

Empirically assessing the plausibility of unconfoundedness in observational studies

Fernando Pires Hartwig^{1,2*}, Kate Tilling^{2,3}, George Davey Smith^{2,3}

¹Postgraduate Program in Epidemiology, Federal University of Pelotas, Pelotas, Brazil.

²MRC Integrative Epidemiology Unit, University of Bristol, Bristol, United Kingdom.

³Population Health Sciences, University of Bristol, Bristol, United Kingdom.

*Corresponding author. Postgraduate Program in Epidemiology, Federal University of Pelotas, Pelotas (Brazil) 96020-220. Phone: 55 53 981126807. E-mail: fernandophartwig@gmail.com.

Abstract

The possibility of unmeasured confounding is one of the main limitations for causal inference from observational studies. There are different methods for partially empirically assessing the plausibility of unconfoundedness. However, most currently available methods require (at least partial) assumptions about the confounding structure, which may be difficult to know in practice. In this paper we describe a simple strategy for empirically assessing the plausibility of conditional unconfoundedness (i.e., whether the candidate set of covariates suffices for confounding adjustment) which does not require any assumptions about the confounding structure, requiring instead assumptions related to temporal ordering between covariates, exposure and outcome (which can be guaranteed by design), measurement error and selection into the study. The proposed method essentially relies on testing the association between a subset of covariates (those associated with the exposure given all other covariates) and the outcome conditional on the remaining covariates and the exposure. We describe the assumptions underlying the method, provide proofs, use simulations to corroborate the theory and illustrate the method with an applied example assessing the causal effect of length-for-age measured in childhood and intelligence quotient measured in adulthood using data from the 1982 Pelotas (Brazil) birth cohort. We also discuss the implications of measurement error and some important limitations.

Keywords: Causal inference; Bias; Confounding; Directed acyclic graphs; Backdoor path; Observational studies.

1. Introduction

Epidemiological studies can be affected by several biases, including confounding, information bias, selection bias and reverse causation. In observational studies, a major limitation for causal inference is the possibility of confounding, which can be avoided by design in randomized trials.¹ There are several examples of apparently robust findings from observational studies being seriously questioned by subsequent trials.^{2,3} Of note, in some instances different results between observational and intervention studies can be explained by factors other than confounding.⁴

Confounding is often defined as the existence of open backdoor paths between the exposure (or risk factor or treatment) and outcome (or response) due to common causes.¹ However, open backdoor paths can also exist due to collider bias. We therefore use the word “confounding” meaning the existence of any open backdoor path. It is well-established that statistical methods cannot determine whether confounding exists without untestable assumptions.^{1,5} Nevertheless, methods for partial empirical verification of unconfoundedness can be useful. Common examples include: covariate balance assessment following inverse probability weighting or propensity score matching (which assumes no unmeasured confounding);⁶ comparing results from instrumental variables and conventional covariate-adjusted analyses (which assume that the instrument is valid and estimate the same causal parameter as the conventional analysis if the latter is free from bias);⁷ negative control exposures⁸ or outcomes⁹ (which assume that exposure-outcome and negative control exposure-outcome or exposure-negative control outcome confounders are the same); and falsification tests for unconfoundedness^{5,10} (which typically require relatively few assumptions, but cannot provide positive evidence in support of unconfoundedness).

Another possible strategy exploits conditioning on the exposure. For example, if there is a known valid instrument for the exposure, the association between the instrument and the outcome conditional on the exposure would be informative of the presence of confounding between the exposure and the outcome due to collider bias.¹¹ Importantly, all these methods require at least partial assumptions about the confounding structure. In practice, although some causal knowledge is often available, it can be difficult to justify the specific causal assumptions required.

We describe a test that explores conditioning on the exposure, formulated non-parametrically so that it does not depend on specific modelling assumptions. First, we describe the notation and assumptions (section 2). Then, we present the test (section 3), use simulations to corroborate the theory (section 4) and illustrate its application in a real data example (section 5). Strengths and weaknesses are discussed in section 6.

2. Notation and assumptions

Let X and Y respectively denote the exposure and the outcome. We assume that X is time-fixed – i.e., a single measure at a specific point in time (e.g., birthweight rather than weight throughout childhood). Let A denote the candidate adjustment set – i.e., the covariate set selected to condition on as an attempt to eliminate confounding in the association between X and Y . We assume the data (i.e., X , Y and A) are generated by some acyclic model, which may contain additional variables and, apart from the constraints imposed by assumptions 1-4 (mentioned below), is left unspecified. Therefore, it is not known whether A is a valid adjustment set.

We assume:

- Assumption 1: Y is not a cause of X . This is guaranteed in a longitudinal study where X precedes Y .
- Assumption 2: X is measured without error.
- Assumption 3: None of the elements in A are caused by X . This is guaranteed if all covariates are pre-exposure variables.
- Assumption 4: Selection into the analytical sample (i.e., the subset of the study participants eligible for analysis addressing the research question) is either not caused by X or not conditionally associated with covariates in A that fulfill the requirements to be used for the proposed test (mentioned below) given all other covariates. That is, eligibility criteria, follow-up attrition, missing data etc. are not caused by (but may nevertheless be associated with) the exposure or not associated with covariates. This is guaranteed if selection into the analytical sample precedes X , which guarantees X is not a cause of selection.
- Assumption 5: Faithfulness. Under this assumption, d-connection (i.e., existence of at least one open path between two variables) implies statistical dependence. For illustration, suppose there are two open paths between X and Y : (i) $X \leftarrow V \rightarrow \boxed{F} \leftarrow Y$ (\boxed{F} indicates conditioning on F) and (ii) $X \rightarrow M \rightarrow Y$. Since both paths are open (they contain no unadjusted collider and no adjusted non-collider), X and Y are d-connected. However, it is possible that path (i) leads to a positive association between X and Y and path (ii) to a negative association, such that the net result is no association.

3. Assessing unconfoundedness

Our main result is the following procedure for empirically assessing the plausibility of unconfoundedness. Suppose that there is at least one covariate (denoted by Z) in the covariate set (denoted by A) such that: (i) Z is associated with (i.e., not independent of) X given all other covariates (denoted by C); and (ii) Z and Y are conditionally independent given X and C . In this case, A is a valid adjustment set. Conversely, if none of the covariates that satisfy condition (i) also satisfy condition (ii), A is either an invalid adjustment set or a minimal valid adjustment set in the sense that $A = Z$ and $A = C$ are invalid adjustment sets and $A = \{C \cup Z\}$ is a valid adjustment set. Therefore, the result is only conclusive if some Z satisfies both (i) and (ii).

In the supplement (section 1), we provide an intuitive explanation of the approach, which is formalized in Theorem 1 and proven in supplementary section 2. Finally, we discuss how our results can be applied for time-varying exposures (supplementary section 3).

4. Simulation study

We performed simulations to corroborate the theoretical results. All analyses described in this and in the next section were performed using R.

We simulated two scenarios (see supplementary section 4 for details). In scenario 1, there is one unmeasured confounder, and the three possible covariates are all instruments (they cause X but do not directly cause Y). In the second scenario, there is no unmeasured confounding, and all three covariates are confounders (Figure 1). In the first scenario, the covariate set is not a valid adjustment set (because it does not include the unmeasured confounder). In the second scenario, the covariate set is a valid adjustment set (when the latter includes all three

covariates), but also minimal. For each scenario, 100,000 datasets were generated where all three covariates achieved $P < 0.05$ upon regressing X on them (this ensures all covariates satisfy condition (i) above). This was repeated for differing sample sizes: 500, 1000, 5000 and 20,000.

Table 1 displays results focusing on simulated datasets where the bias of the covariate-unadjusted linear regression coefficient of Y on X (due to confounding) was larger than 0.2. We considered situations where the covariate set includes one, two or three covariates (which are instruments in scenario 1 or confounders in scenario 2). Since in all scenarios the adjustment set is either valid and minimal (scenario 2 when all covariates are included in the adjustment set) or invalid (the remaining situations) and all covariates are associated with the exposure conditional on the other covariates, the rationale explained in section 3 would imply that all covariates are expected to be associated with the outcome conditional on the exposure and the other covariates (i.e., the column labelled “0” should contain 100% of the simulated datasets), apart from violations of faithfulness or low statistical power. Indeed, for smaller sample sizes, lack of strong statistical evidence of association between a single covariate and the outcome given the exposure was quite likely, especially in scenario 1. However, increasing sample size or number of covariates, the probability that all covariates do not present evidence of association becomes very small. As shown in Supplementary Table 1, those probabilities are considerably larger when focusing on simulated datasets with small bias, indicating, as expected, more powered to detect larger residual confounding.

5. Applied example

We illustrate the proposed method using data from the 1982 Pelotas (Brazil) Birth Cohort. Details on eligibility criteria, follow-up history and data availability can be found elsewhere.^{12,13} The exposure (X) is length-for-age measured at 2 years and the outcome (Y) is intelligence quotient (IQ) measured at 30 years. Given the strong social patterning in growth and cognitive development in this cohort,¹⁴ social determinants are likely the most relevant confounders. We therefore selected three covariates related to this concept: maternal schooling at birth, socioeconomic position at birth (in quintiles)¹⁵ and asset index¹⁶ at 2 years. We also included in the covariate set maternal age and height and individual’s sex, birthweight and a genetic score that predicts height (additive score of ~ 700 independent genetic variants robustly associated with height, where each variant is weighted by its linear regression coefficient with height).¹⁷ The covariate set we are examining is this set of eight variables.

Our analyses included 2562 individuals (out of 5914 recruited at baseline) with complete data for exposure, outcome and covariates. All variables were standardized to have zero mean and unit standard deviation (SD) to facilitate comparisons. Without covariate adjustment, a SD increase in length-for-age was associated with 0.31 (95% CI: 0.28; 0.35) higher SD units of IQ.

Our goal is to assess whether the covariate set is sufficient for confounding adjustment. First, we regressed length-for-age on all covariates simultaneously to check if any of the latter is associated with the exposure conditional on all other covariates (i.e., if any covariate satisfies condition (i) above). Second, we regressed IQ on length-for-age and all covariates simultaneously to check if any covariate is associated with the outcome conditional on the exposure and all other covariates (i.e., if any covariate satisfies condition (ii) above). Under assumptions 1-5, if at least one covariate satisfies both (i) and (ii), then our covariate set is sufficient for confounding adjustment. Third, we performed sensitivity analysis to assess the plausibility of faithfulness and quantify power to detect residual confounding.

As shown in Table 2, all covariates except maternal age were associated with the exposure conditioning on all other covariates (model 1) – i.e., maternal age does not satisfy condition (i) and therefore cannot be used for assessing confoundedness. Among the remaining covariates, there was not strong statistical evidence against no association with the outcome (given the exposure and all other covariates) for maternal height, genetic score and birthweight (model 2). Therefore, these three covariates satisfy both (i) and (ii), so we would conclude that the entire covariate set is a valid adjustment set (as described in supplementary section 2, we would also conclude that a smaller valid adjustment set could be obtained by removing these three covariates from the covariate set).

