# Low Birth Weight

#### Jack Tubbs

#### September 2021

## Contents

Discussion of the Problem	1
R Problem – Infant Birth Weight Data	<b>2</b> 2
SAS	4
Code 1	4
$\operatorname{Code} 2 \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots$	5
Code 3	10
Code 4	16
oglinear Models for Contingency Tables	18
Two-Way Tables	18
Three-Way Tables	19
AS	20
Code 5	20

## Discussion of the Problem

The data contain information about infant mortality in 2003 and were obtained from the US National Center for Health Statistics. A random sample of 2,500+ observations is used in this example. This data are observational, in which case, meaningful inference is limited. The description below is for a causal inference example, which is beyond the scope of this course, given in SAS.

Our approach is to investigate this problem using the material given in the first part of Chapter 3 in the methods lecture notes.

The main variables in the analysis are as follows:

- The treatment variable is **Smoking**. It is an indicator of maternal smoking behavior, with values Yes and No.
- The outcome variable is **Death**. It is an indicator of infant death within one year of birth, with values Yes and No.
- The mediator variable is **LowBirthWgt**. It is an indicator of low birth weight (less than 2,500 grams), with values Yes and No.

The analysis also includes five confounding covariates:

• AgeGroup represents maternal ages of less than 20, between 20 and 35, and greater than 35, with values 1, 2, and 3, respectively.

- **Drinking** is an indicator of maternal drinking during pregnancy, with values Yes and No.
- Married is an indicator of marital status, with values Yes and No.
- Race is an indicator of race, with values Asian, Black, Hispanic, Native (native American), and White.
- SomeCollege is an indicator of whether the mother has 12 or more years of education, with values Yes and No.

## $\mathbf{R}$

##

##

##

##

Black

Native

White

Hispanic

91 375

83 475

169 1337

22

6

52

66

4

264

Needed Packages

```
if(!require(FSA)){install.packages("FSA")}
if(!require(ggplot2)){install.packages("ggplot2")}
if (!require("mosaic")) install.packages("mosaic", dep=FALSE)
if (!require("nortest")) install.packages("nortest", dep=TRUE)
if (!require("epitools")) install.packages("epitools", dep=TRUE)
if (!require("prettyR")) install.packages("prettyR", dep=TRUE)
if (!require("rms")) install.packages("rms", dep=TRUE)
# add other as needed
```

## Problem - Infant Birth Weight Data

Read data from SAS input file

```
# this data came from SASHELP.BWEIGHT
bw = read.csv('bwgt.csv', header = TRUE)
bw = data.frame(bw)
#summary(bw)
bw = transform(bw, AgeGroup.f = as.factor(AgeGroup))
bw = transform(bw, Race.f = as.factor(Race))
bw = transform(bw, Drinking.f = as.factor(Drinking))
bw = transform(bw, Death.f = as.factor(Death))
bw = transform(bw, Smoking.f = as.factor(Smoking))
bw = transform(bw, SomeCollege.f = as.factor(SomeCollege))
bw = transform(bw, LowBirthWgt.f = as.factor(LowBirthWgt))
tally(~ AgeGroup + Race.f, data=bw)
##
           Race.f
## AgeGroup Asian Black Hispanic Native White
##
                          83
                                      6 169
          1
                8
                     91
                             475
##
          2
              101
                    375
                                     22 1337
##
          3
              36
                     52
                              66
                                      4
                                          264
tally(~ Race.f | AgeGroup.f, data=bw)
##
             AgeGroup.f
## Race.f
                 1
                      2
                           3
##
                 8 101
                          36
     Asian
```

```
library(mosaic)
mytab = tally(~ Race.f | AgeGroup.f, data=bw)
addmargins(mytab)
##
            AgeGroup.f
## Race.f
                1
                     2
                          3 Sum
##
    Asian
                8 101
                         36 145
##
    Black
               91 375
                         52 518
##
    Hispanic 83 475
                         66 624
##
    Native
               6
                   22
                         4
                              32
##
    White
              169 1337 264 1770
##
    Sum
              357 2310 422 3089
prop.table(mytab, 1)
##
            AgeGroup.f
## Race.f
                                 2
                      1
##
    Asian
             0.05517241 0.69655172 0.24827586
##
    Black
             0.17567568 0.72393822 0.10038610
    Hispanic 0.13301282 0.76121795 0.10576923
##
##
    Native
             0.18750000 0.68750000 0.12500000
    {\tt White}
             0.09548023 0.75536723 0.14915254
##
library(epitools)
attach(bw)
mytab = tally(~ LowBirthWgt.f | Death.f, data=bw)
addmargins(mytab)
##
               Death.f
## LowBirthWgt.f No Yes Sum
            No 2278 198 2476
##
##
            Yes 205 408 613
##
            Sum 2483 606 3089
prop.table(mytab, 1)
##
               Death.f
## LowBirthWgt.f
                        No
                                  Yes
##
            No 0.92003231 0.07996769
            Yes 0.33442088 0.66557912
riskratio(x=Smoking.f, y=Death.f)
## $data
           Outcome
## Predictor No Yes Total
             156 41
                       197
##
##
      No
            1786 405 2191
##
      Yes
           541 160
                       701
      Total 2483 606 3089
##
##
## $measure
##
           risk ratio with 95% C.I.
## Predictor estimate
                          lower
                                    upper
##
            1.0000000
                             NA
                                      NA
##
        No 0.8881678 0.6670955 1.182502
##
        Yes 1.0966911 0.8087967 1.487063
                                            3
```

```
##
## $p.value
           two-sided
## Predictor midp.exact fisher.exact chi.square
##
                    NA
                                NA
##
        No 0.4206715
                       0.4449380 0.4220298
##
        Yes 0.5556210 0.6286442 0.5493629
##
## $correction
## [1] FALSE
## attr(,"method")
## [1] "Unconditional MLE & normal approximation (Wald) CI"
```

