

Bayesian Inference for Sequential Treatments under Latent Sequential Ignorability

Federico Ricciardi
University College London, UK
f.ricciardi@ucl.ac.uk

Alessandra Mattei, Fabrizia Mealli
Università degli Studi di Firenze, Italy
mattei@disia.unifi.it, mealli@disia.unifi.it

May 3, 2022

Abstract

We focus on causal inference for time-varying (longitudinal) treatments, i.e., situations in which units are assigned to treatment at multiple time points, aiming to assess the effect of different treatment sequences on some final outcome observed at the end of the study. An assumption which is usually invoked in evaluation studies with longitudinal treatment is Sequential Ignorability (SI), which consists in assuming that treatment assignment at each time point is independent of missing past potential outcomes and future potential outcomes given past observed outcomes and covariates up to that point. SI which may be questionable when participation in the treatment depends on individual choices, and treatment assignment may depend on unobservables quantities associated with future potential outcomes. In order to relax SI, we propose to rely on Principal Stratification, formulating a relaxed version of SI that we call Latent Sequential Ignorability, where *latent* indicates that treatment assignment is conditionally independent on future potential outcomes given past treatments, covariates and principal stratum membership, which is a latent variable, since it is defined by the joint value of observed and missing intermediate outcomes. Adopting a Bayesian approach for inference, we discuss and compare sequential ignorability and latent sequential ignorability, using both theoretical arguments as well as simulation studies in which we investigate the relative performance of the two alternative assumptions when one holds and inference is conducted under both assumptions. Simulation results show that when SI does not hold, inference performed under SI may lead to misleading conclusions. Conversely, LSI generally leads to well-shaped posterior distributions centred around the true values, irrespective of which assumption holds. We apply our framework to an illustrative example based on real data, in which we investigate the effects of interest free loans on firm employment policies.

Keywords and phrases: Latent sequential ignorability, Longitudinal treatments, Principal stratification, Sequential ignorability, Rubin Causal Model.

1 Introduction

Many observational studies in several fields, including economics, social science and epidemiology, are often interested in the evaluation of casual effects of time-varying treatments, which are assigned to units sequentially over time (e.g., Robins, 1986, 1989, 1997; Robins et al., 2000; Gill and Robins, 2001; Lechner, 2009; Achy-Brou et al., 2010; Zajonc, 2012; Imai and Ratkovic, 2014). In some longitudinal studies, treatment assignment mechanisms define dynamic treatment regimes, which usually describe

adaptive policies that propose actions in each treatment period depending on past observations and decisions (e.g., Heckman and Navarro, 2007; Hong and Raudenbush, 2008; Murphy, 2003; Robins, 2004; Zajonc, 2012). In this article, we do not consider dynamic treatment regimes, focusing instead on causal inference for time-varying treatments, aiming to assess the effect of different treatment sequences on some final outcome observed at the end of the study.

The example we will present concerns the evaluation of financial aids to firms. In this study firms may have access to public loans multiple times over subsequent years and our focus is on contrasting firms' performances measured in terms of employment levels at the end of the study under different treatment sequences (Pirani et al., 2013).

In the presence of time-varying treatments, causal inference is challenging because intermediate variables are simultaneously post-treatment outcomes and pretreatment confounders. Therefore the analysis of time-varying treatments requires methodological tools that can properly account for a growing number of intermediate variables, some of which are only partially observed, and sequential selection. We will frame our discussion in the context of the potential outcomes approach to causal inference, also referred to as Rubin Causal Model (RCM, e.g., Rubin, 1974, 1977, 1978; Holland, 1986). A critical part of the RCM is the formulation of a treatment assignment mechanism, and this task is even more crucial in longitudinal studies.

An assumption usually invoked in evaluation studies with longitudinal treatment is *Sequential Ignorability* (SI, Robins, 1986), which consist of assuming that the observed treatment at a given time point is independent of missing past potential outcomes and future potential outcomes given past observed outcomes, past treatments and covariates up to that point. Sequential ignorability may be a reasonable assumption in various settings. For instance, in medicine, physicians may propose therapies randomly conditional on observed patient's characteristic, prognostic factors and prior treatments up to that point. In labor economics caseworkers may randomly offer training programs to participants conditional on previous training program participation up to that point and observed performances.

In settings where participation in the treatment depends on individual choices, treatment assignment may depend on unobservables quantities associated with future potential outcomes as well as on unobserved past potential outcomes, so that the sequential ignorability assumption fails to hold. For instance, in our example, firms may decide to apply for a loan at a given time point using both information on their performances under the treatments previously received (the observed outcomes), which also the experimenter can observe, as well as information on their performances under alternative unobserved treatment sequences (the missing outcomes), which may be known to firms (maybe with some approximation) but unknown to the experimenter.

In order to relax SI, we rely on Principal Stratification (PS, Frangakis and Rubin, 2002). Using the concepts of PS, we formulate a relaxed version of SI that we call *Latent Sequential Ignorability* (LSI). LSI amounts to assuming that treatment assignment is conditionally independent of future potential outcomes given pre-treatment variables, past treatments, and principal strata, defined by the joint value of observed and missing intermediate outcomes up to that point. Principal strata encode personal characteristics reflected in the intermediate outcomes, and can be viewed as a coarsened representation of the latent unobserved structure that may affect the decision to participate in the treatment. Note that alternative assumptions could be considered.

LSI has appealing features but also raises challenging inferential issues, due to the latent nature of principal strata. We adopt the Bayesian approach for inference, which is particularly useful for accounting for uncertainties and for pooling information from the data in complex settings. Under LSI models may result as weakly identified in the sense that their posterior distributions have substantial regions of flatness, unless additional assumptions are introduced (Imbens and Rubin, 1997; Mealli and Pacini, 2013). The Bayesian approach, however, clarifies what can be learned when causal estimands are intrinsically not fully identified, but only weakly identified. Bayesian analysis conducted under LSI naturally provides a framework for sensitivity analysis with respect to violations of SI, where sensitivity

parameters are meaningful quantities, with a direct interpretation.

In this work we discuss and compare sequential ignorability and latent sequential ignorability, using both theoretical arguments as well as simulation studies in which we investigate the relative performance of the two alternative assumptions when, in turn, one holds and inference is conducted under both assumptions. We illustrate our framework using data on financial aids to firms to investigate the effectiveness of interests free loans on firms' employment policies.

The article is organized as follows. In Section 2 we introduce the framework and the causal estimands we focus on. In Section 3 we formally define the assignment mechanism and the critical assumptions, SI and LSI. In Section 4 we compare SI and LSI, highlighting their implications and showing how latent sequential ignorability provides a natural framework for conducting sensitivity analyses for assessing the robustness of the estimates to specific violations of the sequential ignorability assumption. In Section 5 we briefly describe Bayesian inference under SI and LSI. In Section 6 we investigate the role and implications of the two alternative assumptions using some simulated experiments. In Section 7 we conduct causal inference under SI and LSI in the context of an illustrative case study. Finally, we conclude with a discussion in Section 8.

2 Basic Setup

In this article we will focus on a simple setup with a two-period structure and binary treatments. This simplified setting allows us to clearly describe all the conceptual issues surrounding sequential treatments, avoiding technical complications that may mask our primary objective, that is, highlighting the implications of SI and LSI and comparing inferences under the two assumptions. Indeed, the extension to more time points makes notation more complicated, but does not represent an issue for the theoretical framework, although it may raise inferential and computational challenges. We are currently working on the extension to multiple time points, investigating alternative sets of assumptions, which allow us to face these inferential and computational challenges.

2.1 Notation

Consider a group of units indexed by $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$. In each of two periods, indexed by $t = 1, 2$, units can be potentially assigned either an active treatment ($w_t = 1$) or a control treatment, which may be no treatment at all ($w_t = 0$). Let W_{it} denote the treatment unit i actually receives at time t : $W_{it} = 1$ if the unit is exposed to the active treatment, $W_{it} = 0$ if the unit is exposed to the control treatment. Let $\mathbf{W}_i = (W_{i1}, W_{i2})$. Then $\mathbf{W}_i \in \{(0, 0), (1, 0), (0, 1), (1, 1)\}$, that is, units can experience treatment in neither period, $\mathbf{W}_i = (0, 0)$; only in the first period, $\mathbf{W}_i = (1, 0)$; only in the second period, $\mathbf{W}_i = (0, 1)$; or in both periods, $\mathbf{W}_i = (1, 1)$. Let \mathbf{W}_t denote the n -dimensional vector with i -th element W_{it} , which is a random vector prior to the assignment at time t , and let \mathbf{w}_t be a realization of the random vector \mathbf{W}_t .

After assignment to the first treatment, but prior to the assignment to the second treatment, a set of intermediate outcomes can be measured for each unit i . Here we focus on one intermediate variable only, denoted by Y_{i1} . The intermediate variable we consider is the lagged outcome (or a transformation of the lagged outcome), which is a measure of the same substantive quantity as the final outcome, but measured at a previous time-point between the receipt of the first treatment and the receipt of the final treatment. This choice is compelling. In fact it is reasonable to believe that the lagged intermediate outcome is related to both the final treatment assignment and final outcome. We use the lagged intermediate outcome as a summary of unobserved confounder factors required to make ignorability of treatment assignment reasonable. This argument often arises also in single time observational studies, where lagged values measured at a time-point prior to the receipt of treatment are included in the set of the pre-treatment variables conditional on which strong ignorability is assumed (Imbens and Rubin, 2015). The final outcome Y_{i2} is the object of primary interest and it is measured after the final treatment.

For each unit i , let $Y_{i1}(\mathbf{w}_1)$ denote the potential outcomes for the intermediate variable at time $t = 1$ given treatment assignment \mathbf{w}_1 in the first period, and let $Y_{i2}(\mathbf{w}_1, \mathbf{w}_2)$ denote the potential outcome for the final outcome given the entire treatment assignment sequence $(\mathbf{w}_1, \mathbf{w}_2)$. We make the Stable Unit Treatment Value Assumption (SUTVA, Rubin, 1980), stating that potential outcomes for any unit are unaffected by the treatment assignments of other units (no interference), and that for each unit there are no different versions of treatment. Formally,

Assumption 1 SUTVA

If $w_{i1} = w'_{i1}$, then $Y_{i1}(\mathbf{w}_1) = Y_{i1}(\mathbf{w}'_1)$;
 If $(w_{i1}, w_{i2}) = (w'_{i1}, w'_{i2})$, then $Y_{i2}(\mathbf{w}_1, \mathbf{w}_2) = Y_{i2}(\mathbf{w}'_1, \mathbf{w}'_2)$.

