

UC Santa Barbara

UC Santa Barbara Previously Published Works

Title

Cause-effect analysis for sustainable development policy

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/6z08k1w1>

Journal

Environmental Reviews, 25(3)

ISSN

1181-8700

Authors

Cucurachi, Stefano
Suh, Sangwon

Publication Date

2017-09-01

DOI

10.1139/er-2016-0109

Peer reviewed

Cause-effect analysis for sustainable development policy

Stefano Cucurachi and Sangwon Suh

Abstract: The sustainable development goals (SDGs) launched by the United Nations (UN) set a new direction for development covering the environmental, economic, and social pillars. Given the complex and interdependent nature of the socioeconomic and environmental systems, however, understanding the cause-effect relationships between policy actions and their outcomes on SDGs remains as a challenge. We provide a systematic review of cause-effect analysis literature in the context of quantitative sustainability assessment. The cause-effect analysis literature in both social and natural sciences has significantly gained its breadth and depth, and some of the pioneering applications have begun to address sustainability challenges. We focus on randomized experiment studies, natural experiments, observational studies, and time-series methods, and the applicability of these approaches to quantitative sustainability assessment with respect to the plausibility of the assumptions, limitations and the data requirements. Despite the promising developments, however, we find that quantifying the sustainability consequences of a policy action, and providing unequivocal policy recommendations based on it is still a challenge. We recognize some of the key data requirements and assumptions necessary to design formal experiments as the bottleneck for conducting scientifically defensible cause-effect analysis in the context of quantitative sustainability assessment. Our study calls for the need of multi-disciplinary effort to develop an operational framework for quantifying the sustainability consequences of policy actions. In the meantime, continued efforts need to be made to advance other modeling platforms such as mechanistic models and simulation tools. We highlighted the importance of understanding and properly communicating the uncertainties associated with such models, regular monitoring and feedback on the consequences of policy actions to the modelers and decision-makers, and the use of what-if scenarios in the absence of well-formulated cause-effect analysis.

Key words: sustainable development goals, causality, cause-effect mechanisms, quantitative sustainability assessment, sustainability policy.

Résumé : Les buts du développement durable (BDD) initiés par les Nations Unies (ONU) établissent une nouvelle direction pour le développement couvrant les piliers environnementaux, économiques et sociaux. Étant donné la nature complexe et interdépendante des systèmes socio-économiques et environnementaux, cependant, comprendre les relations de cause à effet entre les initiatives d'orientation et leurs conséquences sur les BDD demeure un défi. Nous fournissons une revue systématique de la littérature d'analyse de cause à effet dans le contexte d'évaluation quantitative de durabilité. La littérature d'analyse de cause à effet, tant dans le domaine des sciences sociales que des sciences naturelles, a significativement pris de l'ampleur et de la profondeur et certaines des applications pionnières ont commencé à relever des défis de durabilité. Nous nous penchons sur des études d'expériences aléatoires, des expériences naturelles, des études d'observation et des méthodes chronologiques et l'applicabilité de ces approches à l'évaluation quantitative de durabilité en ce qui concerne la plausibilité des hypothèses, les limitations et les exigences en matière de données. Malgré une évolution prometteuse, cependant, nous constatons que quantifier les conséquences d'une initiative d'orientation sur la durabilité et fournir des recommandations de politique claires demeure toujours problématique. Nous reconnaissons certaines des exigences clés en matière de données et les hypothèses requises afin de concevoir des expériences formelles comme étant les obstacles majeurs afin d'effectuer l'analyse scientifiquement défendable de cause à effet dans le contexte d'évaluation quantitative de durabilité. Notre étude souligne le besoin d'effort pluridisciplinaire afin de développer un cadre opérationnel pour quantifier les conséquences de durabilité des initiatives d'orientation. En attendant, il faut poursuivre les efforts pour faire avancer d'autres plates-formes de modélisation comme des modèles mécanistes et des outils de simulation. Nous avons mis en évidence l'importance de comprendre et de correctement communiquer les incertitudes associées à de tels modèles, la surveillance régulière et la rétroaction sur les conséquences des initiatives d'orientation aux modélisateurs et aux décideurs, et l'utilisation de scénarios de simulation en absence d'analyse bien formulée de cause à effet. [Traduit par la Rédaction]

Mots-clés : buts du développement durable, causalité, mécanismes de cause à effet, évaluation quantitative de durabilité, politique de durabilité.

1. Introduction

The Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs, hereafter) launched on January 1, 2016 include 17 goals, 169 targets, and 303 indicators (United Nations 2014; Malik et al. 2015), which will help frame the agendas and policies of the United Nations' member states

through 2030 (Hák et al. 2016). These goals are not only comprehensive, covering the economic, social and environmental dimensions of sustainability, but also highly interconnected (International Council for Science 2015), making it essential to understand synergies, trade-offs and conflicts between them to support decisions (Schindler and Hilborn 2015). Without such understanding, a pol-

Received 15 November 2016. Accepted 28 February 2017.

S. Cucurachi and S. Suh. Bren School of Environmental Science and Management, University of California, Santa Barbara, CA 93106, USA.

Corresponding author: Sangwon Suh (email: suh@bren.ucsb.edu).

Copyright remains with the author(s) or their institution(s). Permission for reuse (free in most cases) can be obtained from [RightsLink](https://rightslink.com).

icy to improve on one goal could conflict with another goal. For example, policies targeting at improving energy provision could conflict with another goal on climate-change mitigation, or those aiming at the protection of marine ecosystem could clash with the provision of sustainable food for all (Laurenti et al. 2016).

Various tools and metrics have supported sustainable development decisions, which we collectively refer to quantitative sustainability assessments (QSAs) in this review. Examples of QSAs include, but not limited to, life cycle assessment (LCA) (Guinée 2002; ISO 2006; Hellweg and Mila i Canals 2014), various footprinting approaches (Wiedmann and Minx 2007; Peters 2010; Hoekstra and Mekkonnen 2012; Mancini et al. 2015; Michalsky and Hooda 2015), assessment of planetary boundaries (Rockström et al. 2009; Hughes et al. 2013; Whiteman et al. 2013; Steffen et al. 2015), environmental input-output models (Huppes et al. 2006; Tukker et al. 2006; Suh 2009; Hertwich 2010; Lenzen et al. 2012; Hertwich et al. 2014), ecosystem valuation approaches (Groot et al. 2010; Costanza et al. 2014), and material flow analysis (MFA) (Matthews et al. 2000; Brunner and Rechberger 2004; Haberl et al. 2007; Fischer-Kowalski and Swilling 2011), among others [see e.g., Ness et al. (2007)]. In particular, so called, consequential LCA (CLCA) aims at quantifying the consequences that a certain action or a policy decision has on the environment and natural resources (Brander et al. 2008; Creutzig et al. 2012; Zamagni et al. 2012; Plevin et al. 2014; Suh and Yang 2014).

The complexity and the interconnected nature of the socio-economic and environmental systems, however, poses a challenge to QSA practitioners in modeling the consequences of a policy action in the context of sustainable development (Cucurachi and Suh 2015). Furthermore, recent developments in economics, ecosystem science, and systems biology on causality research have yet to be embraced by QSA approaches.¹ Over the past decades, the causality literature has evolved to address various conceptual and technical issues such as endogeneity (Antonakis et al. 2014; Kreuzer 2016) and reverse causality [see e.g., Mei-chu (1987); Chong and Calderon (2000); Barsky and Kilian (2004); Chaumont et al. (2012)] in parsing out causal relationships from complex phenomena. For example, Angrist and Krueger (1992) test the effect of children's age when starting school on their eventual years of schooling completed and on educational attainment. Using instrumental variables, the authors conclude that the effect of the starting age on educational attainment is modest. Instrumental variables have also been used to test the effects of education on health (Cutler et al. 2008; Grossman 2008; Conti et al. 2010; Cutler and Lleras-Muney 2010; Heckman et al. 2014), education on well-being (Oreopoulos and Salvanes 2011; Oreopoulos and Petronijevic 2013), and social connections on well-being (Kahneman and Krueger 2006; Fowler and Christakis 2008). However, few of such techniques have been applied to QSAs.

This review aims at surveying the techniques of cause-effect analysis in the context of QSAs. For each method to infer causality (cause-effect analysis technique in the remainder of the text), we present and review relevant applications in the field of sustainability that show how cause-effect analysis techniques can allow QSAs to increase the value of information they provide to decision-makers. Our survey of causality literature was drawn from peer-reviewed articles on theory and methods, causality handbooks, and case studies applying the techniques. Based on the literature surveyed, we classify the analytical approaches to cause-effect

analysis techniques. Each class of techniques was, in turn, searched on the ISI Web of Science and on Google Scholar in combination with the keywords 'sustain*', 'environ*', 'emissions', 'pollut*', 'econ*', 'CO2', and 'GDP'.

The remainder of the review is organized as follows: the next section presents a short chronology of causality theory; in section 3, we start from the ideal approach to causality provided by Rubin's causal model, and then we analyze the techniques that are based on observational (i.e., non-experimental) data; in section 4 we discuss the applicability of cause-effect analysis techniques to QSA; finally section 5 discusses outlook to close this review.

2. A brief chronology

Causality has interested philosophers and scientists since the time of Aristotle (see *Physics II 3 and Metaphysics V 2*). For millennia, however, causal problems have often rested in the realm of philosophical delight rather than inspiring scientific research.

Pearl (2000a) notes that the questions on causality did not enter into formal scientific discourses for a good part of the 19th century. In the dawn of the 20th century, Hume (1902 sec. VII) formally defined a cause as "an object followed by another, and where all the objects, similar to the first, are followed by objects similar to the second. Or, specifically, where, if the first object had not been, the second never had existed". A similar idea of cause was also at the basis of the experimental work of Mill (1856). However, Russell (1912) stated that causal relationships and physical equations are incompatible, describing causality as "a word relic" and excluding the existence of causality from mathematics and physics. In 1911, Pearson still described causality as "another fetish amidst the inscrutable arcana of even modern science" (Pearson 1911). Interestingly, a mechanistic view of causality also existed in the early 20th century philosophy. For example, Laplace thought that cause and effect can be understood perfectly given enough knowledge and data: "We may regard the present state of the universe as the effect of the past and the cause of the future. An intellect which at any given moment knew all of the forces that animate nature and the mutual positions of the beings that compose it, if this intellect were vast enough to submit the data to analysis, could condense into a single formula the movement of the greatest bodies of the universe and that of the lightest atom; for such an intellect nothing could be uncertain and the future just like the past would be present before its eyes" (Laplace 1902).

In the 1950s, further formalizations of probabilistic causality appeared in the philosophical literature (Salmon 1980). Good (1963) and Suppes (1970) attempted to identify the tendency of an event to cause another by (1) constructing causal relations on the basis of probabilistic relations between events, (2) employing the statistical relevance as the basic concept, and (3) assuming temporal precedence of causes [see Russo and Williamson (2007) for a detailed account of probabilistic causality and of assumptions and axioms]. Probabilistic causality "places emphasis upon the mechanisms of causality, primarily uses concepts of process and interaction, and appeals to laws of nature" (Russo 2009).

In the 70s causality still remained as "one of the most important, most subtle, and most neglected of all the problems of Statistic" (Dawid 1979). It is only with the pioneering work of Rubin on the formal framework of potential outcome and counterfactual analysis (Rubin 1974) that the statistical literature reconnects with

¹For example, Weinzettel et al. (2013) use multi-linear regression and concluded that affluence drives the global displacement of land use, thus being the main cause of biodiversity loss globally. The study does provide a strong correlation between affluence and biodiversity loss but does not univocally allow interpretation of the results as a causal relationship. Likewise, Suweis et al. (2013, 2015) use a stochastic logistic model to assess whether the population growth of a nation is driven (i.e. caused) by either local availability of water resources used or by import of water resources from neighboring countries. As acknowledged by the authors, both studies do not consider a number of "other environmental, cultural, and health-related factors", thus limiting the interpretability of the result as a causal relationship. Some of these problems have been widely discussed and well understood in the causality literature (Aldrich 1995; Rimer 1998; Simon and Iwasaki 1988).

causality and establishes a statistical definition of causality. The work of Rubin gave momentum to the development and application of statistical models, or cause-effect analysis techniques, which in the last decades have expanded into various applications including the foundational statistical principles set in the early work of Wright (1921) in the field of genetics.

3. Approaches to causality research

3.1. Correlation studies and their limitations

Cause-effect analysis techniques presented in this review enable answering three types of causal questions: (1) identifying causes (i.e., *why* a singular event occurs), (2) assessing effects (i.e., the *what-if* type of question, referred to the change in effect of some change in the cause), and (3) describing mechanisms [i.e., *how* some effects follow from a certain cause (Holland 2003)]. Before we begin the review of the mainstream approaches to causality research, here we provide a brief discussion on correlation studies. As pointed out by many in the literature (Pearl 2000b), correlation and causation should not be confused. Positive correlation may be defined probabilistically for two variables, X and Y , as follows:

$$(1) \quad P(Y|X) - P(Y)P(X) > 0$$

meaning that the probability that X and Y occur jointly is larger than the product of probabilities for each occurring independently. Similarly, negative correlation, can be defined as:

$$(2) \quad P(Y|X) - P(Y)P(X) < 0$$

and the two variables, X and Y are uncorrelated if:

$$(3) \quad P(Y|X) = P(Y)P(X)$$

Correlation typically indicates that whenever X occurs, there is a higher chance of observing Y . A well-known example is that homelessness and crime rate are correlated, however, mere correlations do not provide a scientific evidence of whether homelessness causes crime, or that crime causes homelessness (Sugihara et al. 2012). The underlying cause could be another variable (e.g., unemployment) that may influence both.

3.2. Randomized experiment

3.2.1. Statistical differences in the outcomes of experimental studies

Experimental randomized studies, in contrast to correlation studies, provide an ideal means to inferring causality (Angrist and Pischke 2008).

In randomized experiments, individuals (or units) taken from a sufficiently large population are divided into two subgroups: one in which individuals receive a treatment (treatment group), and one in which individuals do not receive a treatment (control group). Let us consider the case, in which a large number of similar cities are randomly divided into two groups. One group enforces a road space rationing and the other does not. We can define $T_i = \{0, 1\}$, for all $i = 1, \dots, N$, as a binary random variable describing the treatment (e.g., enforcing a road space rationing or not enforcing a road space rationing). Let us define Y as the variable to be explained, or response variable, such as the urban air quality.

The observed outcome for an individual i , Y_i , can be written as:

$$(4) \quad Y_i = \begin{cases} Y_{1i} & \text{if } T_i = 1 \\ Y_{0i} & \text{if } T_i = 0 \end{cases} \\ = Y_{0i} + (Y_{1i} - Y_{0i})T_i$$

In order for eq. (4) to hold, Rubin (1978, 1980) defines the so-called stable-unit-treatment-value-assumption (SUTVA). The assumption implies that “a causal effect of one treatment relative to another for a particular experimental unit is the difference between the result if the unit had been exposed to the first treatment and the result if, instead, the unit had been exposed to the second treatment” (Rubin 1978). SUTVA rests on the idea that the potential outcome of one participant is not affected by the treatment applied to another participant. For example, one city institutionalizing a road space rationing policy does not affect another city in the experiment. Furthermore, it assumes that for each unit there is a single version of each treatment level (i.e., only one type of road space rationing of equal efficacy is used by all cities under study). The assumption introduced by Rubin (1980) holds if the value of Y for any individual i exposed to a treatment T will be the same no matter what mechanism is used for the assignment of T to i for all individual participants and treatments (Rubin 1986) so that:

$$(5) \quad Y_i(T_1, T_2, \dots, T_n) = Y_i(T_i)$$

The assumption is violated if multiple versions of the treatments or interferences (e.g., communication) between individual participants exist (Rubin 1986). The plausibility of the assumption has been subject matter of a number of publications [we refer the reader to e.g., Sobel (2006) for more information on the issue]. It is, however, notable that this assumption is hardly plausible in a policy context, where a policy instrument is often modified or customized to the local or regional circumstances and policy outcomes are often benchmarked or publicized widely, directly or indirectly affecting others in the experiment. We will come back on this issue later in this review.

In the notation introduced in eq. (4), Y_{0i} is the potential outcome for an individual i (e.g., air quality index, AQI for city i) had the individual not been exposed to the treatment (e.g., road space rationing), regardless of whether the individual is actually exposed to the treatment or not; whereas Y_{1i} is the potential outcome had the individual been exposed to the treatment. In general, $Y_{1i} - Y_{0i}$ represents the causal effect of T_i on Y_i at the individual level. However, it is not possible to observe both potential outcomes simultaneously from any given individual (e.g., a particular city), since an individual is either exposed to treatment or control, not to both at the same time. Therefore, the aggregate causal effects and, in particular, the average causal effect (i.e., the average effect in the general population) is observed instead in reality.

The observed difference in average outcome (e.g., AQI) between the treatment group (e.g., cities enforcing road space rationing) and control (e.g., those not) can be expressed as $E[Y_i|T_i = 1] - E[Y_i|T_i = 0]$. For example, if the average AQI of the cities that exercise road space rationing is 5 and that for those not is 2 using a 1-to-10 quality scale (least to most severe pollution), the observed difference in average outcome becomes 3, which can be interpreted as a worsening effect. However, road space rationing is likely to be introduced to the cities with heavy traffic and air pollution in the first place, and therefore the observed difference in the AQI between the two groups cannot be directly translated into the causal effect of a road space rationing. This problem, referred to as ‘selection bias’, is elaborated further in the next section.

3.2.2. Rubin’s causal model

The expected outcome of a group of individuals who were not exposed to the treatment can be expressed as $E[Y_{0i}|T_i = 0]$. Using the same example, this term shows the AQI of the cities that did not use road space rationing. The expected outcome for group of individuals that were exposed to the treatment, had the group not

exposed to the treatment can be expressed as $E[Y_{oi}|T_i = 1]$. For example, this term would show the average severity of air pollution measured in AQI of those cities that exercise road space rationing, if they had not taken such a measure. Suppose that a group of cities have been using road space rationing. Suppose, further, that one can reverse the time and let the same group avoid using road space rationing. If this were possible, $E[Y_{oi}|T_i = 1]$ would be the current average AQI of these cities after reversing the time. However, this term is obviously not measurable. If it were measurable and if the treatment is independent of potential outcomes (i.e., with T_i randomly assigned), the causal effect of the treatment, $E[Y_{1i}|T_i = 1] - E[Y_{0i}|T_i = 1]$, can be written as:

$$(6) \quad \frac{E[Y_{1i}|T_i = 1] - E[Y_{0i}|T_i = 1]}{\text{average treatment effect on the treated}} = \frac{E[Y_{1i}|T_i = 1] - E[Y_{1i}|T_i = 0]}{\text{observed difference in response}} - \frac{E[Y_{0i}|T_i = 1] + E[Y_{0i}|T_i = 0]}{\text{selection bias}}$$

The term, $E[Y_{1i}|T_i = 1] - E[Y_{0i}|T_i = 1]$ represents the average causal effect of treatment for those who were treated (e.g., the difference in AQI as a result of using road space rationing). The term $E[Y_{1i}|T_i = 1] + E[Y_{0i}|T_i = 0]$ represents the selection bias (Angrist and Pischke 2008) that represents the fact that those who need treatment are more likely to seek treatment. For example, suppose that the average AQI of the cities that actually used road space rationing if they had not introduced road space rationing is 8, and that of those that did not is 2. In this case, the selection bias becomes $8 - 2 = 6$, and therefore the right-hand-side of the equation becomes $3 - 6 = -3$, meaning that the average road space rationing AQI improved on average by 3.