## SAS

#### Code 1

```
The Sashelp.BirthWgt data set contains 100,000 random observations about infant mortality in 2003 from the US National Center for Health Statistics. Each observation records infant death within one year of birth, birth weight, maternal smoking and drinking behavior, and other background characteristics of the mother.

*/

title "Sashelp.bweight --- Infant Birth Weight";
data birthwgt; set sashelp.birthwgt;
run;

proc contents data=birthwgt varnum;
ods select position;
run;

title "The First Five Observations Out of 100,000";
proc print data=birthwgt(obs=10);
run;
```

#### Sashelp.bweight — Infant Birth Weight

#### The CONTENTS Procedure

Variables in Creation Order						
#	Variable	Туре	Len			
1	LowBirthWgt	Char	3			
2	Married	Char	3			
3	AgeGroup	Num	8			
4	Race	Char	9			
5	Drinking	Char	3			
6	Death	Char	3			
7	Smoking	Char	3			
8	SomeCollege	Char	3			

The First Five Observations Out of 100,000

Obs	LowBirthWgt	Married	AgeGroup	Race	Drinking	Death	Smoking	SomeCollege
1	No	No	3	Asian	No	No	No	Yes
2	No	No	2	White	No	No	No	No
3	Yes	Yes	2	Native	No	Yes	No	No
4	No	No	2	White	No	No	No	No
5	No	No	2	White	No	No	No	Yes
6	No	No	2	White	No	No	No	
7	No	No	2	Asian	No	No	No	Yes
8	No	No	3	White	No	No	No	Yes
9	No	Yes	1	Black	No	No	No	No
10	No	No	2	Native	No	No	No	Yes

#### Code 2

I have changed 'Yes' responses to 'Affirm' as SAS orders the variables in the tables using an alphabetical ordering. This new order allows one to have a better interpretation of results.

```
*Create a new smaller data set;
title 'New Sample of Size 2,500';
proc surveyselect data=birthwgt out=new2 method=srs n=2500
                  seed=2021;
run;
/* I needed more death records than the srs gave me */
data new; set birthwgt; if death = 'Yes';
/*merge the two files into one */
data new_bwgt; set new new2;
run;
data new_bwgt; set new_bwgt;
if LowBirthWgt = 'Yes' then LowBirthWgt = 'Affirm';
if Death = 'Yes' then Death = 'Affirm';
if Smoking = 'Yes' then Smoking = 'Affirm';
if Drinking = 'Yes' then Drinking = 'Affirm';
title 'Test for Association between Low Birth Weight and Smoking';
proc freq data=new_bwgt;* order=freq;
tables smoking*LowBirthWgt/norow nopercent chisq relrisk riskdiff;
run;
title 'Test for Association between Low Birth Weight and drinking';
proc freq data=new_bwgt;* order=freq;
tables drinking*LowBirthWgt/norow nopercent chisq relrisk riskdiff;
```

#### New Sample of Size 2,500

#### The SURVEYSELECT Procedure

Selection Method	Simple Random Sampling
Selection Method	Simple Random Sampling

Input Data Set	BIRTHWGT
Random Number Seed	2021
Sample Size	2500
Selection Probability	0.025
Sampling Weight	40
Output Data Set	NEW2

## Test for Association between Low Birth Weight and Smoking

#### The FREQ Procedure

Table of Smoking by LowBirthWgt						
Smoking	L	LowBirthWgt				
	Aff No Total					
Aff	155 26.96	546 23.56	701			
No	420 1771 2191 73.04 76.44					
Total	575 2317 2892					
	Frequency Missing = 197					

Note Statistics for Table of Smoking by LowBirthWgt	
---	--

In the following table there is not a significant association at the .05 level between Low Birth Weight and Smoking. This is seen in the chi-square statistic and the relative risk and odds ratio.