SUTVA allows us to write $Y_{i1}(\mathbf{w}_1) = Y_{i1}(w_{i,1})$ and $Y_{i2}(\mathbf{w}_1, \mathbf{w}_2) = Y_{i2}(w_{i,1}, w_{i,2})$, therefore for each unit i there are two potential outcomes for the post-treatment intermediate variable measured after assignment to the first treatment, $Y_{i1}(0)$ and $Y_{i1}(1)$, and four potential outcomes for the final outcome, $Y_{i2}(0,0)$, $Y_{i2}(1,0)$, $Y_{i2}(0,1)$ and $Y_{i2}(1,1)$.

2.2 Causal Estimands

Causal effects on the final outcome, Y_{i2} , are defined at the unit-level as comparisons of potential outcomes for the final outcome under alternative treatment sequences. For instance, a causal effect of the treatment sequence (w_1, w_2) versus the treatment sequence (w'_1, w'_2) for a unit i is defined as a comparison between the potential outcomes $Y_{i2}(w_1, w_2)$ and $Y_{i2}(w'_1, w'_2)$. Estimands of interest may be simple differences $Y_{i2}(w_1, w_2) - Y_{i2}(w'_1, w'_2)$, but in general comparisons can take different forms.

Causal effects can also be defined for collections of units. More generally, causal effects are comparisons between potential outcomes for a common set of units (Frangakis and Rubin, 2002; Rubin, 2005). In this article the n units are considered as a random sample from a large superpopulation, and focus is on population Average Treatment Effects (ATEs) on the final outcome, that is, the expected value of the differences between potential outcomes at final time $t = 2$ under different treatment sequences. In the presence of two-period binary treatments, we can define six ATEs:

$$ATE_{w_1 w_2, w'_1 w'_2} = E[Y_{i2}(w_1, w_2) - Y_{i2}(w'_1, w'_2)], \quad \forall (w_1, w_2) \neq (w'_1, w'_2) \in \{0, 1\}^2. \quad (1)$$

3 The Assignment Mechanism

Causal effects involve comparisons of potential outcomes, only one of which can ever be observed for each unit at each time point. In our simplified setting with two-period binary treatments, for each unit i we observe one out of two intermediate potential outcomes at time $t = 1$, i.e., $Y_{i1}^{obs} = Y_{i1}(W_{i1})$; and one out of four potential outcomes at time $t = 2$, i.e. $Y_{i2}^{obs} = Y_{i2}(W_{i1}, W_{i2})$. Potential outcomes under unassigned treatment sequences ~~not assigned~~ are missing: $Y_{i1}^{mis} = Y_{i1}(1 - W_{i1})$ and $\mathbf{Y}_{i2}^{mis} = \{Y_{i2}(1 - W_{i1}, W_{i2}), Y_{i2}(W_{i1}, 1 - W_{i2}); Y_{i2}(1 - W_{i1}, 1 - W_{i2})\}$. Therefore, inference on causal effects require to solve a missing data problem, also referred to as the fundamental problem in causal inference by Holland (1986), which clearly blows up with more than two treatment periods. For each unit we also observed a vector of time-invariant pre-treatment variables \mathbf{X}_i , i.e., variables that are not affected by treatments assignment.

In order to learn about the causal effects of interest it is crucial to posit a treatment assignment mechanism. The assignment mechanism is a row-exchangeable function of all covariates and of all potential outcomes, giving the probability of any vector of treatment sequences:

$$Pr(\mathbf{W} | \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y}_1(0), \mathbf{Y}_1(1), \mathbf{Y}_2(0,0), \mathbf{Y}_2(1,0), \mathbf{Y}_2(0,1), \mathbf{Y}_2(1,1)),$$

where \mathbf{W} is a $n \times 2$ matrix with i -th row equal to (W_{i1}, W_{i2}) , \mathbf{X} is a matrix with n rows and i -th row equal to \mathbf{X}_i , and $\mathbf{Y}_1(w_1)$ and $\mathbf{Y}_2(w_1, w_2)$ are n -dimensional vectors with ith elements equal to $Y_{i1}(w_1)$ and $Y_{i2}(w_1, w_2)$, respectively, for $w_1 \in \{0, 1\}$ and $w_2 \in \{0, 1\}$.

In longitudinal settings the assignment mechanism is very complex. We consider two basic restrictions on the assignment mechanism, assuming that it is individualistic

$$Pr(\mathbf{W} | \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y}_1(0), \mathbf{Y}_1(1), \mathbf{Y}_2(0,0), \mathbf{Y}_2(1,0), \mathbf{Y}_2(0,1), \mathbf{Y}_2(1,1)) \propto \prod_i Pr(\mathbf{W}_i | \mathbf{X}_i, Y_{i1}(0), Y_{i1}(1), Y_{i2}(0,0), Y_{i2}(1,0), Y_{i2}(0,1), Y_{i2}(1,1))$$

and probabilistic

$$0 < Pr(\mathbf{W}_i | \mathbf{X}_i, Y_{i1}(0), Y_{i1}(1), Y_{i2}(0,0), Y_{i2}(1,0), Y_{i2}(0,1), Y_{i2}(1,1)) < 1, \quad \forall i.$$

Even under these restrictions, the assignment mechanism still remains complex, because it depends on a large number of missing values, Y_{i1}^{mis} and Y_{i2}^{mis} , for all i . In order to reduce the complexity of the assignment, we now formulate some assumptions, which allow us to characterize longitudinal observational studies and draw inference on the causal estimands of interest. To this end, it is useful to factorize the unit-level assignment probabilities as product of the assignment probabilities at time $t = 1$ and the conditional assignment probabilities at time $t = 2$ given the treatment received at time one. Formally, by the law of total probability, we have

$$Pr(\mathbf{W}_i | \mathbf{X}_i, Y_{i1}(0), Y_{i1}(1), Y_{i2}(0,0), Y_{i2}(1,0), Y_{i2}(0,1), Y_{i2}(1,1)) = Pr(W_{i1} | \mathbf{X}_i, Y_{i1}(0), Y_{i1}(1), Y_{i2}(0,0), Y_{i2}(1,0), Y_{i2}(0,1), Y_{i2}(1,1)) \times Pr(W_{i2} | W_{i1}, \mathbf{X}_i, Y_{i1}(0), Y_{i1}(1), Y_{i2}(0,0), Y_{i2}(1,0), Y_{i2}(0,1), Y_{i2}(1,1)).$$

Much of the literature on time-varying treatments copes with the complications arising in the presence of sequential treatments by assuming that the assignment mechanism is sequentially ignorable (Robins, 1986):

Assumption 2 *Sequential Ignorability (SI)*

$$Pr(\mathbf{W}_i | \mathbf{X}_i, Y_{i1}(0), Y_{i1}(1), Y_{i2}(0,0), Y_{i2}(1,0), Y_{i2}(0,1), Y_{i2}(1,1)) = Pr(W_{i1} | \mathbf{X}_i) \times Pr(W_{i2} | W_{i1}, Y_{i1}^{obs}, \mathbf{X}_i).$$

SI implies that treatment assignment at each time point is independent of past missing potential outcomes and all future potential outcomes given past observed outcomes, treatments and covariates. SI guarantees that the comparison of observed outcomes under alternative treatment sequences, within cells defined by the pre-treatment covariates and the observed intermediate outcome, leads to valid inference on causal effects. Under SI

$$E[Y_{i2}(w_1, w_2) | \mathbf{X}_i] = \int E[Y_{i2}^{obs} | W_{i1} = w_1, W_{i2} = w_2, Y_{i1}^{obs} = y_1, \mathbf{X}_i] dF_{Y_{i1}^{obs} | W_{i1} = w_1, \mathbf{X}_i}(y_1),$$

where $F_{Y_{i1}^{obs} | W_{i1} = w_1, \mathbf{X}_i}(\cdot)$ is the conditional cumulative distribution function of the intermediate outcome, Y_{i1}^{obs} , given the observed treatment at time $t = 1$ and pre-treatment covariates. SI may be a reasonable assumption in various settings, including longitudinal observational studies where it is reasonable to believe that treatments are sequentially assigned using only the observed information (e.g., Zajonc, 2012). However, as in single point observational studies, where the usually made strong ignorability assumption may fail to hold also due to the presence of an unobserved confounder associated with both the potential outcomes and the treatment indicator (Rosenbaum and Rubin, 1983; Rosenbaum, 1987; Imbens, 2003; Ichino et al., 2008), here sequential ignorability may be arguable due to the presence of time-varying

unobserved confounder factors. However, it is reasonable to believe that a firm decides whether applying for a loan at subsequent time points using both information on the hiring policy adopted under the treatment actually received at time $t = 1$, $Y_{i1}(W_{i1})$, and also information on the missing outcome, $Y_{i1}(1 - W_{i1})$, that is, on how it would have behaved had it received the opposite treatment at time $t = 1$.

Motivated by this intuition, we propose to relax SI using the concept of principal stratification (Frangakis and Rubin, 2002). The joint potential values of the intermediate outcome at time $t = 1$, $(Y_{i1}(0), Y_{i1}(1))$, defines a classification of units into principal strata. For simplicity, we assume that the intermediate outcome is binary. Thus, the (basic) principal stratification with respect to the intermediate outcome Y_1 classifies units into four groups according to the joint potential values of Y_1 , $Y_{i1}(0)$ and $Y_{i1}(1)$: $00 = \{i : (Y_{i1}(0) = 0, Y_{i1}(1) = 0)\}$; $01 = \{i : (Y_{i1}(0) = 0, Y_{i1}(1) = 1)\}$; $10 = \{i : (Y_{i1}(0) = 1, Y_{i1}(1) = 0)\}$; and $11 = \{i : (Y_{i1}(0) = 1, Y_{i1}(1) = 1)\}$. Let G_i denote the principal stratum membership for unit i , with $i = (1, \dots, n)$, then $G_i \equiv (Y_{i1}(0), Y_{i1}(1)) \in \{00, 01, 10, 11\}$. For instance, in our illustrative example, the intermediate outcome is an indicator variable taking on value one if a firm hires new staff between the assignment to the first treatment and the assignment to the second treatment. Therefore, for example, the principal stratum 11 includes firms that would hire new staff irrespective of the treatment assignment at time $t = 1$ (see Section 7).

