arXiv:1510.02753v2 [stat.ME] 8 Jul 2020

Organic direct and indirect effects with post-treatment common causes of the mediator and the outcome

JUDITH J. LOK*
Department of Mathematics and Statistics
Boston University
MCS 232
111 Cummington Mall
Boston, MA 02215, USA
jjlok@bu.edu

December 21, 2021

Abstract

Most of the literature on direct and indirect effects assumes that there are no post-treatment common causes of the mediator and the outcome. In contrast to natural direct and indirect effects, organic direct and indirect effects, which were introduced in Lok (2016, 2020), can be extended to provide an identification result for settings with post-treatment common causes of the mediator and the outcome. This article provides a definition and an identification result for organic direct and indirect effects in the presence of post-treatment common causes of mediator and outcome. These new organic indirect and direct effects have interpretations in terms of intervention effects. Organic indirect effects in the presence of post-treatment common causes are an addition to indirect effects through multivariate mediators. Organic indirect effects in the presence of post-treatment common causes can be used e.g. 1. to predict the effect of the initial treatment if its side affects are suppressed through additional interventions or 2. to predict the effect of a treatment that does not affect the post-treatment common cause and affects the mediator the same way as the initial treatment.

Causal inference, Direct and indirect effect, Mediation, Organic direct and indirect effect, Post-treatment common causes of mediator and outcome.

1 Introduction

Most of the literature on direct and indirect effects assumes that there are no post-treatment common causes of the mediator and the outcome (VanderWeele (2015)). In contrast to natural direct and indirect effects, organic direct and indirect effects, introduced in Lok (2016) and Lok and Bosch (2020), can be extended to provide an identification result for settings with post-treatment common causes of the mediator and the outcome, so-called mediator-outcome confounders. This article provides a definition as well as an identification result for organic direct and indirect effects in the presence of post-treatment common causes of the mediator and the outcome. This provides another alternative to the three quantities described in VanderWeele et al. (2014).

Organic direct and indirect effects from Lok (2016) and Lok and Bosch (2020) are intervention based approaches. Indirect effects are the effects of organic interventions. It is important to differentiate between interventions on M that happen before L and interventions on M that happen after L, because the distribution of L under an intervention depends on when that intervention takes place. If one is after interventions that also affect L, it will often be more informative to consider L as part of a multivariate mediator (M, L). Causal mediation analysis proposed in e.g. Robins and Greenland (1992); Pearl (2001); VanderWeele (2015); Imai et al. (2010); Tchetgen-Tchetgen (2011); VanderWeele (2009); Lok (2016); Lok and Bosch (2020) includes such multivariate mediators (M, L). Hence, this article only considers organic interventions I on the mediator that happen after L. This is of particular importance when we evaluate e.g. the effect of interventions that reduce a side effect of the treatment $A = 1$.

Just as organic direct and indirect effects in the absence of post-treatment common causes of the mediator and the outcome, the proposed organic direct and indirect effects do not require that the mediator can be set to any specific value. It suffices that there are "organic" interventions on the mediator that change its distribution.


We provide two alternative definitions, following Lok (2016) and Lok and Bosch (2020). The first definition is closer to natural direct and indirect effects (Robins and Greenland (1992); Pearl (2001); VanderWeele (2015); Imai et al. (2010); Tchetgen-Tchetgen (2011); VanderWeele (2009)), and extends Lok (2016). The second definition is

closer to Baron and Kenny (1986), and extends Lok and Bosch (2020).

2 Setting and notation

Denote treatment by A, the mediator by M, the outcome by Y, pre-treatment common causes of the mediator and the outcome by C, and post-treatment common causes of the mediator and the outcome by L. Following Lok (2016); Lok and Bosch (2020), I indicates an intervention on the mediator M. Initially, I assume that treatment A is randomized; this assumption can be relaxed as in Lok (2016); Lok and Bosch (2020). For the current setting, the DAG is shown in Figure 1.

Figure 1: DAG summarizing the data in the presence of a post-treatment common cause of mediator and outcome L



From the DAG notice that an intervention on the mediator M may happen after L, because L is realized before M.

Organic direct and indirect effects from Lok (2016) and Lok and Bosch (2020) are an intervention based approaches. It is important to differentiate between interventions on M that happen before L and after L, because the distribution of L under the intervention depends on when the intervention takes place. This article only considers organic interventions I on the mediator that happen after L.

A subscript 1 indicates "under treatment, $A = 1$", and a subscript 0 indicates "under no treatment, $A = 0$". $M_{1,I=1}$ and $Y_{1,I=1}$ indicate the mediator and the outcome under treatment, $A = 1$, and organic intervention I. $M_{0,I=1}$ and $Y_{0,I=1}$ indicate the mediator and the outcome under no treatment, $A = 0$, and organic intervention I.