However, as noted earlier the term, $E[Y_{0i}|T_i = 1]$ cannot be directly observed or calculated. Therefore, one would have to find a counterfactual for this term to estimate the causal effect of the treatment in eq. (6) (Angrist and Pischke 2008). This can be obtained by the random assignment of i . Under the Rubin's causal model, the problem of spurious correlations discussed in the previous section can only be eliminated by using randomization of observations to the categories of a hypothesized causal factor (e.g., treatment versus control) or by using a method that somehow mimics randomization process [(Morgan 2013); see section 3.3.1]. Randomization reduces the chance of intentional or unintentional bias, and it allows for effects and errors due to 'unaccounted-for' variables to act randomly, rather than consistently, affecting the response across treatments (Shaffer and Johnson 2008).

For example, random assignment, or 'randomizing' can be achieved by choosing the treatment and control groups with statistically equivalent level of AQIs. Random assignment makes the treatment T_i independent of potential outcomes. In particular, T_i is independent of Y_{oi} , thus allowing us to swap the terms $E[Y_{oi}|T_i = 1]$ and $E[Y_{oi}|T_i = 0]$ in the following expression:

$$(7) \quad E[Y_{1i}|T_i = 1] - E[Y_{1i}|T_i = 0] = E[Y_{1i}|T_i = 1] - E[Y_{0i}|T_i = 0] \\ = E[Y_{1i}|T_i = 1] - E[Y_{0i}|T_i = 1]$$

Given random assignment, eq. (7) can be further reduced to:

$$(8) \quad E[Y_{1i}|T_i = 1] - E[Y_{0i}|T_i = 1] = E[Y_{1i} - Y_{0i}|T_i = 1] = E[Y_{1i} - Y_{0i}]$$

The relationship identified in eq. (8) contains no selection bias, thus signifying, for example, that whether each individual city in the population under study has instituted a road space rationing policy or not, it does not affect the identification of the causal

effect. The effect of a randomly-assigned road policy on the city that implemented it is, in fact, the same as the effect of the road policy on a randomly chosen city.

3.3. Observational studies

For a while, much of the causality literature, in particular in the epidemiological, psychological, and educational sciences (Campbell and Erlebacher 1970), has implied that only properly randomized experiments could lead to useful and trustable estimates of causal effects. However, as Rubin (1974) states, such contention would be untenable if taken as applicable to all fields of science, given that much of the scientific development has been obtained for a big part of the past century without using randomized experiments. The statement still holds today, since randomized experiments are only feasible under certain conditions, and would probably be counterproductive in those contexts in which observational data are not immediately available.²

Conceptually, there are two major criticisms to Rubin's model. First, as discussed earlier, it is impossible to detect the individual causal effect, $Y_{1i} - Y_{0i}$, thus making the true causal effect impossible to detect (Russo et al. 2011). Putting this into a practical context, the same person (or city) cannot simultaneously take and not take a painkiller (or institute a policy) to observe the effect. In some cases, experiments can be done for the same unit over time. Second, Rubin's model is confined to a *Platonic heaven* situation, in which one can observe only average representations, rather than direct causal effects (Dawid 2007, p. 510).

At a more practical level, Rubin (1974) also noted that randomized studies cannot be widely applied when: (a) the cost of performing the equivalent randomized experiment to test for all potential alternatives (or treatments) is prohibitive; (b) there is a presence of ethical reasons according to which the treatments cannot be randomly assigned; or (c) the estimates based on the results from experiment indicate that it would require several years to be completed (Rubin 1974).

For these reasons, researchers rely on observational data, i.e., data that were not generated using an experimental design. Observational data are obtained from surveys, longitudinal and panel data, censuses, and administrative records, and can vary both temporally and spatially (Christman 2008). Observational data are typically inexpensive to collect and are in plentiful supply (Iacus et al. 2012). Investigators using observational data (i.e., from observational studies) share the common objective of devising causal relations and, thus, face similar problems to *experimenters* (Cochran 2009). Complex interactions are also present in observational studies and can greatly complicate the interpretation of effects, although they reflect the inherent complexity of natural systems (Shaffer and Johnson 2008).

3.3.1. Matching methods and quasi-experimental designs

In the absence of a randomized experiment and when only observational data are available, cluster analysis techniques such as matching (Stuart 2010) allow for harnessing the benefits of Rubin's model by equating (or "balancing") the distribution of covariates in the treatment and control groups. Well-matched organized samples of the treatment and control groups can achieve such goal. The methods aim to replicate as closely as possible a randomized experiment, by pruning the observational dataset and making sure that the empirical distributions of covariates are similar (Ho et al. 2006; Stuart 2010). Treatment and control units are paired based on a number of observable pre-treatment covariates (i.e., observable characteristics).

The individuals in a group are paired solely for the purpose of obtaining the best possible estimate of the effect of a causal variable T_i on an observed outcome Y_i . Using matching, differences in

²In their satire, Smith and Pell (2003) point out that the effectiveness of parachutes has never been proven using a randomized control trial.

outcomes for units with different treatment levels but the same values for pre-treatment variables can be interpreted causally (Yang et al. 2016). For example, matching could be based on the probability of T_i for each individual i in the population, calculated as a function of Q_{ik} , with $k = 1, \dots, V$, which represent the set of background variables of interest, that is assumed to predict both T_i and Y_i (Morgan and Harding 2006). The matching procedure will select only matched sets of treatment and control cases that contain equivalent values for these predicted probabilities (Morgan and Harding 2006). The matching algorithm allows selecting from the joint distribution of Q_{ik} and Y_i only the information that is related to the causal variable (or treatment variable) T_i , and the procedure is conducted until the distribution of Q_{ik} is equivalent for both the treatment and control cases, thus until the data are balanced, or matched (Morgan and Harding 2006).

Matching methods do not directly allow for making causal inferences, since they are data-processing algorithms not statistical estimators, thus they require the use of some type of causal estimator to make such inferences [e.g., testing the difference in means between Y in the treatment and control groups; see Iacus et al. (2012)]. As Stuart (2010) points out, after the analyst has created treatment and control groups with adequate balance, and designed the observational study, the analysis moves to the outcome interpretation stage. At this stage, the analysis will typically be limited to techniques of regression adjustment using matched samples and use regression-based techniques in combination with the matched samples. Matching methods, in fact, are best used in combination with regression models (see section 3.3.2), instrumental variables models, or structural equation models [SEM (Ho et al. 2006)].

Matching techniques have been widely used in economics (Abadie and Imbens 2006), medicine (Christakis and Iwashyna 2003), and sociology (Morgan and Harding 2006), among other fields of science [see also (Sekhon 2011)]. Commonly used matching methods include difference-in-differences matching (Abadie 2005), multivariate matching based on the Mahalanobis distance metric (Cochran and Rubin 1973), nearest neighbor matching (Rubin 1973), propensity score matching (Caliendo and Kopeinig 2008), genetic matching (Diamond and Sekhon 2012), and coarsened exact matching (Iacus et al. 2012) [see (Stuart and Rubin 2008) for a review]. Quasi-experimental designs using the treatment and control duality also include difference in differences techniques used with longitudinal data, for which we refer the reader to Abadie (2005), Athey and Imbens (2006), Donald and Lang (2007), and Puhani (2012).

Observational studies become relevant if performed on all causally-important variables and on several control groups that are each representative of a potentially different bias (Rubin 1974). Observational studies do require the analyst to carefully study the process of data generation and the treatment and assignment mechanism (Iacus et al. 2012). In observational studies without randomization the analyst uses the design phase to help with approximating hypothetical randomized experiments. The so-called identification strategy describes the manner in which a researcher uses observational data not generated by a randomized trial to approximate a real experiment (Angrist and Pischke 2008). The use of an observational study allows estimating the average effect on the treated (or ATT) and the average treatment effect (or ATE), based on data availability (Stuart 2010).

3.3.2. Regression-based causality

SEM have become a core method for assessing causality in the social sciences, especially for research questions that cannot be tackled by experimental testing (Pearl 2009). The variables of interest for causal research are for this reason also called *latent variables*, because of their inaccessibility through direct measurement without a substantial measurement error (Bollen 2002). In many cases, it is impossible or too expensive to conduct con-

trolled experiments, but SEM allows for discovery of likely causal relations from observational data (Shimizu et al. 2006).

SEM can also be combined with graphical constructs that allow laying out the causal relationships under analysis pictorially. A particular kind of graph used in causal analysis is the directed acyclic graph (DAG) or Bayesian network (Pearl 1995; Morgan 2013). DAGs are visual representations of qualitative causal assumptions and can be related to probability distributions linked to the data under study and to causal frameworks.

Causal models are usually characterized by the presence of a set of explanatory variables or covariates X (i.e., the putative causes) and a response variable Y (i.e., the putative effect) in the form, for instance, of a simple structural equation:

$$(9) \quad Y = \beta X + \varepsilon$$

where β is the causal effect on Y for a one unit difference in X , representing the coefficient determining the extent of the influence of X on Y ; and ε represents the errors, unmeasured factors, or all other influences on Y .

The interpretation of ε and β is not trivial. Error terms may be interpreted deterministically or epistemically (Russo 2009). In the first case, we may assume that errors represent the lack of knowledge of the analyst. Thus if complete knowledge would be in hand, a precise relationship, between X and Y , could be determined without error. The SEM reports deterministic causal relations. In the epistemic acceptance of the concept, the SEM represents causal relations that are thought to be genuinely indeterministic, thus errors are to be modelled probabilistically (Russo 2009). This second acceptance is the one we hold in this review.

The parameter β has in the context of SEM a causal interpretation, thus it should quantify the extent of the causality. Thus, we can define (Russo 2009):

$$(10) \quad \beta = r \frac{\sigma_X}{\sigma_Y}$$

The correlation coefficient r can be calculated as the ratio between the covariance σ_{XY} and the variances σ_X and σ_Y :

$$(11) \quad r = \frac{\sigma_{XY}}{\sigma_X \sigma_Y}$$

Let us now consider the example below representing a generic bivariate regression equation:

$$(12) \quad Y = \alpha + \beta X + \varepsilon$$

where α is the intercept and ε is the error term. In a causal interpretation of eq. (12) β represents the structural causal effect that applies to all members of the population of interest. Thus, in addition to being linear, this equation says that the functional relationship of interest is the same for all members of the population. Logarithmic transformations or other functional transformations of the variables of interest in the model can be typically considered (Baiocchi 2012). The ordinary least squares estimator of the bivariate regression coefficient β is then (Morgan and Winship 2007):

$$(13) \quad \beta_{OLS} = \frac{\sigma_{YX}}{\sigma_X}$$

The above is just an example of the application of regression techniques for the estimation of the regressors of interest. Regression techniques provide a good estimation of the causal parameters, if the error terms in SEM are uncorrelated with the regressor (see assumptions in section 4.1). The coefficient of determination r^2 may be used to evaluate the goodness of fit of the model. Example of regression techniques include least squares and partial least squares techniques (Wold 1982; Angrist and Imbens 1995; Tenenhaus et al. 2005; Esposito Vinzi et al. 2010). In the next section we focus on the causal interpretation of regression techniques and on the instrumental variable approach. Further applications of regression-based techniques include regression-discontinuity designs, for which we refer the reader to Hahn et al. (2001, Imbens and Lemieux (2008), and Lee and Lemieux (2010).

3.3.2.1. Causal interpretation of regressions

We focus on this section on the causal interpretation of regressions as estimators of causality. We refer the reader to Berk (2004), Gelman and Hill (2006), Morgan and Winship (2007), Angrist and Pischke (2008), Freedman (2009), and Hansen (2015) for a complete presentation of regression techniques and for a complete analysis of the limitations of such approaches.

Regressions do not necessarily hold a causal interpretation, and they can be simply interpreted as a descriptive tool or as “a technique to estimate a best-fitting linear approximation to a conditional expectation function that may be nonlinear in the population” (Morgan and Winship 2007). However, regression, if well specified, can provide information about the causal relation between X and Y . It is the more ambitious question of when a regression has causal interpretation that concerns us in this review, due to its applicability for complex systems under study for QSA. To arrive at a causal model from a regression model, the analyst aims to study how one variable would respond, if one intervened and manipulated other variables (Freedman 2009). This implies that the causal results from a regression-based cause-effect analysis depend on the hypothesis framework of the analyst. It is within this framework that causality can be determined.

Let us assume that X_i is a vector of covariates that are associated in some way with a response variable Y . The conditional expectation function (CEF) of Y is denoted as $E[Y|X_i]$ and denoted as $E[Y|X_i = x]$ for any realization x of X_i [see (Angrist and Pischke 2008) for a formal definition and proof of theorems]. Least squares regression allows the calculation of a regression surface that is a best-fitting linear-in-the-parameters model of $E[Y|X_i]$, thus of the association between Y and any realization x of X_i , minimizing the average squared differences between the fitted values and the true values of $E[Y|X_i = x]$ (Morgan and Winship 2007; Angrist and Pischke 2008).

A regression can be considered causal when the CEF it approximates is causal, or when the CEF describes differences in average potential outcomes for a fixed reference population (Angrist and Pischke 2008). As discussed in section 3.2.1, experiments with random assignments ensure that the causal variable of interest is independent of potential outcomes, thus the groups under comparison are effectively comparable. A core assumption for the causal interpretation of regression, is the conditional independence assumption [or CIA; see (Rosenbaum 1984; Lechner 2001; Angrist and Pischke 2008)], which is at the basis of most empirical work in economics. The CIA is required for a regression to identify a treatment effect. The experimental design introduced in section 3.2 ensures that the causal variable of interest is independent of potential outcomes, which guarantees that the groups being compared are truly comparable (Angrist and Pischke 2008). This notion can be embodied regressions that are causally interpreted. CIA, also called as selection-on-observables, determines that the covariates to be held fixed are assumed to be known and observed. As a consequence, according to this assumption the residual in the causal model is uncorrelated with the regressors. Regression

can be used as an empirical strategy to turn the CIA into causal effects. Under CIA the covariates X_i are held fixed for the causal inference to be valid. These control variables (or covariates) are assumed to be known and observed (Angrist and Pischke 2008).

Let us consider a generic causal model:

$$(14) \quad f_i(B) = \alpha + \rho B + \eta_i$$

where B is a variable that can take on more than two values. The equation is linear and assumes the functional relationship under consideration being the same for all individuals in the population under study. Unlike the factor η_i that captures all unobserved factors determining the outcome for each specific individual B is not indexed per individual. The causal model, therefore, tells us the extent of B for any value of B and not for a specific realization B_i . We can further specify the causal model for the individual case, thus we consider that the causal relationship between putative causes and response is likely to be different for each individual, as in:

$$(15) \quad Y_i = \alpha + \rho B_i + \eta_i$$

A classic example is that B_i could be the number of years of schooling for a certain individual and Y_i could represent the current salary for that individual (Angrist and Krueger 1992). Equation (15) is similar to a bivariate regression model. However, it is eq. (14) that explicitly associates in the model constructed by the analyst the coefficients in eq. (15) with a causal relationship, thus establishing the causal association. The causal model determines that B_i may be correlated with $f_i(B)$ and the residual term η_i .

We can, then, consider the vector of covariates X'_i . The random residual part of eq. (15) η_i can be decomposed under CIA into a linear function of observable characteristics X'_i and an error term v_i :

$$(16) \quad \eta_i = X'_i \gamma + v_i$$

where γ is a vector of population regression coefficients that satisfies the relationship $E[\eta_i|X_i] = X'_i \gamma$. The vector γ is defined by the regression of η_i on X_i , thus the residual v_i and X'_i are uncorrelated by construction [see (Angrist and Pischke 2008) for further details and proof of concept]. By virtue of CIA, we can define (Angrist and Pischke 2008):

$$(17) \quad E[f_i(B)|X_i, B_i] = E[f_i(B)|X_i] = \alpha + \rho B + E[\eta_i|X_i] = \alpha + \rho B + X'_i \gamma$$

We can re-write the causal model as:

$$(18) \quad Y_i = \alpha + \rho B_i + X'_i \gamma + v_i$$

The residual in the causal model is uncorrelated with the regressors B_i and X_i , thus ρ effectively represents the causal effect of interest, allowing for the attribution of causal meaning to the regression. The selection of the right set of control variables is the subject of an extensive literature. We refer the reader to Angrist and Krueger (2001) and Angrist and Pischke (2008) for a detailed analysis of the matter.

3.3.2.2. Instrumental variables and causality

We have just seen how regressions can be causally interpreted within the boundaries of a specific model. A major complication is the possibility that regressors and errors [e.g., B_i , X'_i , and v_i in the example in eq. (18)] are correlated, thus undermining the statistical validity of the model. Under such condition, regression estimates would lose their causal interpretation. For the causal interpretation to hold, the regressors have to be asymptotically

uncorrelated with the errors or residuals. The potential inconsistency is determined by the fact that changes in B_i are not only associated with changes in Y_i but also with changes in v_i .

We consider that the potential outcomes can be written as (Angrist and Pischke 2008):

$$(19) \quad Y_i = \alpha + \rho B_i + A_i' \gamma + v_i$$

Here A_i' is a vector of control variables, which unlike X_i' in the example in eq. (18) is unobserved. Instrumental variable methods (Heckman and Vytlacil 2001; Newey and Powell 2003; Firebaugh 2008; Bollen 2012) allow the analyst to introduce an instrumental variable, say Z_i , that is correlated with the causal variable of interest B_i , and uncorrelated with both A_i' and v_i , such that $E[Z_i v_i] = 0$. Such a condition is a special case of CIA introduced in the previous section. In this case it is the instrumental variable Z_i that is independent of potential outcomes, rather than the variable of interest B_i . It follows then that the causal effect ρ can be expressed as (Angrist and Pischke 2008 chap. 4):

$$(20) \quad \rho = \frac{\sigma_{Y_i Z_i}}{\sigma_{Z_i}} \bigg/ \frac{\sigma_{B_i Z_i}}{\sigma_{Z_i}}$$

The equality in eq. (20) is verified if:

- Z_i has a clear effect on B_i ;
- Z_i affect Y_i only by means of the causal variable B_i ;
- Z_i is independent of potential outcomes, so it is as good as if randomly assigned.

The consideration of instrumental variables allows for the causal interpretation of ρ . Instrumental variables are identified case by case from the processes determining the variable of interest. For the example of the relationship between schooling level and earnings, Angrist and Krueger (1992) used the school start age of pupils as an instrumental variable. Instrumental variables solve the problem of missing or unknown controls. In many cases, in fact, the necessary control variables are typically unmeasured or simply unknown. In the absence of suitable instrumental variables in the system the causal framework does not hold.

There are some recognized pitfalls of the instrumental variable approach (Morgan and Winship 2007). In some cases the assumption that the instrumental variable does not have a direct effect on the response variable may be too strong. Even when such condition is verified, an instrumental variables estimator is biased in a finite sample (Morgan and Winship 2007). These pitfalls may influence the possibility of drawing causal inference from the results of a study (see section 4.1). The limitations of regression-based methods should be carefully considered for the causal analysis to be valid. A causal regression may be invalidated by omitting variables that both affect the dependent variable and are correlated with the variables that are studied in the causal regression model, by the way missing data are handled, and by the presence of potential biases determined by measurement errors (Allison 1999).

3.3.3. Applications

We survey here the application of regression-based techniques and combined matching and regression techniques in the field of sustainability.

Empirical analyses using causal regression techniques have been widely applied to study the relationship between trade openness, economic development and environmental quality (Stern 2004; Copeland and Taylor 2013). In the Environment Kutznets Curve literature, a considerable amount of studies deal with this relationship, treating environmental degradation measures as

the dependent variables and income as the independent variable, and providing mixed results (Soytas et al. 2007).

Antweiler et al. (1998) find that international trade, although altering the pollution intensity of countries, creates small changes in pollution concentrations, especially of SO_2 . The authors find evidence that both environmental regulations and capital-labor endowments determine SO_2 concentrations and conclude that openness and freer trade appear to be good for the environment. The study concludes that if an increase in trade openness generates a 1% increase in income and output then, as a result of scale and technology pollution does fall by approximately 1%. Cole and Elliott (2003) confirm both environmental regulation effects and capital-labor effects for SO_2 and suggest that these results do not necessarily hold for other pollutants, such as NO_x , biochemical oxygen demand (BOD), and CO_2 , for which an increase in emissions is likely to happen as a result of freer trade.