Statistic	DF	Value	Prob
Chi-Square	1	2.8856	0.0894
Likelihood Ratio Chi-Square	1	2.8341	0.0923
Continuity Adj. Chi-Square	1	2.7038	0.1001
Mantel-Haenszel Chi-Square	1	2.8846	0.0894
Phi Coefficient		0.0316	
Contingency Coefficient		0.0316	
Cramer's V		0.0316	

Fisher's Exact Test				
Cell (1,1) Frequency (F)	155			
Left-sided Pr <= F	0.9593			
Right-sided Pr >= F	0.0510			
Table Probability (P)	0.0102			
Two-sided Pr <= P	0.0921			

Column 1 Risk Estimates						
	Risk	ASE	95% Confidence Limits Exact 95% Confidence Limits			5% Confidence Limits
Row 1	0.2211	0.0157	0.1904	0.2518	0.1909	0.2537
Row 2	0.1917	0.0084	0.1752	0.2082	0.1754	0.2088
Total	0.1988	0.0074	0.1843	0.2134	0.1844	0.2138
Difference	0.0294	0.0178	-0.0054	0.0643		
Difference is (Row 1 - Row 2)						

Column 2 Risk Estimates						
	Risk	ASE	95% Confi	95% Confidence Limits Exact 95% Confiden		
Row 1	0.7789	0.0157	0.7482	0.8096	0.7463	0.8091
Row 2	0.8083	0.0084	0.7918	0.8248	0.7912	0.8246
Total	0.8012	0.0074	0.7866	0.8157	0.7862	0.8156
Difference	-0.0294	0.0178	-0.0643	0.0054		
Difference is (Row 1 - Row 2)						

Odds Ratio and Relative Risks							
Statistic Value 95% Confidence Limits							
Odds Ratio	1.1970	0.9725 1.4734					
Relative Risk (Column 1)	1.1535	0.9796	1.3582				
Relative Risk (Column 2)	0.9636	0.9218	1.0074				

Note	Sample Size = 2892 Frequency Missing = 197

## Test for Association between Low Birth Weight and drinking

In the following table there is not a significant association at the .05 level between Low Birth Weight and Drinking. This is seen in the chi-square statistic and the relative risk and odds ratio.

The FREQ Procedure

Table of Drinking by LowBirthWgt				
Drinking	LowBirthWgt			
	Aff	No	Total	
Aff	74	325	399	
All	12.87	14.03		
No	501	1992	2493	
740	87.13	85.97		
Total	575	2317	2892	
Frequency Missing = 197				

Note	Statistics for Table of Drinking by LowBirthWgt

Statistic	DF	Value	Prob
Chi-Square	1	0.5187	0.4714
Likelihood Ratio Chi-Square	1	0.5263	0.4682
Continuity Adj. Chi-Square	1	0.4260	0.5140
Mantel-Haenszel Chi-Square	1	0.5185	0.4715
Phi Coefficient		-0.0134	
Contingency Coefficient		0.0134	
Cramer's V		-0.0134	

Fisher's Exact Test				
Cell (1,1) Frequency (F)	74			
Left-sided Pr <= F	0.2588			
Right-sided Pr >= F	0.7835			
Table Probability (P)	0.0423			
Two-sided Pr <= P	0.4998			

Column 1 Risk Estimates						
	Risk ASE 95% Confidence Limits Exact 95% Confidence Limits					
Row 1	0.1855	0.0195	0.1473	0.2236	0.1485	0.2271
Row 2	0.2010	0.0080	0.1852	0.2167	0.1854	0.2172
Total	0.1988	0.0074	0.1843	0.2134	0.1844	0.2138
Difference	-0.0155	0.0210	-0.0568	0.0258		
Difference is (Row 1 - Row 2)						

Column 2 Risk Estimates							
	Risk	ASE	95% Confidence Limits		95% Confidence Limits Exact 95% Confidence Li		5% Confidence Limits
Row 1	0.8145	0.0195	0.7764	0.8527	0.7729	0.8515	
Row 2	0.7990	0.0080	0.7833	0.8148	0.7828	0.8146	
Total	0.8012	0.0074	0.7866	0.8157	0.7862	0.8156	
Difference	0.0155	0.0210	-0.0258	0.0568			
Difference is (Row 1 - Row 2)							