Principal stratum membership G_i is not affected by treatment assignment at time $t = 1$, W_{i1} , so it only reflects characteristics of unit i . Therefore, principal strata can be viewed as a coarsened representation of the latent unobserved structure that may influence the decision to participate in the treatment at a future time point. Based on principal stratification, we formulate a relaxed version of SI, that we call Latent Sequential Ignorability (LSI), where the word *latent* indicates that treatment assignment is conditionally independent on future potential outcomes conditionally on pre-treatment covariates, past treatments and principal stratum membership. This latter is a latent variable since it is defined by the joint value of observed and missing intermediate outcomes. In other words, LSI is a form of latent ignorability (Frangakis and Rubin, 1999) in that it conditions on variables that are (at least partially) unobserved or latent. Formally:

Assumption 3 *Latent Sequential Ignorability*

$$Pr(\mathbf{W}_i \mid \mathbf{X}_i, Y_{i1}(0), Y_{i1}(1), Y_{i2}(0, 0), Y_{i2}(1, 0), Y_{i2}(0, 1), Y_{i2}(1, 1)) = Pr(W_{i1} \mid \mathbf{X}_i) \times Pr(W_{i2} \mid W_{i1}, Y_{i1}(0), Y_{i1}(1), \mathbf{X}_i).$$

If principal stratum membership were observed, under LSI the comparison of observed outcomes under alternative treatment sequences, within cells defined by the covariates and the principal stratum would lead to valid inference on causal effects. Specifically, under LSI,

$$E[Y_{i2}(w_1, w_2) \mid \mathbf{X}_i] = \int E\left[Y_{i2}^{obs} \mid W_{i1} = w_1, W_{i2} = w_2, G_i = g, \mathbf{X}_i\right] dF_{G_i \mid \mathbf{X}_i}(g),$$

where $F_{G_i \mid \mathbf{X}_i}(\cdot)$ is the conditional cumulative distribution function of the principal stratum membership, G , given pre-treatment covariates.

Unfortunately, the fundamental problem of causal inference implies that we cannot, in general, observe the principal stratum which a unit belongs to. Specifically we can only observe the value of Y_{i1}^{obs} , so that each of the four observed groups $O(W_{i1}, Y_{i1}^{obs})$, defined by the treatment actually received at time $t = 1$, W_{i1} , and the observed value of the intermediate outcome, Y_{i1}^{obs} , comprises a mixture of two principal strata, in particular those indicated in the last two columns of Table 1.

Table 1: Group classification based on observed data $O(W_{i1}, Y_{i1}^{obs})$, associated data pattern and latent principal strata.

Observed group			Latent group	
$O(W_{i1}, Y_{i1}^{obs})$	W_{i1}	Y_{i1}^{obs}	G_i	
$O(0,0)$	0	0	00	01
$O(0,1)$	0	1	10	11
$O(1,0)$	1	0	00	10
$O(1,1)$	1	1	01	11

4 Assessing Sequential Ignorability through Latent Sequential Ignorability

LSI is a relaxed version of SI and for this reason SI can be viewed as a special case of LSI. Therefore, in order to compare SI with LSI and to investigate which one is more appropriate for a given problem at hand, we rely on the relationship between SI and LSI when SI holds.

Under SI, treatment assignment at $t = 2$ does not depend on the missing intermediate potential outcomes, implying that treatment assignment probabilities are homogeneous across some principal strata, conditionally on the treatment assigned at $t = 1$ and covariates. In other words, SI implies that the distributions of W_{i2} conditionally on principal strata sharing the same value for the intermediate observed outcome under the treatment assigned at time 1 are the same. Formally, under SI, for each $w_1 = 0, 1$ and $y_1 = 0, 1$, we have

$$Pr(W_{i2}|\mathbf{X}_i, W_{i1} = w_1, Y_{i1}^{obs} = y_1, Y_{i1}^{mis}) = Pr(W_{i2}|\mathbf{X}_i, W_{i1} = w_1, Y_{i1}^{obs} = y_1).$$

Therefore, if SI holds we have:

$$\begin{aligned} Pr(W_{i2}|\mathbf{X}_i, W_{i1} = 0, G_i = 00) &= Pr(W_{i2}|\mathbf{X}_i, W_{i1} = 0, G_i = 01), \\ Pr(W_{i2}|\mathbf{X}_i, W_{i1} = 0, G_i = 10) &= Pr(W_{i2}|\mathbf{X}_i, W_{i1} = 0, G_i = 11), \\ Pr(W_{i2}|\mathbf{X}_i, W_{i1} = 1, G_i = 00) &= Pr(W_{i2}|\mathbf{X}_i, W_{i1} = 1, G_i = 10), \\ Pr(W_{i2}|\mathbf{X}_i, W_{i1} = 1, G_i = 01) &= Pr(W_{i2}|\mathbf{X}_i, W_{i1} = 1, G_i = 11). \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

This result suggests that we can investigate the robustness of the estimated causal effects with respect to specific violations of the SI assumption, using the assignment probabilities under LSI, $Pr(W_{i2}|\mathbf{X}_i, W_{i1} = w_1, G_i = g)$, as sensitivity parameters. If principal strata encode characteristics of the units that are associated with the treatment assigned at time $t = 2$ and possibly with the final outcome, i.e., LSI holds but SI does not hold, inference under LSI is expected to show evidence against at least one of the equalities in Equation (2), and SI and LSI are expected to lead to substantially different inferential conclusions on the causal effects of interest. Conversely, if we find that treatment assignment probabilities are homogeneous across principal strata according to the equalities in Equation (2), then causal inference under SI is more defensible.

In this sense, LSI naturally provides a framework for sensitivity analysis with respect to violations of SI: looking at the inferential results on the assignment probabilities under LSI we can get some insight on the plausibility of the SI assumption. This framework for sensitivity analysis is in line with the exiting approaches in the literature to sensitivity analysis with respect to violations of the unconfoundedness assumption, usually made in single time observational studies (Rosenbaum and Rubin, 1983; Rosenbaum, 1987; Imbens, 2003; Ichino et al., 2008). In the literature on single time observational studies the robustness of the estimated causal effects with respect to the unconfoundedness assumption is generally assessed focusing on its violations due to the presence of unobserved covariates that are correlated both with the potential outcomes and with the treatment indicator. In those settings, sensitivity parameters are quantities characterizing the distribution of the unobserved covariates and their association with the

potential outcomes and with the treatment indicator, but they do not generally have a substantial meaning. In our framework, sensitivity parameters are meaningful quantities with a direct interpretation: they are the assignment probabilities for specific sub-population of units.

5 Bayesian Inference

We adopt a Bayesian approach to inference. The Bayesian perspective appears to be particularly appropriate for addressing problems of causal inference because it treats the uncertainty in the missing potential outcomes in the same way that it treats the uncertainty in the unknown parameters. A Bayesian approach explicitly deals with the different sources of uncertainty, treating them separately. Also in a Bayesian framework, we can be formally clear about the role played by the treatment assignment mechanism and the complications that raise in drawing inference for sequential treatments under LSI (Rubin, 1978; Imbens and Rubin, 1997).

Bayesian inference considers the observed values to be realizations of random variables and the missing values to be unobserved random variables, starting from the joint probability distributions of all random variables for all units: $p(\mathbf{Y}_1(0), \mathbf{Y}_1(1), \mathbf{Y}_2(0,0), \mathbf{Y}_2(0,1), \mathbf{Y}_2(1,0), \mathbf{Y}_2(1,1), \mathbf{W}_1, \mathbf{W}_2, \mathbf{X})$. We assume this distribution is unit exchangeable, that is, invariant under a permutation of the indexes, then de Finetti's theorem (de Finetti, 1937, 1964) implies that there exists a vector of parameters $\boldsymbol{\theta}$, which is a random variable itself, with prior distribution $p(\boldsymbol{\theta})$, such that $\mathbf{Y}_1(0), \mathbf{Y}_1(1), \mathbf{Y}_2(0,0), \mathbf{Y}_2(0,1), \mathbf{Y}_2(1,0), \mathbf{Y}_2(1,1), \mathbf{W}_1, \mathbf{W}_2$ and \mathbf{X} consist of independent and identically distributed random variables given $\boldsymbol{\theta}$. Thus,

$$p(\mathbf{Y}_2(0,0), \mathbf{Y}_2(0,1), \mathbf{Y}_2(1,0), \mathbf{Y}_2(1,1), \mathbf{Y}_1(0), \mathbf{Y}_1(1), \mathbf{W}_1, \mathbf{W}_2, \mathbf{X}) = \int \prod_i p(Y_{i2}(0,0), Y_{i2}(0,1), Y_{i2}(1,0), Y_{i2}(1,1), Y_{i1}(0), Y_{i1}(1), W_{i1}, W_{i2}, \mathbf{X}_i | \boldsymbol{\theta}) p(\boldsymbol{\theta}) d\boldsymbol{\theta}, \quad (3)$$

and the posterior distribution of $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} p(\boldsymbol{\theta} | \mathbf{Y}_2^{obs}, \mathbf{Y}_1^{obs}, \mathbf{W}_1, \mathbf{W}_2, \mathbf{X}) &\propto \\ &p(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \times \iint \prod_i p(Y_{i2}(0,0), Y_{i2}(0,1), Y_{i2}(1,0), Y_{i2}(1,1), Y_{i1}(0), Y_{i1}(1), W_{i1}, W_{i2}, \mathbf{X}_i | \boldsymbol{\theta}) d\mathbf{Y}_{i2}^{mis} d\mathbf{Y}_{i1}^{mis} = \\ &p(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \times \\ &\iint \prod_i \left[p(\mathbf{X}_i | \boldsymbol{\theta}) \times p(Y_{i1}(0), Y_{i1}(1) | \mathbf{X}_i; \boldsymbol{\theta}) \times p(Y_{i2}(0,0), Y_{i2}(0,1), Y_{i2}(1,0), Y_{i2}(1,1) | Y_{i1}(0), Y_{i1}(1), \mathbf{X}_i; \boldsymbol{\theta}) \times \right. \\ &\quad \left. p(W_{i1} | Y_{i2}(0,0), Y_{i2}(0,1), Y_{i2}(1,0), Y_{i2}(1,1), Y_{i1}(0), Y_{i1}(1), \mathbf{X}_i; \boldsymbol{\theta}) \times \right. \\ &\quad \left. p(W_{i2} | Y_{i2}(0,0), Y_{i2}(0,1), Y_{i2}(1,0), Y_{i2}(1,1), Y_{i1}(0), Y_{i1}(1), \mathbf{X}_i, W_{i1}; \boldsymbol{\theta}) d\mathbf{Y}_{i2}^{mis} d\mathbf{Y}_{i1}^{mis} \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

