

SelectionBias: An R Package for Bounding Selection Bias

Stina Zetterstrom
Uppsala University

Ingeborg Waernbaum
Uppsala University

Abstract

Selection bias can occur when subjects are included or excluded in the analysis based upon some selection criteria for the study population. The bias can jeopardize the validity of the study and sensitivity analyses for assessing the effect of the selection are desired. One method of sensitivity analysis is to construct bounds for the bias. In this work, we present an R package that can be used to calculate two previously proposed bounds for selection bias for the causal relative risk and causal risk difference for both the total and the selected population. The first bound, derived by Smith and VanderWeele (SV), is based on values of sensitivity parameters that describe parts of the joint distribution of the outcome, treatment, selection indicator and unobserved variables. The second bound is based solely on the observed data, and is therefore referred to as an assumption free (AF) bound. In addition to a tutorial for the bounds and the R package, we derive additional properties for the SV bound. We show that the sensitivity parameters are variation independent and derive feasible regions for them. Furthermore, a bound is sharp if it is a priori known that the bias can be equal to the value of the bound, given the values of the selected sensitivity parameters. Conditions for the SV bound to be sharp in the selected subpopulation are provided based on the observed data. We illustrate both the R package and the properties of the bound with a simulated dataset that emulates a study where the effect of the zika virus on microcephaly in Brazil is investigated.

Keywords: assumption free bound, sensitivity analysis, sharp bound.

1. Introduction

Selecting a study population from a larger source population is a common procedure, for example in an observational study with data from a population register. Based on the research question, the study population is commonly constructed from one or several inclusion/exclusion criteria. Subjects who fulfill all the criteria are included in the study population, and subjects who do not fulfill at least one criterion are excluded from the study population. The construction of the study population from these selection criteria might alter the causal effect between an exposure and outcome of interest (Hernán *et al.* 2004). This systematic error is commonly referred to as selection bias and can occur even for causal estimands in the selected study population. Selection bias can also arise if the selections are involuntary, for example, if there are dropouts or other missing values for some individuals in the study (Lu *et al.* 2022).

In an applied study, it is often of interest to assess the magnitude of potential biases using a sensitivity analysis. One type of sensitivity analysis is bounding the selection bias, see for ex-

ample [Huang and Lee \(2015\)](#). When constructing bias bounds, there are two main strategies. The first strategy is to make additional assumptions of the causal structure and strengths of the dependencies, and then make educated guesses on sensitivity parameters describing parts of the causal structure. Several bounds using this approach has been suggested ([Huang and Lee 2015](#); [Greenland 2003](#); [Flanders and Ye 2019](#); [Smith and VanderWeele 2019](#)). The other strategy is to calculate bounds based on the data, without any additional assumptions. Thus, these bounds can be referred to as assumption free (AF) bounds ([Robins 1989](#); [Sjölander 2020](#)). In [Zetterstrom and Waernbaum \(2022\)](#), a proposal of assumption free bounds for selection bias is derived.

The bounds in [Smith and VanderWeele \(2019\)](#), hereafter referred to as the SV bounds, can be calculated using the R package **EValue** and an online calculator ([Smith and VanderWeele 2019](#); [Smith *et al.* 2021](#)), where the user inputs the assumed sensitivity parameters. The sensitivity parameters are summary measures of a joint distribution, and can thus be difficult to specify, especially in the presence of many selection variables. As an alternative, or complement, we present the R package **SelectionBias**, where the practicing data-analyst can implement both the SV and AF bounds. As opposed to **EValue**, the user can input the entire assumed model, which might be easier to specify than the sensitivity parameters. In short, the package includes functions that can calculate the sensitivity parameters for the SV bound, the SV bound and the AF bound. The content in **SelectionBias** is:

- **zika_learner**: a simulated dataset inspired by the study in [de Araújo *et al.* \(2018\)](#) and the zika example in [Smith and VanderWeele \(2019\)](#). The dataset includes seven variables: zika virus, microcephaly, the selection variables birth and public hospital, the selection indicator variable and the two unmeasured variables living area and socio-economic status.
- **SVboundparametersM()**: a function that calculates the sensitivity parameters that comprise the SV bound for a generalization of the M-structure (Figure 1) defined by the user.
- **SVbound()**: a function that calculates the SV bound for sensitivity parameters given by the user, either inserted directly or as output from **SVboundparametersM()**. The SV bound can be calculated for the relative risk and risk difference in either the total or subpopulation.
- **AFbound()**: a function that calculates the AF bound for a dataset supplied by the user. The dataset must include an outcome, a treatment and either a selection variable or a selection probability.
- **SVboundsharp()**: a function that evaluates if the SV bound for the subpopulation is sharp for data supplied by the user.

Additionally, we further investigate and present new properties of the SV bound. Specifically, we derive feasible regions for the sensitivity parameters, and we show that the sensitivity parameters are variation independent, i.e. that they are not restricted by each other or the observed data distribution. [Sjölander \(2020\)](#) presents similar properties for bounds of bias due to unmeasured confounding. Furthermore, we define a sharp bound as a bound where it is a priori known that the bias can be equal to the bound, given the values of the selected

sensitivity parameters, and derive sufficient conditions for a region where the SV bounds in the subpopulation are sharp. Here, sharpness serves as an indicator if the calculated SV bounds are feasible. We also show that the SV bounds for the total population cannot usually be sharp.

The paper is outlined as follows. In Section 2, we present the causal framework, estimands and corresponding selection biases together with an introduction of the SV and AF bounds. In Section 3, the simulated example dataset `zika_learner` is described. In Section 4, we derive the feasible regions and sharpness results of the SV bounds. In Section 5, the R package **SelectionBias** is demonstrated using the `zika_learner` data. Finally, the results are summarized in Section 6.

2. Causal framework and selection bias

In this section, we provide a theoretical background for the bounds calculated in the R package **SelectionBias**. First, we introduce the notation and causal framework, and second, we describe the SV and AF bounds.

2.1. Potential outcomes and causal estimands

We consider an i.i.d. sample of size $i = 1, \dots, n$ units from a population, but henceforth suppress the index i representing units in the sample. Throughout the presentation, sampling variability is ignored and we describe the corresponding population level versions of the quantities under study. We assume a binary treatment, $T = 1$ if the unit is treated and $T = 0$ if the unit is not treated, and two corresponding binary potential outcomes, $Y(1)$ and $Y(0)$ (Rubin 1974). We assume consistency, meaning that the observed outcome is the potential outcome under the actual treatment, $Y = TY(1) + (1 - T)Y(0)$. For every unit in the study we define K binary selection variables, $S_1, \dots, S_k, \dots, S_K$, where S_k indicates if the subject passes the k :th selection criterion. From S_1, \dots, S_K , we define a selection indicator function I_S such that

$$I_S = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \prod_{k=1}^K S_k = 1 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

For a subject to be included in the study, the corresponding I_S must be equal to 1. We assume a vector of observed pre-treatment covariates, denoted by X , such that conditional exchangeability holds in the total population: $Y(t) \perp\!\!\!\perp T \mid X$, $t = 0, 1$. However, similar as to the previous literature, we suppress X throughout and assume that all calculations are performed within strata of the pre-treatment covariates. Additionally, we define a vector of unobserved pre-treatment covariates, U , which is part of the assumptions in the sensitivity analysis with the SV bounds. It is illustrated in a generalized M-structure (Figure 1), where U is a predictor of the outcome. It is worth noting that the unobserved covariates U are not needed in the AF bounds, which simplifies the analysis as the dependencies with U need not be provided by the researcher.

In this paper, the causal estimands of interest are the relative risk and risk difference in the total population, $\beta_R = \text{P}(Y(1) = 1)/\text{P}(Y(0) = 1)$ and $\beta_D = \text{P}(Y(1) = 1) - \text{P}(Y(0) = 1)$, and in the subpopulation, $\beta_{R_S} = \text{P}(Y(1) = 1|I_S = 1)/\text{P}(Y(0) = 1|I_S = 1)$ and $\beta_{D_S} = \text{P}(Y(1) = 1|I_S = 1) - \text{P}(Y(0) = 1|I_S = 1)$. Corresponding to the causal estimands, we define estimands




Figure 1: The generalized M-structure.

Estimand	Causal	Observed	Bias
<i>Relative risk, tot. population</i>	$\beta_R = \frac{\mathbb{P}(Y(1)=1)}{\mathbb{P}(Y(0)=1)}$	$\beta_R^{obs} = \frac{\mathbb{P}(Y=1 T=1, I_S=1)}{\mathbb{P}(Y=1 T=0, I_S=1)}$	$bias(\beta_R) = \frac{\beta_R^{obs}}{\beta_R}$
<i>Risk difference, tot. population</i>	$\beta_D = \mathbb{P}(Y(1) = 1) - \mathbb{P}(Y(0) = 1)$	$\beta_D^{obs} = \mathbb{P}(Y = 1 T = 1, I_S = 1) - \mathbb{P}(Y = 1 T = 0, I_S = 1)$	$bias(\beta_D) = \beta_D^{obs} - \beta_D$
<i>Relative risk, subpopulation</i>	$\beta_{R_S} = \frac{\mathbb{P}(Y(1)=1 I_S=1)}{\mathbb{P}(Y(0)=1 I_S=1)}$	$\beta_{R_S}^{obs} = \frac{\mathbb{P}(Y=1 T=1, I_S=1)}{\mathbb{P}(Y=1 T=0, I_S=1)}$	$bias(\beta_{R_S}) = \frac{\beta_{R_S}^{obs}}{\beta_{R_S}}$
<i>Risk difference, subpopulation</i>	$\beta_{D_S} = \mathbb{P}(Y(1) = 1 I_S = 1) - \mathbb{P}(Y(0) = 1 I_S = 1)$	$\beta_{D_S}^{obs} = \mathbb{P}(Y = 1 T = 1, I_S = 1) - \mathbb{P}(Y = 1 T = 0, I_S = 1)$	$bias(\beta_{D_S}) = \beta_{D_S}^{obs} - \beta_{D_S}$

Table 1: Definition and selection bias for $\beta_R, \beta_D, \beta_{R_S}$ and β_{D_S} .

based on the observed outcome, Y , under selection, $I_S = 1$, β_R^{obs} and β_D^{obs} . These are referred to as the *observed* estimands, even though they are unknown population quantities. More precisely, they are the limiting values of the corresponding observed data summary statistics (Zetterstrom and Waernbaum 2022). The definitions of the causal estimands, the observed estimands and the selection bias are given in Table 1. We perform sensitivity analysis for the largest possible selection bias for the four estimands through the proposed bounds described in the next sections.