3 Definition, identifiability and estimation of organic direct and indirect effects with post-treatment common causes of mediator and outcome: interventions after $A = 1$

If I happens after the post-treatment common cause L of the mediator and the outcome, the value of L under the intervention I and treatment $A = 1$ equals the value of L_1. Hence, we define

Definition 3.1 (Organic intervention in the presence of post-treatment common causes L of mediator and outcome). *An intervention I is an organic intervention if for all l, c,*

$$M_{1,I=1}|L_1 = l, C = c \sim M_0|L_0 = l, C = c \tag{1}$$

and

$$Y_{1,I=1}|M_{1,I=1} = m, L_1 = l, C = c \sim Y_1|M_1 = m, L_1 = l, C = c. \tag{2}$$

The idea behind mediation analysis is that under the intervention I and treatment, $M_{1,I=1}$ resembles M_0. Therefore, this article assumes that $M_{1,I=1}$ depends on L and C in the same way as M_0, just as without L, Lok (2016) assumed that $M_{1,I=1}$ depends on C in the same way as M_0. Notice that without L, Definition 3.1 simplifies to Definition 4.1 from Lok (2016). Notice also that in contrast to Lok (2016), $M_{1,I=1} = M_0$, the basis for natural direct and indirect effects, is no longer a special case of an organic intervention.

Equation (2) means that given $L_1 = l$ and $C = c$, the prognosis under treatment of a unit "with $M_{1,I=1} = m$" is the same as the prognosis under treatment of a unit "with $M_1 = m$". In other words, given C and L_1, treated units with observed mediator equal to m are representative of treated units with $M_{1,I=1} = m$. Similar to Lok (2016), equation (2) can be relaxed to

$$E\left[Y_{1,I=1}|M_{1,I=1} = m, L_1 = l, C = c\right] = E\left[Y_1|M_1 = m, L_1 = l, C = c\right].$$

The consistency assumption is straightforward, but needs to include L:

Assumption 3.2 (Consistency). *If $A = 1$, then $L = L_1$, $M = M_1$ and $Y = Y_1$. If $A = 0$, then $L = L_0$, $M = M_0$ and $Y = Y_0$.*

The following identification result holds:

Theorem 3.3 (Organic direct and indirect effects: identification in the presence of post-treatment common causes L of mediator and outcome). *Under randomized treatment, consistency assumption 3.2 and definition of organic interventions 3.1,* $E\left(Y_{1,I=1}\right)$*, for an organic intervention* I*, is equal to*

$$\int_{(c,l,m)} E\left[Y|M=m,L=l,C=c,A=1\right] f_{M|L=l,C=c,A=0}(m) f_{L|C=c,A=1}(l) f_C(c) dm\, dl\, dc.$$

All objects on the right hand side of the equation in Theorem 3.3 depend on observables only and can be fitted using standard methods. Inference follows along the lines of Section 6 of Lok (2016), see also Section 5 below.

Proof of theorem 3.3

$$\begin{aligned}
E\left(Y_{1,I=1}\right) &= E\left(E\left[Y_{1,I=1}|M_{1,I=1},L_1,C\right]\right) \\
&= \int_{(c,l,m)} E\left[Y_{1,I=1}|M_{1,I=1}=m,L_1=l,C=c\right] f_{M_{1,I=1}|L_1=l,C=c}(m)dm\, f_{L_1|C=c}(l)dl\, f_C(c)dc \\
&= \int_{(c,l,m)} E\left[Y_1|M_1=m,L_1=l,C=c\right] f_{M_0|L_0=l,C=c}(m)dm\, f_{L_1|C=c}(l)dl\, f_C(c)dc \\
&= \int_{(c,l,m)} E\left[Y_1|M_1=m,L_1=l,C=c,A=1\right] f_{M_0|L_0=l,C=c,A=0}(m)dm f_{L_1|C=c,A=1}(l)dl f_C(c)dc \\
&= \int_{(c,l,m)} E\left[Y|M=m,L=l,C=c,A=1\right] f_{M|L=l,C=c,A=0}(m)dm\, f_{L|C=c,A=1}(l)dl\, f_C(c)dc.
\end{aligned}$$

The first two equalities follow from the definition of conditional expectation. The third equality follows from equations (2) and (1). The fourth equality follows from the fact that treatment was randomized; this implies that

$$A \perp\!\!\!\perp \left(Y_1, M_1, L_1\right)|C \qquad \text{and} \qquad A \perp\!\!\!\perp \left(M_0, L_0\right)|C.$$

The last equality follows from Consistency Assumption 3.2. □

4 Definition, identifiability and estimation of organic direct and indirect effects with post-treatment common causes of mediator and outcome: interventions after $A = 0$

