The Architecture of Belief: A Comparative Analysis of Evidence-Based Inference in Ecology and Economics

Contents

Part I: The Foundations of Scientific Inference

From Observation to Conclusion: The Inferential Leap

Defining Inference: Beyond Educated Guesses

At the very heart of the scientific method lies the process of inference: the structured act of drawing conclusions based on evidence and reasoning.[1] It is the intellectual engine that drives discovery, transforming the raw, unprocessed material of observation into the refined knowledge of scientific understanding.[3] Science is not a passive accumulation of facts; it is an active, interpretive endeavor. This necessitates a fundamental distinction between observation and inference. Observation provides the empirical bedrock—the raw data collected through sensory experience or instrumentation—while inference is the interpretive architecture built upon that foundation, a set of conclusions that extend logically beyond what was directly observed.[4]

This "inferential leap" from the specific data collected in a study to broader conclusions about the world is the defining characteristic of scientific inquiry.[6] When a drug trial on a small sample of patients shows positive results, scientists infer that the drug will be effective for a larger population in the future.[6] This process is not one of random speculation but of making informed, "educated guesses" rooted in available data and prior knowledge.[4] The evidence is said to

imply a conclusion, while the scientist *infers* it.[9] This terminology, while figurative, captures the sense of logical necessity that should guide the process; the conclusion should feel as though it is required by the evidence, not merely invented by the researcher.[9]

However, the same set of observations can lead to different inferences depending on the perspective, background knowledge, and potential biases of the observer.[4] An open umbrella may lead one to infer rain, but it could also be for protection from the sun.[9] This variability underscores the critical importance of rigor, transparency, and peer review in the scientific process, as these mechanisms serve to validate findings by subjecting them to diverse and critical viewpoints.[4] Ultimately, inference is the systematic methodology that turns data into discoveries, guiding scientists through the labyrinth of the unknown to arrive at logical, evidence-based conclusions.[3]

The Logic of Discovery: Induction, Deduction, and Abduction

The cognitive process of scientific inference is not monolithic; it is structured by distinct modes of logical reasoning that serve different functions within the cycle of inquiry. The three primary forms—induction, deduction, and abduction—together form a dynamic "triangle of exploration, explanation, and confirmation" that propels scientific knowledge forward.[6]

Inductive inference is the logic of discovery and generalization. It moves from specific, detailed observations to the formulation of broader patterns and theories.[3] This is the quintessential "Sherlock Holmes" method, where individual clues (data points) are pieced together to reveal a larger picture.[3] For instance, observing a consistent trend of rising temperatures in climate data over many decades leads to the inductive generalization of a theory about global warming.[3] In this way, induction serves as the foundation for exploratory research; scientists collect data from a sample and infer that the patterns observed will hold for the broader population or in future instances.[6] The strength of an inductive inference grows with the size of the sample and the number of times the investigation is repeated.[6]

Deductive inference, in contrast, is the logic of confirmation and prediction. It proceeds from a general premise or theory to a specific, logically necessary conclusion.[3] The classic syllogism is its purest form: if all men are mortal (premise 1) and Socrates is a man (premise 2), then Socrates must be mortal (conclusion).[6] In science, deduction is used to test theories by deriving testable predictions. A scientist might theorize that a particular gene regulates a cellular process. The deductive step is to predict that if the theory is correct, then deactivating that gene should produce a specific, observable change in the cell's behavior.[11] The experiment is then conducted to see if the prediction holds. According to the rules of formal logic, if the premises of a valid deductive argument are true, the conclusion cannot be false.[12]

Abductive inference is the logic of explanation. It is the creative process of generating the most plausible hypothesis to account for a surprising or anomalous observation.[6] Unlike induction, which identifies a pattern, or deduction, which tests a prediction, abduction proposes a cause. If a physician observes a set of symptoms, abduction is the reasoning process used to arrive at the most likely diagnosis. This form of inference is a conceptual leap that combines research findings with logical reasoning to propose novel explanations that go beyond the immediate data.[6] An abductive inference is fundamentally a "best guess" that is not guaranteed to be correct but provides a new, testable hypothesis that can then be subjected to deductive scrutiny.[6]

These three modes of reasoning are not mutually exclusive but are iteratively interwoven in the practice of science.[13] Inductive observations of the natural world lead to the abductive generation of explanatory hypotheses, which in turn yield deductive predictions that can be tested through further observation and experimentation. This cyclical process of exploration, explanation, and confirmation is the engine of scientific progress.

The Role of Models: Constructing Reality to Understand It

Scientific inference does not engage with the world directly; rather, it "invariably takes place via models".[1] A scientific model is a simplified, abstract representation of a phenomenon, constructed for the purpose of understanding, prediction, and analysis. Much of science is model-based, meaning that researchers build a conceptual or mathematical model of a system and use it to generate predictions about the data they expect to observe under specific conditions.[2] The core process of inference, therefore, is the comparison of these model-based predictions with actual empirical data.[2] This comparison allows scientists to assess how well a given model explains the data and, by extension, the phenomenon it represents.

This model-centric view of inference can be broken down into two essential components: model fitting and model comparison.[2]

Model fitting is the process of estimating the values of a model's parameters from a set of observational data. For example, in a simple model of planetary motion, the parameters might include the radius and period of a planet's orbit. Model fitting uses observational data to determine the specific values of these parameters that best align the model with reality.[2] Because all real-world data are subject to noise and measurement error, this process is inherently uncertain. This uncertainty is best quantified using the language of probability. The uncertainty in the data translates directly into uncertainty in the estimated model parameters. The most general and rigorous method of inference is to determine the probability distribution function (PDF) of the parameters given the data and the model, often expressed as

$P(\theta|D,M)$, where θ represents the parameters, D the data, and M the model. The shape of this PDF reveals how well-determined the parameters are; a sharply peaked distribution indicates high certainty, while a broad distribution indicates high uncertainty.[2]

Model comparison is the second pillar of inference, and its goal is to identify which of a set of competing models provides the best explanation for the data.[2] The quality of a single model is an ill-posed question; a model can only be judged as "good" or "bad" relative to at least one alternative. Even a simple hypothesis test implicitly compares a model of interest (e.g., a drug has an effect) against a background or null model (e.g., the drug has no effect).[2] This comparative approach is essential because models are never perfect representations of reality. The choice between competing models often involves a trade-off between goodness-of-fit and complexity. A more complex model with more parameters will almost always fit the data better, but it may be "overfitting" the noise rather than capturing the underlying signal. This leads to the principle of parsimony, or Occam's razor: a simpler model is preferred unless a more complex one is demonstrably necessary. This concept, along with the unavoidable use of prior information—that which goes beyond the data at hand—is a central tenet of the Bayesian approach to inference, which provides a formal framework for balancing model fit and complexity.[2]

The recognition that all scientific knowledge is mediated through models is a profound one. It implies that scientific conclusions are always conditional on the set of models being considered. Scientific debates, therefore, are often not about the "facts" themselves, but about which model provides the most powerful, plausible, and parsimonious explanation for those facts. The historic shift from the geocentric to the heliocentric model of the solar system was not just driven by better data, but by a shift in the plausibility of the underlying models and their assumptions.[2]

Paradigms of Proof: Falsification, Bayesian Belief, and Frequentist Probability

While the goal of science is to generate reliable knowledge, deep philosophical divisions exist regarding how to approach the concept of "proof" and quantify certainty. These divisions have given rise to distinct statistical paradigms that shape how evidence is evaluated.

