{\tilde{C}, c}(\tilde{c}, c) dc dm d\tilde{c} \\
&= \int_{(\tilde{c}, m), c} E\left[Y_1 \mid M_1 = m, \tilde{C} = \tilde{c}, C = c\right] f_{M_0|\tilde{C}=\tilde{c}, C=c}(m) f_{\tilde{C}, c}(\tilde{c}, c) dc dm d\tilde{c}.
\end{aligned}$$

The first line follows from equation (8). The second line conditions on  $C$ . The last line follows from  $C \perp\!\!\!\perp Y_1 \mid M_1, \tilde{C}$ .  $\square$

**Proof of Theorem 6.1:**

$$\begin{aligned}
E(Y_{1,I=1}) &= \int_{(c,m)} E[Y_1 \mid M_1 = m, C = c] f_{M_0|C=c}(m) dm f_C(c) dc \\
&= \int_{(c,m)} E[Y_1 \mid M_1 = m, C = c, A = 1] f_{M_0|C=c,A=0}(m) dm f_C(c) dc \\
&= \int_{(c,m)} E[Y \mid M = m, C = c, A = 1] f_{M|C=c,A=0}(m) f_C(c) dm dc.
\end{aligned}$$

The first equality follows from equation (8). The second equality follows from the fact that treatment was randomized; this implies that

$$A \perp\!\!\!\perp (Y_1, M_1) \mid C \quad \text{and} \quad A \perp\!\!\!\perp M_0 \mid C.$$

The last equality follows from the randomization.  $\square$

**Proof of Theorem 7.3:** Theorem 7.3 assumed that either equation (5.5) or equation (5.6) holds for  $Z$ . Suppose first that equation (5.5) holds for  $Z$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned}
E(Y_{1,I=1}) &= \int_{(c,m)} E[Y_1 \mid M_1 = m, C = c] f_{M_0|C=c}(m) dm f_C(c) dc \\
&= \int_{(c,m)} \int_z E[Y_1 \mid M_1 = m, Z = z, C = c] f_{Z|M_1=m,C=c}(z) dz f_{M_0|C=c}(m) f_C(c) dm dc \\
&= \int_{(c,z,m)} E[Y_1 \mid M_1 = m, Z = z, C = c, A = 1] f_{Z|C=c}(z) f_{M_0|Z=z,C=c}(m) f_C(c) dz dm dc \\
&= \int_{(c,z,m)} E[Y_1 \mid M_1 = m, Z = z, C = c, A = 1] f_{M_0|Z=z,C=c,A=0}(m) f_{C,Z}(c, z) dz dm dc \\
&= \int_{(c,z,m)} E[Y \mid M = m, Z = z, C = c, A = 1] f_{M|Z=z,C=c,A=0}(m) f_{C,Z}(c, z) dm dz dc.
\end{aligned}$$

The first line follows from equation (8). The second line conditions on  $Z$ . The third line uses (5.5), for both  $M_0$  and  $M_1$ , Assumption 7.2, and changes the order of integration. The fourth line follows from Assumption 7.2. The last line follows from Assumption 7.1.

Next, suppose that equation (5.6) holds for  $Z$ .

$$\begin{aligned}
& E(Y_{1,I=1}) \\
&= \int_{(c,m)} E[Y_1 \mid M_1 = m, C = c] f_{M_0|C=c}(m) dm f_C(c) dc \\
&= \int_{(c,m)} E[Y_1 \mid M_1 = m, C = c] \int_z f_{M_0|Z=z,C=c}(m) f_{Z|C=c}(z) dz dm f_C(c) dc \\
&= \int_{(c,z,m)} E[Y_1 \mid M_1 = m, Z = z, C = c] f_{M_0|Z=z,C=c}(m) f_{Z,C}(z, c) dm dz dc \\
&= \int_{(c,z,m)} E[Y_1 \mid M_1 = m, Z = z, C = c, A = 1] f_{M_0|Z=z,C=c,A=0}(m) f_{Z,C}(z, c) dm dz dc \\
&= \int_{(c,z,m)} E[Y \mid M = m, Z = z, C = c, A = 1] f_{M|Z=z,C=c,A=0}(m) f_{Z,C}(z, c) dm dz dc.
\end{aligned}$$

The first line follows from equation (8). The second line follows by conditioning on  $Z$ . The third line follows from (5.6) and changing the order of integration. The fourth line follows from Assumption 7.2. The fifth line follows from Assumption 7.1.  $\square$

## B Web-appendix B: The smoking-and-low-birth-weight paradox

Section 4 argued that if a common cause of mediator and outcome  $\tilde{C}$  has not been observed, it is often not reasonable to think that equation (4.4) without  $\tilde{C}$  would hold. As an example, this appendix considers the case of maternal smoking and infant mortality. The effect of smoking during pregnancy ( $A = 1$ ) on infant mortality may be mediated by low birth weight. It turns out that a naive analysis leads to the conclusion that the direct effect of maternal smoking on infant mortality is beneficial. Hernández-Díaz *and others* (2006) explain this “birth weight paradox” and provide an explanation for the possible biases. This appendix shows how this relates to the setup of this article.

