

## STAT 3004: Assignment 4

Cheng Li  
2 Dec 2020

---

### 1 Problems 1

#### 1.1 (13.19)

The estimated  $OR = \frac{52/300}{66/753} = 2.0$

#### 1.2 (13.20)

We use the Woolf formula to obtain a 95% CI for the OR. A 95% CI for  $\ln(OR)$  is given by:  $\ln(\hat{OR}) \pm 1.96 * \sqrt{\frac{1}{a} + \frac{1}{b} + \frac{1}{c} + \frac{1}{d}}$  where a, b, c, d are 52, 300, 66, 753. Therefore the CI of  $\ln(OR)$  is (0.295, 1.069). As a consequence, the 95% CI is (1.3, 2.9).

### 2 Problem 2

#### 2.1 (13.80)

We use the chi-square test for 2 \* 2 tables.

$$\begin{aligned}\chi^2 &= \frac{3000 * [|34 * 1432 - 68 * 1466| - 1500]^2}{102 * 2898 * 1500 * 1500} \\ &= 11.05 \sim \chi_1^2 \text{ under } H_0,\end{aligned}$$

since  $\chi_{1,0.999}^2 = 10.83 < 11.05$ , it follows that  $p < 0.001$ . Thus, raloxifene significantly reduces the risk of new fractures among women with no preexisting fractures.

#### 2.2 (13.81)

We can get that:

$$RR = \frac{34/1500}{68/1500} = 0.5,$$

The *se* of  $\ln RR$  is  $\sqrt{\frac{b}{an_1} + \frac{d}{cn_2}} = 0.2068$ . A 95% CI for  $\ln RR$  is (-1.099, -0.288). So a 95% CI for  $RR$  is (0.33, 0.75).

### 2.3 (13.82)

We use the Mantel Haenszel test. We have the test statistic:

$$X_{MH}^2 = \frac{(|O - E| - 0.5)^2}{V}$$

$$O = 34 + 103 = 137$$

$$E = \frac{102 * 1500}{3000} + \frac{273 * 700}{1500} = 178.4$$

$$V = \frac{102 * 2898 * 1500 * 1500}{3000^2 * 2999} + \frac{273 * 1227 * 700 * 800}{1500^2 * 1499} = 80.26$$

So, the test statistic is:

$$X_{MH}^2 = 20.84 \sim \chi_1^2 \text{ under } H_0$$

And the p-value is less than 0.001. Thus, raloxifene significantly reduces the risk of new fractures in both groups combined.

### 2.4 (13.83)

In the total population, there are 3000 women without preexisting fractures and 1500 women with preexisting fractures. Thus, the standardized risk ratio is

$$SRR = \frac{34/1500 * 3000 + 103/700 * 1500}{68/1500 * 3000 + 170/800 * 1500}$$

$$= 0.63$$

### 2.5 (13.84)

No. Randomization was preformed after stratification by preexisting fractures. Thus it is unlikely to be a confounder.

## 3 Problem 3

### 3.1 (14.53)

A censored observation in 1992 would indicate that a woman was determined not to have breast cancer at the 1992 follow-up questionnaire, but no further information was obtain from her after that time.

### 3.2 (14.54)

For each group, the 10-year survival probability is estimated by  $\hat{S}(10) = \prod(1 - \frac{d_j}{S_{j-1}})$ .

For the current users, this estimate is  $(1 - \frac{0}{200}) * (1 - \frac{3}{199}) * (1 - \frac{2}{194}) * (1 - \frac{4}{190}) * (1 - \frac{2}{185}) * (1 - \frac{2}{133}) = 0.93$

For the never users, this estimate is  $(1 - \frac{0}{1000}) * (1 - \frac{3}{988}) * (1 - \frac{9}{975}) * (1 - \frac{7}{944}) * (1 - \frac{5}{914}) * (1 - \frac{9}{716}) = 0.963$ .

Since we are interested in the incidence rate of breast cancer, we subtract each of these estimates from 1 to obtain estimated 10-year incidence rates of 0.070 for the current users and 0.039 for the never users.

### 3.3 (14.55)

The log-rank test.

### 3.4 (14.56)

For our log-rank test, we have the test statistic:

$$X_{LR}^2 = \frac{(|O - E| - 0.5)^2}{Var_{LR}} \sim \chi_1^2 \text{ under } H_0.$$

Where

$O =$  observed number of failures in the current users group

$E =$  expected number of failures in the current users group

$$= \sum_{i=1}^6 E_i = \sum_{i=1}^6 \frac{(a_i + b_i)(c_i + d_i)}{N_i} = \frac{(d_{i1} + d_{i2}) * S_{i-1,1}}{S_{i-1,1} + S_{i-1,2}}$$

$d_{i1}, d_{i2}$  = number of persons who fail in the i-th year in the current- and never-users group, respectively,  
 $S_{i1}, S_{i2}$  = number of persons who survive up to the i-th year in the current- and never-users groups, respectively.

$$\begin{aligned} Var_{LR} &= \sum_{i=1}^6 V_i \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^6 \frac{(a_i + b_i)(c_i + d_i)(a_i + c_i)(b_i + d_i)}{N_i^2(N_i - 1)} \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^6 \frac{(d_{i1} + d_{i2})(S_{i-1,1} + S_{i-1,2} - d_{i1} - d_{i2})(S_{i-1,1})(S_{i-1,2})}{(S_{i-1,1} + S_{i-1,2})^2(S_{i-1,1} + S_{i-1,2} - 1)} \end{aligned}$$

We can get the p-value is  $0.049 < 0.05$ . So we can reject the null hypothesis.