Covariate adjustment attenuated the point-estimate of the exposure-outcome association by about half (model 2). In model 3, we assess faithfulness by repeating model 2 but excluding socioeconomic variables from the covariate set. Since these are likely the strongest confounders (which is corroborated by the exposure-outcome association in model 3 being nearly identical to the unadjusted analysis), if faithfulness holds then it would be expected that all covariates associated with the exposure in model 1 are also associated with the outcome in model 3. However, birthweight presented no such association, which weakens interpreting the result for this variable in model 2 as evidence against residual confounding. Model 4 corroborates these results, indicating that, out of maternal height, genetic score and birthweight, only the first two seem to satisfy faithfulness.

To further assess whether the covariate set (i.e., the list of eight covariates mentioned in the beginning of this section) is sufficient for confounding adjustment, we used school type (public or private, measured in a subsample of the cohort at age 14-15 years) as a negative control outcome.⁹ This variable is strongly socially patterned in our cohort (so it is affected by the seemingly most important confounders) and is unlikely to be caused by the exposure (length-for-age) itself. The mean of length-for-age (in SD units) was 0.64 (95% CI: 0.41; 0.87) and 0.09 (95% CI: -0.11; 0.30) higher among those who studied in private schools in analysis without and with covariate adjustment, respectively, thus corroborating that the covariate set is sufficient for confounding adjustment.

Since length-for-age, the genetic score and maternal height precede selection into the analytical sample, there is no guarantee that Assumption 4 is satisfied. However, maternal height had less than 2% of missing data, and its mean was only 0.003 (95% CI: -0.049; 0.055) SD units higher among the included in the analytical sample. So, there is very weak evidence for selection bias post enrollment being associated with maternal height. However, maternal height could be correlated with eligibility (e.g., *in utero* survival may be affected by determinants of maternal height), which could still lead to violations of Assumption 4. However, it seems unlikely that the lack of strong evidence for association between maternal height and the outcome in model 2 is solely due to violations of this assumption given the comparison between models 2, 3 and 4, and the negative control outcome analysis.

Finally, we performed power calculations assuming the association between length-for-age and IQ is solely due to residual confounding, and then quantified the power of the proposed method to detect such confounding (full description in supplementary section 5). This analysis indicated 10% and 65% probability that both and at least one of the two covariates (maternal height or genetic score) would detect such residual confounding, respectively. Therefore, our analysis may be underpowered, which could lead to lack of strong statistical evidence for association between these two covariates and the outcome in model 2 even if the covariate set is not sufficient for confounding adjustment.

6. Discussion

We propose a strategy for empirically assessing the plausibility of unconfoundedness. We considered several relevant aspects of an epidemiological study, including temporal relationships between variables and the possibility of selection bias and measurement error. In addition to theoretical proofs corroborated by simulations, our applied example (section 5) illustrates that the method is simple to implement, some simple approaches for assessing the plausibility of faithfulness, the importance of power calculations and the utility of triangulation with other approaches.

There are previous tests with important similarities to ours (see supplementary section 7 for a detailed comparison). One of them was proposed by Pearl (Theorem 6.4.4).⁵ The main differences are that our test requires faithfulness (Pearl's does not) and, if its assumption are satisfied, can correctly classify A as a valid adjustment set, but not as an invalid adjustment set (because A could be minimal in the sense described in section 3). Pearl's test requires that the variable used in the test (analogous to Z in our context) is not a barren proxy (i.e., a variable associated with both the exposure and the outcome without causally affecting either; our test does not need this assumption) and, if its assumptions are satisfied, is a falsification test. Of note, supplementing it with faithfulness does not enable the test to correctly identify X and Y as unconfounded, while supplementing our test with the assumption that Z is not a barren proxy allows for conclusive results regarding C being a valid adjustment set. Entner and colleagues¹⁰ describe an automated covariate selection procedure which can be seen as a generalization of our approach. However, our method has important advantages in relation to its practical application: much lower computational requirements, lower risk of near faithfulness violations by not assessing all possible subsets of A and facilitating empirical verification of this assumption, and a clearer separation between covariate selection and causal effect estimation.

Since our test cannot differentiate whether A is invalid or minimal, it is more applicable to situations where A is unlikely to be minimal – e.g., A if was conservatively selected and therefore likely contains redundant covariates (in the sense that adjusting for only one out of two or more would be sufficient to block a given biasing path). This is frequent in applied research because there is often considerable uncertainty in the causal assumptions needed for covariate selection, which often leads to selecting a large set number of pre- exposure covariates with no clear causal justification. Indeed, such uncertainty would render falsification tests less useful since the researcher's confidence in the selected covariates is relatively low. Moreover, due to measurement error in the covariates or when attempting to adjust for latent constructs, researchers often select covariates known to be closely related and therefore possibly redundant (e.g., select both income and assets as covariates for adjusting for socioeconomic position). Nevertheless, if no assumption on the minimality of A is warranted and all selected covariates that are associated with the exposure (conditional on the other covariates) are also associated with the outcome (given the exposure and the other covariates), one possibility is to expand the covariate set (as long the requirements outlined in the assumptions are satisfied) to include additional (and possibly redundant) variables. If the initial set of covariates was indeed minimally sufficient and the newly added covariate is exogenous (see the end of supplementary section 3 for a note on exogenous covariates), then, given our assumptions, such a newly added covariate would be expected to not be associated with the outcome given the exposure and the initial set of covariates. Of course, if faithfulness is violated, such lack of association could happen even if the initial set was invalid. Therefore,

this type of verification is stronger if faithfulness is plausible. If such a newly added covariate is conditionally associated with the outcome, this would indicate the original adjustment set is invalid. Importantly, in this case the new covariate should not necessarily be added to the adjustment set. For example, if it is a valid instrument (conditional on the original adjustment set), then its inclusion could lead to bias amplification (i.e., larger bias due to conditioning on an instrument if the adjustment set is invalid).^{18,19} Indeed, in the case where all covariates are conditionally associated with the outcome, bias amplification will be a possibility since the adjustment set may be invalid and some covariates could be conditional instruments. However, unless one knows which covariates are conditional instruments (in which case such covariates could be excluded from the adjustment set and used to assess its validity instead – as mentioned in section 1, or for instrumental variable estimation), bias amplification (if any) may be difficult to detect and avoid, although if the adjustment set is invalid there would be bias anyway.

Importantly, our method is not primarily aimed at covariate selection, but for testing if a selected covariates set is sufficient for confounding adjustment. In the supplement (section 8), we discuss how covariate selection strategies^{10,20-22} could be used in combination with our method. It should be noted the possibility of a covariate set being reported as if it had been selected *a priori* when it was in fact selected by an automated search over a large covariate space until finding a covariate set that satisfies Theorem 1 requirements and yields desired results. The risk of this bad practice could be mitigated by pre-registration of analysis protocols, which has been promoted for avoiding “hacking” (intentional selection and report of data or statistical analysis that produce the desired results) or “harking” (when allegedly *a priori* hypotheses are in fact written after the results are known) procedures.^{23,24}

Although faithfulness is generally considered plausible, violations or near-violations are difficult to rule out in practice. As illustrated in the simulations, the more covariates conditionally associated with the exposure and not associated with the outcome, the lower the plausibility that the results are due to faithfulness violations. Another way to assess the plausibility of faithfulness is as follows: suppose Z satisfies both conditions (i) and (ii) of Theorem 1. If Z also satisfies both conditions when using a restricted version of A (lacking known important confounders), then it would suggest that bias was not detected because faithfulness was violated. This was illustrated in the applied example by comparing models 2-4. Yet another way to assess faithfulness is via cross-cohort comparisons with different confounding structures since violations of faithfulness are unlikely to occur in the same way between cohorts. So, if the same Z is not associated with Y given X and C in both cohorts (assuming Z satisfies condition (i) in both cohorts), this would be supportive of A being a valid adjustment set rather than violations of faithfulness.

In supplementary section 6 we discuss in detail the implications of measurement error in X , Y and A . Briefly, A can be mismeasured because we are not interpreting A as if it were identical to its corresponding theoretical set of perfectly measured variables. This is desirable because the actual set of (likely imperfectly measured) covariates is what will be available in practice for bias adjustment. For measurement error in either the exposure or the outcome, the test will indicate whether A is sufficient for bias adjustment regarding the effect of the measured version of the exposure on the measured version of the outcome. As discussed in the supplement, the actual exposure would be an unmeasured confounder of this association in the presence of a non-null causal effect of actual exposure on actual outcome, so the proposed test would be expected to suggest bias. However, it is precisely this confounding by actual

exposure that allows using the association between measured exposure and measured outcome as a proxy of the association between actual exposure and actual outcome. So, detecting this specific backdoor path can be considered either a strength (because it would correctly detect bias in the measured exposure effect estimate) or a limitation (because it detects as bias the backdoor path between measured variables that causes them to be d-connected in the presence of a causal effect between actual variables). Further research could explore the possibility of incorporating measurement error correction in the exposure to mitigate the influence of this specific backdoor path, but doing so often requires strong assumptions on the error structure and magnitude,^{25,26} which is not frequently available in practice.

Another important limitation is the requirement that selection into the analytical sample is not caused by X or associated with Z (assumption 4). This assumption will be quite strong in longitudinal studies such as cohort studies and randomized trials. Selection bias adjustment strategies such as inverse probability weighting^{1,27,28} or multiple imputation can be used to make this assumption more plausible.^{27,29,30}

The proposed approach essentially relies on inferring statistical dependence or independence. However, in finite samples, such inferences are respectively prone to type I and type II error. As mentioned elsewhere, one way to mitigate this problem is to use a stringent cutoff for inferring dependence (for example, a very low p-value threshold when assessing condition (i) described in section 3) and a relaxed cutoff for inferring independence (for example, a large p-value threshold when assessing condition (ii) described in section 3).¹⁰

It should also be noted that our test serves for bias detection, but not for bias quantification. In large studies, the statistical power of the test may be large even if the bias is small, while in small studies the test might be underpowered to detect even considerable bias. Moreover, low power could also happen due to other factors – e.g., high collinearity or model misspecification (e.g., in section 5 we only considered models linear in variables, which could reduce power if the true association is non-linear). We therefore recommend at least simple power analysis (illustrated in section 5) when applying the test in practice. Bias quantification is only possible under additional modelling assumptions. Indeed, there are examples of bias quantification that also exploit conditioning on the exposure,¹¹ which can be useful if the modelling assumptions are considered plausible.

Causal inference always requires assumptions, and no design or analytical approach is robust against all forms of bias. Our method should be viewed as one tool that can be triangulated with other designs for strengthening causal inference,³¹ as our applied example illustrates. Hopefully our results will contribute to improve robustness of findings from observational studies relying on statistical adjustment for covariates, and therefore to the overall triangulation process.

