# Please copy the files for this session

# Twin-based Direction of Causation (DOC) Modeling

International Statistical Genetics Workshop

IBG, University of Colorado Boulder

Friday, 8<sup>th</sup> March 2024

#### MadhurBain Singh

singhm18@vcu.edu

Virginia Institute for Psychiatric and Behavior Genetics Virginia Commonwealth University, Richmond, VA

Thanks to Nathan Gillespie, Hermine H. M. Maes, and Michael C. Neale.



## **Twin-based DOC modeling in SEM**

- Causal inference in cross-sectional data from twins
- Extension of bivariate/multivariate twin design



\*Diagram showing only the within-individual part of the model.

#### Power based on the information from the **cross-twin cross-trait covariance**.

#### Causal effect of X on Y within an individual



#### Note

When we model/estimate an effect of *X* on *Y*, the variable *X* need not have a "direct" effect on *Y*.

There may be a chain of unmeasured variables that partly or fully mediate the effect of *X* on *Y*.

This is true for all models of causal inference.

#### Assumption: The causal process is identical in both siblings.



#### Note

Almost all\* causal models assume a homogeneous causal process in the population under study.

\*unless explicitly specified.

#### Assumption: There are no within- or cross-trait sibling interactions.



Twin-1's trait X has no causal influence on Twin-2's trait X or trait Y, and vice versa.

(e.g., sibling cooperation or rivalry)

#### X causes Y





8



## DOC depends on the two traits having different twin-pair correlations

- In other words, DOC works if the two traits have different ACE/ADE estimates.
- If the two traits have the same (or very similar\*) ACE/ADE estimates, the cross-twin cross-trait covariance is the same (or very similar\*) under the two directions of causal effects.
- So, the model has no (or very little\*) power to differentiate between the two causal processes.
  - i.e., the model has a similar fit under either direction of causation.



the ACE estimates of X must be different from the ACE estimates of Y.

For the DOC model to work,

Neale and Cardon (1992); Heath et al. (1993); Duffy and Martin (1994).

\*If the ACE estimates of X and Y are very similar (but not the same), the DOC model would require extremely large sample sizes to differentiate between the two directions of causation.



Both X and Y have ACE variance decomposition.



#### Exercise: What is the expected cross-twin cross-trait covariance when

#### Exercise: What is the expected cross-twin cross-trait covariance when



#### Exercise: What is the expected cross-twin cross-trait covariance when



#### Compare the model fit statistics with different directions of causation specified



#### An applied example of the classic DOC model



#### between peer group deviance and cannabis use in male twins

#### Nathan A. Gillespie<sup>1</sup>, Michael C. Neale<sup>1</sup>, Kristen Jacobson<sup>2</sup> & Kenneth S. Kendler<sup>1,3</sup>

Department of Psychiatry, Virginia Commonwealth University, Richmond, VA, USA<sup>1</sup> Department of Psychiatry, University of Chicago, Chicago, IL, USA<sup>2</sup> and Department of Human Genetics, Virginia Commonwealth University, Richmond, VA, USA<sup>3</sup>



	-2LL	df	$\Delta$ -2LL	$\Delta df$	Р	BIC
22–25 years						
Cholesky	7725.38	3542				-2805.25
PGD→CU	7744.32	3544	18.94	2.00	< 0.001	-2799.54
CU→PGD	7729.08	3544	3.70	2.00	0.16	-2807.16
PGD↔CU	7728.00	3543	2.62	1.00	0.11	-2805.82

# Causal estimates in DOC may be biased by differences in the measurement error of the two traits

- If the two traits have different levels of measurement error (i.e., reliability), the causal estimates in the standard DOC model (applied to observed phenotypes) will be biased.
- Solutions
  - *If* the reliability/measurement error of the phenotype is known, SEM allows for its specification in the model.
    - See the path diagrams and scripts in the MR-DOC session this afternoon.
  - More realistically, use latent "true" phenotypes derived from multiple indicators and fit the DOC model to latent phenotypes.

#### DOC model between latent phenotypes with multiple indicators



Diagram showing only the within-individual part of the model.