Odds Ratio and Relative Risks					
Statistic Value 95% Confidence Limit:					
Odds Ratio	0.9053	0.6906	1.1869		
Relative Risk (Column 1)	0.9229	0.7406	1.1500		
Relative Risk (Column 2)	1.0194	0.9689	1.0725		

Note	Sample Size = 2892 Frequency Missing = 197

## Code 3

```
title 'Test for Association between Low Birth Weight and Smoking';
title2 'Controlling for Death';
proc freq data=new_bwgt;* order=freq;
tables death*smoking*LowBirthWgt /nopercent norow chisq cmh;
run;

title 'Test for Association between Low Birth Weight and Drinking';
title2 'Controlling for Death';
proc freq data=new_bwgt;* order=freq;
tables death*drinking*LowBirthWgt /nopercent norow chisq cmh;
run;
```

#### Test for Association between Low Birth Weight and Smoking

#### Controlling for Death

Table 1 of Smoking by LowBirthWgt						
C	Controlling for Death=Aff					
Smoking LowBirthWgt						
	Aff	Total				
Aff	102 26.63	58 31.87	160			
No	281 73.37	124 68.13	405			
Total 383 182 565						
Frequency Missing $=41$						

Note	Statistics for Table 1 of Smoking by LowBirthWgt Controlling for Death=Aff

Statistic	DF	Value	Prob
Chi-Square	1	1.6664	0.1967
Likelihood Ratio Chi-Square	1	1.6467	0.1994
Continuity Adj. Chi-Square	1	1.4185	0.2337
Mantel-Haenszel Chi-Square	1	1.6635	0.1971
Phi Coefficient		-0.0543	
Contingency Coefficient		0.0542	
Cramer's V		-0.0543	

Fisher's Exact Test		
Cell (1,1) Frequency (F)	102	
Left-sided Pr <= F	0.1172	
Right-sided Pr >= F	0.9172	
10		

Fisher's Exact Test		
Table Probability (P) 0.0344		
Two-sided Pr <= P	0.2304	

Note	Sample Size = 565 Frequency Missing = 41

Table 2 of Smoking by LowBirthWgt				
	Controlling fo	or Death=No	)	
Smoking	LowBirthWgt			
	Aff No Total			
Aff	53	488	541	
All	27.60	22.86		
No	139	1647	1786	
NO	72.40 77.14			
Total	192	2135	2327	
Frequency Missing $= 156$				

Note	Statistics for Table 2 of Smoking by LowBirthWgt Controlling for Death=No

Statistic	DF	Value	Prob
Chi-Square	1	2.2246	0.1358
Likelihood Ratio Chi-Square	1	2.1450	0.1430
Continuity Adj. Chi-Square	1	1.9666	0.1608
Mantel-Haenszel Chi-Square	1	2.2237	0.1359
Phi Coefficient		0.0309	
Contingency Coefficient		0.0309	
Cramer's V		0.0309	

Fisher's Exact Test		
Cell (1,1) Frequency (F)	53	
Left-sided Pr <= F	0.9410	
Right-sided Pr >= F	0.0821	
Table Probability (P)	0.0231	
Two-sided Pr <= P	0.1532	

Note	Sample Size $= 2327$
	Frequency Missing = 156

## Test for Association between Low Birth Weight and Smoking

## Controlling for Death

Note	Summary Statistics for Smoking by LowBirthWgt Controlling for Death

Cochran-Mantel-Haenszel Statistics (Based on Table Scores)				
Statistic	Alternative Hypothesis	DF	Value	Prob
1	Nonzero Correlation	1	0.0640	0.8003
2	Row Mean Scores Differ	1	0.0640	0.8003
3	General Association	1	0.0640	0.8003

Common Odds Ratio and Relative Risks				
Statistic	Method	Value	95% Confidence Limits	
Odds Ratio	Mantel—Haenszel	1.0328	0.8004	1.3327
	Logit	1.0374	0.8066	1.3341
Relative Risk (Column 1)	Mantel—Haenszel	1.0170	0.8909	1.1610
	Logit	0.9675	0.8563	1.0932
Relative Risk (Column 2)	Mantel—Haenszel	0.9954	0.9599	1.0323
	Logit	0.9809	0.9513	1.0114

Breslow-Day Test for Homogeneity of Odds Ratios		
Chi-Square	3.8091	
DF	1	
Pr > ChiSq	0.0510	

