

# Bayesian Doubly Robust Causal Inference via Loss Functions

Yu Luo\*, David A. Stephens<sup>†</sup>, Daniel J. Graham<sup>‡</sup>, Emma J. McCoy<sup>§</sup>

## Abstract

Frequentist inference has a well-established supporting theory for doubly robust causal inference based on the potential outcomes framework, which is realized via outcome regression (OR) and propensity score (PS) models. The Bayesian counterpart, however, is not obvious as the PS model loses its balancing property in joint modeling. In this paper, we propose a natural and formal Bayesian solution by bridging loss-type Bayesian inference with a utility function derived from the notion of a pseudo-population via the change of measure. Consistency of the posterior distribution is shown with correctly specified and misspecified OR models. Simulation studies suggest that our proposed method can estimate the true causal effect more efficiently and achieve the frequentist coverage if either the OR model is correctly specified or fit with a flexible function of the confounders, compared to the previous Bayesian approach via the Bayesian bootstrap. Finally, we apply this novel Bayesian method to assess the impact of speed cameras on the reduction of car collisions in England.

*Keywords:* Causal inference; General Bayesian updating; Gibbs posteriors; Loss functions; Consistency; Double robustness

---

\*Department of Mathematics, Imperial College London, United Kingdom

<sup>†</sup>Department of Mathematics and Statistics, McGill University, Canada

<sup>‡</sup>Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, Imperial College London, United Kingdom

<sup>§</sup>Department of Mathematics, Imperial College London, United Kingdom

# 1 Introduction

Causal inference based on the potential outcomes framework has been extensively elaborated in the past few decades. The inference target is a causal estimand which typically measures the change in the expected outcome of a subject under different treatment regimes. However, data arising from observational studies often induce dependence between the confounders and the outcome, and this can result in biased causal estimates if the dependence is ignored. Propensity score adjustments have been proposed to reduce confounding bias in estimating causal effects. This approach involves two steps of implementation: first, model the treatment assignment mechanism to obtain the propensity score which is defined as the conditional probability of the treatment assignment given confounding covariates. Second, adjust the treatment-outcome relationship via estimated propensity scores in either form of weighting, matching, stratification, or covariate adjustment. This adjustment often validly corrects for confounding bias under certain assumptions (Rosenbaum and Rubin, 1983). In order to obtain a consistent estimator, we normally need to correctly specify the outcome model, or in the doubly robust version, at least one of the outcome regression (OR) model and propensity score (PS) model (Scharfstein et al., 1999; Bang and Robins, 2005; Cao et al., 2009).

Bayesian inference for causal inference focuses on generating samples from the posterior distribution of causal estimands and calculating the posterior predictive distribution of potential responses from incomplete-data perspectives. Under this framework, Bayesian inference is clear about the role played by treatment assignment in both randomized and non-randomized studies (Rubin, 1978; Imbens and Rubin, 1997). In addition, the Bayesian approach offers a natural framework for uncertainty quantification and prediction, which can render a more thorough understanding of the causal effect from the practical perspective. However, an equivalent Bayesian solution is not obvious as there is no distributional assumption because doubly robust causal inference involves the frequentist estimating equation framework, and also relies on the plug-in method for the PS model. There has been some work on the Bayesian version of causal inference via PS adjustment (for example, McCandless et al., 2009, 2012; Kaplan and Chen, 2012; Karabatsos and Walker, 2012; Zigler and Dominici, 2014; Saarela et al., 2015, 2016; Graham et al., 2016; Stephens et al., 2020). The formal frequentist analogy would be performing fully Bayesian esti-

mation for the PS model, computing PSs and then performing Bayesian inference for the causal effect in the OR using these fitted values. As per the frequentist theory, only our best estimate of PSs results in consistency when we plug PSs into the OR model. But the Bayesian plug-in procedure is not designed to have the required frequentist coverage as the Monte Carlo variance does not reflect the inferential uncertainty captured in the per-replicate posteriors. Furthermore, Saarela et al. (2015) contended that this method is not completely Bayesian.

On the other hand, McCandless et al. (2009) state that the treatment effect via the plug-in method does not acknowledge uncertainty in the estimated PSs, and therefore proposed a Bayesian method that models the PS as a latent variable via the joint density of the outcome and the treatment assignment and obtained a wider Bayesian credible interval compared with the plug-in method. In addition, Karabatsos and Walker (2012) also use a joint model with a Bayesian nonparametric prior to study the random causal effect, where a stick breaking prior with a normal distribution is placed for the causal parameter. They showed the weak consistency of this model under the correct specification of the joint distribution. However, Saarela et al. (2016) noticed that in the joint estimation, the PS no longer possesses the balancing properties of PSs, and that this joint approach is not a true PS adjustment method. Recently, Saarela et al. (2016) and Graham et al. (2016) discussed the notion of Bayesian doubly robust causal inference. Specifically, they employ the Bayesian bootstrap strategy to derive posterior predictive distributions to draw inference on causal quantities.

In this paper, we build a comprehensive Bayesian framework for causal inference via loss functions using recent advances in learning theory for Bayesian loss-type inference (Zhang, 2006; Bissiri et al., 2016). This formulates Bayesian inference without the concept of likelihood, instead relying entirely on a loss-type (or utility) specification to update prior to posterior. The key difference from the previous work by Graham et al. (2016) and Saarela et al. (2016) is that this procedure will offer a fully formal Bayesian solution and give precise definitions of Bayesian causal estimands in terms of posterior (predictive) distributions. Furthermore, our approach does not suffer loss of consistency via the joint estimation for PS adjustment. The result follows using a decision-theoretic argument concerning the decision to ‘report beliefs a posteriori’. We also develop Bayesian consistency results for the posterior distribution of the causal parameter via correctly specified and misspecified outcome models. This double robustness is achieved

by singling out the PS for this robust form of modeling. To our knowledge, no such Bayesian causal inference method has been presented previously, which offers a novel and natural Bayesian solution to causal inference problems with the doubly robust property.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 outlines Bayesian causal inference via the joint distribution and the Bayesian bootstrap. We bridge the gap between formulations of causal inference via importance sampling and Bayesian loss-type inference in Section 3, followed by results on consistency. Section 4 compares the proposed method with simulation studies in Graham et al. (2019) and Saarela et al. (2016). We apply this method in a real example from England to study the causal effect of the installation of speed cameras on the number of personal injury collisions in Section 5. Finally, Section 6 presents some concluding remarks and future research directions.

## 2 Bayesian Causal Inference

### 2.1 Causal Inference via the Joint Distribution

In a causal inference setting, let  $Z_i = (Y_i, D_i, X_i), i = 1, \dots, n$ , where for the  $i$ th unit of observation  $Y_i$  denotes a response,  $D_i$  the treatment (or exposure) received, and  $X_i$  a vector of pre-treatment covariates or confounder variables. Under an experimental design  $\mathcal{E}$ , we know that  $D_i \perp\!\!\!\perp_{\mathcal{E}} X_i$  with the marginal distribution of  $D_i$ ,  $f_{\mathcal{E}}(d_i)$  known as a constant. However, in observational studies,  $\mathcal{O}$ ,  $D_i \not\perp\!\!\!\perp_{\mathcal{O}} X_i$  and appropriate adjustment is required to estimate causal effects. Under the potential outcome framework, the observed outcome is,  $Y_i = (1 - D_i) Y_i(0) + D_i Y_i(1)$ , if the exposure,  $D_i$ , is binary where  $\{Y_i(0), Y_i(1)\}$  is the pair of potential outcomes. We assume that the treatment assignment is ignorable,  $D_i \perp\!\!\!\perp_{\mathcal{O}} \{Y_i(0), Y_i(1)\} | X_i$ , and we also assume that the pair of potential outcomes  $\{Y_i(0), Y_i(1)\}$  is not affected by any other subjects, which is termed the stable unit-treatment value assumption (SUTVA). The primary focus of our inference is to estimate the average treatment effect, which is defined as  $\mathbb{E}[Y_i(1) - Y_i(0)]$ . Assuming there are no unmeasured confounders and  $f_{\mathcal{O}}(d_i | x_i) > 0$  for all  $f(x_i) \neq 0$ ,

$$\mathbb{E}[Y_i(1) - Y_i(0)] = \int_{x_i} \{\mathbb{E}[Y_i | D_i = 1, x_i] - \mathbb{E}[Y_i | D_i = 0, x_i]\} f(x_i) dx_i$$