2.2. Bounds for selection bias

In this section, we describe the SV and AF bounds, denoted by $\mathcal{B}(\cdot)$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{B}}(\cdot)$, respectively. The bounds are constructed as upper bounds given that the biases in Table 1 are positive, meaning that the observed estimands are overestimating their causal counterpart. The condition is technical since the bias can be reversed by simply recoding the treatment. For the SV bounds, two versions of conditional independence assumptions involving the outcome, selection indicator, treatment and unmeasured variable are additionally made (see Appendix A). The assumptions differ depending on the estimand of interest. If total population estimands β_R and β_D are of interest conditioning on U and T must be sufficient for the independence of the observed outcome Y and the selection indicator I_S . For the case when subpopulation estimands β_{R_S} and β_{D_S} are considered, an assumption requiring exchangeability conditional on U and I_S is instead made. An example where both assumptions are fulfilled is the M-structure in Figure 1. Note that, in the presence of multiple selections, the unmeasured variable can be a vector. The purpose of the different assumptions is to ensure the theoretical possibility

Total population estimands: β_R, β_D	Subpopulation estimands: β_{R_S}, β_{D_S}
$RR_{UY T=1} = \frac{\max_u \mathbb{P}(Y=1 T=1, U=u)}{\min_u \mathbb{P}(Y=1 T=1, U=u)}$	$RR_{UY S=1} = \max_t \frac{\max_u \mathbb{P}(Y=1 T=t, U=u, I_S=1)}{\min_u \mathbb{P}(Y=1 T=t, U=u, I_S=1)}$
$RR_{UY T=0} = \frac{\max_u \mathbb{P}(Y=1 T=0, U=u)}{\min_u \mathbb{P}(Y=1 T=0, U=u)}$	
$RR_{SU T=1} = \max_u \frac{\mathbb{P}(U=u T=1, I_S=1)}{\mathbb{P}(U=u T=1, I_S=0)}$	$RR_{TU S=1} = \max_u \frac{\mathbb{P}(U=u T=1, I_S=1)}{\mathbb{P}(U=u T=0, I_S=1)}$
$RR_{SU T=0} = \max_u \frac{\mathbb{P}(U=u T=0, I_S=0)}{\mathbb{P}(U=u T=0, I_S=1)}$	

Table 2: Definitions for the sensitivity parameters used in the SV bounds for the total population estimands, β_R, β_D , and the subpopulation estimands, β_{R_S} and β_{D_S} .

to get unbiased estimates, if the unmeasured variable was observed.

SV bounds

The SV bounds are defined by sensitivity parameters that are constructed as relative risks formed by the joint distribution of the outcome, treatment, selection indicator variable and unmeasured variables, (Y, T, I_S, U) . The definitions are given in Table 2.

The SV bound for the relative risk in the total population, $\mathcal{B}(\beta_R)$, is defined as

$$\mathcal{B}(\beta_R) = BF_1 \cdot BF_0 \quad (1)$$

where

$$BF_1 = \frac{RR_{UY|T=1} \cdot RR_{SU|T=1}}{RR_{UY|T=1} + RR_{SU|T=1} - 1},$$

$$BF_0 = \frac{RR_{UY|T=0} \cdot RR_{SU|T=0}}{RR_{UY|T=0} + RR_{SU|T=0} - 1}.$$

The SV bound for the risk difference in the total population, $\mathcal{B}(\beta_D)$, additionally includes the observed probability of success for each treatment group, as well as the previously defined BF_0 and BF_1 . It is defined as

$$\mathcal{B}(\beta_D) = BF_1 - \mathbb{P}(Y = 1|T = 1, I_S = 1)/BF_1 + \mathbb{P}(Y = 1|T = 0, I_S = 1) \cdot BF_0. \quad (2)$$

The SV bounds have simpler expressions for the subpopulation. The bounds $\mathcal{B}(\beta_{R_S})$ and $\mathcal{B}(\beta_{D_S})$ are defined as

$$\mathcal{B}(\beta_{R_S}) = BF_U = \frac{RR_{UY|S=1} \cdot RR_{TU|S=1}}{RR_{UY|S=1} + RR_{TU|S=1} - 1} \quad (3)$$

and

$$\mathcal{B}(\beta_{D_S}) = \max[\mathbb{P}(Y = 1|T = 0, I_S = 1) \cdot (BF_U - 1), \mathbb{P}(Y = 1|T = 1, I_S = 1) \cdot (1 - 1/BF_U)]. \quad (4)$$

The sensitivity parameters describe the strength of associations in the joint distribution. For the total population, $RR_{UY|T=t}$ is the maximum relative risk of $Y = 1$ comparing two values

Estimand	Assumption-free bound
β_R^*	$\tilde{\mathcal{B}}(\beta_R) = \mathbb{P}(Y(0) = 1)^{max} / (\mathbb{P}(Y = 1 T = 0, I_S = 1)\mathbb{P}(T = 1 I_S = 1)\mathbb{P}(I_S = 1))$
β_D^*	$\tilde{\mathcal{B}}(\beta_D) = \mathbb{P}(Y(0) = 1)^{max} + \mathbb{P}(Y = 1 T = 1, I_S = 1) \cdot [1 - \mathbb{P}(T = 1 I_S = 1)\mathbb{P}(I_S = 1)] - \mathbb{P}(Y = 1 T = 0, I_S = 1)$
$\beta_{R_S}^{**}$	$\tilde{\mathcal{B}}(\beta_{R_S}) = \mathbb{P}(Y(0) = 1 I_S = 1)^{max} / (\mathbb{P}(Y = 1 T = 0, I_S = 1)\mathbb{P}(T = 1 I_S = 1))$
$\beta_{D_S}^{**}$	$\tilde{\mathcal{B}}(\beta_{D_S}) = \mathbb{P}(Y(0) = 1 I_S = 1)^{max} + \mathbb{P}(Y = 1 T = 1, I_S = 1)[1 - \mathbb{P}(T = 1 I_S = 1)] - \mathbb{P}(Y = 1 T = 0, I_S = 1)$
* $\mathbb{P}(Y(0) = 1)^{max} = \min[\mathbb{P}(T = 1 I_S = 1)\mathbb{P}(I_S = 1) + 2\mathbb{P}(I_S = 0) + \mathbb{P}(Y = 1 T = 0, I_S = 1)\mathbb{P}(T = 0 I_S = 1)\mathbb{P}(I_S = 1), 1]$	
** $\mathbb{P}(Y(0) = 1 I_S = 1)^{max} = \min[\mathbb{P}(T = 1 I_S = 1) + \mathbb{P}(Y = 1 T = 0, I_S = 1)\mathbb{P}(T = 0 I_S = 1), 1]$	

Table 3: The assumption free bounds for β_R , β_D , β_{R_S} and β_{D_S} .

of U , for each treatment group, and $RR_{SU|T=t}$ is the maximum factor by which selection is associated with an increased prevalence of $U = u$ within each treatment group. Similar interpretations can be formulated for the sensitivity parameters defining the bound for the subpopulation estimands β_{R_S} and β_{D_S} . It is worth noting that it can be difficult to interpret and specify the sensitivity parameters, especially in the presence of multiple selection variables and multiple unmeasured variables. Instead, it may be easier to break down the bound into smaller pieces, and calculate it for a specified data generating process (DGP). We facilitate such calculations for the user by having both approaches in the R package **SelectionBias**.

AF bounds

The AF bounds are constructed from the data assuming that the selection bias is positive but without the conditional independence assumptions implied by the M-structure. The idea is to find the minimum possible value of the causal estimand, β^{min} , from the data. The maximum possible bias is then found by inserting β^{min} into the expression for the bias instead of the actual causal estimand, β . The definitions of the AF bounds are found in Table 3.

The AF bounds have the advantage that they do not require any assumptions about the causal model and that they are based on the maximum selection bias. This means that any other bound that takes a greater value than the AF bound is not useful. However, if the treatment or outcome is rare, i.e., the probability $\mathbb{P}(Y = 1|T = 0, I_S = 1)$ or $\mathbb{P}(T = 1|I_S = 1)$ is small, the AF bounds for the relative risks can be very large, and non-informative in practice. When this is the case, and extra knowledge is available, it is instead advisable to use the SV bounds or other bounds taking the knowledge into account.

3. The simulated data set

For the purpose of illustration of the bounds we construct the simulated dataset `zika_learner` inspired by a numerical zika example used in [Smith and VanderWeele \(2019\)](#) together with a case-control study that investigates the effect of zika virus on microcephaly ([de Araújo et al. 2018](#)). In Section 4, the data is used to present properties of the SV bounds and is therefore introduced before the rest of the R package. The data can be loaded by

```
R> data("zika_learner", package = "SelectionBias")
```

The zika example in [Smith and VanderWeele \(2019\)](#) covers the case of a single selection.

When constructing the dataset `zika_learner`, a natural extension is to include a second selection variable. The two selections are the binary variables birth and public hospital, and the selection process is described in Figure 2a. Note that, in the original study pre-treatment covariates for both the mother and the infant were included in order to control for confounding (de Araújo *et al.* 2018). However, we only consider one stratum of the covariates and thus exclude all observed pre-treatment covariates in the simulated dataset. Furthermore, all variables are binary and generated from the binomial distribution. The causal model of the dataset is given in Figure 2b. The prevalences of the variables, and strengths of dependencies between them, are chosen to mimic real data and the assumed values for the sensitivity parameters in Smith and VanderWeele (2019). Even though the dataset is inspired by a case-control study, the simulated dataset in the R package emulates a register with 5000 observations, similar to a prototypical observational study (Lebov *et al.* 2019). The variables included are:

- *Living area* (V). A binary, unobserved variable indicating whether the subject lives in an urban area ($V = 1$) or not ($V = 0$). The probability of living in an urban area is set to 0.85 following numbers from the World Bank.
- Socioeconomic status, *SES* (U). A binary variable indicating socioeconomic status (high vs low), with probability set to 0.5.
- *Zika* (T). In 2016 there was approximately 34000 cases of zika virus during pregnancy (de Oliveira *et al.* 2017), and there is approximately 2.9 million births per year in Brazil (Malta *et al.* 2019). The risk of getting zika was higher in urban areas (Ali *et al.* 2017). Thus, the prevalence of zika in the simulated dataset is around 1% with a positive impact of V , see Table 4 for details.
- *Microcephaly* (Y). The estimated prevalence of microcephaly was 74 cases per 10000 births and the controlled odds ratio of zika virus on microcephaly was estimated to 73.1 (de Araújo *et al.* 2018). We mimic these values with an overall prevalence of 0.8% and a relative risk of 74.5 among the selected subpopulation after two selections, see Table 4 for details.
- *Birth* (S_1). Pregnancies that ended in a live or still birth were included in the study, and pregnancies that ended in a miscarriage or an abortion were excluded. The probability of a pregnancy ending in birth is assumed to be affected both by zika virus infection and socioeconomic status. The number of births per year in Brazil is approximately 2.9 million and the number of unregulated abortions per year are estimated to 500000 (Malta *et al.* 2019). The prevalence of birth in the simulated dataset is 0.86, with a strong negative impact of zika virus, and a positive impact of socioeconomic status, see Table 4 for details.
- *Public hospital* (S_2). Births that occurred in public hospitals were included in the study, and births that occurred in private hospitals were excluded. A majority of the population in Brazil visits public hospitals, and here it is assumed that it is strongly affected by socioeconomic status and weakly affected by living area, see Table 4 for details.