Note	Sample Size = 2892
	Frequency Missing = 197

## Test for Association between Low Birth Weight and Drinking

## Controlling for Death

Table 1 of Drinking by LowBirthWgt				
(	Controlling for Death=Aff			
Drinking	LowBirthWgt			
	Aff No To		Total	
Aff	45 11.75	25 13.74	70	
No	338 157 495 88.25 86.26			
Total	383	182	565	
Frequency Missing $=41$				

Note	Statistics for Table 1 of Drinking by LowBirthWgt Controlling for Death=Aff

Statistic	DF	Value	Prob
Chi-Square	1	0.4487	0.5029
Likelihood Ratio Chi-Square	1	0.4419	0.5062
Continuity Adj. Chi-Square	1	0.2843	0.5939
Mantel-Haenszel Chi-Square	1	0.4479	0.5033
Phi Coefficient		-0.0282	
Contingency Coefficient		0.0282	
Cramer's V		-0.0282	

Fisher's Exact Test	
Cell (1,1) Frequency (F)	45
Left-sided Pr <= F	0.2940
Right-sided Pr >= F	0.7912
Table Probability (P)	0.0852
Two-sided Pr <= P	0.4976

Note	Sample Size = 565
	Frequency Missing $= 41$

Table 2 of Drinking by LowBirthWgt				
(	Controlling for Death=No			
Drinking	lking LowBirthWgt			
	Aff No Tota		Total	
Aff	29 15.10	300 14.05	329	
No	163 1835 1998 84.90 85.95			
Total	192	2135	2327	
Frequency Missing $=156$				

Note	Statistics for Table 2 of Drinking by LowBirthWgt Controlling for Death=No

Statistic	DF	Value	Prob
Chi-Square	1	0.1608	0.6884
Likelihood Ratio Chi-Square	1	0.1581	0.6909
Continuity Adj. Chi-Square	1	0.0858	0.7696
Mantel-Haenszel Chi-Square	1	0.1607	0.6885
Phi Coefficient		0.0083	
Contingency Coefficient		0.0083	
Cramer's V		0.0083	

Fisher's Exact Test		
Cell (1,1) Frequency (F)	29	
Left-sided Pr <= F	0.7002	
Right-sided Pr >= F	0.3773	
Table Probability (P)	0.0775	
Two-sided Pr <= P	0.6660	

Note	Sample Size = 2327 Frequency Missing = 156

## Test for Association between Low Birth Weight and Drinking

## Controlling for Death

Note	Summary Statistics for Drinking by LowBirthWgt Controlling for Death

Cochran-Mantel-Haenszel Statistics (Based on Table Scores)					
Statistic	Alternative Hypothesis	DF	Value	Prob	
1	Nonzero Correlation	1	0.0102	0.9194	
2	Row Mean Scores Differ	1	0.0102	0.9194	
3	General Association	1	0.0102	0.9194	

Common Odds Ratio and Relative Risks						
Statistic	Method	Value	95% Confidence Limits			
Odds Ratio	Mantel—Haenszel	0.9834	0.7080	1.3659		
	Logit	0.9836	0.7110	1.3609		
Relative Risk (Column 1)	Mantel—Haenszel	0.9908	0.8261	1.1883		
	Logit	0.9668	0.8191	1.1413		
Relative Risk (Column 2)	Mantel—Haenszel	1.0021	0.9611	1.0449		
	Logit	0.9942	0.9592	1.0305		

Breslow-Day Test for Homogeneity of Odds Ratios		
Chi-Square	0.5994	
DF	1	
Pr > ChiSq	0.4388	

Note	Sample Size = 2892 Frequency Missing = 197
	Trequency Missing — 101

## Code 4

```
title 'Test for Association between Low Birth Weight and Death';
title2 '';
proc freq data=new_bwgt;* order=freq;
tables LowBirthWgt*death/norow nopercent chisq relrisk riskdiff;
run;
ods latex close;
```

#### Test for Association between Low Birth Weight and Death

In the following table there is a significant association at the .05 level between Death and Low Birth Weight. This is seen in the chi-square statistic and the relative risk and odds ratio.