Under frequentist inference, the estimand of the average treatment effect is consistent if  $\mathbb{E}[Y_i | D_i, x_i]$  is correctly specified. In general, Bayesian causal inference can be written as the joint distribution of  $(Z_1, \dots, Z_n)$  via the de Finetti representation (de Finetti, 1937)

$$f_{\mathcal{O}}(z_1, \dots, z_n) = \int_{\gamma, \theta} \prod_{i=1}^n f_{\mathcal{O}}(y_i | d_i, x_i) \times f_{\mathcal{O}}(d_i | x_i) f(x_i) \pi_0(\gamma, \theta) d\gamma d\theta$$

where  $\pi_0(\gamma, \theta)$  is the prior density of parameters  $\gamma$  and  $\theta$  which parameterize  $f_{\mathcal{O}}(d | x; \gamma)$  and  $f_{\mathcal{O}}(y | d, x; \theta)$  respectively. Then, the Bayesian version of the average treatment effect can be expressed as

$$\int_{\theta} \{\mathbb{E}[Y_i | D_i = 1, x_i; \theta] - \mathbb{E}[Y_i | D_i = 0, x_i; \theta]\} \pi_n(\theta) d\theta \quad (1)$$

where  $\pi_n(\theta) \propto \prod_{i=1}^n f_{\mathcal{O}}(y_i | d_i, x_i) \times \pi_0(\gamma, \theta)$  and  $\mathbb{E}[Y_i | d_i, x_i; \theta] = \int y_i f_{\mathcal{O}}(y_i | d_i, x_i; \theta) dy_i$ . Therefore, much work on Bayesian causal inference seeks to draw posterior distribution of  $\theta$  via the joint distribution of  $Y_i$  and  $D_i$  given  $X_i$ , i.e.,

$$f_{\mathcal{O}}(y_i, d_i | x_i) = f_{\mathcal{O}}(y_i | d_i, x_i) \times f_{\mathcal{O}}(d_i | x_i) \quad (2)$$

To implement formal Bayesian inference on the joint distribution, we need to specify the following two models:

- PS model:  $f_{\mathcal{O}}(d | x; \gamma)$  ;
- Outcome model:  $u(d, x; \theta) = \int y f_{\mathcal{O}}(y | d, x; \theta) dy$ .

If  $D$  is a binary indicator, then we can define the PS as  $e(x; \gamma) = \mathbb{P}(D = 1 | x; \gamma)$ . If estimates of the PS are needed, they are often taken to be  $e(x; \gamma) = \text{expit}(x^{\top} \gamma)$  or some nonparametric prediction approaches.

In frequentist inference, Little and An (2004) and Kang and Schafer (2007) demonstrated that if the OR is correctly specified before the propensity-related terms are added, any additional term merely results in a overfitted model. On the other hand, if the PS is correctly specified, the propensity-related covariates can remove the bias in estimating  $\theta$ , and any information provided by  $x$  does not make the estimate more accurate. Therefore, a common frequentist approach is to include the estimated PS, or a function of the PS, into the OR model, i.e.  $f_{\mathcal{O}}(y | d, e(x; \gamma), x; \theta)$ ,

in the hope that, even if the OR is misspecified, adjusting for the PS will still adequately control for any residual bias and confounding.

As mentioned in the introduction, this two-step frequentist plug-in method does not appear to have an obvious Bayesian analogy since Bayesian inference always requires a complete specification from a full probability model. The Bayesian two-step method has been criticized as either not completely Bayesian (Saarela et al., 2015) nor acknowledge uncertainty in the estimated PSs (McCandless et al., 2009). Joint estimation of outcome and propensity models provides a more natural Bayesian counterpart. However, Rubin (2007) argued that  $e(x; \gamma)$  should be estimated without knowing the outcome to have the balancing properties. Thus, joint estimation is not a true Bayesian PS adjustment approach as the posterior distribution of  $\gamma$  depends on  $y$  (Saarela et al., 2015), resulting in a non-vanishing bias.

## 2.2 Causal Inference via Importance Sampling

In this section, we consider estimation of the causal effect without using the potential outcome framework. Saarela et al. (2015, 2016) approached the data arising from observational studies,  $\mathcal{O}$ , via a decision rule that maximizes an expected utility with respect to the parameters. Suppose we have an outcome model with causal parameter  $\theta$ ,  $f(y_i|d_i, x_i; \theta)$ , a Bayesian estimator for  $\theta$  can be obtained through maximizing an expected utility function,  $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{E}}[\log f(Y_i|D_i, X_i; \theta)]$  with respect to  $\theta$  under  $\mathcal{E}$ . The calculation can be proceeded via the importance sampling:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{E}}[\log f(Y_i|D_i, X_i; \theta)] &= \int_{z_i} \log f(y_i|d_i, x_i; \theta) f_{\mathcal{E}}(z_i|\xi) dz_i \\
&= \int_{z_i} \log f(y_i|d_i, x_i; \theta) \frac{f_{\mathcal{E}}(z_i|\xi)}{f_{\mathcal{O}}(z_i|\xi)} f_{\mathcal{O}}(z_i|\xi) dz_i \\
&= \int_{z_i} \log f(y_i|d_i, x_i; \theta) \frac{f_{\mathcal{E}}(y_i|d_i, x_i, \xi) f_{\mathcal{E}}(d_i|x_i, \xi) f_{\mathcal{E}}(x_i|\xi)}{f_{\mathcal{O}}(y_i|d_i, x_i, \xi) f_{\mathcal{O}}(d_i|x_i, \xi) f_{\mathcal{O}}(x_i|\xi)} f_{\mathcal{O}}(z_i|\xi) dz_i \quad (3) \\
&= \int_{z_i} \log f(y_i|d_i, x_i; \theta) \frac{f_{\mathcal{E}}(d_i|\xi)}{f_{\mathcal{O}}(d_i|x_i, \xi)} f_{\mathcal{O}}(z_i|\xi) dz_i \\
&= \int_{z_i} \log f(y_i|d_i, x_i; \theta) \frac{f_{\mathcal{E}}(d_i|\xi)}{f_{\mathcal{O}}(d_i|x_i, \xi)} dF_{\mathcal{O}}(z_i|\xi)
\end{aligned}$$