The unobserved variables, living area (V) and SES (U) are constructed such that the assumed values for the sensitivity parameters in Smith and VanderWeele (2019) approximately




Figure 2: Flow chart (A) and causal model (B) for the `zika_learner` dataset.

Model	Coefficients (θ)/ Proportions	Function argument
$P(V = 1)$	0.85	<code>Vval</code>
$P(U = 1)$	0.50	<code>Uval</code>
$P(T = 1 V) = g(V'\theta_T)$	(-6.20, 1.75)	<code>Tcoef</code>
$P(Y = 1 T, U) = g[(T, U)'\theta_Y]$	(-5.20, 5.00, -1.00)	<code>Ycoef</code>
$P(S_1 = 1 T, U) = g[(V, U, T)'\theta_{S_1}]$	(1.20, 0.00, 2.00, -4.00)	<code>Scoef</code>
$P(S_2 = 1 V, U) = g[(V, U, T)'\theta_{S_2}]$	(2.20, 0.50, -2.75, 0.00)	<code>Scoef</code>

Table 4: Data generating process for the dataset `zika_learner`. Models generating causal dependencies are logistic, $g(X'\theta)$, for predictor variable X and model parameter θ .

describes the true sensitivity parameters in our DGP. The causal dependencies are generated by the logistic models described in Table 4. For the simulated dataset, the proportions for the variables are presented in Table 5. The proportions are calculated both by treatment status (zika virus infection) and overall, for the total dataset, the subset with $S_1 = 1$ and the subset with $S_1 = 1$ and $S_2 = 1$. For the DGP, the causal estimand is $\beta_R = 90.7$ in the total population, $\beta_{R_S} = 92.3$ in the subset of $S_1 = 1$, and $\beta_{R_S} = 88.1$ in the subset of $S_1 = 1$ and $S_2 = 1$. The observed estimands for the dataset are $\beta_R^{obs} = 89.5$ (after one selection), and $\beta_R^{obs} = 74.5$ (after two selections). Since the observed estimands are smaller than the causal estimands, the coding of the treatment must be reversed in order to bound the bias from above, and the resulting causal estimands are $\beta_R = 1/90.7$, $\beta_{R_S} = 1/92.3$ (after one selection) and $\beta_{R_S} = 1/88.1$ (after two selections). The observed estimands after the recoding are $\beta_R^{obs} = 1/89.5$ and $\beta_R^{obs} = 1/74.5$ after one and two selections, respectively.

4. Investigations of the SV bound

In this section, we provide new results of variation independence and sharpness of the SV bounds inspired by and similar to previous results for bounds for unmeasured confounding derived by Sjölander (2020). First, we give the feasible regions for the sensitivity parameters defined in Table 2. Secondly, we derive a criterion for when the SV bounds in the subpopula-

Variable	Not zika infected $T = 0$	Zika infected $T = 1$	Overall
<i>No selection,</i>			
Microcephaly	0.003	0.361	0.008
Urban	0.849	0.951	0.850
SES	0.499	0.426	0.498
<i>First selection, $S_1 = 1$</i>			
Microcephaly	0.003	0.273	0.004
Urban	0.845	1.000	0.846
SES	0.556	0.818	0.557
<i>First and second selection, $S_1 = 1, S_2 = 1$</i>			
Microcephaly	0.004	0.286	0.005
Urban	0.858	1.000	0.858
SES	0.382	0.714	0.382

Table 5: Proportions for the variables in the `zika_learner` dataset, by treatment status and overall.

tion are sharp, and discuss why the SV bounds in the total population usually are not sharp. All proofs are provided in Appendix B.

4.1. Variation independence

For the bounds to give meaningful values, the sensitivity parameters must be chosen to be within their feasible region, i.e. the sensitivity parameters must be set to values they can take. In Theorems 1 and 2, we establish such feasible regions for the sensitivity parameters for the SV bounds:

Theorem 1 $\{RR_{UY|T=1}, RR_{UY|T=0}, RR_{SU|T=1}, RR_{SU|T=0}\}$ are restricted by their definitions to values equal to or above 1. Furthermore, for the distribution $\mathbb{P}(Y, T, U, I_S)$, there exists a U such that $\{RR_{UY|T=1}, RR_{UY|T=0}, RR_{SU|T=1}, RR_{SU|T=0}\}$ are not restricted by each other or by the observed data distribution, $\mathbb{P}(Y, T, I_S)$.

Theorem 2 $\{RR_{UY|S=1}, RR_{TU|S=1}\}$ are restricted by their definitions to values equal to or above 1. Furthermore, for the distribution $\mathbb{P}(Y, T, U | I_S = 1)$, there exists a U such that $\{RR_{UY|S=1}, RR_{TU|S=1}\}$ are not restricted by each other or by the observed data distribution, $\mathbb{P}(Y, T | I_S = 1)$.

The key implication of the theorems are that the sensitivity parameters are variation independent, meaning that they can be considered freely with the only restriction that they must be larger than or equal to one. For our results, variation independence means that the SV bounds are valid for any values of the sensitivity parameters greater than one. However, it is worth noting that sensitivity parameters within their feasible regions does not guarantee informative bounds.

4.2. Sharp bounds

Below, we address if a bound is informative by evaluating sharpness of the bound.

Definition 3 A bound is sharp if the bias can be equal to the value of the bound, for an observed distribution and correctly specified sensitivity parameters.




Figure 3: Illustration of sharpness for the SV bound.

In Zetterstrom and Waernbaum (2022), we show that if the SV bound take values that are larger than the AF bound, it is not sharp. Since the AF bound is the maximum value the selection bias can possibly take, any value of the SV bound greater than this is unattainable for the bias. However, just because the SV bound is smaller than the AF bound does not guarantee that it is sharp, given the assumed sensitivity parameters. There is a region between the sharpness limit and the AF bound where the SV bound can be either sharp or not, as illustrated in Figure 3. In Theorem 4, we present a sufficient condition for when the SV bounds in the subpopulation are sharp.

Theorem 4 *Assume $\{RR_{UY|S=1}, RR_{TU|S=1}\}$ and $P(Y, T, U|I_S = 1)$ such that $BF_U \leq 1/P(Y = 1|T = 0, I_S = 1)$, then the bounds for β_{R_S} and β_{D_S} are sharp.*

Given that the sensitivity parameters are correct, we have from Theorem 4 that the SV bounds for the subpopulation are sharp if $BF_U \leq 1/P(Y = 1|T = 0, I_S = 1)$. Furthermore, the SV bounds are not sharp if they are larger than the AF bounds. If the SV bound falls between the two boundaries, its sharpness is inconclusive.

Theorem 4 is illustrated using the dataset `zika_learner`, with only the first selection variable (birth) included. Figure 4 presents the SV bound for the relative risk in the subpopulation for different values of the sensitivity parameters, $RR_{UY|S=1}$ and $RR_{TU|S=1}$. The dotted dark blue curves in Figures 4a and 4b indicates where the SV bound is equal to the AF bound, $\mathcal{B}(\beta_{R_S}) = \tilde{\mathcal{B}}(\beta_{R_S}) = 3.669$. The solid dark blue curve in Figure 4b is where the SV bound is equal to the sharp limit, $1/P(Y = 1|T = 0, I_S = 1) = 3.667$. Any SV bound below this curve is sharp, meaning that the bias can take the value of the bound. In this case, the sharp limit is almost identical to the AF bound. This is because $P(T = 1|I_S = 1) \approx 1$ and thus, the numerator in the AF bound is very close to 1, the denominator is very close to $P(Y = 1|T = 0, I_S = 1)$ and the AF bound is almost identical to the limit for sharpness. Note that the treatment has been recoded in order to bound the bias from above.

There is no corresponding result for sharp bounds for the total population. A property of the bias for the relative risk (see Table 1) is

$$\begin{aligned} bias(\beta_R) &= \frac{\beta_R^{obs}}{\beta_R} \leq \frac{P(Y = 1|T = 1, I_S = 1)}{P(Y = 1|T = 0, I_S = 1)} \bigg/ \frac{\min_s P(Y = 1|T = 1, I_S = s)}{\max_s P(Y = 1|T = 0, I_S = s)} \\ &\leq BF_1 \cdot BF_0, \end{aligned}$$

and if $P(Y = 1|T = t, I_S = 1) \neq P(Y = 1|T = t, I_S = 0)$, $t = 0, 1$, the first inequality is strict, which implies that the bias cannot be as large as the bound. It is interesting to note that if $P(Y = 1|T = t, I_S = 1) = P(Y = 1|T = t, I_S = 0)$ for both $t = 0, 1$, then $\min_s P(Y = 1|T = 1, I_S = s) = P(Y = 1|T = 1, I_S = 1)$ and $\max_s P(Y = 1|T = 0, I_S = s) =$




Figure 4: (a) $\mathcal{B}(\beta_{R_S})$ for different $RR_{UY|S=1}$ and $RR_{TU|S=1}$ (b) Close-up view indicating the sharp, inconclusive and non-sharp regions.

$P(Y = 1|T = 0, I_S = 1)$, which results in $\beta_R^{obs}/\beta_R = 1$, i.e. no selection bias. Corresponding results hold for the risk difference, see Appendix B. However, given assumed values of the sensitivity parameters, the SV bounds can be smaller than the AF bounds and therefore still be informative.

5. R package SelectionBias

In this section, we describe the R package **SelectionBias**. The different functions in the R package are illustrated using either the simulated dataset `zika_learner`, or the model structure that the dataset is simulated from, see Table 4.

