

432 Class 17 Slides

github.com/THOMASELOVE/432-2018

2018-03-20

Setup

```
library(skimr)
library(rms)
library(broom)
library(tidyverse)

colscr <- read.csv("screening.csv") %>% tbl_df
colscr2 <- read.csv("screening2.csv") %>% tbl_df
```

Today's Materials

- 0 Start of Class Announcements
- 1 Logistic Regression for Aggregated Data
- 2 Probit Regression for a Binary Outcome
- 3 Project 1 Group Meetings

Logistic Regression for Aggregated Data

Colorectal Cancer Screening Data

The `screening.csv` data (imported into the R tibble `colscr` are simulated. They mirror a subset of the actual results from the Better Health Partnership's pilot study of colorectal cancer screening in primary care clinics in Northeast Ohio.

Available to us are the following variables

Variable	Description
location	clinic code
subjects	number of subjects reported by clinic
screen_rate	proportion of subjects who were screened
screened	number of subjects who were screened
notscreened	number of subjects not screened
meanage	mean age of clinic's subjects, years
female	% of clinic's subjects who are female
pct_lowins	% of clinic's subjects who have Medicaid or are uninsured
system	system code

Skim results

Skim summary statistics

n obs: 26

n variables: 9

Variable type: factor

variable	missing	complete	n	n_unique	top_counts	ordered
location	0	26	26	26	A: 1, B: 1, C: 1, D: 1	FALSE
system	0	26	26	4	Sys: 7, Sys: 7, Sys: 6, Sys: 6	FALSE

Variable type: integer

variable	missing	complete	n	mean	sd	p0	p25	median	p75	p100	hist
notscreened	0	26	26	663.23	271.17	231	508.75	611	791	1356	
screened	0	26	26	2584.04	1765.11	572	1395.25	2169.5	2716	6947	
subjects	0	26	26	3247.27	1945.83	803	1914.75	2765.5	3607.75	7677	

Variable type: numeric

variable	missing	complete	n	mean	sd	p0	p25	median	p75	p100	hist
female	0	26	26	58.72	6.29	46.2	55.42	60.05	62.62	70.3	
meanage	0	26	26	60.58	1.93	58	58.82	60.5	61.98	65.9	
pct_lowins	0	26	26	24.47	19.13	0.3	4.8	23.95	44.03	51.3	
screen_rate	0	26	26	0.77	0.072	0.64	0.72	0.76	0.81	0.9	

Fitting a Logistic Regression Model to Proportion Data

Here, we have a binary outcome (was the subject screened or not?) but we have aggregated results. We can use the counts of the numbers of subjects at each clinic (in `subjects`) and the proportion who were screened (in `screen_rate`) to fit a logistic regression model, as follows:

```
m_screen1 <- glm(screen_rate ~ meanage + female +  
                  pct_lowins + system, family = binomial,  
                  weights = subjects, data = colscr)
```



```
tidy(m_screen1)
```

	term	estimate	std.error	statistic
1	(Intercept)	-1.32703925	0.5530782215	-2.3993699
2	meanage	0.06798655	0.0089754129	7.5747549
3	female	-0.01931425	0.0015830906	-12.2003429
4	pct_lowins	-0.01345472	0.0008585381	-15.6716603
5	systemSys_2	-0.13821891	0.0246591342	-5.6051809
6	systemSys_3	-0.04001702	0.0254505472	-1.5723443
7	systemSys_4	0.02292732	0.0294207148	0.7792918

	p.value
1	1.642331e-02
2	3.598062e-14
3	3.095177e-34
4	2.363243e-55
5	2.080376e-08
6	1.158707e-01
7	4.358078e-01

Fitting Counts of Successes and Failures

```
m_screen2 <- glm(cbind(screened, notscreened) ~  
                 meanage + female + pct_lowins + system,  
                 family = binomial, data = colscr)
```

```
tidy(m_screen2)
```

	term	estimate	std.error	statistic
1	(Intercept)	-1.32703925	0.5530782214	-2.3993699
2	meanage	0.06798655	0.0089754129	7.5747549
3	female	-0.01931425	0.0015830906	-12.2003430
4	pct_lowins	-0.01345472	0.0008585381	-15.6716604
5	systemSys_2	-0.13821891	0.0246591342	-5.6051809
6	systemSys_3	-0.04001702	0.0254505472	-1.5723443
7	systemSys_4	0.02292732	0.0294207148	0.7792918

	p.value
1	1.642331e-02
2	3.598062e-14
3	3.095174e-34
4	2.363242e-55
5	2.080375e-08
6	1.158707e-01
7	4.358078e-01

How does one address this problem in rms?