The last equality follows under the stability assumption. Under the no unmeasured confounders assumption,  $f_{\mathcal{E}}(y_i|d_i, x_i; \xi) = f_{\mathcal{O}}(y_i|d_i, x_i; \xi)$ , and  $f_{\mathcal{E}}(x_i|\xi) = f_{\mathcal{O}}(x_i|\xi)$ . Let  $w_i(\xi) = \frac{f_{\mathcal{E}}(d_i|\xi)}{f_{\mathcal{O}}(d_i|x_i, \xi)}$ , then  $f_{\mathcal{O}}(z_i|\xi)$  can be modeled under a Bayesian non-parametric model. We assume a multinomial model on the finite set  $\{z_1, \dots, z_n\}$  with unknown probability  $\xi = (\xi_1, \dots, \xi_n)$  and a

priori of  $\xi = (\xi_1, \dots, \xi_n) \sim \text{Dirichlet}(\alpha, \dots, \alpha)$ . By conjugacy, the posterior distribution of  $\xi \sim \text{Dirichlet}(\alpha + 1, \dots, \alpha + 1)$ . If  $\alpha \rightarrow 0$ , this yields the Bayesian bootstrap (Rubin, 1981), where  $f_{\mathcal{O}}(z_i | \xi) = \sum_{k=1}^n \xi_k \delta_{z_k}(z_i)$  and  $\xi = (\xi_1, \dots, \xi_n) \sim \text{Dirichlet}(1, \dots, 1)$ . Therefore, the causal parameter can be estimated via

$$\hat{\theta}(\xi) = \arg \max_{\theta} \sum_{k=1}^n w_k(\xi) \xi_k \log f(y_k | d_k, x_k; \theta). \quad (4)$$

From Graham et al. (2016), we can repeatedly draw a single set of random weights  $\xi$  and new weights to obtain the approximate posterior distribution of  $\theta$  (Newton and Raftery, 1994). In addition, Graham et al. (2016) constructed posterior predictive intervals to estimate the average causal effects with the double robust property. Note that this Bayesian nonparametric estimation procedure in (4) is equivalent to solving the weighted-likelihood estimating equation

$$\sum_{s=1}^S \sum_{i=1}^n w_i^{(s)} \frac{\partial \log f(y_i^{(s)} | d_i^{(s)}, x_i^{(s)}; \theta)}{\partial \theta} = 0$$

where  $\{z_i^{(s)} = (y_i^{(s)}, d_i^{(s)}, x_i^{(s)}), s = 1, \dots, S, i = 1, \dots, n\}$  represent  $S$  sets of  $n$  Monte Carlo draws from  $f_{\mathcal{O}}(z_i | \xi)$ . Interestingly, Graham et al. (2016) claimed that this is an approximate Bayesian method, but in fact this approach is an exact Bayesian procedure under a Bayesian non-parametric model (Stephens et al., 2020). Suppose  $F_Z(\cdot)$  denotes the true but unknown distribution, and we assume that the Dirichlet process model  $DP(\alpha, G)$  is placed as a prior for  $F_Z(\cdot)$  with support on a countable set, where  $\alpha > 0$  is the concentration parameter and  $G$  is the base measure. In light of data  $(z_1, \dots, z_n)$ , the resulting posterior distribution of  $F_Z(\cdot)$  is also a Dirichlet process,  $DP(\alpha_n, G_n)$ , where  $\alpha_n = \alpha + n$  and  $G_n = \frac{\alpha}{\alpha+n}G + \frac{1}{\alpha+n} \sum_{k=1}^n \delta_{z_k}(\cdot)$ , and  $\alpha \rightarrow 0$  yields a Dirichlet  $(1, \dots, 1)$  distribution on  $(z_1, \dots, z_n)$ . Therefore,  $f_{\mathcal{O}}(z_i | \xi) = \sum_{k=1}^n \xi_k \delta_{z_k}(z_i)$  is the limiting Dirichlet process specification, which follows the exact Bayesian calculation.

In the next section, we will bridge this utility-type estimation with a new Bayesian formulation but does not require the concept of likelihood to draw inference on the causal parameter. This essentially yields formal Bayesian inference without the prosperity score adjustment.

### 3 Bayesian Causal Inference vis Loss Functions

#### 3.1 Gibbs Posterior via Weighted Outcome Models

In the formulation (3),  $\mathcal{E}$  is a model which incorporates the inferential target, but  $\mathcal{O}$  is the data generating model (we assume that both models admit de Finetti-type representations), with the two models linked - under absolute continuity assumptions - via the change of measure. We can attempt to bridge between the formulations in (3) and the new directions opened up by the work of Zhang (2006) and Bissiri et al. (2016), which formulates Bayesian inference without the concept of likelihood, instead relying entirely on a loss-type (or utility) specification to update prior to posterior. Given data  $(z_1, \dots, z_n)$  from  $F_0(z)$ , the true data generating model, the parameter of interest  $\theta$  can be inferred via minimizing the expected loss

$$\mathbb{E}[\ell(Z, \theta)] = \int \ell(z, \theta) dF_0(z)$$

where  $\ell(z, \theta)$  is a loss function. This Bayesian paradigm motivates recent advances in learning theory for Bayesian loss-type inference. Zhang (2006) and Bissiri et al. (2016) mimicked the objective function for learning parameter  $\theta$  in a parameter space  $\Theta$  using loss functions. The objective function for Bayesian loss-type inference with a probability measure  $\mu$  on  $\Theta$  is defined as

$$\arg \inf_{\mu \in \mathcal{M}_{\pi_0}} \left\{ \int_{\Theta} \ell(z, \theta) \mu(d\theta) + \mathcal{K}(\mu, \pi_0) \right\} \quad (5)$$

where  $\mathcal{M}_v$  is the space which is absolutely continuous with respect to  $v$  and  $\mathcal{K}(\mu, \pi_0)$  is the Kullback-Leibler divergence between two probability measures  $\mu$  and  $\pi_0$ . The Kullback-Leibler divergence is chosen for coherent inference (Bissiri and Walker, 2012). The solution for this optimization problem in (5) is the so-called Gibbs posterior  $\pi(\theta|z) \propto \exp(-\ell(z, \theta)) \times \pi_0(\theta)$  if and only if  $\int_{\Theta} \exp(-\ell(z, \theta)) \pi_0(d\theta) < +\infty$ . Therefore, we can connect this two ideas by defining the loss function as

$$\ell(z, \theta) = - \sum_{i=1}^n w_i \log f(y_i|d_i, x_i; \theta)$$

which leads the posterior distribution for  $\theta$  as

$$\pi(\theta|z) \propto \exp\left(\sum_{i=1}^n w_i \log f(y_i|d_i, x_i; \theta)\right) \times \pi_0(\theta)$$

The key difference from work using the Bayesian bootstrap is that this posterior distribution,  $\pi(\theta|z)$ , is a formal Bayesian solution to update prior beliefs on  $\theta$  to posterior beliefs. The result follows using a decision-theoretic argument concerning the decision to ‘report beliefs a posteriori’. The connection with frequentist (semiparametric) estimating equations is obtained by exploiting this general Bayesian updating method. Also, to connect with frequentist inference, in the next section, we will show the consistency of  $\pi(\theta|z)$  with correctly specified and misspecified outcome models.

### 3.2 Consistency under Model Misspecification

In this section, we assess the consistency of the proposed causal Gibbs posterior. Throughout this section, we assume that the true data generating outcome model is  $h(u(d, x; \theta_0)) = \theta_0 d + g_0(x; \beta_0)$  where  $h(\cdot)$  is some link function. Then, the causal effect in (1) becomes the posterior mean of  $\theta$ . The aim of the Bayesian consistency is to show that the posterior distribution of  $\theta$  concentrates around the true data generating parameter  $\theta_0$  (Barron et al., 1999; Yang and Barron, 1999; Walker and Hjort, 2001). All proofs are relegated to the appendix. The following definition formulates the Bayesian consistency mathematically with the frequentist analogy.