The assumptions on the assignment mechanism are crucial to draw inference on the causal estimands. Under latent sequential ignorability (Assumption 3), within cells defined by the values of pre-treatment variables \mathbf{X}_i , the treatment at time $t = 1$ is assigned independently of the relevant post-treatment variables, $Y_{i1}(w_1)$ and $Y_{i2}(w_1, w_2)$, $w_1 = 0, 1$; $w_2 = 0, 1$, and the treatment at time $t = 2$ is assigned independently of the final potential outcomes, $Y_{i2}(w_1, w_2)$, $w_1 = 0, 1$; $w_2 = 0, 1$, conditional on the treatment assigned at time $t = 1$, W_{i1} , and the principal strata defined by $(Y_{i1}(0), Y_{i1}(1))$. Therefore, under LSI the posterior distribution of $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ becomes

$$\begin{aligned} p(\boldsymbol{\theta} | \mathbf{Y}_2^{obs}, \mathbf{Y}_1^{obs}, \mathbf{W}_1, \mathbf{W}_2, \mathbf{X}) &\propto p(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \times \\ &\iint \prod_i \left[p(\mathbf{X}_i | \boldsymbol{\theta}) \times p(Y_{i1}(0), Y_{i1}(1) | \mathbf{X}_i; \boldsymbol{\theta}) \times p(Y_{i2}(0,0), Y_{i2}(0,1), Y_{i2}(1,0), Y_{i2}(1,1) | Y_{i1}(0), Y_{i1}(1), \mathbf{X}_i; \boldsymbol{\theta}) \times \right. \\ &\quad \left. p(W_{i1} | \mathbf{X}_i; \boldsymbol{\theta}) \times p(W_{i2} | Y_{i1}(0), Y_{i1}(1), \mathbf{X}_i, W_{i1}; \boldsymbol{\theta}) d\mathbf{Y}_{i2}^{mis} d\mathbf{Y}_{i1}^{mis} \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

Equation (5) further simplifies under SI, which implies that the treatment at time $t = 2$ is assigned independently of both missing intermediate potential outcomes Y_{i1}^{mis} and final potential outcomes, $Y_{i2}(w_1, w_2)$, $w_1, w_2 = 0, 1$, conditional on the pre-treatment variables, \mathbf{X}_i , the treatment assigned at time $t = 1$, W_{i1} , and the past observed potential outcomes, Y_{i1}^{obs} :

$$p(\boldsymbol{\theta} | \mathbf{Y}_2^{obs}, \mathbf{Y}_1^{obs}, \mathbf{W}_1, \mathbf{W}_2, \mathbf{X}) \propto p(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \times \int \int \prod_i [p(\mathbf{X}_i | \boldsymbol{\theta}) \times p(Y_{i1}(0), Y_{i1}(1) | \mathbf{X}_i; \boldsymbol{\theta}) \times p(Y_{i2}(0,0), Y_{i2}(0,1), Y_{i2}(1,0), Y_{i2}(1,1) | Y_{i1}(0), Y_{i1}(1), \mathbf{X}_i; \boldsymbol{\theta}) \times p(W_{i1} | \mathbf{X}_i; \boldsymbol{\theta}) \times p(W_{i2} | Y_{i1}^{obs}, \mathbf{X}_i, W_{i1}; \boldsymbol{\theta}) dY_{i2}^{mis} dY_{i1}^{mis}]. \quad (6)$$

It is worth noting that, under the assumption that the parameters governing the distributions under the integral sign in Equations (5) and (6) are a priori distinct and independent from each other functions of $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ (Rubin, 1978), we can ignore the distributions $p(\mathbf{X}_i | \boldsymbol{\theta}_X)$ and $p(W_{i1} | \mathbf{X}_i; \boldsymbol{\theta})$ in drawing Bayesian inference on the relevant estimands. If SI holds, Bayesian causal inference does not even require to model the distribution of the treatment at time $t = 2$, $p(W_{i2} | Y_{i1}^{obs}, \mathbf{X}_i, W_{i1}; \boldsymbol{\theta})$ (Rubin, 1978; Zajonc, 2012), although we decided to model it in the analyses below to better describe and discuss the role of LSI and SI in longitudinal studies.

Throughout the article we assume that conditional on \mathbf{X}_i and $\boldsymbol{\theta}$, the four outcomes $Y_{i2}(0,0)$, $Y_{i2}(0,1)$, $Y_{i2}(1,0)$, $Y_{i2}(1,1)$ are independent. Data are not informative about the partial association structure between final potential outcomes, because $Y_{i2}(0,0)$, $Y_{i2}(0,1)$, $Y_{i2}(1,0)$, $Y_{i2}(1,1)$ are never jointly observed, but the independence assumption has little inferential effect if we regard the n units in the study as a random sample from a super-population and we focus on super-population causal estimands that do not depend on the association structure between the final potential outcomes. Indeed, the causal estimands of primary interest here, the average causal effects in Equation (1) are super-population causal estimands, which are free of the association structure between the final potential outcomes.

Let $O(W_{i1}, Y_{i1}^{obs}, W_{i2})$ denote the observed group defined by the observed variables W_{i1} , Y_{i1}^{obs} , and W_{i2} , and recall that $G_i \equiv (Y_{i1}(0), Y_{i1}(1)) \in \{00, 01, 10, 11\}$. Let $\pi_{ig} = p(G_i = g | \mathbf{X}_i; \boldsymbol{\theta})$, $h_{ig}^{w_1} = p(W_{i2} | G_i = g, \mathbf{X}_i, W_{i1} = w_1; \boldsymbol{\theta})$ and $f_{ig}^{w_1, w_2} = p(Y_{i2}(w_1, w_2) | G_i = g, \mathbf{X}_i; \boldsymbol{\theta})$, $g = 00, 01, 10, 11$, $w_1, w_2 = 0, 1$. Then performing the integration in Equation (5), under LSI the posterior distribution of $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ given the observed data can be written as follows:

$$p(\boldsymbol{\theta} | \mathbf{Y}_2^{obs}, \mathbf{Y}_1^{obs}, \mathbf{W}_1, \mathbf{W}_2, \mathbf{X}) \propto p(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \times \prod_{i \in O(0,0,0)} [\pi_{i00}(1 - h_{i00}^0) f_{i00}^{0,0} + \pi_{i01}(1 - h_{i01}^0) f_{i01}^{0,0}] \times \prod_{i \in O(0,0,1)} [\pi_{i00} h_{i00}^0 f_{i00}^{0,1} + \pi_{i01} h_{i01}^0 f_{i01}^{0,1}] \times \prod_{i \in O(0,1,0)} [\pi_{i10}(1 - h_{i10}^0) f_{i10}^{0,0} + \pi_{i11}(1 - h_{i11}^0) f_{i11}^{0,0}] \times \prod_{i \in O(0,1,1)} [\pi_{i10} h_{i10}^0 f_{i10}^{0,1} + \pi_{i11} h_{i11}^0 f_{i11}^{0,1}] \times \prod_{i \in O(1,0,0)} [\pi_{i00}(1 - h_{i00}^1) f_{i00}^{1,0} + \pi_{i10}(1 - h_{i10}^1) f_{i10}^{1,0}] \times \prod_{i \in O(1,0,1)} [\pi_{i00} h_{i00}^1 f_{i00}^{1,1} + \pi_{i10} h_{i10}^1 f_{i10}^{1,1}] \times \prod_{i \in O(1,1,0)} [\pi_{i01}(1 - h_{i01}^1) f_{i01}^{1,0} + \pi_{i11}(1 - h_{i11}^1) f_{i11}^{1,0}] \times \prod_{i \in O(1,1,1)} [\pi_{i01} h_{i01}^1 f_{i01}^{1,1} + \pi_{i11} h_{i11}^1 f_{i11}^{1,1}]. \quad (7)$$

Therefore model-based Bayesian inference under LSI requires to specify three models: (1) the model for principal strata conditional on covariates, π_{ig} ; (2) the model for treatment assigned at time $t = 2$ conditional on principal strata, past treatment and covariates, $h_{ig}^{w_1}$; and (3) the model for final potential outcomes conditional on principal strata and covariates, $f_{ig}^{w_1, w_2}$.