5.1. `SVboundparametersM()`

The sensitivity parameters for the SV bound are calculated for the M-structure using the function `SVboundparametersM()`. Note that neither the SV bound or the sensitivity parameters are available for observed data, since they depend on the unobserved variables, U . However, the observed probabilities $P(Y = 1|T = 1, I_S = 1)$ and $P(Y = 1|T = 0, I_S = 1)$ are needed in order to check if the causal estimand for the assumed model structure is smaller or larger than the observed estimand. The input in the code is the causal estimand of interest, the assumed model structure and the observed probabilities of success. In this example, the assumed model structure is the DGP in Table 4, and the observed probabilities are found in Table 5. The code and the output are:

```
R> SVboundparametersM(whichEst = "RR_sub",
+   Vval = matrix(c(1, 0, 0.85, 0.15), ncol = 2),
+   Uval = matrix(c(1, 0, 0.5, 0.5), ncol = 2),
+   Tcoef = c(-6.2, 1.75),
+   Ycoef = c(-5.2, 5.0, -1.0),
+   Scoef = matrix(c(1.2, 2.2, 0.0, 0.5, 2.0, -2.75, -4.0, 0.0), ncol = 4),
```

```

+   Mmodel = "L",
+   pY1_T1_S1 = 0.286,
+   pY1_T0_S1 = 0.004)

"BF_U"           1.5625
"RR_UY|S=1"     2.7089
"RR_TU|S=1"     2.3293
"Reverse treatment" TRUE

```

First, the causal estimand of interest, "RR_tot", "RD_tot", "RR_sub" or "RD_sub", is indicated. Second, the matrix for V is given, where the first column contains the values that V can take, and the second column contains the probabilities for the corresponding values. In the zika example, we have a binary random variable so that the first two elements in the matrix are 1 and 0, although any discrete V can be used. A continuous V must be discretized, and the probabilities for all categories must sum to 1. Third, and similar to V , the matrix for U is given, where the first column contains the values that U can take, and the second column contains the probabilities for the corresponding values. U can also be discretized to approximate a continuous variable. Fourth, the coefficients used in the model for T are provided, where the first entry is the intercept and the second the slope describing its dependencies on V . The fifth input is the coefficient vector for the outcome model, where the first entry is the intercept, the second and third entries are the slope coefficients describing the dependence on T and U . The sixth input is the coefficient matrix for the selection variables. The number of rows correspond to the number of selection variables. The input matrix has four columns that represent the intercept, and slope coefficients for V , U and T , respectively. A summary of the code notation is seen in the last column of Table 4. The seventh argument indicates whether the models are probit (`Mmodel = "P"`) or logistic (`Mmodel = "L"`). Lastly, the observed probabilities of success within each treatment group, $P(Y = 1|T = t, I_S = 1)$, $t = 0, 1$, are given. These are used to check if the selection bias for the assumed DGP is positive or negative. In this example, the estimand of interest is the relative risk in the subpopulation, `whichEst = "RR_sub"`, the DGP is given in Table 4, logistic models are used in the DGP and the observed probabilities after two selections are found in Table 5. The output is the sensitivity parameters for SV bound, rounded to four decimals, and an indicator stating if the bias is negative and the coding for the treatment has been reversed. Here, it is the subpopulation that is of interest, and therefore, the sensitivity parameters in the second column in Table 2 are presented. The obtained output in this example is, $RR_{TU|S=1} = 2.33$ and $RR_{UY|S=1} = 2.71$, which gives $BF_U = 1.56$, and the treatment coding is reversed.

5.2. SVbound()

The SV bound is calculated using the function `SVbound()` in the package. The input is the relevant causal estimand ("RR_tot", "RD_tot", "RR_sub" or "RD_sub") and the sensitivity parameters provided by the user. These can either be inserted directly or as output from `SVboundparametersM()`. If the user provide the sensitivity parameters directly, the SV bound is not restricted to the M-structure, although the assumptions in Appendix A must still be fulfilled. For the structure in Table 4, the code and the output are:

```
R> SVbound(whichEst = "RR_sub",
```

```
+ RR_UY_S1 = 2.71,
+ RR_TU_S1 = 2.33)
```

```
"SV bound" 1.56
```

The causal estimand is the relative risk in the subpopulation, `whichEst = "RR_sub"`, and the sensitivity parameters are $RR_{UY|S=1} = 2.71$ and $RR_{TU|S=1} = 2.33$, calculated from `SVboundparametersM()`. The output is the SV bound, rounded to two decimals. In this example, the SV bound is 1.56. Note that if the causal estimand is underestimated, the recoding of the treatment has to be done by the user.

5.3. AFbound()

The function `AFbound()` takes data as input. Using the `zika_learner` data as input, the code and output are:

```
R> AFbound(whichEst = "RR_sub",
+ outcome = mic_ceph,
+ treatment = 1 - zika,
+ selection = sel_ind)
```

```
"AF bound" 3.5
```

Four inputs are given to the code: the relevant causal estimand ("`RR_tot`", "`RD_tot`", "`RR_sub`" or "`RD_sub`"), the outcome variable, the treatment variable and the selection indicator. Here, the causal estimand of interest is the relative risk in the subpopulation, and the outcome, treatment, and selection are the variables microcephaly, zika and the selection indicator formed from the selection variables birth and public hospital. In this setting, the bias is negative, and we have reversed the coding of the treatment, since the AF bound bounds the bias from above. The recoding of the treatment has to be done by the user. The output is the AF bound, rounded to two decimals, which is 3.50 in this example.

In this simulated dataset, data is available on all observations and we chose to only include those with $S_1 = S_2 = 1$. However, if the data is not available for those subjects with $I_S = 0$, as could be the case with missing data, one can input the selection probability instead of the selection indicator variable. Here, the selection probability is calculated as `mean(sel_ind)`. In this case, the code and output are:

```
R> AFbound(whichEst = "RR_sub",
+ outcome = mic_ceph[sel_ind == 1],
+ treatment = 1 - zika[sel_ind == 1],
+ selection = mean(sel_ind))
```

```
"AF bound" 3.5
```

This setting is supposed to mimic the case when there is no data available on the non-selected subjects, and thus only the subjects with $I_S = 1$ are included. The result is the same as the previous example, since the selection probability is calculated from the complete dataset.

5.4. `SVboundsharp()`

The function `SVboundsharp()` evaluates whether the SV bound in the subpopulation is sharp. As input, it takes the value of BF_U , the probability $P(Y = 1|T = 0, I_S = 1)$, the SV bound and the AF bound. The output is a string stating whether the SV bound is sharp, inconclusive or not sharp. The last two arguments, `SVbound` and `AFbound`, are optional. They are not necessary in order to check if the SV bound is sharp, or it is inconclusive. However, they must be entered to check if the SV bound is *not* sharp. Therefore, if `SVbound` and `AFbound` are not provided, the output is a string stating whether the bound is sharp, or if it is inconclusive. Here, $BF_U = 1.56$, the probability $P(Y = 1|T = 0, I_S = 1) = 0.27$ (calculated from `zika_learner`), the SV bound is 1.56 and the AF bound is 3.5. The code and output are:

```
R> SVboundsharp(BF_U = 1.56,
+   pY1_T0_S1 = 0.27,
+   SVbound = 1.56,
+   AFbound = 3.5)
```

```
"SV bound is sharp."
```

In this setting, the SV bound is sharp. As before, the bias is negative, and we have reversed the coding of the treatment. Note that if the causal estimand is underestimated, the recoding of the treatment has to be done manually.

6. Conclusion

To perform sensitivity analyses for selection bias we investigate two bounds for a binary outcome. The first bound (SV) proposed by [Smith and VanderWeele \(2019\)](#) requires a conditional independence assumption and values of strength of dependencies provided by the researcher. The second bound, referred to as the AF bound, is based solely on the data without any additional assumptions ([Zetterstrom and Waernbaum 2022](#)).

For practitioners, we present the R package **SelectionBias**. The package provides functions for calculating sensitivity parameters of the SV bound under a user specified model together with functions producing the bound itself and an associated check for if the bound is sharp. The AF bound is calculated for a user provided dataset. For users to become familiar with the functions, the R package also includes a simulated dataset, `zika_learner`, and the DGP the dataset is simulated from. The simulated data emulates a register-based cohort study, inspired by a case-control study investigating the effect of zika virus on microcephaly in Brazil ([de Araújo et al. 2018](#)).

Moreover, we provide results concerning feasible and meaningful regions of the SV bounds. We show that the sensitivity parameters the bounds are based upon are not restricted by each other or the observed data distribution. Furthermore, we define a bound as sharp if it is possible for the bias to be equal to the value of the bound, and derive regions when the SV bounds in the subpopulation are sharp, given that the sensitivity parameters are correct. The new contributions are illustrated with the simulated `zika_learner` dataset. In this example, the limit for the sharp region is almost identical to the AF bound. The example demonstrates

that the SV bound can take on values that are smaller than the AF bound, especially in the case of a rare treatment and/or outcome. Thus, the extra information used in the SV bound can give a tighter and more informative bound for the selection bias. However, with the R package, the user can perform the calculations for many different designs, and thereby gain a broader knowledge of the possible magnitude of the selection bias.

Acknowledgments

This work was financed by the Swedish Research Council, grant number 2016-00703.

References

- Ali S, Gugliemini O, Harber S, Harrison A, Houle L, Ivory J, Kersten S, Khan R, Kim J, LeBoa C, Nez-Whitfield E, O'Marr J, Rothenberg E, Segnitz RM, Sila S, Verwillow A, Vogt M, Yang A, Mordecai EA (2017). "Environmental and Social Change Drive the Explosive Emergence of Zika Virus in the Americas." *PLOS Neglected Tropical Diseases*, **11**(2), e0005135. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pntd.0005135>.
- de Araújo TVB, de Alencar Ximenes RA, de Barros Miranda-Filho D, Souza WV, Montarroyos UR, de Melo APL, Valongueiro S, de Fátima Pessoa Militão de Albuquerque M, Braga C, Filho SPB, Cordeiro MT, Vazquez E, de Cavalcanti Souza Cruz D, Henriques CMP, Bezerra LCA, da Silva Castanha PM, Dhalia R, Marques-Júnior ETA, Martelli CMT, Rodrigues LC, Dhalia C, Santos M, Cortes F, Kleber de Oliveira W, Evelim Coelho G, Cortez-Escalante JJ, Campelo de Albuquerque de Melo CF, Ramon-Pardo P, Aldighieri S, Mendez-Rico J, Espinal M, Torres L, Nassri Hazin A, Van der Linden A, Coentro M, Santiago Dimech G, Siqueira de Assuncao R, Ismael de Carvalho P, Felix Oliveira V (2018). "Association Between Microcephaly, Zika Virus Infection, and Other Risk Factors in Brazil: Final Report of a Case-Control Study." *The Lancet Infectious Diseases*, **18**(3), 328–336. doi:[https://doi.org/10.1016/S1473-3099\(17\)30727-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1473-3099(17)30727-2).
- de Oliveira WK, de França GVA, Carmo EH, Duncan BB, de Souza Kuchenbecker R, Schmidt MI (2017). "Infection-Related Microcephaly After the 2015 and 2016 Zika Virus Outbreaks in Brazil: A Surveillance-Based Analysis." *The Lancet*, **390**(10097), 861–870. doi:[https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(17\)31368-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(17)31368-5).
- Flanders WD, Ye D (2019). "Limits for the Magnitude of M-bias and Certain Other Types of Structural Selection Bias." *Epidemiology*, **30**(4), 501–508. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1097/EDE.0000000000001031>.
- Greenland S (2003). "Quantifying Biases in Causal Models: Classical Confounding vs Collider-Stratification Bias." *Epidemiology*, **14**(3), 300–306. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1097/01.EDE.0000042804.12056.6C>.
- Hernán MA, Hernández-Díaz S, Robins JM (2004). "A Structural Approach to Selection Bias." *Epidemiology*, **15**(5), 615–625. URL <http://www.jstor.org/stable/20485961>.
- Huang TH, Lee WC (2015). "Bounding Formulas for Selection Bias." *American Journal of Epidemiology*, **182**(10), 868–872. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1093/aje/kwv130>.