Neale and Cardon (1992); Heath et al. (1993)

#### DOC model between latent phenotypes with multiple indicators



The DOC model of interest is fitted to latent phenotypes (that have no measurement error).

#### Multiple indicators/items of a phenotype



For example,  $X_1$ ,  $X_2$ , and  $X_3$  may be

- Symptoms of depression (e.g., CIDI-SF)
- Symptoms of alcohol use disorder (e.g., AUDIT)
- Externalizing behaviors in children/adolescents (e.g., the Child Behavior Checklist)
- Measures of cognitive functions in older populations (e.g., the Mini-Mental Status Examination)

#### **Common latent factor: "True phenotype" from multiple indicators/items**



The common latent factor reflects the shared variance between the different items/indicators.

Saturated means model

#### ACE variance decomposition of the latent phenotype (no measurement error)



Measurement error is captured by the indicator-specific variance not explained by the common factor (true phenotype).

To improve figure readability, the means are not shown.

#### Plus, ACE decomposition of indicator-specific (residual) variances



Measurement error is captured by the  $Es_{X1}$ ,  $Es_{X2}$ , and  $Es_{X3}$  variance components (of the indicatorspecific variances).

## Two latent phenotypes (X and Y)



#### **Direction-of-causation modeling with two latent phenotypes**



#### Five possible sources of covariance in the model



The model, as shown, is not identified.

We cannot estimate all five sources of covariance at the same time in this model.

## ACE ["confounding-only"] model with two latent phenotypes



#### Null hypothesis for DOC

The observed associations between the indicators of X and Y are due to

- Background confounding due to unmeasured genetic and/or environmental factors
- No causation between X and Y

#### DOC model: X causes Y



#### Alternative hypothesis 1

- X causes Y
- No background confounding due to unmeasured variables

#### DOC model: Y causes X



#### Alternative hypothesis 2

- Y causes X
- No background confounding due to unmeasured variables

#### DOC model: Reciprocal causation between X and Y



#### Alternative hypothesis 3

- Reciprocal causation between X and Y
- No background confounding due to unmeasured variables

#### **Hybrid DOC model: Causation + Confounding**



We may estimate any <u>three</u> sources of covariance between X and Y.

For example,

- X causes Y
- Background confounding due to unmeasured additive genetic factors
- Background confounding due to unmeasured shared/familial environmental factors

## Script Walk-through

## Start with the ACE ["confounding-only"] model



#### ACE variance-covariance components of the latent factors



#### ACE variance-covariance components of the latent factors



#### ACE variance-covariance components of the latent factors



#### Causal Paths – Fixed at zero in the ACE confounding-only model



#### Causal Paths – Fixed at zero in the ACE confounding-only model



#### Causal Paths – Fixed at zero in the ACE confounding-only model



> B FullMatrix 'B' \$labels Fx Fy "bxy" Fx NA Fy "byx" NA \$values Fx Fy 0 0 Fx 00 Fy \$free: No free parameters. \$lbound: No lower bounds assigned. \$ubound: No upper bounds assigned.

#### **Factor loadings**



#### **Factor loadings**



## **Factor loadings**



> Fl FullMatrix 'Fl'
<pre>\$labels     Fx Fy X1 "f_x1Fx" NA X2 "f_x2Fx" NA X3 "f_x3Fx" NA Y1 NA "f_y1Fy" Y2 NA "f_y2Fy" Y3 NA "f_y3Fy"</pre>
\$values Fx Fy X1 0.8 0.0 X2 0.8 0.0 X3 0.8 0.0 Y1 0.0 0.8 Y2 0.0 0.8 Y3 0.0 0.8
\$free Fx Fy X1 TRUE FALSE X2 TRUE FALSE X3 TRUE FALSE Y1 FALSE TRUE Y2 FALSE TRUE Y3 FALSE TRUE
\$lbound: No lower bounds assigned.
subound, no upper bounds assigned.