For exposition simplicity assume that whether a pregnant woman smokes or not is unrelated to her prognosis with respect to low birth weight or complications in her infant in the “smoking” and “not smoking” scenarios. So, differences in

outcomes between smokers and nonsmokers are caused by smoking only, effectively implying that the treatment “smoking” can be considered randomized. In practice, this may be violated if women with other unhealthy behaviors besides smoking are more likely to smoke. Those complications are ignored here, because the issues addressed in this appendix are present even under randomized treatment, and relaxing the randomization assumption was already discussed in Section 7.

Some infants may have a low birth weight due to genetically determined birth defects, which are likely not caused by smoking, or due to environmental causes other than smoking like malnutrition. These causes may be more predictive of infant mortality than smoking (Hernández-Díaz *and others* (2006)). For exposition simplicity this appendix bases the discussion on genetically determined birth defects as common causes of birth weight and infant mortality. Denote these by  $\tilde{C}$ . Suppose that, as in most studies,  $\tilde{C}$  is not observed. Now consider an intervention  $I$  (Definition 4.1 equation (4.3)) which causes birth weight for the smoking mothers to have the same distribution as the birth weight for non-smoking mothers, without changing genetically determined birth defects  $\tilde{C}$ . Then, the prognosis of an infant had the mother smoked and “had the infant had a normal birth weight  $M_{1,I=1}$  under intervention  $I$ ” is most likely not the same as the prognosis of an infant had the mother smoked and “had the infant had normal birth weight  $M_1$  without intervention”. Without the intervention, in an infant of a smoking mother with normal birth weight  $M_1$ , genes responsible for birth defects are most likely more favorable: the birth weight was normal without intervention, even while the mother was smoking. So, one would think that the prognosis  $Y_1$  is good for such an infant. Under intervention  $I$ , some of the infants of smoking women with normal birth weight  $M_{1,I=1}$  will have genetically determined birth defects: the birth weight has been intervened on to be normal without changing genetically determined birth defects. The possibility of genetically determined birth defects would lead to a worse prognosis  $Y_{1,I=1}$  for such infants. Thus, equation (4.4) will generally not hold in this situation.

Next, I consider how this issue affects the estimators of the direct and indirect effects if  $\tilde{C}$  is ignored (which it has to be, because it is assumed that  $\tilde{C}$  is unobserved). Let the outcome  $Y$  be an indicator of infant mortality, and let  $I$  be an intervention for which equation (4.3) holds. If  $\tilde{C}$  is ignored,  $E(Y_{1,I=1})$  would be estimated using the data for women who smoked but who had infants with relatively high birth weights, because that is the distribution of the birth weights  $M_{1,I=1}$  under intervention  $I$ . As argued in the previous paragraph, this approach is too optimistic, and thus the mortality probability  $E(Y_{1,I=1})$  is underestimated.

Thus, the part of the effect of smoking that is mediated through low birth weight, the indirect effect of smoking, is overestimated. As a consequence, the direct effect of smoking on infant mortality is underestimated.

This is in line with what was found in e.g. Hernández-Díaz *and others* (2006), who studied controlled direct effects, and found that conditional on birth weight, smoking and infant mortality were negatively associated in infants with low birth weight. A naive approach would thus conclude that the direct effect of smoking is beneficial. Hernández-Díaz *and others* (2006) explained this by noting that low birth weight may be more harmful if caused by genetic birth defects than if caused by smoking. As outlined above, this is a violation of equation (4.4).

The solution to this issue is to try to include in  $C$  as many pre-treatment common causes of mediator and outcome as feasible. In the case of the genetically determined birth defects in the above example, this could perhaps be done through observed traits of the newborn babies. If this is unfeasible, conclusions may be flawed because equation (4.4) fails to hold. The direction of the bias can be reasoned as described in the previous paragraph: in this example, ignoring birth defects results in an overestimation of the organic indirect effect of smoking (mediated by birth weight), and an underestimation of the detrimental organic direct effect of smoking (not mediated by birth weight).

