

ACE Bounds; SEMs with Equilibrium Conditions

Thomas S. Richardson and James M. Robins

University of Washington and Harvard School of Public Health

We congratulate the author on an enlightening account of the instrumental variable approach from the viewpoint of Econometrics. We first make some comments regarding the bounds on the ACE under the non-parametric IV model, and then discuss potential outcomes in the market equilibrium model.

1. ACE BOUNDS UNDER THE IV MODEL

We consider the model in which X and Y are binary, taking values in $\{0, 1\}$, while Z takes K states $\{1, \dots, K\}$. We use the notation $X(z_i)$ to indicate $X(z=i)$, similarly $Y(x_j)$ for $Y(x=j)$. We consider four different sets of assumptions:

- (i) $Z \perp\!\!\!\perp Y(x_0), Y(x_1), X(z_1), \dots, X(z_K)$;
- (ii) $Z \perp\!\!\!\perp Y(x_0), Y(x_1)$;
- (iii) for $i \in \{1, \dots, K\}$, $j \in \{0, 1\}$, $Z \perp\!\!\!\perp X(z_i), Y(x_j)$;
- (iv) there exists a U such that $U \perp\!\!\!\perp Z$ and for $j \in \{0, 1\}$, $Y(x_j) \perp\!\!\!\perp X, Z \mid U$.

Condition (i) is joint independence of Z and all potential outcomes for Y and X . (ii) does not assume independence (or existence) of counterfactuals for X . (iii) is a subset of the independences in (i), none of which involve potential outcomes from different worlds.¹ The counterfactual independencies (i), (ii), (iii) arise most naturally in the context where the instrument is randomized, as depicted by the DAG in Fig. 1(a). The assumption (iii) may be read (via d-separation) from the Single-World Intervention Graph (SWIG)² $\mathcal{G}_1(z, x)$, depicted in Fig. 1(b), which represents the factorization of $P(Z, X(z), Y(x), U)$, implied by the IV model.

Lastly (iv) consists of only three independence statements, but does assume the existence of an unobserved variable U that is sufficient to control for confounding between X and Y . No assumption is made concerning the existence of counterfactuals $X(z)$; confounding variables (U^*) between Z and X are permitted (so long as $U^* \perp\!\!\!\perp U$). The DAG \mathcal{G}_2 and corresponding SWIG $\mathcal{G}_2(x)$ are shown in Fig. 1(c),(d).

THEOREM 1. *Under any of the assumptions (i), (ii), (iii), (iv) the joint distribution $P(Y(x_0), Y(x_1))$ is characterized by the $4K$ inequalities:*

- (1) $P(Y(x_i)=y) \leq P(Y=y, X=i \mid Z=z) + P(X=1-i \mid Z=z)$,
- (2) $P(Y(x_0)=y, Y(x_1)=\tilde{y}) \leq P(Y=y, X=0 \mid Z=z) + P(Y=\tilde{y}, X=1 \mid Z=z)$.

Box 354322 Seattle, WA 98195 (e-mail: thomasr@uw.edu). 677 Huntington Ave Boston, MA 02115 (e-mail: robins@hsph.harvard.edu).

¹In other words, they do not involve both $Y(x_0)$ and $Y(x_1)$, nor $X(z_i)$ and $X(z_j)$ for $i \neq j$.

²See (Richardson and Robins, 2013) for details.

Thus a distribution $P(X, Y | Z)$ is compatible with the stated assumptions if and only if there exists a distribution $P(Y(x_0), Y(x_1))$ satisfying (1) and (2).

THEOREM 2. *Under any of the assumptions (i), (ii), (iii), (iv) for all $i, j \in \{0, 1\}$, $P(Y(x_i) = j) \leq g(i, j)$, where:*

$$g(i, j) \equiv \min \left\{ \min_z \left[P(X=i, Y=j | Z=z) + P(X=1-i | Z=z) \right], \right. \\ \left. \min_{z, \tilde{z}: z \neq \tilde{z}} \left[P(X=i, Y=j | Z=z) + P(X=1-i, Y=0 | Z=z) \right. \right. \\ \left. \left. + P(X=i, Y=j | Z=\tilde{z}) + P(X=1-i, Y=1 | Z=\tilde{z}) \right] \right\}.$$

Furthermore, $P(Y(x_0))$ and $P(Y(x_1))$ are variation independent. Consequently:

$$1 - g(1, 0) - g(0, 1) \leq ACE(X \rightarrow Y) \leq g(0, 0) + g(1, 1) - 1.$$

These bounds are sharp.