The **falsificationist** paradigm, most famously articulated by philosopher Karl Popper and operationalized in the concept of "strong inference," posits that scientific hypotheses can never be proven true, only disproven or falsified.[14] This asymmetry arises because a correct prediction can be generated by a false hypothesis, but an incorrect prediction logically refutes the hypothesis that generated it.[11] The method of strong inference, therefore, involves devising and testing multiple alternative hypotheses and conducting experiments designed to eliminate as many of them as possible. A hypothesis gains credibility not through confirmation, but by repeatedly withstanding rigorous attempts at falsification.[14] This approach emphasizes a critical, skeptical mindset and is foundational to the traditional, hypothesis-driven scientific method taught in many disciplines.[11]

The **frequentist** paradigm, which has dominated statistical practice for much of the 20th century, provides the mathematical machinery for this falsificationist approach. It defines probability as the long-run relative frequency of an event over an infinite number of repeated trials.[15] This framework is the basis for Null Hypothesis Significance Testing (NHST), in which a researcher tests a "null hypothesis" (

H0) of no effect or no difference. The analysis yields a *p*-value, which is the probability of observing data as extreme as, or more extreme than, what was actually collected, *assuming the null hypothesis is true* (P(Y|H0)).[15] If the

p-value is sufficiently small (typically below 0.05), the null hypothesis is rejected. Importantly, this framework does not provide the probability of the hypothesis being true; it only assesses the compatibility of the data with the null hypothesis. In frequentist inference, model parameters are considered to be fixed, unknown "true" quantities, and inference is based solely on the data from the current sample.[15]

The **Bayesian** paradigm offers a fundamentally different epistemology. It defines probability not as a long-run frequency but as a subjective "degree of belief" in a proposition.[10] This framework allows for the direct calculation of the probability of a hypothesis being true given the available data (

P(H|Y)).[15] The process begins with a "prior probability distribution," which quantifies the researcher's initial beliefs about a hypothesis or parameter before collecting new data. This prior is then updated with the new evidence (the data) using Bayes' theorem to yield a "posterior probability distribution," which represents the updated state of belief.[2] Bayesian inference explicitly and formally incorporates prior knowledge, treats model parameters as random variables about which one can have a degree of belief, and provides a natural framework for comparing multiple competing hypotheses and quantifying the evidence in favor of each.[2]

The tension between these paradigms is a recurring theme in scientific methodology. Frequentist NHST has been criticized for its unintuitive definition of the *p*-value and its encouragement of binary, "significant/not significant" thinking.[16] Bayesianism, while praised for its logical coherence and intuitive interpretation of probability, has been criticized for the subjectivity inherent in choosing a prior distribution.[2] The choice of inferential paradigm is not merely a technical decision; it reflects a deeper philosophical stance on the nature of evidence, probability, and scientific knowledge itself.

Part II: The Practice of Inference in Ecology

Taming Complexity: Inferential Methods in Ecological Science

The field of ecology presents a formidable challenge to the practice of scientific inference. Ecologists study systems characterized by immense complexity, high natural variability, and interactions that span vast spatial and temporal scales.[16] These inherent features of the subject matter profoundly shape the methodological toolkit of the discipline, forcing a pragmatic and diverse approach to drawing conclusions from evidence. The inferential landscape of ecology is defined by a necessary adaptation to studying systems that are often too large, too slow, and too interconnected to fit neatly into the confines of a controlled laboratory experiment.

From Experiments to Observation: The Ecologist's Methodological Spectrum

Ecological research employs a broad spectrum of methods, ranging from tightly controlled experiments to purely observational studies, each with its own strengths and limitations in establishing causal claims.[16]

At one end of the spectrum are **field experiments**, which are highly valued for their ability to establish clear cause-and-effect relationships by actively manipulating variables in a natural setting.[20] For example, an ecologist might add a predator to some plots of land while leaving others untouched to directly measure the predator's impact on prey populations. However, conducting rigorous experiments in the field is fraught with pitfalls that can threaten the validity of the resulting inferences. These include:

- **Selection Bias:** This occurs when the experimental units (e.g., plots, ponds) are not randomly assigned to treatment and control groups. In many management scenarios, control sites (e.g., protected areas) are inherently different from treatment sites, making it difficult to attribute observed differences solely to the intervention.[20]
- **Performance Bias:** This arises when treatment and control groups are cared for or monitored differently, which can itself affect the outcome. For example, if water temperature is monitored more closely in experimental tanks than in control tanks, this differential attention could become a confounding factor.[20]
- **Pseudoreplication:** A common and serious error in which replicates are not statistically independent. For instance, taking multiple samples from the same pond and treating them as independent replicates of a pond-level treatment is a form of pseudoreplication that inflates statistical confidence without increasing the true sample size.[20]

As ecology increasingly tackles large-scale questions, such as the effects of climate change or the effectiveness of landscape-level conservation policies, the feasibility of manipulative experiments diminishes.[18] Consequently, ecologists must increasingly rely on

observational studies. This shift introduces the central challenge of **confounding variables**: factors that are correlated with both the presumed cause (e.g., temperature) and the observed effect (e.g., species abundance), potentially creating a spurious association or masking a true one.[18] For example, in studying the effect of plant diversity on grassland productivity, soil fertility acts as a confounder because it influences both the number of species that can grow and their productivity, making it difficult to isolate the effect of diversity alone.[19]

To address the challenge of confounding in observational data, ecologists are increasingly adopting rigorous causal inference methods from other disciplines like epidemiology and economics.[18] A key tool in this effort is the use of

causal diagrams, such as Directed Acyclic Graphs (DAGs), which are visual representations of the assumed causal relationships among variables in a system.[18] DAGs help researchers to explicitly state their assumptions and systematically identify potential confounding variables that must be controlled for in the statistical analysis. This is often paired with sophisticated sampling designs, such as nested or longitudinal sampling, which can help to statistically disentangle the effects of the variable of interest from those of site-level or time-varying confounders.[18]

Statistical Debates: The Decline of NHST and the Rise of Multi-Model Inference

For many years, statistical inference in ecology was dominated by the frequentist framework of Null Hypothesis Significance Testing (NHST).[16] In this approach, a researcher formulates a null hypothesis of "no effect" (e.g., a conservation intervention has no impact on population size) and uses a statistical test to calculate a

p-value. A small *p*-value leads to the rejection of the null hypothesis. However, this paradigm has faced sustained and heavy criticism within the ecological community for several reasons.[16] A primary critique is that NHST encourages a simplistic, binary worldview, forcing researchers to either "reject" or "fail to reject" a null hypothesis, which often has little to do with the magnitude or biological importance of the effect being studied. The focus on a single null hypothesis is often biologically unrealistic, and the common misinterpretation of the

p-value as the probability that the null hypothesis is true has led to widespread confusion and flawed conclusions.[15]

In response to these limitations, there has been a significant shift in ecological statistics toward alternative approaches that are better suited to handling complexity and uncertainty. Two of the most prominent are information-theoretic methods and Bayesian inference.

Information-Theoretic (IT) approaches, most notably those based on Akaike's Information Criterion (AIC), represent a paradigm shift from testing a single null hypothesis to comparing a set of multiple, competing hypotheses (represented as statistical models).[16] AIC evaluates each model based on a trade-off between its goodness-of-fit to the data and its complexity (number of parameters). The analysis then provides a measure of the relative support for each model in the set, allowing researchers to weigh the evidence for different biological explanations rather than being confined to the rigid logic of NHST.[16] This multi-model inference approach acknowledges that there are often several plausible explanations for an ecological pattern and provides a formal way to assess their relative likelihood.