The FREQ Procedure

Table of LowBirthWgt by Death					
LowBirthWgt	Death				
	Aff	No	Total		
A CC	408	205	613		
Aff	67.33	8.26			
No	198	2278	2476		
IVO	32.67	91.74			
Total	606	2483	3089		

Note	Statistics for Table of LowBirthWgt by Death

Statistic	DF	Value	Prob
Chi-Square	1	1068.5596	<.0001
Likelihood Ratio Chi-Square	1	897.1241	<.0001
Continuity Adj. Chi-Square	1	1064.8493	<.0001
Mantel-Haenszel Chi-Square	1	1068.2137	<.0001
Phi Coefficient		0.5882	
Contingency Coefficient		0.5070	
Cramer's V		0.5882	

Fisher's Exact Test		
Cell (1,1) Frequency (F)	408	
Left-sided Pr <= F	1.0000	
Right-sided Pr >= F	<.0001	
Table Probability (P)	<.0001	
Two-sided Pr <= P	<.0001	

Column 1 Risk Estimates						
	Risk	ASE	95% Coi	95% Confidence Limits		5% Confidence Limits
Row 1	0.6656	0.0191	0.6282	0.7029	0.6267	0.7029
Row 2	0.0800	0.0055	0.0693	0.0907	0.0696	0.0914
Total	0.1962	0.0071	0.1822	0.2102	0.1823	0.2106
Difference	0.5856	0.0198	0.5468	0.6245		
Difference is (Row 1 - Row 2)						

	Column 2 Risk Estimates					
	Risk	ASE	95% Confidence Limits		Exact 95	5% Confidence Limits
Row 1	0.3344	0.0191	0.2971	0.3718	0.2971	0.3733
Row 2	0.9200	0.0055	0.9093	0.9307	0.9086	0.9304
Total	0.8038	0.0071	0.7898	0.8178	0.7894	0.8177
Difference	-0.5856	0.0198	-0.6245	-0.5468		
Difference is (Row 1 - Row 2)						

Note all the confidence intervals do not contain one, indicating a strong association between infant birth weight and survival.

Odds Ratio and Relative Risks				
Statistic	Value	95% Con:	fidence Limits	
Odds Ratio	22.8979	18.3410	28.5869	
Relative Risk (Column 1)	8.3231	7.2003	9.6210	
Relative Risk (Column 2)	0.3635	0.3249	0.4067	

Note	Sample Size $= 3089$

## Loglinear Models for Contingency Tables

I do not normally cover this material until the spring semester. It is covered in greater detail in our graduate course on Categorical Models. Yet, this example is ideally suited for this approach. Agresti covers this material in Chapter 8 and SDK covers the material in chapter 16.

## Two-Way Tables

## Loglinear Models for the $2 \times 2$ Table

Suppose that one has the  $2 \times 2$  table given by

X	Y=1	Y=2	Total
1	$n_{11}$	$n_{12}$	$n_{1+}$
2	$n_{21}$	$n_{22}$	$n_{2+}$
Total	$n_{+1}$	$n_{+2}$	n

With cell probabilities given by

X	Y=1	Y=2	Total
1	$\pi_{11}$	$\pi_{12}$	$\pi_{1+}$
2	$\pi_{21}$	$\pi_{22}$	$\pi_{2+}$
Total	$\pi_{+1}$	$\pi_{+2}$	1

One of the foundational issues in analysis of these tables is to test for independence of the two random variables X and Y. Independence implies that,

$$\frac{\pi_{11}}{\pi_{+1}} = \frac{\pi_{12}}{\pi_{+2}} = \pi_{1+}$$

and

$$\pi_{11} = \pi_{1+}\pi_{+1}$$
.

From which it follows that

$$\pi_{ij} = \pi_{i+}\pi_{+j}$$
  $i, j = 1, 2.$ 

If X and Y are independent then it follows that the odds ratio,  $\psi$ , is

$$\psi = \frac{\pi_{11}\pi_{22}}{\pi_{12}\pi_{21}} = 1.$$

Taking the log of both sides leads to,

$$log \ \psi = log \ \pi_{11} + log \ \pi_{22} - log \ \pi_{12} - log \ \pi_{21} = 0.$$

Now consider the log transformation of the expected counts for the  $ij^{th}$  cell given by  $m_{ij}$ . For which one has,

$$log (m_{ij}) = \mu + \lambda_i^X + \lambda_j^Y + \lambda_{ij}^{XY}$$

for i, j = 1, 2 where  $m_{ij} = n\pi_{ij}$ . This equation is called the **saturated loglinear model** for the  $2 \times 2$  table.

