# Statistical Analysis of Randomized Experiments with Nonignorable Missing Binary Outcomes

	Kosuke Imai	
	Department of Politics Princeton University	
	July 31, 2007	
Kosuke Imai (Princeton University)	Nonignorable Missing Outcomes	1 / 13
	Introduction Overview	
Overview		

- Missing outcomes in randomized experiments.
- A growing literature on the topic:
  - Method of bounds (e.g., Horowitz and Manksi, 2000).
  - Semiparametric methods (e.g., Scharfstein et al. 1999).
  - Ignorability (e.g., Yau and Little, 2001).
  - Latent ignorability (e.g., Frangakis and Rubin, 1999).
- Nonignorable missing outcomes:
  - Political science: self-reported voting behavior.
  - Economics: self-reported income.
  - Medicine: self-reported health status.
- The paper offers (with and without noncompliance):
  - Alternative identification and estimation strategies.
  - 2 New sensitivity analyses.
  - Applications in political science, psychology, and public health.

Setup

# Framework for Standard Randomized Experiments

- Causal inference via potential outcomes (e.g., Holland 1986).
  - Experimental unit:  $i = 1, 2, \ldots, n$ .
  - Binary treatments:  $T_i \in \{0, 1\}$ .
  - Potential outcomes:  $Y_i(T_i)$ .
  - Observed outcome:  $Y_i = T_i Y_i(1) + (1 T_i) Y_i(0)$ .
  - Potential response indicators:  $R_i(T_i)$ .
  - Observed response indicator:  $R_i = T_i R_i(1) + (1 T_i) R_i(0)$ .
  - Pre-treatment covariates:  $X_i$ .
- No interference among units (Cox 1958; Rubin 1990).
- Randomized treatment:  $(Y_i(1), Y_i(0), R_i(1), R_i(0)) \perp T_i$  for all *i*.
- Estimands:
  - Average Treatment Effect (ATE):  $\tau_{ATE} \equiv E[Y_i(1) - Y_i(0)] = E[Y_i \mid T_i = 1] - E[Y_i \mid T_i = 0].$
  - Conditional Average Treatment Effect (CATE):  $\tau_{CATE} \equiv \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} E[Y_i(1) - Y_i(0) \mid X_i].$

Kosuke Imai (Princeton University)	Nonignorable Missing Outcomes	3 / 13

Standard Randomized Experiments Identification and Estimation Strategies

Identification Problem in the Binary Case

- Assume  $Y_i(0), Y_i(1) \in \{0, 1\}$ .
- Define,

$$\begin{array}{lll} \rho_{jk} & \equiv & \mathsf{Pr}(\,\mathsf{Y}_i = \mathsf{1} \mid T_i = j, R_i = k), \\ \pi_{jk} & \equiv & \mathsf{Pr}(\,T_i = j, R_i = k), \end{array}$$

• Then, the ATE can be written as,

$$\tau_{ATE} = \frac{p_{10}\pi_{10} + p_{11}\pi_{11}}{\pi_{10} + \pi_{11}} - \frac{p_{00}\pi_{00} + p_{01}\pi_{01}}{\pi_{00} + \pi_{01}},$$

where  $p_{00}$  and  $p_{10}$  are not identifiable from the data.

Since p<sub>j0</sub> ∈ [0, 1], the sharp bounds (Horowitz & Manski, 2000) are given by,

$$\tau_{ATE} \in \left[\frac{p_{11}\pi_{11}(\pi_{00} + \pi_{01}) - (\pi_{00} + p_{01}\pi_{01})(\pi_{10} + \pi_{11})}{(\pi_{10} + \pi_{11})(\pi_{00} + \pi_{01})}, \frac{(\pi_{10} + p_{11}\pi_{11})(\pi_{00} + \pi_{01}) - p_{01}\pi_{01}(\pi_{10} + \pi_{11})}{(\pi_{10} + \pi_{11})(\pi_{00} + \pi_{01})}\right]$$

#### **Identification Strategies**

• Ignorability Assumption (Little & Rubin, 1987): For  $j \in \{0, 1\}$ ,

$$\Pr(R_i(j) = 1 | T_i = j, Y_i(j) = 1, X_i = x) \\ = \Pr(R_i(j) = 1 | T_i = j, Y_i(j) = 0, X_i = x),$$

• Nonignorability (NI) Assumption: For  $k \in \{0, 1\}$  and  $x \in \mathcal{X}$ ,

$$\Pr(R_i(j) = 1 | T_i = 0, Y_i(0) = k, X_i = x)$$
  
= 
$$\Pr(R_i(j) = 1 | T_i = 1, Y_i(1) = k, X_i = x).$$

- Missing-data mechanism directly depends on the realized value of the outcome variable itself, but is conditionally independent of the treatment status.
- Identification of the ATE is established via Bayes rule (PROPOSITION 1).