Note that to evaluate $g(i, j)$ requires finding a minimum over $K + \binom{K}{2}$ expressions. In the case where $K = 2$, these bounds reduce to those given by Balke and Pearl (1997), who assume (i).³ Robins (1989) and Manski (1990) derived what are called the ‘natural bounds’ on the ACE under the weaker assumption that $Z \perp\!\!\!\perp Y(x_0)$ and $Z \perp\!\!\!\perp Y(x_1)$. As noted by Imbens, without further assumptions these bounds are not sharp. However, the natural bounds are sharp under (i) or (iii), if, in addition, we assume there are no Defiers (an assumption that has testable implications). Cheng and Small (2006) considered bounds on the ACE when $K = 3$ under additional assumptions.

2. MARKET EQUILIBRIUM AND BI-CAUSAL MODELS

Imbens’ clear description of the market equilibrium model is particularly informative. We also strongly endorse the author’s contention that the RHS of systems of structural equations should be interpreted as describing potential outcomes for the LHS.⁴

However, we note that this position has important implications both for interpretation and inference. Furthermore, it does not seem to be universally accepted within Economics. LeRoy (2006), states that “economic models use the equality symbol with its usual mathematical meaning, not with the meaning of the assignment operator;” an approach that is clearly incompatible with an interpretation in terms of potential outcomes. For example, it becomes permissible to renormalize structural equations to change which variable is on the LHS.

On a similar basis it has also been argued that statistical analyses of such models should be invariant to the normalization; see also Hillier (1990); Basmann (1963).⁵ Contrary to Imbens remark,⁶ this alternative view does not appear to

³Dawid (2003) working in a non-counterfactual framework also established the bounds for $K = 2$ under the DAG in Fig. 1(a); however, his proof also applies to Fig. 1(c). Robins and Greenland (1996) observed that the Balke-Pearl bounds were also sharp under (ii).

⁴Pearl (2000); Lauritzen (2001); Lauritzen and Richardson (2002) argue that these are not really ‘equations’ but are better viewed as ‘assignments’ in computer languages, e.g. $y \leftarrow x + 1$.

⁵For example Greene (2003, p.401) states (in the context of the IV model): “one significant virtue of [the Limited Information Maximum Likelihood Estimator] is its invariance to normalization of the equations”.

⁶Footnote 7, p.16.

be motivated by considerations of measurement error. LeRoy (2006) makes clear that he does not believe that structural equations describe potential outcomes for endogenous variables and does not discuss issues relating to measurement.⁷ Rather, this appears to be a fundamental difference in interpretation.

The market equilibrium model specifies potential outcomes for $Q_t^d(p)$, $Q_t^s(p)$:

$$(3) \quad Q_t^d(p) = \alpha^d + \beta^d p + \varepsilon_t^d,$$

$$(4) \quad Q_t^s(p) = \alpha^s + \beta^s p + \varepsilon_t^s,$$

and imposes the equilibrium condition:⁸

$$(5) \quad Q_t^d(p) = Q_t^s(p).$$

Strotz and Wold (1960) described such systems as *bi-causal*. It should be observed that the model does not specify potential outcomes for price ($P_t(q_s, q_d)$), nor does it view price as externally determined (aka exogenous). Instead price is determined implicitly as a consequence of the equilibrium condition. In this regard, the model might be regarded as incomplete: indeed Haavelmo (1958) is quite critical of this model for failing to offer any *explanation* as to how the equilibrium price is determined. The model also falls outside the scope of non-parametric structural equation models (NPSEM) (see e.g. Pearl, 2000), which require one equation for each endogenous variable;⁹ likewise the model defies standard graphical representation, though see Figure 2(a).

A related question concerns whether there exist dynamic acyclic (aka recursive) systems of structural equations that lead to the equilibrium distribution corresponding either to a cyclic system of structural equations or a bi-causal system.¹⁰ Fisher (1970) provides just such a ‘correspondence principle’ under which the distribution implied by a cyclic linear SEM is obtained as a time average of a deterministic set of first order difference equations reaching a static equilibrium subject to stochastic boundary conditions. The correspondence assumes that the equilibration time is very fast relative to the interval between observations so the time averaged variables are in deterministic equilibrium. Fisher also derived conditions on the coefficient matrices of a cyclic SEM that are required in order for the system to reach equilibrium; in fact he further required that each subset of structural equations also have this property.

⁷For example, LeRoy (2006, p.23) states that “The assumption that it makes sense to delete one or more of the structural equations and replace the value of the internal variable so determined by a constant without altering the other equations [...] is virtually never satisfied in economic models since each external variable typically affects equilibrium values of more than one internal variable.” He goes on to assert “In fact, it is difficult to think of nontrivial models in any area of research in which the [...] assumption is satisfied.”