- Lebov JF, Arias JF, Balmaseda A, Britt W, Cordero JF, Galvão LA, Garces AL, Hambidge KM, Harris E, Ko A, Krebs N, Marques ETA, Martinez AM, McClure E, Miranda-Filho DB, Moreira MEL, Mussi-Pinhata MM, Ochoa TJ, Osorio JE, Scalabrin DMF, Schultz-Cherry S, Seage GR, Stolka K, Ugarte-Gil CA, Vega CMV, Welton M, Ximenes R, Zorrilla C (2019). “International Prospective Observational Cohort Study of Zika in Infants and Pregnancy (ZIP Study): Study Protocol.” *BMC Pregnancy and Childbirth*, **19**(1), 1–10. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1186/s12884-019-2430-4>.
- Lu H, Cole SR, Howe CJ, Westreich D (2022). “Toward a Clearer Definition of Selection Bias When Estimating Causal Effects.” *Epidemiology*, **33**(5), 699–706. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1097/EDE.0000000000001516>.
- Malta M, Wells S, LeGrand S, Seixas M, Baptista A, da Silva CMFP, Kalume C, Whetten K (2019). “Abortion in Brazil: The Case for Women’s Rights, Lives, and Choices.” *The Lancet Public Health*, **4**(11), e552. doi:[https://doi.org/10.1016/S2468-2667\(19\)30204-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2468-2667(19)30204-X).
- Robins JM (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*, pp. 113–159.
- Rubin DB (1974). “Estimating Causal Effects of Treatments in Randomized and Non-randomized Studies.” *Journal of Educational Psychology*, **66**(5), 688–701. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1037/h0037350>.
- Sjölander A (2020). “A Note on a Sensitivity Analysis for Unmeasured Confounding, and the Related E-Value.” *Journal of Causal Inference*, **8**(1), 229–248. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1515/jci-2020-0012>.
- Smith LH, Mathur MB, VanderWeele TJ (2021). “Multiple-bias Sensitivity Analysis Using Bounds.” *Epidemiology*, **32**(5), 625–634. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1097/EDE.0000000000001380>.
- Smith LH, VanderWeele TJ (2019). “Bounding Bias Due to Selection.” *Epidemiology*, **30**(4), 509–516. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1097/EDE.0000000000001032>.
- Zetterstrom S, Waernbaum I (2022). “Selection Bias and Multiple Inclusion Criteria in Observational Studies.” *Epidemiologic Methods*, **11**(1), 1–21. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1515/em-2022-0108>.

A. Underlying assumptions for the SV bound

The SV bounds are valid under additional assumptions. First, the bounds are constructed for a positive bias, i.e.

$$\theta^{obs} > \theta, \quad (5)$$

where $\theta \in (\beta_R, \beta_D, \beta_{R_S}, \beta_{D_S})$ and $\theta^{obs} \in (\beta_R^{obs}, \beta_D^{obs})$. This is a technical assumption, since if the causal estimand is underestimated, the coding of the treatment can be reversed. Secondly, there are two different conditional independence assumptions for the causal model, depending on whether the total or subpopulation estimands are of interest:

Assumption 5 (Total population estimands β_R and β_D) For some unmeasured variable(s) U : $Y \perp\!\!\!\perp I_S | (T = t, U = u)$, for $t = 0, 1$.

Assumption 6 (Subpopulation estimands β_{R_S} and β_{D_S}) For some unmeasured variable(s) U : $Y(t) \perp\!\!\!\perp T | (I_S = 1, U = u)$, for $t = 0, 1$.

The assumptions differ since their purpose is to provide conditions for unbiased estimation of the distinct estimands of interest under selection if the unmeasured variable was observed. The difference arises from either i) a lack of generalization of a causal effect from a subpopulation to the total population, or ii) a violation of conditional exchangeability in the subpopulation, $Y(t) \not\perp\!\!\!\perp T | X, I_S = 1$. There are however structures in which both Assumptions 5 and 6 are fulfilled, for example the DAG in Figure 1.

B. Proofs

B.1. Theorem 1

Since $RR_{UY|T=t} = \max_u \mathbb{P}(Y = 1 | T = t, U = u) / \min_u \mathbb{P}(Y = 1 | T = t, U = u)$, $t = 0, 1$, $RR_{UY|T=t} \geq 1$, $t = 0, 1$ by definition. Define $g_1(u) = \mathbb{P}(U = u | T = 1, I_S = 1) / \mathbb{P}(U = u | T = 1, I_S = 0)$ and $g_0(u) = \mathbb{P}(U = u | T = 0, I_S = 0) / \mathbb{P}(U = u | T = 0, I_S = 1)$. Note that $E[g_1(U) | T = 1, I_S = 0] = \sum_u g_1(u) \mathbb{P}(U = u | T = 1, I_S = 0) = \sum_u \mathbb{P}(U = u | T = 1, I_S = 1) = 1$, which gives that $RR_{SU|T=1} = \max_u g_1(u) \geq 1$. Similar arguments gives $RR_{SU|T=0} \geq 1$.

To show that $\{RR_{UY|T=1}, RR_{UY|T=0}, RR_{SU|T=1}, RR_{SU|T=0}, \mathbb{P}(Y, T, I_S)\}$ are variation independent, we construct a distribution $\mathbb{P}(Y, T, U, I_S)$ that marginalize to a given set $\{RR_{UY|T=1}^*, RR_{UY|T=0}^*, RR_{SU|T=1}^*, RR_{SU|T=0}^*, \mathbb{P}^*(Y, T, I_S)\}$. We do not consider boundary points in order to avoid technicalities. We construct the distribution as:

1. Let

$$\mathbb{P}(T) = \mathbb{P}^*(T).$$

2. Let U be categorical with three possible outcomes,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}(U = 0|T = 0, I_S = 0) &= \frac{(1 - \varepsilon)RR_{SU|T=0}^*(RR_{SU|T=1}^* - 1)}{RR_{SU|T=0}^*RR_{SU|T=1}^* - 1} \\
\mathbb{P}(U = 1|T = 0, I_S = 0) &= \frac{(1 - \varepsilon)(RR_{SU|T=0}^* - 1)}{RR_{SU|T=0}^*RR_{SU|T=1}^* - 1} \\
\mathbb{P}(U = 2|T = 0, I_S = 0) &= \varepsilon \\
\mathbb{P}(U = 0|T = 0, I_S = 1) &= \frac{(1 - \varepsilon)(RR_{SU|T=1}^* - 1)}{RR_{SU|T=0}^*RR_{SU|T=1}^* - 1} \\
\mathbb{P}(U = 1|T = 0, I_S = 1) &= \frac{(1 - \varepsilon)RR_{SU|T=1}^*(RR_{SU|T=0}^* - 1)}{RR_{SU|T=0}^*RR_{SU|T=1}^* - 1} \\
\mathbb{P}(U = 2|T = 0, I_S = 1) &= \varepsilon,
\end{aligned}$$

where $0 < \varepsilon < 1$ is defined below. We have

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_u \mathbb{P}(U = u|T = 0, I_S = s) &= \frac{(1 - \varepsilon)RR_{SU|T=t}^*(RR_{SU|T=1-t}^* - 1)}{RR_{SU|T=0}^*RR_{SU|T=1}^* - 1} \\
&\quad + \frac{(1 - \varepsilon)(RR_{SU|T=t}^* - 1)}{RR_{SU|T=0}^*RR_{SU|T=1}^* - 1} \\
&\quad + \frac{\varepsilon(RR_{SU|T=0}^*RR_{SU|T=1}^* - 1)}{RR_{SU|T=0}^*RR_{SU|T=1}^* - 1} = 1,
\end{aligned}$$

for $t = 0, 1$ and $s = 0, 1$. Furthermore,

$$RR_{SU|T=0} = \max_u \frac{\mathbb{P}(U = u|T = 0, I_S = 0)}{\mathbb{P}(U = u|T = 0, I_S = 1)} = \frac{\mathbb{P}(U = 0|T = 0, I_S = 0)}{\mathbb{P}(U = 0|T = 0, I_S = 1)} = RR_{SU|T=0}^*.$$

Similarly, let

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}(U = 0|T = 1, I_S = 1) &= \frac{(1 - \varepsilon)RR_{SU|T=1}^*(RR_{SU|T=0}^* - 1)}{RR_{SU|T=0}^*RR_{SU|T=1}^* - 1} \\
\mathbb{P}(U = 1|T = 1, I_S = 1) &= \frac{(1 - \varepsilon)(RR_{SU|T=1}^* - 1)}{RR_{SU|T=0}^*RR_{SU|T=1}^* - 1} \\
\mathbb{P}(U = 2|T = 1, I_S = 1) &= \varepsilon \\
\mathbb{P}(U = 0|T = 1, I_S = 0) &= \frac{(1 - \varepsilon)(RR_{SU|T=0}^* - 1)}{RR_{SU|T=0}^*RR_{SU|T=1}^* - 1} \\
\mathbb{P}(U = 1|T = 1, I_S = 0) &= \frac{(1 - \varepsilon)RR_{SU|T=0}^*(RR_{SU|T=1}^* - 1)}{RR_{SU|T=0}^*RR_{SU|T=1}^* - 1} \\
\mathbb{P}(U = 2|T = 1, I_S = 0) &= \varepsilon,
\end{aligned}$$

such that

$$\sum_u \mathbb{P}(U = u|T = 1, I_S = s) = 1$$

and

$$RR_{SU|T=1} = \max_u \frac{\mathbb{P}(U = u|T = 1, I_S = 1)}{\mathbb{P}(U = u|T = 1, I_S = 0)} = \frac{\mathbb{P}(U = 0|T = 1, I_S = 1)}{\mathbb{P}(U = 0|T = 1, I_S = 0)} = RR_{SU|T=1}^*.$$