The discussion in this section illustrates the importance of the assumptions behind mediation analysis. One can compare whether the distribution on the left hand side of equation (4.4) puts more mass on larger values of the outcome or on smaller values of the outcome as compared to the distribution on the right hand side. Thus, an advantage of the current approach is that the direction of the bias that results from lack of validity of equation (4.4) can be discussed in the context of each particular application.

## **C Web-appendix C: Interventions on the mediator under treatment or on the mediator under no treatment?**

There has been some discussion in the previous literature about whether one should consider setting the mediator to its value under treatment versus setting it to its value without treatment (see e.g. VanderWeele, 2009). As indicated in Section 8, the approach in this article can easily be extended to incorporate both. To illustrate what might be of most clinical interest in a particular setting, consider

two scenarios. In scenario 1, an alternative treatment  $I'$  changes the mediator the same way conventional treatment  $A$  does, without having a direct effect on the outcome. This would be especially relevant for example if the direct effect of treatment  $A$  is a harmful side effect. In this case, one would want to compare the distribution of the outcome under no treatment with the distribution of the outcome under no treatment if the mediator under intervention  $I'$ ,  $M_{0,I'=1}$ , has the same distribution as  $M_1$ . For example, with  $Y_{0,I'=1}$  the outcome under  $I'$  with  $A = 0$ , one would want to estimate  $E(Y_{0,I'=1} - Y_0)$  as the effect mediated through  $M$ . This is a different quantity than the organic indirect effect of Section 4, but can be estimated in a similar way by changing the coding of  $A$  as in Section 8. In scenario 2, the quantity of interest is the effect of an alternative treatment  $\tilde{A}$ , where  $\tilde{A}$  has the same direct effect as treatment  $A$ , but does not affect the mediator  $M$ . This would be especially relevant if the effect of treatment  $A$  on the mediator is a harmful side effect. In this case one would want to consider an intervention such that  $M_{1,I=1}$  under treatment has the same distribution as  $M_0$ . In that situation, the quantity of interest is  $E(Y_{1,I=1} - Y_0)$ , the organic direct effect of treatment  $A = 1$  as defined in Definition 4.1. Scenario 1 motivates an intervention that causes the mediator without treatment to have the same distribution as  $M_1$ , scenario 2 motivates an intervention that causes the mediator with treatment to have the same distribution as  $M_0$ . When studying the biological mechanisms by which particular treatments are effective, both types of interventions may be of interest.

## D Web-appendix D: Inference under randomized treatment

I now illustrate how one might use the identification result of Section 6 to estimate  $E(Y_{1,I=1})$ , and hence the organic indirect and direct effects, under semi-parametric assumptions.

Suppose that  $M_1 \sim M_0 + \beta_1 + \beta_3^T C \mid C$ , with  $\beta_1 \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $\beta_3 \in \mathbb{R}^k$ . This would be the case if, as in e.g. Valeri and VanderWeele (2013),  $M$  follows a regression model  $M = \beta_0 + \beta_1 A + \beta_2^T C + \beta_3^T AC + \epsilon$ , where the random variable  $\epsilon$  has the same distribution given  $C$  under treatment as without treatment, and with  $\beta_1 \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $\beta_2, \beta_3 \in \mathbb{R}^k$ . Suppose in addition that the expected value of  $Y$  given  $C$  and  $M$  under treatment follows some parametric model of the form  $E[Y \mid M = m, C = c, A = 1] = f_\theta(m, c)$ . Notice that this last model applies only to the distribution of  $Y$  conditional on  $A = 1$ , not conditional on  $A = 0$ . This

implies that the model does not restrict treatment-mediator interactions. Then, Theorem 6.1 implies  $E(Y_{1,I=1}) = E[f_\theta(M - \beta_1 - \beta_3^T C, C) | A = 1]$  (proof: see below). This can be estimated by fitting the models for  $\beta$  and  $\theta$  using standard methods, plugging the parameter estimates in, and replacing the expectation given  $A = 1$  by its empirical average. Standard errors can be estimated with the bootstrap.

Notice that the resulting estimator uses changes in the distribution of the mediator with and without treatment, but the distribution of the outcome only in treated units. This leads to an estimator for the indirect effect that does not use data on the outcomes for untreated units.