Standard Randomized Experiments Identification and Estimation Strategies

#### Inference under the Nonignorability Assumption

Without covariates (or within strata defined by covariates): the ML estimator is in a closed form (PROPOSITION 2).

With covariates:

• Modeling approach (e.g., logistic regression):

$$q_j(x) = \Pr(Y_i = 1 | T_i = j, X_i = x),$$
  
 $r_{jk}(x) = \Pr(R_i = 1 | T_i = j, Y_i = k, X_i = x),$ 

• Complete-data likelihood function:

$$\prod_{i=1}^{n} \left[ r_{\cdot 1}(X_i)^{R_i} \{ 1 - r_{\cdot 1}(X_i) \}^{1-R_i} \right]^{Y_i} \left[ r_{\cdot 0}(X_i)^{R_i} \{ 1 - r_{\cdot 0}(X_i) \}^{1-R_i} \right]^{1-Y_i} \\ \times \left[ q_1(X_i)^{Y_i} \{ 1 - q_1(X_i) \}^{1-Y_i} \right]^{T_i} \left[ q_0(X_i)^{Y_i} \{ 1 - q_0(X_i) \}^{1-Y_i} \right]^{1-T_i},$$

where  $r_{k}(x) = r_{1k}(x) = r_{0k}(x)$  for  $x \in \mathcal{X}$  under the NI assumption. • Computation: *EM* algorithm, Gibbs sampler with prior distributions.

#### Standard Randomized Experiments Sensitivity Analysis

## Sensitivity Analysis

- Neither MAR nor NI assumptions are testable.
- Sensitivity analysis based on the following parameter,

$$\theta_k^{NI} \equiv \frac{\Pr(R_i(1) = 1 \mid T_i = 1, Y_i(1) = k)}{\Pr(R_i(0) = 1 \mid T_i = 0, Y_i(0) = k)},$$

for k = 0, 1 where the range of the parameter is given by,

$$\frac{(1-p_{11})\pi_{11}}{(1-p_{11})\pi_{11}+\pi_{10}} \leq \theta_0^{NI} \leq \frac{(1-p_{01})\pi_{01}+\pi_{00}}{(1-p_{01})\pi_{01}}$$
$$\frac{p_{11}\pi_{11}}{p_{11}\pi_{11}+\pi_{10}} \leq \theta_1^{NI} \leq \frac{p_{01}\pi_{01}+\pi_{00}}{p_{01}\pi_{01}}.$$

- $\tau_{ATE}$  is now a function of  $\theta_k^{NI}$  and identifiable parameters.
- See how  $\tau_{ATE}$  varies along with the value of  $\theta_k$ .

Kosuke Imai (Princeton University)	Nonignorable Missing Outcomes	7 / 13

Setup

### Randomized Experiments with Noncompliance

• Randomized "encouragement" design:

Randomized Experiments with Noncompliance

- Binary encouragement:  $Z_i \in \{0, 1\}$ .
- Potential binary treatments:  $T_i(Z_i) \in \{0, 1\}$ .
- Observed treatment:  $T_i = Z_i T_i(1) + (1 Z_i) T_i(0)$ .
- Potential outcomes:  $Y_i(Z_i)$ .
- Observed outcome:  $Y_i = Z_i Y_i(1) + (1 Z_i) Y_i(0)$ .
- Potential response indicators:  $R_i(Z_i)$ .
- Observed response indicator:  $R_i = Z_i R_i(1) + (1 Z_i) R_i(0)$ .
- Randomization of encouragement:

$$(Y_i(1), Y_i(0), T_i(1), T_i(0), R_i(1), R_i(0)) \perp Z_i,$$

• Intention-To-Treat (ITT) effect:  $\tau_{ITT} \equiv E[Y_i(T_i(1), 1) - Y_i(T_i(0), 0)].$ 

Setup

#### Instrumental Variables (Angrist, Imbens & Rubin, 1996)

- Noncompliance
  - Complier:  $T_i(1) = 1$  and  $T_i(0) = 0$ .
  - Noncomplier:
    - 1 Always-taker  $(C_i = c)$ :  $T_i(1) = T_i(0) = 1$ .
    - 2 Never-taker ( $C_i = n$ ):  $T_i(1) = T_i(0) = 0$ .
    - 3 Defier  $(C_i = d)$ :  $T_i(1) = 0$  and  $T_i(0) = 1$ .
- Assumptions:
  - 1 Monotonicity (no defier):  $T_i(1) > T_i(0)$ .
  - 2 Exclusion restriction for noncompliers:  $Y_i(1) = Y_i(0)$  for  $C_i = a, n$ (i.e., zero ITT effect for always-takers and never-takers).
- Complier Average Causal Effect (IV estimand):

$$au_{CACE} \equiv E[Y_i(1) - Y_i(0) \mid C_i = c] = \frac{E[Y_i(1) - Y_i(0)]}{E[T_i(1) - T_i(0)]}.$$