7. References


1. Hernán MA, Robins JM. Causal Inference: What If. Boca Raton, FL, USA: Chapman & Hall/CRC; 2020.
2. Davey Smith G, Ebrahim S. 'Mendelian randomization': can genetic epidemiology contribute to understanding environmental determinants of disease? *Int J Epidemiol*. 2003;32(1):1-22.

3. Davey Smith G, Holmes MV, Davies NM, Ebrahim S. Mendel's laws, Mendelian randomization and causal inference in observational data: substantive and nomenclatural issues. *Eur J Epidemiol.* 2020;35(2):99-111.
4. Hernan MA, Alonso A, Logan R, Grodstein F, Michels KB, Willett WC, et al. Observational studies analyzed like randomized experiments: an application to postmenopausal hormone therapy and coronary heart disease. *Epidemiology.* 2008;19(6):766-79.
5. Pearl J. *Causality: Models, Inference and Reasoning.* 2 ed. Cambridge (UK): Cambridge University Press; 2009.
6. Austin PC, Stuart EA. Moving towards best practice when using inverse probability of treatment weighting (IPTW) using the propensity score to estimate causal treatment effects in observational studies. *Stat Med.* 2015;34(28):3661-79.
7. Baum CF, Schaffer ME, Stillman S. Instrumental Variables and GMM: Estimation and Testing. *Stata Journal.* 2003;3(1):30.
8. Davey Smith G. Negative control exposures in epidemiologic studies. *Epidemiology.* 2012;23(2):350-1; author reply 1-2.
9. Lipsitch M, Tchetgen Tchetgen E, Cohen T. Negative controls: a tool for detecting confounding and bias in observational studies. *Epidemiology.* 2010;21(3):383-8.
10. Entner D, Hoyer P, Spirtes P. Data-driven covariate selection for nonparametric estimation of causal effects. In: Carlos MC, Pradeep R, editors. *Proceedings of the Sixteenth International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics; Proceedings of Machine Learning Research: PMLR;* 2013. p. 256--64.
11. Barry C, Liu J, Richmond R, Rutter MK, Lawlor DA, Dudbridge F, et al. Exploiting collider bias to apply two-sample summary data Mendelian randomization methods to one-sample individual level data. *PLoS Genet.* 2021;17(8):e1009703.
12. Victora CG, Barros FC. Cohort profile: the 1982 Pelotas (Brazil) birth cohort study. *Int J Epidemiol.* 2006;35(2):237-42.
13. Horta BL, Gigante DP, Goncalves H, dos Santos Motta J, Loret de Mola C, Oliveira IO, et al. Cohort Profile Update: The 1982 Pelotas (Brazil) Birth Cohort Study. *Int J Epidemiol.* 2015;44(2):441, a-e.
14. Victora CG, Hartwig FP, Vidaletti LP, Martorell R, Osmond C, Richter LM, et al. Effects of early-life poverty on health and human capital in children and adolescents: analyses of national surveys and birth cohort studies in LMICs. *Lancet.* 2022;399(10336):1741-52.
15. Barros AJ, Victora CG, Horta BL, Goncalves HD, Lima RC, Lynch J. Effects of socioeconomic change from birth to early adulthood on height and overweight. *Int J Epidemiol.* 2006;35(5):1233-8.
16. Barros AJ, Victora CG. [A nationwide wealth score based on the 2000 Brazilian demographic census]. *Rev Saude Publica.* 2005;39(4):523-9.
17. Wood AR, Esko T, Yang J, Vedantam S, Pers TH, Gustafsson S, et al. Defining the role of common variation in the genomic and biological architecture of adult human height. *Nat Genet.* 2014;46(11):1173-86.
18. Myers JA, Rassen JA, Gagne JJ, Huybrechts KF, Schneeweiss S, Rothman KJ, et al. Effects of adjusting for instrumental variables on bias and precision of effect estimates. *Am J Epidemiol.* 2011;174(11):1213-22.
19. Ding P, VanderWeele TJ, Robins JM. Instrumental variables as bias amplifiers with general outcome and confounding. *Biometrika.* 2017;104(2):291-302.
20. VanderWeele TJ. Principles of confounder selection. *Eur J Epidemiol.* 2019;34(3):211-9.
21. VanderWeele TJ, Shpitser I. A new criterion for confounder selection. *Biometrics.* 2011;67(4):1406-13.
22. Guo FR, Zhao Q. Confounder Selection via Iterative Graph Expansion. *arXiv.* 2023. Available from: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2309.06053>.

23. Brodeur A, Cook N, Hartley J, Heyes A. Do Pre-Registration and Pre-Analysis Plans Reduce p-Hacking and Publication Bias? SSRN. 2022. Available from: <https://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4180594>.
24. Dirnagl U. Preregistration of exploratory research: Learning from the golden age of discovery. *PLoS Biol.* 2020;18(3):e3000690.
25. Cai J, Zhang N, Zhou X, Spiegelman D, Wang M. Correcting for bias due to mismeasured exposure history in longitudinal studies with continuous outcomes. *Biometrics.* 2023.
26. Keogh RH, White IR. A toolkit for measurement error correction, with a focus on nutritional epidemiology. *Stat Med.* 2014;33(12):2137-55.
27. Perkins NJ, Cole SR, Harel O, Tchetgen Tchetgen EJ, Sun B, Mitchell EM, et al. Principled Approaches to Missing Data in Epidemiologic Studies. *Am J Epidemiol.* 2018;187(3):568-75.
28. Seaman SR, White IR. Review of inverse probability weighting for dealing with missing data. *Stat Methods Med Res.* 2013;22(3):278-95.
29. Sterne JA, White IR, Carlin JB, Spratt M, Royston P, Kenward MG, et al. Multiple imputation for missing data in epidemiological and clinical research: potential and pitfalls. *BMJ.* 2009;338:b2393.
30. Harel O, Mitchell EM, Perkins NJ, Cole SR, Tchetgen Tchetgen EJ, Sun B, et al. Multiple Imputation for Incomplete Data in Epidemiologic Studies. *Am J Epidemiol.* 2018;187(3):576-84.
31. Lawlor DA, Tilling K, Davey Smith G. Triangulation in aetiological epidemiology. *Int J Epidemiol.* 2016;45(6):1866-86.

FIGURE

Figure 1. Directed acyclic graphs illustrating scenarios 1 (panel a) and 2 (panel b) of the simulation study. X , Y , U and C_1 , C_2 and C_3 respectively denote the exposure, outcome, unmeasured confounder and three covariates.



Since all covariates were simulated the same way (see supplementary section 4 for details), the varying number of covariates in Table 1 were obtained by defining the adjustment set (A) as follows: $A = \emptyset$ (for no covariate); $A = C_1$ (for one covariate); $A = \{C_1, C_2\}$ (for two covariates); and $A = \{C_1, C_2, C_3\}$ (for three covariates).

TABLES

Table 1. Number of simulated datasets (and row proportions) with a given number of covariates (all associated^A with the exposure conditional on all other covariates) and a given number of covariates not associated^B with the outcome conditional on the exposure and all other covariates. These results are restricted to simulated datasets where the absolute bias of the linear regression coefficient of the outcome on the exposure was larger than 0.2.

Scenario	Sample size	# covariates ^C	# covariates conditionally unassociated with Y			
			0	1	2	3
1	500 (44031) ^D	1	65.0	35.0	-	-
		2	57.4	29.5	13.1	-
		3	53.9	29.5	11.2	5.4
	1000 (43751) ^D	1	75.5	24.5	-	-
		2	67.9	25.3	6.8	-
		3	64.9	25.3	7.5	2.3
	5000 (43336) ^D	1	89.7	10.3	-	-
		2	84.8	14.1	1.1	-
		3	83.8	14.1	1.9	0.2
20,000 (43281) ^D	1	95.2	4.8	-	-	
	2	92.3	7.4	0.3	-	
	3	92.1	7.4	0.5	0.0	
2	500 (50864) ^D	1	86.8	13.2	-	-
		2	78.7	19.5	1.8	-
		3	77.8	19.5	2.6	0.1
	1000 (49411) ^D	1	90.6	9.4	-	-
		2	84.4	14.7	0.9	-
		3	84.1	14.7	1.2	0.0
	5000 (48233) ^D	1	96.1	3.9	-	-
		2	93.1	6.7	0.2	-
		3	93.1	6.7	0.2	0.0
	20,000 (47878) ^D	1	97.9	2.1	-	-
		2	96.6	3.4	0.0	-
		3	96.6	3.4	0.0	0.0

^ABy associated, we mean that the corresponding coefficients of a linear regression of the exposure on the covariates achieved $P < 5\%$.

^BBy not associated, we mean that the corresponding coefficients of a linear regression of the outcome on the exposure and covariates achieved $P \geq 5\%$.

^CThe number of covariates in the analysis was varied by selecting different measured covariates into the adjustment set. See Figure 1 for details.

^DNumber of datasets with the desired level of bias in the exposure-outcome association.

Table 2. Association of early-life factors with length-for-age Z scores at age 2 years and with intelligence quotient at age 30 years in the 1982 Pelotas Birth Cohort (n=2562^a). Results are standardized linear regression coefficients (95% confidence intervals) and P-values.

Independent variable	Model 1 - LAZ	Model 2 - IQ	Model 3 - IQ	Model 4 - IQ
Length-for-age (LAZ)	-	P=1.9×10 ⁻¹³	P=5.1×10 ⁻⁴²	-
	-	0.15 (0.11; 0.20)	0.30 (0.26; 0.35)	-
SEP at birth	P=9.9×10 ⁻⁶	P=2.7×10 ⁻⁹	-	-
	0.11 (0.06; 0.15)	0.15 (0.10; 0.20)	-	-
Maternal schooling	P=6×10 ⁻⁴	P=5×10 ⁻¹⁹	-	-
	0.08 (0.03; 0.12)	0.21 (0.17; 0.26)	-	-
Asset index	P=1.2×10 ⁻¹⁴	P=2.1×10 ⁻¹⁶	-	-
	0.15 (0.11; 0.19)	0.17 (0.13; 0.21)	-	-
Maternal age	P=0.6219	P=0.8050	P=0.0012	-
	-0.01 (-0.04; 0.02)	0.00 (-0.04; 0.03)	0.06 (0.02; 0.10)	-
Maternal height	P=1.3×10 ⁻³³	P=0.2673	P=0.0064	P=0.0253
	0.22 (0.18; 0.26)	-0.02 (-0.06; 0.02)	0.06 (0.02; 0.10)	0.05 (0.01; 0.09)
Genetic score	P=1.3×10 ⁻²⁴	P=0.2821	P=0.0032	P=0.017
	0.17 (0.14; 0.21)	-0.02 (-0.06; 0.02)	-0.06 (-0.10; -0.02)	-0.05 (-0.09; -0.01)
Sex	P=6.9×10 ⁻⁷	P=0.0003	P=0.0005	-
	0.08 (0.05; 0.11)	-0.06 (-0.10; -0.03)	-0.07 (-0.10; -0.03)	-
Birthweight	P=1.7×10 ⁻⁵⁸	P=0.2814	P=0.8271	P=0.2890
	0.27 (0.24; 0.31)	0.02 (-0.02; 0.06)	0.00 (-0.04; 0.04)	0.02 (-0.02; 0.06)

Model 1: regression of length-for-age Z scores (LAZ) on all covariates simultaneously. Covariates associated with LAZ satisfy condition (i) described in section 3.