In this section we start with $A = 0$, and evaluate the effect of an intervention I that happens after L but creates a setting where the distribution of the mediator given

L resembles that of the mediator given L under treatment $A = 1$. This setting is relevant e.g. if interest lies in a treatment that does not affect L but has a similar effect on the mediator as $A = 1$. In this case, the value of L under the intervention and $A = 0$ equals the value of L_0. We define organic interventions in this setting as follows:

Definition 4.1 (Organic intervention in the presence of post-treatment common causes L of mediator and outcome). *An intervention I is an organic intervention if for all l, c,*

$$M_{0,I=1}|L_0 = l, C = c \sim M_1|L_1 = l, C = c \tag{3}$$

and

$$Y_{0,I=1}|M_{0,I=1} = m, L_0 = l, C = c \sim Y_0|M_0 = m, L_0 = l, C = c. \tag{4}$$

The idea behind mediation analysis is that under the intervention I and no treatment, $M_{0,I=1}$ resembles M_1. Therefore, this article assumes that $M_{0,I=1}$ depends on L and C in the same way as M_1, just as without L, Lok and Bosch (2020) assumed that $M_{0,I=1}$ depends on C in the same way as M_1. Without L, Definition 4.1 simplifies to Lok and Bosch (2020). As in Lok and Bosch (2020), $M_{0,I=1} = M_1$ is not a special case of an organic intervention.

Equation (4) means that given $L_0 = l$ and $C = c$, the prognosis under "no treatment" of a unit "with $M_{0,I=1} = m$" is the same as the prognosis under "no treatment" of a unit "with $M_0 = m$". In other words, given C and L_0, untreated units with observed mediator equal to m are representative of untreated units with $M_{0,I=1} = m$. Similar to Lok (2016); Lok and Bosch (2020), equation (4) can be relaxed to

$$E\left[Y_{0,I=1}|M_{0,I=1} = m, L_0 = l, C = c\right] = E\left[Y_0|M_0 = m, L_0 = l, C = c\right].$$

The consistency assumption is the same as Consistency Assumption 3.2. The following identification result follows from the same proof as Theorem 3.3:

Theorem 4.2 (Organic direct and indirect effects: identification in the presence of post-treatment common causes L of mediator and outcome). *Under randomized treatment, consistency assumption 3.2 and definition of organic interventions 3.1, $E\left(Y_{0,I=1}\right)$, for an organic intervention I, is equal to*

$$\int_{(c,l,m)} E\left[Y|M = m, L = l, C = c, A = 0\right] f_{M|L=l,C=c,A=1}(m) f_{L|C=c,A=0}(l) f_C(c) dm\, dl\, dc.$$

5 Organic direct and indirect effects with post-treatment common causes of mediator and outcome: interventions after $A = 1$

In the presence of post-treatment common causes L of the mediator and the outcome, inference can be done based on Section 3, Theorem 3.3. For example, suppose that

$$M_1 \sim M_0 + \beta_1 + \beta_4 C + \beta_5 L | C, L \tag{5}$$

with $\beta_1 \in \mathbb{R}$, $\beta_4 \in \mathbb{R}^k$, and would be the case if, for example,

$$M = \beta_0 + \beta_1 A + \beta_2 C + \beta_3 L + \beta_4 AC + \beta_5 AL + \beta_6 CL + \epsilon,$$

where the random variable ϵ has the same distribution given (C, L) under treatment as without treatment, and with $\beta_0, \beta_1 \in \mathbb{R}$, $\beta_2, \beta_4 \in \mathbb{R}^k$, $\beta_3, \beta_5 \in \mathbb{R}^l$, and $\beta_6 \in \mathbb{R}^p$. Suppose in addition that the expected value of Y given M, L, and C under treatment follows some parametric model of the form

$$E\left[Y | M = m, L = l, C = c, A = 1\right] = f_\theta(m, l, c). \tag{6}$$

Then, Theorem 3.3 implies that

$$\begin{aligned}
&E\left(Y^I_{1,M_{1,I=1}}\right) \\
&= \int_{(m,l,c)} E\left[Y | M = m, L = l, C = c, A = 1\right] f_{M|L=l,C=c,A=0}(m) f_{L|C=c,A=1}(l) f_C(c) dm dl dc \\
&= \int_{(c,l,m)} f_\theta(m, l, c) f_{M|L=l,C=c,A=1}(m + \beta_1 + \beta_4 c + \beta_5 l) f_{L|C=c,A=1}(l) f_C(c) dm dl dc \\
&= \int_{(c,l,\tilde{m})} f_\theta(\tilde{m} - \beta_1 - \beta_4 c - \beta_5 l, l, c) f_{M|L=l,C=c,A=1}(\tilde{m}) f_{L|C=c,A=1}(l) f_C(c) d\tilde{m} dl dc \\
&= E\left[f_\theta(M - \beta_1 - \beta_4 C - \beta_5 L, L, C) | A = 1\right],
\end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

just as in Section 6 of Lok (2016). Expression (7) can be estimated by fitting models (5) and (6) above using standard methods, plugging the parameter estimates in (7), and replacing the expectation given $A = 1$ by its empirical average. Standard errors can be estimated using the bootstrap.