Since there are 1 + 2 + 2 + 4 = 9 parameters in this model and only four observations (cell frequencies) it is necessary to define the following constraints on the model,

$$\sum_i \lambda_i^X = 0 \quad \sum_j \lambda_j^Y = 0 \quad \sum_i \lambda_{ij}^{XY} = \sum_j \lambda_{ij}^{XY} = 0.$$

The loglinear model expected cell counts can be written as,

X	Y=1	Y=2
1	$exp(\mu + \lambda_1^X + \lambda_1^Y + \lambda_{11}^{XY})$	$exp(\mu + \lambda_1^X - \lambda_1^Y - \lambda_{11}^{XY})$
2	$exp(\mu - \lambda_1^X + \lambda_1^Y - \lambda_{11}^{XY})$	$exp(\mu - \lambda_1^X - \lambda_1^Y + \lambda_{11}^{XY})$

Using the above loglinear model, the odds ratio can be written as

$$\psi = \frac{m_{11}m_{22}}{m_{12}m_{21}}$$

so that

$$log \ \psi = log \ m_{11} + log \ m_{22} - log \ m_{12} - log \ m_{21} = 4\lambda_{11}^{XY}.$$

In which case, the hypothesis of independence of X and Y is equivalent to  $H_0: \lambda_{11}^{XY} = 0$ . Thus, the loglinear model when the assumption of independence holds becomes,

$$log (m_{ij}) = \mu + \lambda_i^X + \lambda_j^Y \quad i, j = 1, 2.$$

#### $R \times C$ Tables

Agresti considers the model given by,

$$\mu_{ij} = \mu \alpha_i \beta_j$$
.

From which one has the saturated model

$$\log \mu_{ij} = \lambda + \lambda_i^X + \lambda_j^Y + \lambda_{ij}^{XY} \tag{1}$$

and the independent model,

$$\log \mu_{ij} = \lambda + \lambda_i^X + \lambda_i^Y \tag{2}$$

for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, R, j = 1, 2, \dots, C$ .

## Three-Way Tables

## Types of Independence

• The saturated model has loglinear form,

$$log~\mu_{ijk} = \lambda + \lambda_i^X + \lambda_j^Y + \lambda_k^Z + \lambda_{ij}^{XY} + \lambda_{ik}^{XZ} + \lambda_{jk}^{YZ} + \lambda_{ijk}^{XYZ}$$

• Mutual Independence X, Y, and Z are mutually independent when

$$\pi_{ijk} = \pi_{i++}\pi_{+j+}\pi_{++k}$$

for all i, j and k. Mutual independence implies that the expected frequencies  $\{\mu_{ijk}\}$  have the loglinear form given by,

$$log \ \mu_{ijk} = \lambda + \lambda_i^X + \lambda_j^Y + \lambda_k^Z,$$

in which case

$$\lambda_{ij}^{XY} = \lambda_{ik}^{XZ} = \lambda_{jk}^{YZ} = \lambda_{ijk}^{XYZ} = 0.$$

• Joint Independence Variable Y is jointly independent of X and Z when

$$\pi_{ijk} = \pi_{i+k}\pi_{+j+}$$

for all i, j and k. The loglinear form can be written as,

$$log \ \mu_{ijk} = \lambda + \lambda_i^X + \lambda_j^Y + \lambda_k^Z + \lambda_{ik}^{XZ},$$

in which case

$$\lambda_{ij}^{XY} = \lambda_{jk}^{YZ} = \lambda_{ijk}^{XYZ} = 0.$$

Mututal independence implies joint independence of any one variable from the others.

• Conditional Independence X and Y are conditionally independent, given Z when

$$\pi_{ij|k} = \pi_{i+|k} \pi_{+j|k}$$

for all i, j and k. This holds for joint probabilities over the entire table, hence,

$$\pi_{ijk} = \pi_{i+k}\pi_{+jk}/\pi_{++k}.$$

The loglinear form can be written as,

$$\log \mu_{ijk} = \lambda + \lambda_i^X + \lambda_j^Y + \lambda_k^Z + \lambda_{ik}^{XZ} + \lambda_{jk}^{YZ},$$

in which case

$$\lambda_{ij}^{XY} = \lambda_{ijk}^{XYZ} = 0.$$

## SAS

#### Code 5

#### Three Way Model

#### Death, Low Birth Weight and Smoking

#### The CATMOD Procedure

Data Summary					
Response	Death*Smoking*LowBirthWg	Response Levels	8		
Weight Variable	None	Populations	1		
Data Set	NEW_BWGT	Total Frequency	2892		
Frequency Missing	197	Observations	2892		

Population Profiles		
Sample Sample Size		
1	2892	

Response Profiles				
Response	Death	Smoking	LowBirthWgt	
1	Aff	Aff	Aff	
2	Aff	Aff	No	
3	Aff	No	Aff	
4	Aff	No	No	
5	No	Aff	Aff	
6	No	Aff	No	
7	No	No	Aff	
8	No	No	No	

Maximum Likelihood Analysis
Maximum likelihood computations converged.

