# Statistics 305/605: Introduction to Biostatistical Methods for Health Sciences

R Demo for Chapter 16: Multiple  $2 \times 2$  Contingency Tables

Jinko Graham

2018-10-07

## Example Data: Smoking, Aortic Stenosis and Sex

```
uu <- url("http://people.stat.sfu.ca/~jgraham/Teaching/S305_17/Data/sten.txt")
stenosis <- read.table(uu,header=TRUE)
head(stenosis)</pre>
```

```
## smoke AS sex
## 1 1 1 1 1
## 2 1 1 1 1
## 3 1 1 1 1
## 4 1 1 1
## 5 1 1 1
## 6 1 1
```

- ▶ AS is 1 for patients with a ortic stenosis (AS) and 0 otherwise.
- smoke is 1 for smokers and 0 for non-smokers
- sex is 1 for males and 0 for females.

### Tabulating data in multiway tables

► Can use the xtabs() function to get tables of AS by smoke that are stratified by sex:

```
xtabs(~AS + smoke + sex, data=stenosis)
## , , sex = 0
##
##
      smoke
## AS
     0 47 19
##
##
   1 29 14
##
   , , sex = 1
##
##
      smoke
## AS
     0 20 24
##
    1 25 37
##
```

- ► Tables of AS by smoke without regard to sex
  - ► This is called the "pooled table", as opposed to the stratified tables from the previous slide.

```
xtabs(~AS + smoke, data=stenosis)
```

```
## smoke
## AS 0 1
## 0 67 43
## 1 54 51
```

#### Software Notes

- xtabs() uses R formulas; e.g., ~ AS + smoke + sex.
- ► The order of the variables in the formula specifies the order of the margins.
  - ▶ If you switched to, say, ~ AS + sex + smoke, you would have tables of disease by sex that are stratified by smoking status.

# Test of Homogeneity in the AS Example

- ► Are the ORs for AS the same across the different sexes? Does sex modify the effect of smoking on AS?
- ▶ R has no built-in function or add-on packages (that I know of) for this test. You can use one that I wrote. Below are the steps.
  - 1. For each stratum i of the extraneous variable, get the stratum-specific log-ORs and weights,  $y_i = \log_e(\widehat{OR}_i)$ 's and  $w_i = 1/se^2(\log_e\widehat{OR}_i)$  using stratumStats()
  - 2. Pass these stratum-specific statistics to homogTest(), which combines them into the homogeneity test statistic and returns a *p*-value for the test of homogeneity of ORs across the strata.

#### stratumStats()

[1] 5.561132

▶ Get the stratum-specific log-OR,  $y_i = \log_e(\widehat{OR}_i)$ , and weight  $w_i = 1/se^2(\log_e \widehat{OR}_i)$ ,

```
stratumStats <- function(a,b,c,d) {
    y<-log(a*d/(b*c))
    w <- 1/(1/a+1/b+1/c+1/d)
    return(list(y=y,w=w))
}</pre>
```

► Apply stratumStats() to the first stratum defined by the extraneous variable sex.

```
s1 <- stratumStats(47,19,29,14)
s1

## $y
## [1] 0.1774701
##</pre>
```

► Then apply stratumStats() to the 2nd stratum defined by the sex.

```
s2 <- stratumStats(20,24,25,37)
```

▶ The R objects s1 and s2 contain the  $(y_i, w_i)$  pairs for the 1st (females) and 2nd (males) stratum of sex, respectively.

#### homogTest()

homogTest() takes the stratum-specific log-ORs and weights in s1 and s2 as arguments and returns the X<sup>2</sup> statistic for homogeneity, along with a p-value.

```
homogStat <- function(s1, s2) {
    Y <- (s1$w*s1$y + s2$w*s2$y)/(s1$w+s2$w)
    X2 <- s1$w*(s1$y-Y)^2 + s2$w*(s2$y-Y)^2
    p <- pchisq(X2,df=1,lower.tail=FALSE)
    return(list(X2=X2,pval=p))
}</pre>
```

Apply homogStat():

```
homogStat(s1,s2)
```

```
## $X2
## [1] 0.003072521
##
## $pval
## [1] 0.9557956
```

▶ We retain the hypothesis of homogeneous ORs. Insufficient evidence to claim that sex modifies the effect of smoking on AS.