Valeri and VanderWeele (2013) provide code to estimate direct and indirect effects based on the mediation formula for the case where  $M$  and  $Y$  both follow regression or logistic regression models.

**Proof of inference under randomized treatment:**

$$\begin{aligned}
E(Y_{1,I=1}) &= \int_{(c,m)} E[Y | M = m, C = c, A = 1] f_{M|C=c,A=0}(m) f_C(c) dm dc \\
&= \int_{(c,m)} f_\theta(m, c) f_{M|C=c,A=1}(m + \beta_1 + \beta_3^T c) f_C(c) dm dc \\
&= \int_{(c,\tilde{m})} f_\theta(\tilde{m} - \beta_1 - \beta_3^T c, c) f_{M|C=c,A=1}(\tilde{m}) f_C(c) d\tilde{m} dc \\
&= E[f_\theta(M - \beta_1 - \beta_3^T C, C) | A = 1],
\end{aligned}$$

where the first equality follows from Theorem 6.1, the second equality follows from  $M_1 \sim M_0 + \beta_1 + \beta_3^T C | C$ , see above, the third equality from a change of variables with  $\tilde{m} = m + \beta_1 + \beta_3^T c$ , and the fourth equality from the fact that treatment  $A$  is randomized, and therefore the distribution of  $C$  does not depend on  $A$ .  $\square$

## E Web-appendix E: Organic direct and indirect effects: independence assumptions instead of distributional assumptions

Some readers may be more at ease with independence assumptions underlying causal inference than with the distributional assumptions considered in the main

text. This can be done in the current context as follows. Let  $R$  describe the possible treatments as follows:  $R = 0$ : treatment 0,  $R = 1$ : treatment 1 and  $R = 2$ : treatment 1 combined with an "organic" intervention  $I$  on the mediator. Equivalent to the definition in the main text, the definition for  $I$  being an organic intervention on the mediator could be formulated as that both equations (9) and (10) are satisfied:

$$M \perp\!\!\!\perp R \mid C = c, R \neq 1 \quad (9)$$

$$Y \perp\!\!\!\perp R \mid M = m, C = c, R \neq 0. \quad (10)$$

Of course, for easier interpretation,  $R \neq 1$  could be replaced by " $R = 0$  or  $R = 2$ " and  $R \neq 0$  could be replaced by " $R = 1$  or  $R = 2$ ". The first of these assumptions states that, for given pre-treatment covariates  $C$ , the mediator is independent of whether the mediator was intervened on during treatment versus no treatment was given. The second of these assumptions states that, for given mediator and pre-treatment covariates  $C$ , the outcome is independent of whether the mediator got its value  $m$  because it was intervened on during treatment versus treatment 1 was given.

## F Web-appendix F: Organic direct and indirect effects without counterfactuals

Some of the literature on causal inference is avoiding counterfactuals, see e.g. Dawid (1979), Didelez *and others* (2006), and Geneletti (2007). Although this has not been a concern in the main manuscript, some readers may appreciate that organic direct and indirect effects can also be defined without counterfactuals, if "organic" interventions are possible in a three-arm clinical trial with  $R = 0$ : treatment 0,  $R = 1$ : treatment 1 and  $R = 2$ : treatment 1 combined with an "organic" intervention  $I$  on the mediator. In this setting, the definition for  $I$  being an organic intervention on the mediator is that both equations (11) and (12) are satisfied:

$$M \mid R = 2, C = c \sim M \mid R = 0, C = c \quad (11)$$

$$Y \mid R = 2, M = m, C = c \sim Y \mid R = 1, M = m, C = c. \quad (12)$$

Equation (11) states that the distribution of the mediator under treatment combined with the intervention  $I$  is as under treatment 0, and equation (12) intuitively

states that the intervention  $I$  on the mediator has no direct effect on the outcome  $Y$ .

The organic direct and indirect effects based on  $I$  can now be defined as

$$E[Y|R = 1] - E[Y|R = 2]$$

and

$$E[Y|R = 2] - E[Y|R = 0].$$

As in the main paper, the mediation formula holds for  $E[Y | R = 2]$  because

$$\begin{aligned} E[Y | R = 2] &= E(E[Y|M, C, R = 2]) \\ &= \int_{m,c} E[Y|M = m, C = c, R = 2] f_{M|C=c,R=2}(m) f_{C|R=2}(c) \\ &= \int_{m,c} E[Y|M = m, C = c, R = 1] f_{M|C=c,R=0}(m) f_C(c), \end{aligned}$$

because  $R$  is randomized, (11), and (12).