Maximum Likelihood Analysis of Variance				
Source	DF	Chi-Square	Pr > ChiSq	
Death	1	154.35	<.0001	
Smoking	1	369.69	<.0001	
Death*Smoking	1	3.46	0.0627	
LowBirthWgt	1	152.09	<.0001	
Death*LowBirthWgt	1	718.75	<.0001	
Smoking*LowBirthWgt	1	0.06	0.8002	
Likelihood Ratio	1	3.73	0.0535	

Maximum Likelihood Predicted Values for Response Functions					
Function Number	Observed		Pı	redicted	Residual
	Function	Standard Error	Function	Standard Error	
1	-2.78174	0.102035	-2.70818	0.091798	-0.07355
2	-3.34627	0.133598	-3.47632	0.123381	0.130054
3	-1.76836	0.064544	-1.79023	0.064295	0.021877
4	-2.58643	0.093122	-2.52479	0.08532	-0.06164
5	-3.43642	0.139553	-3.58015	0.127129	0.143728
6	-1.2164	0.05154	-1.19711	0.050321	-0.01929
7	-2.47224	0.088326	-2.41662	0.081669	-0.05562

	Maximum Likelihood Predicted Values for Frequencies						
Death	Smoking	LowBirthWgt	Observed		Predicted		Residual
			Frequency	Standard Error	Frequency	Standard Error	
Aff	Aff	Aff	102	9.919803	109.2989	9.548808	-7.2989
Aff	Aff	No	58	7.539018	50.7011	5.985303	7.298899
Aff	No	Aff	281	15.92786	273.7011	15.29083	7.298899
Aff	No	No	124	10.89418	131.2989	10.55222	-7.2989
No	Aff	Aff	53	7.213092	45.7011	5.566915	7.298899
No	Aff	No	488	20.14086	495.2989	19.91188	-7.2989
No	No	Aff	139	11.50301	146.2989	11.1763	-7.2989
No	No	No	1647	26.62762	1639.701	26.38253	7.298899

## Three Way Model

#### Final Model

## The CATMOD Procedure

Data Summary					
Response	Death*Smoking*LowBirthWg	Response Levels	8		
Weight Variable	None	Populations	1		
Data Set	NEW_BWGT	Total Frequency	2892		
Frequency Missing	197	Observations	2892		

Population Profiles		
Sample Sample Size		
1	2892	

Response Profiles					
Response	Death	Smoking	LowBirthWgt		
1	Aff	Aff	Aff		
2	Aff	Aff	No		
3	Aff	No	Aff		
4	Aff	No	No		
5	No	Aff	Aff		
6	No	Aff	No		
7	No	No	Aff		
8	No	No	No		

Maximum Likelihood Analysis				
Maximum I	ikelihood computations converged.			

Maximum Likelihood Analysis of Variance						
Source	DF	Chi-Square	Pr > ChiSq			
Death	1	167.50	<.0001			
LowBirthWgt	1	201.07	<.0001			
Death*LowBirthWgt	1	721.21	<.0001			
Smoking	1	405.06	<.0001			
Death*Smoking	1	6.34	0.0118			
Likelihood Ratio	2	3.79	0.1502			

All the above terms are significant, including the association between smoking and death!

Maximum Likelihood Predicted Values for Response Functions						
Function Number	Observed		Pi	Residual		
	Function	Function Standard Error		Standard Error		
1	-2.78174	0.102035	-2.71524	0.08769	-0.0665	
2	-3.34627	0.133598	-3.45927	0.102826	0.112998	
3	-1.76836	0.064544	-1.78652	0.06252	0.018168	
4	-2.58643	0.093122	-2.53055	0.082415	-0.05588	
5	-3.43642	0.139553	-3.60304	0.089917	0.166622	
6	-1.2164	0.05154	-1.19431	0.049075	-0.02208	
7	-2.47224	0.088326	-2.40873	0.075344	-0.06351	

	Maximum Likelihood Predicted Values for Frequencies						
Death	Smoking	LowBirthWgt	Observed		Predicted		Residual
			Frequency	Standard Error	Frequency	Standard Error	
Aff	Aff	Aff	102	9.919803	108.4602	8.907781	-6.46018
Aff	Aff	No	58	7.539018	51.53982	5.057426	6.460177
Aff	No	Aff	281	15.92786	274.5398	14.94761	6.460177
Aff	No	No	124	10.89418	130.4602	9.976526	-6.46018
No	Aff	Aff	53	7.213092	44.63773	3.537735	8.362269
No	Aff	No	488	20.14086	496.3623	19.48686	-8.36227
No	No	Aff	139	11.50301	147.3623	10.41251	-8.36227
No	No	No	1647	26.62762	1638.638	26.05253	8.362269