⁸To simplify notation, throughout we work directly in terms of log price and log quantity.

⁹Indeed LeRoy (2006) argues against the interpretation of structural equations in terms of potential outcomes on the grounds that this interpretation, as advanced by Pearl, requires a one-to-one mapping between equations and endogenous variables, that, he argues, does not make sense for the market equilibrium model.

¹⁰Analysis of this question was stimulated by a heated debate that arose between Wold, who advocated a recursive, regression-based approach to demand analysis, and Haavelmo and the Cowles Commission who advocated simultaneous equations. See Haavelmo (1943); Wold and Bentzel (1946); Wold and Jurén (1953); Bentzel and Hansen (1954); Strotz and Wold (1960); Basmann (1963); historical overviews are given by Morgan (1991); Epstein (1987).

However, Fisher’s correspondence presumes a normalization under which each variable is associated with a single equation (as in an NPSEM) and hence would not apply to a bi-causal system. [Richardson \(1996\)](#) described a system of finite difference equations that gives rise to the bi-causal system (3)–(5):

$$\begin{aligned} (6) \quad \text{Consumers:} \quad & Q_{t+(k+1)\delta}^d(p_{t+k\delta}) = \alpha^d + \beta^d p_{t+k\delta} + \varepsilon_t^d, \\ (7) \quad \text{Suppliers:} \quad & Q_{t+(k+1)\delta}^s(p_{t+k\delta}) = \alpha^s + \beta^s p_{t+k\delta} + \varepsilon_t^s, \\ (8) \quad \text{Merchants:} \quad & P_{t+(k+1)\delta}(q_{t+k\delta}^d, q_{t+k\delta}^s, p_{t+k\delta}) = p_{t+k\delta} + \lambda(q_{t+k\delta}^d - q_{t+k\delta}^s), \end{aligned}$$

for $k = \{0, \dots, \delta^{-1} - 1\}$. Note that the disturbances $(\varepsilon_t^d, \varepsilon_t^s)$ represent boundary conditions and hence remain fixed during the interval $[t, t + 1)$. As in Fisher’s correspondence the observed variables correspond to limiting time-averages over a unit interval:

$$\bar{Q}_t^d = \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \delta \sum_{k=0}^{\delta^{-1}-1} Q_{t+k\delta}^d, \quad \bar{Q}_t^s = \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \delta \sum_{k=0}^{\delta^{-1}-1} Q_{t+k\delta}^s, \quad \bar{P}_t = \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \delta \sum_{k=0}^{\delta^{-1}-1} P_{t+k\delta}.$$

Under suitable conditions on the coefficients, $(\bar{Q}_t^d, \bar{Q}_t^s, \bar{P}_t)$ obey the equations (3)–(5). Note that the Merchants’ Eq. (8) which includes P , leads to the equilibrium condition (5) that does not.¹¹ It might be objected to the proposed model that there is no disturbance term in the equation for price. The explanation for this is that the disturbance terms in the non-recursive model correspond to constant factors in the deterministic evolution. The equation for price gives the change in price during a small interval (length δ) to the discrepancy between supply and demand. Adding a disturbance term would say that throughout the observation period (length 1) the merchants’ reaction to change in price was off by a constant factor, so that even if quantities supplied and demanded were identical, the merchants would change the price. Thus if we add an error ε_t^p the model will not, in general, arrive at equilibrium within the unit interval.¹²

[Iwasaki and Simon \(1994\)](#) represent equilibrating mechanisms via ‘causal influence diagrams’ in which the derivatives of variables are included. Under this scheme the model (6)–(8) is represented by the graph in [Figure 2\(b\)](#). This example serves to show that time averages of (deterministic) equilibrating systems need not have a structural equation for each variable. See also ([Dash and Druzdzel, 2001](#)) for related work.

REFERENCES

- Balke, A. and J. Pearl (1997). Bounds on treatment effects from studies with imperfect compliance. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 92, 1171–1176.
- Basman, R. (1963). The causal interpretation of non-triangular systems of economic relations (with discussion). *Econometrica* 31 (3), 439–453.
- Bentzel, R. and B. Hansen (1954). On recursiveness and interdependency in economic models. *Review of Economic Studies* 22, 153–168.
- Cheng, J. and D. S. Small (2006). Bounds on causal effects in three-arm trials with non-compliance. *J. Roy. Statist. Soc. Ser. B* 68, 815–836.

¹¹In causal terms this model is similar to one presented in [Wold \(1959\)](#). Wold viewed his model as a formalization of Cournot’s theories.

