In standard ordinary least square, unbiased estimates of the average treatment effect can be calculated when the exposure variable is not correlated with the error term. However, in non-experimental studies, the exposure variable is oftentimes correlated with the error term and yields a spurious conclusion driven not by the exposure variable but by the association between the exposure variable and error term.

An instrumental variable is used to reduce this bias, but two conditions must be met: (1) strong correlation with the exposure variable and (2) no correlation with the error term.

**Introduction**

When random assignment of an exposure \((D)\) is not possible in a study, we are confronted with a challenge to draw a causal inference. Random assignment mitigates bias by balancing observed and unobserved characteristics at baseline across exposure groups. Non-experimental studies without randomization lead to selection bias, as the distribution of factors that affect outcomes may be imbalanced between the exposed and unexposed groups. These factors are called confounders.

In a simple linear regression framework estimated using ordinary least squares (OLS), such confounding is addressed by controlling for these factors as covariates \((X)\) in the regression:

\[
Y = \beta_0 + \beta_1 D + \beta_2 X + \varepsilon,
\]

where, under some general assumptions, \(\beta_1\) represents the average treatment effect (ATE) parameter. Alternatively, propensity score methods can balance the distribution of these observed confounders between groups [1]. However, it is almost impossible to justify that all possible confounders are observed in the data at hand and have been adjusted for. Consequently, the effects of an exposure estimated from non-experimental studies using traditional methods are always subject to bias from the unobserved confounders. In the regression setting, such unobserved confounding is indicated when the exposure variable \(D\) is correlated with the error term \(\varepsilon\), and therefore, OLS produces biased estimates for \(\beta_1\). The exposure variable \(D\) is consequently endogenous.

This problem is further illustrated with a path analysis in Figure 1. Panel A shows the direct effect of the explanatory variable \(D\) on outcome \(Y\). Standard OLS produces unbiased estimates of \(\beta_1\) if there is no association between all other factors that affect \(Y\) (i.e., error) and exposure \(D\). But if we observe the correlation in Panel B between exposure and error, the OLS will generate biased estimates that are not equal to the ATE. The OLS estimate would pick up a spurious correlation between \(D\) and \(Y\) that is not the causal effect of \(D\), but rather driven by the association of \(\varepsilon\) with \(D\) and \(Y\).

**Instrumental Variables**

This endogeneity problem can be addressed with an instrumental variable (IV), which is a naturally occurring factor that directly affects the endogenous variable in question, but does not affect outcomes in any other way. An IV can act as a natural randomizer in the absence of artificial random assignment, and therefore, helps tease out the causal effect of the exposure even in the presence of unobserved confounding.
For an IV method to be a consistent estimator for $\beta_1$, two critical conditions should be met. First, the IV must be strongly correlated with the exposure variable given $X$, 

$$\text{Cov}(Z, D | X) \neq 0,$$

and second the IV should be uncontaminated, (i.e., it cannot be correlated with the error term),

$$\text{Cov}(Z, \varepsilon | X) = 0.$$

In Panel C, the added IV $Z$ is associated with the exposure but not the error term. The first assumption is testable. In fact, weak instruments usually create more bias than it helps alleviate. Typically, a rule of thumb is that the F-stat for an IV predicting $D$ should be at least 10 [2]. The second assumption is not testable, and one must rely on theoretical rationales and some necessary statistical tests to support this assumption. However, if unobserved confounding is large, even moderately contaminated IVs can produce results that are more robust than naive regression [3].

**Why Is This So Important?**

Unobserved variables correlated with both the exposure and outcomes variables can strongly influence the estimated relationship between the two and mask the magnitude of the causal effect. Good instrument variables help limit that biased inference.

Some final points to consider about IV analyses: IV should never be used to fix bad study designs; bad IV can cause more problems than solutions; and IV methods vary based on the type of regression methods used, such as two-stage predictor substitution and two-stage residual inclusion [4].

**Conclusions**

Studies taking advantage of IV have illuminated the causal relationships in Vietnam veterans with decreased wages [5], early birth season with lower educational attainment [6], and the effect of cardiac catheterization on mortality. Although challenging, selecting the best IV while meeting all the criteria established above can result in unbiased estimators of the ATE. More importantly, establishing causal relationships with non-experimental studies provides meaningful evidence to guide decision makers and policy makers.
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**Additional information:**

The preceding article was part of the ongoing effort to share best practices and communicate lessons learned from ongoing education and service activities. Go to page 45 for this issue’s Student Corner for more student news.

**ISPOR STUDENT & MEETING TRAVEL GRANTS**

Applications for ISPOR Student & Meeting Travel Grants are now being accepted for the ISPOR 21st Annual International Meeting in Washington, DC; ISPOR 7th Asia Pacific Conference in Singapore, and the ISPOR 19th Annual European Congress in Vienna, Austria.

**APPLICATION DEADLINES:**

- ISPOR 21ST ANNUAL INTERNATIONAL MEETING: MARCH 11, 2016
- ISPOR 7TH ASIA PACIFIC CONFERENCE: JUNE 17, 2016
- ISPOR 19TH ANNUAL EUROPEAN CONGRESS: 19 AUGUST 2016

- To apply for a Student Travel Grant
  http://www.ispor.org/student/Travel/grantApp.asp.
- To apply for an ISPOR Meeting Travel Grant
  http://www.ispor.org/awards/MeetingTravelScholarship.asp.