Bayesian inference is also experiencing a rapid and widespread adoption in ecology, facilitated by advances in computational power.[15] The Bayesian framework is particularly well-suited to ecological problems for several reasons. First, it allows for the formal incorporation of prior knowledge into an analysis, which is valuable in a field where long-term studies and expert knowledge are common.[15] Second, its output—the posterior probability distribution—provides a direct and intuitive measure of uncertainty about model parameters and hypotheses. Instead of a

p-value, a Bayesian analysis can state, for example, that there is a 95% probability that a population's growth rate lies within a certain range.[15] This direct probabilistic statement about the hypothesis of interest (

$P(H|Y)$) is often what ecologists and managers actually want to know, making it a more powerful and epistemologically satisfying tool for science and decision-making.[15]

Modeling Nature: From Population Dynamics to Integrated Systems

Given the complexity of ecological systems and the frequent inability to perform decisive experiments, mathematical and statistical modeling plays an indispensable role in ecological inference. Models are the primary tools used to synthesize data, understand system dynamics, and predict the consequences of environmental change or management actions.[29]

A cornerstone of ecological modeling is the study of **population dynamics**. For decades, **matrix models** (such as Leslie and Lefkovitch matrices) have been a powerful framework for projecting population changes over time by explicitly accounting for the vital rates of individuals in different age classes or life stages, such as survival, growth, and reproduction.[29] Historically, these models were often deterministic, with parameters estimated in an ad-hoc fashion. However, modern approaches embed these dynamic models within a rigorous statistical inference framework, typically a Bayesian one.[29] This allows for the formal estimation of model parameters from various data sources while simultaneously accounting for multiple sources of uncertainty, including:

- **Process variation:** Natural stochasticity in survival and reproduction (demographic and environmental).
- **Observation error:** The fact that populations are never counted with perfect accuracy.
- **Parameter uncertainty:** The uncertainty in the estimates of the vital rates themselves.[29]

A recent and powerful extension of this approach is the development of **Integrated Population Models (IPMs)**. An IPM is a statistical technique that simultaneously analyzes multiple, often disparate, types of data for a single population within one unified analytical framework.[33] For example, an IPM might combine census or count data (which informs population size), capture-recapture data (which informs survival rates), and nest monitoring data (which informs reproductive rates).[32] By formally linking these different data types through a shared underlying population model, IPMs optimize the use of all available information. This integration leads to more precise and robust estimates of both demographic rates and population abundance than could be achieved by analyzing each dataset separately.[33] IPMs represent a state-of-the-art approach to evidence-based inference in population ecology, providing the comprehensive understanding necessary for effective conservation and management.[32]

Application in Practice: The Rise of Evidence-Based Conservation

The principles of rigorous, evidence-based inference have found a powerful application in the field of conservation biology, sparking a movement known as evidence-based conservation. This movement seeks to transform conservation from a practice often guided by intuition and anecdote into a discipline grounded in the systematic and critical appraisal of scientific evidence.

From Anecdote to Analysis: The Mandate for Evidence-Based Conservation

The central premise of evidence-based conservation is that decisions regarding the management of species and habitats should be based on the best available evidence of "what works".[35] This approach emerged from the recognition that a significant portion of conservation actions were being implemented based on tradition, personal experience, or anecdotal evidence, rather than on a rigorous assessment of scientific data.[36] Studies have shown that this can lead to the implementation of inefficient, ineffective, or even harmful management practices, thereby wasting scarce conservation resources and failing to achieve desired outcomes.[35]

Inspired by the success of evidence-based practice in medicine, evidence-based conservation advocates for a paradigm shift. It calls for a more systematic process of gathering, appraising, and applying scientific evidence to increase the effectiveness and cost-efficiency of conservation interventions.[35] The goal is to bridge the "knowledge-action gap"—the persistent disconnect between the vast amount of scientific knowledge being produced and the limited extent to which it is used by practitioners and policymakers on the ground.[20]

Synthesizing Knowledge: Systematic Reviews and Adaptive Management

To bridge this gap, the evidence-based conservation movement has developed specific methodologies for synthesizing and applying scientific knowledge.

The cornerstone of this approach is the **systematic review**. Unlike a traditional literature review, a systematic review is a highly structured, transparent, and repeatable process designed to answer a specific, well-defined question (e.g., "What is the effectiveness of planting native vegetation for restoring pollinator populations?").[35] The process involves an exhaustive search for all relevant evidence (including peer-reviewed articles and "grey literature" like government reports), a critical appraisal of the quality and rigor of each study to assess its susceptibility to bias, and a formal synthesis of the findings.[37] Organizations such as the Collaboration for Environmental Evidence (CEE) have been established to set standards for and facilitate the production of these reviews, acting as a conservation equivalent to the Cochrane Collaboration in medicine.[37] The outputs of this process, which also include more concise synopses and summaries, are made available through platforms like the

Conservation Evidence journal and database, providing practitioners with accessible and reliable information on the effectiveness of interventions.[35]

A key framework for applying this synthesized evidence in practice is **adaptive management**. This approach treats management actions as experiments to be learned from.[37] It involves a cyclical process of planning, implementing, and rigorously monitoring the outcomes of conservation interventions. The data collected through monitoring provides the evidence base to evaluate the effectiveness of the actions, which in turn informs the refinement of future management strategies.[37] This allows conservation practices to remain flexible and to be continuously improved based on a growing body of evidence, rather than being locked into static, traditional methods.[37]

Case Studies in Conservation: Evaluating Interventions for Species and Habitats

The practical impact of evidence-based inference is best illustrated through concrete examples where a systematic approach to evidence has led to improved conservation outcomes.

- **Challenging Conventional Wisdom in Reed Bed Management:** For years, the practice of burning reed beds as a management tool was avoided due to a widely held belief that it was harmful to soil invertebrate populations. This belief was based largely on anecdote rather than data. A randomized, replicated, and controlled experiment was established to test this assumption. The results showed that controlled burning did not significantly affect invertebrate populations in the long term, revealing it to be a highly efficient and effective method for restoring this critical habitat.[36] This case demonstrates how rigorous evidence can overturn entrenched but unfounded beliefs, leading to better management practices.

- **Demonstrating the Overall Effectiveness of Conservation:** A major challenge for the conservation movement is demonstrating its impact. A landmark study published in 2024 synthesized the results of 665 published case studies to provide a definitive answer. The evidence showed that in the majority of cases, conservation actions were effective at halting or reversing biodiversity loss.[41] Specific examples include the management of invasive predators on Florida's barrier islands, which led to a substantial improvement in the nesting success of loggerhead turtles, and the implementation of Forest Management Plans in the Congo Basin, which resulted in 74% lower deforestation rates compared to concessions without such plans.[41] This large-scale synthesis provides powerful, evidence-based support for the value of conservation investment.
- **Learning from Failure and Unintended Consequences:** Evidence-based approaches are valuable not only for identifying successes but also for learning from failures. In one instance in India, an intervention to physically remove an invasive algae species backfired; the process of removal broke the algae into many pieces, which actually facilitated its dispersal and spread. Rigorous monitoring revealed this negative outcome, allowing managers to abandon the ineffective strategy and develop a new one.[41] In another case, the establishment of marine protected areas, intended to protect seahorses, inadvertently led to lower seahorse abundance because the protection also increased the populations of their predators, such as octopuses. This highlights the complexity of ecological systems and the critical need for monitoring to detect unintended consequences.[41]
- **Structured Frameworks for Implementation:** The principles of evidence-based inference are being codified in structured frameworks like the **Conservation Standards**, which provide a systematic methodology for designing, managing, and monitoring conservation projects. Case studies from organizations like the World Wildlife Fund (WWF) in Cameroon and The Nature Conservancy (TNC) show how this framework is being applied to real-world challenges, from managing chimpanzee habitats and protecting wildlife to designing projects that reduce carbon emissions.[42] These frameworks operationalize the evidence-based approach, guiding practitioners through the entire project cycle to ensure that actions are based on clear assumptions and that outcomes are measured and learned from.