Model 2: regression of IQ on LAZ and all covariates simultaneously. Covariates not associated with IQ satisfy condition (ii) described in section 3.

Model 3: regression of IQ on LAZ and all covariates (except socioeconomic covariates) simultaneously. This is a sensitivity analysis to assess the plausibility of faithfulness (see section 5 for details).

Model 4: for each tested covariate, regression of IQ on LAZ and the selected covariate only. This is a sensitivity analysis to assess the plausibility of faithfulness (see section 5 for details).

SEP: Socioeconomic position.

^aAll analyses were restricted to those with available data for length-for-age Z scores, intelligence quotient and the remaining variables.

Supplementary material for “Empirically assessing the plausibility of unconfoundedness in observational studies” by Hartwig FP, Tilling K and Davey Smith G

Summary

1. Intuition for the proposed method	2
2. Theorem 1	3
3. Unconfoundedness assessment of time-varying exposures and in mediation analysis	6
4. Simulation study	6
5. Power calculations.....	10
6. Assessing unconfoundedness in the presence of measurement error	11
7. Comparison to previous methods	13
8. Covariate selection methods.....	17
9. References.....	18
10. Supplementary Table.....	19
11. Supplementary Figures.....	20

1. Intuition for the proposed method

For an intuitive understanding of the method, consider the example in Supplementary Figure 1a. Initially suppose that $A = C$. Now consider two possibilities within this scenario: (i) $U = \emptyset$ (i.e., there are no unmeasured confounders) and (ii) $U \neq \emptyset$ (i.e., there are unmeasured confounders). The goal is to use the measured variables (Z, X, A and Y) to check which possibility (i or ii) is correct. One possibility is to test the association of Z and Y conditional on X and A . In this case, the only open path between Z and Y would be the $Z \rightarrow \boxed{X} \leftarrow U \rightarrow Y$ (this is because the path $Z \rightarrow \boxed{X} \rightarrow Y$ is blocked by conditioning on X and the path $Z \rightarrow \boxed{X} \leftarrow C \rightarrow Y$ is blocked by conditioning on $C = A$). Therefore, Z and Y would be conditionally d-connected if $U \neq \emptyset$ and d-separated if $U = \emptyset$. By Assumption 5, conditional associations between Z and Y could therefore be used as a test to check if A is a valid adjustment set in this situation. Note that the same conclusions applies if Z is not a cause of X (Supplementary Figure 1b).

This simple example illustrates the role of Assumptions 1-5 (Supplementary Figure 1c-f contains examples of violations of Assumptions 1-4). Notice that a variable associated with X given A was used to assess if A is a valid adjustment set. By Assumptions 3 and 4, paths of the form $X \rightarrow Z$ and $X \rightarrow \boxed{V} \leftarrow Z$ cannot occur. Therefore, any dependency between Z and X implies that there are one or more open (given A) paths between Z and X with an arrow pointing at X . This in turn implies that there are paths between Z and U (as well as all other causes of X) where X is a collider. Therefore, by conditioning on X , any path between Z and Y of the form $Z \rightarrow \boxed{X} \rightarrow Y$ (or $Z \leftarrow V \rightarrow \boxed{X} \rightarrow Y$) is blocked, and any path of path of the form $Z \rightarrow \boxed{X} \leftarrow U \rightarrow Y$ is open. Therefore, if there are unmeasured confounders, d- Z and Y will be d-connected given X . Given Assumption 5, this implies that conditional (on X) association (or lack thereof) between Z and Y provides information about unmeasured confounders. Assumption 2 is required for the path between Z and Y mediated by X to be fully blocked by conditioning on X . Otherwise, even in the absence of confounding, Z and Y may be dependent. Assumption 1 is required because, if $Y \rightarrow X$, then causes of Y would be associated with Y given C even in the absence of confounding. Finally, Assumption 5 is required to ensure that d-connection implies association. This is important to avoid scenarios, for example, where there are unmeasured confounders such that Z and Y are d-connected given X , but Z and Y are not associated due to some form of cancellation due to multiple open paths.

Notice, however, that Assumptions 1-5 are compatible with multiple causal structures. For example, in Supplementary Figure 1g, all the arguments above apply and the evidence against no association between Z and Y conditional on X can be used to test if A is a valid adjustment set: if $A = C$, then Z and Y are unassociated conditional on X and A ; otherwise, Z and Y would be associated via $Z \rightarrow C \rightarrow Y$ and $Z \rightarrow \boxed{X} \leftarrow C \rightarrow Y$. This is also true in Supplementary Figure 1h; indeed, in this case $A = C$ would be clearly an invalid adjustment set since Z would itself be a confounder.

In all examples discussed so far, Z can be used to assess whether $A = C$ is a valid adjustment set. However, there are also examples where this fails. Consider the situation illustrated in Supplementary Figure 1i. Notice that C is a valid adjustment set because the only other backdoor path between X and Y is blocked at Z . However, Z and Y would be d-connected given X and C . So, even though C is a valid adjustment set, Z and Y would be conditionally associated, unlike the examples discussed above.

The above limitations can be solved in at least two ways. The simplest one is to include the additional assumption that Z causes X . An alternative solution, which does not require

additional assumptions, requires modifying the perspective presented above. Notice that, so far, all examples discussed assessing the validity of A for confounding adjustment using an element outside the adjustment set, which we denoted by Z . However, now consider the case where $Z \in A$ (i.e., Z is one of the covariates in the candidate adjustment). That is, the idea is now to use one or more elements in the adjustment set (instead of elements outside of the adjustment set) to assess the validity of the adjustment set (which now includes Z).

It is clear that $A = \{C \cup Z\}$ is a valid, but not minimal, adjustment set in Supplementary Figure 1a,b,g,h,i. This is because Z can only be associated with Y via X (after conditioning on C) and C itself is a valid adjustment set. Moreover, the problem illustrated in Supplementary Figure 1i no longer exists, since in this case $A = \{C \cup Z\}$ is an invalid adjustment set (because conditioning on Z opens a backdoor path between X and Y) and Z and Y are d-connected given X and C . The downside would be in situations like Supplementary Figure 1h, where A is a valid adjustment set but Z is nevertheless associated with Y given X and C . This indicates that, if $A = \{C \cup Z\}$, then conditional association between Z and Y does not necessarily imply that A is an invalid adjustment set.

2. Theorem 1

We now state a formal version of our main result, which is described rather informally in section 3 in the main text.

Theorem 1: Let $Z = \{Z_j\}_{j=1}^J$ denote a non-empty subset of A which satisfies the following condition: Z_j and X are dependent conditional on $A_j^* = \{A \cap Z_j^C\}$ (where Z_j^C is the complement of Z_j) for all $j = 1, \dots, J$. If Z_j and Y are dependent conditional on $\{A_j^* \cup X\}$ for all $j = 1, \dots, J$, then A is either an invalid or a minimally sufficient adjustment set in the following sense: for all $j = 1, \dots, J$, given adjustment for A_j^* , there will be no confounding if and only if Z_j is additionally adjusted for. Otherwise – that is, if Z_j and Y are independent conditional on $\{A_j^* \cup X\}$ for at least one $j \in \{1, \dots, J\}$, then A is a valid (but non-minimal) adjustment set, and A_j^* is also a valid (possibly, but not necessarily, minimal) adjustment set.

To prove Theorem 1, we first define the following lemmas:

Lemma 1: Dependence between Z_j and X conditional on A_j^* implies there is at least one open (given A_j^*) path between Z_j and X that is directed into X (i.e., of the form $Z_j \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow X$ or $Z_j \leftarrow \dots \rightarrow X$).

Proof of Lemma 1: the existence of at least one open path follows from the notion that d-connection is required for dependence. Paths of the form $Z_j \rightarrow \dots \leftarrow X$ or $Z_j \leftarrow \dots \leftarrow X$. can only be conditionally open if they contain a collider than is being conditioned on (this is true even for the second path, because Z_j is not caused by X by Assumption 3). However, neither A nor S are caused by X (Assumptions 3 and 4, respectively), so it is not possible that these paths contain A or S as colliders. Since no other variable is being conditioned on, these paths are closed. Therefore, it must be the case that there is at least one conditionally open path between Z_j and X that is directed into X .

Lemma 2: Z_j and Y can only be d-connected conditional on $\{A_j^* \cup X\}$ through paths that do not include X as a non-collider (i.e., paths that either include X as a collider or do not include X at all).

Proof of Lemma 2: from Assumption 2, X is measured without error. So, conditioning on X blocks all paths where X is a non-collider.

Corollary 1: Z_j and Y can only be d-connected conditional on $\{A_j^* \cup X\}$ through paths of the following form:

- 1: $Z_j \rightarrow \overset{\dots}{(a1)} \rightarrow \boxed{X} \leftarrow \overset{\dots}{(b1)} \rightarrow Y$.
- 2: $Z_j \rightarrow \overset{\dots}{(a1)} \rightarrow \boxed{X} \leftarrow \overset{\dots}{(b2)} \leftarrow Y$.
- 3: $Z_j \leftarrow \overset{\dots}{(a2)} \rightarrow \boxed{X} \leftarrow \overset{\dots}{(b1)} \rightarrow Y$.
- 4: $Z_j \leftarrow \overset{\dots}{(a2)} \rightarrow \boxed{X} \leftarrow \overset{\dots}{(b2)} \leftarrow Y$.
- 5: $Y \leftarrow \overset{\dots}{(c1)} \leftarrow Z_j \rightarrow \overset{\dots}{(a1)} \rightarrow \boxed{X}$
- 6: $Y \leftarrow \overset{\dots}{(c1)} \leftarrow Z_j \leftarrow \overset{\dots}{(a2)} \rightarrow \boxed{X}$
- 7: $Y \leftarrow \overset{\dots}{(c2)} \rightarrow Z_j \rightarrow \overset{\dots}{(a1)} \rightarrow \boxed{X}$
- 8: $Y \leftarrow \overset{\dots}{(c2)} \rightarrow Z_j \leftarrow \overset{\dots}{(a2)} \rightarrow \boxed{X}$
- 9: $Y \rightarrow \overset{\dots}{(c3)} \rightarrow Z_j \rightarrow \overset{\dots}{(a1)} \rightarrow \boxed{X}$
- 10: $Y \rightarrow \overset{\dots}{(c3)} \rightarrow Z_j \leftarrow \overset{\dots}{(a2)} \rightarrow \boxed{X}$
- 11: $Y \rightarrow \overset{\dots}{(c4)} \leftarrow Z_j \rightarrow \overset{\dots}{(a1)} \rightarrow \boxed{X}$
- 12: $Y \rightarrow \overset{\dots}{(c4)} \leftarrow Z_j \leftarrow \overset{\dots}{(a2)} \rightarrow \boxed{X}$