Frankel and Rose (2005) study the effect of trade on the environment and use exogenous geographic determinants (i.e., lagged income, population size, rate of investment, and human capital formation) as instrumental variables to account for the endogeneity of trade. The authors conclude that trade appears to have a beneficial effect on some measures of environmental quality. In particular, they conclude that trade significantly tends to reduce the concentrations of SO_2 and NO_2 . Managi et al. (2009) find that trade is beneficial for OECD countries, while it has detrimental effects on SO_2 and CO_2 concentrations in non-OECD countries. A lower BOD is found in non-OECD countries. The detrimental impact is found to be larger in the long term, rather than in the short term.

A bulk body of research regards the accumulation of greenhouse gases (GHGs) in the atmosphere leading to climate change. Regression techniques of econometric inspiration are commonly applied for the study of the influence of climate change on a number of endpoints. The matter of adaptation under climate change is analyzed using nonlinear regression in Schlenker and Roberts (2009). The author controls for precipitation, technological change, soils, and location-specific unobserved factors, and the results show a nonlinear relationship between temperature and soil yields. The relationship between mortality and changes in daily temperatures is described using regression techniques in Barreca et al. (2013). The authors document a remarkable decline in the mortality effect of temperature extremes in the 20th century in the United States, and point to air conditioning as a central determinant in the reduction of mortality risks associated with extreme temperatures. The exposure to extreme temperatures determined by climate change is linked to deleterious effects on fetal health, the decrease in birth weight, and an increase in the probability of low birth weight in Deschenes et al. (2009 p. 216). The analysis rests on a number of strong assumptions about data, including that the climate change predictions used in the regression model are correct. In a similar fashion, climate policy has been linked to increase in mortality and migration (Deschenes and Moretti 2009), fluctuations in the labor markets (Deschenes 2010), and reduced profits from agriculture in the United States (Deschenes and Greenstone 2007) and in California (Deschenes and Kolstad 2011). Conflicts and social instability have also been associated with climate change (Homer-Dixon 1991). Earlier studies have shown that random weather events, such as drought and prolonged heat waves, might at times be correlated with armed conflict in Africa (Miguel et al. 2004; Smith and Vivekananda 2007; Burke et al. 2009). Hsiang et al. (2011) show that a causal link between temperature and conflict does exist at various scales for relatively richer countries as well. The issue of causal links between climate and conflict is contentious (Cane et al. 2014; Raleigh et al. 2014). Buhaug (2010 p. 16480) investigated the scientific base of the claims and concluded that "a robust correlational link between climate variability and civil war do not hold up to closer inspection" when alternative statistical models and alter-

native measures of conflict are used. Hsiang and Meng (2014) reproduced the analysis of Buhaug (2010) and corrected the statistical procedure for model comparison. The study concludes that the claim of Buhaug (2010) is inconsistent with the evidence presented, thus climate change does affect conflicts in Africa (Hsiang and Meng 2014).

The potential sustainable impacts of fair trade, eco-certification, and eco-labelling have been amply studied using matching techniques in combination with regression techniques. Ruben et al. (2009) use data from coffee and banana co-operatives in Peru and Costa Rica and find, using propensity score matching, that fair trade improves access of farmers to credit and investments, and also affects their attitude towards risk. The participation in a fair trade system improved employment, as well as their bargaining power and trading conditions. The difference-in-differences identification strategy is used by Hallstein and Villas-Boas (2013) to test the efficacy of eco-labels in promoting sustainable seafood consumption. The study finds evidence that in a sample of ten stores in the San Francisco Bay area the implementation of an eco-label led to a significant decline in sales in the range of 15%-40% of certain classes of products with limited environmental sustainability. Miller et al. (2011) use difference-in-differences to test the impact of a scheme of cash transfer on food security in Malawi. The study presents evidence that food security is improved by the transfer of cash by the government to rural households in Malawi. Eco-certification is also the subject of the study of Blackman and Naranjo (2012). The study uses propensity score matching to control for selection bias and tests the impact of eco-certification on a high-value agricultural commodity, organic coffee from Costa Rica. The study finds that organic certification improves the environmental performance of coffee growers by reducing the use of chemicals and improving the environmental performance of management practices.

Matching techniques have been used also to check progress on poverty reduction and on other goals in the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) (Sachs and McArthur 2005). Maertens et al. (2011) use a variety of matching techniques to test the impact of globalization on poverty reduction in Senegal. The study finds a significant positive impact of globalization on poverty reduction through employment creation and labor market participation. Setboonsarng and Parnie (2008) test the impact of microfinance on the MDGs using data from a microfinance institution in Pakistan. Using difference-in-differences, the study finds that the lending program of the institution contributed to income generation activities that have a beneficial impact on the MDGs. Arun et al. (2006) use propensity score matching to test whether microfinance reduces poverty in India and show that microfinance institutions have a significantly positive effect on poverty reduction. Arnold et al. (2010) draw on the potential outcome model for causal inference and use a matched cohort to test the relationship between health and development. In a matched sample of 25 villages in rural India the study finds a positive influence on health from new toilet construction, while no impact was found from height-for-age.

In the field of sustainable fisheries, Costello et al. (2008) apply propensity score matching to evaluate the benefits of tradable harvest quotas (i.e., catch shares) on preventing the collapse of global fish resources. The study finds that the implementation of catch shares halts, and even reverses, the global trend toward widespread collapse of fish resources. The results are confirmed using propensity score matching by the same research group (Costello et al. 2010).

Quasi-experimental designs have been used to evaluate the biodiversity and social impacts of conservation and protection practices. Linkie et al. (2008) evaluate the impact of protected area on the conservation of species in a large protected area in Indonesia. The study uses propensity score matching to compare the deforestation rates in villages around the protected area and villages

not around the area. The study finds no evidence of a positive effect of the protected area on the reduction of deforestation. Nelson and Chomitz (2011) test the impact of protected areas in reducing fires in tropical forests in various regions. The study finds that protected areas substantially reduced fire incidence in Latin America, Asia, and Africa. Matching criteria in this study included the distance to road network, distance to major cities, elevations and slope, and rainfall. Andam et al. (2008) apply matching methods to evaluate the impact on deforestation of Costa Rica's renowned protected-area system between 1960 and 1997. The institution of protected areas reduces deforestation and 10% of forests would have disappeared without being protected. Ferraro and Hanauer (2014) use a quasi-experimental design to study the mechanisms through which the policies of establishing protected areas affect social and environmental outcomes. The authors analyze the causal effects of ecosystem conservation programs on environmental and social outcomes, by focusing on the mechanisms determining variations that arise in a certain area after land-use restrictions have been put in place. The study uses an asset-based poverty index developed by Andam et al. (2010) and investigates the effect of protected areas on this index. Therefore, the population is divided into treatment and treated groups, respectively the causal effect of protected areas and the people living around protected areas. After controlling for potential confounding variables and biases, the authors conclude that two-thirds of the poverty reduction in Costa Rica can be causally attributed to opportunities afforded by tourism, while changes in infrastructure or land cover had a little causal influence on the outcome.

3.4. Time-series methods

3.4.1. Granger causality

The vast availability of time-series data has given rise to a plethora of methods aimed at understanding complex systems through studying their evolution in time. Time-series refer to data observed over a number of discrete time-steps. In such cases, one may assume that causes both precede and help predict their effects. We credit Wiener (1956) with the intuition that the causality of a (time-series) variable in relation to another can be measured by how well one variable helps to predict the other. We can say that variable Y 'causes' variable X if the ability to predict X is improved by incorporating information about Y in the prediction of X . The concept was later formulated by Granger (1969), leading to the establishment of the Wiener-Granger framework of 'causality'. Geweke made several other important contributions to the concept (Geweke 1982, 1984).

Let us consider two variables X and Y . We can say that X does not cause Y if the conditional distribution of the effect Y only depends on the past history of Y itself and not on the past history of the putative cause X .

Let us consider the history of X and Y , respectively $\{X\}$ and $\{Y\}$

$$(21) \quad \begin{aligned} \{X_t\} &= (X_t, X_{t-1}, X_{t-2}, \dots, X_1) \\ \{Y_t\} &= (Y_t, Y_{t-1}, Y_{t-2}, \dots, Y_1) \end{aligned}$$

with L representing the number of time lags.

According to Granger causality (GC) we say that X does not Granger-cause Y if Y_t only depends on its history but not on the history of X , alternatively expressed as (Granger 1969):

$$(22) \quad P(Y_t | X_{t-1}, Y_{t-1}) = P(Y_t | Y_{t-1})$$

No relevant information can be extracted from the history of X to assess the effect Y , thus the predictability of Y does not increase if X is part of the universe of possible causative variables. Con-

versely, if X Granger-causes Y , one can generally say that the past of X contains information that helps predict the future of Y .

GC models typically use vector auto-regression (VAR) models to analyze multivariate time-series. VAR models are simple constructions in which the value of a variable at a particular time is modeled as a linear weighted sum of its own past and of the past of a set of other variables. Each variable is a vector stochastic process representing a time-series. The structure of the VAR model provides information about the forecasting ability of a variable or of a group of variables. Therefore, GC does not directly imply true causality, but rather only implies forecasting ability (Zivot and Wang 2006).

Operationally, GC analysis rests on estimating and comparing the VAR models, given a set of time-series data. Let us expand our example, consider a third variable Z together with X and Y . We are still interested in measuring whether X Granger-causes Y . The analysis starts with the joint estimation of a full VAR model for all the variables. A prediction/estimation error is computed for all the variables in the set (Seth et al. 2015). A second VAR model is then estimated, omitting X from the universe of all possible causative variables. For each remaining variable a new set of prediction or estimation errors is calculated. If the prediction or estimation error for Y is significantly smaller for the full regression including X , then we may confidently state that X Granger-causes Y , conditioned on Z . As reported in Seth et al. (2015), the magnitude of the GC is given by the ratio of the variance of the prediction-error terms for the reduced regression and the full regressions.

The standard test of GC developed by Granger (Granger 1969) is based on a linear regression model:

$$(23) \quad Y_t = a_0 + \sum_{k=1}^L b_{1k} Y_{t-k} + \sum_{k=1}^L b_{2k} X_{t-k} + \xi_t$$

where ξ_t are uncorrelated random variables with zero mean and variance σ^2 , L is again the specified number of time lags, and the time is $t = L + 1, \dots, S$. The null hypothesis that X_t does not Granger-cause Y_t is supported when $b_{2k} = 0$ for $k = 1, \dots, L$, thus allowing eq. (23) to reduce to:

$$(24) \quad Y_t = a_0 + \sum_{k=1}^L b_{1k} Y_{t-k} + \xi_t$$

Test statistics that can be applied to test the hypothesis are reported in Hlaváčková-Schindler et al. (2007).

GC has a number of useful properties [see e.g., (Geweke 1982; Seth et al. 2015)], including that VAR models may be estimated using relatively simple computation algorithms (e.g., ordinary least squares). Furthermore, the analyst needs to make only minimal assumptions about the underlying physical mechanisms linking the variables under study as long as they rest on data that is suitable for VAR modelling. GC is based on the comparison of model errors; therefore, the analysis is applicable only to the case of stochastic variables, i.e., variables that can be modelled as having random variations, and to data that have variance and mean that are stable over time (Geweke 1984).

A number of limitations, including those identified by Granger himself (Granger 1969), are applicable to GC. Strictly speaking, what GC establishes is the fact that one event happens before another, which may or may not provide an evidence of a cause-effect relationship between them (Hu et al. 2011). GC is typically a bivariate procedure in 2-dimensional systems. In the presence of a third variable that commonly causes changes in the two variables with a different time-lag, the model may falsely recognize the relationship between the two variables as a GC. Limitations of the

approach also include the inapplicability of GC in the presence of nonlinear, contemporaneous causal links (Russo 2009). A number of approaches have been developed to test for the strength of GC [see e.g., (Dolado and Lütkepohl 1996; Zapata and Rambaldi 1997; Clarke and Mirza 2006)].

3.4.2. Convergent cross mapping in dynamic nonlinear systems

A number of methods extended the Granger's concept to nonlinear cases [see e.g., Ancona et al. (2004) for nonlinear bivariate time series; Baek and Brock (1992), Hiemstra and Jones (1994) for non-parametric GC]. We refer to Hlaváčková-Schindler et al. (2007) for a thorough analysis of these methods and to Hu et al. (2011) for further methodological expansions that address limitations of GC.

GC may also give ambiguous results in deterministic settings, especially for dynamic systems with weak to moderate coupling (Sugihara et al. 2012). The assumption of separability (see section 4.1) is not satisfied in such systems. In this case, as noted by Sugihara et al. (2012), if X is a cause for Y , information about X will be redundantly present in Y and, as a consequence of Takens' theorem (Takens 1981), removing X from the universe of all possible causative variables would not remove the information carried by X .

Work from Sugihara and co-authors (Deyle and Sugihara 2011; Sugihara et al. 2012; Clark et al. 2015) addresses the limitations of GC for the case of (1) non-separable systems, (2) weakly coupled variables, and (3) a presence of interactions among variables from external driving variables (e.g., ecological variables such as species from temperature, precipitation, and upwelling). The applications demonstrated in Sugihara et al. (2012) are particularly interesting to understand causality in dynamic systems that are common in ecology (e.g., predator-prey systems).

For the case of dynamic systems, time-series variables can be considered causally linked if they belong to the same dynamic system (Takens 1981; Deyle and Sugihara 2011; Sugihara et al. 2012). Under such consideration, each variable can identify the state of the other, thus information about the past of one variable can be recovered from the time-series of the other, and vice versa (Sugihara et al. 2012).

Let us consider again two time-series of length L :

$$(25) \quad \begin{aligned} \{X_t\} &= (X_t, X_{t-1}, X_{t-2}, \dots, X_1) \\ \{Y_t\} &= (Y_t, Y_{t-1}, Y_{t-2}, \dots, Y_1) \end{aligned}$$

X and Y are said to be causally linked if they share the same common attractor manifold M , thus if they are part of the same dynamic system (Sugihara et al. 2012). The manifold can be defined as the system of coordinates constructed from lagged coordinates of the time-series variables, of X and Y using the history of the variables as defined in eq. (25). Following Takens' theorem (Takens 1981), we can reconstruct the value of the manifold M from a single observation variable of the system. Thus, we can generate a system of coordinates in the attractor manifold built from X , M_X , and a system of coordinates built from Y , M_Y . The convergent cross mapping [CCM; see (Sugihara et al. 2012; Clark et al. 2015; Ye et al. 2015) for a thorough analysis] approach tests for causality by measuring the extent to which the historical record of Y values can reliably estimate states of X . Using CCM, the analyst can test at a time t whether points located closely (i.e., with similar coordinates in the manifold) in M_Y can be used to identify closely-located points in M_X (Sugihara et al. 2012). Using a nearest-neighbor algorithm (Sugihara and May 1990) CCM allows attributing weights to points in the manifold M_X and estimating the value of Y using these weights, thus estimating the quantity $Y|M_X$. Finally, the causal effect can be estimated by measuring the correlation between Y and $Y|M_X$ (McCracken and Weigel 2014). If high correlation is measured, the analyst may confidently use Y to estimate X or vice versa. Time-series variables that are mutually

coupled, in fact, allow for cross-mapping estimations in both directions, thus each variable can be estimated from the other.

CCM can also accommodate for the case of time-series variables that do not interact with each other, but which are both driven by a common variable. Information about the common cause, e.g., Z , can still be recovered from X and Y . Such application is of particular interest for the study of non-dynamic and chaotic variables. Increasingly data availability estimates improve in accuracy, thus implying convergence in CCM and declining estimation error when cross-mapped estimates are calculated (Sugihara et al. 2012).

3.4.3. Causality as information flow through transfer entropy

As described in the previous sections, GC measures causal influence statistically based on prediction by means, e.g., of a VAR in stochastic systems with separability, and CCM deals with dynamical systems where causal variables have synergistic effects. More recently, transfer entropy [TE; (Schreiber 2000a; Runge et al. 2012; Gencaga et al. 2015; Gómez-Herrero et al. 2015)] has gained traction, finding application in a wide range of fields [see e.g., (Katura et al. 2006; Wibral et al. 2013; Lehnertz and Dikten 2015)]. TE is an information-theoretic measure of the time-directed information flows between jointly dependent processes (Barnett and Seth 2014). Of particular interest is the application of TE to quantify the information flow or information transfer within complex and dynamic systems (Runge 2015). The application of TE is especially suitable for systems for which only time-series of measurements are available and for which the underlying mechanisms that would be needed to directly infer causal relations are poorly understood.

Still bearing in mind the idea of Wiener earlier reported, one would expect the relationship between two variables X and Y to be asymmetric and that the information flows in a direction from the source Y to the target X (Razak and Jensen 2014). TE is a measure of such directed information transfer between joint processes. TE is asymmetric, so that $TE(X \rightarrow Y) \neq TE(Y \rightarrow X)$. The difference indicates a direction of information flow, which can be considered as a measure of potential causation from X to Y (Boba et al. 2015). In contrast with GC, TE is not framed in terms of prediction but in terms of resolution of uncertainty (Barnett et al. 2009). Therefore, $TE(Y \rightarrow X)$ is the degree to which Y provides information to disambiguate the future of X (i.e., to reduce the level of uncertainty on the future of X) beyond the degree to which X already disambiguates its own future (Barnett et al. 2009).

At the basis of TE is the concept of differential entropy for a continuous random variable introduced by Shannon (Shannon 2001). Shannon's theorem is a very general way of characterizing the statistical dependency or shared information between two variables. Following the theorem, differential entropy is defined as:

$$(26) \quad H(X_i = x) = - \int p(x) \log_2 p(x) dx$$

The discrete version of eq. (26) can be defined for a discrete random variable X with a domain of definition D_x , having possible values x with probability $p = p(x)$ (Boba et al. 2015). The value of the entropy $H(X)$ measures the average amount of information gained from a measurement that specifies one particular value x :

$$(27) \quad H(X_i = x) = - \sum_{x \in D_x} p(x) \log_2(p(x))$$

The entropy of X can be seen as a measure of the uncertainty of X (Hlaváčková-Schindler et al. 2007). We use \log_2 and \log interchangeably hereafter.

Let us consider again two random variables, X and Y , whose probability distributions are p_x and p_y , and whose outcomes are from a set $D := D_x \cap D_y$. The interdependence between X and Y can be calculated using the Kullback–Leibler divergence (Kullback and Leibler 1951):

$$(28) \quad D_{KL}(p_x|p_y) = \sum_{x \in D} p_x(x) \log \frac{p_x(x)}{p_y(x)}$$

The concept of entropy rate H_r of a process was developed by Schreiber (Schreiber 2000b) to include a direction of the information flow and a chronological ordering. As in Boba et al. (2015), we may assume that time intervals τ are equidistant and use counters like $n := \lceil t/\tau \rceil$ to enumerate the time points. H_r can be, then, defined as:

$$(29) \quad H_r = - \sum_{x_{n+1}, x_n^m} p(x_{n+1}, x_n^m) \log [p(x_{n+1}|x_n^m)]$$

In the formulation, x_n^m is an m -tuple of measurements at time steps $n, n-1, \dots, n-m+1$. Let us employ the same history length m for both data sets x_n and y_n , and, thus, define TE as (Schreiber 2000b):

$$(30) \quad TE(Y \rightarrow X) = \sum p(x_{x+1}, x_n^m, y_n^m) \log \frac{p(x_{x+1}|x_n^m, y_n^m)}{p(x_{x+1}|x_n^m)}$$

According to Lizier and Prokopenko (2010), TE can be viewed as 'a conditional mutual information, [...] the average information in the source about the next state of the destination that was not already contained in the destination's past states'. TE is a directional, dynamic measure of information transfer, but still remains a measure of observed (conditional) correlation rather than direct effect (Lizier and Prokopenko 2010). TE can be considered as a nonlinear generalization of GC for the case of Gaussian variables (i.e., normally-distributed), and a formal link between GC and TE can be found in Barnett et al. (2009). Conversely, one can define GC as an approximation to TE (Schreiber 2000a), which is exact for Gaussian variables. The equivalence between GC and TE means that the former can be interpreted in terms of information-theoretic bits-per-unit-time (Barnett et al. 2009).