3. Let

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(Y = 1|T = 0, U = 0) &= \mathbb{P}^*(Y = 1|T = 0, I_S = 1) \\ \mathbb{P}(Y = 1|T = 0, U = 1) &= \mathbb{P}^*(Y = 1|T = 0, I_S = 1) \frac{RR_{UY|T=0}^*[\mathbb{P}(U = 1|T = 0, I_S = 1) + \varepsilon]}{RR_{UY|T=0}^* \mathbb{P}(U = 1|T = 0, I_S = 1) + \varepsilon} \\ \mathbb{P}(Y = 1|T = 0, U = 2) &= \mathbb{P}^*(Y = 1|T = 0, I_S = 1) \frac{\mathbb{P}(U = 1|T = 0, I_S = 1) + \varepsilon}{RR_{UY|T=0}^* \mathbb{P}(U = 1|T = 0, I_S = 1) + \varepsilon} \\ \mathbb{P}(Y = 1|T = 1, U = 0) &= \mathbb{P}^*(Y = 1|T = 1, I_S = 1) \frac{RR_{UY|T=1}^*[\mathbb{P}(U = 0|T = 1, I_S = 1) + \varepsilon]}{RR_{UY|T=1}^* \mathbb{P}(U = 0|T = 1, I_S = 1) + \varepsilon} \\ \mathbb{P}(Y = 1|T = 1, U = 1) &= \mathbb{P}^*(Y = 1|T = 1, I_S = 1) \\ \mathbb{P}(Y = 1|T = 1, U = 2) &= \mathbb{P}^*(Y = 1|T = 1, I_S = 1) \frac{\mathbb{P}(U = 0|T = 1, I_S = 1) + \varepsilon}{RR_{UY|T=1}^* \mathbb{P}(U = 0|T = 1, I_S = 1) + \varepsilon}. \end{aligned}$$

Since

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial}{\partial \varepsilon} \mathbb{P}(Y = 1|T = t, U = 1 - t) &= \mathbb{P}^*(Y = 1|T = t, I_S = 1) RR_{UY|T=t}^* \\ &\cdot \frac{\mathbb{P}(U = 1 - t|T = t, I_S = 1)(RR_{UY|T=t}^* - 1)}{[RR_{UY|T=t}^* \mathbb{P}(U = 1 - t|T = t, I_S = 1) + \varepsilon]^2} > 0 \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \mathbb{P}(Y = 1|T = t, U = 1 - t) = \mathbb{P}^*(Y = 1|T = t, I_S = 1),$$

for $t = 0, 1$, we can choose ε such that all probabilities are between 0 and 1. We then get

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}(Y = 1|T = 1, I_S = 1) &= \sum_u \mathbb{P}(Y = 1|T = 1, U = u)\mathbb{P}(U = u|T = 1, I_S = 1) \\
&= \mathbb{P}^*(Y = 1|T = 1, I_S = 1) \frac{RR_{UY|T=1}^*[\mathbb{P}(U = 0|T = 1, I_S = 1) + \varepsilon]}{RR_{UY|T=1}^*\mathbb{P}(U = 0|T = 1, I_S = 1) + \varepsilon} \cdot \mathbb{P}(U = 0|T = 1, I_S = 1) \\
&\quad + \mathbb{P}^*(Y = 1|T = 1, I_S = 1) \cdot \mathbb{P}(U = 1|T = 1, I_S = 1) \\
&\quad + \mathbb{P}^*(Y = 1|T = 1, I_S = 1) \frac{\mathbb{P}(U = 0|T = 1, I_S = 1) + \varepsilon}{RR_{UY|T=1}^*\mathbb{P}(U = 0|T = 1, I_S = 1) + \varepsilon} \cdot \mathbb{P}(U = 2|T = 1, I_S = 1) \\
&= \frac{\mathbb{P}^*(Y = 1|T = 1, I_S = 1)}{RR_{UY|T=1}^*\mathbb{P}(U = 0|T = 1, I_S = 1) + \varepsilon} \\
&\quad \cdot \left[RR_{UY|T=1}^*\mathbb{P}(U = 0|T = 1, I_S = 1)^2 + RR_{UY|T=1}^*\varepsilon\mathbb{P}(U = 0|T = 1, I_S = 1) \right. \\
&\quad + RR_{UY|T=1}^*\mathbb{P}(U = 0|T = 1, I_S = 1)\mathbb{P}(U = 1|T = 1, I_S = 1) + \varepsilon\mathbb{P}(U = 1|T = 1, I_S = 1) \\
&\quad \left. + \mathbb{P}(U = 0|T = 1, I_S = 1)\mathbb{P}(U = 2|T = 1, I_S = 1) + \varepsilon\mathbb{P}(U = 2|T = 1, I_S = 1) \right] \\
&= \frac{\mathbb{P}^*(Y = 1|T = 1, I_S = 1)}{RR_{UY|T=1}^*\mathbb{P}(U = 0|T = 1, I_S = 1) + \varepsilon} \\
&\quad \cdot \left[RR_{UY|T=1}^*\mathbb{P}(U = 0|T = 1, I_S = 1)\{\mathbb{P}(U = 0|T = 1, I_S = 1) + \mathbb{P}(U = 1|T = 1, I_S = 1) + \varepsilon\} \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \varepsilon\{\mathbb{P}(U = 0|T = 1, I_S = 1) + \mathbb{P}(U = 1|T = 1, I_S = 1) + \mathbb{P}(U = 2|T = 1, I_S = 1)\} \right] \\
&= \frac{\mathbb{P}^*(Y = 1|T = 1, I_S = 1)}{RR_{UY|T=1}^*\mathbb{P}(U = 0|T = 1, I_S = 1) + \varepsilon} \cdot [RR_{UY|T=1}^*\mathbb{P}(U = 0|T = 1, I_S = 1) + \varepsilon] \\
&= \mathbb{P}^*(Y = 1|T = 1, I_S = 1),
\end{aligned}$$

since $\mathbb{P}(U = 2|T = 1, I_S = 1) = \varepsilon$. Similarly,

$$\mathbb{P}(Y = 1|T = 0, I_S = 1) = \mathbb{P}^*(Y = 1|T = 0, I_S = 1).$$

Since

$$\mathbb{P}(Y = 1|T = 0, U = 1) > \mathbb{P}(Y = 1|T = 0, U = 0) > \mathbb{P}(Y = 1|T = 0, U = 2) \quad (6)$$

and

$$\mathbb{P}(Y = 1|T = 1, U = 0) > \mathbb{P}(Y = 1|T = 1, U = 1) > \mathbb{P}(Y = 1|T = 1, U = 2), \quad (7)$$

we get the equalities

$$RR_{UY|T=0} = RR_{UY|T=0}^* \quad (8)$$

and

$$RR_{UY|T=1} = RR_{UY|T=1}^*. \quad (9)$$

Thus, $\{RR_{SU|T=1}, RR_{SU|T=0}, RR_{UY|T=1}, RR_{UY|T=0}, \mathbb{P}(Y, T, I_S)\}$ are variation independent.

B.2. Theorem 2

Since

$$RR_{UY|S=1} = \max_t \frac{\max_u \mathbb{P}(Y = 1|T = t, U = u, I_S = 1)}{\min_u \mathbb{P}(Y = 1|T = t, U = u, I_S = 1)}, \quad t = 0, 1,$$

$RR_{UY|S=1} \geq 1$, $t = 0, 1$, by definition. Define $g(u) = \mathbb{P}(U = u|T = 1, I_S = 1)/\mathbb{P}(U = u|T = 0, I_S = 1)$. Note that $E[g(U)|T = 0, I_S = 1] = \sum_u g(u)\mathbb{P}(U = u|T = 0, I_S = 1) = \sum_u \mathbb{P}(U = u|T = 1, I_S = 1) = 1$, which gives $RR_{TU|S=1} = \max_u g(u) \geq 1$.

To show the second part of Theorem 2, i.e. that $\{RR_{UY|S=1}, RR_{TU|S=1}, \mathbb{P}(Y, T|I_S = 1)\}$ are variation independent, we construct a distribution $\mathbb{P}(Y, T, U|I_S = 1)$ that marginalize to a given set $\{RR_{UY|S=1}^*, RR_{TU|S=1}^*, \mathbb{P}^*(Y, T|I_S = 1)\}$. We do not consider boundary points in order to avoid technicalities. We construct the distribution as:

1. Let

$$\mathbb{P}(T|I_S = 1) = \mathbb{P}^*(T|I_S = 1).$$

2. Let

$$\mathbb{P}(U = 0|T = 0, I_S = 1) = \frac{(1 - \varepsilon)RR_{TU|S=1}^*}{RR_{TU|S=1}^* + 1}$$

$$\mathbb{P}(U = 1|T = 0, I_S = 1) = \frac{(1 - \varepsilon)}{RR_{TU|S=1}^* + 1}$$

$$\mathbb{P}(U = 2|T = 0, I_S = 1) = \varepsilon$$

$$\mathbb{P}(U = 0|T = 1, I_S = 1) = \frac{(1 - \varepsilon)}{RR_{TU|S=1}^* + 1}$$

$$\mathbb{P}(U = 1|T = 1, I_S = 1) = \frac{(1 - \varepsilon)RR_{TU|S=1}^*}{RR_{TU|S=1}^* + 1}$$

$$\mathbb{P}(U = 2|T = 1, I_S = 1) = \varepsilon.$$

We then have that

$$RR_{TU|S=1} = \max_u \frac{\mathbb{P}(U = u|T = 1, I_S = 1)}{\mathbb{P}(U = u|T = 0, I_S = 1)} = \frac{\mathbb{P}(U = 1|T = 1, I_S = 1)}{\mathbb{P}(U = 1|T = 0, I_S = 1)} = RR_{TU|S=1}^*.$$

3. Let

$$\mathbb{P}(Y = 1|T = 0, U = u, I_S = 1) = \mathbb{P}^*(Y = 1|T = 0, I_S = 1), \quad u \in \{0, 1, 2\}$$

$$\mathbb{P}(Y = 1|T = 1, U = 0, I_S = 1) = \mathbb{P}^*(Y = 1|T = 1, I_S = 1)$$

$$\mathbb{P}(Y = 1|T = 1, U = 1, I_S = 1) = \mathbb{P}^*(Y = 1|T = 1, I_S = 1) \frac{RR_{UY|S=1}^*[\mathbb{P}(U = 1|T = 1, I_S = 1) + \varepsilon]}{RR_{UY|S=1}^* \mathbb{P}(U = 1|T = 1, I_S = 1) + \varepsilon}$$

$$\mathbb{P}(Y = 1|T = 1, U = 2, I_S = 1) = \mathbb{P}^*(Y = 1|T = 1, I_S = 1) \frac{\mathbb{P}(U = 1|T = 1, I_S = 1) + \varepsilon}{RR_{UY|S=1}^* \mathbb{P}(U = 1|T = 1, I_S = 1) + \varepsilon}.$$

