

Presentation 1 session April 18, 2024



WWW.UHASSELT.BE/DSI



Introduction



A correct model formulation is important for easy and valid interpretation of estimation and inferential results

Steven Abrams

Set the scene - Terminology



- ▶ Let *Y* represent a **population random variable** of interest (i.e., response variable)
- ▶ A sample $Y_1, Y_2, ..., Y_n$ (of size n) is drawn from the study population for estimation and inference (i.i.d.)
- ▶ The unit of analysis is denoted here by index i, i.e., referring to subject i (i = 1, ..., n)
- ▶ Moreover, consider covariate information x_i , i = 1,...,n with

$$\boldsymbol{x}_i = [x_{i1} \ x_{i2} \ \dots \ x_{ip}]^T$$

- a $(p \times 1)$ -column vector for subject i
- ▶ Matrix representation: X is an $(n \times (p+1))$ -matrix defined as

$$m{X} = [m{1} \; m{x}_1 \; m{x}_2 \; \dots \; m{x}_n]^T = \left[egin{array}{ccccc} 1 & x_{11} & x_{12} & \dots & x_{1p} \ 1 & x_{21} & x_{22} & \dots & x_{2p} \ dots & dots & dots & dots & dots \ 1 & x_{n1} & x_{n2} & \dots & x_{np} \end{array}
ight]$$

Simple linear model formulation



► Consider first a **linear regression model** in which the response variable is regressed against the covariates:

$$Y_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 x_{i1} + \ldots + \beta_p x_{ip} + \epsilon_i,$$

where

- $ightharpoonup Y_i$ represents the outcome of subject $i=1,\ldots,n$,
- $ightharpoonup x_{ij}$ is the value of the jth covariate related to subject i,
- lacktriangleright $\epsilon_i \sim N(0, \sigma^2)$ are independent and identically distributed (i.i.d.) random variables.
- ► Model assumptions:
 - ▶ Independence, linearity, homoscedasticity and normality

Simple linear model formulation



- Based on this model, we have
 - $\blacktriangleright \mu(\boldsymbol{x}_i) := \mathsf{E}(Y_i|\boldsymbol{x}_i) = \beta_0 + \beta_1 x_{i1} + \ldots + \beta_n x_{in}$
 - lacktriangle Given that $\epsilon_i \sim N(0,\sigma^2)$ are i.i.d., we have that $Y_i|x_i$ are i.i.d. with

$$Y_i|\boldsymbol{x}_i \sim N(\mu(\boldsymbol{x}_i), \sigma^2)$$

In matrix form:

$$Y = X\beta + \epsilon$$

with

$$\bullet \ \mathbf{Y} = [Y_1 \ Y_2 \ \dots \ Y_n]^T = \begin{bmatrix} Y_1 \\ Y_2 \\ \vdots \\ Y_n \end{bmatrix}, \quad \boldsymbol{\beta} = [\beta_0 \ \beta_1 \ \beta_2 \ \dots \ \beta_p]^T = \begin{bmatrix} \beta_0 \\ \beta_1 \\ \beta_2 \\ \vdots \\ \beta_p \end{bmatrix}$$

• $\epsilon = [\epsilon_1 \ \epsilon_2 \ \dots \ \epsilon_n]^T$

ANOVA model formulation



Let x_{i1}, \ldots, x_{ip} represent **dummy-variables** related to a single categorical variable (with p+1 levels), i.e., for $j=1,\ldots,p$

$$x_{ij} = \left\{ \begin{array}{ll} 1 & \text{category for observation } i \text{ is } j \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{array} \right.$$

In that case, the linear regression model corresponds to an **ANOVA model** for observations Y_{jk}^* $(k = 1, ..., n_j; j = 1, ..., p + 1)$ which can be formulated as follows:

$$\mu_j := \mathsf{E}(Y_{jk}^*) = \mu + \tau_j,$$

where

- ▶ Y_{jk}^* is the kth observation in group j; $Y_{jk}^* \sim N(\mu_j, \sigma^2)$
- ▶ Sample size n equals sum of group sizes n_j
- ▶ For identifiability reasons, we assume $\tau_{p+1} = 0$
- \blacktriangleright Consequently, μ represents the mean of group p+1

- ▶ For the aforementioned **parametrization**, we have $\beta_0 = \mu$ and $\beta_j = \tau_j$ for j = 1, ..., p
- ▶ Can we also consider the parametrization based on the following constraint?

$$\sum_{j=1}^{p+1} \tau_j = 0$$

Linear mixed model for clustered data



- ightharpoonup Consider clustered data with N_c clusters with size n_i for cluster i $(i=1,\ldots,N_c)$
- ▶ Let Y_{ij} represent the jth measurement in cluster i ($j = 1, ..., n_i$)
- ▶ A random intercept linear mixed model can be formulated as follows:

$$Y_{ij} = \beta_0 + b_i + \beta_1 x_{ij1} + \beta_2 x_{ij2} + \ldots + \beta_p x_{ijp} + \epsilon_{ij},$$

where

- ightharpoonup ϵ_{ij} i.i.d. random variables with $\epsilon_{ij} \sim N(0, \sigma^2)$
- $ightharpoonup b_i \sim N(0, \sigma_b^2)$ independent

Hierarchical data - more indices (or not)



- Let Y_{ijklm} represent the mth measurement $(m=1,\ldots,M_l)$ belonging to individual l $(l=1,\ldots,L_k)$ in household k $(k=1,\ldots,K_j)$ living in municipality j $(j=1,\ldots,J_i)$ of region i $(i=1,\ldots,I)$
- ▶ Mean structure (with nested random effects):

$$\mu_{ijklm}(\mathbf{b}_{ijkl}) = \beta_0 + \beta_1 x_{ijklm1} + \beta_2 x_{ijklm2} + \ldots + \beta_p x_{ijklmp} + b_{l(k)} + b_{k(j)} + b_{j(i)},$$

where

$$\boldsymbol{b}_{ijkl} = [b_{l(k)} \ b_{k(j)} \ b_{j(i)}]^T \sim N(\mathbf{0}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma})$$

with

- \triangleright Σ the variance-covariance matrix
- ▶ Nesting is a property of the data, or rather the experimental design, not the model

Generalized Linear (Mixed) Model – GL(M)M



- ► Specify three different components:
 - ► Distributional component
 - ► Systematic component
 - ▶ Link function

Tips and tricks



- ▶ Do not mix regression and ANOVA notation for covariates, e.g., for observations i = 1, ..., n, effect garden_i does not make sense (i.e., implies n parameters for garden effect): garden_i $\neq \beta_i$ garden_i, where garden_i is a dummy-variable
- ▶ Definition of indices should be clear (don't reuse indices and make sure indices are defined consistently in model components)
- Order plays a role!
- ▶ Software: check dummy- versus effect-coding
- ► Specify (conditional) distributional assumption(s) (also for random effects):

$$Y_i \sim N(\mu_i, \sigma^2)$$

 $\lambda_i = \dots$

- ► Check identifiability issues: $\beta_0 + \sum_{i=1}^{15} \beta_c C_{ij}$ with C_{ij} compound-specific dummies
- Note: $\log(Y_i) \neq \log(E(Y_i|x_i))$