

Models In Epidemiology And Biostatistics

Gordon Hilton Fick

OCCS Example

Breslow & Day 2: The Oxford Childhood Cancer Survey (Breslow & Day, 1980, p. 238; Kneale, 1971; Steward & Kneale, 1970). Data are from a case-control study of childhood leukemia and lymphoid tumors and in utero X-ray exposure (Kneale et al., 1971). [bd2_occs.dta]

[adapted from B&D p239]

"Cases were ascertained as all children under ten years of age in England and Wales who died of cancer (leukaemia or solid tumours) during the period 1954-65. For each of these a neighbourhood control of the same age was selected who was alive and well at the time the case died. Only "traced" pairs, for whom both case and control mothers could be found and interviewed, were analysed. The published data ignore the exact pairing but do preserve the stratification by age and year of birth. Exposure in this example is simply a question of whether or not the study subjects received in utero irradiation, as reported by the mother. The stratification variables were age at death, from 0 to 9 years, and year of birth, from 1944 to 1964. Because of the limited period of case ascertainment, not all 210 possible combinations of these factors appear. For example, among childhood cancer patients born in 1944, only those who died at age 9 are represented. A total of 120 such strata were available. In order to estimate the overall [odds ratio] of obstetric radiation, and to determine whether, and if so how, it varied with age and year, B&D fitted [several models]. Different subsets of these were entered into the regression equation so as to detect particular kinds of trends and patterns in the [odds ratio].

...absolutely no improvements in fit accompanied the addition to the model of either linear or quadratic terms in age. The [model with the quadratic term] would be expected to be particularly sensitive to a peak in [odds ratio] as a function of age. The lack of evidence for any such peak argues against the hypothesis that the age distributions for radiogenic and idiopathic cancers are different. Improvements in radiological technology probably account for the declining effect with year of birth (Bithel & Stewart, 1975)

...there is reasonably strong evidence for a decrease in [odds ratio] with year of birth. Additional improvement in fit occurs when a quadratic term in year is added to the model, which would indicate a degree of curvature in the regression []."

A 'classic' stratified analysis with year of birth as a potential modifier/confounder reveals modification and gives an indication that the modification is nonlinear. There is a zero cell in the 2x2 table for year 1944.

. cc case xray,by(year)

year	OR	[95% Conf. Interval]		M-H Weight
-----+-----				
44	.	.8157625	.	0 (exact)
45	1.86413	.4370265	9.220175	1.735849 (exact)
46	6.086957	1.655264	33.37558	1.277778 (exact)
47	5.403974	1.94783	18.51057	2.157143 (exact)
48	1.837037	.9587835	3.603219	7.765487 (exact)
49	2.298573	1.291701	4.189765	8.855872 (exact)
50	1.815077	1.114283	2.990642	13.49565 (exact)
51	2.208451	1.426582	3.459539	15.30886 (exact)
52	1.608289	1.09168	2.380225	22.19341 (exact)
53	1.139128	.7872242	1.65031	28.75047 (exact)
54	1.241791	.8663844	1.782844	28.95062 (exact)
55	2.180089	1.500615	3.187992	20.76115 (exact)

56		1.654557	1.154303	2.380164	25.20788 (exact)
57		1.7875	1.150412	2.798637	16.50794 (exact)
58		1.283668	.8268379	1.999771	19.38889 (exact)
59		1.167917	.6518969	2.104466	11.91061 (exact)
60		1.261538	.7046335	2.275107	11.47059 (exact)
61		1.187135	.5792494	2.453088	8.015625 (exact)
62		2.580709	1.03145	7.041538	3.479452 (exact)
63		.8901099	.304439	2.567848	4.55 (exact)
64		8.68	.9789227	403.4644	.390625 (exact)

Crude		1.650475	1.477037	1.84433	(exact)
M-H combined		1.65431	1.482312	1.846267	

Test of homogeneity (Tarone) chi2(20) = 35.85 Pr>chi2 = 0.0160

Test that combined OR = 1:

Mantel-Haenszel chi2(1) = 81.99
Pr>chi2 = 0.0000

. gen cy = case*year

. gen y2 = year*year

. gen cy2 = case*y2

. logit xray i.case##i.year

note: 0.case#44.year != 0 predicts failure perfectly

0.case#44.year dropped and 28 obs not used

note: 1.case#64.year omitted because of collinearity

Logistic regression	Number of obs	=	11824
	LR chi2(40)	=	199.09
	Prob > chi2	=	0.0000
Log likelihood = -4463.1587	Pseudo R2	=	0.0218

xray		Coef.	Std. Err.	z	P> z	[95% Conf. Interval]