Since

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial}{\partial \varepsilon} \mathbb{P}(Y = 1|T = 1, I_S = 1, U = 1) &= \mathbb{P}^*(Y = 1|T = 1, I_S = 1) RR_{UY|S=1}^* \\ &\quad \cdot \frac{\mathbb{P}(U = 1|T = 1, I_S = 1)(RR_{UY|S=1}^* - 1)}{[RR_{UY|S=1}^* \mathbb{P}(U = 1|T = 1, I_S = 1) + \varepsilon]^2} > 0 \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \mathbb{P}(Y = 1|T = 1, U = 1, I_S = 1) = \mathbb{P}^*(Y = 1|T = 1, I_S = 1),$$

we can choose ε such that all probabilities are between 0 and 1. We then get

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}(Y = 1|T = 1, I_S = 1) &= \sum_u \mathbb{P}(Y = 1|T = 1, U = u, I_S = 1)\mathbb{P}(U = u|T = 1, I_S = 1) \\
&= \mathbb{P}^*(Y = 1|T = 1, I_S = 1)\mathbb{P}(U = 0|T = 1, I_S = 1) \\
&+ \mathbb{P}^*(Y = 1|T = 1, I_S = 1) \frac{RR_{UY|S=1}^*[\mathbb{P}(U = 1|T = 1, I_S = 1) + \varepsilon]}{RR_{UY|S=1}^* \mathbb{P}(U = 1|T = 1, I_S = 1) + \varepsilon} \mathbb{P}(U = 1|T = 1, I_S = 1) \\
&+ \mathbb{P}^*(Y = 1|T = 1, I_S = 1) \frac{\mathbb{P}(U = 1|T = 1, I_S = 1) + \varepsilon}{RR_{UY|S=1}^* \mathbb{P}(U = 1|T = 1, I_S = 1) + \varepsilon} \mathbb{P}(U = 2|T = 1, I_S = 1) \\
&= \frac{\mathbb{P}^*(Y = 1|T = 1, I_S = 1)}{RR_{UY|S=1}^* \mathbb{P}(U = 1|T = 1, I_S = 1) + \varepsilon} \\
&\cdot \left[RR_{UY|S=1}^* \mathbb{P}(U = 0|T = 1, I_S = 1)\mathbb{P}(U = 1|T = 1, I_S = 1) + \varepsilon \mathbb{P}(U = 0|T = 1, I_S = 1) \right. \\
&+ RR_{UY|S=1}^* \mathbb{P}(U = 1|T = 1, I_S = 1)^2 + RR_{UY|S=1}^* \varepsilon \mathbb{P}(U = 1|T = 1, I_S = 1) \\
&+ \mathbb{P}(U = 1|T = 1, I_S = 1)\mathbb{P}(U = 2|T = 1, I_S = 1) + \varepsilon \mathbb{P}(U = 2|T = 1, I_S = 1) \left. \right] \\
&= \frac{\mathbb{P}^*(Y = 1|T = 1, I_S = 1)}{RR_{UY|S=1}^* \mathbb{P}(U = 1|T = 1, I_S = 1) + \varepsilon} \\
&\cdot \left[RR_{UY|S=1}^* \mathbb{P}(U = 1|T = 1, I_S = 1) \{ \mathbb{P}(U = 0|T = 1, I_S = 1) + \mathbb{P}(U = 1|T = 1, I_S = 1) + \varepsilon \} \right. \\
&+ \varepsilon \{ \mathbb{P}(U = 0|T = 1, I_S = 1) + \mathbb{P}(U = 1|T = 1, I_S = 1) + \mathbb{P}(U = 2|T = 1, I_S = 1) \} \left. \right] \\
&= \frac{\mathbb{P}^*(Y = 1|T = 1, I_S = 1)}{RR_{UY|S=1}^* \mathbb{P}(U = 1|T = 1, I_S = 1) + \varepsilon} \left[RR_{UY|S=1}^* \mathbb{P}(U = 1|T = 1, I_S = 1) + \varepsilon \right] \\
&= \mathbb{P}^*(Y = 1|T = 1, I_S = 1),
\end{aligned}$$

since $\mathbb{P}(U = 2|T = 1, I_S = 1) = \varepsilon$, and that

$$\mathbb{P}(Y = 1|T = 0, I_S = 1) = \mathbb{P}^*(Y = 1|T = 0, I_S = 1).$$

Since

$$\mathbb{P}(Y = 1|T = 0, U = 1, I_S = 1) > \mathbb{P}(Y = 1|T = 0, U = 0, I_S = 1) > \mathbb{P}(Y = 1|T = 0, U = 2, I_S = 1)$$

we have that

$$RR_{UY|S=1} = \frac{\mathbb{P}(Y = 1|T = 0, U = 1, I_S = 1)}{\mathbb{P}(Y = 1|T = 0, U = 2, I_S = 1)} = RR_{UY|S=1}^*.$$

Thus, $\{RR_{TU|S=1}, RR_{UY|S=1}, \mathbb{P}(Y, T|I_S = 1)\}$ are variation independent.

B.3. Theorem 4

To show that the bounds for the relative risk and the risk difference in the subpopulation are sharp when $BF_U \leq 1/\mathbb{P}(Y = 1|T = 0, I_S = 1)$, we construct a distribution that marginalizes to any given set $\{RR_{TU|S=1}^*, RR_{UY|S=1}^*, \mathbb{P}^*(Y, T, U|I_S = 1)\}$ such that $BF_U^* \leq 1/\mathbb{P}^*(Y = 1|T = 0, I_S = 1)$ and $\beta_{R_S}^* = \beta_R^{obs*}/BF_U^*$.

1. Let

$$\mathbb{P}(T|I_S = 1) = \mathbb{P}^*(T|I_S = 1).$$

2. Let

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(U = 1|T = 1, I_S = 1) &= 1 \\ \mathbb{P}(U = 1|T = 0, I_S = 1) &= \frac{1}{RR_{TU|S=1}^*}. \end{aligned}$$

Then $RR_{TU|S=1} = RR_{TU|S=1}^*$.

3. Let

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(Y = 1|T = 0, U = 0, I_S = 1) &= \mathbb{P}^*(Y = 1|T = 0, I_S = 1) \cdot BF_U^*/RR_{UY|S=1}^* \\ \mathbb{P}(Y = 1|T = 0, U = 1, I_S = 1) &= \mathbb{P}^*(Y = 1|T = 0, I_S = 1) \cdot BF_U^* \\ \mathbb{P}(Y = 1|T = 1, U = 0, I_S = 1) &= \mathbb{P}^*(Y = 1|T = 1, I_S = 1)/RR_{UY|S=1}^* \\ \mathbb{P}(Y = 1|T = 1, U = 1, I_S = 1) &= \mathbb{P}^*(Y = 1|T = 1, I_S = 1). \end{aligned}$$

Provided that

$$BF_U^* \leq \frac{1}{\mathbb{P}^*(Y = 1|T = 0, I_S = 1)},$$

$RR_{UY|S=1} = RR_{UY|S=1}^*$. Furthermore,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(U = 0|I_S = 1) &= \mathbb{P}(U = 0|T = 0, I_S = 1)\mathbb{P}(T = 0|I_S = 1) \\ &\quad + \mathbb{P}(U = 0|T = 1, I_S = 1)\mathbb{P}(T = 1|I_S = 1) \\ &= \left(1 - \frac{1}{RR_{TU|S=1}^*}\right) \mathbb{P}(T = 0|I_S = 1), \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(U = 1|I_S = 1) &= \mathbb{P}(U = 1|T = 0, I_S = 1)\mathbb{P}(T = 0|I_S = 1) \\ &\quad + \mathbb{P}(U = 1|T = 1, I_S = 1)\mathbb{P}(T = 1|I_S = 1) \\ &= \frac{1}{RR_{TU|S=1}^*} \mathbb{P}(T = 0|I_S = 1) + \mathbb{P}(T = 1|I_S = 1), \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(Y(1) = 1|I_S = 1) &= \mathbb{P}(Y = 1|T = 1, U = 0, I_S = 1)\mathbb{P}(U = 0|I_S = 1) \\ &\quad + \mathbb{P}(Y = 1|T = 1, U = 1, I_S = 1)\mathbb{P}(U = 1|I_S = 1) \\ &= \frac{\mathbb{P}^*(Y = 1|T = 1, I_S = 1)}{RR_{UY|S=1}^*} \cdot \left(1 - \frac{1}{RR_{TU|S=1}^*}\right) \cdot \mathbb{P}(T = 0|I_S = 1) \\ &\quad + \mathbb{P}^*(Y = 1|T = 1, I_S = 1) \cdot \left(\mathbb{P}(T = 1|I_S = 1) + \mathbb{P}(T = 0|I_S = 1) \cdot \frac{1}{RR_{TU|S=1}^*}\right) \\ &= \mathbb{P}^*(Y = 1|T = 1, I_S = 1) \cdot [\mathbb{P}(T = 1|I_S = 1) + \mathbb{P}(T = 0|I_S = 1) \\ &\quad \cdot \left(\frac{1}{RR_{UY|S=1}^*} - \frac{1}{RR_{TU|S=1}^* RR_{UY|S=1}^*} + \frac{1}{RR_{TU|S=1}^*}\right)] \\ &= \mathbb{P}^*(Y = 1|T = 1, I_S = 1) \cdot \left(\mathbb{P}(T = 1|I_S = 1) + \mathbb{P}(T = 0|I_S = 1) \cdot \frac{1}{BF_U^*}\right) \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}(Y(0) = 1|I_S = 1) &= \mathbb{P}(Y = 1|T = 0, U = 0, I_S = 1)\mathbb{P}(U = 0|I_S = 1) \\
&+ \mathbb{P}(Y = 1|T = 0, U = 1, I_S = 1)\mathbb{P}(U = 1|I_S = 1) \\
&= \frac{\mathbb{P}^*(Y = 1|T = 0, I_S = 1) \cdot BF_U^*}{RR_{UY|S=1}^*} \cdot \left(1 - \frac{1}{RR_{TU|S=1}^*}\right) \cdot \mathbb{P}(T = 0|I_S = 1) \\
&+ \mathbb{P}^*(Y = 1|T = 0, I_S = 1) \cdot BF_U^* \cdot \left(\mathbb{P}(T = 1|I_S = 1) + \mathbb{P}(T = 0|I_S = 1) \cdot \frac{1}{RR_{TU|S=1}^*}\right) \\
&= \mathbb{P}^*(Y = 1|T = 0, I_S = 1) \cdot BF_U^* \cdot [\mathbb{P}(T = 1|I_S = 1) + \mathbb{P}(T = 0|I_S = 1) \\
&\cdot \left(\frac{1}{RR_{UY|S=1}^*} - \frac{1}{RR_{TU|S=1}^* RR_{UY|S=1}^*} + \frac{1}{RR_{TU|S=1}^*}\right)] \\
&= \mathbb{P}^*(Y = 1|T = 0, I_S = 1) \cdot BF_U^* \cdot \left(\mathbb{P}(T = 1|I_S = 1) + \mathbb{P}(T = 0|I_S = 1) \cdot \frac{1}{BF_U^*}\right).
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, we get

$$\beta_{R_S} = \frac{\mathbb{P}^*(Y = 1|T = 1, I_S = 1)}{\mathbb{P}^*(Y = 1|T = 0, I_S = 1)BF_U^*}.$$