**Definition 1.** As data  $z_1, z_2, \dots, z_n$  accumulate from some unknown underlying  $f(z|\theta_0)$ , then the posterior mass for the model assigning to a set  $A$  is given by

$$\Pi^n(A) = \pi(\theta \in A | z_1, \dots, z_n) = \frac{\int_A R_n(\theta) \pi_0(d\theta)}{\int R_n(\theta) \pi_0(d\theta)}$$

where  $R_n(\theta) = \prod_{i=1}^n \frac{f(z_i|\theta)}{f(z_i|\theta_0)}$  and  $\pi_0(\theta)$  is the prior density for  $\theta$ . If  $A_\epsilon = \{\theta : d(\theta, \theta_0) > \epsilon\}$  where  $d(\theta, \theta_0)$  is some distance measure, the Bayesian consistency is defined as

$$\Pi^n(A_\epsilon) \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{almost surely}$$

### 3.2.1 When the PS is misspecified

With this definition of consistency, we can formally start to show that the consistency of the posterior distribution can be guaranteed under correct specification of the outcome model, which is demonstrated by the following theorem.

**Theorem 1.** Denote  $y \in \mathbb{Y}$  and let  $d(\theta, \theta_0) = \int_{\mathbb{Y}} -w \log \frac{f(y|d,x,\theta)}{f(y|d,x,\theta_0)} f(y|d,x;\theta_0) dy$ , for every  $(\theta, \theta_0) \in \Theta^2$  such that  $\int_{\mathbb{Y}} \left| w \log \frac{f(y|d,x,\theta)}{f(y|d,x,\theta_0)} f(y|d,x;\theta_0) \right| dy < +\infty$ . Assume that the data generating parameter  $\theta_0$  in the outcome model belongs to the support of the prior distribution, i.e.  $\pi_0(\theta \in U) > 0$ , for every neighborhood  $U$  of  $\theta_0$ , and  $\int_{\Theta} \exp(\sum_{i=1}^n w_i \log f(y_i|d_i, x_i; \theta)) \times d\pi_0(\theta) < +\infty$ . If the outcome model,  $f(y|d, x; \theta)$ , is correctly specified, and then

$$\Pi^n(U) = \frac{\int_U \exp[\sum_{i=1}^n (w_i \log f(y_i|d_i, x_i; \theta) - w_i \log f(y_i|d_i, x_i; \theta_0))] \pi_0(d\theta)}{\int_{\Theta} \exp[\sum_{i=1}^n (w_i \log f(y_i|d_i, x_i; \theta) - w_i \log f(y_i|d_i, x_i; \theta_0))] \pi_0(d\theta)} \rightarrow 1 \text{ almost surely}$$

This result is not surprising as a frequentist counterpart of this theorem follows from the usual properties of estimation under a well-specified outcome model.

### 3.2.2 When the OR is misspecified

Suppose that the true data generating mechanism for the outcome  $Y$  is

$$h[\mathbb{E}(Y|x, d)] = \theta_0 d + g_0(x)$$

where  $h(\cdot)$  is some link function. We consider fitting or approximating the  $g_0$  by  $g_1(x) \approx g_0(x)$ . As we are seeking to model the conditional distribution of  $Y$  given  $x$  and  $d$ , then we can perform the transformation of the observed outcome as  $y^{\text{mis}} = t_1(y, g_1(x))$  which satisfies  $\mathbb{E}(Y^{\text{mis}}|X, D) = m(\theta D)$ , where  $t_1$  is the function of the transformation and  $m(\cdot)$  is some function. Hypothetically, if we knew  $g_0(x)$ , we could apply the similar transformation, i.e.,  $y^* = t_0(y, g_0(x))$  so that  $\mathbb{E}(Y^*|X, D) = m(\theta_0 D)$  with some transformation  $t_0$ .

We know that under the correct specification of the OR, the posterior distribution of the causal parameter will accumulate at true parameter  $\theta_0$ . Therefore, the posterior distribution based on data  $\{y_i^*, d_i, x_i\}_{i=1}^n$ ,  $\pi(\theta | \{y_i^*, d_i, x_i\}_{i=1}^n) \propto \exp(\sum_{i=1}^n w_i \log f(y_i^*|d_i; \theta)) \pi_0(\theta)$ , will achieve consistency for  $\theta_0$  according to Theorem 1. Similarly, the posterior distribution based on data

$\{y_i^{\text{mis}}, d_i, x_i\}_{i=1}^n$ ,  $\pi(\theta | \{y_i^{\text{mis}}, d_i, x_i\}_{i=1}^n) \propto \exp(\sum_{i=1}^n w_i \log f(y_i^{\text{mis}} | d_i; \theta)) \pi_0(\theta)$ , which assumes to accumulate at  $\theta^{\text{mis}}$ . Therefore, the posterior distribution based on data  $\{y_i^{\text{mis}}, d_i, x_i\}_{i=1}^n$  can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\exp\left[\sum_{i=1}^n (w_i \log f(y_i^{\text{mis}} | d_i; \theta) - w_i \log f(y_i^{\text{mis}} | d_i; \theta_0))\right] \pi_0(\theta)}{\int_{\Theta} \exp\left[\sum_{i=1}^n (w_i \log f(y_i^{\text{mis}} | d_i; \theta) - w_i \log f(y_i^{\text{mis}} | d_i; \theta_0))\right] \pi_0(d\theta)} \\ &= \frac{\exp\left[\sum_{i=1}^n \left(w_i \log f(y_i^{\text{mis}} | d_i; \theta) - w_i \log f(y_i^{\text{mis}} | d_i; \theta^{\text{mis}}) + w_i \log \frac{f(y_i^{\text{mis}} | d_i; \theta^{\text{mis}})}{f(y_i^{\text{mis}} | d_i; \theta_0)}\right)\right] \pi_0(\theta)}{\int_{\Theta} \exp\left[\sum_{i=1}^n \left(w_i \log f(y_i^{\text{mis}} | d_i; \theta) - w_i \log f(y_i^{\text{mis}} | d_i; \theta^{\text{mis}}) + w_i \log \frac{f(y_i^{\text{mis}} | d_i; \theta^{\text{mis}})}{f(y_i^{\text{mis}} | d_i; \theta_0)}\right)\right] \pi_0(d\theta)} \end{aligned}$$

The next theorem will give us conditions when Bayesian consistency can be achieved with a misspecified outcome model.

**Theorem 2.** *Assume that the data generating parameter  $\theta_0$  in the outcome model belongs to the support of the prior distribution, i.e.  $\pi_0(\theta \in U) > 0$ , for every neighborhood  $U$  of  $\theta_0$  but not  $\theta^{\text{mis}}$ , and  $\int_{\Theta} \exp(\sum_{i=1}^n w_i \log f(y_i | d_i, x_i; \theta)) \times d\pi_0(\theta) < +\infty$ . If the outcome model is misspecified, and then*

$$\frac{\int_U \exp\left[\sum_{i=1}^n (w_i \log f(y_i^{\text{mis}} | d_i; \theta) - w_i \log f(y_i^{\text{mis}} | d_i; \theta_0))\right] \pi_0(d\theta)}{\int_{\Theta} \exp\left[\sum_{i=1}^n (w_i \log f(y_i^{\text{mis}} | d_i; \theta) - w_i \log f(y_i^{\text{mis}} | d_i; \theta_0))\right] \pi_0(d\theta)} \rightarrow 1 \quad \text{almost surely} \quad (6)$$

*if and only if  $Y^{\text{mis}}$  and  $Y^*$  have the same distribution.*

**Remark:** This theorem essentially demonstrates that  $Y^{\text{mis}}$  and  $Y^*$  have to have the same distribution in order to achieve consistent causal inference. By approximating the function of  $g_0$  using a flexible model of  $x$  or by including PSs into the OR,  $Y^{\text{mis}}$  and  $Y^*$  would have the same distribution empirically. The inclusion of a misspecified function  $g_1(\cdot)$  does not affect the consistency even if it is misspecified. Little and An (2004) showed doubly robustness in a robust likelihood context if the OR can be approximated by a set of spline functions formed by PSs and confounders without correct specification of the parametric form of  $g_0(\cdot)$ , which coincides with the concept of this theorem. The following simulation study will demonstrate how to implement this approximation from a practical point of view.