1.case		2.161012	1.102318	1.96	0.050	.0005075 4.321516
year						
45		1.77575	1.363396	1.30	0.193	-.8964566 4.447956
46		.7259616	1.389707	0.52	0.601	-1.997814 3.449737
47		.7549406	1.339521	0.56	0.573	-1.870472 3.380354
48		1.834109	1.284057	1.43	0.153	-.6825964 4.350815
49		1.765116	1.280588	1.38	0.168	-.7447892 4.275022
50		2.000808	1.273925	1.57	0.116	-.4960383 4.497655
51		1.920932	1.272013	1.51	0.131	-.5721683 4.414031
52		2.276298	1.268642	1.79	0.073	-.2101938 4.76279
53		2.350403	1.267095	1.85	0.064	-.1330569 4.833863
54		2.499085	1.266937	1.97	0.049	.015935 4.982236
55		2.216086	1.268739	1.75	0.081	-.2705975 4.702769
56		2.466349	1.267521	1.95	0.052	-.017946 4.950644
57		2.147109	1.271376	1.69	0.091	-.3447428 4.638961
58		2.201834	1.270212	1.73	0.083	-.2877364 4.691404
59		1.734237	1.27668	1.36	0.174	-.7680106 4.236485
60		2.03404	1.277093	1.59	0.111	-.4690153 4.537096
61		2.012592	1.284423	1.57	0.117	-.5048305 4.530014
62		1.433463	1.311749	1.09	0.274	-1.137518 4.004444
63		2.084051	1.303668	1.60	0.110	-.4710915 4.639193
64		.8472979	.7457818	1.14	0.256	-.6144076 2.309003

case#year						
0 44		(empty)				
1 45		-1.538217	1.284566	-1.20	0.231	-4.055921 .9794863

1 46		-.3548979	1.277232	-0.28	0.781	-2.858227	2.148431
1 47		-.4739031	1.212136	-0.39	0.696	-2.849645	1.901839
1 48		-1.552858	1.145799	-1.36	0.175	-3.798583	.6928669
1 49		-1.328723	1.137329	-1.17	0.243	-3.557848	.9004011
1 50		-1.564884	1.127611	-1.39	0.165	-3.77496	.6451924
1 51		-1.368721	1.122949	-1.22	0.223	-3.56966	.8322188
1 52		-1.685841	1.118543	-1.51	0.132	-3.878145	.5064621
1 53		-2.030749	1.117019	-1.82	0.069	-4.220066	.1585685
1 54		-1.944457	1.116328	-1.74	0.082	-4.13242	.2435051
1 55		-1.381646	1.117533	-1.24	0.216	-3.571971	.8086783
1 56		-1.657478	1.116406	-1.48	0.138	-3.845594	.5306372
1 57		-1.580194	1.12313	-1.41	0.159	-3.781488	.6211005
1 58		-1.911291	1.122866	-1.70	0.089	-4.112068	.2894866
1 59		-2.00579	1.137085	-1.76	0.078	-4.234435	.2228553
1 60		-1.92868	1.137123	-1.70	0.090	-4.157401	.3000406
1 61		-1.98947	1.153202	-1.73	0.084	-4.249705	.2707655
1 62		-1.212948	1.186532	-1.02	0.307	-3.538508	1.112612
1 63		-2.277422	1.20346	-1.89	0.058	-4.636162	.0813169
1 64		(omitted)					
<hr/>							
_cons		-4.281275	1.260333	-3.40	0.001	-6.751483	-1.811068

Notice that because of the zero cell, Stata flags year 1944 but then drops a coefficient with 1964. This makes interpretation awkward.

Reverse coding of year of birth [gen y65= 65-year] attempts to resolve the awkward deletion.

```
. logit xray case##y65
```

```
note: 0.case#21.y65 != 0 predicts failure perfectly
      0.case#21.y65 dropped and 28 obs not used
```

```
note: 1.case#21.y65 omitted because of collinearity
```

Logistic regression	Number of obs	=	11,824
	LR chi2(40)	=	199.09
	Prob > chi2	=	0.0000
Log likelihood = -4463.1587	Pseudo R2	=	0.0218