Let $h_{iy_1}^{w_1} = p(W_{i2} | Y_{i1}(w_1) = y_1, \mathbf{X}_i, W_{i1} = w_1; \boldsymbol{\theta})$, $y_1 = 0, 1$, $w_1 = 0, 1$. Performing the integration in

Equation (6), under SI the posterior distribution of $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ given the observed data can be written as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
p(\boldsymbol{\theta} | \mathbf{Y}_2^{obs}, \mathbf{Y}_1^{obs}, \mathbf{W}_1, \mathbf{W}_2, \mathbf{X}) &\propto p(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \times \\
&\prod_{i \in O(0,0,0)} (1 - h_{i0}^0) \left[\pi_{i00} f_{i00}^{0,0} + \pi_{i01} f_{i01}^{0,0} \right] \times \prod_{i \in O(0,0,1)} h_{i0}^0 \left[\pi_{i00} f_{i00}^{0,1} + \pi_{i01} f_{i01}^{0,1} \right] \times \\
&\prod_{i \in O(0,1,0)} (1 - h_{i1}^0) \left[\pi_{i10} f_{i10}^{0,0} + \pi_{i11} f_{i11}^{0,0} \right] \times \prod_{i \in O(0,1,1)} h_{i1}^0 \left[\pi_{i10} f_{i10}^{0,1} + \pi_{i11} f_{i11}^{0,1} \right] \times \\
&\prod_{i \in O(1,0,0)} (1 - h_{i0}^1) \left[\pi_{i00} f_{i00}^{1,0} + \pi_{i10} f_{i10}^{1,0} \right] \times \prod_{i \in O(1,0,1)} h_{i0}^1 \left[\pi_{i00} f_{i00}^{1,1} + \pi_{i10} f_{i10}^{1,1} \right] \times \\
&\prod_{i \in O(1,1,0)} (1 - h_{i1}^1) \left[\pi_{i01} f_{i01}^{1,0} + \pi_{i11} f_{i11}^{1,0} \right] \times \prod_{i \in O(1,1,1)} h_{i1}^1 \left[\pi_{i01} f_{i01}^{1,1} + \pi_{i11} f_{i11}^{1,1} \right]. \quad (8)
\end{aligned}$$

Now, define $\pi_{iy_1} = p(Y_{i1}(w_1) = y_1 | \mathbf{X}_i, \boldsymbol{\theta})$, $y_1 = 0, 1$ and $f_{iy_1}^{w_1, w_2} = p(Y_{i2}(w_1, w_2) | Y_{i1}(w_1) = y_1, \mathbf{X}_i, \boldsymbol{\theta})$, $y_1 = 0, 1$, $w_1 = 0, 1$, $w_2 = 0, 1$. Then, under SI, the posterior distribution of $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ given the observed data in Equation (8) can be also written as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
p(\boldsymbol{\theta} | \mathbf{Y}_2^{obs}, \mathbf{Y}_1^{obs}, \mathbf{W}_1, \mathbf{W}_2, \mathbf{X}) &\propto p(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \times \\
&\prod_{i \in O(0,0,0)} (1 - h_{i0}^0) \pi_{i0} f_{i0}^{0,0} \times \prod_{i \in O(0,0,1)} h_{i0}^0 \pi_{i0} f_{i0}^{0,1} \times \prod_{i \in O(0,1,0)} (1 - h_{i1}^0) \pi_{i1} f_{i1}^{0,0} \times \prod_{i \in O(0,1,1)} h_{i1}^0 \pi_{i1} f_{i1}^{0,1} \times \\
&\prod_{i \in O(1,0,0)} (1 - h_{i0}^1) \pi_{i0} f_{i0}^{1,0} \times \prod_{i \in O(1,0,1)} h_{i0}^1 \pi_{i0} f_{i0}^{1,1} \times \prod_{i \in O(1,1,0)} (1 - h_{i1}^1) \pi_{i1} f_{i1}^{1,0} \times \prod_{i \in O(1,1,1)} h_{i1}^1 \pi_{i1} f_{i1}^{1,1}. \quad (9)
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, on the basis of Equations (8) and (9), we can conduct model-based Bayesian inference under SI using two alternative model specifications. Specifically, on the one hand Equation (8) suggests to use a specification similar to that we employ under LSI, specifying (1) the model for principal strata conditional on covariates, π_{ig} ; (2) the model for treatment assigned at time $t = 2$ conditional on intermediate observed outcomes, past treatment and covariates, $h_{iy_1}^{w_1}$; and (3) the model for final potential outcomes conditional on principal strata and covariates, $f_{ig}^{w_1, w_2}$. This specification, which we refer to as specification *SI-1*, implies that the only difference between Bayesian inference under LSI and SI-1 concerns the model for treatment assigned at time $t = 2$, which depends on principal strata when LSI holds, but does only depend on the observed values of the intermediate outcome under SI. On the other hand, on the basis of Equation (9) we can model only the distributions for the observed data, specifying (1) the model for intermediate observed outcomes conditional on covariates, π_{iy_1} ; (2) the model for treatment assigned at time $t = 2$ conditional on intermediate observed outcomes, past treatment and covariates, $h_{iy_1}^{w_1}$; and (3) the model for final potential outcomes conditional on on intermediate observed outcomes and covariates, $f_{iy_1}^{w_1, w_2}$. We refer to this model specification based on Equation (9) as specification *SI-2*. A more detailed discussion on the reasons we use this dual specification will be given in the Concluding Remarks (see Section 8).

6 Simulations

In this Section we investigate the role of LSI and SI using simulations. In our simulated experiment we set up two alternative scenarios in which both the data generating process and the assumptions underlying inference can vary. In the first scenario we generate data under SI, while in the second scenario LSI is assumed. Then we conduct Bayesian inference on the relevant causal estimands for each scenario under both LSI and SI, and in this latter case we use both the SI-1 and the SI-2 specifications.

In order to clearly assess the implications of the two alternative assumptions, LSI and SI, and investigate the robustness of the estimands to violations of SI, we focus on a simple setting: we assume that

we are in an experimental setting, with no covariates \mathbf{X}_i involved, and the first treatment, W_{i1} , randomly assigned, for each unit i . We also consider relatively large sample sizes of 5000 units to avoid (or, at least, reduce) sampling variability issues.

6.1 Data generating processes

The true simulation models for all of the simulations are based on Equation (7) under LSI and Equation (8) under SI, which require to specify parametric models for principal strata (π_{ig}), the treatment assignment probabilities at time $t = 2$ (either $h_{ig}^{w_1}$ or $h_{iy_1}^{w_1}$) and the final outcome ($f_{ig}^{w_1, w_2}$).

The model for principal strata membership contains three conditional probit models, defined using indicator variables $G_i(11)$, $G_i(00)$ and $G_i(10)$ for whether unit i belongs to principal stratum 11, 00 or 10:

$$\begin{aligned} G_i(11) &= 1 & \text{if } G_i^*(11) \equiv \alpha^{11} + \varepsilon_{i,11} \leq 0, \\ G_i(00) &= 1 & \text{if } G_i^*(11) > 0 \text{ and } G_i(00)^* \equiv \alpha^{00} + \varepsilon_{i,00} \leq 0, \\ G_i(10) &= 1 & \text{if } G_i^*(11) > 0, G_i(00)^* > 0 \text{ and } G_i(10)^* \equiv \alpha^{10} + \varepsilon_{i,10} \leq 0, \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

where $\varepsilon_{i,11} \sim N(0, 1)$, $\varepsilon_{i,00} \sim N(0, 1)$, and $\varepsilon_{i,10} \sim N(0, 1)$ independently. Therefore

$$\pi_{i11} = 1 - \Phi(\alpha^{11}), \quad \pi_{i00} = \Phi(\alpha^{11}) [1 - \Phi(\alpha^{00})], \quad \pi_{i10} = \Phi(\alpha^{11}) \Phi(\alpha^{00}) [1 - \Phi(\alpha^{10})]$$

and $\pi_{i01} = 1 - \sum_{g \in \{11, 00, 10\}} \pi_{ig} = \Phi(\alpha^{11}) \Phi(\alpha^{00}) \Phi(\alpha^{10})$, where $\Phi(\cdot)$ is the cumulative distribution function of the standard Normal distribution.

For the model of the treatment indicator at time $t = 2$, W_{i2} , we use a probit specification. Under LSI, we assume the following probit model for the treatment assignment at time $t = 2$:

$$W_{i2} = 1 \quad \text{if } W_{i2}^* \equiv \gamma_{w_1} + \gamma_{w_1}^{Y_1(0)} Y_{i1}(0) + \gamma_{w_1}^{Y_1(1)} Y_{i1}(1) + \gamma_{w_1}^{Y_1(0)Y_1(1)} Y_{i1}(0)Y_{i1}(1) + \varepsilon_{i, w_2} > 0, \quad (11)$$

where $\varepsilon_{i, w_2} \sim N(0, 1)$, $w_1 \in \{0, 1\}$, $Y_{i1}(0) \in \{0, 1\}$ and $Y_{i1}(1) \in \{0, 1\}$. Under model (11), the treatment assignment probabilities at time $t = 2$ are

$$h_{ig}^{w_1} = \begin{cases} \Phi(\gamma_{w_1}) & \text{if } W_{i1} = w_1 \text{ and } G_i = 00; \\ \Phi\left(\gamma_{w_1} + \gamma_{w_1}^{Y_1(0)}\right) & \text{if } W_{i1} = w_1 \text{ and } G_i = 10; \\ \Phi\left(\gamma_{w_1} + \gamma_{w_1}^{Y_1(1)}\right) & \text{if } W_{i1} = w_1 \text{ and } G_i = 01; \\ \Phi\left(\gamma_{w_1} + \gamma_{w_1}^{Y_1(0)} + \gamma_{w_1}^{Y_1(1)} + \gamma_{w_1}^{Y_1(0)Y_1(1)}\right) & \text{if } W_{i1} = w_1 \text{ and } G_i = 11; \end{cases}$$

with $w_1 = 0, 1$.

Under SI, treatment assignment probabilities at time $t = 2$ are free of the missing values for the intermediate outcome, we therefore impose:

$$\gamma_1^{Y_1(0)} = \gamma_0^{Y_1(1)} = \gamma_0^{Y_1(0)Y_1(1)} = \gamma_1^{Y_1(0)Y_1(1)} = 0 \quad (12)$$

assuming that

$$W_{i2} = 1 \quad \text{if } W_{i2}^* \equiv \gamma_{w_1} + \gamma_{w_1}^{Y_1(w_1)} Y_{i1}(w_1) + \varepsilon_{i, w_2} > 0 \quad (13)$$

where $\varepsilon_{i, w_2} \sim N(0, 1)$, $w_1 \in \{0, 1\}$, $Y_{i1}(w_1) \in \{0, 1\}$. Thus, under SI we have:

$$h_{iy_1}^{w_1} = \begin{cases} \Phi(\gamma_{w_1}) & \text{if } W_{i1} = w_1 \text{ and } y_1 = 0, \\ \Phi\left(\gamma_{w_1} + \gamma_{w_1}^{Y_1(w_1)}\right) & \text{if } W_{i1} = w_1 \text{ and } y_1 = 1. \end{cases}$$

with $w_1 \in \{0, 1\}$.