Corollary 2: Z_j and X may be d-connected conditional on A_j^* through paths including Y :

- 13: $Z_j \rightarrow \overset{\dots}{(c1)} \rightarrow Y \leftarrow \overset{\dots}{(b1)} \rightarrow X$
- 14: $Z_j \rightarrow \overset{\dots}{(c1)} \rightarrow Y \rightarrow \overset{\dots}{(b2)} \rightarrow X$
- 15: $Z_j \leftarrow \overset{\dots}{(c2)} \rightarrow Y \leftarrow \overset{\dots}{(b1)} \rightarrow X$
- 16: $Z_j \leftarrow \overset{\dots}{(c2)} \rightarrow Y \rightarrow \overset{\dots}{(b2)} \rightarrow X$
- 17: $Z_j \leftarrow \overset{\dots}{(c3)} \leftarrow Y \leftarrow \overset{\dots}{(b1)} \rightarrow X$
- 18: $Z_j \leftarrow \overset{\dots}{(c3)} \leftarrow Y \rightarrow \overset{\dots}{(b2)} \rightarrow X$
- 19: $Z_j \rightarrow \overset{\dots}{(c4)} \leftarrow Y \leftarrow \overset{\dots}{(b1)} \rightarrow X$
- 20: $Z_j \rightarrow \overset{\dots}{(c4)} \leftarrow Y \rightarrow \overset{\dots}{(b2)} \rightarrow X$

Paths 13-20 can be obtained by combining segments (b) and (c) above. The fact that paths 13-20 are directed into X follows from Lemma 1. Nevertheless, for clarity, we note that paths directed from X are not allowed because they must be causal paths (i.e., paths that explain the causal effect of X on Y), because paths of other forms would only be open if they contained A_j^* or S as a collider, which is not the case given Assumptions 3 and 4. However, for the paths to be open at Y , either Y is a collider (as in paths 13 or 15), but it causes either A or S , which is not allowed if X causes Y (but allowed if X does not cause Y) because this would imply that X causes such nodes; or Y is a non-collider and the path between Y and Z_j is open, which can only happen if Y causes Z_j (which would imply X causes Z_j , which is not the case given Assumption 3 if X causes Y) or the path contains A or S as a collider (which would imply X causes A or S , which is not the case given Assumptions 3 and 4 if X causes Y).

We now start the proof of Theorem 1 with the second part of the theorem (i.e., the claim that conditional d-separation of Z_j and Y implies that A is a valid adjustment set).

First consider paths 1-4, where the path between Z_j and Y include X (as a collider, which is the only possibility given our assumptions). Segment (a) denotes paths between Z_j and X that do not include Y , and segment (b) denotes backdoor paths between X and Y that do not include Z_j . In all cases, if the path between X and Y is open given $\{A_j^* \cup X\}$, then Z_j and Y will be conditionally d-connected. This is because the path between Z_j and X is open (by assumption) and X is a collider. So, for Z_j and Y to be conditionally d-separated, conditioning on A_j^* must be sufficient to block the paths between Z_j and Y – i.e., to block all backdoor paths between X and Y that do not include Z_j .

Now consider paths 5-12, which denote backdoor paths between X and Y that include Z_j . Segment (c) denotes paths between Z_j and Y that do not include X . First, consider all paths where Z_j is not a collider (paths 5, 6, 7, 9, 11 and 12). If segment (c) is open given A_j^* (although the conditioning set also includes X , such inclusion is not relevant because the path does not contain X), then Z_j and Y will be conditionally d-connected. So, for Z_j and Y to be conditionally d-separated, conditioning on A_j^* must be sufficient to block segments (c) – i.e., to block all backdoor paths between X and Y that include Z_j .

Paths 8 and 10 denote backdoor paths between X and Y that include Z_j as a collider and are therefore blocked at Z_j . In this case, even though A_j^* is a valid adjustment set (assuming it blocks all other backdoor paths considered above), Z_j and Y_j are d-connected given A_j^* . Although this may at first seem misleading, this is actually the correct result, because the candidate adjustment set is A , not A_j^* . Since $Z_j \in A$, A is not a valid adjustment set (because conditioning on A requires conditioning on Z_j , which would open the backdoor path at Z_j) unless conditioning on A_j^* also blocks segment (c) in paths 8 and 10.

Finally, we consider the case where the implication of Lemma 1 is satisfied by a path between Z_j and X that include Y (paths 13-20). For Z_j and X to be d-connected conditional on A_j^* through such paths, both segments (b) and (c) must be conditionally open. For paths 13 and 15, this also requires that Y affects either A_j^* or S , which is possible given our assumptions if X does not cause Y . So, for Z_j and Y to be conditionally d-separated, conditioning on A_j^* must be sufficient to block segment (c). Notice that, if only segment (c), but not segment (b), is blocked, there will be a backdoor path between X and Y . But this would not lead to a wrong conclusion, because in this case Z_j and X will also be conditionally d-separated, and Theorem 1 requirements would indicate that such Z_j cannot be used for the proposed test.

Therefore, for Z_j and Y to be d-separated conditional on $\{A_j^* \cup X\}$, conditioning on A_j^* must be sufficient to block all backdoor paths between X and Y , whether or not such paths include Z_j . In this case, A (and, indeed, A_j^*) would be a valid adjustment set. Of note, since this argument applies to any Z_j , if at least one Z_j satisfies the above conditions, A would be a valid adjustment set. This proves the second part of Theorem 1.

The first part of Theorem 1, with regards to A being an invalid adjustment set, follows from the arguments above. If A_j^* does not block segment (b), then Z_j and Y are conditionally d-connected (paths 1-4) and A is not a valid adjustment set because such backdoor paths would also not be blocked by additionally conditioning on Z_j . However, it is possible that conditioning on A_j^* blocks segment (b) in paths 5, 6, 7, 9, 11 and 12, but not in paths 8 and 10. If paths 8 and 10 do not exist, then A is a valid adjustment set, because conditioning on Z_j would block the other paths. In this case, Z_j and Y would be conditionally d-connected even though A is a valid adjustment

set. In this situation, A is minimally sufficient in the sense that neither Z_j nor A_j^* individually are valid adjustment sets. One example of this is when A is a valid adjustment, but no proper subset of A is a valid adjustment set. Regarding paths 12-20, if A_j^* does not block segment (b), then Z_j and Y will be d-connected (otherwise, Z_j and X would be d-separated and such Z_j would not satisfy the requirements of Theorem 1). This proves the first part of Theorem 1, thus concluding the proof.

As mentioned above, one limitation of the proposed approach is that, if Z_j and Y are dependent conditional on $\{A_j^* \cup X\}$ for all $j \in \{1, \dots, J\}$, it is unclear whether A is a valid adjustment set or not. However, if Z_j is known to be exogenous, then conditional d-connected between Z_j and Y implies A_j^* is an invalid adjustment set. This is because, if Z_j is exogenous, then paths 8 and 10 do not exist, thus eliminating the possibility that conditioning on Z_j introduces bias.

3. Unconfoundedness assessment of time-varying exposures and in mediation analysis

Before discussing how to apply the method for exposure protocols involving multiple time points, we consider the meaning of Assumption 1 in the case where only a single measure of a time-varying exposure is of interest (as in the main text), both X and Y are time-varying and one may cause the other. In this case, measurement timing must be carefully considered. For example, let X_t and $Y_{t'}$ represent the exposure and outcome variables measured at times t and t' . If $t < t'$, then $Y_{t'}$ cannot be a cause of X_t , even though the set $\{Y_1, Y_2, \dots, Y_{t'}\}$ may contain causes of X_t . In this case, such members of this set may be confounders of the effect of X_t on $Y_{t'}$. This is different to the situation where $t = t'$, where both $X_t \rightarrow Y_{t'}$ and $Y_{t'} \rightarrow X_t$ are possible.

We now discuss how to apply the method to assess the plausibility of unconfoundedness when estimating the effect of exposure protocols over time. Let $t \in \{0, 1, \dots, T\}$ index the time, and $Y = Y_{T+1}$ (to ensure Assumption 1 holds). So, for each t , we have the exposure X_t and the candidate adjustment set A_t (of note, A_t may contain $X_{t'}$ and elements from $A_{t'}$, for all $t' < t$). Then, if assumptions 1-5 hold for all t , the test can be applied for each X_t to assess conditional exchangeability. If the latter hold for all X_t , then sequential exchangeability holds and it is therefore possible to estimate the causal effect of exposure protocols involving multiple time points.¹ Similarly, our results can be applied to mediation analysis. Suppose we have an exposure measured at time $t = 0$ and a mediator M measured at time $t = 1$. Then, A_0 denotes the candidate set for adjusting exposure-mediator and exposure-outcome confounding (also called base confounders); and A_1 denotes the candidate adjustment set for mediator-outcome confounding (also called post confounders).²

4. Simulation study

As mentioned in the main text (section 4), there were two simulation scenarios:

- Scenario 1: One positive unmeasured confounder; all covariates are instruments.

In the first scenario, we simulate three covariates and one unmeasured confounder (U). A includes some or all covariates, but not U , so A is an invalid adjustment set. All covariates and U have mutually independent standard normal distributions. The effect of each covariate on X was sampled from a uniform distribution ranging from -1 to 1. The effect of U on X was sampled from a uniform distribution ranging from 0 to 1. These effect estimates were re-scaled so that the three covariates and U collectively account for $\rho\%$ (where ρ was sampled from a uniform distribution ranging from 0.05 to 0.95) of the variance in X (the residual variance was generated

by adding a normally distributed error term). Y was simulated similarly, except that only U affects Y .

- Scenario 2: No unmeasured confounding; all covariates are confounders.

In the second scenario, we simulate three covariates, all of which are confounders, and no unmeasured confounder. A includes some or all covariates, so A is an invalid or minimally-sufficient adjustment set. X and Y were simulated as in scenario 1, with the three confounders affecting both X and Y .