6 Discussion

This article provides an intervention based approach to mediation analysis, extended to settings with post-treatment common causes L of the mediator M and the outcome Y. The types of interventions that are relevant depend on the subject matter, on what one intends to do with the results of the mediation analysis.

If interest lies in interventions that affect not only the mediator M but also the post-treatment common causes L, mediation analysis with a multivariate mediator (M, L) could be most relevant. Existing mediation analysis approaches from e.g. Robins and Greenland (1992); Pearl (2001); VanderWeele (2015); Imai et al. (2010); Tchetgen-Tchetgen (2011); VanderWeele (2009); Lok (2016); Lok and Bosch (2020) can be used for the multivariate mediator (M, L).

If interest lies in interventions that affect only the mediator M (and not L), the approach in this article, which extends Lok (2016) and Lok and Bosch (2020) to settings with post-treatment common causes L of the mediator M and the outcome Y, can be used. In our approach, interventions are considered that do not affect the post-treatment common cause L. Organic interventions I affect the distribution of the mediator M given the common causes (L, C) so that M follows the distribution of the mediator given the "other" treatment option. That is, when combining an organic intervention I with $A = 1$, the distribution of the mediator $M_{1,I=1}$ given $(L = l, C = c)$, which now equals $(L_1 = l, C = c)$, is affected to become the distribution of the mediator M_0 given $(L_0 = l, C = c)$. And, when combining an organic intervention I with $A = 0$, the distribution of the mediator $M_{0,I=1}$ given $(L = l, C = c)$, which now equals $(L_0 = l, C = c)$, is affected to become the distribution of the mediator M_1 given $(L_1 = l, C = c)$. After that, the outcomes follow their "natural course", that is, $Y_{1,I=1}$ continues to evolve as Y_1 given (M_1, L_1, C) and $Y_{0,I=1}$ continues to evolve as Y_0 given (M_0, L_0, C).

Settings where interest lies in interventions that affect only the mediator M (and not L) include settings where interventions on the mediator are designed to counter side-effects of a treatment $A = 1$. They also include settings with new treatments which are designed to not affect the post-treatment common cause L but which do affect the mediator M.

Our proposed organic direct and indirect effects add another decomposition of the treatment effect into effects through different pathways, adding to existing methods described in VanderWeele et al. (2014). We show that organic direct and indirect effects are identifiable in settings with post-treatment common causes of the mediator and the outcome. We also provide examples of inference. Organic direct and indirect effects have interpretations in terms of intervention effects, and

thus contribute to critical thinking about the purpose of mediation analyses.

References

Baron, R. M. and D. A. Kenny (1986). The moderator-mediator variable distinction in social psychological research: conceptual, strategic, and statistical considerations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 51*, 1173–1182.

Imai, K., L. Keele, and T. Yamamoto (2010). Identification, infrerence and sensitivity analysis for causal mediation effects. *Statistical Science 25*, 51–71.

Lok, J. J. (2016). Defining and estimating causal direct and indirect effects when setting the mediator to specific values is not feasible. *Statistics in Medicine 35*(22), 4008–4020.

Lok, J. J. and R. J. Bosch (2020). Causal organic direct and indirect effects: closer to Baron and Kenny, with a product method for binary mediators. Submitted to *Epidemiology*.

Pearl, J. (2001). Direct and indirect effects. In *Proceedings of the 17th annual conference on uncertainty in artificial intelligence (UAI-01)*, pp. 411–442. San Francisco: Morgan Kaufmann.

Robins, J. M. and S. Greenland (1992). Identifiability and exchangeability for direct and indirect effects. *Epidemiology 3*, 143–155.

Tchetgen-Tchetgen, E. J. (2011). On causal mediation analysis with a survival outcome. *The International Journal of Biostatistics 7*(1), 1–38.

VanderWeele, T. J. (2009). Marginal Structural Models for the estimation of direct and indirect effects. *Epidemiology 20*(1), 18–26.

VanderWeele, T. J. (2015). *Explanation in causal inference: methods for mediation and interaction*. Oxford University Press.

VanderWeele, T. J., S. Vansteelandt, and J. M. Robins (2014). Effect decomposition in the presence of an exposure-induced mediator-outcome confounder. *Epidemiology (Cambridge, Mass.) 25*(2), 300.