Part III: The Practice of Inference in Economics

The discipline of economics has undergone what many have termed a "credibility revolution" over the past several decades, marked by a profound shift toward rigorous empirical methods for identifying causal relationships.[43] The central inferential challenge in economics is fundamentally one of causality: isolating the effect of a specific policy, action, or variable in a complex social world where controlled experiments are often impossible and numerous factors are changing simultaneously. This has led to the development of a sophisticated and powerful toolkit for evidence-based inference, designed to untangle correlation from causation and provide reliable guidance for policy.

The Causal Quest: Inferential Methods in Economics

The intellectual core of modern empirical economics is the problem of the counterfactual. Economic questions are almost always *ceteris paribus* questions—they ask what the effect of changing one thing would be, holding all other things equal.[44] For example, what is the effect of an additional year of education on a person's income, all else being equal? The fundamental difficulty is that the data available to answer such questions are generated

mutatis mutandis—with many other things changing at the same time.[45] People who choose to get more education are also likely to be different in other ways that affect income, such as innate ability, motivation, or family background. A simple correlation between education and income therefore cannot be interpreted as a causal effect.[45]

To solve this problem, the goal of economic inference is to construct a credible **counterfactual**: an estimate of what would have happened to the individuals who received the "treatment" (e.g., more education) if they had, in fact, *not* received it.[46] The causal effect is the difference between the observed outcome and this unobserved counterfactual outcome. The econometric approach formalizes this concept using the potential outcomes framework, which defines two potential outcomes for each individual:

$Y(1)$ (the outcome if treated) and $Y(0)$ (the outcome if not treated). The causal effect for an individual is $Y(1)-Y(0)$, but because we can only ever observe one of these two states, this creates a fundamental problem of missing data.[44] The various inferential methods in economics are all designed as clever strategies to solve this missing data problem and construct a valid estimate of the counterfactual.

The "Gold Standard": Randomized Controlled Trials (RCTs) for Policy Evaluation

The most direct and powerful method for constructing a valid counterfactual is the **Randomized Controlled Trial (RCT)**. In an RCT, individuals, communities, or firms are randomly assigned to a treatment group (which receives the intervention) or a control group (which does not).[49] The power of randomization is that it ensures that, on average, the treatment and control groups are statistically identical in every respect—both observed characteristics like age and income, and unobserved characteristics like motivation and ability—

except for their receipt of the treatment.[49]

Because the two groups are identical at the outset, any difference in their outcomes after the intervention can be confidently attributed to the causal effect of the treatment itself. The control group provides a direct and unbiased measure of the counterfactual.[51] For this reason, RCTs are often referred to as the "gold standard" for causal inference.[50]

Over the past two decades, RCTs have become an immensely popular and influential tool for policy evaluation, particularly in the field of development economics.[49] They have been used to rigorously test the effectiveness of a wide range of public policies, including:

- **Health Policy:** The famous Oregon Medicaid Experiment randomly assigned access to Medicaid to low-income adults, providing credible evidence on the effects of health insurance on health care utilization, financial hardship, and health outcomes.[51]
- **Education Policy:** Numerous RCTs have evaluated the impact of interventions like smaller class sizes, student mentoring programs, and school vouchers, including the large-scale Head Start Impact study in the United States.[51]
- **Social Programs:** RCTs have been used to assess the success of homelessness prevention programs, welfare-to-work requirements, and job-training initiatives.[51]
- **Crime and Criminal Justice:** Experiments have tested the effectiveness of different policing strategies, such as "hot-spot" patrolling and the use of body-worn cameras.[51]

Harnessing History: Natural Experiments and Quasi-Experimental Designs

While RCTs are the ideal, they are often not feasible due to ethical, political, or financial constraints. In such cases, economists turn to a suite of **quasi-experimental methods** that leverage naturally occurring situations that approximate a randomized experiment. These methods have been at the heart of the "credibility revolution" in empirical economics.

- **Natural Experiments:** These are historical events or institutional rules that exogenously assign some individuals or groups to a treatment while leaving others as a control group.[53] The key is that the assignment is "as good as random," meaning it is not correlated with the underlying characteristics of the individuals that could also affect the outcome.[55] Seminal examples include:
    - The 1990s minimum wage increase in New Jersey, which was compared to the neighboring state of Pennsylvania where the wage did not change, to estimate the effect on employment.[54]

    - The division of Germany after World War II, which created two populations with similar starting cultures and histories but subjected them to vastly different economic and political systems, allowing researchers to study the long-term effects of institutions on economic behavior and preferences.[53]
    - Using an individual's quarter of birth as a source of random variation in years of schooling (due to compulsory schooling laws), which allowed researchers to estimate the causal return to education on earnings.[54]
- **Instrumental Variables (IV):** This is a statistical technique used when the treatment variable is endogenous (i.e., correlated with unobserved factors that also affect the outcome). The method requires finding an "instrument"—a variable that is correlated with the treatment but is not correlated with the outcome, except through its effect on the treatment.[45] The instrument essentially isolates a portion of the variation in the treatment that is "as good as random," allowing for a causal estimate. The Vietnam War draft lottery, for example, has been used as an instrument for military service to estimate its effect on lifetime earnings.[56]
- **Regression Discontinuity (RD):** This design is used when a treatment is assigned based on whether an individual falls above or below a specific cutoff score on some continuous variable (e.g., an exam score for a scholarship, a poverty index for a social program).[45] The logic of RD is that individuals who are just barely above the cutoff are very similar to those who are just barely below it. By comparing the outcomes of these two groups, one can estimate the local causal effect of the treatment at the threshold.[45]
- **Difference-in-Differences (DiD):** This is one of the most common quasi-experimental methods. It is used when data is available for a treatment group and a control group both before and after an intervention.[45] The DiD estimator first calculates the change in the outcome for the treatment group over time (before to after) and then subtracts the change in the outcome for the control group over the same period. This "differencing out" of the control group's trend removes biases from time-invariant unobserved differences between the groups and from common time trends affecting both groups, isolating the causal impact of the treatment.[47]

The Econometric Framework: Structural Models and Causal Parameters

While quasi-experimental methods are powerful for estimating the average causal effect of a specific intervention, the broader **econometric approach to causality** seeks to go further. This approach involves building **structural models**—explicit mathematical representations of the underlying economic theory and behavioral mechanisms that generate the observed data.[44]

A structural model does more than just estimate a treatment effect; it aims to characterize the "all causes" model, including the equations that govern agents' choices (e.g., the decision to participate in a program) and the equations that determine outcomes.[44] By explicitly modeling the unobserved variables that influence both choice and outcomes, these models can disentangle selection effects from true treatment effects and provide a deeper understanding of the "causes of effects," not just the "effects of causes".[44]

The ultimate goal of structural econometrics is to estimate "deep parameters" of behavior or technology that are believed to be invariant to changes in policy.[44] If these deep parameters can be successfully identified, the model can be used to simulate and forecast the effects of policies that have never been tried before, addressing fundamental policy questions that are beyond the scope of a simple program evaluation.[44] This approach represents a powerful synthesis of economic theory and empirical evidence, using the structure of the theory to interpret the data and explore a wide range of counterfactual worlds.[57]

Application in Practice: The Drive for Evidence-Based Policy

The methodological advances in causal inference have fueled a parallel movement in the public sphere: the push for Evidence-Based Policymaking (EBP). This movement advocates for government decisions to be informed by the best available scientific evidence, aiming to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of public spending.