The simulations were performed using the R code below:

```
rm(list=ls())

n.z    <- 3    #Number of measured covariates
n.iter <- 1e5 #Number of datasets to be simulated per scenario-
sample size pair

res <- NULL #Object where simulations results will be stored

for(scenario in 1:2) { #Simulation scenarios (described in
"Simulation study" sections in the main text and the supplement)

  for(n in c(500,1000,5000,20000)) { #n: sample size

    count <- 0    #Object to count the number of simulated datasets
until n.iter is achieved

    continue <- T #Object to indicate whether or not more datasets
should be simulated

    while(continue) {

      #####
      # Simulate covariates #
      #####

      z1 <- rnorm(n) #Measured covariate 1
      z2 <- rnorm(n) #Measured covariate 2
      z3 <- rnorm(n) #Measured covariate 3
```

```

u <- rnorm(n) #Unmeasured covariate

z <- cbind(z1,z2,z3)

if(scenario==1) {
  cor.res <- cor(cbind(z,u))

} else if(scenario==2) {
  cor.res <- cor(z)
}

diag(cor.res) <- NA

if(max(abs(cor.res), na.rm=T)>0.05) { next() } #Ensure
covariates are (nearly) uncorrelated

beta.z <- runif(n.z,-1,1)
beta.u <- runif(1,0,1)*as.numeric(scenario==1) #Effect of U
on X

#####
# Simulate exposure (X) #
#####

x <- z%*%beta.z + u*beta.u

r2.x <- runif(1,0.05,0.95) #Simulate the amount of variance
in X collectively explained by the covariates

x <- x/sd(x)*sqrt(r2.x) + rnorm(n,0,sqrt(1-r2.x))

pxm1 <- summary(lm(x~z1))$coef[-1,4] #Situation where
there is one measured covariate

```

```
pxm2 <- summary(lm(x~z1+z2))$coef[-1,4] #Situation where
there are two measured covariates
```

```
pxm3 <- summary(lm(x~z1+z2+z3))$coef[-1,4] #Situation where
there are three measured covariates
```

```
px <- c(pxm1, pxm2, pxm3)
```

```
if(any(px>=0.05)) { next() } #Ensure all measured covariates
meet some criterion to be classified as associated with X
```

```
count <- count + 1
```

```
names(px) <- c('px1m1',
               'px1m2', 'px2m2',
               'px1m3', 'px2m3', 'px2m3')
```

```
#####
```

```
# Simulate outcome (Y) #
```

```
#####
```

```
gamma.z <- runif(n.z, -1, 1) * as.numeric(scenario == 2)
```

```
gamma.u <- runif(1, 0, 1) * as.numeric(scenario == 1) #Effect of
U on Y
```

```
y <- z %*% gamma.z + u * gamma.u
```

```
r2.y <- runif(1, 0.05, 0.95) #Simulate the amount of variance
in Y collectively explained by the covariates
```

```
y <- y / sd(y) * sqrt(r2.y) + rnorm(n, 0, sqrt(1 - r2.y))
```

```
pym1 <- summary(lm(y~x+z1))$coef[-c(1:2), 4] #Situation
where there is one measured covariate
```

```
pym2 <- summary(lm(y~x+z1+z2))$coef[-c(1:2), 4]
#Situation where there are two measured covariates
```

```

    pym3      <-      summary(lm(y~x+z1+z2+z3))$coef[-c(1:2),4]
#Situation where there are three measured covariates

    py <- c(pym1, pym2, pym3)

    names(py) <- c('py1m1',
                  'py1m2','py2m2',
                  'py1m3','py2m3','py2m3')

    bias <- lm(y~x)$coef[2] #Bias of the covariate-unadjusted
linear regression coefficient

    cur.res <- c(scenario=scenario, n=n, px, py, bias=bias)

    res <- rbind(res, cur.res)

    if(count==n.iter) { continue <- F }

    if(count%%1e3==0) { print(paste('Scenario: ', scenario, '.
n: ', n, '. Progress: ', round(100*count/n.iter,1), '%', sep=''))
}
}
}
}

write.table(res, 'Simulation_results.txt', sep='\t', row.names=F)
#Save the results of the simulation study

```

5. Power calculations

In the applied example, the standardized (i.e., expressing standard deviations changes in the outcome associated with a standard deviation increase in the exposure) covariate-adjusted linear regression coefficient of IQ at age 30 years and on length-for-age (LAZ) at age 2 years was 0.15 (95% CI: 0.11; 0.20). Since this is not a negligible point estimate, we attempted to quantify our power to detect residual confounding assuming that there is no causal effect – i.e., the association between exposure and outcome is entirely due to confounding.

The power calculations were performed using simulations. Initially, we regressed LAZ on covariates (see section 5 in the main text for details). This model can be expressed as follows:

$$E[\widehat{\text{LAZ}}|A] = \widehat{\beta}_0 + \sum_i^K \widehat{\beta}_i A_i$$

where A_i denotes the i -th covariate and K denotes the number of covariates.

Let A_1 and A_2 respectively denote maternal height and the genetic score, so their corresponding estimated regression coefficients are $\widehat{\beta}_1$ and $\widehat{\beta}_2$.

We then regressed IQ on LAZ and covariates:

$$E[\text{IQ}|\widehat{\text{LAZ}}, A] = \widehat{\gamma}_0 + \widehat{\gamma}_1 \text{HAZ} + \sum_i^K \widehat{\gamma}_{i+1} A_i$$

For the power calculations, the estimated regression coefficient of LAZ on IQ ($\widehat{\gamma}_1$) was assumed to be entirely due to confounding. Of note, for both regression models above, all variables were standardized to have zero mean and unit variance.

The regression coefficients estimated above were used to inform the power calculations. Each simulated dataset had the same sample size used in the empirical example (2562) and was generated as follows:

$$U \sim N(0,1)$$

$$\text{LAZ}^* = \widehat{\beta}_1 A_1 + \widehat{\beta}_2 A_2 + \sqrt{\widehat{\gamma}_1} U + \varepsilon_{\text{LAZ}}$$

$$\text{IQ}^* = \sqrt{\widehat{\gamma}_1} U + \varepsilon_{\text{IQ}}$$

where $\varepsilon_{\text{LAZ}} \sim N(0, 1 - \text{Var}[\widehat{\beta}_1 A_1 + \widehat{\beta}_2 A_2] - \widehat{\gamma}_1)$ and $\varepsilon_{\text{IQ}} \sim N(0, 1 - \widehat{\gamma}_1)$ are normally distributed error terms chosen so that $\text{Var}[\text{LAZ}^*] = \text{Var}[\text{IQ}^*] = 1$. U , ε_{LAZ} and ε_{IQ} are all mutually independent and independent of A_1 and A_2 .

In the simulated dataset, the exposure-outcome association is entirely due to unmeasured confounding. Therefore, each covariate would be expected to be associated with IQ^* given LAZ^* and the other covariate.

Finally, we regressed IQ^* on LAZ^* , A_1 and A_2 :

$$E[\text{IQ}^*|\widehat{\text{LAZ}}^*, A_1, A_2] = \widehat{\delta}_0 + \widehat{\delta}_1 \text{HAZ}^* + \widehat{\delta}_2 A_1 + \widehat{\delta}_3 A_2$$

We then verified if 95% confidence intervals of either $\widehat{\delta}_2$ or $\widehat{\delta}_3$, as well as both, included the nullity (zero). Such result was obtained for 20,000 simulated datasets, and power estimates were obtained by calculating the proportion of datasets where at least one, as well as both, covariates were associated with the simulated outcome.

6. Assessing unconfoundedness in the presence of measurement error

Measurement error was only explicitly considered in Assumption 2. Therefore, the proposed approach should work when there is measurement error in all other variables. We now discuss why this is the case and provide some guidance on how to properly interpret the approach in the presence of measurement error, including measurement error in the exposure.

The simplest case is measurement error in covariates. For example, suppose all elements in C in Supplementary Figure 2a were measured, but one or more were measured with error (we denote the measured version of variable V as V'). In this case, $A = C'$. Therefore, A refers to

the set of covariates as they were measured, not to their theoretical perfectly measured counterparts. Measured versions of variables can be represented in DAGs as follows: $C \rightarrow C' \leftarrow E_C$, where E_C represents sources of error in C .¹ In Supplementary Figure 2a, Z and Y would be d-connected given X and A even though C is a valid adjustment set. However, this is the correct result because the actual adjustment set is $A = C' \neq C$. Therefore, the proposed approach would correctly classify A as an invalid adjustment set. More generally, it should be noted that Assumptions 1-5 refer to A itself, so whether all elements in A are perfectly measured versions of some set of covariates is irrelevant. This is a desirable property, since in practice interest lies in knowing whether the set of covariates effectively measured is a valid adjustment set.

A similar rationale applies to when the outcome is measured with error. Let G denote the (possibly theoretical) perfect version of the outcome. If the outcome is measured with error, then $Y = G' \neq G$ – that is, Y refers to the actual measure of the outcome. Therefore, the proposed approach can be used to assess whether the measured versions of covariates is a valid adjustment set to test the effect of the exposure (so far assumed to be perfectly measured) on the measured version of the outcome. Notice that this is not a specific limitation of the proposed approach, but rather of having measurement error in the outcome, which prevents estimating associations or causal effect between exposure and outcome, allowing only estimation with regards to the measured version of the outcome.

The discussion above on measurement error did not relax any of Assumptions 1-5, since these do not imply no measurement error in covariates or outcome. We now consider measurement error in X , which would violate Assumption 2. Let T denote the (possibly theoretical) perfect version of the exposure. If the outcome is measured with error, then $X = T' \neq T$ – that is, X refers to the actual measure of the exposure. Therefore, the proposed approach can be used to assess whether the measured versions of covariates is a valid adjustment set to test the effect of the measured version of the exposure on the measured version of the outcome under Assumptions 1-5 applied to A , X and Y as defined in this section. Again, this is not a specific limitation of the proposed approach, but rather of having measurement error.

Even though the question of whether $X = T'$ affects $Y = G'$ is well-defined, the question of scientific interest often relates to T and G . In this case, the association between T' and G' would be used as a proxy for the target research question. However, the proposed approach would not be well-suited for this type of application. This is illustrated in Supplementary Figure 2b (notice that Assumptions 1, 3 and 4 are satisfied), where X and Y are d-connected if T causes G , but d-separated otherwise. That is, d-connection between X and Y is informative of the presence of a causal effect of T on G . If T does not cause G , then Z and Y are d-separated given X and C , as expected since there is no confounding. However, if T causes G , then Z and Y are d-connected given X and C because conditioning on X would not in general fully block the path $Z \rightarrow T \rightarrow G \rightarrow Y$. Strictly speaking, this is the correct result, because $T \notin A$ is a confounder of X and Y . However, such confounding by T is what allows using the association between X and Y as a proxy for the association between T and G . Therefore, from a practical perspective, it might have been desirable that the proposed approach did not detect this specific form of confounding.

In conclusion, if Assumption 2 is unlikely to hold, then there is another source of ambiguity in Theorem 1 (which would also apply to Theorem 2). If Assumption 2 is not maintained, then if there is at least one covariate that is associated with X given all other covariates and associated with Y given X and all other covariates, then measured covariates are a valid adjustment set and either (i) the exposure is well-measured; or (ii) the exposure is measured with error, but T does

not cause G . Notice that this situation is still indicative of A being a valid adjustment set. However, if all covariates that are associated with X given all other covariates are also associated with Y given X and all other covariates, then either (i) A is not a valid adjustment set; (ii) A is a minimally sufficient adjustment set; or (iii) X is a missmeasured version of T and T causes G . Notice that this scenario was already ambiguous, and it remained so. Indeed, whether it is desirable that (iii) is a possible source of conditional association between Z and Y is debatable. Indeed, one could argue that since the association between X and Y would be biased for the causal effect of T on G even in the absence of confounding between T and G , then it may actually be desirable that this is detected by the proposed approach.