Kosuke Imai (Princeton University)

Nonignorable Missing Outcomes

Randomized Experiments with Noncompliance Identification and Estimation Strategies

Identification Strategies

• Ignorability (Yau & Little, 2001): For i = 0, 1 and l = 0, 1,

$$Pr(R_i(l) = 1 | Y_i(l) = 1, T_i(l) = j, Z_i = l, X_i = x)$$
  
= 
$$Pr(R_i(l) = 1 | Y_i(l) = 0, T_i(l) = j, Z_i = l, X_i = x).$$

Latent Ignorability (Frangakis & Rubin, 1999): **1** Latent ignorability: For I = 0, 1 and  $t \in \{c, n, a\}$ ,

> $Pr(R_i(I) = 1 | Y_i(I) = 1, Z_i = I, C_i = t, X_i = x)$ =  $\Pr(R_i(I) = 1 | Y_i(I) = 0, Z_i = I, C_i = t, X_i = x).$

2 Compound exclusion restriction for noncompliers:  $Y_i(0) = Y_i(1)$ , and  $R_i(1) = R_i(0)$ , for  $C_i = n, a$ . • Nonignorability: For i = 0, 1, and k = 0, 1,

$$\Pr(R_i(1) = 1 \mid T_i(1) = j, Y_i(1) = k, Z_i = 1, X_i = x)$$
  
= 
$$\Pr(R_i(0) = 1 \mid T_i(0) = j, Y_i(0) = k, Z_i = 0, X_i = x).$$

9/13

# Theoretical Results in the Binary Case

- Apply the same analytical strategy as before.
- Define,

$$\begin{array}{rcl} \rho_{jkl} &\equiv & \mathsf{Pr}(\mathsf{Y}_i = \mathsf{1} \mid T_i = j, R_i = k, Z_i = l), \\ \pi_{jkl} &\equiv & \mathsf{Pr}(T_i = j, R_i = k, Z_i = l). \end{array}$$

• Rewrite the ITT effect as,

$$\tau_{ITT} = \frac{\sum_{j=0}^{1} \sum_{k=0}^{1} p_{jk1} \pi_{jk1}}{\sum_{j=0}^{1} \sum_{k=0}^{1} \pi_{jk1}} - \frac{\sum_{j=0}^{1} \sum_{k=0}^{1} p_{jk0} \pi_{jk0}}{\sum_{j=0}^{1} \sum_{k=0}^{1} \pi_{jk0}},$$

where  $\pi_{ikl}$  and  $p_{i1l}$  are identifiable, but  $p_{i0l}$  is not.

• Thus, the identification of  $\tau_{ITT}$  requires four constraints (PROPOSITION 3).

Kosuke Imai (Princeton University)	Nonignorable Missing Outcomes	11 / 13

Randomized Experiments with Noncompliance Identification and Estimation Strategies

### Inference and Sensitivity Analysis

• With no covariate:

- ML estimator and its asymptotic variance are in a closed-form.
- Sensitivity analysis parameters:

$$\psi_{jk}^{NI} \equiv \frac{\Pr(R_i(1) = 1 \mid T_i(1) = j, Y_i(1) = k, Z_i = 1)}{\Pr(R_i(0) = 1 \mid T_i(0) = j, Y_i(0) = k, Z_i = 0)},$$

• Modeling approach:

$$\begin{array}{rcl} p_{jl}(x) &\equiv & \Pr(Y_i = 1 \mid T_i = j, Z_i = l, X_i = x), \\ q_l(x) &\equiv & \Pr(T_i = 1 \mid Z_i = l, X_i = x), \\ r_{jk}(x) &\equiv & \Pr(R_i = 1 \mid T_i = j, Y_i = k, X_i = x). \end{array}$$

 $\tau_{ITT}(x) = [p_{11}(x)q_1(x) + p_{01}(x)\{1 - q_1(x)\}] - [p_{10}(x)q_0(x) + p_{00}(x)\{1 - q_0(x)\}]$ 

#### Concluding Remarks

## **Concluding Remarks**

- Nonignorable missing data in randomized experiments.
- Identification and estimation strategies for randomized experiments with and without noncompliance.
- Sensitivity analyses to examine robustness of conclusiosns.

Kosuke Imai (Princeton University)

Nonignorable Missing Outcomes

13/13