#### ACE components of the indicator-specific variances (= residuals)



#### ACE components of the indicator-specific variances (= residuals)



## ACE components of the indicator-specific variances (= residuals)



Δε									
> AS DiscNetnix !Ac!									
DiagMatrix As									
\$Labels									
X1	X2	X3	Y1	Y2	Y3				
X1 "As_X1"	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA				
X2 NA	"As_X2"	NA	NA	NA	NA				
X3 NA	NA	"As_X3"	NA	NA	NA				
Y1 NA	NA	NA	"As_Y1"	NA	NA				
Y2 NA	NA	NA	NA	"As_Y2"	NA				
Y3 NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	"As_Y3"				
\$values									
X1	X2 X3	Y1 Y2	2 Y3						
X1 0.05 0.	00 0 00	0.00 0.0	0 0 00						
15 0.00 0.	00 0.00	0.00 0.00	0 0.05						
<i>t</i> .c									
\$free									
X1	X2	X3 Y1	Y2	Y3					
X1 TRUE F	ALSE FAL	SE FALSE	FALSE F	ALSE					
X2 FALSE	TRUE FAL	SE FALSE	FALSE F	ALSE					
X3 FALSE F	ALSE TR	UE FALSE	FALSE F	ALSE					
Y1 FALSE F	ALSE FAL	SE TRUE	FALSE F	ALSE					
Y2 FALSE F	ALSE FAL	SE FALSE	TRUE F	ALSE					
Y3 FALSE F	ALSE FAL	SE FALSE	FALSE	TRUE					

#### Specify the means



#### Specify the means



#### Specify the means



# **Tutorial**

Please copy the scripts for this session

mkdir ~/doc
cp -r /home/madhur/2024/Day-5/DOC/\* ~/doc/.

## Qualtrics link

This link is also on top of the R script: **DOC\_multiple\_indicator.R** 

https://qimr.az1.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV\_eW1CeUT3ZibFMzQ

## **Tutorial: DOC modeling with multiple indicators**

- 1. Fit the **ACE "confounding-only" model** = *Null hypothesis for DOC*.
- 2. Run the **Direction of Causation models** (alternative causal hypotheses):
  - *a)* X causes Y (no background ACE covariance)
  - *b) Y* causes *X* (no background ACE covariance)
  - c) Reciprocal causation between *X* and *Y* (no background ACE covariance)

Infer the mechanism of covariance between X and Y based on the best-fitting model.

3. Bonus: Fit a **hybrid model with three sources of covariance** (causation + confounding).

#### The "true" model – as simulated



Data simulated using the script *xtra\_Data\_Simulation\_DoC\_Multiple\_Indicator.R* 

## **Further Readings**

 Maes, H. H. M., Neale, M. C., Kirkpatrick, R. M., & Kendler, K. S. (2021). Using Multimodel Inference/Model Averaging to Model Causes of Covariation Between Variables in Twins. Behavior Genetics, 51(1), 82-96. <u>https://doi.org/10.1007/s10519-020-10026-8</u>

Fit all possible bivariate twin models

Obtain a weighted average of the parameter estimates across models

Models are weighted by their goodness of fit

 Neale, M. C., & Kendler, K. S. (1995). Models of comorbidity for multifactorial disorders. American Journal of Human Genetics, 57(4), 935–953. <u>https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/7573055/</u>

Theoretical and methodological exposition of different causes of covariation between traits

#### References

- Neale, M. C., & Cardon, L. R. (1992). Direction of Causation. In M. C. Neale & L. R. Cardon (Eds.), *Methodology for Genetic Studies of Twins and Families* (pp. 261-287). Springer Netherlands. <u>https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-015-8018-2\_13</u>
- Heath, A. C., Kessler, R. C., Neale, M. C., Hewitt, J. K., Eaves, L. J., & Kendler, K. S. (1993). Testing hypotheses about direction of causation using cross-sectional family data. *Behavior Genetics*, 23(1), 29-50. <u>https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01067552</u>
- Duffy, D. L., & Martin, N. G. (1994). Inferring the direction of causation in cross-sectional twin data: Theoretical and empirical considerations. *Genetic Epidemiology*, 11(6), 483-502. <u>https://doi.org/10.1002/gepi.1370110606</u>