

Models In Epidemiology And Biostatistics

Gordon Hilton Fick

Esophageal Cancer Study

Data from a case-control study of esophageal cancer and tobacco consumption (Breslow & Day, 1980; Tuyns, 1977) are available in bd1.dta. We begin with interest in the relation between tobacco consumption (tobhigh: 1 = 20+ g/day, 0 = less than 20 g/day) and esophageal cancer (case: 1 = case, 0 = control) while considering alcohol consumption (alchigh: 1 = 80+ g /day, 0 = < 80 g/day) as a potential confounder/modifier.

```
. cc case tobhigh,by(alchigh)
```

alchigh	OR	[95% Conf. Interval]		M-H Weight	
0	2.061417	1.266494	3.305202	11.54545	(exact)
1	1.699605	.8631744	3.362881	7.404878	(exact)
Crude	1.960784	1.361333	2.806287		(exact)
M-H combined	1.920038	1.326402	2.779359		
Test of homogeneity (M-H) chi2(1) = 0.24 Pr>chi2 = 0.6256					
Test that combined OR = 1:					
		Mantel-Haenszel	chi2(1) =	12.29	
			Pr>chi2 =	0.0005	

```
. cc case tobhigh if alchigh==0
```

	Exposed	Unexposed	Total	Proportion Exposed
Cases	34	70	104	0.3269
Controls	127	539	666	0.1907
Total	161	609	770	0.2091
		Point estimate	[95% Conf. Interval]	
Odds ratio	2.061417		1.266494	3.305202 (exact)
Attr. frac. ex.	.5148969		.2104186	.6974466 (exact)
Attr. frac. pop	.1683317			
chi2(1) = 10.10 Pr>chi2 = 0.0015				

```
. cc case tobhigh if alchigh==1
```

	Exposed	Unexposed	Total	Proportion Exposed
Cases	30	66	96	0.3125
Controls	23	86	109	0.2110
Total	53	152	205	0.2585
		Point estimate	[95% Conf. Interval]	
Odds ratio	1.699605		.8631744	3.362881 (exact)
Attr. frac. ex.	.4116279		-.1585145	.7026359 (exact)
Attr. frac. pop	.1286337			
chi2(1) = 2.74 Pr>chi2 = 0.0977				

Breslow and Day [Volume 1] provide considerably more analyses based grouped data: alc and tob

each with 4 levels:

```
. table alc case tob
```

alc	tob and case							
	0-9	10-19	20-29	30+				
	control	case	control	case	control	case	control	case
0-39	252	9	74	10	37	5	23	5
40-79	145	34	68	17	47	15	20	9
80-119	42	19	30	19	10	6	5	7
120+	8	16	6	12	5	7	3	10

First, simultaneous stratification on alc and tob:

```
. egen ta=group(tob alc)
```

```
. tabodds case ta,or
```

ta	Odds Ratio	chi2	P>chi2	[95% Conf. Interval]	
1	1.000000
2	6.565517	29.04	0.0000	2.979617	14.466964
3	12.666667	47.63	0.0000	4.993105	32.133201
4	56.000000	109.38	0.0000	14.125754	222.005855
5	3.783784	8.71	0.0032	1.462533	9.789192
6	7.000000	25.20	0.0000	2.887903	16.967329
7	17.733333	62.46	0.0000	6.619385	47.507599
8	56.000000	96.34	0.0000	12.906495	242.978441
9	3.783784	5.85	0.0156	1.186680	12.064768
10	8.936170	31.25	0.0000	3.522942	22.667175
11	16.800000	34.01	0.0000	4.598697	61.373908
12	39.200000	62.41	0.0000	8.627518	178.109165
13	6.086957	11.35	0.0008	1.834218	20.199907
14	12.600000	34.00	0.0000	4.200670	37.793967
15	39.200000	62.41	0.0000	8.627518	178.109165
16	93.333333	103.21	0.0000	14.766136	589.938431

```
Test of homogeneity (equal odds): chi2(15) = 173.42
Pr>chi2 = 0.0000
```

```
Score test for trend of odds: chi2(1) = 57.58
Pr>chi2 = 0.0000
```

Then some intermediate steps with adjustment:

```
. tabodds case alc,or adjust(tob age)
```

Mantel-Haenszel odds ratios adjusted for tob and age

alc	Odds Ratio	chi2	P>chi2	[95% Conf. Interval]	
0-39	1.000000
40-79	4.049572	33.40	0.0000	2.422136	6.770484
80-119	7.490421	51.90	0.0000	3.929177	14.279432
120+	22.797747	112.60	0.0000	9.810159	52.979492

```
Score test for trend of odds: chi2(1) = 118.37
Pr>chi2 = 0.0000
```

```
. tabodds case tob,or adjust(alc age)
```

Mantel-Haenszel odds ratios adjusted for alc and age

tob	Odds Ratio	chi2	P>chi2	[95% Conf. Interval]	
0-9	1.000000
10-19	1.505990	3.49	0.0619	0.976845	2.321766
20-29	1.556719	2.63	0.1050	0.907592	2.670114
30+	8.099868	29.72	0.0000	3.303340	19.861064

```
Score test for trend of odds: chi2(1) = 20.07
                             Pr>chi2 = 0.0000
```

Then they offer a series of models using this grouped data [with discussion]

```
. logit case i.alc##i.tob
```

```
Logistic regression               Number of obs   =       975
                                LR chi2(15)       =      166.89
                                Prob > chi2        =       0.0000
Log likelihood = -411.2976         Pseudo R2      =       0.1687
```

case	Coef.	Std. Err.	z	P> z	[95% Conf. Interval]	
alc						
40-79	1.881831	.3890857	4.84	0.000	1.119237	2.644425
80-119	2.538974	.4376305	5.80	0.000	1.681234	3.396714
120+	4.025352	.5500721	7.32	0.000	2.94723	5.103473
tob						
10-19	1.330725	.4781139	2.78	0.005	.3936385	2.26781
20-29	1.330725	.5848986	2.28	0.023	.1843443	2.477105
30+	1.806148	.5987968	3.02	0.003	.632528	2.979768
alc#tob						
40-79#10-19	-1.266646	.5817479	-2.18	0.029	-2.406851	-.1264407
40-79#20-29	-1.022449	.6829041	-1.50	0.134	-2.360916	.3160187
40-79#30+	-1.154283	.7456387	-1.55	0.122	-2.615708	.3071423
80-119#10-19	-.9942523	.625299	-1.59	0.112	-2.219816	.2313113
80-119#20-29	-1.048319	.8277766	-1.27	0.205	-2.670732	.5740929
80-119#30+	-.6764453	.8819614	-0.77	0.443	-2.405058	1.052167
120+#10-19	-1.330725	.8161451	-1.63	0.103	-2.93034	.2688906
120+#20-29	-1.687399	.9340576	-1.81	0.071	-3.518119	.1433197
120+#30+	-1.295323	.9896418	-1.31	0.191	-3.234985	.6443398
_cons	-3.332205	.3392335	-9.82	0.000	-3.99709	-2.667319

They proceed to provide a number of analyses using the actual [ungrouped] values of alc and tob. They note that there were 163 values for alc ranging from 0 to 268 g/day. They call alc a "true continuous" variable. There were in fact 9 levels for tob ranging from 0 to 50+ g/day. They call tob "discrete".

They consider transformations of alc and tob using log(alc+1) and log(tob+1). They then consider models based on linearity on these transformed scales.