# Confounding

# Simpson's Paradox and the AS Example

- ▶ As sex doesn't appear to be an effect modifier, we can consider whether it is a confounder.
- ▶ Do this informally, by checking whether the ORs when we account for sex are different from the OR when we ignore sex.

```
OR1<-exp(s1$y) #OR in females
OR1

## [1] 1.194192

OR2<-exp(s2$y) #OR in males
OR2

## [1] 1.233333
```

- ▶ The estimated ORs for smoking and AS, stratified by sex are about the same: 1.19 for females and 1.23 for males.
  - ► This suggests that, for both females and males, smoking *slightly* increases the odds of AS.

- ► However, the estimated OR from the pooled table (when we ignore sex) is 1.47.
  - This suggests a stronger effect of smoking than we obtain from the stratified tables!

```
## smoke
## AS 0 1
## 0 67 43
## 1 54 51

a<-67; b<-43; c<-54; d<-51

ORpooled<-a*d/(b*c)

ORpooled</pre>
```

► Simpson's paradox: When the effect of an exposure on the odds of the disease outcome differs in the stratified and pooled analyses.

## [1] 1.471576

#### The MH Common OR Estimate and Test

- ► The effect of smoking on AS appears to differ between the analyses that stratify on versus ignore sex.
- ▶ We therefore adjust for sex as a potential confounding variable by getting the MH estimate of the common (adjusted) OR.
- Once we have the MH estimate of the common OR across the strata of the extraneous variable, we may test H<sub>0</sub> that this common OR is one.
- ► The text, section 16.2.3, goes into the details of the derivation, if you're interested.
- Instead, focus on using R to apply this test and interpreting the results.
  - R has a built-in function mantelhaen.test() that we can apply.

### MH Test applied to the AS Example

- ▶ Apply mantelhaen.test() to the stenosis data.
  - ► As the text doesn't use a continuity correction, to be consistent, we turn off the default setting in the function.

```
##
## Mantel-Haenszel chi-squared test without continuity correction
##
## data: smoke and AS and sex
## Mantel-Haenszel X-squared = 0.44568, df = 1, p-value = 0.5044
## alternative hypothesis: true common odds ratio is not equal to 1
## 95 percent confidence interval:
## 0.6877312 2.1460496
## sample estimates:
## common odds ratio
## 1.214868
```

▶ Referring to the p-value reported in the output, we see that, at the 5% level, there is no statistical evidence that smoking affects the odds of AS, once we adjust for sex.

#### Confidence Interval for the Common OR

- ▶ mantelhaen.test() returns a 95% CI of about (0.69, 2.1).
- ► Though not discussed, can extend the MH test to arbitrary values of the common OR.
  - ▶ We only covered the special case where the value hypothesized is 1; i.e.  $H_0: OR = 1$  (unassociated) vs.  $H_a: OR \neq 1$  (associated).
- ▶ The 95% CI is obtained by finding the set of all OR values that would be retained in a test at the 5% level.
  - ▶ E.G., With the AS data, if we were to test  $H_0: OR = 0.69$  vs.  $H_a: OR \neq 0.69$ , we'd retain  $H_0$  at 5% level.
  - Similarly, if we were to test  $H_0: OR = 2.1$  vs.  $H_a: OR \neq 2.1$ , we'd retain  $H_0$  at 5% level.
  - And the same for all values in between.
  - Any values smaller than 0.69 or larger than 2.1 for  $H_0$  would lead to rejection with these data.
- ▶ Thus the 95% CI obtained from the AS data is (0.69, 2.1).
  - ► This is called "inverting the test" and is how R gets the CI (but not the text, which we'll skip).