

HOMEWORK #4 Solutions

1A. The equations are given below:

- Linear (log odds) form:

$$\log \frac{P(\text{exer3})}{1-P(\text{exer3})} = -0.5186 - 0.4268 \text{ exer3}$$

- Nonlinear (probability) form:

$$P(\text{exer3}) = \frac{\exp(-0.5186 - 0.4268 \text{ exer3})}{1 + \exp(-0.5186 - 0.4268 \text{ exer3})} = \frac{1}{1 + \exp(0.5186 + 0.4268 \text{ exer3})}$$

1B. The coefficient denoted `cons_` in the output is the intercept of the regression model. This gives the log odds of hypertension (`hypert` = 1) for an individual reporting exercising less than 3 times / week (i.e. `exer3` = 0). The coefficient for `exer3` is the log odds ratio comparing the odds of hypertension in individuals exercising ≥ 3 times weekly to the corresponding odds in those who report less exercise.

1C. The exponentiated coefficient and 95% confidence interval (0.653; 0.501, 0.851) are shown in the Stata output below:

```
. dis exp(-.4267843 )
.6526043

. dis exp(-.6918335)
.50065727

. dis exp(-.1617351)
.85066652
```

1D. The estimated odds ratio for `exer3` is 0.653, indicating that women in HERS who exercise at the higher level have approximately 35% lower odds of hypertension than women reporting less exercise.

1E. As discussed in lecture, the z in the output refers to the Wald statistic for the null hypothesis that the true coefficient for `exer3` is zero, and is calculated as the ratio of the regression coefficient to its standard error. The P -value for this test is 0.002, indicating rejection of the null hypothesis using the conventional 5% significance level. We can restate the null hypothesis and test results equivalently in terms of the odds ratio for `exer3`, and conclude that the true odds ratio is less than one at the same level of significance. Similarly, the 95% confidence limits for the true coefficient (odds ratio) exclude the null value of zero (one), corroborating the Wald test P -value and adding information in the HERS sample about the degree of uncertainty about the true odds ratio.

2A. The requested representations are given by the two equations below:

- Linear (log odds) form : $\log \frac{P(\text{bmi})}{1-P(\text{bmi})} = -1.7421 + 0.0376 \text{ bmi}$
- Nonlinear (probability) form : $P(\text{bmi}) = \frac{\exp(-1.7421 + 0.0376 \text{ bmi})}{1 + \exp(-1.7421 + 0.0376 \text{ bmi})}$

2B. As before, the coefficient denoted `cons_` is the intercept of the regression model. This gives the log odds of hypertension (`hypt = 1`) for an individual with a body mass index of zero (`bmi = 0`). This is clearly not of practical interest, and a more interpretable result would be based on a model fitted to the *centered* value of `bmi` (i.e. `bmi - mean(bmi)`). In this case, the intercept term is interpreted as the log odds ratio for an individual with average BMI. This model is shown below (where `bmic` represents the centered version of `bmi`):

```
. logistic hypt bmic, coef
```

```
Logistic regression               Number of obs   =       1055
                                LR chi2(1)         =         9.35
                                Prob > chi2          =        0.0022
Log likelihood = -667.76922       Pseudo R2        =        0.0070
```

	hypt	Coef.	Std. Err.	z	P> z	[95% Conf. Interval]	
	bmic	.0376171	.012309	3.06	0.002	.0134918	.0617423
	_cons	-.6934261	.065649	-10.56	0.000	-.8220958	-.5647564

The intercept term now corresponds to an outcome odds of $\exp(-0.6934261) = 0.50$. (i.e. the odds of hypertension among individuals with average BMI is 1 in 2.) This odds estimate can be converted to an outcome probability (P) using the following relationship:

$$\text{odds} = \frac{P}{1-P}; \quad P = \frac{\text{odds}}{1+\text{odds}}$$

Notice that the coefficient (and corresponding odds ratio) for `bmi` are the same in both models. Thus, the original model suffices if interest is limited to the effect on outcome risk of changes in BMI. The coefficient for `bmi` (in either model) represents the change in the log odds of hypertension associated with a one-unit (in kg/m^2) increase in BMI.

2C. The exponentiated coefficient and 95% confidence interval (1.0383336; 1.0135832, 1.0636882) are shown in the Stata output below:

```
. dis exp(.0376171)
1.0383336
. dis exp(.0134918)
1.0135832
. dis exp(.0617423)
1.0636882
```

2D. The estimated odds ratio for `bmi` is 1.04, indicating that a one-unit increase in `bmi` (in

kg/m²) is associated an approximate 4% increase in odds of hypertension.