Informing the State: The Principles and Politics of Evidence-Based Policymaking

Evidence-Based Policymaking is the principle that public policy decisions should be grounded in rigorously established, objective evidence, rather than being driven primarily by ideology, anecdote, political intuition, or the influence of special interests.[58] The core of EBP is a systematic process that involves three key stages: (1) the collection of high-quality data; (2) rigorous data analysis to generate evidence on program effectiveness; and (3) the explicit use of this evidence to inform decisions at all stages of the policymaking process, from problem definition to budget allocation and program implementation.[59]

This approach has gained significant traction and has been institutionalized within governments in countries like the United States and the United Kingdom. In the U.S., the bipartisan Foundations for Evidence-Based Policymaking Act of 2018 requires federal agencies to develop evidence-building plans and name chief data and evaluation officers.[60] The Biden administration has further emphasized this commitment with a memorandum on "Restoring Trust in Government Through Scientific Integrity and Evidence-Based Policymaking".[60] In the UK, the "What Works" network and the Cabinet Office's Evaluation Task Force have been established to promote the use of robust evidence, particularly from

RCTs, in government spending and policy design.[50] These institutional structures are crucial, as they create the demand for evidence and the capacity within government to use it effectively.

Impact and Influence: Successes and Shortcomings of Evidence in Economic Policy

The impact of EBP, particularly fueled by the rise of RCTs in development economics, has been substantial. Policy innovations that have been rigorously tested have reached millions of people, and the use of evidence is now a much larger part of the policy conversation than it was two decades ago.[49] However, the influence of evidence on policy is often constrained and contested.

A fundamental reality is that purely evidence-based policy does not exist.[57] Evidence seldom speaks for itself; it must be interpreted through a conceptual or modeling framework. The data can tell us what happened, but a model is required to tell us

why it happened and what would have happened under a different policy.[57] Because different people can use different models to interpret the same evidence, disagreements over policy can persist even when the facts are not in dispute.

Furthermore, policymaking is not a purely rational, technical process. It is a complex, non-linear process shaped by politics, stakeholder interests, values, and institutional constraints.[59] Evidence is just one input among many and often has to compete with powerful political narratives and the influence of lobbying groups.[61] The challenges are numerous: providing causal evidence that is relevant and timely for fast-moving policy debates, overcoming data access limitations, ensuring the reliability of published research, and navigating the politicization of scientific findings.[61] The successful application of EBP is therefore not just a technical challenge of producing good research; it is an institutional and political challenge of creating a system where that research is valued, understood, and used.

Case Studies in Policy: From Minimum Wage to Development Aid

Specific examples powerfully illustrate both the potential and the complexity of using evidence-based inference to inform economic policy.

- **The Minimum Wage Debate:** The 1994 natural experiment by David Card and Alan Krueger had a profound impact on the economic debate over the minimum wage. By comparing employment in fast-food restaurants in New Jersey (where the minimum wage was raised) and neighboring Pennsylvania (where it was not), they found no evidence that the wage increase caused job losses.[54]

This finding, derived from a credible quasi-experimental design, challenged the deeply entrenched conventional wisdom in economics and fundamentally changed the policy conversation, demonstrating that the employment effects of minimum wage increases are not as simple or universally negative as previously thought.

- **Improving Education in Developing Countries:** A series of influential RCTs conducted in Kenya tested various low-cost interventions aimed at improving poor educational outcomes. The researchers tested providing more textbooks, providing flip charts, and providing funds to hire additional teachers on short-term contracts. The results were revealing and non-intuitive. Providing more textbooks—a seemingly obvious solution—had no effect on the test scores of the average student, though it did help the top-performing students. In contrast, hiring an extra contract teacher, who was paid much less than a regular civil service teacher, had a significant positive impact on learning for all students.[65] This evidence provided clear, actionable guidance for policymakers, showing that how money is spent can be more important than how much is spent, and directing resources toward a more cost-effective intervention.
- **Conditional Cash Transfers (CCTs):** In the late 1990s, the Mexican government designed a large-scale anti-poverty program called PROGRESA (now Oportunidades), which provided cash payments to poor families on the condition that their children attended school and received preventative health care. Crucially, the program was rolled out as a large-scale RCT, with some villages randomly assigned to receive the program immediately and others assigned to a control group that would receive it later.[66] The evaluation produced clear and compelling evidence that the program was effective in improving education, health, and nutrition outcomes. This rigorous evidence base was instrumental in persuading a new, opposition political party to continue and expand the program after winning the presidency in 2000. The success and credible evaluation of PROGRESA led to its replication across dozens of countries in Latin America and around the world, making CCTs a cornerstone of modern social policy.[66]

Part IV: A Comparative Synthesis and Critical Outlook

Two Sciences, One Goal: A Synthesis of Ecological and Economic Inference

While both ecology and economics strive to understand and predict the behavior of complex systems through evidence-based inference, their paths to this shared goal diverge significantly. These divergences are not arbitrary; they are necessary adaptations to the fundamentally different natures of the systems they study, the experimental constraints they face, and the types of data they can collect. A comparative analysis reveals a fascinating landscape of contrasting philosophies, complementary methodologies, and shared challenges.

Contrasting Worlds: Experimental Constraints and the Nature of Data

The most profound difference between the inferential architectures of ecology and economics lies in their relationship with experimentation and the character of their data.

Experimental Feasibility: Economics, dealing with human subjects and institutions, has been able to embrace the **Randomized Controlled Trial (RCT)** as its methodological "gold standard".[50] Interventions like providing a social program, offering a financial incentive, or changing a classroom environment can often be randomly assigned to individuals, households, or communities, allowing for the clean identification of causal effects.[51] This ability to conduct large-scale experiments has been a driving force behind the discipline's "credibility revolution." In contrast, **ecology is severely constrained** in its ability to experiment. Manipulating entire ecosystems, studying the effects of global climate change, or experimenting on endangered species is often practically impossible, ethically impermissible, or both.[18] While small-scale field experiments are a vital part of the ecologist's toolkit, the inability to randomize at the scale of many key questions forces a much greater reliance on observational data and the complex statistical models needed to interpret it.

Nature of Data: This difference in experimental capacity is reflected in the typical nature of their data. Ecological data is often characterized by what has been termed the "Four Vs" of big data, with a particular emphasis on **Variety** and **Veracity**.[68] Ecological datasets are immensely heterogeneous, drawing from disparate subdisciplines (e.g., genetics, community ecology, remote sensing) and data types (e.g., species counts, chemical concentrations, satellite imagery).[69] This variety creates enormous challenges for data integration. Furthermore, ecological data are often fraught with veracity issues, including measurement error, sampling bias, and high natural variability (noise), which must be explicitly modeled.[68]

Economic data, while also facing its own challenges, is increasingly defined by enormous **Volume** and **Velocity**. The digital age has produced vast streams of administrative data (e.g., tax records), financial market data, and large-scale survey data that are often more structured and comprehensive than what is available in ecology.[70] While variety and veracity are still concerns, the sheer volume of available data has enabled the application of data-intensive methods and has shaped the focus of modern econometrics.

Philosophical Divides: The Role of Abstract Theory vs. Empirical Observation

Historically, the two disciplines have also exhibited different philosophical postures. Economics has traditionally been a field driven by **abstract, deductive theory**. Foundational concepts like rational choice and market equilibrium were developed axiomatically, and the role of empirical work was often seen as secondary—to illustrate or test the predictions of a pre-existing theory.[72] This approach is viable when one can assume a well-defined "objective function" for the system's agents (e.g., individuals maximize utility, firms maximize profit), from which behavior can be logically deduced.[72]

Ecology, in contrast, has developed primarily as an **observational and experimental science**. Its theories have often emerged more inductively from empirical patterns observed in the field.[72] This is in part because it is difficult to define a single, simple "objective function" for an ecosystem; its properties are emergent and contingent, not derived from a set of axioms. The "sad truth," as one ecologist noted, is that abstract ecological theory has often existed in a world of its own, separate from the mainstream of empirical research.[72]

While the "empirical revolution" has made economics far more data-driven, this fundamental difference in their philosophical starting points—one beginning with abstract principles, the other with empirical observation—continues to influence their respective approaches to model building and inference.[43]

Shared Burdens: Confronting Complexity, Confounding, and Uncertainty

Despite these profound differences, ecology and economics are united by a formidable shared challenge: both study **complex adaptive systems**.[17] Ecosystems and economies are not simple, linear, mechanical systems. They are self-organizing networks of heterogeneous, interacting agents (whether organisms or humans) characterized by feedback loops, non-linear dynamics, emergent properties, and evolution over time.[74] This shared nature creates shared inferential burdens.

