De Vocht, F., Angus, C., Tilling, K., Brennan, A., & Hickman, M. (2018). Response to: 'Synthetic control methodology as a tool for evaluating population-level health interventions' by Bouttell et al. *Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health*, 72(9).
<https://doi.org/10.1136/jech-2018-211037>

Peer reviewed version

Link to published version (if available):
[10.1136/jech-2018-211037](https://doi.org/10.1136/jech-2018-211037)

[Link to publication record in Explore Bristol Research](#)
PDF-document

This is the author accepted manuscript (AAM). The final published version (version of record) is available online via BMJ at <https://jech.bmj.com/content/72/9/864>. Please refer to any applicable terms of use of the publisher.

University of Bristol - Explore Bristol Research

General rights

This document is made available in accordance with publisher policies. Please cite only the published version using the reference above. Full terms of use are available:
<http://www.bristol.ac.uk/red/research-policy/pure/user-guides/ebr-terms/>

Response to: ‘Synthetic control methodology as a tool for evaluating population-level health interventions’.

Frank de Vocht^{1,2}, Colin Angus^{2,3}, Kate Tilling^{1,2}, Alan Brennan^{2,3}, Matthew Hickman^{1,2}

¹ Population Health Sciences, Bristol Medical School, University of Bristol, UK.

² NIHR School for Public Health Research

³ SchARR School of Health and Related Research, University of Sheffield, UK.

Corresponding author: Dr Frank de Vocht. Population Health Sciences, Bristol Medical School, University of Bristol. Canynge Hall, 39 Whatley Road, Bristol, UK. BS8 2PS.

Email: frank.devocht@bristol.ac.uk

Contributorship: FV and CA conceived of the letter and wrote the first draft. All authors (FV, CA, KT, AB and MH) commented on draft versions and approved the final version.

Funding: No external funding was obtained.

Competing interests: The authors declare no competing interests

The Corresponding Author has the right to grant on behalf of all authors and does grant on behalf of all authors, an exclusive licence (or non-exclusive for government employees) on a worldwide basis to the BMJ Publishing Group Ltd and its Licensees to permit this article (if accepted) to be published in JECH editions and any other BMJ PGL products to exploit all subsidiary rights, as set out in our licence.

(<http://group.bmj.com/products/journals/instructions-for-authors/licence-forms/>).

We read with interest the recent paper from Boutell and colleagues on the use of synthetic control methodology (SCM) as a tool for the evaluation of population-level health interventions (1).

We welcome and support their conclusion that these methods provide a valuable addition to the methodological arsenal of those undertaking evaluations of public health, and other, interventions where randomisation is not possible or practical, or retrospectively where the opportunity for randomisation was missed. We echo their call for other researchers to adopt these methods more widely.

As the literature review reported in Boutell *et al.* was conducted up to February 2016, it has missed more recent developments in the field. In particular we would like to highlight a study which we recently published in this journal in which we describe a Bayesian structural time series approach to SCM and apply it to estimate the impact of local alcohol licensing policies on hospital admissions and crime (2). This approach, originally developed by Broderson *et al.* (3), extends the work of Abadie and colleagues (4,5) and addresses several of the limitations identified by Boutell *et al.* In particular, by using Bayesian averaging over all combinations of controls or other predictors, this approach minimises the dependence of the counterfactual scenario on the specific set of controls (or other

predictors) selected by the researchers. In addition, through the use of structural time series to generate the synthetic control which represents the counterfactual, temporal changes in the correlations between predictors and outcomes pre-intervention (expressed as changes in model betas) can be taken into account. This methodology does not, therefore, rely on a synthetic control constructed at a single point in time. It is also possible to interpret the results of this approach in the framework of traditional statistical inference through posterior tail area probabilities (posterior predictive p-values), which can be interpreted as the posterior mean of classical p-values (6).

We would like to thank Boutell and colleagues for their clear explanation of synthetic control methods. We hope this will promote their use to improve the extent to which we can learn from, often messy, real-world interventions. By highlighting further developments in the methodology which address some of the limitations of 'traditional' SCM we hope to further broaden their use.

- (1) Boutell J, Craig P, Lewsey J, *et al.* Synthetic control methodology as a tool for evaluating population-level health interventions. *J Epidemiol Community Health* 2018. doi: 10.1136/jech-2017-210106
- (2) de Vocht, Tilling, Pliakas, Angus, Egan, Brennan, Campbell, Hickman. The intervention effect of local alcohol licensing policies on hospital admission and crime: a natural experiment using a novel Bayesian synthetic time-series method. *J Epidemiol Community Health*. 2017;71(9):912-918. doi: 10.1136/jech-2017-208931
- (3) Brodersen KH, Gallusser F, Koehler J, *et al.* Inferring causal impact using bayesian structural time-series models. *Ann Appl Stat* 2015; 9 :247–74. doi:10.1214/14-AOAS788
- (4) Abadie A, Gardeazabal J. The Economic costs of Conflict: a Case Study of the basque country. *Am Econ Rev* 2003; 93 :113–32. doi:10.1257/000282803321455188
- (5) Abadie A, Diamond A, Hainmueller J. Synthetic control methods for comparative case studies: estimating the effect of California's Tobacco Control Program. *J Am Stat Assoc* 2010; 105: 493–505. doi:10.1198/jasa.2009.ap08746
- (6) Meng X-L. Posterior Predictive p-Values. *The Annals of Statistics* 1994;22:1142–60. doi:10.1214/aos/1176325622