Lastly, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}(Y = 1|T = 1, I_S = 1) &= \mathbb{P}(Y = 1|T = 1, U = 0, I_S = 1)\mathbb{P}(U = 0|T = 1, I_S = 1) \\
&+ \mathbb{P}(Y = 1|T = 1, U = 1, I_S = 1)\mathbb{P}(U = 1|T = 1, I_S = 1) \\
&= \mathbb{P}^*(Y = 1|T = 1, I_S = 1)
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}(Y = 1|T = 0, I_S = 1) &= \mathbb{P}(Y = 1|T = 0, U = 0, I_S = 1)\mathbb{P}(U = 0|T = 0, I_S = 1) \\
&+ \mathbb{P}(Y = 1|T = 0, U = 1, I_S = 1)\mathbb{P}(U = 1|T = 0, I_S = 1) \\
&= \frac{\mathbb{P}^*(Y = 1|T = 1, I_S = 1)BF_U^*}{RR_{UY|S=1}^*} \cdot \left(1 - \frac{1}{RR_{TU|S=1}^*}\right) \\
&+ \mathbb{P}^*(Y = 1|T = 1, I_S = 1)BF_U^* \cdot \frac{1}{RR_{TU|S=1}^*} \\
&= \mathbb{P}^*(Y = 1|T = 1, I_S = 1)BF_U^* \cdot \frac{1}{BF_U^*} \\
&= \mathbb{P}^*(Y = 1|T = 1, I_S = 1).
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, the bound for the relative risk in the subpopulation is sharp.

We use the same distribution as for the relative risk to show that the bound for the risk difference is sharp when $BF_U \leq 1/\mathbb{P}(Y = 1|T = 0, I_S = 1)$. Furthermore, from the eAppendix

2e in [Smith and VanderWeele \(2019\)](#), we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
\beta_{D_S}^+ &= \mathbb{P}(Y = 1|T = 1, I_S = 1) - \sum_u \mathbb{P}(Y = 1|T = 0, U = u, I_S = 1)\mathbb{P}(U = u|T = 1, I_S = 1) \\
&= \mathbb{P}(Y = 1|T = 1, I_S = 1) - \frac{\mathbb{P}^*(Y = 1|T = 0, I_S = 1)BF_U^*}{RR_{UY|S=1}^*} \cdot 0 \\
&\quad - \mathbb{P}^*(Y = 1|T = 0, I_S = 1)BF_U^* \cdot 1 \\
&= \mathbb{P}(Y = 1|T = 1, I_S = 1) - \mathbb{P}^*(Y = 1|T = 0, I_S = 1)BF_U^* \\
&= \mathbb{P}(Y = 1|T = 1, I_S = 1) - \mathbb{P}(Y = 1|T = 0, I_S = 1)BF_U
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
\beta_{D_S}^- &= \sum_u \mathbb{P}(Y = 1|T = 1, U = u, I_S = 1)\mathbb{P}(U = u|T = 0, I_S = 1) - \mathbb{P}(Y = 1|T = 0, I_S = 1) \\
&= \frac{\mathbb{P}^*(Y = 1|T = 1, I_S = 1)}{RR_{UY|S=1}^*} \cdot \left(1 - \frac{1}{RR_{TU|S=1}^*}\right) \\
&\quad + \mathbb{P}^*(Y = 1|T = 1, I_S = 1) \cdot \frac{1}{RR_{TU|S=1}^*} - \mathbb{P}(Y = 1|T = 0, I_S = 1) \\
&= \frac{\mathbb{P}^*(Y = 1|T = 1, I_S = 1)}{BF_U^*} - \mathbb{P}(Y = 1|T = 0, I_S = 1) \\
&= \frac{\mathbb{P}(Y = 1|T = 1, I_S = 1)}{BF_U} - \mathbb{P}(Y = 1|T = 0, I_S = 1).
\end{aligned}$$

We thus get

$$\beta_{D_S}^+ - \beta_{D_S}^{obs} = \mathbb{P}(Y = 1|T = 0, I_S = 1) \cdot (BF_U - 1)$$

and

$$\beta_{D_S}^- - \beta_{D_S}^{obs} = \mathbb{P}(Y = 1|T = 1, I_S = 1) \cdot (1 - 1/BF_U)$$

and since $bias(\beta_{D_S}) \leq \max(\beta_{D_S}^{obs} - \beta_{D_S}^+, \beta_{D_S}^{obs} - \beta_{D_S}^-)$ ([Smith and VanderWeele 2019](#), eAppendix 2e), we get that the bound for the risk difference in the subpopulation is sharp.

B.4. Non-sharp for the total population

We have that the bias for the relative risk ([Smith and VanderWeele 2019](#), eAppendix 1a)

$$bias(\beta_R) = \frac{\beta_R^{obs}}{\beta_R} \leq \frac{\mathbb{P}(Y = 1|T = 1, I_S = 1)}{\mathbb{P}(Y = 1|T = 0, I_S = 1)} \bigg/ \frac{\min_s \mathbb{P}(Y = 1|T = 1, I_S = s)}{\max_s \mathbb{P}(Y = 1|T = 0, I_S = s)} \leq BF_1 \cdot BF_0. \quad (10)$$

Thus, if

$$\beta_R = \frac{\mathbb{P}(Y = 1|T = 1)}{\mathbb{P}(Y = 1|T = 0)} > \frac{\min_s \mathbb{P}(Y = 1|T = 1, I_S = s)}{\max_s \mathbb{P}(Y = 1|T = 0, I_S = s)}, \quad (11)$$

the first inequality in (10) is strict.

The relative risk is

$$\begin{aligned}
\beta_R &= \frac{\mathbb{P}(Y = 1|T = 1)}{\mathbb{P}(Y = 1|T = 0)} \\
&= \frac{\mathbb{P}(Y = 1|T = 1, I_S = 0)\mathbb{P}(I_S = 0|T = 1) + \mathbb{P}(Y = 1|T = 1, I_S = 1)\mathbb{P}(I_S = 1|T = 1)}{\mathbb{P}(Y = 1|T = 0, I_S = 0)\mathbb{P}(I_S = 0|T = 0) + \mathbb{P}(Y = 1|T = 0, I_S = 1)\mathbb{P}(I_S = 1|T = 0)} \\
&= \frac{\max_s \mathbb{P}(Y = 1|T = 1, I_S = s)\mathbb{P}(I_S = s|T = 1) + \min_{s'} \mathbb{P}(Y = 1|T = 1, I_S = s')\mathbb{P}(I_S = s'|T = 1)}{\min_s \mathbb{P}(Y = 1|T = 0, I_S = s)\mathbb{P}(I_S = s|T = 0) + \max_{s'} \mathbb{P}(Y = 1|T = 0, I_S = s')\mathbb{P}(I_S = s'|T = 0)} \\
&= \frac{\min_{s'} \mathbb{P}(Y = 1|T = 1, I_S = s')}{\max_{s'} \mathbb{P}(Y = 1|T = 0, I_S = s')} \cdot \frac{\mathbb{P}(I_S = s|T = 1)[\max_s \mathbb{P}(Y = 1|T = t, I_S = s) - \min_{s'} \mathbb{P}(Y = 1|T = 1, I_S = s')] + \mathbb{P}(I_S = s|T = 0)[\min_s \mathbb{P}(Y = 1|T = 0, I_S = s') - \max_{s'} \mathbb{P}(Y = 1|T = 0, I_S = s')]}{\mathbb{P}(Y = 1|T = 0, I_S = s')} \\
&\geq \frac{\min_{s'} \mathbb{P}(Y = 1|T = 1, I_S = s')}{\max_{s'} \mathbb{P}(Y = 1|T = 0, I_S = s')}.
\end{aligned}$$

If $\mathbb{P}(Y = 1|T = t, I_S = 1) \neq \mathbb{P}(Y = 1|T = t, I_S = 0)$ for $t = 0, 1$, the inequality is strict and the bias is

$$bias(\beta_R) = \frac{\beta_R^{obs}}{\beta_R} < \frac{\mathbb{P}(Y = 1|T = 1, I_S = 1)}{\mathbb{P}(Y = 1|T = 0, I_S = 1)} \bigg/ \frac{\min_s \mathbb{P}(Y = 1|T = 1, I_S = s)}{\max_s \mathbb{P}(Y = 1|T = 0, I_S = s)} \leq BF_1 \cdot BF_0,$$

i.e. the bound is not sharp.

For the risk difference, the bias is defined as

$$bias(\beta_D) = \beta_D^{obs} - \beta_D.$$

Using the same kind of reasoning as above,

$$\beta_D \geq \min_s \mathbb{P}(Y = 1|T = 1, I_S = s) - \max_s \mathbb{P}(Y = 1|T = 0, I_S = s),$$

where the inequality is strict if $\mathbb{P}(Y = 1|T = t, I_S = 1) \neq \mathbb{P}(Y = 1|T = t, I_S = 0)$ for $t = 0, 1$.

The bias then is

$$\begin{aligned}
bias(\beta_D) &= \beta_D^{obs} - \beta_D < [\mathbb{P}(Y = 1|T = 1, I_S = 1) - \mathbb{P}(Y = 1|T = 0, I_S = 1)] \\
&\quad - [\min_s \mathbb{P}(Y = 1|T = 1, I_S = s) - \max_s \mathbb{P}(Y = 1|T = 0, I_S = s)] \\
&\leq BF_1 - \mathbb{P}(Y = 1|T = 1, I_S = 1)/BF_1 + \mathbb{P}(Y = 1|T = 0, I_S = 1) \cdot BF_0,
\end{aligned}$$

i.e. the bound is not sharp.

Affiliation:

Stina Zetterstrom, Ingeborg Waernbaum

Department of Statistics

Uppsala University

Uppsala, Sweden

E-mail: stina.zetterstrom@statistics.uu.se,

ingeborg.waernbaum@statistics.uu.se