The most critical of these is **confounding**. In both disciplines, the central task of disentangling correlation from causation requires confronting the problem of unobserved variables that influence both a cause and an effect. In economics, this is the problem of "omitted variable bias" or "endogeneity," where, for example, unobserved ability affects both education and income.[45] In ecology, it is the ubiquitous presence of confounding environmental factors, where, for example, unobserved soil quality affects both plant diversity and productivity.[18] The sophisticated methodological toolkits of both fields are, in large part, elaborate strategies for dealing with this single, pervasive problem.

Both fields also grapple with **model uncertainty**. They acknowledge that their models are, by necessity, radical simplifications of a vastly more complex reality.[57] The "true" model generating the data is unknown and likely unknowable. This leads to a state of "deep uncertainty," where not only are the outcomes of processes probabilistic, but the probabilities themselves are unknown.[79] This recognition has spurred the move in both fields away from relying on a single, "correct" model and toward methods—such as Bayesian model averaging in ecology and sensitivity analysis in economics—that can account for uncertainty across a range of plausible models.[29]

A Comparative Matrix of Inferential Approaches in Ecology and Economics

The following table synthesizes the core distinctions and similarities in the inferential architectures of ecology and economics, providing a structured overview of the key themes discussed throughout this report.

Feature	Ecology	Economics
Primary Goal of Inference	Understanding patterns, processes, and dynamics; prediction; increasingly, causal attribution.	Causal identification; estimating the *ceteris paribus* effect of interventions; prediction.
Dominant Philosophy	Historically empirical and observation-based; growing adoption of Bayesian "degree of belief."	Historically deductive and theory-driven; now dominated by the potential outcomes/counterfactual framework.
Core Methodologies	Field experiments, observational studies, population modeling (IPMs), multi-model inference (AIC, Bayes).	Randomized Controlled Trials (RCTs), quasi-experimental methods (IV, RD, DiD), structural econometrics.
Experimental Feasibility	Highly constrained at large scales due to ethical, practical, and systemic limitations.	Feasible for many individual- and group-level interventions, making RCTs a "gold standard."
Nature of Data	High **Variety** (heterogeneous sources), high **Veracity** challenges (noise, bias).	High **Volume** and **Velocity** (Big Data), often more structured (administrative, financial).

Approach to Complexity	Focus on emergent properties, feedback loops, cross-scale interactions, and non-stationarity (Panarchy).	Focus on agent-based behavior, market equilibrium, and controlling for heterogeneity and endogeneity.
Key Challenge	Managing system complexity and confounding in observational settings with limited experimental control.	Constructing a credible counterfactual to isolate causal effects from selection bias and endogeneity.
Primary Application	Evidence-Based Conservation and Environmental Management.	Evidence-Based Policy and Program Evaluation.

The Future of Evidence-Based Inference

The movement toward more rigorous, evidence-based practice in both ecology and economics represents a significant advance in the application of science to real-world problems. However, this movement is not without its critics and limitations, and its future will be shaped by new technologies and a growing recognition of the need for interdisciplinary synthesis.

Critiques and Limitations: When "What Works" Isn't Enough

The push for evidence-based practice has faced important critiques in both fields, which caution against a naive or overly rigid application of its principles.

In **ecology**, one major concern is the **problem of generalizability**. The evidence for the effectiveness of a conservation intervention is often highly context-specific. An action that works in one ecosystem, for one species, may not work elsewhere, yet there is often a lack of locally relevant evidence to guide management in a specific place.[80] Furthermore, the emphasis on rigorous, quantitative evidence, particularly from systematic reviews, has been criticized for potentially devaluing other important forms of knowledge, such as the experiential wisdom of practitioners and the traditional ecological knowledge of indigenous communities.[62] This has led some to advocate for the term "evidence-informed" rather than "evidence-based" practice, to better reflect the reality that scientific evidence is just one crucial input into a complex decision-making process that must also consider local values, costs, and feasibility.[81]

In **economics**, a primary critique is that the evidence-based policy movement can understate the role of politics and theory. The idea that policy can be a simple, technical process of applying "what works" ignores the reality that policymaking is an inherently political process, often driven by ideology and competing interests.[61] Furthermore, as discussed previously, evidence never speaks for itself; it is always interpreted through the lens of a theoretical or conceptual model.[57] Disagreements about policy are often, at their root, disagreements about the correct model of the world, not about the evidence itself. A purely evidence-based policy is a myth; all policy is, implicitly or explicitly, "model-based".[57]

The Algorithmic Turn: Machine Learning and the New Frontier of Causal Inference

The future of inference in both disciplines is being reshaped by the "algorithmic turn"—the integration of **Machine Learning (ML)** and artificial intelligence into the analytical toolkit.[68]

In **economics**, the field of **Causal ML** is rapidly developing. ML algorithms are exceptionally good at handling high-dimensional data and complex, non-linear relationships. They are being used to improve causal inference by, for example, selecting the most important control variables from a vast set of possibilities, or by systematically identifying how the effects of a policy differ across heterogeneous subgroups of the population (e.g., a job training program that works for young workers but not for older ones).[82] These methods promise to increase the precision and nuance of causal estimates derived from complex datasets.

In **ecology**, ML is being used to analyze massive and complex datasets, such as those from remote sensing satellites or genomic sequencing, to identify patterns and make predictions.[68] It is also being applied to accelerate the process of evidence synthesis that is central to evidence-based conservation. For example, ML tools can help researchers sift through tens of thousands of scientific papers to find the relevant studies for a systematic review much more quickly than human reviewers could alone.[84]

However, the rise of ML also presents new challenges. Many ML models are "black boxes," meaning their internal workings can be opaque and difficult to interpret, which can be problematic for transparent and accountable policymaking.[82] Moreover, because most ML algorithms are optimized for prediction rather than for causal inference, their naive application can lead to biased and misleading results if not combined with a rigorous causal framework.[82]

Toward an Integrated Science: Lessons and Pathways for Cross-Disciplinary Inference

This comparative analysis reveals that while ecology and economics have developed distinct inferential cultures, they have much to learn from one another. Their differences are not signs of one being more "scientific" than the other, but rather intelligent adaptations to the unique challenges they face.

Ecology can benefit from the deep and rigorous toolkit for causal inference developed in economics. As ecologists increasingly turn to observational data to answer large-scale questions, adopting the formal logic of counterfactuals, causal diagrams, and quasi-experimental designs can add a new level of rigor and credibility to their conclusions, helping them to more confidently move from correlation to causation.[18]

Economics can benefit from ecology's profound appreciation for systemic complexity, non-linear dynamics, and cross-scale interactions. Economic models often achieve causal identification by abstracting away from the very complexities—such as feedback loops, tipping points, and emergent properties—that ecologists see as central to the functioning of their systems.[74] As economics confronts challenges like climate change, financial instability, and sustainable development, incorporating the systems-thinking perspective that is native to ecology will be essential for building more realistic and relevant models.

Ultimately, the most pressing challenges of the 21st century—from climate change and biodiversity loss to pandemics and sustainable development—are not purely ecological or purely economic problems. They are intertwined **social-ecological** problems that defy disciplinary boundaries.[85] Addressing them effectively will require an integrated science that can draw on the strengths of both inferential traditions: the causal rigor of economics and the systemic wisdom of ecology. The future of evidence-based inference lies not in the victory of one method over another, but in the thoughtful and creative synthesis of their complementary strengths.