¹²Having said this, the equations (6) & (7) still imply that producers and consumers make systematic errors in computing prices over a time-scale of length δ .

- Dash, D. and M. J. Druzdzel (2001). Caveats for causal reasoning with equilibrium models. In S. Benferhat and P. Besnard (Eds.), *Proceedings of the Sixth European Conference on Symbolic and Quantitative Approaches to Reasoning with Uncertainty (ECSQARU)*, Volume 2143 of *Lecture Notes in Artificial Intelligence*, Toulouse, France, pp. 192–203. Springer-Verlag.
- Dawid, A. P. (2003). Causal inference using influence diagrams: The problem of partial compliance (with discussion). In P. J. Green, N. L. Hjort, and S. Richardson (Eds.), *Highly Structured Stochastic Systems*, pp. 45–81. Oxford University Press.
- Epstein, R. (1987). *A History of Econometrics*. Amsterdam: North Holland.
- Fisher, F. M. (1970). A correspondence principle for simultaneous equation models. *Econometrica* 38, 73–92.
- Greene, W. H. (2003). *Econometric Analysis* (5th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Haavelmo, T. (1943). The statistical implications of a system of simultaneous equations. *Econometrica* 11, 1–12.
- Haavelmo, T. (1958). *Hva Kan Statistiske Likevektsmodeller Fortelle Oss?* (in Norwegian). What can static equilibrium models tell us? *Suppl. to Nationaløkonomisk Tidsskrift* 96. Translation published in *Economic Inquiry* 12.
- Hillier, G. H. (1990). On the normalization of structural equations: Properties of direction estimators. *Econometrica* 58(5), pp. 1181–1194.
- Iwasaki, Y. and H. Simon (1994). Causality and model abstraction. *Artificial Intelligence* 67, 143–194.
- Lauritzen, S. L. (2001). Causal inference from graphical models. In O. E. Barndorff-Nielsen, D. R. Cox, and C. Klüppelberg (Eds.), *Complex Stochastic Systems*, pp. 63–107. Boca Raton, FL: Chapman & Hall.
- Lauritzen, S. L. and T. S. Richardson (2002). Chain graph models and their causal interpretations (with discussion). *J. R. Stat. Soc. Ser. B* 64, 321–361.
- LeRoy, S. F. (2006). Causality in economics. Technical report, UC Santa Barbara.
- Manski, C. (1990). Non-parametric bounds on treatment effects. *American Economic Review* 80, 351–374.
- Morgan, M. S. (1991). The stamping out of process analysis in econometrics. In N. de Marchi and M. Blaug (Eds.), *Appraising Economic Theories*, pp. 237–272. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- Pearl, J. (2000). *Causality*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Richardson, T. S. (1996). *Models of feedback: interpretation and discovery*. Ph. D. thesis, Carnegie-Mellon University.
- Richardson, T. S. and J. M. Robins (2013). Single World Intervention Graphs (SWIGs): A unification of the counterfactual and graphical approaches to causality. Technical Report 128, Center for Statistics and the Social Sciences, University of Washington.
- Robins, J. M. (1989). The analysis of randomized and non-randomized AIDS treatment trials using a new approach to causal inference in longitudinal studies. In L. Sechrest, H. Freeman, and A. Mulley (Eds.), *Health Service Research Methodology: A focus on AIDS*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Public Health Service.
- Robins, J. M. and S. Greenland (1996). Identification of causal effects using instrumental variables: Comment. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 91(434), pp. 456–458.
- Strotz, R. and H. Wold (1960). Recursive versus non-recursive systems: An attempt at synthesis. *Econometrica* 28(2), 417–427.
- Wold, H. and R. Bentzel (1946). On statistical demand analysis from the viewpoint of simultaneous equations. *Skandinavisk Aktuarietidskrift* 29, 95–114.
- Wold, H. and L. Juréen (1953). *Demand Analysis*. New York: Wiley.
- Wold, H. O. A. (1959). Ends and means in econometric model building. basic considerations reviewed. In U. Grenander (Ed.), *Probability and Statistics, The Harald Cramér volume*. Almqvist & Wiksell.




FIG 1. (a) IV model with no confounding between Z and X ; (b) SWIG representing $P(Z, X(z), Y(x), U)$; (c) IV model with confounding between Z and X ; (d) SWIG representing $P(Z, X, Y(x), U, U^*)$.




FIG 2. (a) Attempt to depict the bi-causal model; (b) a schematic showing the deterministic system (6)–(8); the edge \xrightarrow{I} denotes that P is the integral of ΔP ; see *Iwasaki and Simon (1994)*.