We can use Glm.

```
d <- datadist(colscr)
options(datadist = "d")

mod_screen_1 <- Glm(screen_rate ~ meanage + female +
                     pct_lowins + system,
                     family = binomial, weights = subjects,
                     data = colscr, x = T, y = T)
```

mod_screen_1

General Linear Model

```
Glm(formula = screen_rate ~ meanage + female + pct_lowins + s  
    family = binomial, data = colscr, weights = subjects, x =  
    y = T)
```

Model Likelihood

Ratio Test

Obs	26	LR chi2	2008.90
Residual d.f.	19	d.f.	6
g	0.4614539	Pr(> chi2)	<0.0001

	Coef	S.E.	Wald Z	Pr(> Z)
Intercept	-1.3270	0.5531	-2.40	0.0164
meanage	0.0680	0.0090	7.57	<0.0001
female	-0.0193	0.0016	-12.20	<0.0001
pct_lowins	-0.0135	0.0009	-15.67	<0.0001

Probit Regression

Colorectal Cancer Screening Data on Individuals

The data in the `colscr2` data frame describe (disguised) data on the status of 172 adults who were eligible for colon cancer screening. The goal is to use the other variables (besides subject ID) to predict whether or not a subject is up to date.

colscr2 contents

Variable	Description
subject	subject ID code
age	subject's age (years)
race	subject's race (White/Black/Other)
hispanic	subject of Hispanic ethnicity (1 = yes / 0 = no)
insurance	Commercial, Medicaid, Medicare, Uninsured
bmi	body mass index at most recent visit
sbp	systolic blood pressure at most recent visit
up_to_date	meets colon cancer screening standards

summary(colscr2)

```
> summary(colscr2)
```

subject	age	race	hispanic
Min. :101.0	Min. :51.00	Black:118	Min. :0.00000
1st Qu.:143.8	1st Qu.:54.00	Other: 9	1st Qu.:0.00000
Median :186.5	Median :57.00	White: 45	Median :0.00000
Mean :186.5	Mean :57.80		Mean :0.06395
3rd Qu.:229.2	3rd Qu.:61.25		3rd Qu.:0.00000
Max. :272.0	Max. :69.00		Max. :1.00000

insurance	bmi	sbp	up_to_date
Commercial:32	Min. :17.20	Min. : 89.0	Min. :0.0000
Medicaid :81	1st Qu.:25.48	1st Qu.:118.0	1st Qu.:0.0000
Medicare :46	Median :30.05	Median :127.0	Median :1.0000
Uninsured :13	Mean :31.24	Mean :128.9	Mean :0.6047
	3rd Qu.:36.03	3rd Qu.:138.0	3rd Qu.:1.0000
	Max. :55.41	Max. :198.0	Max. :1.0000

A logistic regression model

```
m_scr2_logistic <- glm(up_to_date ~ age + race + hispanic +  
                        insurance + bmi + sbp,  
                        family = binomial, data = colscr2)
```

Results

	term	estimate	std.error
1	(Intercept)	2.7040470104	2.741862469
2	age	0.0204900528	0.039692006
3	raceOther	-1.9722351207	1.002323683
4	raceWhite	-0.3210458270	0.400174430
5	hispanic	0.0005854686	0.795348176
6	insuranceMedicaid	-1.0151859843	0.494516885
7	insuranceMedicare	-0.5216005528	0.562993549
8	insuranceUninsured	0.1099966224	0.790619608
9	bmi	0.0155894129	0.021354689
10	sbp	-0.0241776892	0.009913777

	statistic	p.value
1	0.9862081126	0.32403100
2	0.5162261820	0.60569645
3	-1.9676628955	0.04910684
4	-0.8022647189	0.42239985
5	0.0007361161	0.99941266