Works cited

1. www2.mpia-hd.mpg.de, accessed September 13, 2025, https://www2.mpia-hd.mpg.de/homes/bailer-jones/inference.html#:~:text=Inference%20may%20be%20defined%20as,invariably%20takes%20place%20via%20models.

2. What is inference?, accessed September 13, 2025, https://www2.mpia-hd.mpg.de/homes/bailer-jones/inference.html

3. Inference in Scientific Research - Arkane Cloud, accessed September 13, 2025, https://arkanecloud.com/inference-in-scientific-research/

4. Inference - (Honors Biology) - Vocab, Definition, Explanations | Fiveable, accessed September 13, 2025, https://library.fiveable.me/key-terms/hs-honors-biology/inference

5. Inferencing | Reading Rockets, accessed September 13, 2025, https://www.readingrockets.org/classroom/classroom-strategies/inferencing

6. Three Types of Scientific Inference - Paul Spector, accessed September 13, 2025, https://paulspector.com/three-types-of-scientific-inference/

7. Scientific Inference, accessed September 13, 2025, https://sites.socsci.uci.edu/~johnsonk/CLASSES/ScientificInference/ScientificInference.html

8. Scientific Inference — Definition & Examples - Expii, accessed September 13, 2025, https://www.expii.com/t/scientific-inference-definition-examples-10307

9. Inference: The Process - CSU College of Law, accessed September 13, 2025, https://www.law.csuohio.edu/sites/default/files/academics/firstassignments/1409/inference_the_process.pdf

10. Inference - Wikipedia, accessed September 13, 2025, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Inference

11. Perspective: Dimensions of the scientific method - PMC - PubMed Central, accessed September 13, 2025, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC6742218/

12. Rule of inference - Wikipedia, accessed September 13, 2025, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Rule_of_inference

13. Scientific method - Wikipedia, accessed September 13, 2025, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Scientific_method

14. Strong Inference: The Way of Science - Ryoko Oono Lab, accessed September 13, 2025, https://oono-lab.eemb.ucsb.edu/sites/default/files/2022-01/strong-inference-the-way-of-science.pdf

15. Bayesian inference in ecology - Harvard Forest, accessed September 13, 2025, https://harvardforest.fas.harvard.edu/publications/pdfs/ellison_2004_ecology_letters.pdf

16. Inference in ecology and evolution - UCF College of Sciences, accessed September 13, 2025, https://sciences.ucf.edu/biology/pascencio/wp-content/uploads/sites/24/2016/11/Stephens-et-al.-2007b.pdf

17. Ecological Systems as Complex Systems: Challenges for an ... - MDPI, accessed

September 13, 2025, https://www.mdpi.com/1424-2818/2/3/395

18. Causal Inference With Observational Data and Unobserved Confounding Variables - PMC, accessed September 13, 2025, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC11750058/

19. Foundations and future directions for causal inference in ecological research Authors - EcoEvoRxiv, accessed September 13, 2025, https://ecoevorxiv.org/repository/object/8208/download/15427/

20. (PDF) How experimental biology and ecology can support evidence-based decision-making in conservation: Avoiding pitfalls and enabling application - ResearchGate, accessed September 13, 2025, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/318014869_How_experimental_biology_and_ecology_can_support_evidence-based_decision-making_in_conservation_Avoiding_pitfalls_and_enabling_application

21. The Use of Field Experiments in Environmental and Resource Economics, accessed September 13, 2025, https://www.journals.uchicago.edu/doi/full/10.1093/reep/rew008

22. How experimental biology and ecology can support evidence-based decision-making in conservation: avoiding pitfalls and enabling application - PMC, accessed September 13, 2025, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC5550808/

23. Foundations and future directions for causal inference in ecological research - EcoEvoRxiv, accessed September 13, 2025, https://ecoevorxiv.org/repository/view/8208/

24. Causal inference and effect estimation using observational data, accessed September 13, 2025, https://jech.bmj.com/content/76/11/960

25. (PDF) Causal Inference With Observational Data and Unobserved Confounding Variables, accessed September 13, 2025, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/388222420_Causal_Inference_With_Observational_Data_and_Unobserved_Confounding_Variables

26. Causal inference for ecology and conservation - YouTube, accessed September 13, 2025, https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=nQW0pgCL4bA

27. Causal Inference in Ecology → Term - Pollution → Sustainability Directory, accessed September 13, 2025, https://pollution.sustainability-directory.com/term/causal-inference-in-ecology/

28. Inference in ecology and evolution - PubMed, accessed September 13, 2025,

https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/17174005/

29. Embedding Population Dynamics Models in Inference - arXiv, accessed September 13, 2025, https://arxiv.org/pdf/0708.3796

30. Ecology, Evidence, and Objectivity: In Search of a Bias-Free Methodology - Frontiers, accessed September 13, 2025, https://www.frontiersin.org/journals/ecology-and-evolution/articles/10.3389/fevo.2019.00399/full

31. Embedding Population Dynamics Models in Inference - Project Euclid, accessed September 13, 2025, https://projecteuclid.org/journals/statistical-science/volume-22/issue-1/Embedding-Population-Dynamics-Models-in-Inference/10.1214/088342306000000673.full

32. Inferences about population dynamics from count data using multistate models: a comparison to capture–recapture approaches, accessed September 13, 2025, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC3936388/

33. Integrated Population Models: Achieving Their Potential. Journal of Statistical Theory and Practice, 17 (1). ISSN 1559 - Kent Academic Repository, accessed September 13, 2025, https://kar.kent.ac.uk/id/document/3286056

34. Integrated Population Models: Achieving their Potential - Edinburgh Research Explorer, accessed September 13, 2025, https://www.research.ed.ac.uk/files/305349193/Integrated_review_paper_3.pdf

35. Evidence-based conservation - Wikipedia, accessed September 13, 2025, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Evidence-based_conservation

36. The Need for Evidence-Based Conservation - ResearchGate, accessed September 13, 2025, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/7080806_The_Need_for_Evidence-Based_Conservation

37. Evidence-Based Conservation - UK Parliament, accessed September 13, 2025, https://www.parliament.uk/globalassets/documents/post/postpn_379-evidence-based-conservation.pdf

38. The need for evidence-based conservation - PubMed, accessed September 13, 2025, https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/16701275/

39. The Centre for Evidence-Based Conservation (CEBC) – A brief history, accessed September 13, 2025, https://environmentalevidence.org/cebc/

40. Evidence Champions - Conservation Evidence - Page Content, accessed September 13, 2025, https://www.conservationevidence.com/content/page/82

41. First-of-its-kind study definitively shows that conservation actions are effective at halting and reversing biodiversity loss | GEF, accessed September 13, 2025, https://www.thegef.org/newsroom/press-releases/first-its-kind-study-definitively-shows-conservation-actions-are-effective

42. Case Studies - conservationstandards.org, accessed September 13, 2025, https://www.conservationstandards.org/case-studies/

43. Imbens' work ignited an empirical revolution in economics | Stanford Report, accessed September 13, 2025, https://news.stanford.edu/stories/2021/10/imbens-work-ignited-empirical-revolution-economics

44. Econometric Causality, accessed September 13, 2025, http://jenni.uchicago.edu/Spencer_Conference/Papers%202010/JJH%20Final/JJH%20Session%204%20Causality/Spencer-INET_Econ-Caus_HANDOUT_2010-12-09a_jlt.pdf

45. Causal inference in economics and marketing - PNAS, accessed September 13, 2025, https://www.pnas.org/doi/10.1073/pnas.1510479113

46. Field Experiments: A Bridge Between Lab and Naturally-Occurring Data - National Bureau of Economic Research, accessed September 13, 2025, https://www.nber.org/system/files/working_papers/w12992/w12992.pdf