7. Comparison to previous methods

Pearl³ describes several tests for confounding detection and explains their limitations. We now compare such tests with our proposed test to highlight advantages and disadvantages of each.

In his Definition 6.2.2, Pearl describes the following criterion: X and Y are classified as unconfounded if each member M of V (where V denotes the set of variables in the problem that are not affected by X) satisfies at least one of the following conditions: M is not associated with X (condition 1 – C_1); M is not associated with Y conditional on X (C_2). Otherwise (i.e., if any M in V violates both conditions), X and Y are classified as confounded. Of note, M , V , C_1 and C_2 respectively correspond to Z , T , U_1 and U_2 in Pearl's notation.

Using Pearl's terminology, a criterion for no-confounding is necessary if it is always correct when classifying X and Y as confounded, and sufficient if it is always correct when classifying X and Y as unconfounded. Pearl correctly describes that the criterion described above fails with respect to both properties. We now briefly describe how such failures can happen (an in-depth discussion is available elsewhere).³

Failure with respect to sufficient can happen via:

- **Marginality:** the associational criterion above tests each element of V individually, but it could be the case that two factors jointly confound X and Y while each factor separately satisfies the condition for no confounding (i.e., each factor satisfies either C_1 or C_2). In this case, the criterion would incorrectly classify X and Y as unconfounded.
- **Closed-world assumptions:** the associational criterion classifies X and Y as unconfounded if all M in V satisfy either C_1 or C_2 . However, it is possible that V does not contain some confounders. So, unless V contains all possible confounders (i.e., the closed-world assumption holds), X and Y can be confounded even though no M in V violate both conditions. Since this assumption is impossible to verify, Pearl argues that any confounding test will be insufficient.

Failure with respect to necessity can happen via:

- **Barren proxies:** M can be a collider on a backdoor path between X and Y , but nevertheless be associated with both X and Y (as Z_j in path 8, or example). For example, consider a DAG which has a single path: $X \leftarrow U_1 \rightarrow M \leftarrow U_2 \rightarrow Y$ (U_1 and U_2 are unmeasured). In this case, M violates both C_1 and C_2 , but X and Y are not confounded.
- **Incidental cancellations:** it is possible, for example, that M and U (unmeasured) are causes of X and Y , but their effects end up cancelling so that there is no net confounding. So, M would violate both C_1 and C_2 even though X and Y are not confounded.

Pearl also describes a modified associational criterion (Definition 6.3.2) which excludes barren proxies from V by assumption. However, the remaining limitations still apply.

Finally, Pearl proposes an operational test for stable no-confounding (Theorem 6.4.4). By stable no-confounding, it is meant that X and Y are structurally unconfounded (that is, X and Y are unconfounded regardless of the parameterization of the topological structure of the true causal model underlying the data). Of note, this is the same form of confounding our approach aims at detecting. Pearl's test is the following: let M be a variable that is unaffected by X but may possibly affect Y . If Z violates both C_1 and C_2 , then X and Y are not stable unconfounded.

Pearl's test solves the failures with respect to necessity by focusing on stable confounding and by assuming that M is not a barren proxy. Given the impossibility of ensuring the closed-world assumption holds (and therefore of sufficiency), Pearl's test focuses on detecting confoundedness – that is, if M satisfies either C_1 or C_2 , it is not necessarily the case that X and Y are stable unconfounded. Therefore, Pearl's test is not affected by insufficiency in the sense that it does not attempt to classify a case as unconfounded.

The last sentence above is the first important limitation of Pearl's test. That is, while it can be very useful for rejecting a given candidate adjustment set as sufficient for confounding adjustment, it can never provide positive evidence supporting that the candidate adjustment set is valid. In practice, researchers are of course interested in knowing whether their candidate adjustment set is wrong, but the key interest is in finding a valid candidate adjustment set, which would allow valid causal inferences.

We now describe how our proposed approach deals with the limitations of previous associational criteria and Pearl's operational test. Lack of sufficiency via marginality is not possible under faithfulness. To illustrate this, we use Pearl's example involving two members of V : $M_1 \sim \text{Benoulli}(0.5)$ and $M_2 \sim \text{Benoulli}(0.5)$, and M_1 and M_2 are independent. Then, $X = \mathbb{1}(M_1 = M_2)$ (where $\mathbb{1}$ denotes the indicator function) and $Y = \mathbb{1}(M_1 \neq M_2)$. In this example, X and Y are perfectly negatively correlated due to confounding, but M_1 and M_2 are not individually associated with X or Y . One can note that this example is a specific parametrization of the model $X \sim \text{Benoulli}(p_X)$ and $Y \sim \text{Benoulli}(p_Y)$, where $p_X = \beta_0 + \beta_1 M_1 + \beta_2 M_2 + \beta_3 M_1 M_2$ (where $(\beta_0, \beta_1, \beta_2, \beta_3) \in \mathbb{R}^4: p_X \in [0,1]$) and $p_Y = \gamma_0 + \gamma_1 M_1 + \gamma_2 M_2 + \gamma_3 M_1 M_2$ (where $(\gamma_0, \gamma_1, \gamma_2, \gamma_3) \in \mathbb{R}^4: p_Y \in [0,1]$). In the example, $\beta_0 = \gamma_1 = \gamma_2 = 1$, $\beta_1 = \beta_2 = -1$, $\beta_3 = 2$, $\gamma_0 = 0$ and $\gamma_3 = -2$. Under this specific choice of parameters values, indeed there is no association of M_1 or M_2 with X or Y . However, the overwhelming majority of possible values for these parameters would not result in lack of association.

The second possible mechanism for sufficiency violation is the closed-world assumption, which can never be guaranteed to hold. Our approach is not subject to this limitation because we only consider for the test members of A that are conditionally d-connected with X through a path directed into X . This, in combination with faithfulness, implies that any conditionally open path between X and Y directed into X will result in an open path between the member of A and Y (see section 1 above for details). Therefore, one does not need to know in advance whether A contains all possible confounders.

Regarding necessity, faithfulness implies that incidental cancellations are not possible, but this is not particularly relevant to us since, as Pearl, we are interested in stable unbiasedness. Moreover, our approach does not require assuming that Z_j is not a barren proxy. This is because we are assessing whether A (which includes Z_j) is a valid adjustment set (see section 1 above

for details). To understand the importance of this feature of our test, consider Pearl’s interpretation of the requirement that M may possibly affect Y : in Pearl’s view, such requirement implies the graph should not assume that such relationship does not exist – therefore, a directed path from M to Y must be included. Although there is nothing wrong with this interpretation, it is not a neutral one: it does imply that, under one or more combinations of values of parents of Y (which may or may not exist in the study population), changing the value of M through an intervention changes the value of Y . This reveals the difficulty of knowing in practice whether M may possibly affect Y in Pearl’s sense: to not be willing to assume that X does not cause Y (in the sense that one does not know whether such causal effect exists or not) is different than assuming that M causes Y under some combination of values of parents of Y .

In practice, we believe that the most common situation is that researchers are not willing to make assumptions on either side. So, we employ the following weaker interpretation of “ M may possibly affect Y ”, which we believe to be more natural than Pearl’s: while acknowledging that M causing Y as a possibility, one is also not willing to assume that M causes Y under some conditions – in other words, the researchers wants to refrain from making causal assumptions regarding the relationship between M and Y . In this case, we should consider all scenarios compatible with a situation where we do not know whether M affects Y (i.e., scenarios with and without an arrow from M to Y). Under this interpretation, M is not guaranteed to not be a barren proxy, in which case Pearl’s method may fail (because one of its requirements is violated) with respect to necessity.

So, in essence, ours and Pearl’s tests have different assumptions: our test assumes faithfulness and make no assumptions on barren proxies; while Pearl’s test assumes M is not a barren proxy and does not require faithfulness. As a result, our test is sufficient but not necessary; and Pearl’s test is necessary but not sufficient. However, a key difference is that, if we assume Z_j is not a barren proxy, then our test is necessary when classifying A_j^* as an invalid adjustment set (like Pearl’s test, which makes no statement on whether M is a valid adjustment set). However, if we supplement Pearl’s test with faithfulness, the test does not become sufficient, because M not violating C_1 or C_2 would not necessarily mean X and Y is unconfounded: for example, in a DAG having only the paths $M \rightarrow Y$ and $X \leftarrow U \rightarrow Y$ (where U is unmeasured), M would not violate C_1 even though there is confounding. Of note, such lack of sufficiency even under faithfulness is not surprising since the test was not formulated to provide positive evidence in support of unconfoundedness.

Another approach with substantial overlap with ours is the covariate selection method described by Entner and colleagues⁴. They describe two rules and show that, if one of them is satisfied, then the set of covariates being considered is a valid adjustment set. As in our paper, they assume it is known that X does not cause any element of V , Y is not a cause of X , and faithfulness. It is also assumed there is no selection whatsoever, which is much stronger than our assumption regarding selection (see Assumption 4 in section 2 in the main text).

To describe the rules, let V be the set from which covariates for confounding adjustment are going to be selected. Moreover, let $W \in V$ (i.e., w is one of the variables belonging to V), $K \subseteq V$ (i.e., K is any subset of variables belonging to V) $D \subseteq V \cap W^C$ (i.e., D is a subset of variables belonging to V which does not include W). We can now define the two rules:

- Rule 1 states that, if there exists a w and a D such that (i) W and Y conditionally associated given D and (ii) W and Y conditionally independent given D and X , then X causes Y and D is a valid adjustment set.

- Rule 2 comprises the following conditions: (i) X and Y are conditionally independent given K , (ii) W and X are conditionally dependent given D and (iii) W and Y are conditionally independent D . If either (i) or both (ii) and (iii) are satisfied some K or W - D pair, then X does not cause Y .

Under the assumptions outlined in section 2 in the main text, whenever our method classifies $A = \{Z, C\}$ as a valid adjustment set, Entner and colleagues' method will provide equivalent results. To see this, note that, under our assumptions, whenever A is classified as a valid adjustment (which would also imply C is a valid adjustment set, as discussed in section 2 in the supplement) set by our method, the following conditions hold: (a) there is at least one open path (conditional on C) between Z and X that points into X , and no conditionally open paths that do not point into X ; (b) Z and Y are conditionally independent given C and X (this is the result that, according to Theorem 1, implies that A is a valid adjustment set). If X causes Y , then (a) would imply that Z and Y are d-connected given C , because there is an open path between Z and Y through X . Under faithfulness, this would imply that condition (i) of rule 1 is satisfied. Since condition (ii) of rule 1 is the same as (b), and the latter is satisfied whenever our method classifies A (and therefore C) as a valid adjustment set, then condition (ii) our rule 1 is trivially also satisfied in this situation. Therefore, if X causes Y , whenever our method classified A and C as valid adjustment sets, rule 1 would be satisfied and C would be classified as a valid adjustment set.