## 4 Simulation

We have discussed consistency based on the proposed Bayesian method, and in this section, we use simulation examples to compare the proposed Bayesian causal inference method with the method via the Bayesian bootstrap.

### 4.1 Example 1: Graham et al. (2019)

This simulation example is based on the data generating process used by Graham et al. (2019): a binary treatment  $D$  is assigned as a function of covariate  $X$ , and the outcome of interest  $Y$  depends on both treatment  $D$  and covariate  $X$ .

$$\begin{aligned} X &\sim \mathcal{N}(0, 10) \\ D|X &\sim \text{Bernoulli}(\text{expit}(\alpha_0 + \alpha_1 X)) \\ Y|D, X &\sim \mathcal{N}(\theta_0 + \theta_1 D + \theta_2 X, 5) \end{aligned}$$

where  $\alpha_0 = 2, \alpha_1 = 0.2, \theta_0 = 10, \theta_1 = 5, \theta_2 = 0.2$ . The causal parameter of interest (the average treatment effect) is  $\theta_1$ . In the Bayesian analysis, we assume that marginal distribution of  $D$  is from  $\text{Bernoulli}(0.5)$ . The prior distribution of  $\theta_0, \theta_1, \theta_2$  is placed as  $\mathcal{N}(10, 100^2), \mathcal{N}(5, 100^2), \mathcal{N}(0.2, 100^2)$  respectively.

The following scenarios are considered:

- The OR is correctly specified with an incorrectly specified PS model, in which  $\mathbb{P}(D = 1 | X) \sim \text{Uniform}(0, 1)$ .

In this case, then  $w_i = (0.5/u_i)^{d_i} (0.5/(1 - u_i))^{1-d_i}$ , where  $u_i$  is from  $\text{Uniform}(0, 1)$ , and the Gibbs posterior distribution for the parameters is proportional to

$$\pi(\{u_i\}_{i=1}^n, \theta_0, \theta_1, \theta_2 | z) \propto \exp\left(\sum_{i=1}^n w_i \log f(y_i | d_i, x_i; \theta)\right) \times \pi_0(\theta_0) \pi_0(\theta_1) \pi_0(\theta_2) \prod_{i=1}^n \pi_0(u_i)$$

- The OR is incorrectly specified with  $X$  excluded from the regression with a correctly specified

PS model. The joint Gibbs posterior for the parameters becomes

$$\pi(\alpha_0, \alpha_1, \theta_0, \theta_1 | z) \propto \exp\left(\sum_{i=1}^n w_i \log f(y_i | d_i, x_i; \theta)\right) \times \pi_0(\alpha_0) \pi_0(\alpha_1) \pi_0(\theta_0) \pi_0(\theta_1)$$

- Both the OR and PS model are incorrectly specified as specified in previous cases. Similarly to the first case, we can work the joint posterior distribution for the parameters:

$$\pi(\{u_i\}_{i=1}^n, \theta_0, \theta_1 | z) \propto \exp\left(\sum_{i=1}^n w_i \log f(y_i | d_i, x_i; \theta)\right) \times \pi_0(\theta_0) \pi_0(\theta_1) \prod_{i=1}^n \pi_0(u_i)$$

The joint posterior distribution in all cases cannot be analyzed directly. However, using a Metropolis-Hastings-within-Gibbs algorithm, the posterior can be summarized. We implement the Markov chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) algorithm in **Stan** (Carpenter et al., 2017) to produce Gibbs posterior samples of the causal parameter  $\theta_1$  based on 10,000 MCMC samples with 1,000 burn-in iterations. Non-informative priors are placed for the rest of parameters. Two types of OR are considered, and specifically the OR is modeled with and without the PS as a covariate.

Table 1: Simulation results of  $\theta_1$  on 1000 runs on generated datasets of size 1,000. ABDR represents results from the Bayesian bootstrap approach from Graham et al. (2019)’s simulation study. Gibbs-Post is the proposed loss-type Bayesian method, and PS-cov represents that the PS is added as a covariate in the OR via the joint estimation. Av. Est. presents the mean of the posterior mean over 1,000 runs, and Emp. Var. represents the Monte Carlo variance. MSE stands for the mean square error.

	Model Specification	Av. Est.	Emp. Var.	MSE
Gibbs-Post	Correct OR Incorrect PS	5.001	0.045	0.045
	Incorrect OR Correct PS	5.197	0.048	0.087
	Incorrect OR Incorrect PS	5.380	0.046	0.190
Gibbs-Post	Correct OR Incorrect PS	5.000	0.067	0.067
	Incorrect OR Correct PS	5.001	0.050	0.050
PS-cov	Incorrect OR Incorrect PS	5.380	0.072	0.218
ABDR	Correct OR Incorrect PS	5.018	0.862	0.862
	Incorrect OR Correct PS	5.008	0.046	0.046
	Incorrect OR Incorrect PS	5.360	0.946	1.074

Table 1 shows the results of this simulation. The results from the proposed method have smaller empirical variances compared to the Bayesian bootstrap approach, which indicates that the posterior mean estimate of the Gibbs posterior is more efficient with smaller MSE. As with

Theorem 1, as long as the OR is correctly specified, the posterior mean based on 1000 runs provides a consistent estimate of the true causal effect, even that, in this example, the PS model is severely misspecified. When the OR is misspecified, as stated in Theorem 2, we need a flexible model of  $x$  into the OR so that  $Y^{\text{mis}}$  and  $Y^*$  will approximately have the same distribution. As this is a one-confounder example, simply adding the PS as a covariate can achieve the consistency, and does not increase the variance compared with the ABDR method. Finally when both OR and PS are misspecified, the posterior mean estimates are similar, but the ABDR method yields significantly a greater variance.

## 4.2 Example 2: Saarela et al. (2016)

In this example, we consider the simulation study constructed by Saarela et al. (2016) to compare with their joint estimation, importance sampling method via the Bayesian bootstrap (ISBS) and the ISBS doubly robust (ISBS-DR) approaches. The data are simulated as the following hierarchy:

$$\begin{aligned} X_1, X_2, X_3, X_4 &\sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1) \\ U_1 &= \frac{|X_1|}{\sqrt{1 - 2/\pi}} \\ D | U_1, X_2, X_3 &\sim \text{Bernoulli}(\text{expit}(0.4U_1 + 0.4X_2 + 0.8X_3)) \\ Y | D, U_1, X_2, X_4 &\sim \mathcal{N}(D - U_1 - X_2 - X_4, 1) \end{aligned}$$

In this case, two scenarios are considered:

- Scenario I: Misspecify the OR model using covariates  $(x_1, x_2, x_4)$  and correctly specify a treatment assignment model using covariates  $(u_1, x_2, x_3)$ .
- Scenario II: Correctly specify the OR model using covariates  $(u_1, x_2, x_4)$  and misspecify a treatment assignment model using covariates  $(x_1, x_2, x_3)$ .

