

Models In Epidemiology And Biostatistics
Gordon Hilton Fick
Session 3 : A Detailed Annotated Example

```
. cc dis exp,exact
```

	Exposed	Unexposed	Total	Proportion Exposed	
Cases	210	90	300	0.7000	
Controls	120	180	300	0.4000	
Total	330	270	600	0.5500	
	Point estimate		[95% Conf. Interval]		
Odds ratio	3.5		2.461396	4.980692	(exact)
Attr. frac. ex.	.7142857		.5937264	.7992247	(exact)
Attr. frac. pop	.5				
1-sided Fisher's exact P = 0.0000					
2-sided Fisher's exact P = 0.0000					

```
. disp r(p_exact)
1.830e-13
```

*** r(p_exact) provides the p-value with significant digits

```
. cc dis exp if smo==1,exact
```

	Exposed	Unexposed	Total	Proportion Exposed	
Cases	197	48	245	0.8041	
Controls	77	19	96	0.8021	
Total	274	67	341	0.8035	
	Point estimate		[95% Conf. Interval]		
Odds ratio	1.012716		.5270515	1.888145	(exact)
Attr. frac. ex.	.0125568		-.8973477	.4703796	(exact)
Attr. frac. pop	.0100967				
1-sided Fisher's exact P = 0.5383					
2-sided Fisher's exact P = 1.0000					

```
. cc dis exp if smo==2,exact
```

	Exposed	Unexposed	Total	Proportion Exposed	
Cases	13	42	55	0.2364	
Controls	43	161	204	0.2108	
Total	56	203	259	0.2162	
	Point estimate		[95% Conf. Interval]		
Odds ratio	1.158915		.5225342	2.444502	(exact)
Attr. frac. ex.	.1371237		-.9137503	.5909188	(exact)
Attr. frac. pop	.0324111				
1-sided Fisher's exact P = 0.4039					
2-sided Fisher's exact P = 0.7131					

```
. cc dis expo,by(smo)
```

smo	OR	[95% Conf. Interval]		M-H Weight	
1	1.012716	.5270515	1.888145	10.83871	(exact)
2	1.158915	.5225342	2.444502	6.972973	(exact)
Crude	3.5	2.461396	4.980692		(exact)
M-H combined	1.069951	.679206	1.685489		
Test of homogeneity (M-H) chi2(1) = 0.08 Pr>chi2 = 0.7746					
Test that combined OR = 1:					
Mantel-Haenszel chi2(1) =				0.08	
Pr>chi2 =				0.7708	

*** There is no evidence that smoking is a modifier from the test of homogeneity of odds ratios ($p = 0.7746$). Further, the smoking group specific estimated odds ratios are nearly the same as are the confidence intervals and group specific p-values. So here it makes sense to explore whether smoking is a confounder.

*** There is evidence that smoking is a confounder since the M-H "adjusted" OR estimate (1.069951) is different from the crude OR estimate (3.5). The confidence interval for the "assumed common" OR includes one while the confidence interval for the "crude" OR does not include one. These 2 intervals do not overlap. A test of significance for a difference between the "crude" OR and the "assumed common" OR is not warranted in most epidemiologic settings. We can test whether the assumed common OR is equal to 1 [$p\text{-value} = 0.7708$] and hence there is no evidence against the hypothesis that there is no disease-exposure association.

```
. gen smc=2-smo
```

*** gen here generates an indicator variable smc for smoking group

```
. gen ds=dis*smc
```

*** gen here creates the ds variable needed for model 2

*** model 2 fit

```
. logit expo dis smc ds
```

```
Iteration 0:  log likelihood = -412.88329
Iteration 1:  log likelihood = -304.1997
Iteration 2:  log likelihood = -304.0952
Iteration 3:  log likelihood = -304.09518
```

Logistic regression	Number of obs	=	600
	LR chi2(3)	=	217.58
	Prob > chi2	=	0.0000
Log likelihood = -304.09518	Pseudo R2	=	0.2635

expo	Coef.	Std. Err.	z	P> z	[95% Conf. Interval]	
dis	.1474841	.3608318	0.41	0.683	-.5597332	.8547015
smc	2.71957	.3083595	8.82	0.000	2.115197	3.323944
ds	-.1348479	.4708796	-0.29	0.775	-1.057755	.7880592
_cons	-1.320204	.1716595	-7.69	0.000	-1.656651	-.9837577

*** same model fit but now showing the exponents of the coefficients

```
. logit expo dis smc ds,or
```

```
Iteration 0:   log likelihood = -412.88329
Iteration 1:   log likelihood = -304.1997
Iteration 2:   log likelihood = -304.0952
Iteration 3:   log likelihood = -304.09518
```

```
Logistic regression               Number of obs   =           600
                                LR chi2(3)         =          217.58
                                Prob > chi2         =           0.0000
Log likelihood = -304.09518       Pseudo R2        =           0.2635
```

expo	Odds Ratio	Std. Err.	z	P> z	[95% Conf. Interval]	
dis	1.158915	.4181733	0.41	0.683	.5713615	2.350673
smc	15.1738	4.678986	8.82	0.000	8.291219	27.76966
ds	.8738488	.4114776	-0.29	0.775	.3472345	2.199124
_cons	.2670807	.045847	-7.69	0.000	.1907769	.3739034