2E. The estimated odds ratio for a 30-unit increase in bmi is given below:

```
. dis exp(.0376171*30)
3.0910567
```

2F. The derivation is given below, comparing the log odds of an individual with bmi = 50 to one with bmi = 20:

$$\begin{aligned} \log \frac{P(50)}{1-P(50)} - \log \frac{P(20)}{1-P(20)} &= (-1.7421 + 0.0376 \times 50) - (-1.7421 + 0.0376 \times 20) \\ &= 0.0376 \times 30 = 1.128; \quad \exp(1.128) = 3.09 \end{aligned}$$

2G. The desired “relative risk” is obtained by plugging the estimated coefficients and values for bmi directly into the expression for the outcome probability:

$$\frac{P(50)}{P(20)} = \frac{\frac{\exp(-1.7421 + 0.0376 \times 50)}{1 + \exp(-1.7421 + 0.0376 \times 50)}}{\frac{\exp(-1.7421 + 0.0376 \times 20)}{1 + \exp(-1.7421 + 0.0376 \times 20)}} = \frac{0.5344}{0.2709} = 1.973$$

Since we aren’t given the necessary variability information about the coefficients in the logistic output, we can’t compute a confidence interval for the estimated relative risk. A confidence would require an application of the `nlcom` command, or an alternative like bootstrap sampling. Here’s the `nlcom` estimate:

```
. nlcom ((exp(_b[_cons] + _b[bmi]*50)/(1+exp(_b[_cons] + _b[bmi]*50)))) /
((exp(_b[_cons] + _b[bmi]*20)/(1+exp(_b[_cons] + _b[bmi]*20))))

      _nl_1: ((exp(_b[_cons] + _b[bmi]*50)/(1+exp(_b[_cons] + _b[bmi]*50)))) /
((exp(_b[_cons] + _b[bmi]*20)/(1+exp(_b[_cons] + _b[bmi]*20))))
```

hypt	Coef.	Std. Err.	z	P> z	[95% Conf. Interval]	
-----+-----						
_nl_1	1.973107	.3929321	5.02	0.000	1.202974	2.74324
-----+-----						

Problem 3

Here is the Stata output for the desired model:

```
. logistic sta i.crn i.typ i.can i.loc i.agecat i.syscat
```

```
note: 1.loc != 0 predicts success perfectly
      1.loc dropped and 5 obs not used
```

```
Logistic regression               Number of obs   =       195
                                LR chi2(10)        =       62.06
                                Prob > chi2         =       0.0000
Log likelihood = -60.742305       Pseudo R2      =       0.3381
```

sta	Odds Ratio	Std. Err.	z	P> z	[95% Conf. Interval]	
1.crn	2.840999	2.165964	1.37	0.171	.6375571	12.65969
1.typ	52.63315	69.20641	3.01	0.003	3.999717	692.611
1.can	13.62877	13.28441	2.68	0.007	2.017263	92.0769
loc						
1	1 (empty)					
2	16.38254	15.17629	3.02	0.003	2.665963	100.672
agecat						
2	4.240071	3.244213	1.89	0.059	.9464375	18.99566
3	5.588847	4.478942	2.15	0.032	1.161885	26.88322
4	13.20398	9.938337	3.43	0.001	3.020121	57.72781
syscat						
2	.7691673	.4733606	-0.43	0.670	.2302368	2.569608
3	1.059359	.6293668	0.10	0.923	.3306305	3.394246
4	.0768537	.0754065	-2.62	0.009	.0112329	.525821
_cons	.0011421	.0018182	-4.26	0.000	.0000504	.0258683

3A. The interpretation of the estimated odds ratios is as follows:

1. The odds ratio for `crn` compares the odds of dying for individuals with a history of chronic renal failure with the corresponding odds for those with no such history. This estimate is adjusted for the other predictors in the model.
2. The odds ratio for `typ` compares the odds of death for individuals admitted for emergencies relative to the corresponding odds for elective admissions, also adjusted for the presence of the other included predictors.

3B. The predictor `loc` has three levels, yet only one odds ratio was estimated. Stata's warning message about this appears in the output above. An explanation is apparent when viewing the cross-tabulation of the outcome `sta` and the predictor `loc`:

```
. tab sta loc
```

vital status (1 = died)	level of consciousness at admis			Total
	0	1	2	
0	158	0	2	160
1	27	5	8	40
Total	185	5	10	200

Since all five individuals with level 1 of `loc` were observed to die, the corresponding odds are infinite. Therefore, a log odds ratio can't be estimated for the logistic model (because an infinite OR doesn't make any sense, and there are no data to provide a realistic estimate) so these individuals are removed from the model fit. One way to retain these data in the model would be to collapse the categories of `loc` into two. The disadvantage with this approach is that collapsing categories may change the interpretation of other aspects of the model. In this case, it may be best to go with the default output, and note that five individuals couldn't be used.

3C. The trend test is given below in Stata 11 syntax, referring the table in Chapter 4:

```
. test -2.agecat+3.agecat+3*4.agecat==0

( 1)  - [sta]2.agecat + [sta]3.agecat + 3*[sta]4.agecat = 0

      chi2( 1) =    11.55
      Prob > chi2 =    0.0007
```

The results are consistent with a significant linear trend in the log mortality odds with increasing age.