In both scenarios, a non-informative prior is placed for all the parameters. Table 2 shows the results of this simulation study based on 10,000 MCMC samples with 1,000 burn-in iterations. Again, we consider the OR model with and without the PS, and with the reciprocal of the PS as a covariate via the joint estimation. We also consider cases of adding B-spline for  $x_1$  and generalized additive model (GAM) in the OR to verify Theorem 2. In Scenario II, all cases yield

good estimates for the causal effect. But notably, as with the previous example, our proposed approach has smaller variance compared with the Bayesian bootstrap method, except in the case of adding the reciprocal of the PS as the covariate. This is consistent with Saarela et al. (2016)’s example of adding a clever covariate. For Scenario I, when the OR is misspecified, joint estimation with a cubic polynomial basis of the PS, and our method without additional functions of  $x$ , simply cannot provide a consistent estimate and fails to recover the coverage rate. However, when we add the function of  $x$  as a covariate, the estimate gets closer to the true causal effect, so as the coverage rate. The best performance is achieved when we use the GAM model or add the B-spline with 3 knots at the quartiles for  $x_1$ , which is the misspecified covariate. It can provide a good estimate of the causal effect and succeed in recovering the coverage probability, and it performs better than the Bayesian bootstrap method in the coverage probability in both scenarios. In other words, we have approximated the true distribution of the transformed outcome via the flexible model. We also fit the model using the Bayesian additive regression tree (BART) model with its recent popularity in the Bayesian OR-modeling community (Hahn et al., 2020). Although BART can recover the similar coverage probability with our approach and the Bayesian bootstrap method, it appears that there is a small bias when OR is misspecified.

Table 2: Simulation results of the causal contrast, with true value equal to 1, on 5000 simulation runs on generated datasets of size 1,000. ISBS and ISBS-DR represent results from the importance sampling method via the Bayesian bootstrap and the doubly robust version of the importance sampling method via the Bayesian bootstrap from Saarela et al. (2016)’s simulation study. Joint estimation is also from Saarela et al. (2016) and stands for Bayesian inference from (2) with a cubic polynomial basis of the PS in the OR. Coverage represents the 95% interval coverage probability.

Estimator	Scenario I			Scenario II		
	Av. Est.	Emp. Var.	Coverage	Av. Est.	Emp. Var.	Coverage
Gibbs-Post	0.81	0.006	51.0%	1.00	0.005	94.5%
Gibbs-Post (PS-cov)	1.03	0.005	91.1%	1.00	0.005	93.4%
Gibbs-Post (1/PS-cov)	1.00	0.030	92.1%	1.00	0.009	93.4%
Gibbs-Post (B-spline for $x_1$ )	0.99	0.005	94.6%	1.00	0.005	95.0%
Gibbs-Post (GAM)	1.00	0.005	94.1%	1.00	0.005	94.2%
BART (PS-weighting)	0.98	0.005	94.1%	0.99	0.005	94.7%
Joint Estimation	1.05	0.005	89.1%	1.00	0.005	95.4%
ISBS	0.99	0.007	93.9%	1.00	0.006	94.9%
ISBS-DR	1.00	0.008	94.1%	1.00	0.006	94.8%

## 5 Application

### 5.1 UK Speed Camera Data

Our real example consists of data on the location of fixed speed cameras for 771 camera sites in the eight English administrative districts, including Cheshire, Dorset, Greater Manchester, Lancashire, Leicester, Merseyside, Sussex and the West Midlands. These data will form the treated group. For the untreated group, we randomly select a sample of 4,787 points on the network within our eight administrative districts. Details of these data can be found in Graham et al. (2019). The objective of this study is to evaluate the causal effect of the installation of speed cameras on the number of personal injury collisions.

The outcome of interest is the number of personal injury collisions per kilometer as recorded from the location with or without speed cameras. The data are taken from records completed by police officers each time that an incident is reported to them, and police records are collated and processed by the Department for Transport in the UK as the ‘STATS 19’ data. The location of each personal injury collision is recorded using the British National Grid coordinate system and can be located on a map using Geographical Information System (GIS) software. Data are collected from 1999 to 2007 to ensure the availability of collision data for the years before and after the camera installation for every camera site as speed cameras were introduced varying from 2002 to 2004.

There is a formal set of selection guidelines for speed camera in the UK (Gains et al., 2004). This guideline helps us select covariates which represent the characteristics of units that simultaneously determine the treatment assignment and outcome. Primary guidelines for site selection include the site length, the number of fatal and serious collisions (FSCs) and the number of personal injury collisions (PICs). In addition to the guideline, drivers might try to avoid the routes with speed cameras, and the reduction in collisions may come from a reduced traffic flow. Therefore, we include the annual average daily flow (AADF) as a confounder to control the effect due to the traffic flow. Moreover, we also include important factors that would have safety impacts on speed cameras, such as road types, speed limit, and the number of minor junctions within site length (Christie et al., 2003).


## 5.2 Results

We apply our proposed Bayesian approach to the speed camera data. First, we fit the model by simply adding all the covariates described previously. Subsequently, we include flexible models for variables such as the AADF, the number of minor junctions, where Graham et al. (2019) included smooth functions in their OR model. Specifically, the GAM and B-spline model with 3 knots at the quartiles are considered. We place uninformative priors for all the parameters and Table 3 shows summary statistics of the average treatment effect based on 50,000 MCMC samples with 6,000 burn-in iterations. Figure 1 below shows the posterior distribution of the treatment effect parameter derived from the models with and without flexible modeling, and the results are similar between the GAM and B-spline model. Our models indicate that the installation of the speed camera can reduce road traffic collisions by 1.2 to 1.3 incidents per site on average. In Graham et al. (2019), they reported the percentage reduction in an average change in road traffic collisions with the presence of speed cameras, and therefore we also obtained the posterior predictive distribution of this quantity in Table 3. Compared to Graham et al. (2019), our models demonstrate that there are 16%-17% reduction in road traffic collisions with the presence of speed camera, indicating a stronger causal relationship. Similar with the simulated examples, we obtained narrower 95% credible intervals and smaller standard deviations. It appears that by introducing flexible modeling the magnitude of average causal effects has reduced, but there is still enough evidence of road traffic collisions associated with the presence of speed cameras.

Table 3: Summary statistics for the posterior distribution of the average treatment effect (ATE) and the posterior predictive distribution of the percentage change of the ATE for speed camera data. ABDR represents results from the Bayesian bootstrap doubly robust approach from Graham et al. (2019).

	Posterior Mean	Standard Deviation	95% Credible Interval
<i>ATE</i>			
Gibbs-Post	-1.294	0.081	(-1.452, -1.135)
Gibbs-Post (B-spline)	-1.243	0.147	(-1.531, -0.962)
Gibbs-Post (GAM)	-1.229	0.146	(-1.513, -0.943)
<i>Percentage Change of the ATE</i>			
Gibbs-Post	-17.057	1.020	(-19.039, -15.045)
Gibbs-Post (B-spline)	-16.412	1.851	(-20.009, -12.780)
Gibbs-Post (GAM)	-16.213	1.847	(-19.779, -12.569)
ABDR	-14.359	3.605	(-21.841, -7.352)

Figure 1: Posterior distribution of the average treatment effect from the Bayesian doubly-robust model.



## 6 Discussion

In this paper, we have framed the causal inference problem in a formal Bayesian setting and developed a novel doubly robust Bayesian causal inference method, formulating Bayesian causal inference without the concept of likelihood nor potential outcome frameworks. Our approach yields doubly robust inference by the use of flexible modeling in the OR model. Simulation examples demonstrated that the proposed approach outperformed the current method using the Bayesian bootstrap in estimating the causal effect and recovering the coverage probability. We conclude that the inclusion of flexible modeling in the OR model can yield relatively more robust inference of the causal effect because linear additive relationships among variables that may be simplistic. Finally, we applied this method to study road safety outcomes and quantified the causal effect of speed cameras on road traffic, concluding that the presence of speed cameras can reduce road traffic collisions. Such inference could aid the transportation authority to propose a more effective installation plan of speed cameras to improve road safety.

