

## **Randomization and Causality**

#### **Prof. Uwe Saint-Mont**

#### Universität der Bundeswehr

Hamburg, Mai 2019



**Randomization, Causal Graphs** 

## References

- R.A. Fisher (1935). The Design of Experiments. Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd.
- J. Pearl & D. Mackenzie (2018). The Book of Why. New York: Basic Books. [BoW]
- U. Saint-Mont (2015). Randomization Does Not Help Much, Comparability Does.

https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0132102



## **Ideal Experiment**

 $\mathbf{Y} = \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{X})$ 



# Given an ideal experiment, the endpoint is a function of the intervention only.



## **Real Situation**



## Accessing a causal effect

#### There are several strategies to achieve this:

#### **1. Pearl's "front door" criterion.**

## 2. Fisher's randomization.









X (water quality)

Y (cholera)

### The Book of Why [BoW], pp. 248-249





#### BoW, pp. 225, 229



# The book of why

BoW, p. 231, slightly rephrased: Front-door adjustment is a powerful tool, since it allows us to control for confounders that we cannot observe, including those that we can't even name.

For exactly the same reason, randomized controlled trials are considered the "gold standard" of causal effect estimation.





## BoW, p. 149 (simplified)



# **Randomization (Fisher 1935)**



In a randomized experiment, the outcome of some random process triggers the intervention (Treatment vs. Control, in particular).

According to the received view, randomization does not threaten the validity of an experiment, since it "disables all the old confounders without introducing any new confouders." (BoW, p. 149)





#### Main argument in Saint-Mont (2015)



## Tell me Why did ... happen

Alas, randomization may create an imbalance – a new path - and thus an alternative explanation.

Thus one cannot say why an endpoint occurred: it may have been caused by the intervention <u>or</u> by the imbalance.