Note that in Stata 12-13 we could also use the new contrast command as shown in the book:

```
. contrast q(1).agecat, noeffects

Contrasts of marginal linear predictions

Margins      : asbalanced

-----+-----
          |          df          chi2          P>chi2
-----+-----
    agecat |             1          11.55          0.0007
-----+-----
```

3D. The following `lincom` statement asks for the desired OR:

```
. lincom 3.agecat - 2.agecat

( 1)  - [sta]2.agecat + [sta]3.agecat = 0

-----+-----
      sta | Odds Ratio   Std. Err.      z    P>|z|     [95% Conf. Interval]
-----+-----
      (1) |    1.318102   .8756019    0.42   0.678     .3585127     4.846114
```

Refitting the model using the 2nd category of age as baseline would be another way to get this result. The following output is edited to include only the estimated ORs for `agecat`:

```
. logistic sta i.crn i.typ i.can i.loc ib2.agecat i.syscat
```

agecat							
1		.2358451	.1804525	-1.89	0.059	.0526436	1.056594
3		1.318102	.8756019	0.42	0.678	.3585127	4.846114
4		3.114093	1.864163	1.90	0.058	.9633494	10.06652

3E. The Stata code on the following page refits the full model again (suppressing output), saves the log-likelihood in the location `LF`, then fits each of the nested models excluding the predictors of interest (again suppressing output) and performs the requested LR tests.

```
. quietly logistic sta i.crn i.typ i.can i.loc i.agecat i.syscat
. estimates store LF
. quietly logistic sta i.crn i.typ i.can i.loc i.syscat
. lrtest LF
```

Likelihood-ratio test	LR chi2(3) =	14.96
(Assumption: . nested in LF)	Prob > chi2 =	0.0018

```
. quietly logistic sta i.crn i.typ i.can i.loc i.agecat
. lrtest LF
```

Likelihood-ratio test	LR chi2(3) =	10.86
(Assumption: . nested in LF)	Prob > chi2 =	0.0125

The first test result is for the contribution of `agecat`, the second for `syscat`. (Recall that the LR test evaluates the contribution of the variable(s) left out of the full model.)

O1. Possible Stata code for the requested program is reproduced below:

```
* Example simulation to investigate non-collapsibility of an OR
* estimated from a logistic model for a binary outcome Y,
* dependent on two binary predictors X1 and X2 that are
* independent (i.e. not confounders of each other's effects
* on Y). The program below takes the sample size "n" as well as
* regression coefficients (b0, b1 & b2) for the logistic model
* relating the outcome y to predictors x1 & x2 as arguments

program define lreg
args n b0 b1 b2
drop _all
set obs `n'

* generate a binary random variable x1 with prevalence 0.5
gen x1 = rbinomial(1,0.5)

* generate an indep. continuous random variable x2 with
* mean 0, SD 1
gen x2 = rnormal(0,1)

* generate a binary random variable y dependent on x1 & x2
* via a logistic model with coefficients b0, b1 & b2
gen px = 1/(1 + exp(-(`b0' + `b1'*x1 + `b2'*x2)))
gen y = rbinomial(1,px)

* fit adjusted model, save adjusted effect of x1
logistic y x1 x2, coef
matrix rb = r(table)
scalar badj = rb[1,1]

* fit marginal model, save b1 & b2 coefficients
logistic y x1, coef
matrix rb = r(table)
scalar bmar = rb[1,1]

end
```

The output below shows a few runs of the program using the `simulate` command with 1000 repetitions. The created variables `_sim_1` and `_sim_2` contain the simulated values for the conditional and marginal log odds ratios, respectively, so the `summarize` command is used to provide the mean values over the 1000 repetitions for each simulation.


```
. simulate badj bmar, nodots reps(1000): lreg 400 -0.85 0.7 -0.1
```

```
command: lreg 400 -0.85 0.7 -0.1
_sim_1: badj
_sim_2: bmar
```

```
. summarize _sim_1 _sim_2
```

Variable	Obs	Mean	Std. Dev.	Min	Max
_sim_1	1,000	.7097447	.212815	.1003962	1.42337
_sim_2	1,000	.7059824	.2119548	.1236945	1.420839

```
. simulate badj bmar, nodots reps(1000): lreg 400 -0.85 0.7 -0.5
```

```
command: lreg 400 -0.85 0.7 -0.5
_sim_1: badj
_sim_2: bmar
```

```
. summarize _sim_1 _sim_2
```

Variable	Obs	Mean	Std. Dev.	Min	Max
_sim_1	1,000	.7003013	.2079314	.0898541	1.349149
_sim_2	1,000	.6616466	.2002114	.0433823	1.309007

```
. simulate badj bmar, nodots reps(1000): lreg 400 -0.85 0.7 -0.7
```

```
command: lreg 400 -0.85 0.7 -0.7
_sim_1: badj
_sim_2: bmar
```

```
. summarize _sim_1 _sim_2
```

Variable	Obs	Mean	Std. Dev.	Min	Max
_sim_1	1,000	.7201719	.22069	.0398158	1.361675
_sim_2	1,000	.6489487	.2062387	-.0381939	1.267067

The results indicate that for stronger effects of x_2 , the discrepancy between the conditional and marginal log odds ratios for x_1 increases (i.e. the non-collapsibility effect becomes more apparent). Since x_1 & x_2 are generated independently, this effect can't be explained by confounding.