3.4.4. Applications

3.4.4.1. Granger causality

The study of the GC between energy consumption, income and climate in countries of the globe is a well-studied topic (Wagner et al. 2016). The application of the method allows for using a time-series approach to study the dynamic link between CO₂ emissions and income. The approach allows for including in the analysis the temporal component of the relationship between the emissions and economic growth, unlike the case previously introduced on causal regression-based techniques. Methodological issues and inconsistencies with the application of GC in this context are well-documented (Bruns et al. 2014).

Omri et al. (2014) test the causality between CO₂ emissions, economic growth, and foreign direct investment (FDI) using panel data for a global panel of 54 countries over the period 1992–2011. The authors prove a bidirectional GC between FDI and CO₂ for all countries, except for those in Europe and North Asia. The study also finds a unidirectional GC between CO₂ and economic growth, except for the analyzed countries in the Middle East, North Africa, and sub-Saharan Africa, for which a bidirectional causality cannot be rejected. Pao and Tsai (2011a) analyze the period between 1992 and 2007 for the causality between CO₂ emissions, energy

consumption, FDI, and GDP in Brazil, Russian Federation, India, and China. The authors suggest that emissions are highly responsive to change in both energy consumption and GDP, but not in FDI. Furthermore, the authors find a unidirectional causality from energy consumption to emissions and a bidirectional GC between emissions and FDI.

Soytas et al. (2007) use a time-series of data for the period 1960–2004 and show that income does not Granger-cause carbon emissions in the US in the long run, but energy use does, thus revealing that a decreased energy use can reduce carbon emissions. Chiou-Wei et al. (2008) use linear and nonlinear GC to test the relationship between energy consumption and economic growth for a sample of Asian newly industrialized countries and the US. The study supports the neutrality hypothesis for the US, Thailand, and South Korea. A unidirectional causality from economic growth to energy consumption is found between the Philippines and Singapore, while energy consumption may have affected growth in Taiwan, Hong Kong, Malaysia, and Indonesia. Menyah and Wolde-Rufael (2010) examine the causal relationship among CO₂ emissions, renewable and nuclear energy consumption, and real GDP for the US during the period 1960–2007. The test results indicate no causality from renewable energy to CO₂ emissions and a unidirectional causality from nuclear energy consumption to CO₂ emissions.

For the case of Central America, Apergis and Payne (2009) show that energy consumption and economic growth Granger-cause CO₂ emissions, and that there is a bivariate causality between energy consumption and CO₂ emissions. Long et al. (2015) investigate the relationships between energy consumption, carbon emissions and economic growth in China from 1952 to 2012. The study finds a bivariate causality between GDP and CO₂ emissions and between GDP and coal, gas, and electricity consumption, thus suggesting that a change in the energy consumption structure of China would be required to meet climate goals. Acaravci and Ozturk (2010) show that there is evidence of a causal relationship between energy consumption, income and carbon emissions in Denmark, Germany, Greece, Iceland, Italy, Portugal, and Switzerland. Halicioglu (2009) indicates that, for the case of the country of Turkey, GC runs in both directions between CO₂ emissions and income both in the short term and long term. The authors, thus, state that it is possible to forecast the future levels of these variables from the past levels of each other. Ang (2008) confirms the existence of a causality running from economic growth to energy consumption growth, both in the short run and the long run, for the country of Malaysia. GC is verified in this context also for the case of ASEAN-5 countries [Malaysia, Indonesia, Singapore, the Philippines, and Thailand (Chandran and Tang 2013)], Tunisia (Fodha and Zaghdoud 2010), India (Ghosh 2009), and Brazil (Pao and Tsai 2011b).

A number of studies used GC to test the relationship between urbanization and carbon emissions. Hossain (2011) finds no evidence of causality in the short and long run for nine emerging industrialized countries for the period 1971–2007. Al-mulali and Sab (2012) study 19 countries and find a positive causal relationship between urbanization and CO₂ emissions in 84% of the cases. The same groups confirm these results for the middle eastern and north African countries in the MENA group for the years 1980–2009 (Al-mulali et al. 2013). Long-run bidirectional causality is found between urbanization and electricity consumption in a study by Liddle and Lung (2014) on 105 countries for the period 1971–2009. Wang et al. (2016a) find that urbanization Granger-causes carbon emissions in the long and short run for the ASEAN countries and for the BRICS (i.e., Brazil, Russia, India, China, and South Africa) countries (Wang et al. 2016b) within the period 1985–2014.

GC has found applications also in the field of climatology. GC is here used to test the connection between atmospheric CO₂ concentrations and global mean temperature. Young et al. (1991)

show a causal relationship between atmospheric CO₂ concentrations and global sea surface temperatures. Sun and Wang (1996) suggest that global surface temperature Granger-causes global CO₂ emissions, but past temperatures do not significantly improve the predictability of current CO₂ concentrations. Tol and De Vos (1998) demonstrate that there is a robust statistical relationship between the records of the global mean surface air temperature and the atmospheric concentration of CO₂ over the period 1870–1991. Stern and Kaufmann (2013) find that both natural and anthropogenic forcing cause temperature change and also that temperature causes greenhouse gas concentration changes. The causal link between temperature and CO₂ concentration is tested in 2013 using ice core data from 800 000 to 6000 years ago. The authors show strong evidence that CO₂ concentration Granger-causes temperature, as well as that temperature Granger-causes carbon dioxide concentration. Triacca (2005) shows the limits of the applications of GC in this context and proves that past observations of CO₂ concentration do not significantly improve the predictability of current temperature. Further discussions on the application of GC to these systems are available in the literature (Palus and Vejmelka 2007; Kampen 2010; Smirnov and Mokhov 2015).

3.4.4.2. Convergent cross mapping

Sugihara et al. (2012) apply CCM and find causal evidence of the influence of climate forcing on populations of sardines and anchovies in the California Current. Clark et al. (2015) further expand the concept to include spatial variation in time-series data to accommodate for the case of limited availability of data for a specific location. CCM has been applied also in the field of climate science. van Nes et al. (2015) applied CCM and found a marked positive feedback effect from temperature variability on greenhouse-gas concentrations. Tsonis et al. (2015) studied the association between cosmic rays and global temperature in the 20th-century observational record without finding measurable evidence of a causal effect linking cosmic rays to the overall 20th-century warming trend. The authors, however, do find a significant causal effect of cosmic rays on short-term variability in global temperatures. The reproduction of the study by Luo et al. (2015) could not reproduce and confirm the findings.

3.4.4.3. Transfer entropy

TE has found limited application in the sustainability sciences. Kumar and Ruddell (2010) use the technique to identify feedbacks between vegetation and climate components, using observations from a network of monitoring towers across North America. The study finds that the relationship between variability and information production leads to the emergence of ordered organization in the overall system.

4. Cause-effect analysis techniques in the context of QSA

The ability for causal models to answer these questions in the context of QSA largely depends on whether (1) the assumptions used by the technique are relevant in the context of QSA, and (2) whether it is viable to construct the model considering data availability. Different causal models may exhibit strengths and weaknesses for particular QSA applications depending on the relevance of the assumptions and the availability of data, requiring the modelers to carefully evaluate the most suitable ones considering the objectives and constraints of the study at hand.

4.1. Evaluation of major assumptions of cause-effect analysis techniques for QSA

Table 1 lists the major assumptions used for cause-effect analysis techniques introduced in section 3 [see also Russo (2009)].

Table 1. Set of assumptions of cause-effect analysis techniques.

Assumption	Definition	Cause-effect analysis technique				
		ES	OS	GC	CCM	TE
Linearity	Causal relationships are linear in the parameters and in the explanatory variable X and the response variable Y .	x	(x) [†]	x		
Separability and additivity	The response variable Y is the sum of explanatory variables X and the errors ε .		x			
No omitted variables and no systematic measurement errors	The analyst assumes that the factors considered in the analysis sufficiently represent the causal relationship at stake, and the measurement errors in the variables are random (i.e., not systematic) and are within a tolerable range. Under the hypothetical condition that expected ε is equal to zero, the causal effect Y is explained by the explanatory variables X s.	x	x	x	x	x
Stable-unit-treatment-value-assumption	The potential outcome of one individual of a population is not affected by the treatment applied to another individual of the population.	x	x	x	x	x
No correlation within and between explanatory variables and errors	Explanatory variables and errors are not correlated with each other.	x	x			
Cause inclusiveness	A cause contains unique information about an effect not available elsewhere.			x	x	x

Note: ES, experimental design based on Rubin's model; OS, observational designs based matching and regression techniques; GC, Granger-causality; CCM, convergent cross mapping; TE, transfer entropy.

[†]In the case of nonlinear regression, linearity assumption does not apply to OS.

4.1.1. Linearity

The assumption of linearity needs to be carefully considered when applying the techniques in the context of QSAs, and when interpreting the results of the analysis. The impossibility of building complex nonlinear models does not fully impede to explain complex systems and provide interpretable causal mechanisms. Linear models, in fact, can also support exploratory science and help identify trends and dynamics in systems that are complex in reality [see also Hofman et al. (2017) on predictive models accuracy]. QSA typically deals with highly-nonlinear phenomena, thus the assumption of linearity would question the strength of the causal-effect relationship measured assuming a linear relationship. The application of QSA to the SDGs, for example, will likely require the analysis of complex nonlinear interconnected systems of policy interventions and effects. Understanding such actions and their consequences under this condition requires incorporating all potential non-linearities into the causal model.

In the context of SDGs, SDG number 14, which states "Conserve and sustainably use the oceans, seas and marine resources for sustainable development", includes the specific target of "reducing the loss of marine species" (target 14.2 in the SDGs). The loss of marine species is determined by numerous factors and by interspecies relationships that can only be partially grasped using linear relationships. When time-series data are available, GC assumes linearity, while CCM is shown to be applicable to dynamic, nonlinear systems, thus avoiding the necessity to linearize relationships that are not linear in the real world. The applicability of this technique in the context of QSA needs to be further tested. Therefore, ES, linear OS, and GC have limited applicability for the QSAs of a system that involves significant nonlinear processes.

The assumption of separability and additivity regards the application of OS for causal inference. Under this assumption, the changes in the whole system under study can be understood as a sum of the changes by single constituents of the system. This assumption may not always be verified in the context of QSA, since individual constituents of a system that is being studied under a QSA may present specific properties that would result in a different behavior of the whole system if combined with other constituents. In the context of sustainability policy, for instance, government may decide to support a cleaner technology by means of tax rebates, which in turn would typically have a beneficial effect on the penetration of the technology in the market. Said rebates may be successful in promoting the diffusion of this more

environmentally desirable technology, while they may totally fail in some cases. This can be due, for instance, to the strong and stable presence of a dominant alternative technology that has already reached maturity, or to the lower cost of another alternative technology because of the contingent low cost of raw materials, or to the irrational preference of consumers towards another preferred technology. The consideration in the analysis of elements, such as market dynamics and irrationality of decision-making, may bring upon the system unpredictable changes and unexpected behaviors that stem from the interaction between these components over time. These interactions and changes could not be anticipated by simply integrating the single elements into the analysis.

4.1.2. Separability and additivity

The assumptions of separability and additivity also relate to the assumption of no omitted variables and no systematic measurement errors to which all techniques are bound. Due to the complexity and the type interactions considered in QSA that often involve socioeconomic transformations, it is likely that the analysis may have one or more unaccounted factors. For example, SDG number 7 states "Ensure access to affordable, reliable, sustainable and modern energy for all". A goal like this cuts across various socioeconomic and technological variables of our society including population, income, energy technologies, natural resource availability, price, social welfare, pollution, public health, legal systems, and their changes and interactions with each other, to name just a few (see section 3.4.1, where energy consumption is connected to the emission of pollutants such as SO_2 , NO_x). The existence and directionality of such causal relationships were measured in most cases by means of GC (see section 3.4.1). When using such studies for the purpose of predicting future emissions of pollutants, however, the existence of other intervening factors such as the existence of emission standards, regulations and their level of stringency, or availability and affordability of emission mitigation technologies in those countries may come into play, depending on their significance in explaining the relationships between energy consumption and pollutant emissions. Similarly, ES, OS, CCM, and TE should possibly include these factors if used to predict future changes.

4.1.3. Stable-unit-treatment-value

Earlier in this review, we have stressed the importance of extending the causal relationship between variables from a single

Table 2. Synthesis of cause-effect analysis techniques for QSA research.

Cause-effect analysis technique	Data requirements	Advantages	Disadvantages
ES	High	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Most trusted approach • Quantifiable strength of the causal relationship 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cost of implementation • Complexity of systems under analysis • Limited possibility of integrating assumptions in QSA • Limited possibility of replicating a study
OS	Medium	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good alternative to experimental designs • Ease of application • Ease of access to data 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Risk of data manipulation • Limited possibility of randomization for certain variables • Limited possibility of generalizing findings from sample to the full population
GC	Medium	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extensive literature • Ease of application • Ease of access to time-series data 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inapplicability in the presence of nonlinear, contemporaneous causal systems • Ambiguous results for dynamic systems with weak to moderate coupling
CCM	Low	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Short time-series data • Applicability to dynamic systems • Applicability to nonlinear, contemporaneous causal systems 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited application to contexts with multiple causal variables • Untested application in the sustainability realm
TE	Medium	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Applicability to dynamic systems • Easy to model 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is only a measure of observed (conditional) correlation rather than direct effect • Untested application in the sustainability realm

Note: ES, experimental design based on Rubin's model; OS, observational designs based on matching and regression techniques; GC, Granger causality; CCM, convergent cross mapping; TE, transfer entropy.

case or unit in a system to a population of individuals or units, thus to the entire system under assessment. These criteria fall within SUTVA. The assumption is necessary to all techniques considered, but is especially relevant for the causal interpretation of regressions. The assumption of stability ensures that the causal factor is supposed to operate homogeneously in the population of interest. The size of the sample directly relates to the data availability for QSA (see section 4.2). A sufficient sample size is, thus, fundamental to generalize the findings for any of the techniques that we presented. State-level policies on sustainability and their outcomes are limited by the fact that there are only about a couple of hundred states in the world and that the circumstances under which those states operate, in terms of population, climate, endowment of wealth and resources, etc. are very different. This problem is exacerbated when considering the fact that much of the sustainability-related policies have been experimented mostly in high-income countries, leaving few empirical evidences associated with low-income countries. This problem can be mitigated by the virtue of 'natural experiments' (Hsiang et al. 2011; Gans et al. 2013; Hanna and Oliva 2015), while identifying a natural experiment that is directly applicable to the question at hand is often challenging.

The behavior of the entire population cannot be understood by the behavior of individual constituents in the presence of interactions among them (see section 3.2.1), which may display emergent properties at the system's level (Odum and Barrett 1971; Bar-Yam 1997). A failure to recognize that a certain system has properties that are emergent can lead to a fallacious identification of a cause-effect relationship. In this case, it is recommended to explore other approaches such as quantitative systems modelling, socio-technical transition analysis, and initiative-based learning as elaborated in Turnheim et al. (2015).

4.1.4. Parameters and error term

In regression-based causal models, the error term is uncorrelated with the regressors, allowing the analyst to interpret how much of the causal impact is escaping her control due to the factor ϵ . This assumption applies to ES and OS techniques. This assumption for QSA means that all unknowns may be referred to the error term, without the risk of missing, e.g., a third screening factor Z when analyzing variable X and the related outcome Y . For the case of techniques that use time-series data, the core assump-

tion is that a variable X includes unique useful data to predict the state of a latent variable Y , so that variable X is causally linked to Y . The assumption entails that no other variable should be relevant to describe such cause-effect chain, thus the potential bias from unobservable variables can only be identified if all potential other influential variables are considered.

Techniques that involve the use of time-series, namely GC, CCM, and TE, can be used for causality assessments under the assumption that the cause contains unique information about the effect under study that could not be possibly obtained studying the time-series data of another potential cause. Such assumption would mean that it could be possible to univocally relate effects to a single cause. Such assumption may prove difficult to test in the general context of application of QSA, in which before identifying a single cause-effect relationship a number of time-series should be simultaneously tested to check for the potential information transfer and causal links between them. For this reason, the applicability of these cause-effect analysis techniques should be tested in practical case studies, e.g., related to the SDG. Practical applications would show the extent to which the assumption of causal inclusion could be always demonstrated.

4.2. Applicability

Applicability of a technique should give a due consideration to the relevance of the assumptions that they require. Even if the assumptions used in the presented cause-effect analysis techniques are relevant for the particular problems with which a QSA is concerned, a technique may show limited applicability due to other limitations, such as data availability. As seen in section 3.2.1, Rubin's model, for example, is an ideal approach to cause-effect analysis. The model shows that causality can be inferred from a well-designed randomized experiment (Holland 1986a). Even though such experimental design would be preferable, the applicability of Rubin's model in the context of QSA is limited due to the data requirement that any large-scale sustainability problem require to consider (see Table 2).

The data required to conduct and experiment in the fashion suggested by Rubin's approach is often prohibitive, due to the difficulty of easily assigning individuals to treatment and control groups, and also due to the difficulty of verifying alternative versions of the world that the counterfactual nature of Rubin's model assumes. Unlike typical treatments considered in empirical stud-

ies, in the context of sustainability policy, we have earlier noted that policy actions tend to evolve after they are launched, thus limiting the possibility of guarantying that the sample data under study is stable throughout the experimental design.

Also, in Rubin's model only the factors that are treated in an experiment can be considered as legitimate potential causes (Bhrolcháin and Dyson 2007). This implies that in all those contexts in which attributes need to be taken into account the potential outcome model cannot be applied. This interpretation would rule out personal attributes such as sex, or voluntary actions, such as deciding to start recycling waste, as potential causes. In other words, there would be "no causation without manipulation" (Holland 1986b p. 959), so only factors that could, in principle, be manipulated should be considered as potential causes. By ruling out factors that are not treated in an experiment from the pool of potential causes, the claim may confuse the factors that *can be* causes with those that *can be shown to be* causes experimentally (Bhrolcháin and Dyson 2007). Many phenomena that are thought to be potential causes in QSAs sciences, in fact, cannot be manipulated. And even if an intervention of the analyst would be possible, it would still be difficult, if not impossible, to find a counterfactual that could be selected as a control. Such a specification would rule out experimentation from QSA, as well as from the social and natural sciences. For this reason, the concept of causality is not dependent upon conditions of manipulability (Russo et al. 2011), and the capacity of an analyst to manipulate a cause is irrelevant to whether a factor is or could be a cause in an experimental setting. Using a truly experimental design in QSA context comes with challenges as we have highlighted. The absence of an experimental design like Rubin's does not render the identification of causality impossible. We explored a set of techniques that can be used to assess causality and sustain causal claims also in cases in which Rubin's model is unsuitable.