xray	Coef.	Std. Err.	z	P> z	[95% Conf. Interval]
1.case	2.161012	1.102318	1.96	0.050	.0005075 4.321516
y65					
2	1.236753	1.06928	1.16	0.247	-.8589974 3.332504
3	.5861655	1.079118	0.54	0.587	-1.528866 2.701197
4	1.165294	1.04573	1.11	0.265	-.8842993 3.214887
5	1.186743	1.036714	1.14	0.252	-.845179 3.218664
6	.8869392	1.036206	0.86	0.392	-1.143987 2.917865
7	1.354536	1.028226	1.32	0.188	-.6607499 3.369822
8	1.299811	1.029664	1.26	0.207	-.7182926 3.317915
9	1.619051	1.024899	1.58	0.114	-.3897144 3.627817
10	1.368788	1.026406	1.33	0.182	-.6429305 3.380507
11	1.651788	1.024177	1.61	0.107	-.3555623 3.659137
12	1.503105	1.024372	1.47	0.142	-.5046275 3.510838
13	1.429	1.026285	1.39	0.164	-.5824816 3.440482
14	1.073634	1.03045	1.04	0.297	-.9460108 3.093278
15	1.15351	1.032809	1.12	0.264	-.8707574 3.177778
16	.9178184	1.041016	0.88	0.378	-1.122535 2.958172
17	.9868113	1.045281	0.94	0.345	-1.061902 3.035524
18	-.0923572	1.112711	-0.08	0.934	-2.273231 2.088517
19	-.1213363	1.172644	-0.10	0.918	-2.419677 2.177005
20	.9284517	1.14134	0.81	0.416	-1.308534 3.165437
21	-.8472979	.7457818	-1.14	0.256	-2.309003 .6144076

```

case#y65 |
0 21 | 0 (empty)
1 2 | -2.277422 1.20346 -1.89 0.058 -4.636162 .0813169
1 3 | -1.212948 1.186532 -1.02 0.307 -3.538508 1.112612
1 4 | -1.98947 1.153202 -1.73 0.084 -4.249705 .2707655
1 5 | -1.92868 1.137123 -1.70 0.090 -4.157401 .3000406
1 6 | -2.00579 1.137085 -1.76 0.078 -4.234435 .2228553
1 7 | -1.911291 1.122866 -1.70 0.089 -4.112068 .2894866
1 8 | -1.580194 1.12313 -1.41 0.159 -3.781488 .6211005
1 9 | -1.657478 1.116406 -1.48 0.138 -3.845594 .5306372
1 10 | -1.381646 1.117533 -1.24 0.216 -3.571971 .8086783
1 11 | -1.944457 1.116328 -1.74 0.082 -4.13242 .2435051
1 12 | -2.030749 1.117019 -1.82 0.069 -4.220066 .1585685
1 13 | -1.685841 1.118543 -1.51 0.132 -3.878145 .5064621
1 14 | -1.368721 1.122949 -1.22 0.223 -3.56966 .8322188
1 15 | -1.564884 1.127611 -1.39 0.165 -3.77496 .6451924
1 16 | -1.328723 1.137329 -1.17 0.243 -3.557848 .9004011
1 17 | -1.552858 1.145799 -1.36 0.175 -3.798583 .6928669
1 18 | -.4739031 1.212136 -0.39 0.696 -2.849645 1.901839
1 19 | -.3548979 1.277232 -0.28 0.781 -2.858227 2.148431
1 20 | -1.538217 1.284566 -1.20 0.231 -4.055921 .9794863
1 21 | 0 (omitted)
_cons | -3.433978 1.015996 -3.38 0.001 -5.425294 -1.442661

```

With this coding, both terms involving y65=21 [year=44] are dropped. A more natural circumstance.

The 2x2 table with the zero cell can be studied using a 'classic' approach and an 'exact' approach.

```
. cc xray case if year==44,exact
```

	case		Proportion
	Exposed	Unexposed	Total Exposed
Cases	3	0	3 1.0000
Controls	25	28	53 0.4717
Total	28	28	56 0.5000
	Point estimate		[95% Conf. Interval]
Odds ratio	.	.	.8157625 . (Cornfield)
Attr. frac. ex.	.	.	-.2258469 . (Cornfield)
Attr. frac. pop	.	.	

1-sided Fisher's exact P = 0.1182
2-sided Fisher's exact P = 0.2364

Note: Exact confidence levels not possible with zero count cells.

```
. exlogistic xray case if year==44,test(prob) nolog
note: CMLE estimate for case is +inf; computing MUE
```

```

Exact logistic regression      Number of obs =      56
                               Model prob.   =    .1181818
                               Pr <= prob.    =    0.2364

```

xray	Odds Ratio	Prob.	Pr<=Prob.	[95% Conf. Interval]
case	4.082205*	.1181818	0.2364	.4225252 +Inf

(*) median unbiased estimates (MUE)

For a discussion of median unbiased estimation, see [for example] the paper: "An Estimate of the Odds

. logit xray case year y2 cy cy2

Logistic regression

Number of obs = 11852

LR chi2(5) = 147.55

Prob > chi2 = 0.0000

Pseudo R2 = 0.0162

Log likelihood = -4492.8123

xray	Coef.	Std. Err.	z	P> z	[95% Conf. Interval]	
case	23.70231	9.102694	2.60	0.009	5.861357	41.54326
year	1.622869	.2713843	5.98	0.000	1.090966	2.154773
y2	-.0147354	.0024866	-5.93	0.000	-.0196091	-.0098617
cy	-.8189415	.335467	-2.44	0.015	-1.476445	-.1614382
cy2	.0071771	.0030814	2.33	0.020	.0011377	.0132166
_cons	-46.61945	7.383641	-6.31	0.000	-61.09112	-32.14778

. logit xray case year cy

Logistic regression

Number of obs = 11852

Pseudo R2 = 0.0096

Log likelihood = -4522.5276

xray	Coef.	Std. Err.	z	P> z	[95% Conf. Interval]	
case	2.22213	.7077249	3.14	0.002	.8350145	3.609245
year	.0173936	.0099927	1.74	0.082	-.0021917	.036979
cy	-.0316978	.0129821	-2.44	0.015	-.0571422	-.0062534
_cons	-3.125853	.5465336	-5.72	0.000	-4.197039	-2.054667