This fully Bayesian approach is attractive as it offers a natural Bayesian solution to causal inference problems without suffering from the non-vanishing bias via joint estimation. It also provides a means of informed and coherent decision making in the presence of uncertainty. Unlike the Bayesian bootstrap method, which requires resampling twice to include the prior distribution and obtain the credible interval, prior information can be easily incorporated into our model and the uncertainty quantification is ready to be summarized from the posterior distribution or the posterior predictive distribution. Moreover, our model can be straightforwardly extended to the marginal structural model (MSM) for longitudinal settings, where the weighted pseudo-likelihood derived from the MSM will be used as the utility function (Saarela et al., 2015).

Bayesian methods are not widely used in causal inference, but are generally applicable. It can yield interpretable variability estimates in finite sample at the cost of interpretable modeling assumptions and also allow the statistician to impose structures onto the inference problem. Further work will consider extensions to causal inference problems in presence of interference, where the outcome of one subject can be influenced by an intervention received by another. Furthermore, with a great attention on Bayesian nonparametrics (Guan et al., 2020; Hahn et al., 2020; Ray and van der Vaart, 2020), studying various forms of double robustness of the proposed

approach by placing nonparametric Bayesian priors is also a topic for further research.

## A Appendix: Proofs of Theorem 1-2

### A.1 Proof of Theorem 1

*Proof.* As the map  $d(\theta, \theta_0)$  is defined in  $\Theta^2$ , by the strong law of large numbers (SLLN),

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{-1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n w_i \log \frac{f(y_i|d_i, x_i, \theta)}{f(y_i|d_i, x_i, \theta_0)} \rightarrow d(\theta, \theta_0) \quad \text{almost surely for } \forall \theta \in \Theta \quad (7)$$

Also, by Jensen's inequality,

$$d(\theta, \theta_0) = w \mathbb{E} \left[ -\log \frac{f(Y|D, X, \theta)}{f(Y|D, X, \theta_0)} \right] \geq -w \log \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{f(Y|D, X, \theta)}{f(Y|D, X, \theta_0)} \right] = 0$$

Assume that there is some positive real number  $M > 0$  and a set  $S_M = \{\theta : d(\theta, \theta_0) \leq M\}$  such that  $\pi_0(\theta \in S_M) \geq 0$ . Then by Fatou's lemma, there exists a neighborhood  $U$  of  $\theta_0$  such that  $\pi_0(\theta \in S_M \cap U) \geq 0$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} & \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} e^{2nM} \int_U \exp \left[ \sum_{i=1}^n (w_i \log f(y_i|d_i, x_i; \theta) - w_i \log f(y_i|d_i, x_i; \theta_0)) \right] \pi_0(d\theta) \\ & \geq \int_U \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \exp \left[ 2nM + \sum_{i=1}^n (w_i \log f(y_i|d_i, x_i; \theta) - w_i \log f(y_i|d_i, x_i; \theta_0)) \right] \pi_0(d\theta) \\ & = \int_U \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \exp \left[ n \left( 2M - \frac{-1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n w_i \log \frac{f(y_i|d_i, x_i, \theta)}{f(y_i|d_i, x_i, \theta_0)} \right) \right] \pi_0(d\theta) \\ & = \int_{U \cap S_M} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \exp [n(2M - d(\theta, \theta_0))] \pi_0(d\theta) = \infty \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

In fact since  $M$  is arbitrary, there is a neighborhood  $U \subset S_M$  of  $\theta_0$  which is small enough so that  $\pi_0(\theta \in U) < \pi_0(\theta \in S_M)$ . Therefore,  $\int_U \exp \left[ \sum_{i=1}^n \left( w_i \log \frac{f(y_i|d_i, x_i, \theta)}{f(y_i|d_i, x_i, \theta_0)} \right) \right] \pi_0(d\theta) \geq e^{-2nM}$ .

Similarly, by reverse Fatou's lemma,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{U^c} \exp \left[ \sum_{i=1}^n (w_i \log f(y_i | d_i, x_i; \theta) - w_i \log f(y_i | d_i, x_i; \theta_0)) \right] \pi_0(d\theta) \\
& \leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\{\theta \in U^c : d(\theta, \theta_0) = 0\}} \exp(-nd(\theta, \theta_0)) d\pi_0(\theta) \\
& \quad + \int_{\{\theta \in U^c : d(\theta, \theta_0) > 0\}} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \exp(-nd(\theta, \theta_0)) \pi_0(d\theta) \\
& \leq \pi_0(\theta \in U^c : \theta = \theta_0) + 0 = 0
\end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

Therefore,  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{U^c} \exp \left[ \sum_{i=1}^n \left( w_i \log \frac{f(y_i | d_i, x_i, \theta)}{f(y_i | d_i, x_i, \theta_0)} \right) \right] \pi_0(d\theta) = 0$ . Combine (8) and (9), then we can get

$$\frac{\int_{U^c} \exp \left[ \sum_{i=1}^n (w_i \log f(y_i | d_i, x_i; \theta) - w_i \log f(y_i | d_i, x_i; \theta_0)) \right] \pi_0(d\theta)}{\int_U \exp \left[ \sum_{i=1}^n (w_i \log f(y_i | d_i, x_i; \theta) - w_i \log f(y_i | d_i, x_i; \theta_0)) \right] \pi_0(d\theta)} \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{almost surely}$$

This implies that  $\Pi^n(U) \rightarrow 1$  almost surely.

□

## A.2 Proof of Theorem 2

*Proof.* ( $\Rightarrow$ ) If  $Y^{\text{mis}}$  and  $Y^*$  have the same distribution,  $f(y_i^{\text{mis}} | d_i; \theta_0) = f(y_i^* | d_i; \theta_0)$  and (6) holds according to Theorem 1.

( $\Leftarrow$ ) Define  $d^{\text{mis}}(\theta, \theta^{\text{mis}}) = \int_{\mathbb{Y}^{\text{mis}}} -w \log \frac{f(y^{\text{mis}} | d, x, \theta)}{f(y^{\text{mis}} | d, x, \theta^{\text{mis}})} f(y^{\text{mis}} | d, x; \theta^{\text{mis}}) dy^{\text{mis}}$ , and a set  $U$  which is

neighborhood of  $\theta_0$  but not  $\theta^{\text{mis}}$  which satisfies  $\pi_0(\theta \in U) > 0$ . By Fatou's lemma we know that,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{U^c} \exp \left[ \sum_{i=1}^n \left( w_i \log f(y_i^{\text{mis}} | d_i; \theta) - w_i \log f(y_i^{\text{mis}} | d_i; \theta^{\text{mis}}) - w_i \log \frac{f(y_i^{\text{mis}} | d_i; \theta_0)}{f(y_i^{\text{mis}} | d_i; \theta^{\text{mis}})} \right) \right] \pi_0(d\theta) \\
& \geq \int_{\theta \in U^c: d^{\text{mis}}(\theta, \theta^{\text{mis}}) > d^{\text{mis}}(\theta_0, \theta^{\text{mis}})} \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \exp [nd^{\text{mis}}(\theta_0, \theta^{\text{mis}}) - nd^{\text{mis}}(\theta, \theta^{\text{mis}})] \pi_0(d\theta) + \\
& \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\theta \in U^c: d^{\text{mis}}(\theta, \theta^{\text{mis}}) = d^{\text{mis}}(\theta_0, \theta^{\text{mis}})} \exp [nd^{\text{mis}}(\theta_0, \theta^{\text{mis}}) - nd^{\text{mis}}(\theta, \theta^{\text{mis}})] \pi_0(d\theta) + \\
& \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\theta \in U^c: d^{\text{mis}}(\theta, \theta^{\text{mis}}) < d^{\text{mis}}(\theta_0, \theta^{\text{mis}})} \exp [nd^{\text{mis}}(\theta_0, \theta^{\text{mis}}) - nd^{\text{mis}}(\theta, \theta^{\text{mis}})] \pi_0(d\theta) \\
& = 0 + \pi_0(\theta \in U^c : d^{\text{mis}}(\theta, \theta^{\text{mis}}) = d^{\text{mis}}(\theta_0, \theta^{\text{mis}})) + \\
& \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\theta \in U^c: d^{\text{mis}}(\theta, \theta^{\text{mis}}) < d^{\text{mis}}(\theta_0, \theta^{\text{mis}})} \exp [nd^{\text{mis}}(\theta_0, \theta^{\text{mis}}) - nd^{\text{mis}}(\theta, \theta^{\text{mis}})] \pi_0(d\theta) \\
& = \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\theta \in U^c: d^{\text{mis}}(\theta, \theta^{\text{mis}}) < d^{\text{mis}}(\theta_0, \theta^{\text{mis}})} \exp [nd^{\text{mis}}(\theta_0, \theta^{\text{mis}}) - nd^{\text{mis}}(\theta, \theta^{\text{mis}})] \pi_0(d\theta)
\end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