Finally, we need a model for the final outcome, Y_{i2} . In the empirical example the final outcome, Y_{i2} , is the number of employees, which we consider as a continuous variable. Consistently we focus on a continuous final outcome in the simulation studies. Specifically we specify Normal distributions for Y_{i2} conditional on principal strata:

$$Y_{i2}(w_1, w_2) | G_i = g \sim N\left(\beta_{w_1 w_2} + \beta_{w_1 w_2}^{Y_1(0)} Y_{i1}(0) + \beta_{w_1 w_2}^{Y_1(1)} Y_{i1}(1) + \beta_{w_1 w_2}^{Y_1(0)Y_1(1)} Y_{i1}(0)Y_{i1}(1); \sigma_{w_1 w_2, g}^2\right), \quad (14)$$

$w_1 \in \{0, 1\}$, $w_2 \in \{0, 1\}$, $g \in \{00, 01, 10, 11\}$. For simplicity, we impose prior equality of the variance parameters across principal strata: $\sigma_{w_1 w_2, g}^2 = \sigma_{w_1 w_2}^2$, $g \in \{00, 01, 10, 11\}$. Let $\Phi(\mu; \sigma^2)$ denote the probability density function of a Normal distribution with mean μ and variance σ^2 . Then, the Normal distributions in Equation (14) implies that

$$f_{ig}^{w_1, w_2} = \begin{cases} \Phi\left(\beta_{w_1 w_2}; \sigma_{w_1 w_2}^2\right) & \text{if } W_{i1} = w_1, W_{i2} = w_2, \text{ and } G_i = 00; \\ \Phi\left(\beta_{w_1 w_2} + \beta_{w_1 w_2}^{Y_1(0)}; \sigma_{w_1 w_2}^2\right) & \text{if } W_{i1} = w_1, W_{i2} = w_2, \text{ and } G_i = 10; \\ \Phi\left(\beta_{w_1 w_2} + \beta_{w_1 w_2}^{Y_1(1)}; \sigma_{w_1 w_2}^2\right) & \text{if } W_{i1} = w_1, W_{i2} = w_2, \text{ and } G_i = 01; \\ \Phi\left(\beta_{w_1 w_2} + \beta_{w_1 w_2}^{Y_1(0)} + \beta_{w_1 w_2}^{Y_1(1)} + \beta_{w_1 w_2}^{Y_1(0)Y_1(1)}; \sigma_{w_1 w_2}^2\right) & \text{if } W_{i1} = w_1, W_{i2} = w_2, \text{ and } G_i = 11; \end{cases}$$

$w_1 \in \{0, 1\}$, $w_2 \in \{0, 1\}$. We use this model specification to generate data for the final outcome under both LSI and SI. Therefore, the complete parameter vector for the simulation models is $\theta = (\alpha, \gamma, \beta, \sigma^2)$, where $\alpha = (\alpha^{11}, \alpha^{00}, \alpha^{10})$, $\gamma = \{\gamma_{w_1}, \gamma_{w_1}^{Y_1(0)}, \gamma_{w_1}^{Y_1(1)}, \gamma_{w_1}^{Y_1(0)Y_1(1)}\}_{w_1 \in \{0, 1\}}$, $\beta = \{\beta_{w_1 w_2}, \beta_{w_1 w_2}^{Y_1(0)}, \beta_{w_1 w_2}^{Y_1(1)}, \beta_{w_1 w_2}^{Y_1(0)Y_1(1)}\}_{w_1 \in \{0, 1\}, w_2 \in \{0, 1\}}$ and $\sigma^2 = \{\sigma_{w_1 w_2}^2\}_{w_1 \in \{0, 1\}, w_2 \in \{0, 1\}}$. The parameter vector θ includes 31 parameters, 4 of which are forced to be equal to 0 when SI holds according to Equation (12). The true values of these parameters are given in the Supplementary Material available on-line.

6.2 Inference in the simulations

For each simulation scenario we conduct inference under both LSI and SI. Under LSI we assume the parametric models specified in Equations (10), (11) and (14) in Section 6.1. It is worth noting that inference under LSI always uses a correct model specification, even when SI holds. In fact, when SI holds, some parameters, namely $\gamma_1^{Y_1(0)}$, $\gamma_0^{Y_1(1)}$, $\gamma_0^{Y_1(0)Y_1(1)}$ and $\gamma_1^{Y_1(0)Y_1(1)}$, are simply equal to zero.

Under the specification of type SI-1 we assume the parametric models specified in Equations (10), (13) and (14) in Section 6.1. Under the specification of type SI-2 we specify the probit model in Equation (13) for treatment assignment at time $t = 2$, and the following models for the intermediate and final outcomes. We use a probit specification for the intermediate outcome, $Y_{i1}(w_1)$:

$$Y_{i1}(w_1) = 1 \quad \text{if} \quad Y_{i1}^*(w_1) \equiv \alpha_{w_1} + \varepsilon_{i, Y_1(w_1)} > 0 \quad (15)$$

where $\varepsilon_{i, Y_1(w_1)} \sim N(0, 1)$, $w_1 \in \{0, 1\}$, and we posit a Normal model on the final outcome $Y_{i2}(w_1, w_2)$, conditional on $Y_{i1}(w_1)$:

$$Y_{i2}(w_1, w_2) | Y_{i1}(w_1) = y_1 \sim N\left(\beta_{w_1 w_2} + \beta_{w_1 w_2}^{Y_1(w_1)} y_1; \sigma_{w_1 w_2, y_1}^2\right) \quad (16)$$

$w_1 \in \{0, 1\}$, $w_2 \in \{0, 1\}$, $y_1 \in \{0, 1\}$. Again we impose $\sigma_{w_1 w_2, y_1=0}^2 = \sigma_{w_1 w_2, y_1=1}^2 \equiv \sigma_{w_1 w_2}^2$. We assume that parameters are a priori independent and use proper, although non informative, Normal (or Scale-Inv- χ^2 for $\sigma_{w_1 w_2}^2$) prior distributions.

Table 2: Summary statistics for the causal estimands posterior distributions when LSI holds.

Estimand	true	LSI				SI-1				SI-2			
		mean	sd	2.5%	97.5%	mean	sd	2.5%	97.5%	mean	sd	2.5%	97.5%
$ATE_{11.00}$	12.54	12.41	0.19	11.91	12.76	12.17	0.17	11.74	12.52	12.21	0.19	11.84	12.58
$ATE_{11.01}$	6.25	6.17	0.32	5.50	6.92	5.56	0.26	5.01	6.15	3.24	0.19	1.87	2.61
$ATE_{11.10}$	7.54	7.52	0.25	6.96	7.99	6.97	0.23	6.43	7.46	3.64	0.18	3.27	4.00
$ATE_{10.00}$	5.01	4.89	0.20	4.61	5.26	5.21	0.18	4.93	5.51	8.57	0.16	8.25	8.88
$ATE_{01.10}$	1.29	1.33	0.32	0.44	2.14	1.41	0.28	0.79	2.05	1.40	0.16	1.09	1.71
$ATE_{01.00}$	6.29	6.22	0.27	5.57	6.77	6.61	0.22	6.21	6.96	9.97	0.16	9.64	10.28

Posterior inference on θ is obtained using Markov Chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) methods. The MCMC algorithms we adopted under LSI and SI with specification SI-1 use Gibbs sampler with data augmentation to impute at each step the missing principal stratum membership, G_i . Under SI with specification SI-2, the likelihood function does not involve mixtures of distributions associated with the latent strata, but only depends on observed distributions, so the posterior distribution of θ can be easily derived using Gibbs sampler methods. See on-line Supplementary Materials for further details on the prior distributions and the MCMC algorithms. The posterior distributions were simulated running a chain for 9000 MCMC iterations, after an initial 1000 burn-in iterations.

6.3 Simulation Results

Simulation results for the causal estimands of interest are shown in Tables 2 and 3 and in Figures 1 and 2. Table 2 and Table 3 show means, standard deviations and 95% posterior credible intervals for the average causal effects in Equation (1) when LSI and SI holds, respectively, and inference is conducted using LSI, SI-1 and SI-2 specifications. Similarly, under the same scenarios and model specifications, Figures 1 and 2 depict the posterior distributions of the six average causal effects.

Table 2 and Figure 1 make it clear that when LSI is the true assumption behind the data generating process, inference under SI may lead to misleading results. Figure 1 shows that only the LSI inferential framework is able to always lead to valid inference about the six causal effects of interest. All the posterior distributions of the six ATE s derived under LSI reach their maximum in a thin neighbourhood around the true ATE values, so the posterior modes, which approximately correspond to the posterior means, appear to be good point estimates for the causal effects of interest. Also the posterior variability is relatively small and the 95% posterior credible intervals, which always cover the true ATE values, are quite narrow, making inference very precise. Conversely, assuming SI, when LSI actually holds, may yield to completely wrong inferences, especially when a specification of type SI-2 is used. The posterior distributions of the six ATE s derived under SI with a specification of type SI-1 cover the true ATE values only in the queue for most of the six causal effects. Specifically, the 95% posterior credible intervals cover the true ATE values only for three out of the six ATE s: $ATE_{10.00}$, $ATE_{01.10}$, and $ATE_{01.00}$. For the remain causal estimands, $ATE_{11.00}$, $ATE_{11.01}$, and $ATE_{11.10}$, the true values are extreme values according to the estimated posterior distributions. The handicaps of inference under SI is even more dramatic when a specification of type SI-2 is used. In such a case, the posterior distributions for four out of six ATE s are located far away from the true values. The different performances of inference under SI, comparing specifications of type SI-1 and SI-2, may be (at least partially) justified noting that the first specification accounts for heterogeneity in the distribution of the final outcome, and thus in the causal effects, across principal strata. Therefore, although focus is on average causal effects for the whole population, if principal strata are strongly associated with the final outcomes, a parametrization of type SI-1 may in some measure address the consequences of a misspecified treatment assignment mechanism.

When SI is the true assumption underlying the data generation process, both LSI and SI (with either




Figure 1: Posterior density functions for the ATEs under the LSI scenario. Inference using LSI (solid), SI-1 (dotted) and SI-2 (dashed). The vertical solid line indicates the true value of the ATE.