*** To acclimatize to the models and the fits, it is best to write them down:

Here $p = \Pr(\text{exposure})$ and the model is:

$$\log(p/(1-p)) = \beta_0 + \beta_1 D + \beta_2 S + \beta_3 DS$$

The fit is:

$$\log(\hat{p}/(1-\hat{p})) = b_0 + b_1 D + b_2 S + b_3 DS = -1.320204 + 0.1474841 D + 2.71957 S - 0.1348479 DS$$

Notice that:

$$\exp(b_0) = \exp(-1.320204) = 0.2670807 \quad \exp(b_1) = \exp(0.1474841) = 1.158915 \quad \text{and so on...}$$

*** So 1.158915 is an estimate (for the non-smokers) of the ratio of odds of exposure among those with disease to the odds of exposure among those without disease

*** notice that 0.873849 is actually an estimate of a ratio of two odds ratios. The label on the output is incorrect.

```
. est stor M2
```

*** used for a LR test

```
. logit expo dis smc
```

```
Logistic regression               Number of obs   =           600
                                LR chi2(2)         =          217.49
                                Prob > chi2         =           0.0000
Log likelihood = -304.13608       Pseudo R2        =           0.2634
```

expo	Coef.	Std. Err.	z	P> z	[95% Conf. Interval]	
dis	.0676887	.2319921	0.29	0.770	-.3870075	.5223848
smc	2.66253	.2331505	11.42	0.000	2.205563	3.119496
_cons	-1.302446	.1592554	-8.18	0.000	-1.61458	-.9903109

```
. logit expo dis smc,or
```

```
Iteration 0:  log likelihood = -412.88329
Iteration 1:  log likelihood = -304.24066
Iteration 2:  log likelihood = -304.1361
Iteration 3:  log likelihood = -304.13608
```

```
Logistic regression              Number of obs   =          600
                                LR chi2(2)        =        217.49
                                Prob > chi2         =         0.0000
Log likelihood = -304.13608      Pseudo R2       =         0.2634
```

	expo	Odds Ratio	Std. Err.	z	P> z	[95% Conf. Interval]
	dis	1.070032	.248239	0.29	0.770	.679086 1.686044
	smc	14.3325	3.341629	11.42	0.000	9.075362 22.63497
	_cons	.2718661	.0432961	-8.18	0.000	.1989741 .3714612

*** 1.070032 is the maximum likelihood estimate (MLE) of the assumed common OR. It is slightly different from the M-H estimate (1.069951). Confidence limits are almost the same (but not quite the same) *** In other words, under the assumption that the OR among smokers is the same as the OR among non-smokers, an estimate of this assumed common OR_{ac} is 1.070032

If $H_0: OR_{ac} = 1$ then the p-value=0.770

```
. est stor M3
```

```
. logit expo dis
```

```
Iteration 0:  log likelihood = -412.88329
Iteration 1:  log likelihood = -385.21491
Iteration 2:  log likelihood = -385.16279
Iteration 3:  log likelihood = -385.16279
```

```
Logistic regression              Number of obs   =          600
                                LR chi2(1)        =         55.44
                                Prob > chi2         =         0.0000
Log likelihood = -385.16279      Pseudo R2       =         0.0671
```

	expo	Coef.	Std. Err.	z	P> z	[95% Conf. Interval]
	dis	1.252763	.1725164	7.26	0.000	.914637 1.590889
	_cons	-.4054651	.1178511	-3.44	0.001	-.6364491 -.1744811

```
. logit expo dis,or
```

```
Iteration 0:  log likelihood = -412.88329
Iteration 1:  log likelihood = -385.21491
Iteration 2:  log likelihood = -385.16279
Iteration 3:  log likelihood = -385.16279
```

```
Logistic regression              Number of obs   =          600
                                LR chi2(1)        =         55.44
                                Prob > chi2         =         0.0000
Log likelihood = -385.16279      Pseudo R2       =         0.0671
```

	expo	Odds Ratio	Std. Err.	z	P> z	[95% Conf. Interval]
	dis	3.5	.6038074	7.26	0.000	2.495869 4.90811
	_cons	.6666667	.0785674	-3.44	0.001	.5291681 .8398927

*** We see that 3.5 is an estimate of the crude OR. This number is the same as that number computed in the first table [cc dis exp, exact]

```
. est stor M1
```

```
. lrtest M2 M3
```

```
Likelihood-ratio test                                LR chi2(1)  =      0.08
(Assumption: M3 nested in M2)                       Prob > chi2 =     0.7749
```