4.2.1. Observational studies and QSA

Methods based on observational data, such as matching techniques and causal regressions, under the analyzed set of assumptions can provide an alternative means of assessing causality in the context of QSA. We presented a number of examples that show that a well-defined causal regression allows for cause-effect analysis even under the absence of an experimental design. The "no causation without manipulation" criteria, again, would seem to rule out causal inference from observational studies (Angrist and Pischke 2008). Over the years, many have questioned this standpoint. Glymour (1986), for instance, finds the statement an unnecessary restriction, and objections can be found in the demography (Bhrolcháin and Dyson 2007) and economic literature (Angrist and Pischke 2008). Pearl (2009) argues that the essential ingredient for causation is the capacity of some variable to respond to variation in other variables, regardless of the manipulation restriction imposed on the analyst. There certainly is, according to Pearl, causation without manipulation, such as the gravitational force of the moon that causes tides [see also Goldthorpe (2001); Pearl (2009)]. In the systems typically under assessment in QSA, manipulation does not rule out, then, the use of observational studies. Moreover, observational data are increasingly available and global efforts to collect and classify data are undergoing. Applications of OS should be further tested.

Time-series techniques benefit from a vast availability of time-series data also in the QSA domain. GC has found wide application to study the GDP-energy-pollution nexus (Wagner et al. 2016). When interpreting the results of GC in the context of QSA, one should remember that the technique poorly performs in the presence of nonlinear, contemporaneous causal systems, and its results are ambiguous when dynamic systems with weak to moderate coupling are under assessment (Sugihara et al. 2012). This element does pose some factual limitations in the use of GC for

QSA, also given the number of interconnected systems that are typically under scrutiny.

The applicability of CCM should be further tested for QSA, since it would allow for the consideration of dynamic, strongly coupled systems also under conditions of limited data availability. In the context of sustainable energy of interest for SDG number 7, for instance, such approach could be beneficial to test the relationship between renewable energy deployment and climate-change mitigation using the relatively limited data available for renewable energy sources, which have been monitored only in the last two decades. Similarly, TE could support such assessments, since it is easily applicable in the context of complex dynamic systems; however, the limited application in real cases does not allow for total appreciation of the full potential of TE for QSA at the current stage of knowledge.

In order for cause-effect analysis techniques to be applicable for QSA, causal explanations should not be derived with statistical methods alone (Goldthorpe 2001). The role of the analyst in the form of background knowledge and theories, otherwise considered a subject-matter input, is key to design a causality study for QSA. To this end, all methods come with limitations and in all cases the *caveat* of the presence of strong assumptions is valid, as we have pointed out for each method in the previous section. In some cases, little evidence is available to the analyst when the claim is made that a causal model accurately estimates causal effects, and sometimes causal models can be wrong. We hold here the definition that of Berk et al. (2013) coined for SEM, stating that a causal model is "a quantitative theory of how the data were generated, in which a statistical formalization for random variables is combined with a causal account derived from subject-matter knowledge". For QSA, the statistical properties of the observed data model and the assumptions need to be carefully scrutinized before inferring causal relationships to avoid spurious results (Hlaváčková-Schindler et al. 2007). Global tests of model fit (e.g., the likelihood ratio χ^2 test) should be combined with local tests [e.g., partial correlations and tetrad tests (Bollen and Ting 2000)], which allow for a more accurate model diagnosis and fine-tuning (Bollen and Pearl 2013). Also, more replications of causal models should be then combined as needed in different settings and among different populations to strengthen the causal claims (Brand and Thomas 2013).

4.2.2. Dynamic and temporal inconsistencies

The causal models we described typically deal with historical data, and try to map causal mechanisms based on relationships between inputs and outcomes that have typically matured over a stretch of time in the past. However, the preferences of decision-makers measured at one point in time are not fixed, and they are not necessarily representative of future preferences. The so-called dynamic or temporal inconsistency (Thaler 1981; Loewenstein and Prelec 1992) refers to the apparent disagreement between decisions taken or preferences expressed at a certain time, and that change at a later stage. This incongruence of behavior determines a situation in which plans that are made (or policy that are developed) at one point in time may not attain the same level of outcome later (Pearce et al. 2003). This is true for the case of individuals, and even more for the case of societies that are usually satisfied with weaker rationality and congruence conditions than individuals (Pearce et al. 2003). In the context of QSA, the issue of dynamic inconsistencies is especially relevant, as the temporal dimension involved tends to be a longer-term future, over which causal relationships may change. The existence of dynamic inconsistency indicates that policy recommendations based on a QSA that uses a causal relationship need to be re-evaluated over time to fully account for the changes in preference over time.

5. Outlook: causality for quantitative sustainability assessment

The ability to identify causality between policy instruments and sustainability performance indicators, including those listed under the SDGs, provides decision-makers with a powerful tool. We surveyed a number of cause-effect analysis techniques and their applications in the field of sustainability (in section 3, and also see [Appendix A](#) for a synthesis). Our review demonstrates that in the field of QSAs causality could provide a means to understand phenomena and their causes, as well as to investigate the effective policy measure to achieve desired outcomes. The use of cause-effect analysis techniques has important benefits also in analyzing the effect of a policy option (e.g., the level of air pollution abatement due to the introduction of road space rationing in a city). Such techniques can be used by decision-makers to prioritize policy options, and understand the expected outcomes and potential unintended consequences.

We used SDGs to contextualize causal research and its applicability in QSA. In this context, we showed the challenges of understanding how various processes in the systems under study by QSA are connected and how specific policy or management actions can help address SDGs. Our review also discussed a number of caveats when applying cause-effect analysis techniques to QSA. The application of cause-effect analysis techniques is still a challenge in the field of sustainable development. Existing frameworks are confined to limited idealistic and isolated cases that are still far from the breadth of analysis that is required by the SDGs. Existing frameworks, as they stand, therefore, may offer limited insights for the questions as complex as SDGs. Overcoming such barriers would require a cross-disciplinary effort to develop an operational framework for quantifying the sustainability consequences of policy actions addressing the needs of QSA, discussed in this review. In the meantime, it is inevitable that QSA practitioners will have to make use of the imperfect information on causality from for example, mechanistic models or from the use of the cause-effect analysis techniques presented in this review under the assumptions used and the limitations associated with them.

The application of causality for QSA also poses a number of challenges that relate to both the assumptions and the data requirement. Assumptions need to be tested, and the related uncertainties should be analyzed in order for a cause-effect analysis to be valid ([Maxim and van der Sluijs 2011](#)). The results should be carefully interpreted in light of the assumptions.

In relation to data availability, we discussed both experimental and observational techniques. Although experimental studies are always the preferred option, they are often impractical, and analysts may be reliant on observational studies alone. Formal experiments are of limited application for many of the most pressing questions of social relevance such as those directly related to climate change, large-scale agricultural intensification or habitat loss ([Stephens et al. 2014](#)). When it comes to irreversible, large-scale changes that SDGs and corresponding policy actions are interested in, obviously, experiments are neither practical nor desirable. Furthermore, deriving an unbiased estimate using indirect approaches, such as natural experiments, comes with its own challenges and limitations ([Cucurachi and Suh 2015](#)). Adequate non-experimental settings are, then, required to avoid these questions remaining elusive in the absence of experimental evidence. Sufficient survey data and time-series data are available for regression-based causality and time-series cause-effect analysis techniques, respectively, and new methodological developments, such as CCM and TE, allow for dealing with causality under those circumstances in which the analyst faces dearth of data.

Non-experimental cause-effect analysis techniques are powerful but do have limitations and need to accurately be interpreted before causal claims can be safely held to the test. Robust and

unambiguous results are difficult to obtain, and many causal claims are yet to be tested with an experimental or quasi-experimental design. Simple correlation at times is taken as a direct measure of the strength of the causal mechanism, or a certain *driver* X is identified as determinant for a certain response Y (e.g., international trade as a driver of biodiversity loss) without testing the relationship using a formal cause-effect analysis technique. The latter does not exclude any complex model from providing valuable information to decision-makers, but only suggests caution when causal claims are not supported by experimental models or carefully designed causal models fitted on observational data with all the related assumptions and limitations.

We acknowledge that the framework of hypotheses, assumptions, limitations and the boundaries of the causal analysis matter when claiming the existence of a causal relationship, or when an analysis aims at verifying the existence of causal mechanisms. Still, new avenues of research can open opportunities for the development of improved cause-effect analysis techniques that build upon the body of knowledge that we have analyzed in this review.

We highlighted the difficulty of framing cause-effect research at the country level, due to the limited number of countries available as a sample, and due to the sheer differences that exist among them. A more promising level of analysis could have cities, instead, at the core. Socio-technical transitions that work at a single city level can be more easily compared with other cities with similar characteristics. To this end, the phenomenon of urban experimentation ([Bulkeley and Broto 2013](#); [Rijke et al. 2013](#); [Voytenko et al. 2016](#)) that has been gaining momentum in the last years does have the potential to support change at the global level in the context of SDGs (see also SDG number 9 on resilient cities). New datasets are being compiled based on the local experience of cities, and further efforts should be supported to collect and categorize this information. These data can be used to set up causal quasi-experimental and observational designs to support decision-making for sustainability and the SDGs.

The increased availability of data to which urban experimentation contributes joins the possibility to access and use large data sets. The challenges to causally analyze the so-called Big Data to reveal patterns, trends, and associations, especially related to human behavior and interactions, are enormous ([Shiffrin 2016](#)). The task is daunting and requires efforts across multiple disciplines, from the economics to all the sub-disciplines of the sustainability sciences ([Athey 2017](#)). Machine learning techniques, among others, have been suggested as a promising joint topic from which such effort could begin ([Varian 2016](#)).

QSA sciences, such as industrial ecology, should combine the benefits of an increased availability of data ([Xu et al. 2015](#)) with the benefits of understanding causality. Qualitative approaches such as causal loop diagrams ([Asif et al. 2015](#); [Laurenti et al. 2015](#); [Efroymsen et al. 2016](#)) should be combined with quantitative techniques, and also QSA scientists should reach to other disciplines to contribute to perfect the existing cause-effect analysis techniques. Until new techniques and a new framework for causality in QSA would be available, scientists would still have to resort to alternative techniques (e.g., agent-based modelling) that, although useful and at times sufficient for single assessments, cannot provide a substantive basis for causal inference at the level required by the SDGs.

In the sub-field of LCA ([Hellweg and Mila i Canals 2014](#)), causality is of particular interest in the context of the consequential approach to LCA ([Zamagni et al. 2012](#)). Following the consequential approach, the LCA analyst defines changes in a product system and models how the physical and social processes will be triggered by such changes in the system ([Earles and Halog 2011](#)). In short, consequential LCA assumes that changes to some parts of the life cycle inventory system lead to a series of consequences through chains of cause-effect relationships ([Curran et al. 2005](#)).

Concepts borrowed from economic modelling, such as elasticities of supply and demand or general and partial equilibrium models, have been proposed in existing consequential LCA studies or have been recommended for inclusion to simulate responses to changes in the system (Ekvall and Andrae 2006). Practical applications that include these theories in LCA are still limited (Suh and Yang 2014), and only recently alternative solutions have been proposed, for instance using optimization techniques to anticipate changes in a system (Duchin and Levine 2011). We add to the research agenda of the consequential LCA community the necessity to study cause-effect relationships by means of causality theory and methods, thus contributing to increasing the value of the results.

The adoption of causality in all QSAs and the necessity to control causal dynamics and mechanisms requires involvement of experts from a variety of disciplines that can help disentangle those mechanisms and design appropriate causal studies. Collaborations among multiple disciplines will help development of new computational models, methods, and tools to tackle the various aspects of sustainability (Gomes 2009; Marvuglia et al. 2015). Such effort will progressively allow for understanding of the interconnections between SDGs and the results of QSAs beyond the sole use of indicators (Mirshojaeian and Kaneko 2012).

Acknowledgements

This article was developed under Assistance Agreement No. 83557901 awarded by the US Environmental Protection Agency to University of California Santa Barbara. It has not been formally reviewed by EPA. The views expressed in this document are solely those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect those of the Agency. The authors thank Professor Olivier Deschenes (UCSB) and Jessica Perkins (UCSB) for helpful comments on an earlier version of this manuscript.

References

- Abadie, A. 2005. Semiparametric difference-in-differences estimators. *Rev. Econ. Stud.* **72**(1): 1–19. doi:10.1111/0034-6527.00321.
- Abadie, A., and Imbens, G.W. 2006. Large sample properties of matching estimators for average treatment effects. *Econometrica*, **74**(1): 235–267. doi:10.1111/j.1468-0262.2006.00655.x.
- Acaravci, A., and Ozturk, I. 2010. On the relationship between energy consumption, CO₂ emissions and economic growth in Europe. *Energy*, **35**(12): 5412–5420. doi:10.1016/j.energy.2010.07.009.
- Aldrich, J. 1995. Correlations genuine and spurious in Pearson and Yule. *Stat. Sci.* **10**: 364–376.
- Allison, P. 1999. Multiple regression: A primer. Edited by P.F. Press.
- Al-mulali, U., and Sab, C. 2012. The impact of energy consumption and CO₂ emission on the economic and financial development in 19 selected countries. *Renew. Sustain. Energy Rev.* **16**: 4365–4369. doi:10.1016/j.rser.2012.05.017.
- Al-mulali, U., Fereidouni, H., Lee, J.Y.M., and Sab, C.N. 2013. Exploring the relationship between urbanization, energy consumption, and CO₂ emission in MENA countries. *Renew. Sustain. Energy Rev.* **23**: 107–112. doi:10.1016/j.rser.2013.02.041.
- Ancona, N., Marinazzo, D., and Stramaglia, S. 2004. Radial basis function approach to nonlinear Granger causality of time series. *Phys. Rev. E*, **70**(5): 56221. APS. doi:10.1103/PhysRevE.70.056221.
- Andam, K., Ferraro, P., Pfaff, A., Sanchez-Azofeifa, G.A., and Robalino, J.A. 2008. Measuring the effectiveness of protected area networks in reducing deforestation. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* **105**(42): 16089–16094. doi:10.1073/pnas.0800437105. PMID:18854414.
- Andam, K.S., Ferraro, P.J., Sims, K.R.E., Healy, A., and Holland, M.B. 2010. Protected areas reduced poverty in Costa Rica and Thailand. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* **107**(22): 9996–10001. doi:10.1073/pnas.0914177107. PMID:20498058.
- Ang, J. 2008. Economic development, pollutant emissions and energy consumption in Malaysia. *J. Policy Model.* **30**: 271–278. doi:10.1016/j.jpplmod.2007.04.010.
- Angrist, J.D., and Imbens, G.W. 1995. Two-stage least squares estimation of average causal effects in models with variable treatment intensity. *J. Am. Stat. Assoc.* **90**(430): 431–442. [Taylor & Francis.] doi:10.1080/01621459.1995.10476535.
- Angrist, J.D., and Krueger, A.B. 1992. The effect of age at school entry on educational attainment: an application of instrumental variables with moments from two samples. *J. Am. Stat. Assoc.* **87**(418): 328–336. [Taylor & Francis Group.] doi:10.1080/01621459.1992.10475212.
- Angrist, J.D., and Krueger, A.B. 2001. Instrumental variables and the search for identification: From supply and demand to natural experiments. *J. Econ. Perspect.* **15**: 69–85. doi:10.1257/jep.15.4.69.
- Angrist, J.D., and Pischke, J.-S. 2008. Mostly harmless econometrics: An empiricist's companion. Princeton University Press.
- Antonakis, J., Bendahan, S., Jacquart, P., and Lalive, R. 2014. Causality and endogeneity: Problems and solutions. *The Oxford Handbook of Leadership and Organizations*, Oxford University Press, New York. pp. 93–117.
- Antweiler, W., Copeland, B., and Taylor, M. 1998. Is free trade good for the environment? *Am. Econ. Rev.* **91**: 877–908.
- Apergis, N., and Payne, J.E. 2009. Energy consumption and economic growth in Central America: Evidence from a panel cointegration and error correction model. *Energy Econ.* **31**(2): 211–216. doi:10.1016/j.eneco.2008.09.002.
- Arnold, B., Khush, R., Ramaswamy, P., London, A.G., Rajkumar, P., Ramaprabha, P., Durairaj, N., Hubbard, A.E., Balakrishnan, K., and Colford, J.M. 2010. Causal inference methods to study nonrandomized, preexisting development interventions. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* **107**(52): 22605–22610. doi:10.1073/pnas.1008944107. PMID:21149699.
- Arun, T., Imai, K., and Sinha, F. 2006. Does microfinance reduce poverty in India? Propensity score matching based on a national-level household data. *In Economics Discussion Paper*, The University of Manchester.
- Asif, F., Rashid, A., Bianchi, C., and Nicolescu, C. 2015. System dynamics models for decision making in product multiple lifecycles. *Resour. Conserv. Recycl.* **101**: 20–33. doi:10.1016/j.resconrec.2015.05.002.
- Athey, S. 2017. Beyond prediction: Using big data for policy problems. *Science*, **355**(6324): 483–485. doi:10.1126/science.124321. PMID:28154050.
- Athey, S., and Imbens, G. 2006. Identification and inference in nonlinear difference-in-differences models. *Econometrica*, **74**(2): 431–497. doi:10.1111/j.1468-0262.2006.00668.x.
- Baek, E., and Brock, W. 1992. A general test for nonlinear Granger causality: Bivariate model. Iowa State University and University of Wisconsin at Madison. Working Paper.
- Baiocchi, G. 2012. On dimensions of ecological economics. *Ecol. Econ.* **75**: 1–9. doi:10.1016/j.ecolecon.2012.01.016.
- Barnett, L., and Seth, A.K. 2014. The MVGC multivariate Granger causality toolbox: A new approach to Granger-causal inference. *J. Neurosci. Methods*, **223**: 50–68. [Elsevier B.V.] doi:10.1016/j.jneumeth.2013.10.018. PMID:24200508.
- Barnett, L., Barrett, A.B., and Seth, A.K. 2009. Granger causality and transfer entropy are equivalent for Gaussian variables. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **103**: 1–10. doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.103.238701.
- Barrea, A., Clay, K., Deschenes, O., Greenstone, M., Shapiro, J.S., and Deschenes, O. 2013. Adapting to climate change: the remarkable decline in the US temperature-mortality relationship over the 20th century. *NBER Working Paper [January]*, **46**. doi:10.3386/w18692.
- Barsky, R., and Kilian, L. 2004. Oil and the macroeconomy since the 1970s. *NBER Working Paper No. 10855*.
- Bar-Yam, Y. 1997. *Dynamics of complex systems*. Vol. 213. Addison-Wesley, Reading, Mass.
- Berk, R.A. 2004. *Regression analysis: A constructive critique*. Sage Publishing.
- Berk, R., Brown, L., George, E., and Pitkin, E. 2013. What you can learn from wrong causal models. *In Handbook of causal analysis for social research*. pp. 403–424.
- Bhrolcháin, M.N., and Dyson, T. 2007. On causation in demography: Issues and illustrations. *Popul. Dev. Rev.* **33**(1): 1–36. [JSTOR.] doi:10.1111/j.1728-4457.2007.00157.x.
- Blackman, A., and Naranjo, M. 2012. Does eco-certification have environmental benefits? Organic coffee in Costa Rica. *Ecol. Econ.* **83**: 58–66. doi:10.1016/j.ecolecon.2012.08.001.
- Boba, P., Bollmann, D., Schoepe, D., Wester, N., Wiesel, J., and Hamacher, K. 2015. Efficient computation and statistical assessment of transfer entropy. *Front. Phys.* **3**(March): 1–9. doi:10.3389/fphy.2015.00010.
- Bollen, K.A. 2002. Latent variables in psychology and the social sciences. *Annu. Rev. Psychol.* **53**(1): 605–634. [Annual Reviews 4139 El Camino Way, P.O. Box 10139, Palo Alto, CA 94303-0139, USA.] doi:10.1146/annurev.psych.53.100901.135239. PMID:11752498.
- Bollen, K.A. 2012. Instrumental variables in sociology and the social sciences. *Annu. Rev. Sociol.* **38**: 37–72. [Annual Reviews.] doi:10.1146/annurev-soc-081309-150141.
- Bollen, K.A., and Pearl, J. 2013. Eight myths about causality and structural equation models. *In Handbook of causal analysis for social research*. Springer. pp. 301–328.
- Bollen, K., and Ting, K. 2000. A tetrad test for causal indicators. *Psychol. Methods*, **5**(1): 3–22. doi:10.1037/1082-989X.5.1.3. PMID:10937320.
- Brand, J., and Thomas, J. 2013. Causal effect heterogeneity. *In Handbook of causal analysis for social research*. pp. 189–213.
- Brander, M., Tipper, R., Hutchison, C., and Davis, G. 2008. Consequential and attributional approaches to LCA: a guide to policy makers with specific reference to greenhouse gas LCA of biofuels. *Econometrica Press (April)*. pp. 1–14.
- Brunner, P., and Rechberger, H. 2004. Practical handbook of material flow analysis. *Int. J. Life Cycle Assess.* **9**(5): 337–338. doi:10.1007/BF02979426.
- Bruns, S., Gross, C., and Stern, D. 2014. Is there really Granger causality between energy use and output? *Energy J.* **35**(4): 101–134. doi:10.5547/01956574.35.4.5.