Table 3: Summary statistics for the causal estimands posterior distributions when SI holds.

Estimand	true	LSI				SI-1				SI-2			
		mean	sd	2.5%	97.5%	mean	sd	2.5%	97.5%	mean	sd	2.5%	97.5%
$ATE_{11.00}$	12.54	12.52	0.25	12.00	12.98	12.62	0.26	12.13	13.08	12.42	0.18	12.06	17.77
$ATE_{11.01}$	6.25	6.16	0.31	5.51	6.91	6.31	0.31	5.60	7.00	6.14	0.21	5.73	6.55
$ATE_{11.10}$	7.54	7.49	0.27	6.85	8.12	7.56	0.28	6.88	8.22	7.53	0.19	7.14	7.90
$ATE_{10.00}$	5.01	5.02	0.17	4.65	5.31	5.06	0.17	4.68	5.35	4.89	0.18	4.55	5.23
$ATE_{01.10}$	1.29	1.33	0.25	0.62	1.90	1.24	0.24	0.66	1.85	1.39	0.21	0.99	1.79
$ATE_{01.00}$	6.29	6.35	0.23	5.66	6.84	6.30	0.21	5.78	6.80	6.28	0.18	5.92	6.63

a specification of type SI-1 or a specification of type SI-2) lead to valid inferences about the causal estimands of interest. As can be seen in Figure 2 and Table 3, the posterior distributions are bell-shaped approximately symmetrical curves around the true ATE values, providing relatively narrow 95% posterior credible intervals, which always cover the true ATE values. These results are consistent with the nature of the LSI assumption, which is a relaxed version of SI. In fact SI can be viewed as a special case of LSI, where the equalities in Equation (2) hold.

Equalities in Equation (2) are indeed key quantities to assess the SI assumption. Specifically, we can get some insight on its plausibility by looking at the posterior distributions of the treatment assignment probabilities at time $t = 2$, given the treatment received at time $t = 1$ and principal stratum membership, derived under the LSI assumption. Figures 3 and 4 show the posterior distributions of those treatment assignment probabilities coupled according to the equalities in Equation (2). As we could expect, the posterior distributions of the treatment assignment probabilities at time $t = 2$ in Figure 3, which are derived when LSI holds but SI does not, appear to be highly heterogeneous across principal strata, suggesting strong evidence against the equalities in Equation (2), and thus, against SI. On the other




Figure 2: Posterior density functions for the ATEs under the SI scenario. Inference using LSI (solid), SI-1 (dotted) and SI-2 (dashed). The vertical solid line indicates the true value of the ATE.

hand, the posterior distributions in Figure 4 look very similar and are highly overlapping, showing no evidence against SI in favor of LSI. It is worth noting that our simulation results are based on a single simulated data set. Studying the frequentist properties of our procedure in repeated samples is beyond the scope of the paper.

7 An illustrative example: the Tuscan Government Funding Program

We illustrate our framework in a program evaluation study concerning causal effects on firms' performances of an interest free loans policy aiming to ease access to credit by making it less costly. The program, promoted by the Tuscan Regional government (Italy), started in 2002 and it is still ongoing. Firms meeting certain standards to be eligible can apply to get an interest free loan at various points in time, thus firms may apply and be granted multiple times over subsequent years.

As an illustration, in this paper, we consider the calls published in the years between 2002 and 2007, and we focus on casual effects defined by contrasting firms' performances measured in terms of employment levels at the end of the study, in 2007, under different treatment sequences. Treatment sequences are defined using two binary treatment variables: W_{i1} equal to one if firm i is granted at least one time between 2002 and 2004, and zero otherwise; and W_{i2} equal to one if firm i is granted at least one time between 2005 and 2007, and zero otherwise. The final outcome of interest, Y_{i2} , is the firm i 's number of employees at the end of 2007. As intermediate outcome we consider a binary variable Y_{i1} describing the hiring policy of firm i at the end of 2004: $Y_{i1} = 1$ if new employees work for firm i at the end of 2004, and $Y_{i1} = 0$ otherwise. Therefore the basic principal stratification with respect to this intermediate variable classifies firms in four latent groups: $G_i = 00$ comprising firms that would not hire irrespective of the treatment received at time $t = 1$; $G_i = 01$ comprising firms that would hire if granted but would not hire if not granted; $G_i = 10$ comprising firms that would hire if not granted and would hire




Figure 3: Posterior density functions for the assignment probabilities when LSI holds.

if granted; and $G_i = 11$ comprising firms that would always hire irrespective of the treatment received at time $t = 1$. Principal strata with respect to the indicator for hiring choices can be viewed as a coarsened representation of the latent hiring preferences of a firm, which are reasonable associated with both the decision to participate in the treatment at a subsequent time point and the final outcome.

Firms exposed to different treatment sequences are likely to differ in many dimensions. Thus, preliminary analyses based on matching procedures were conducted to create a sub-population of firms exposed to alternative treatment sequences, where the distributions of the confounders, including both pretreatment baseline covariates and intermediate (time-variant) confounder variables, are overlapping and well balanced across firms exposed to alternative treatment sequences (see Pirani et al., 2013, for details). Our final sample consists of 4615 firms, among which 632 firms received a loan only in one treatment period, 33 firms received a loan in both treatment periods, and the rest did not received any loan in the observation period.

Bayesian inference for the average casual effects of interest was conducted under both LSI and SI. Under LSI the model we specified involved the tree sub-models described in Equations (10), (11) and (14). Bayesian inference under SI was conducted using both a specification of type SI-1, which involved the tree sub-models described in Equations (10), (13) and (14), and a specification of type SI-2, which involved the tree sub-models described in Equations (15), (13) and (16).

Table 4 shows the posterior means, standard deviations and 95% posterior credible intervals for the stratum membership probabilities and the six $ATEs$, while Figure 5 portrays their posterior density functions. Inference under SI does not seem to strongly depend on the type of specification used. Both specifications SI-1 and SI-2 lead to similar results for all the six causal effects of interest but two, $ATE_{01,00}$ and $ATE_{10,00}$. The posterior density functions of $ATE_{01,00}$ and $ATE_{10,00}$ derived under specification SI-1 are shifted on the right with respect to those derived under specification SI-2 and have greater posterior means.

Under LSI we obtain substantially different inferential results than those under SI, especially for




Figure 4: Posterior density functions for the assignment probabilities when SI holds.

some causal estimands. LSI leads to posterior distributions for the causal effects $ATE_{10.00}$, $ATE_{11.01}$ and $ATE_{11.10}$ that are essentially the same as those derived under SI with a specification of type SI-1, but provides posterior distributions for $ATE_{11.00}$, $ATE_{11.01}$ and $ATE_{11.10}$ that are centered on much higher values and have a higher variability than those derived under SI. Specifically the posterior means of $ATE_{11.00}$, $ATE_{11.01}$ and $ATE_{11.10}$ derived under LSI are more than 1.8 times those derived under SI, but the posterior standard deviations of $ATE_{11.00}$, $ATE_{11.01}$ and $ATE_{11.10}$ derived under LSI are about twice those derived under SI. The loss of precision we have assuming LSI rather than SI is probably due to the greater complexity of the model; the small proportion of firms that is estimated to belong to some principal strata (e.g., the posterior means of the probabilities to belongs to groups 01 and 11 are equal to 0.04, see $\hat{\pi}_g$ in Table 4); and the extremely low estimated probability to receive a loan at time $t = 2$ for all firms but those in the principal stratum 01 that received a loan at time $t = 1$ (see Table 5).

Given that LSI and SI lead to quite different graphs, it becomes of compelling interest to investigate the plausibility of the SI assumptions. To this end, we look at the posterior distributions of the assignment probabilities at time $t = 2$, summarized in Table 5 and displayed in Figure 6. As we can see in Table 5 the probability to receive a loan in the second treatment period is very small for all firms expect for those belonging to principal stratum 01 that received a loan in the first treatment period. Also we find large differences comparing the posterior distributions of the assignment probabilities at time $t = 2$ two by two according to the equalities in Equation (2). Among firms that did not receive a loan in the first treatment period ($W_{i1} = 0$) the posterior mean of the probability to receive a loan in the second treatment period is about 7% for firms in principal stratum 10 and about 1% for firms in principal stratum 11. Among firms that received a loan in the first treatment period ($W_{i1} = 1$) the posterior mean of the probability to receive a loan in the second treatment period is about 76% for firms in principal stratum 01 and less than 5‰ for firms in principal stratum 11. The differences in the probabilities to receive a loan in the second treatment period between these groups of firms are even more evident if one looks at the posterior distribution displayed in Figure 6. In fact there is no overlap in the posterior distributions showed in the

Table 4: Summary statistics for the causal estimands posterior distributions in the real case.

Estimand	LSI				SI-1				SI-2			
	mean	sd	2.5%	97.5%	mean	sd	2.5%	97.5%	mean	sd	2.5%	97.5%
$\hat{\pi}_{00}$	0.69	0.01	0.67	0.70	0.69	0.01	0.67	0.70	—	—	—	—
$\hat{\pi}_{01}$	0.04	0.00	0.03	0.05	0.04	0.00	0.03	0.04	—	—	—	—
$\hat{\pi}_{10}$	0.23	0.01	0.22	0.25	0.24	0.01	0.22	0.25	—	—	—	—
$\hat{\pi}_{11}$	0.04	0.00	0.03	0.05	0.04	0.00	0.03	0.05	—	—	—	—
$ATE_{11.00}$	15.11	6.03	-0.69	21.62	8.22	3.47	1.63	15.70	6.88	2.96	0.90	12.66
$ATE_{11.01}$	10.19	6.07	-5.69	16.83	3.57	3.53	-3.15	11.20	3.87	3.01	-2.16	9.58
$ATE_{11.10}$	11.73	6.01	-3.97	18.36	5.02	3.50	-1.60	12.52	5.00	3.00	-1.06	10.85
$ATE_{10.00}$	3.39	0.51	2.38	4.39	3.20	0.51	2.21	4.18	1.88	0.52	0.89	2.88
$ATE_{01.10}$	1.54	0.70	0.15	2.93	1.45	0.70	0.09	2.80	1.13	0.77	-0.39	2.59
$ATE_{01.00}$	4.92	0.55	3.85	6.07	4.65	0.56	3.52	5.71	3.01	0.58	1.90	4.13

Table 5: Summary statistics for the assignment probabilities in the real case.