*** For this example, the Likelihood Ratio (LR) test gives almost the same p-value as the Wald test. In principle, the LR test has better sampling properties than the Wald test.

```
. lrtest M1 M2
```

```
Likelihood-ratio test                                LR chi2(2)  =    162.14
(Assumption: M1 nested in M2)                       Prob > chi2 =     0.0000
```

*** This test is not needed here

```
. disp 1/(1+exp(1.320204)) .21078436
```

*** This is the proportion exposed among the non-smoking controls (or the estimated probability of exposure among the non-smoking controls

```
. disp log(.21078/(1-.21078)) -1.3202302
```

*** This is the estimated log of odds of exposure among the non-smoking controls

*** Lets now consider modeling the log odds of disease

*** Interpret all the regression coefficients and their exponents.

*** When are the interpretations the same as modeling the log odds of exposure? When are the interpretations different? Why?

```
. gen es = expo * smc
```

```
. logit dis expo smc es
```

```
Iteration 0:  log likelihood = -415.88831
Iteration 1:  log likelihood = -336.60557
Iteration 2:  log likelihood = -336.52171
Iteration 3:  log likelihood = -336.5217
```

```
Logistic regression                                Number of obs    =      600
                                                    LR chi2(3)       =    158.73
                                                    Prob > chi2      =     0.0000
Log likelihood = -336.5217                        Pseudo R2       =     0.1908
```

	dis	Coef.	Std. Err.	z	P> z	[95% Conf. Interval]	
expo		.147484	.3608318	0.41	0.683	-.5597334	.8547013
smc		2.270497	.3216918	7.06	0.000	1.639992	2.901001
es		-.1348477	.4708797	-0.29	0.775	-1.057755	.7880595
_cons		-1.343735	.1732648	-7.76	0.000	-1.683328	-1.004142

```
. logit dis expo smc es, or
```

```
Iteration 0:  log likelihood = -415.88831
Iteration 1:  log likelihood = -336.60557
Iteration 2:  log likelihood = -336.52171
Iteration 3:  log likelihood = -336.5217
```

```
Logistic regression                Number of obs    =          600
                                   LR chi2(3)         =       158.73
                                   Prob > chi2         =       0.0000
Log likelihood = -336.5217         Pseudo R2        =       0.1908
```

	dis	Odds Ratio	Std. Err.	z	P> z	[95% Conf. Interval]
expo		1.158915	.4181733	0.41	0.683	.5713614 2.350672
smc		9.68421	3.115331	7.06	0.000	5.15513 18.19235
es		.873849	.4114777	-0.29	0.775	.3472345 2.199125
_cons		.2608696	.0451995	-7.76	0.000	.1857548 .3663589

```
. logit dis expo smc
```

```
Iteration 0:  log likelihood = -415.88831
Iteration 1:  log likelihood = -336.64237
Iteration 2:  log likelihood = -336.56261
Iteration 3:  log likelihood = -336.5626
```

```
Logistic regression                Number of obs    =          600
                                   LR chi2(2)         =       158.65
                                   Prob > chi2         =       0.0000
Log likelihood = -336.5626         Pseudo R2        =       0.1907
```

	dis	Coef.	Std. Err.	z	P> z	[95% Conf. Interval]
expo		.0676888	.2319921	0.29	0.770	-.3870074 .5223849
smc		2.208323	.2354759	9.38	0.000	1.746799 2.669847
_cons		-1.325646	.1604954	-8.26	0.000	-1.640211 -1.01108

```
. logit dis expo smc, or
```

```
Iteration 0:  log likelihood = -415.88831
Iteration 1:  log likelihood = -336.64237
Iteration 2:  log likelihood = -336.56261
Iteration 3:  log likelihood = -336.5626
```

```
Logistic regression                Number of obs    =          600
                                   LR chi2(2)         =       158.65
                                   Prob > chi2         =       0.0000
Log likelihood = -336.5626         Pseudo R2        =       0.1907
```

	dis	Odds Ratio	Std. Err.	z	P> z	[95% Conf. Interval]
expo		1.070032	.248239	0.29	0.770	.6790861 1.686044
smc		9.100444	2.142935	9.38	0.000	5.736212 14.43777
_cons		.2656314	.0426326	-8.26	0.000	.1939392 .3638258

```
. logit dis expo, or
```

```
Iteration 0:  log likelihood = -415.88831
Iteration 1:  log likelihood = -388.19658
Iteration 2:  log likelihood = -388.16781
Iteration 3:  log likelihood = -388.16781
```

```
Logistic regression
```

```
Number of obs      =          600
LR chi2(1)          =          55.44
Prob > chi2         =          0.0000
Pseudo R2          =          0.0667
```

```
Log likelihood = -388.16781
```

```
-----+-----
      dis | Odds Ratio   Std. Err.      z    P>|z|     [95% Conf. Interval]
-----+-----
      expo |           3.5   .6038074     7.26   0.000     2.495869     4.90811
      _cons |            .5   .0645497    -5.37   0.000     .3882222     .6439611
-----+-----
```