- Buhaug, H. 2010. Climate not to blame for African civil wars. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* **107**(38): 16477–16482. doi:10.1073/pnas.1005739107. PMID:20823241.
- Bulkeley, H., and Broto, V.C. 2013. Government by experiment? Global cities and the governing of climate change. *Trans. Inst.* **38**: 361–375. doi:10.1111/j.1475-5661.2012.00535.x.
- Burke, M.B., Miguel, E., Satyanath, S., Dykema, J.A., and Lobell, D.B. 2009. Warming increases the risk of civil war in Africa. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* **106**(49): 20670–20674. doi:10.1073/pnas.0907998106. PMID:19934048.
- Caliendo, M., and Kopeinig, S. 2008. Some practical guidance for the implementation of propensity score matching. *J. Econ. Surv.* **22**(1): 31–72. doi:10.1111/j.1467-6419.2007.00527.x.
- Campbell, D.T., and Erlebacher, A. 1970. How regression artifacts in quasi-experimental evaluations can mistakenly make compensatory education look harmful. *Compensatory education: a national debate*. Vol. 3. pp. 185–210. [Brunner/Mazel New York.]
- Cane, M.A., Miguel, E., Burke, M., Hsiang, S.M., Lobell, D.B., Meng, K.C., and Satyanath, S. 2014. Temperature and violence. *Nat. Clim. Change*, **4**(April): 234–235. doi:10.1038/nclimate2171.
- Chandran, V., and Tang, C. 2013. The impacts of transport energy consumption, foreign direct investment and income on CO₂ emissions in ASEAN-5 economies. *Renew. Sustain. Energy Rev.* **24**: 445–453. doi:10.1016/j.rser.2013.03.054.
- Chaumont, A., Nickmilder, M., Dumont, X., Lundh, T., Skerfving, S., and Bernard, A. 2012. Associations between proteins and heavy metals in urine at low environmental exposures: evidence of reverse causality. *Toxicol. Lett.* **210**(3): 345–352. doi:10.1016/j.toxlet.2012.02.005. PMID:22353377.
- Chiou-Wei, S., Chen, C., and Zhu, Z. 2008. Economic growth and energy consumption revisited—evidence from linear and nonlinear Granger causality. *Energy Econ.* **30**(6): 3063–3076. doi:10.1016/j.eneco.2008.02.002.
- Chong, A., and Calderon, C. 2000. Causality and feedback between institutional measures and economic growth. *Econ. Polit.* **12**(1): 69–81. doi:10.1111/1468-0343.00069.
- Christakis, N.A., and Iwashyna, T.J. 2003. The health impact of health care on families: A matched cohort study of hospice use by decedents and mortality outcomes in surviving, widowed spouses. *Soc. Sci. Med.* **57**: 465–475. doi:10.1016/S0277-9536(02)00370-2. PMID:12791489.
- Christman, M.C. 2008. Statistical modeling of observational data with spatial dependencies. *J. Wildl. Manage.* **72**(1): 23–33. doi:10.2193/2007-295.
- Clark, A.T., Ye, H., Isbell, F., Deyle, E.R., Cowles, J., Tilman, G.D., and Sugihara, G. 2015. Spatial convergent cross mapping to detect causal relationships from short time series. *Ecology*, **96**(5): 1174–1181. doi:10.1890/14-1479.1. PMID:26236832.
- Clarke, J., and Mirza, S. 2006. A comparison of some common methods for detecting Granger noncausality. *J. Stat. Comput.* **76**(3): 207–231. doi:10.1080/10629360500107741.
- Cochran, W. 2009. *Planning and analysis of observational studies*. Vol. 232. John Wiley & Sons.
- Cochran, W.G., and Rubin, D.B. 1973. Controlling bias in observational studies: a review. *Sankhya Ind. J. Stat. Ser. A*, **35**(4): 417–446.
- Cole, M., and Elliott, R. 2003. Determining the trade–environment composition effect: the role of capital, labor and environmental regulations. *J. Environ. Econ.* **46**(3): 363–383. doi:10.1016/S0095-0696(03)00021-4.
- Conti, G., Heckman, J., and Urzua, S. 2010. The education-health gradient. *Am. Econ. Rev.* **100**(2): 234–238. [NIH Public Access.] doi:10.1257/aer.100.2.234. PMID:24741117.
- Copeland, B., and Taylor, M. 2013. *Trade and the environment: Theory and evidence*. Princeton University Press.
- Costanza, R., de Groot, R., Sutton, P., van der Ploeg, S., Anderson, S.J., Kubiszewski, I., Farber, S., and Turner, R.K. 2014. Changes in the global value of ecosystem services. *Glob. Environ.* **26**: 152–158. doi:10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2014.04.002.
- Costello, C., Gaines, S., and Lynham, J. 2008. Can catch shares prevent fisheries collapse? *Science*, **321**(5896): 1678–1681. doi:10.1126/science.1159478. PMID:18801999.
- Costello, C., Lynham, J., Lester, R., and Gaines, S. 2010. Economic incentives and global fisheries sustainability. *Ann. Rev. Resour. Econ.* **2**: 299–318. doi:10.1146/annurev.resource.012809.103923.
- Creutzig, F., Popp, A., Plevin, R., Luderer, G., Minx, J., and Edenhofer, O. 2012. Reconciling top-down and bottom-up modelling on future bioenergy deployment. *Nat. Clim. Change*, **2**(5): 320–327. [Nature Publishing Group.] doi:10.1038/nclimate1416.
- Cucurachi, S., and Suh, S. 2015. A moonshot for sustainability assessment. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **49**: 9497–9498. doi:10.1021/acs.est.5b02960. PMID:26230673.
- Curran, M.A., Mann, M., and Norris, G. 2005. The international workshop on electricity data for life cycle inventories. *J. Clean. Prod.* **13**(8): 853–862. [Elsevier.] doi:10.1016/j.jclepro.2002.03.001.
- Cutler, D.M., and Lleras-Muney, A. 2010. Understanding differences in health behaviors by education. *J. Health Econ.* **29**(1): 1–28. [Elsevier.] doi:10.1016/j.jhealeco.2009.10.003. PMID:19963292.
- Cutler, D.M., Lleras-Muney, A., and Vogl, T. 2008. Socioeconomic status and health: dimensions and mechanisms. NBER Working Paper No. 14333.
- Dawid, A. 2007. Counterfactuals, hypotheticals and potential responses: a philosophical examination of statistical causality. *In Causality and probability in the Sciences*. Edited by F. Russo and J. Williamson. pp. 503–532.
- Dawid, A.P. 1979. Conditional independence in statistical theory. *J. R. Stat. Soc. Ser. B*, **41**(1): 1–31.
- Deschenes, O. 2010. Climate policy and labor markets. *Bus. Econ.* **45**(3): 152–157.
- Deschenes, O., and Greenstone, M. 2007. The economic impacts of climate change: evidence from agricultural output and random fluctuations in weather. *Am. Econ. Rev.* **102**(7): 3761–3773. doi:10.1257/aer.102.7.3761.
- Deschenes, O., and Kolstad, C. 2011. Economic impacts of climate change on California agriculture. *Clim. Change*, **109**: 365–386. doi:10.1007/s10584-011-0322-3.
- Deschenes, O., and Moretti, E. 2009. Extreme weather events, mortality, and migration. *Rev. Econ. Stat.* **91**(4): 659–681. doi:10.1162/rest.91.4.659.
- Deschenes, O., Greenstone, M., and Guryan, J. 2009. Climate Change and Birth Weight. *Am. Econ. Rev. Pap. Proc.* **99**(2): 211–217. doi:10.1257/aer.99.2.211.
- Deyle, E.R., and Sugihara, G. 2011. Generalized theorems for nonlinear state space reconstruction. *PLoS ONE*, **6**(3): e18295. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0018295. PMID:21483839.
- Diamond, A., and Sekhon, J.S. 2012. Genetic matching for estimating causal effects: a general multivariate matching method for achieving balance in observational studies. *Rev. Econ. Stat.* **95**(3): 932–945. doi:10.1162/REST_a_00318.
- Dolado, J., and Lütkepohl, H. 1996. Making Wald tests work for cointegrated VAR systems. *Econom. Rev.* **15**(4): 369–386. doi:10.1080/07474939608800362.
- Donald, S., and Lang, K. 2007. Inference with difference-in-differences and other panel data. *Rev. Econ. Stat.* **89**(2): 221–233. doi:10.1162/rest.89.2.221.
- Duchin, F., and Levine, S. 2011. Sectors may use multiple technologies simultaneously: The rectangular choice-of-technology model with binding factor constraints. *Econ. Syst. Res.* **23**: 281–302. doi:10.1080/09535314.2011.571238.
- Earles, J.M., and Halog, A. 2011. Consequential life cycle assessment: a review. *Int. J. Life Cycle Assess.* **16**(5): 445–453. doi:10.1007/s11367-011-0275-9.
- Efroymson, R., Kline, K., Angelsen, A., Verburg, P., Dale, V.H., Langeveld, J.W.A., and McBride, A. 2016. A causal analysis framework for land-use change and the potential role of bioenergy policy. *Land Use Pol.* **59**: 516–527. doi:10.1016/j.landusepol.2016.09.009.
- Ekvall, T., and Andrae, A. 2006. Attributional and consequential environmental assessment of the shift to lead-free solders (10 pp). *Int. J. Life Cycle Assess.* **11**(5): 344–353. doi:10.1065/lca2005.05.208.
- Esposito Vinzi, V., Chin, W.W., Henseler, J., and Wang, H. 2010. *Handbook of partial least squares: Concepts, methods and applications*. Springer, Heidelberg, Dordrecht, London, New York.
- Ferraro, P.J., and Hanauer, M.M. 2014. Quantifying causal mechanisms to determine how protected areas affect poverty through changes in ecosystem services and infrastructure. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* **111**(11): 4332–4337. doi:10.1073/pnas.1307712111. PMID:24567397.
- Firebaugh, G. 2008. Seven rules for social research. ERIC.
- Fischer-Kowalski, M., and Swilling, M. 2011. Decoupling: natural resource use and environmental impacts from economic growth. United Nations Environment Programme.
- Fodha, M., and Zaghdoud, O. 2010. Economic growth and pollutant emissions in Tunisia: an empirical analysis of the environmental Kuznets curve. *Energy Pol.* **38**: 1150–1156. doi:10.1016/j.enpol.2009.11.002.
- Fowler, J.H., and Christakis, N.A. 2008. Dynamic spread of happiness in a large social network: longitudinal analysis over 20 years in the Framingham Heart Study. *BMJ*, **337**: a2338. [BMJ Publishing Group Ltd.] doi:10.1136/bmj.a2338. PMID:19056788.
- Frankel, J.A., and Rose, A.K. 2005. Is trade good or bad for the environment? Sorting out the causality. *Rev. Econ. Stat.* **87**(1): 85–91. doi:10.1162/0034653053327577.
- Freedman, D.A. 2009. *Statistical models: theory and practice*. Cambridge University Press.
- Gans, W., Alberini, A., and Longo, A. 2013. Smart meter devices and the effect of feedback on residential electricity consumption: Evidence from a natural experiment in Northern Ireland. *Energy Econ.* **36**: 729–743. doi:10.1016/j.eneco.2012.11.022.
- Gelman, A., and Hill, J. 2006. *Data analysis using regression and multilevel/hierarchical models*. Cambridge University Press.
- Gengca, D., Knuth, K., and Rossow, W. 2015. A recipe for the estimation of information flow in a dynamical system. *Entropy* **17**(1): 438–470. [Multidisciplinary Digital Publishing Institute.] doi:10.3390/e17010438.
- Geweke, J. 1982. Measurement of linear dependence and feedback between multiple time series. *J. Am. Stat. Assoc.* **77**(378): 304–313. doi:10.1080/01621459.1982.10477803.
- Geweke, J.F. 1984. Measures of conditional linear dependence and feedback between time series. *J. Am. Stat. Assoc.* **79**(388): 907–915. doi:10.1080/01621459.1984.10477110.
- Ghosh, S. 2009. Electricity supply, employment and real GDP in India: evidence from cointegration and Granger-causality tests. *Energy Pol.* **37**(8): 2926–2929. doi:10.1016/j.enpol.2009.03.022.
- Glymour, C. 1986. Comment: Statistics and metaphysics. *J. Am. Stat. Assoc.* **81**(396): 964–966. [Taylor & Francis.] doi:10.2307/2289067.
- Goldthorpe, J.H. 2001. Causation, statistics, and sociology. *Eur. Sociol. Rev.* **17**(1): 1–20. [Oxford University Press.] doi:10.1093/esr/17.1.1.
- Gomes, C. 2009. Why health information technology doesn't work. *Bridge*, **39**(4): 5.