W_1	G	mean	sd	Q_1	median	Q_3
0	00	0.0690	0.0048	0.0657	0.0689	0.0721
	01	0.0432	0.0170	0.0309	0.0414	0.0532
	10	0.0708	0.0081	0.0652	0.0706	0.0762
	11	0.0105	0.0100	0.0032	0.0074	0.0149
1	00	0.0890	0.0418	0.0795	0.0990	0.1156
	10	0.0765	0.1167	0.0139	0.0267	0.0538
	01	0.7627	0.1326	0.6785	0.7812	0.8643
	11	0.0004	0.0018	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000

right-upper and lower panel in Figure 6. The posterior distributions of the probability to receive a loan in the second treatment period for firms in principal strata 00 and 01 assigned to $W_{i1} = 0$ and for firms in principal strata 00 and 10 assigned to $W_{i1} = 1$ are more similar, although there is still strong evidence against the assumption that they are the same, which is implied by SI. Therefore our results show some evidence that SI might be a questionable assumption in this study, suggesting inference under LSI to be more reliable here.

8 Concluding Remarks

We focus on the role of the critical assumptions about the assignment mechanism in causal inference for time-varying treatments. We propose a relaxed version of the usually invoked sequential ignorability assumption, that we call latent sequential ignorability, which implies that the joint values of potential outcomes for the relevant intermediate variables (i.e., the principal strata), rather than their observed values only, include crucial information about the decision to participate in the treatment.

LSI focuses on specific violations of SI due to the presence of unobserved factors affecting the decision to participate in the treatment that can be summarized by principal strata.

In studies where ignorability assumptions are reasonable, LSI provides a powerful framework, which also permit to easily assess the sensitivity of inferential conclusions with respect to violations of SI implied by LSI looking at inferences on the probabilities of treatment assignment at a given time point under LSI, conditional on the observed history and principal strata. These quantities are key estimands in causal inference under LSI, so no additional effort is required to perform sensitivity analysis under LSI.




Figure 5: Posterior density functions for the ATEs in the real case application. Inference using LSI (solid), SI-1 (dotted) and SI-2 (dashed).

Simulation results show that LSI conducts to valid inference for causal effects even if SI holds, although it usually involves more complex models. On the other hand, inference under SI may lead to very misleading inferential conclusions when it does not hold, but LSI does. These results were expected since they immediately follow from the relationship between LSI and SI: LSI is a relaxed version of SI, so SI can be simply viewed a special case of LSI.

In our illustrative example, sensitivity analysis showed strong evidence against SI: the posterior distributions of the treatment assignment probabilities at time $t = 2$ withing groups defined by the first treatment and principal stratum membership are quite heterogeneous. Therefore, given the relationship between LSI and SI and the evidences from the simulation results, we argue that it is better to rely on inferences based on LSI.

Another appealing feature of LSI is that it provides a natural framework to investigate the heterogeneity of the effects across principal strata. Assessing causal effects stratified by intermediate outcomes under SI generally requires additional efforts. In particular, in a Bayesian setting, one needs to specify a model for principal strata membership conditional on the covariates, and a model for the potential outcomes $Y_{i2}(w_1, w_2)$ conditional on principal strata and covariates. This model specification, which corresponds to using a specification of type SI-1 under SI, is the core of the inferential approach under LSI, but it is not standard in causal inference under SI. Here we did not investigate issues concerning causal effect heterogeneity across principal strata, focusing on comparing inferences about causal effects for the whole population under LSI and SI, however the heterogeneity of the effects with respect to principal strata can be often of interest to policy makers.

As a general message, our study stresses the importance to carefully evaluate the plausibility of the assumptions underlying the analysis especially in complex settings like those arising in longitudinal observational studies.

The extension of our framework to multiple (i.e., more than two) time points is without any doubt




Figure 6: Posterior density functions for the assignment probabilities.

an interesting future development. The extension to additional periods is conceptually straightforward, but raises challenging practical issues due to the fact that the number of principal strata increases exponentially with the number of time points. To cope with the increasingly huge missing data problem, additional assumptions are required. For instance we could invoke Markovian properties, similarly to what has been done, e.g., both by Lin et al. (2008) in a study in which units are randomized at the baseline (i.e., at the initial time) and compliance to treatment may vary longitudinally, and by Dai et al. (2012) who considered, again, a unique treatment and some post-randomization time-varying behavioural variables.

Acknowledgements

Financial support for this research was generously provided through the grant “Programma Futuro in Ricerca 2012 – RBFR12SHVV_003”, financed by the Italian Ministero dell’Istruzione, dell’Università e della Ricerca.

References

- Achy-Brou, A. C., C. E. Frangakis, and M. Griswold (2010). Estimating treatment effects of longitudinal designs using regression models on propensity scores. *Biometrics* 66, 824–833.
- Dai, J. Y., P. B. Gilbert, and B. R. Mâsse (2012). Partially hidden markov model for time-varying principal stratification in hiv prevention trials. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 107, 52–65.
- de Finetti, B. (1937). La prévision: ses lois logiques, ses sources subjectives. In *Annales de l’institut Henri Poincaré*, Volume 7, pp. 1–68. Presses universitaires de France.

- de Finetti, B. (1964). Foresight: Its logical laws, its subjective sources. In H. E. Kyburg and H. E. Smokler (Eds.), *Studies in Subjective Probability*, pp. 93–158. New York: Wiley.
- Frangakis, C. E. and D. B. Rubin (1999). Addressing complications of intention-to-treat analysis in the combined presence of all-or-none treatment-noncompliance and subsequent missing outcomes. *Biometrika* 86, 365–379.
- Frangakis, C. E. and D. B. Rubin (2002). Principal stratification in causal inference. *Biometrics* 58(1), 21–29.
- Gill, R. D. and J. M. Robins (2001). Causal inference for complex longitudinal data: The continuous case. *The Annals of Statistics* 29, 1785–1811.
- Heckman, J. J. and S. Navarro (2007). Dynamic discrete choice and dynamic treatment effects. *Journal of Econometrics* 136, 341–396.
- Holland, P. (1986). Statistics and Causal Inference. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 81, 945–960.
- Hong, G. and S. W. Raudenbush (2008). Causal inference for time-varying instructional treatments. *Journal of Educational and Behavioral Statistics* 33, 333–362.
- Ichino, A., F. Mealli, and T. Nannicini (2008). From temporary help jobs to permanent employment: What can we learn from matching estimators and their sensitivity? *Journal of Applied Econometrics* 23, 305–327.
- Imai, K. and M. Ratkovic (2014). Robust estimation of inverse probability weights for marginal structural models. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*. To appear.
- Imbens, G. and D. B. Rubin (1997). Bayesian inference for causal effects in randomized experiments with noncompliance. *The Annals of Statistics* 25, 305–327.
- Imbens, G. and D. B. Rubin (2015). *Causal Inference for Statistics, Social, and Biomedical Sciences: An Introduction*. Cambridge University Press.
- Imbens, G. W. (2003). Sensitivity to exogeneity assumptions in program evaluation. *The American Economic Review*, 93, 126–132.
- Lechner, M. (2009). Sequential causal models for the evaluation of labor market programs. *Journal of Business and Economic Statistics* 27, 71–83.
- Lin, J. Y., T. Ten Have, and M. R. Elliott (2008). Longitudinal Nested Compliance Class Model in the Presence of Time-Varying Noncompliance. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 103, 505–513.
- Mealli, F. and B. Pacini (2013). Using secondary outcomes to sharpen inference in randomized experiments with noncompliance. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 108(503), 1120–1131.
- Murphy, S. A. (2003). Optimal dynamic treatment regimes. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society, Series B* 65, 331–355.
- Pirani, E., M. Mariani, and F. Mealli (2013). A longitudinal design for the evaluation of the effects of subsidized loans on firm survival and growth. Presented at the 1st Southern European Conference on Survey Methodology, 12-14 December 2013, Barcellona, Spain.

- Robins, J. M. (1986). A new approach to causal inference in mortality studies with sustained exposure periods - Application to control of the healthy worker survivor effect. *Mathematical Modelling* 7, 1393–1512.
- Robins, J. M. (1989). The analysis of randomized and non-randomized aids treatment trials using a new approach to causal inference in longitudinal studies. *Health Service Research Methodology: A Focus on AIDS*, 113–159.
- Robins, J. M. (1997). Causal inference from complex longitudinal data. *Latent Variable Modeling and Applications to Causality* 120, 69–117.
- Robins, J. M. (2004). Optimal structural nested models for optimal sequential decisions. In *Proceedings of the Second Seattle Symposium in Biostatistics: Analysis of Correlated Data*, pp. 189–326.
- Robins, J. M., M. A. Hernan, and B. Brumback (2000). Marginal structural models and causal inference. *Epidemiology* 11, 550–560.
- Rosenbaum, P. (1987). Sensitivity analysis to certain permutation inferences in matched observational studies. *Biometrika* 74, 13–26.
- Rosenbaum, P. R. and D. B. Rubin (1983). Assessing sensitivity to an unobserved binary covariate in an observational study with binary outcome. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society, Series B: Methodological* 45, 212–218.
- Rubin, D. B. (1974). Estimating Causal Effects of Treatments in Randomized and Nonrandomized Studies. *J. Educ. Psychol.* 66(5), 688–701.
- Rubin, D. B. (1977). Assignment to Treatment Group on the Basis of a Covariate. *Journal of Educational Statistics* 2, 1–26.
- Rubin, D. B. (1978). Bayesian Inference for Causal Effects: The Role of Randomization. *The Annals of Statistics* 6, 34–58.
- Rubin, D. B. (1980). Discussion of 'Randomization analysis of experimental data in the Fisher randomization test' by Basu. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 75, 591–593.
- Rubin, D. B. (2005). Causal Inference Using Potential Outcomes: Design, Modeling, Decisions. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 100(469), 322–331.
- Zajonc, T. (2012). Bayesian inference for dynamic treatment regimes: Mobility, equity, and efficiency in student tracking. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 107(497), 80–92.