Now consider the case where X does not cause Y . Note that condition (ii) of rule 2 is implied by (a) above under faithfulness. Indeed, Theorem 1 requires that condition (ii) of rule 2 is satisfied, with (a) being a consequence of it given the assumptions described in section 2 in the main text. If (b) is satisfied, our method will classify A as a valid adjustment, and X and Y would be conditionally d-separated (and therefore independent) given A , indicating X does not cause Y . Likewise, in this situation, then Z and Y will be conditionally d-separated given C (because C is a valid adjustment set, so any association between Z and Y must be mediated by X), thus satisfying condition (iii) of rule 2 and concluding that X does not cause Y .

It should also be noted that Entner and colleagues' method may be able to classify a set of covariates as valid when ours cannot. For example, consider the simple scenario $X \leftarrow C \rightarrow Y$. In this case, $V = C$. Since X does not cause Y , condition (i) of rule 2 would be satisfied. In contrast, since there C would be associated with Y given X (there is no additional covariates in this example), which would be interpreted as an inconclusive result according to Theorem 1. Similar examples in the case where X does not cause Y could be constructed to further illustrate this. The conclusion, therefore, is that our method can be seen as a special case of Entner and colleagues' method, since they arrive at equivalent conclusions when our method can classify A as a valid adjustment set, while Entner and colleagues' method may be able to correctly identify a valid adjustment set even though our method would yield inconclusive results.

Despite the advantage of Entner and colleagues' method mentioned above, there are important strengths of our method. Our method only assesses one covariate set (A), while Entner and colleagues' method goes through all subsets of A , which would be computationally prohibitively even for relatively small sets of covariates. Although such exploration of subsets of A could yield important results (for example, a subset of A may be a valid adjustment set when A as a whole is not), it would have at least two negative implications. One of them is the possibility of finding contradictory cases in finite samples, even though the two rules are mutually exclusive, which would lead to inconclusive results.^{4,5} The second one is that going over all subsets may induce faithfulness violations. For example, consider a situation where the effect of X on Y is positive

but some elements of A are negative confounders (i.e., they induce a negative association between X and Y) of different strengths (i.e., some are strong negative confounders, some are weaker negative confounders). Going through all subsets of A in this case would essentially produce several negative confounding levels (depending on the covariates left out from the covariate set being tested), one of which may be close enough to the effect of X on Y so that condition (i) of rule 2 is satisfied in finite samples due to quasi-violations of faithfulness. In our implementation, the fact that we first select a subset of “testing” covariates (those associated with X given all other covariates) facilitates assessing the plausibility of faithfulness (as illustrated and discussed in sections 5 and 6 in the main text). Finally, the selection of testing covariates does not involve Y at all, and the association between X and Y plays no role in assessing if A is a valid adjustment set. Conversely, Entner and colleagues’ approach involve Y when selecting the testing covariate (condition (i) of rule 1) and even the association between X and Y itself (which is the research question) is used for assessing the validity of the adjustment set (condition (i) of rule 2). Although this is not problematic in infinite samples satisfying the assumptions the method requires, in practice it may lead to preferential selection of covariates that yield the desired results – for example, if the hypothesis is that X and Y are causally unrelated, preference might be given to subsets of A that satisfy condition (ii) in finite samples, which could be a result of faithfulness (quasi) violations, as discussed above. Therefore, our approach more clearly separates the analytical steps of covariate selection and causal effect estimation, which is generally considered a good practice for causal inference.⁶

Entner and colleagues⁴ also describe, in Theorem 4, a falsification test which essentially postulates that, if Z is exogenous, associated with X given C and with Y given X and C , then C is an invalid adjustment set. This is also the conclusion of our Theorem 1 for the case of an exogenous Z (see supplementary section 3 for details). However, as mentioned above, our method not only provide a falsification test (if Z is exogenous) but can also correctly classify A as a valid adjustment set.

8. Covariate selection methods

In addition to Entner and colleagues’ method, other covariate selection approaches are worth describing. One of them is the so-called disjunctive cause criterion, which postulates that, if the entire set of measured covariates contains a subset that is a valid adjustment set, it is possible to select a valid adjustment set by selecting covariates that cause X or Y (or both), except those that are known to be instruments (to avoid bias amplification);^{7,8} and proxies of unmeasured common causes of X or Y .^{9,10} This approach for covariate selection allows using partial causal knowledge (i.e., whether a covariate is a cause of X and/or Y , with no requirement regarding the causal relationships between covariates themselves) to select a valid adjustment set. An important limitation of this approach is the assumption that there is a valid adjustment set within the set of measured covariates, which may be difficult to justify, although in general it is likely more plausible if the entire set of covariates is large, covers many different domains (socioeconomic, behavioural, genetic etc.) and accounts for a large proportion of the variance of X . If pre-specifying the set of covariates is undesirable (for example, when deciding which covariates to measure at the study design stage), a recently proposed method uses iterative graph expansion to learn from the user, who inputs causal assumptions bit by bit until a valid adjustment set is found (or the method declares that none exists).¹¹ In addition to being dynamic (in the sense that it interactively learns from the user), this method is efficient in the sense that it requires the user to provide only as many causal assumptions are required to find a valid adjustment set.

It should be noted that both the disjunctive cause criterion and the iterative graph expansion methods differs from the main application of our test, which aims at assessing whether a given set of covariates (selected using these criteria or any other) is a valid adjustment set. Indeed, the two approaches could be used in combination, with unconfoundedness assessment (which assesses if a selected covariate set is a valid adjustment set, but provides no guidance on how to select covariates apart from the assumptions the method requires) following covariate selection (which guides how to define the candidate adjustment set). Of note, even though it is sensible to not use known instruments for bias adjustment, such instruments could nevertheless be used for unconfoundedness assessment (as described above) of the selected adjustment set.

9. References

1. Hernán MA, Robins JM. Causal Inference: What If. Boca Raton, FL, USA: Chapman & Hall/CRC; 2020.
2. VanderWeele T. Explanation in Causal Inference: Methods for Mediation and Interaction. New York, NY, USA: Oxford University Press; 2015.
3. Pearl J. Causality: Models, Inference and Reasoning. 2 ed. Cambridge (UK): Cambridge University Press; 2009.
4. Entner D, Hoyer P, Spirtes P. Data-driven covariate selection for nonparametric estimation of causal effects. In: Carlos MC, Pradeep R, editors. Proceedings of the Sixteenth International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics; Proceedings of Machine Learning Research: PMLR; 2013. p. 256--64.
5. Witte J, Didelez V. Covariate selection strategies for causal inference: Classification and comparison. *Biom J.* 2019;61(5):1270-89.
6. Austin PC, Stuart EA. Moving towards best practice when using inverse probability of treatment weighting (IPTW) using the propensity score to estimate causal treatment effects in observational studies. *Stat Med.* 2015;34(28):3661-79.
7. Myers JA, Rassen JA, Gagne JJ, Huybrechts KF, Schneeweiss S, Rothman KJ, et al. Effects of adjusting for instrumental variables on bias and precision of effect estimates. *Am J Epidemiol.* 2011;174(11):1213-22.
8. Ding P, VanderWeele TJ, Robins JM. Instrumental variables as bias amplifiers with general outcome and confounding. *Biometrika.* 2017;104(2):291-302.
9. VanderWeele TJ, Shpitser I. A new criterion for confounder selection. *Biometrics.* 2011;67(4):1406-13.
10. VanderWeele TJ. Principles of confounder selection. *Eur J Epidemiol.* 2019;34(3):211-9.
11. Guo FR, Zhao Q. Confounder Selection via Iterative Graph Expansion. arXiv. 2023. Available from: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2309.06053>.

10. Supplementary Table

Supplementary Table 1. Number of simulated datasets (and row proportions) with a given number of covariates (all associated^A with the exposure conditional on all other covariates) and a given number of covariates not associated^B with the outcome conditional on the exposure and all other covariates. These results are restricted to simulated datasets where the absolute bias of the linear regression coefficient of the outcome on the exposure was no larger than 0.2.

Scenario	Sample Size	# covariates	# covariates conditionally unassociated with Y			
			0	1	2	3
1 ^D	500 (55969) ^D	1	17.5	82.5	-	-
		2	17.5	21.7	60.8	-
		3	17.5	21.7	18.8	42.0
	1000 (56249) ^D	1	25.9	74.1	-	-
		2	25.9	26.7	47.4	-
		3	25.9	26.7	20.2	27.2
	5000 (56664) ^D	1	49.2	50.8	-	-
		2	38.5	30.3	31.2	-
		3	30.7	30.3	17.8	21.2
	20,000 (56719) ^D	1	66.8	33.2	-	-
		2	57.4	25.8	16.8	-
		3	51.8	25.8	11.7	10.7

^ABy associated, we mean that the corresponding coefficients of a linear regression of the exposure on the covariates achieved $P < 5\%$.


^BBy not associated, we mean that the corresponding coefficients of a linear regression of the outcome on the exposure and covariates achieved $P \geq 5\%$.

^CWe did not include results for scenario 2 in this table because comparing scenario 2 results between Table 1 and Supplementary Table 1 is difficult, because in this scenario the magnitude of the bias in the exposure-outcome association depends on the direct effect of the covariates on the outcome, which also influences covariate-outcome associations.

^DNumber of datasets with the desired level of bias in the exposure-outcome association.

11. Supplementary Figures

Supplementary Figure 1. Hypothetical directed acyclic graphs (DAGs) illustrating the proposed test for unconfoundedness. In all scenarios, X , Y , S and $\{Z \cup C\}$ respectively represent the exposure, outcome, selection into the study and measured covariates. K , L , U and W represent unmeasured variables.



a) Assumptions 1-4 satisfied, and Z causes X .

b) Assumptions 1-4 satisfied, and Z does not cause X .

c) Assumption 1 violated.

d) Assumption 2 violated.

e) Assumption 3 violated.

f) Assumption 4 violated.

g) Assumptions 1-4 satisfied, and Z and Y are conditionally (on C) d-connected only through X .

h) Assumptions 1-4 satisfied, Z and Y are d-connected even upon conditioning on X and C , and Z is a non-collider on a backdoor path between X and Y .

i) Assumptions 1-4 satisfied, Z and Y are d-connected even upon conditioning on X and C , and Z is a collider on a backdoor path between X and Y .

Supplementary Figure 2. Directed acyclic graphs illustrating scenarios with measurement error in one or more covariates. V' represents the measured version of V , and sources of measurement error are represented by E_V .