- Gómez-Herrero, G., Wu, W., Rutanen, K., Soriano, M., Pipa, G., and Vicente, R. 2015. Assessing coupling dynamics from an ensemble of time series. *Entropy*, **17**(4): 1958–1970. [Multidisciplinary Digital Publishing Institute.] doi:[10.3390/e17041958](https://doi.org/10.3390/e17041958).
- Good, I.J. 1963. A causal calculus. *Br. Soc. Philos. Sci.* **197**(4869): 753–753. doi:[10.1038/197753a0](https://doi.org/10.1038/197753a0).
- Granger, C.W.J. 1969. Investigating causal relations by econometric models and cross-spectral methods. *Econometrica*, **37**: 424–438. doi:[10.2307/1912791](https://doi.org/10.2307/1912791).
- Groot, R., De Fisher, B., Christie, M., and Aronson, J. 2010. Integrating the ecological and economic dimensions in biodiversity and ecosystem service valuation. In (TEEB): Ecological and Economic Foundations. Earthscan.
- Grossman, M. 2008. The relationship between health and schooling. *East. Econ. J.* **34**(3): 281–292. [Nature Publishing Group.] doi:[10.1057/eej.2008.13](https://doi.org/10.1057/eej.2008.13).
- Guinée, J. 2002. Handbook on life cycle assessment operational guide to the ISO standards. *Int. J. Life Cycle Assess.*
- Haberl, H., Erb, K., Krausmann, F., Gaube, V., Bondeau, A., Plutzer, C., Gingrich, S., Lucht, W., and Fischer-Kowalski, M. 2007. Quantifying and mapping the human appropriation of net primary production in earth's terrestrial ecosystems. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* **104**(31): 12942–12947. PMID: 17616580.
- Hahn, J., Todd, P., and Van der Klaauw, W. 2001. Identification and estimation of treatment effects with a regression-discontinuity design. *Econometrica*, **69**(1): 201–209. doi:[10.1111/1468-0262.00183](https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-0262.00183).
- Hák, T., Janoušková, S., and Moldan, B. 2016. Sustainable Development goals: A need for relevant indicators. *Ecol. Indic.* **60**: 565–573. doi:[10.1016/j.ecolind.2015.08.003](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolind.2015.08.003).
- Halicioglu, F. 2009. An econometric study of CO₂ emissions, energy consumption, income and foreign trade in Turkey. *Energy Pol.* **37**(3): 1156–1164. doi:[10.1016/j.enpol.2008.11.012](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2008.11.012).
- Hallstein, E., and Villas-Boas, S. 2013. Can household consumers save the wild fish? Lessons from a sustainable seafood advisory. *J. Environ. Econ.* **66**: 52–71.
- Hanna, R., and Oliva, P. 2015. The effect of pollution on labor supply: Evidence from a natural experiment in Mexico City. *J. Public Econ.* **122**: 68–79. doi:[10.1016/j.jpubeco.2014.10.004](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpubeco.2014.10.004).
- Hansen, B.E. 2015. *Econometrics*. University of Wisconsin.
- Heckman, J.J., and Vytlačil, E.J. 2001. Instrumental variables, selection models, and tight bounds on the average treatment effect. Springer.
- Heckman, J.J., Humphries, J.E., Veramendi, G., and Urzua, S.S. 2014. Education, health and wages. NBER Working Paper No. 19971.
- Hellweg, S., and Mila i Canals, L. 2014. Emerging approaches, challenges and opportunities in life cycle assessment. *Science*, **344**(6188): 1109–1113. doi:[10.1126/science.1248361](https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1248361). PMID: 24904154.
- Hertwich, E. 2010. Assessing the environmental impacts of consumption and production: priority products and materials. IRP UNEP.
- Hertwich, E.G., Gibon, T., Bouman, E.A., Arvesen, A., Suh, S., Heath, G.A., Bergesen, J.D., Ramirez, A., Vega, M.I., and Shi, L. 2014. Integrated life-cycle assessment of electricity-supply scenarios confirms global environmental benefit of low-carbon technologies. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* **112**: 6277–6282. doi:[10.1073/pnas.1312753111](https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1312753111). PMID: 25288741.
- Hiemstra, C., and Jones, J.D. 1994. Testing for linear and nonlinear Granger causality in the stock price-volume relation. *J. Finance*, **49**(5): 1639–1664. [Wiley Online Library.] doi:[10.1111/j.1540-6261.1994.tb04776.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6261.1994.tb04776.x).
- Hlaváčková-Schindler, K., Paluš, M., Vejmelka, M., and Bhattacharya, J. 2007. Causality detection based on information-theoretic approaches in time series analysis. *Phys. Rep.* **441**(1): 1–46. [Elsevier.] doi:[10.1016/j.physrep.2006.12.004](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physrep.2006.12.004).
- Ho, D.E., Imai, K., King, G., and Stuart, E.A. 2006. Matching as nonparametric preprocessing for reducing model dependence in parametric causal inference. *Polit. Anal.* **15**(3): 199–236. doi:[10.1093/pan/mpj1013](https://doi.org/10.1093/pan/mpj1013).
- Hoekstra, A.Y., and Mekonnen, M.M. 2012. The water footprint of humanity. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* **109**(9): 3232–3237. doi:[10.1073/pnas.1109936109](https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1109936109). PMID: 22331890.
- Hofman, J., Sharma, A., and Watts, D. 2017. Prediction and explanation in social systems. *Science*, **355**(6324): 486–488. doi:[10.1126/science.aal3856](https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aal3856). PMID: 28154051.
- Holland, P.W. 1986a. Statistics and causal inference. *J. Am. Stat. Assoc.* **81**(396): 945–960. doi:[10.1080/01621459.1986.10478354](https://doi.org/10.1080/01621459.1986.10478354).
- Holland, P.W. 1986b. Statistics and causal inference. *J. Am. Stat. Assoc.* **81**(396): 945–960. [Taylor & Francis.] doi:[10.1080/01621459.1986.10478354](https://doi.org/10.1080/01621459.1986.10478354).
- Holland, P. 2003. Causation and race. ETS Research Report Series, 2003(1): i–21. doi:[10.1002/j.2333-8504.2003.tb01895.x](https://doi.org/10.1002/j.2333-8504.2003.tb01895.x).
- Homer-Dixon, T.F. 1991. On the threshold: environmental changes as causes of acute conflict. *Int. Secur.* **16**: 76–116. [JSTOR.] doi:[10.2307/2539061](https://doi.org/10.2307/2539061).
- Hossain, M. 2011. Panel estimation for CO₂ emissions, energy consumption, economic growth, trade openness and urbanization of newly industrialized countries. *Energy Pol.* **39**(11): 6991–6999. doi:[10.1016/j.enpol.2011.07.042](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2011.07.042).
- Hsiang, S.M., and Meng, K.C. 2014. Reconciling disagreement over climate-conflict results in Africa. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* **111**(6): 2100–2103. doi:[10.1073/pnas.1316006111](https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1316006111). PMID: 24520173.
- Hsiang, S.M., Meng, K.C., and Cane, M.A. 2011. Civil conflicts are associated with the global climate. *Nature*, **476**(7361): 438–441. [Nature Publishing Group.] doi:[10.1038/nature10311](https://doi.org/10.1038/nature10311). PMID: 21866157.
- Hu, S., Dai, G., Worrell, G., and Dai, Q. 2011. Causality analysis of neural connectivity: critical examination of existing methods and advances of new methods. *IEEE Trans. Neural Networks*, **22**(6): 829–844. doi:[10.1109/TNN.2011.2123917](https://doi.org/10.1109/TNN.2011.2123917). PMID: 21511564.
- Hughes, T., Carpenter, S., Rockström, J., Scheffer, M., and Walker, B. 2013. Multiscale regime shifts and planetary boundaries. *Trends Ecol. Evol.* **28**: 389–395. doi:[10.1016/j.tree.2013.05.019](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2013.05.019). PMID: 23769417.
- Hume, D. 1902. Enquiries concerning the human understanding: and concerning the principles of morals. English ed. Clarendon Press.
- Huppes, G., Koning, A., Suh, S., and Heijungs, R. 2006. Environmental impacts of consumption in the European Union: high-resolution input-output tables with detailed environmental extensions. *J. Ind. Ecol.* **10**(3): 129–146. doi:[10.1162/jiec.2006.10.3.129](https://doi.org/10.1162/jiec.2006.10.3.129).
- Iacus, S.M., King, G., and Porro, G. 2012. Causal inference without balance checking: Coarsened exact matching. *Polit. Anal.* **20**(1): 1–24. doi:[10.1093/pan/mpr013](https://doi.org/10.1093/pan/mpr013).
- Imbens, G., and Lemieux, T. 2008. Regression discontinuity designs: A guide to practice. *J. Econom.* **142**(2): 615–635. doi:[10.1016/j.jeconom.2007.05.001](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeconom.2007.05.001).
- International Council for Science, I.S.S.C. 2015. Review of targets for the Sustainable Development Goals: The Science Perspective.
- ISO. 2006. ISO 14044: Environmental management — life cycle assessment — requirements and guidelines. *Environ. Manage.* **3**: 54.
- Kahneman, D., and Krueger, A.B. 2006. Developments in the measurement of subjective well-being. *J. Econ. Perspect.* **20**(1): 3–24. [American Economic Association.] doi:[10.1257/089533006776526030](https://doi.org/10.1257/089533006776526030).
- Kampen, J.K. 2010. A methodological note on the making of causal statements in the debate on anthropogenic global warming. *Theor. Appl. Climatol.* **104**(3–4): 423–427. doi:[10.1007/s00704-010-0355-y](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00704-010-0355-y).
- Kang, J., and Larsson, R. 2013. What is the link between temperature and carbon dioxide levels? A Granger causality analysis based on ice core data. *Theor. Appl. Climatol.* **116**(3–4): 537–548. doi:[10.1007/s00704-013-0960-7](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00704-013-0960-7).
- Katura, T., Tanaka, N., Obata, A., Sato, H., and Maki, A. 2006. Quantitative evaluation of interrelations between spontaneous low-frequency oscillations in cerebral hemodynamics and systemic cardiovascular dynamics. *Neuroimage*, **31**(4): 1592–1600. [Elsevier.] doi:[10.1016/j.neuroimage.2006.02.010](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2006.02.010). PMID: 16549367.
- Kreuzer, M. 2016. Assessing causal inference problems with Bayesian process tracing: the economic effects of proportional representation and the problem of endogeneity. *New Polit. Econ.* **21**: 473–483. doi:[10.1080/13563467.2015.1134467](https://doi.org/10.1080/13563467.2015.1134467).
- Kullback, S., and Leibler, R.A. 1951. On information and sufficiency. *Ann. Math. Stat.* **22**: 79–86. [JSTOR.] doi:[10.1214/aoms/1177729694](https://doi.org/10.1214/aoms/1177729694).
- Kumar, P., and Ruddell, B. 2010. Information driven ecohydrologic self-organization. *Entropy*, **12**(10): 2085–2096. doi:[10.3390/e12102085](https://doi.org/10.3390/e12102085).
- Laplace, P. 1902. A philosophical essay on probabilities. English ed. John Wiley, New York.
- Laurenti, R., Singh, J., Sinha, R., Potting, J., and Frostell, B. 2015. Unintended environmental consequences of improvement actions: a qualitative analysis of systems' structure and behavior. *Syst. Res. Behav. Sci.* (January 2014). doi:[10.1002/sres.2330](https://doi.org/10.1002/sres.2330).
- Laurenti, R., Sinha, R., Singh, J., and Frostell, B. 2016. Towards addressing unintended environmental consequences: a planning framework. *Sustain. Dev.* **24**: 1–17. doi:[10.1002/sd.1601](https://doi.org/10.1002/sd.1601).
- Lechner, M. 2001. Identification and estimation of causal effects of multiple treatments under the conditional independence assumption. Springer.
- Lee, D., and Lemieux, T. 2010. Regression discontinuity designs in economics. *J. Econ. Lit.* **48**(2): 281–355. doi:[10.1257/jel.48.2.281](https://doi.org/10.1257/jel.48.2.281).
- Lehnertz, K., and Dikten, H. 2015. Assessing directionality and strength of coupling through symbolic analysis: an application to epilepsy patients. *Philos. Trans. R. Soc. A Math. Phys. Eng. Sci.* **373**(2034): 20140094. [The Royal Society.] doi:[10.1098/rsta.2014.0094](https://doi.org/10.1098/rsta.2014.0094).
- Lenzen, M., Moran, D., Kanemoto, K., Foran, B., Lobefaro, L., and Geschke, A. 2012. International trade drives biodiversity threats in developing nations. *Nature*, **486**(7401): 109–112. doi:[10.1038/nature11145](https://doi.org/10.1038/nature11145). PMID: 22678290.
- Liddle, B., and Lung, S. 2014. Might electricity consumption cause urbanization instead? Evidence from heterogeneous panel long-run causality tests. *Glob. Environ. Change*, **24**: 42–51. doi:[10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2013.11.013](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2013.11.013).
- Linker, M., Smith, R., Zhu, Y., Martyr, D.J., Suedmeyer, B., Pramono, J., and Leader-Williams, N. 2008. Evaluating biodiversity conservation around a large Sumatran protected area. *Conserv. Biol.* **22**(3): 683–690. doi:[10.1111/j.1523-1739.2008.00906.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1523-1739.2008.00906.x). PMID: 18336620.
- Lizier, J.T., and Prokopenko, M. 2010. Differentiating information transfer and causal effect. *Eur. Phys. J. B*, **73**(4): 605–615. [Springer.] doi:[10.1140/epjb/e2010-00034-5](https://doi.org/10.1140/epjb/e2010-00034-5).
- Loewenstein, G., and Prelec, D. 1992. Anomalies in intertemporal choice: Evidence and an interpretation. *Q. J. Econ.* **107**: 573–597. doi:[10.2307/2118482](https://doi.org/10.2307/2118482).
- Long, X., Naminse, E.Y., Du, J., and Zhuang, J. 2015. Nonrenewable energy, renewable energy, carbon dioxide emissions and economic growth in China from 1952 to 2012. *Renew. Sustain. Energy Rev.* **52**: 680–688. doi:[10.1016/j.rser.2015.07.176](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2015.07.176).
- Luo, M., Kantz, H., Lau, N.-C., Huang, W., and Zhou, Y. 2015. Questionable dynamical evidence for causality between galactic cosmic rays and interannual variation in global temperature. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* **112**(34): E4638–E4639. doi:[10.1073/pnas.1510571112](https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1510571112). PMID: 26283407.
- Maertens, M., Colen, L., and Swinnen, J.F.M. 2011. Globalisation and poverty in

- Senegal: a worst case scenario? *Eur. Rev. Agric. Econ.* **38**: 31–54. doi:10.1093/erae/jbq053.
- Malik, O.A., Hsu, A., Johnson, L.A., and de Sherbinin, A. 2015. A global indicator of wastewater treatment to inform the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). *Environ. Sci. Pol.* **48**: 172–185. [Elsevier.] doi:10.1016/j.envsci.2015.01.005.
- Managi, S., Hibiki, A., and Tsurumi, T. 2009. Does trade openness improve environmental quality? *J. Environ. Econ. Manage.* **58**(3): 346–363. doi:10.1016/j.jeem.2009.04.008.
- Mancini, L., Benini, L., and Sala, S. 2015. Resource footprint of Europe: Complementarity of material flow analysis and life cycle assessment for policy support. *Environ. Sci. Pol.* **54**: 367–376. [Elsevier.] doi:10.1016/j.envsci.2015.07.025.
- Marvuglia, A., Benetto, E., and Murgante, B. 2015. Calling for an integrated computational systems modelling framework for life cycle sustainability analysis. *J. Environ. Account. Manage.* **3**(3): 213–216. doi:10.5890/JEAM.2015.09.001.
- Matthews, E., Amann, C., Bringezu, S., Fischer-Kowalski, M., Hüttler, W., Kleijn, R., et al. 2000. The weight of nations. Material outflows from industrial economies. World Resources Institute, Washington, D.C.
- Maxim, L., and van der Sluijs, J.P. 2011. Quality in environmental science for policy: Assessing uncertainty as a component of policy analysis. *Environ. Sci. Pol.* **14**(4): 482–492. [Elsevier.] doi:10.1016/j.envsci.2011.01.003.
- McCracken, J., and Weigel, R. 2014. Convergent cross-mapping and pairwise asymmetric inference. *Phys. Rev. E*, **90**(6). doi:10.1103/PhysRevE.90.062903.
- Mei-chu, W. 1987. Tests of causality and exogeneity between exports and economic growth: the case of Asian NICs. *J. Econ. Dev.* **12**(2).
- Menyah, K., and Wolde-Rufael, Y. 2010. CO₂ emissions, nuclear energy, renewable energy and economic growth in the US. *Energy Pol.* **38**: 2911–2915. doi:10.1016/j.enpol.2010.01.024.
- Michalsky, M., and Hooda, P.S. 2015. Greenhouse gas emissions of imported and locally produced fruit and vegetable commodities: A quantitative assessment. *Environ. Sci. Pol.* **48**: 32–43. [Elsevier.] doi:10.1016/j.envsci.2014.12.018.
- Miguel, E., Satyanath, S., and Sergenti, E. 2004. Economic shocks and civil conflict: an instrumental variables approach. *J. Polit. Econ.* **112**(4): 725–753. doi:10.1086/421174.
- Mill, J.S. 1856. A system of logic, ratiocinative and inductive, being a connected view of the principles, and the methods of scientific investigation. JW Parker.
- Miller, C., Tsoka, M., and Reichert, K. 2011. The impact of the Social Cash Transfer Scheme on food security in Malawi. *Food Pol.* **36**: 230–238. doi:10.1016/j.foodpol.2010.11.020.
- Mirshojaeian, H., and Kaneko, S. 2012. Causality between pillars of sustainable development: global stylized facts or regional phenomena? *Ecol. Indic.* **14**(1): 197–201. [Elsevier Ltd.] doi:10.1016/j.ecolind.2011.07.005.
- Morgan, S.L. 2013. Handbook of causal analysis for social research. Springer.
- Morgan, S.L., and Harding, D.J. 2006. Matching estimators of causal effects. *Sociol. Methods Res.* **35**: 3–60. doi:10.1177/0049124106289164.
- Morgan, S.L., and Winship, C. 2007. Counterfactuals and causal inference. Cambridge University Press.
- Nelson, A., and Chomitz, K. 2011. Effectiveness of strict vs. multiple use protected areas in reducing tropical forest fires: a global analysis using matching methods. *PLoS ONE*, **6**: e22722. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0022722. PMID: 21857950.
- Ness, B., Urbel-Piirsalu, E., Anderberg, S., and Olsson, L. 2007. Categorising tools for sustainability assessment. *Ecol. Econ.* **60**(3): 498–508. doi:10.1016/j.ecolecon.2006.07.023.
- Newey, W.K., and Powell, J.L. 2003. Instrumental variable estimation of nonparametric models. *Econometrica*, **71**: 1565–1578. [JSTOR.] doi:10.1111/1468-0262.00459.
- Odum, E., and Barrett, G. 1971. Fundamentals of ecology. Vol. 3. Saunders, Pa.
- Omri, A., Nguyen, D., and Rault, C. 2014. Causal interactions between CO₂ emissions, FDI, and economic growth: evidence from dynamic simultaneous-equation models. *Econ. Model.* **42**: 382–389. doi:10.1016/j.econmod.2014.07.026.
- Oreopoulos, P., and Petronijevic, U. 2013. Making college worth it: A review of research on the returns to higher education. NBER Working Paper No. 19053.
- Oreopoulos, P., and Salvanes, K.G. 2011. Priceless: The nonpecuniary benefits of schooling. *J. Econ. Perspect.* **25**: 159–184. [JSTOR.] doi:10.1257/jep.25.1.159.
- Palus, M., and Vejmelka, M. 2007. Directionality of coupling from bivariate time series: how to avoid false causalities and missed connections. *Phys. Rev. E. Stat. Nonlin. Soft Matter Phys.* **75**(5 Pt 2): 056211. [American Physical Society.] doi:10.1103/PhysRevE.75.056211.
- Pao, H., and Tsai, C. 2011a. Multivariate Granger causality between CO₂ emissions, energy consumption, FDI (foreign direct investment) and GDP (gross domestic product): evidence from a panel of BRIC (Brazil, Russian Federation, India, and China) countries. *Energy*. **36**: 685–693. doi:10.1016/j.energy.2010.09.041.
- Pao, H., and Tsai, C. 2011b. Modeling and forecasting the CO₂ emissions, energy consumption, and economic growth in Brazil. *Energy*, **36**(5): 2450–2458. doi:10.1016/j.energy.2011.01.032.
- Pearce, D., Groom, B., Hepburn, C., and Koundouri, P. 2003. Valuing the future. *World Econ.* **4**(2): 121–141.
- Pearl, J. 1995. Causal diagrams for empirical research. *Biometrika*, **82**(4): 669–688. [Biometrika Trust.] doi:10.1093/biomet/82.4.669.
- Pearl, J. 2000a. Causal inference without counterfactuals. *J. Am. Stat. Assoc.* **95**(450): 428–431. doi:10.2307/2669380.
- Pearl, J. 2000b. Causality: models, reasoning, and inference Cambridge University Press New York, NY, USA.
- Pearl, J. 2009. Causality. Cambridge University Press.
- Pearson, K. 1911. The grammar of science. 3rd ed. A.C. Black, London, Engl. 153.
- Peters, G. 2010. Carbon footprints and embodied carbon at multiple scales. *Curr. Opin. Environ. Sustain.* **2**(4): 245–250. doi:10.1016/j.cosust.2010.05.004.
- Plevin, R., Delucchi, M., and Creutzig, F. 2014. Using attributional life cycle assessment to estimate climate-change mitigation benefits misleads policy makers. *J. Ind.* **18**: 73–83.
- Puhani, P. 2012. The treatment effect, the cross difference, and the interaction term in nonlinear “difference-in-differences” models. *Econ. Lett.* **115**(1): 85–87. doi:10.1016/j.econlet.2011.11.025.
- Raleigh, C., Linke, A., and O’Loughlin, J. 2014. Extreme temperatures and violence. *Nat. Clim. Change*, **4**(2): 76–77. [Nature Publishing Group.] doi:10.1038/nclimate2101.
- Razak, F.A., and Jensen, H.J. 2014. Quantifying “causality” in complex systems: understanding transfer entropy. *PLoS ONE*, **9**: e99462. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0099462. PMID:24955766.
- Rijke, J., Farrelly, M., Brown, R., and Zevenbergen, C. 2013. Configuring transformative governance to enhance resilient urban water systems. *Environ. Sci. Pol.* **25**: 62–72. doi:10.1016/j.envsci.2012.09.012.
- Rimer, B. 1998. Correlation is not causation. *Am. J. Public Health*, **88**(5): 832–835. doi:10.2105/AJPH.88.5.832. PMID:9585761.
- Rockström, J., Steffen, W., Noone, K., Persson, Å., Chapin, F.S., III, Lambin, E., et al. 2009. Planetary boundaries: exploring the safe operating space for humanity. *Ecol. Soc.* **14**: 32.
- Rosenbaum, P.R. 1984. Testing the conditional independence and monotonicity assumptions of item response theory. *Psychometrika*, **49**(3): 425–435. [Springer.] doi:10.1007/BF02306030.
- Ruben, R., Fort, R., and Zúñiga-Arias, G. 2009. Measuring the impact of fair trade on development. *Dev. Practice*, **19**: 777–788. doi:10.1080/09614520903207049.
- Rubin, D.B. 1973. Matching to remove bias in observational studies. *Biometrics*, **29**(1): 159–183. doi:10.2307/2529684.
- Rubin, D.B. 1974. Estimating causal effects of treatments in randomized and nonrandomized studies. *J. Edu. Psychol.* **66**: 688–701. doi:10.1037/h0037350.
- Rubin, D.B. 1978. Bayesian inference for causal effects: The role of randomization. *Ann. Stat.* **6**: 34–58. [JSTOR.] doi:10.1214/aos/1176344064.
- Rubin, D.B. 1980. Comment. *J. Am. Stat. Assoc.* **75**(371): 591–593. [Taylor & Francis.] doi:10.1080/01621459.1980.10477517.
- Rubin, D.B. 1986. Which ifs have causal answers? *Statistics (Ber.)*, **81**(396): 961–962.
- Runge, J. 2015. Quantifying information transfer and mediation along causal pathways in complex systems. *Phys. Rev. E*, **92**. doi:10.1103/PhysRevE.92.062829.
- Runge, J., Heitzig, J., Petoukhov, V., and Kurths, J. 2012. Escaping the curse of dimensionality in estimating multivariate transfer entropy. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **108**: 258701. doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.108.258701. PMID:23004667.
- Russell, B. 1912. On the notion of cause. In *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society*. pp. 1–26.
- Russo, F. 2009. Causality and causal modelling in the social sciences. In *Causality and causal modelling in the social sciences*. doi:10.1007/978-14020-8817-9.
- Russo, F., and Williamson, J. 2007. Interpreting causality in the health sciences. *Int. Stud. Philos. Sci.* **21**(2): 157–170. doi:10.1080/02698590701498084.
- Russo, F., Wunsch, G., and Mouchart, M. 2011. Inferring causality through counterfactuals in observational studies: some epistemological issues. *Bull. Methodol.* **111**(1978): 43–64. doi:10.1177/0759106311408891.
- Sachs, J., and McArthur, J. 2005. The millennium project: a plan for meeting the millennium development goals. *Lancet*.
- Salmon, W. 1980. Probabilistic causality. *Pacific Philosophical Quarterly*, **61**: 50–74.
- Schindler, D., and Hilborn, R. 2015. Prediction, precaution, and policy under global change. *Science*, **347**(6225): 953–954. doi:10.1126/science.1261824. PMID:25722401.
- Schlenker, W., and Roberts, M.J. 2009. Nonlinear temperature effects indicate severe damages to U.S. crop yields under climate change. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* **106**(37): 15594–15598. doi:10.1073/pnas.0906865106. PMID:19717432.
- Schreiber, T. 2000a. Measuring information transfer. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **85**(2): 461–464. [APS.] doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.85.461. PMID:10991308.
- Schreiber, T. 2000b. Measuring information transfer. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **85**: 0–3. doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.85.461.
- Sekhon, J. 2011. Multivariate and propensity score matching. *J. Stat. Softw.* **42**(7): 52. doi:10.1.1.335.7044.
- Setboonsang, S., and Parnpiet, Z. 2008. Microfinance and the millennium development goals in Pakistan: impact assessment using propensity score matching. ADBI Institute, Discussion Paper No. 104. Asian Development Bank Institute, Tokyo.
- Seth, A.K., Barrett, A.B., and Barnett, L. 2015. Granger causality analysis in neuroscience and neuroimaging. *J. Neurosci.* **35**(8): 3293–3297. doi:10.1523/JNEUROSCI.4399-14.2015. PMID:25716830.
- Shaffer, T., and Johnson, D. 2008. Ways of learning: observational studies versus experiments. *J. Wildl. Manage.* **72**. doi:10.2193/2007-293.