47. Economics Nobelist on causal inference - Amazon Science, accessed September 13, 2025, https://www.amazon.science/blog/economics-nobelist-on-causal-inference

48. Causality and Econometrics - National Bureau of Economic Research, accessed September 13, 2025, https://www.nber.org/system/files/working_papers/w29787/w29787.pdf

49. The Influence of Randomized Controlled Trials on Development Economics Research and on Development Policy, accessed September 13, 2025, https://economics.mit.edu/sites/default/files/publications/2016.09%20the-influence-of-rcts-on-developmental-eco.pdf

50. Randomised controlled trials: - Can they inform the development of green innovation policies in the UK? - LSE, accessed September 13, 2025, https://www.lse.ac.uk/granthaminstitute/wp-content/uploads/2022/10/Randomised-control-trials_Can-they-inform-the-development-of-green-innovation-policy-in-the-UK-1.pdf

51. Randomized Controlled Trials of Public Policy | Institute for Public ..., accessed September 13, 2025, http://ippsr.msu.edu/public-policy/michigan-wonk-blog/randomized-controlled-trials-public-policy

52. Randomised Controlled Trials – Policy Evaluation: Methods and Approaches, accessed September 13, 2025, https://scienceetbiencommun.pressbooks.pub/pubpolevaluation/chapter/randomised-controlled-trials/

53. Natural Experiments in Macroeconomics - National Bureau of ..., accessed September 13, 2025, https://www.nber.org/system/files/working_papers/w21228/w21228.pdf

54. Natural experiments help answer important questions - Nobel Prize, accessed September 13, 2025, https://www.nobelprize.org/uploads/2021/10/popular-economicsciencesprize2021-3.pdf

55. Causality and natural experiments: the 2021 Nobel Prize in Economic Sciences - Oxera, accessed September 13, 2025, https://www.oxera.com/insights/agenda/articles/causality-and-natural-experiments-the-2021-nobel-prize-in-economic-sciences/

56. Natural experiment - Wikipedia, accessed September 13, 2025, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Natural_experiment

57. Purely Evidence-Based Policy Doesn't Exist | Chicago Booth Review, accessed September 13, 2025, https://www.chicagobooth.edu/review/purely-evidence-based-policy-doesnt-exist

58. Evidence-based policy - Wikipedia, accessed September 13, 2025, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Evidence-based_policy

59. Evidence-Based Policymaking Primer - Bipartisan Policy Center, accessed September 13, 2025, https://bipartisanpolicy.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/03/Evidence-Based-Policymaking-Primer.pdf

60. Evidence-based policymaking in the US and UK - CEPR, accessed September 13, 2025, https://cepr.org/voxeu/columns/evidence-based-policymaking-us-and-uk

61. Challenges and recommendations for evidence informed policy - On Think Tanks, accessed September 13, 2025, https://onthinktanks.org/announcement/challenges-and-recommendations-for-evidence-informed-policy/

62. (PDF) Conservation, evidence and policy - ResearchGate, accessed September 13, 2025, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/259434807_Conservation_evidence_and_policy

63. www.nber.org, accessed September 13, 2025, https://www.nber.org/papers/w24535#:~:text=But%20despite%20its%20obvious%20appeal,the%20transmission%20of%20research%20findings.

64. Evidence-Based Policymaking: Promise, Challenges and Opportunities for Accounting and Financial Markets Research | NBER, accessed September 13, 2025, https://www.nber.org/papers/w24535

65. A guide to evidence based policymaking (with examples) - Government and public policy short courses, accessed September 13, 2025, https://onlinecourses.bsg.ox.ac.uk/blog/guide-to-evidence-based-policymaking

66. Full article: Policy Evaluation in Polarized Polities: The Case of Randomized Controlled Trials - Taylor & Francis Online, accessed September 13, 2025, https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/00220388.2023.2284673

67. Data-driven causal analysis of observational time series in ecology - bioRxiv, accessed September 13, 2025, https://www.biorxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.08.03.233692.full

68. Situating Ecology as a Big-Data Science: Current Advances, Challenges, and Solutions, accessed September 13, 2025, https://repositorio.fedepalma.org/bitstream/handle/123456789/141540/Situating_ecology_as_a_big-data_science.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y

69. Challenges and Opportunities of Open Data in Ecology - eScholarship.org, accessed September 13, 2025, https://escholarship.org/content/qt7627s45z/qt7627s45z_noSplash_8fc68ae3482ed28270ca38af117b828b.pdf

70. An overview of evidence-based economics, accessed September 13, 2025, https://evidence-based-economics.org/an-overview-of-evidence-based-economics/

71. The Economics and Implications of Data: An Integrated Perspective in - IMF eLibrary, accessed September 13, 2025, https://www.elibrary.imf.org/view/journals/087/2019/013/article-A001-en.xml

72. Economics and ecology: a comparison of experimental methodologies and philosophies, accessed September 13, 2025, https://ideas.repec.org/a/eee/ecolec/v5y1992i2p101-

126.html

73. Economics and Ecology: A Comparison of Experimental Methodologies and Philosophies, accessed September 13, 2025, https://ideas.repec.org/p/ias/cpaper/90-wp62.html

74. Challenges of complexity economics, accessed September 13, 2025, https://www.worldeconomicsassociation.org/newsletterarticles/complexity-economics/

75. Complex systems approaches to 21st century challenges: Introduction to the Special Issue, accessed September 13, 2025, https://www.inet.ox.ac.uk/publications/complex-systems-approaches-to-21st-century-challenges-introduction-to-the-special-issue

76. Understanding the Complexity of Economic, Ecological, and Social Systems - AMETIhST, accessed September 13, 2025, http://www.ametihst.fr/AMETIHST/Pastoralisme_files/Hollings-ecosystems2001.pdf

77. Causal inference with observational data and unobserved confounding variables - bioRxiv, accessed September 13, 2025, https://www.biorxiv.org/content/10.1101/2024.02.26.582072v1.full-text

78. ecologyandsociety.org, accessed September 13, 2025, https://ecologyandsociety.org/vol1/iss2/art4/#:~:text=Model%20uncertainty%20occurs%20when%20the,difficult%20to%20assess%20their%20likelihood.

79. Reflections : Uncertainty and Decision Making in Climate Change Economics, accessed September 13, 2025, https://www.journals.uchicago.edu/doi/10.1093/reep/ret023

80. Evidence-based conservation with Mossy Earth: encouraging lessons and challenges, accessed September 13, 2025, https://about.conservationevidence.com/2023/10/18/evidence-based-conservation-with-mossy-earth-encouraging-lessons-and-challenges/

81. The case for policy-relevant conservation science - PMC, accessed September 13, 2025, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC4510816/

82. Machine learning for causal inference in economics - IZA World of Labor, accessed September 13, 2025, https://wol.iza.org/articles/machine-learning-for-causal-inference-in-economics

83. Machine learning for causal inference in economics - IZA World of Labor, accessed

September 13, 2025, https://wol.iza.org/articles/machine-learning-for-causal-inference-in-economics/long

84. Evidence-based Conservation - Science for Nature and People Partnership, accessed September 13, 2025, https://snappartnership.net/teams/evidence-based-conservation/

85. Eliciting the plurality of causal reasoning in social-ecological systems research, accessed September 13, 2025, https://ecologyandsociety.org/vol29/iss1/art14/

86. Navigating causal reasoning in sustainability science - PMC - PubMed Central, accessed September 13, 2025, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC11436621/

87. Evidence-Based Causal Chains for Linking Health, Development, and Conservation Actions | BioScience | Oxford Academic, accessed September 13, 2025, https://academic.oup.com/bioscience/article/68/3/182/4850537