Predicting status for Harry and Sally

- Harry is age 65, White, non-Hispanic, with Medicare insurance, a BMI of 28 and SBP of 135.
- Sally is age 60, Black, Hispanic, with Medicaid insurance, a BMI of 22 and SBP of 148.

```
newdat_s2 <- data_frame(subject = c("Harry", "Sally"),  
                        age = c(65, 60),  
                        race = c("White", "Black"),  
                        hispanic = c(0, 1),  
                        insurance = c("Medicare", "Medicaid"),  
                        bmi = c(28, 22),  
                        sbp = c(135, 148))
```

Predicting Harry and Sally's status

```
predict(m_scr2_logistic, newdata = newdat_s2,  
        type = "response")
```

1	2
0.5904364	0.4215335

The prediction for Harry is 0.59, and for Sally, 0.42, by this logistic regression model.

A probit regression model

Now, consider a probit regression, fit by changing the default link for the binomial family as follows:

```
m_scr2_probit <- glm(up_to_date ~ age + race + hispanic +  
                    insurance + bmi + sbp,  
                    family = binomial(link = "probit"),  
                    data = colscr2)
```

tidy(m_scr2_probit)

	term	estimate	std.error	statistic
1	(Intercept)	1.584603569	1.658488821	0.9554503
2	age	0.013461338	0.024106778	0.5584047
3	raceOther	-1.238445198	0.587092981	-2.1094533
4	raceWhite	-0.199260184	0.243505258	-0.8182993
5	hispanic	0.029483051	0.484818945	0.0608125
6	insuranceMedicaid	-0.619276718	0.293205189	-2.1120933
7	insuranceMedicare	-0.322880519	0.333548759	-0.9680160
8	insuranceUninsured	0.052775722	0.463797571	0.1137904
9	bmi	0.009652339	0.012886845	0.7490071
10	sbp	-0.014695526	0.005944435	-2.4721484

p.value

1	0.33935005
2	0.57656807
3	0.03490548
4	0.41318630
5	0.95150854

Interpreting the Probit Model's Coefficients

(Intercept)	age	raceOther
1.584603569	0.013461338	-1.238445198
raceWhite	hispanic	insuranceMedicaid
-0.199260184	0.029483051	-0.619276718
insuranceMedicare	insuranceUninsured	bmi
-0.322880519	0.052775722	0.009652339
sbp		
-0.014695526		

The probit regression coefficients give the change in the z-score of the outcome of interest (here, `up_to_date`) for a one-unit change in the target predictor, holding all other predictors constant.

- So, for a one-year increase in age, holding all other predictors constant, the z-score for `up_to_date` increases by 0.013
- And for a Medicaid subject as compared to a Commercial subject of the same age, race, ethnicity, bmi and sbp, the z-score for the Medicaid subject is predicted to be -0.619 lower, according to this model.

What about Harry and Sally?

Do the predictions for Harry and Sally change much with this probit model, as compared to the logistic regression?

```
predict(m_scr2_probit, newdata = newdat_s2, type = "response")
```

1	2
0.5885511	0.4364027

Project 1 Groups

Project 1 Groups

Group	Names
-------	-------

- | | |
|----|--|
| 1 | Laura Baldassari, Jenny Feng, Maher Kazimi, Satyakam Mishra, Vinh Trinh |
| 2 | Zainab (Albar) Albar, Dongze (Zaza) He, Nik Krieger, Andrew Shan |
| 3 | Andrew Tang, Sneha Vakamudi, Ruipeng Wei, Peter Wilkinson |
| 4 | Gwen Donley, Carli Lehr, Connor Swingle, Frances Wang |
| 5 | Ryan Honomichl, JJ Huang, Xin Xin Yu, Bilal Zonjy |
| 6 | Khaled Alayed, Kedar Mahajan, Preeti Pathak, Sarah Planchon Pope |
| 7 | Estee Cramer, Laura Cremer, Hyun Jo Kim, Roberto Martinez |
| 8 | Abhishek Deshpande, Jack McDonnell, Grace Park, Gabby Rieth |
| 9 | Haimeng Bai, Sophia Cao, Kate Dobbs, Elina Misicka |
| 10 | Vaishali (Vee) Deo, Caroline El Sanadi, Kaylee Sarna, Sandra Silva Camargo |
-