- Shannon, C.E. 2001. A mathematical theory of communication. *ACM SIGMOBILE Mob. Comput. Commun. Rev.* 5(1): 3–55. [ACM.] doi:10.1145/584091.584093.
- Shiffrin, R.M. 2016. Drawing causal inference from Big Data. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* 113(27): 7308–7309. doi:10.1073/pnas.1608845113. PMID:27382143.
- Shimizu, S., Hoyer, P.O., Hyvärinen, A., and Kerminen, A. 2006. A linear non-Gaussian acyclic model for causal discovery. *J. Mach. Learn. Res.* 7: 2003–2030. [JMLR.org.]
- Simon, H., and Iwasaki, Y. 1988. Causal ordering, comparative statics, and near decomposability. *J. Econ.* 39(1): 149–173. doi:10.1016/0304-4076(88)90043-7.
- Smirnov, D.A., and Mokhov, I.I. 2015. Relating Granger causality to long-term causal effects. *Phys. Rev. E. Stat. Nonlin. Soft Matter Phys.* 92(4): 042138. [American Physical Society.] doi:10.1103/PhysRevE.92.042138. PMID:26565199.
- Smith, D., and Vivekananda, J. 2007. A climate of conflict: the links between climate change, peace and war (London: International Alert).
- Smith, G., and Pell, J. 2003. Parachute use to prevent death and major trauma related to gravitational challenge: systematic review of randomised controlled trials. *BMJ Br. Med. J.* 327(7429): 1459. doi:10.1136/bmj.327.7429.1459.
- Sobel, M.E. 2006. What do randomized studies of housing mobility demonstrate? Causal inference in the face of interference. *J. Am. Stat. Assoc.* 101(476): 1398–1407. [Taylor & Francis.]
- Soytas, U., Sari, R., and Ewing, B. 2007. Energy consumption, income, and carbon emissions in the United States. *Ecol. Econ.* 62(3): 482–489. doi:10.1016/j.ecolecon.2006.07.009.
- Steffen, W., Richardson, K., Rockstrom, J., Cornell, S.E., Fetzer, I., Bennett, E.M., et al. 2015. Planetary boundaries: Guiding human development on a changing planet. *Science*, 347(6223): 1259855. doi:10.1126/science.1259855. PMID: 25592418.
- Stephens, P.A., Pettorelli, N., Barlow, J., Whittingham, M.J., and Cadotte, M.W. 2014. Management by proxy? The use of indices in applied ecology. *J. Appl. Ecol.* 52: 1–6. doi:10.1111/1365-2664.12383.
- Stern, D.I. 2004. The rise and fall of the environmental Kuznets Curve. *World Dev.* 32(8): 1419–1439. doi:10.1016/j.worlddev.2004.03.004.
- Stern, D.I., and Kaufmann, R.K. 2013. Anthropogenic and natural causes of climate change. *Clim. Change*, 122(1–2): 257–269. doi:10.1007/s10584-013-1007-x.
- Stuart, E.A. 2010. Matching methods for causal inference: a review and a look forward. *Stat. Sci.* 25(1): 1–21. doi:10.1214/09-STS313. PMID:20871802.
- Stuart, E., and Rubin, D. 2008. Best practices in quasi-experimental designs. *In* Best practices in quantitative methods. pp. 155–176.
- Sugihara, G., and May, R. 1990. Nonlinear forecasting as a way of distinguishing chaos from measurement error in time series. *Nature*, 344(6268): 734. doi:10.1038/344734a0. PMID:2330029.
- Sugihara, G., May, R., Ye, H., Hsieh, C.-h., Deyle, E., Fogarty, M., and Munch, S. 2012. Detecting causality in complex ecosystems. *Science*, 338(6106): 496–500. doi:10.1126/science.1227079. PMID:22997134.
- Suh, S. 2009. Handbook of input-output economics in industrial ecology. Springer Science & Business Media.
- Suh, S., and Yang, Y. 2014. On the uncanny capabilities of consequential LCA. *Int. J. Life Cycle Assess.* 19(6): 1179–1184. doi:10.1007/s11367-014-0739-9.
- Sun, L., and Wang, M. 1996. Global warming and global dioxide emission: an empirical study. *J. Environ. Manage.* 46: 327–343. doi:10.1006/jema.1996.0025.
- Suppes, P. 1970. A probabilistic theory of causality. North-Holland Publishing Company.
- Suweis, S., Rinaldo, A., Maritan, A., and D’Odorico, P. 2013. Water-controlled wealth of nations. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* 110(11): 4230–4233. doi:10.1073/pnas.1222452110. PMID:23359709.
- Suweis, S., Carr, J.A., Maritan, A., Rinaldo, A., and D’Odorico, P. 2015. Resilience and reactivity of global food security. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* 112(22): 201507366. doi:10.1073/pnas.1507366112.
- Takens, F. 1981. Detecting strange attractors in turbulence. Springer.
- Tenenhaus, M., Vinzi, V.E., Chatelin, Y.-M., and Lauro, C. 2005. PLS path modeling. *Comput. Stat. Data Anal.* 48(1): 159–205. [Elsevier.] doi:10.1016/j.csda.2004.03.005.
- Thaler, R. 1981. Some empirical evidence on dynamic inconsistency. *Econ. Lett.* 8: 201–207. doi:10.1016/0165-1765(81)90067-7.
- Tol, R., and De Vos, A. 1998. A Bayesian statistical analysis of the enhanced greenhouse effect. *Clim. Change*, 38: 87–112. doi:10.1023/A:1005390515242.
- Triacca, U. 2005. Is Granger causality analysis appropriate to investigate the relationship between atmospheric concentration of carbon dioxide and global surface air temperature? *Theor. Appl. Climatol.* 81(3–4): 133–135. [Springer.] doi:10.1007/s00704-004-0112-1.
- Tsonis, A.A., Deyle, E.R., May, R.M., Sugihara, G., Swanson, K., Verbeten, J.D., and Wang, G. 2015. Dynamical evidence for causality between galactic cosmic rays and interannual variation in global temperature. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* 112(11): 3253–3256. doi:10.1073/pnas.1420291112. PMID:25733877.
- Tukker, A., Huppes, G., Oers, L., and Heijungs, R. 2006. Environmentally extended input-output tables and models for Europe. Available from <https://openaccess.leidenuniv.nl/handle/1887/11433> [accessed 9 June 2016].
- Turnheim, B., Berkhout, F., Geels, F., Hof, A., McMeekin, A., Nykvist, B., and van Vuuren, D. 2015. Evaluating sustainability transitions pathways: Bridging analytical approaches to address governance challenges. *Glob. Environ. Change*, 35: 239–253. doi:10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2015.08.010.
- United Nations. 2014. Sustainable development goals. United Nations sustainable development knowledge platform. Available from <http://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/?menu=1300> [accessed 17 April 2015].
- van Nes, E.H., Scheffer, M., Brovkin, V., Lenton, T.M., Ye, H., Deyle, E., and Sugihara, G. 2015. Causal feedbacks in climate change. *Nat. Clim. Change*, 5(5): 445–448. [Nature Publishing Group.] doi:10.1038/nclimate2568.
- Varian, H.R. 2016. Causal inference in economics and marketing. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* 113(27): 7310–7315. doi:10.1073/pnas.1510479113. PMID:27382144.
- Voytenko, Y., McCormick, K., and Evans, J. 2016. Urban living labs for sustainability and low carbon cities in Europe: Towards a research agenda. *J. Clean. Prod.* 123: 45–54. doi:10.1016/j.jclepro.2015.08.053.
- Wagner, L., Ross, I., Foster, J., and Hankamer, B. 2016. Trading off global fuel supply, CO₂ emissions and sustainable development. *PLoS ONE*, 11: e0149406. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0149406. PMID:26959977.
- Wang, Y., Chen, L., and Kubota, J. 2016a. The relationship between urbanization, energy use and carbon emissions: evidence from a panel of Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) countries. *J. Clean. Prod.* 112: 1368–1374. doi:10.1016/j.jclepro.2015.06.041.
- Wang, Y., Li, L., Kubota, J., Han, R., Zhu, X., and Lu, G. 2016b. Does urbanization lead to more carbon emission? Evidence from a panel of BRICS countries. *Appl. Energy*, 168: 375–380. doi:10.1016/j.apenergy.2016.01.105.
- Weinzettel, J., Hertwich, E.G., Peters, G.P., Steen-Olsen, K., and Galli, A. 2013. Affluence drives the global displacement of land use. *Glob. Environ. Change*, 23(2): 433–438. [Elsevier Ltd.] doi:10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2012.12.010.
- Whiteman, G., Walker, B., and Perego, P. 2013. Planetary boundaries: Ecological foundations for corporate sustainability. *J. Manage. Stud.* 50: 307–336. doi:10.1111/j.1467-6486.2012.01073.x.
- Wibral, M., Pampu, N., Priesemann, V., Siebenhühner, F., Seiwert, H., Lindner, M., Lizier, J.T., and Vicente, R. 2013. Measuring information-transfer delays. *PLoS ONE*, 8(2): e55809. [Public Library of Science.] doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0055809. PMID:23468850.
- Wiedmann, T., and Minx, J. 2007. A definition of ‘carbon footprint’. *Science*, 1(01): 1–11.
- Wiener, N. 1956. The theory of prediction. *Mod. Math. Eng.* 1: 125–139. [McGraw-Hill, New York.]
- Wold, H. 1982. Soft modelling: the basic design and some extensions. *Systems under indirect observation. Part II.* North Holland Press, Amsterdam, the Netherlands. pp. 36–37.
- Wright, S. 1921. Correlation and causation. *J. Agric. Res.* 20(7): 557–585. [Washington.]
- Xu, M., Cai, H., and Liang, S. 2015. Big data and industrial ecology. *J. Ind. Ecol.* 19(2): 205–210. doi:10.1111/jiec.12241.
- Yang, S., Imbens, G.W., Cui, Z., Faries, D.E., and Kadziola, Z. 2016. Propensity score matching and subclassification in observational studies with multi-level treatments. *Biomet. Methodol.* 72: 1055–1085.
- Ye, H., Deyle, E.R., Gilarranz, L.J., and Sugihara, G. 2015. Distinguishing time-delayed causal interactions using convergent cross mapping. *Sci. Rep.* 5: 14750. [Nature Publishing Group.] doi:10.1038/srep14750. PMID:26435402.
- Young, P., Ng, C., Lane, K., and Parker, D. 1991. Recursive forecasting, smoothing and seasonal adjustment of non-stationary environmental data. *J. Forecast.* 10(1–2): 57–89. doi:10.1002/for.3980100105.
- Zamagni, A., Guinée, J., Heijungs, R., Masoni, P., and Raggi, A. 2012. Lights and shadows in consequential LCA. *Int. J. Life Cycle Assess.* 17(7): 904–918. doi:10.1007/s11367-012-0423-x.
- Zapata, H., and Rambaldi, A. 1997. Monte Carlo evidence on cointegration and causation. *Oxford Bull. Econ. Stat.* 59(2): 285–298. doi:10.1111/1468-0084.00065.
- Zivot, E., and Wang, J. 2006. Vector autoregressive models for multivariate time series. *In* Modeling Finance Time Series with S-PLUS. pp. 369–413. Springer.

Appendix A

Appendix Table A1 appears on the following pages.

Table A1. Synthesis of studies surveyed.

Author	Country/Region	Results
Regression-based causality		
Antweiler et al. (1998)	Multi-regional	Environmental regulations and capital-labor endowments determine SO ₂ concentrations and conclude that openness and freer trade appear to be good for the environment
Cole and Elliott (2003)	Multi-regional	Environmental regulations effects and capital-labor effects determine SO ₂ concentration. The results are not confirmed for other pollutants, such as NO _x , biochemical oxygen demand (BOD) and CO ₂ , for which an increase in emissions is likely to happen as a result of freer trade
Frankel and Rose (2005)	Multi-regional	Trade appears to have a beneficial effect on some measures of environmental quality (e.g. concentrations of SO ₂ and NO ₂)
Managi et al. (2009)	Multi-regional	Trade has detrimental effects on SO ₂ and CO ₂ in non-OECD countries
Schlenker and Roberts (2009)	Multi-regional	Nonlinear relationship between climate change and yields
Barreca et al. (2013)	United States	Decline in the mortality effect of temperature extremes in the 20th century in the United States
Deschenes et al. (2009)	United States	GHG have deleterious effects on fetal health, decrease birth weight and increase the probability of low birth weight
Deschenes and Moretti (2009)	United States	Climate policy increases mortality and migration
Deschenes (2010)	United States	Climate change determines fluctuations in the labor markets
Deschenes and Greenstone (2007)	United States	Climate change reduces profits from agriculture
Deschenes and Kolstad (2011)	California	Climate change reduces profits from agriculture
Hsiang et al. (2011)	Multi-regional	A causal link between climate change and conflict does exist at various scales, also for relatively richer countries
Buhaug (2010)	Multi-regional	There is no causal link between climate and social conflict
Hsiang and Meng (2014)	Africa	Climate change affect conflicts in Africa
Ruben et al. (2009)	Peru and Costa Rica	Fair trade improves access of farmers to credit, investments and affects their attitude to risk
Hallstein and Villas-Boas (2013)	United States	Eco-label led to a significant decline in the range of 15%-40% of the consumption of products with limited environmental sustainability
Miller et al. (2011)	Malawi	Food security is improved by the transfer of cash by the government to rural households
Blackman and Naranjo (2012)	Costa Rica	Organic certification improves the environmental performance of coffee growers
Maertens et al. (2011)	Senegal	Significant positive impact of globalization on poverty reduction through employment creation and labor market participation
Setboonsarng and Parpiev (2008)	Pakistan	Micro-credit initiatives reduce poverty
Arun et al. (2006)	India	Positive influence on health determined by new toilet construction. No impact was found on height-for-age
Costello et al. (2008, 2010)	Global	Catch shares prevent the collapse of global fish resources
Linkie et al. (2008)	Indonesia	No evidence of a positive effect of the protected area on the reduction of deforestation
Nelson and Chomitz (2011)	Global	Protected areas substantially reduced fire incidence in Latin America, Asia, and Africa
Andam et al. (2008)	Costa Rica	Protected areas reduce deforestation
Ferraro and Hanauer (2014)	Costa Rica	Protected areas cause poverty reduction
Time-series causality using Granger-causality		
Omri et al. (2014)	54 countries	Bidirectional GC between foreign direct investment (FDI) and CO ₂ for all countries, except for those in Europe and North Asia. The study finds a unidirectional GC between CO ₂ and economic growth, except for the analyzed countries in the Middle East, North Africa, and sub-Saharan Africa, for which a bidirectional causality cannot be rejected
Pao and Tsai (2011a)	Brazil, Russian Federation, India, and China	CO ₂ emissions are highly responsive to change in both energy consumption and GDP, but not in FDI. The authors also find a unidirectional causality from energy consumption to emissions and a bi-directional GC between emissions and FDI
Soytas et al. (2007)	United States	Income does not Granger-cause carbon emissions in the US in the long run. Energy use Granger-cause carbon emissions
Chiou-Wei et al. (2008)	Sample of newly industrialized Asian countries; United States	Neutral GC between energy consumption and economic growth for United States, Thailand, and South Korea. Unidirectional causality from economic growth to energy consumption for Philippines and Singapore, evidence that energy consumption may have affected economic growth for Taiwan, Jong Kong, Malaysia, and Indonesia
Menyah and Wolde-Rufael (2010)	United States	No causality from renewable energy to CO ₂ , and a unidirectional causality from nuclear energy consumption to CO ₂ emissions

Table A1 (concluded).

Author	Country/Region	Results
Apergis and Payne (2009)	Central America	Energy consumption and economic growth Granger-cause CO ₂ emissions. There is a bivariate causality between energy consumption and CO ₂ emissions
Long et al. (2015)	China	Bivariate causality between GDP and CO ₂ emissions, and between GDP and coal, gas, and electricity consumption
Acaravci and Ozturk (2010)	Denmark, Germany, Greece, Iceland, Italy, Portugal and Switzerland	There is evidence of a causal relationship from energy consumption, income and carbon emissions
Halicioglu (2009)	Turkey	GC runs in both directions between CO ₂ emissions and income both in the short term and long term
Ang (2008)	Malaysia	The study confirms the existence of a causality running from economic growth to energy consumption growth, both in the short run and the long run
Chandran and Tang (2013)	Malaysia, Indonesia, Singapore, the Philippines, and Thailand	Causality running from economic growth to energy consumption growth
Fodha and Zaghdoud (2010)	Tunisia	Causality running from economic growth to energy consumption growth
Ghosh (2009)	India	Causality running from economic growth to energy consumption growth
Pao and Tsai (2011b)	Brazil	Causality running from economic growth to energy consumption growth
Hossain (2011)	9 emerging industrialized countries	No evidence of causality in the short and long run between urbanization and carbon emissions
Al-mulali and Sab (2012)	19 countries	Positive causal relationship between urbanization and CO ₂ emissions in 84% of the cases
Al-mulali et al. (2013)	MENA countries	Positive causal relationship between urbanization and CO ₂ emissions in 84% of the cases
Liddle and Lung (2014)	105 countries	Long-run bidirectional causality is found between urbanization and electricity consumption
Wang et al. (2016a)	ASEAN countries	Urbanization Granger-causes carbon emissions in the long and short run
Wang et al. (2016b)	BRICS countries	Urbanization Granger-causes carbon emissions in the long and short run
Young et al. (1991)	Global	Causal relationship between atmospheric CO ₂ concentrations and global sea surface temperatures
Sun and Wang (1996)	Global	Global surface temperature Granger-causes global CO ₂ emissions
Tol and De Vos (1998)	Global	There is a causal relationship between global mean surface air temperature and the atmospheric concentration of CO ₂
Stern and Kaufmann (2013)	Global	Both natural and anthropogenic forcing cause temperature change. Temperature causes greenhouse gas concentration changes
Kang and Larsson (2013)	Global	Carbon dioxide concentration Granger-causes temperature, as well as that temperature Granger-causes carbon dioxide concentration
Convergent cross mapping Sugihara et al. (2012)	California	The study finds causal evidence of the influence of climate forcing on populations of sardines and anchovies
van Nes et al. (2015)	Multi-regional	Marked positive feedback effect from temperature variability on GHG concentrations
Tsonis et al. (2015)	Global	No measurable evidence of the link between cosmic rays and global temperature. Significant causal effect of cosmic rays on short-term variability in global temperatures
Luo et al. (2015)	Global	No measurable evidence of the link between cosmic rays and global temperature
Transfer entropy Kumar and Ruddell (2010)	North America	The relationship between variability and information production leads to the emergence of ordered organization in an ecosystem