(6) holds as long as lower bound of (10) is 0, and then  $\{\theta \in U^c : d^{\text{mis}}(\theta, \theta^{\text{mis}}) < d^{\text{mis}}(\theta_0, \theta^{\text{mis}})\}$  is a empty set. As we know that  $d^{\text{mis}}(\theta, \theta^{\text{mis}}) \geq 0$  and the equality holds if and only if  $\theta = \theta^{\text{mis}}$ , and  $U^c$  is a neighborhood of  $\theta^{\text{mis}}$ , which implies that  $\theta_0 = \theta^{\text{mis}}$  and  $Y^{\text{mis}}$  and  $Y^*$  have the same distribution.

□

## References

- Bang, H. and J. M. Robins (2005). Doubly robust estimation in missing data and causal inference models. *Biometrics* 61(4), 962–973.
- Barron, A., M. J. Schervish, and L. Wasserman (1999). The consistency of posterior distributions in nonparametric problems. *The Annals of Statistics* 27(2), 536–561.
- Bissiri, P. G., C. C. Holmes, and S. G. Walker (2016). A general framework for updating belief distributions. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)* 78(5), 1103–1130.
- Bissiri, P. G. and S. G. Walker (2012). Converting information into probability measures with

- the Kullback–Leibler divergence. *Annals of the Institute of Statistical Mathematics* 64(6), 1139–1160.
- Cao, W., A. A. Tsiatis, and M. Davidian (2009). Improving efficiency and robustness of the doubly robust estimator for a population mean with incomplete data. *Biometrika* 96(3), 723–734.
- Carpenter, B., A. Gelman, M. D. Hoffman, D. Lee, B. Goodrich, M. Betancourt, M. Brubaker, J. Guo, P. Li, and A. Riddell (2017). Stan : A probabilistic programming language. *Journal of Statistical Software* 76(1), 1–32.
- Christie, S., R. A. Lyons, F. D. Dunstan, and S. J. Jones (2003). Are mobile speed cameras effective? A controlled before and after study. *Injury Prevention* 9(4), 302–306.
- de Finetti, B. (1937). La prévision: ses lois logiques, ses sources subjectives. In *Annales de l’institut Henri Poincaré*, Volume 7, pp. 1–68.
- Gains, A., B. Heydecker, J. Shrewsbury, and S. Robertson (2004). The national safety camera programme 3-year evaluation report. *UK Department for Transport*.
- Graham, D. J., E. J. McCoy, and D. A. Stephens (2016). Approximate Bayesian inference for doubly robust estimation. *Bayesian Analysis* 11(1), 47–69.
- Graham, D. J., C. Naik, E. J. McCoy, and H. Li (2019). Do speed cameras reduce road traffic collisions? *PLoS One* 14(9), e0221267.
- Guan, Q., B. J. Reich, E. B. Laber, and D. Bandyopadhyay (2020). Bayesian nonparametric policy search with application to periodontal recall intervals. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 115(531), 1066–1078.
- Hahn, P. R., J. S. Murray, and C. M. Carvalho (2020). Bayesian regression tree models for causal inference: Regularization, confounding, and heterogeneous effects (with discussion). *Bayesian Analysis* 15(3), 965–1056.
- Imbens, G. W. and D. B. Rubin (1997). Bayesian inference for causal effects in randomized experiments with noncompliance. *The Annals of Statistics* 25(1), 305–327.

- Kang, J. D. and J. L. Schafer (2007). Demystifying double robustness: A comparison of alternative strategies for estimating a population mean from incomplete data. *Statistical Science* 22(4), 523–539.
- Kaplan, D. and J. Chen (2012). A two-step Bayesian approach for propensity score analysis: Simulations and case study. *Psychometrika* 77(3), 581–609.
- Karabatsos, G. and S. G. Walker (2012). A Bayesian nonparametric causal model. *Journal of Statistical Planning and Inference* 142(4), 925–934.
- Little, R. and H. An (2004). Robust likelihood-based analysis of multivariate data with missing values. *Statistica Sinica* 14(3), 949–968.
- McCandless, L. C., P. Gustafson, and P. C. Austin (2009). Bayesian propensity score analysis for observational data. *Statistics in Medicine* 28(1), 94–112.
- McCandless, L. C., S. Richardson, and N. Best (2012). Adjustment for missing confounders using external validation data and propensity scores. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 107(497), 40–51.
- Newton, M. A. and A. E. Raftery (1994). Approximate Bayesian inference with the weighted likelihood bootstrap. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)* 56(1), 3–26.
- Ray, K. and A. van der Vaart (2020). Semiparametric Bayesian causal inference. *The Annals of Statistics* 48(5), 2999–3020.
- Rosenbaum, P. R. and D. B. Rubin (1983). The central role of the propensity score in observational studies for causal effects. *Biometrika* 70(1), 41–55.
- Rubin, D. B. (1978). Bayesian inference for causal effects: The role of randomization. *The Annals of Statistics* 6(1), 34–58.
- Rubin, D. B. (1981). The Bayesian bootstrap. *The Annals of Statistics* 9(1), 130–134.
- Rubin, D. B. (2007). The design versus the analysis of observational studies for causal effects: Parallels with the design of randomized trials. *Statistics in Medicine* 26(1), 20–36.

- Saarela, O., L. R. Belzile, and D. A. Stephens (2016). A Bayesian view of doubly robust causal inference. *Biometrika* 103(3), 667–681.
- Saarela, O., D. A. Stephens, E. E. Moodie, and M. B. Klein (2015). On Bayesian estimation of marginal structural models. *Biometrics* 71(2), 279–288.
- Scharfstein, D. O., A. Rotnitzky, and J. M. Robins (1999). Adjusting for nonignorable drop-out using semiparametric nonresponse models. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 94(448), 1096–1120.
- Stephens, D. A., W. S. Nobre, E. E. M. Moodie, and A. M. Schmidt (2020). Bayesian causal inference using regression on the propensity score. (*In Revision*), 1–31.
- Walker, S. G. and N. L. Hjort (2001). On Bayesian consistency. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)* 63(4), 811–821.
- Yang, Y. and A. Barron (1999). Information-theoretic determination of minimax rates of convergence. *The Annals of Statistics* 27(5), 1564–1599.
- Zhang, T. (2006). From  $\epsilon$ -entropy to KL-entropy: Analysis of minimum information complexity density estimation. *The Annals of Statistics* 34(5), 2180–2210.
- Zigler, C. M. and F. Dominici (2014). Uncertainty in propensity score estimation: Bayesian methods for variable selection and model-averaged causal effects. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 109(505), 95–107.