

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

## Chapter 15, part 2: Chi-Square Tests

Jinko Graham

2018-10-16

# Chi-square tests of association

- ▶ In chapter 14, we tested for association between two categorical variables by testing for differences between proportions
  - ▶ Call the test from Chapter 14 the  $Z$  test.
- ▶ Applied the  $Z$  test to data from the WHI.
  - ▶ Recall that the WHI randomized 16,608 post-menopausal women aged 50-79 years to receive either hormone replacement therapy (estrogen plus progestin EP+;  $n_1 = 8506$ ), or a placebo (EP-;  $n_2 = 8102$ ).
- ▶ We tested for a difference in the proportions of women with invasive breast cancer (BC+) in the hormone replacement therapy (EP+) and placebo (EP-) groups.

- ▶ The first few rows of the dataset are as follows:

```
##      EP  BC
##  1 EP+ BC+
##  2 EP+ BC+
##  3 EP+ BC+
##  4 EP+ BC+
##  5 EP+ BC+
##  6 EP+ BC+
##  7 EP+ BC+
##  8 EP+ BC+
```

- ▶ A cross-tabulation of the BC and EP variables in the dataset is:

```
##      BC
## EP    BC-  BC+
## EP- 7980  122
## EP+ 8340  166
```

## Association between HRT and breast cancer

- ▶ The table of proportions below gives the conditional distributions of BC status given EP status.
  - ▶ The proportions in each row add to 1.
- ▶ BC and EP are associated if their conditional distributions are different.

| ## |     | BC         |            |
|----|-----|------------|------------|
| ## | EP  | BC-        | BC+        |
| ## | EP- | 0.98494199 | 0.01505801 |
| ## | EP+ | 0.98048436 | 0.01951564 |

- ▶ Previously, we used the Z test for different conditional distributions
- ▶ Looks for differences in the proportion of BC+ in the EP- and EP+ groups.
- ▶ Can be applied to data in  $2 \times 2$  tables

# Chi-square test of association

- ▶ When applied to  $2 \times 2$  tables, the  $Z$  test for a difference in proportions is equivalent to the chi-square ( $\chi^2$ ) test.
- ▶ But the chi-square test has the advantage of generalizing from  $2 \times 2$  tables to  $r \times c$  tables, for  $r \geq 2$  rows and  $c \geq 2$  columns.
- ▶ Compares *observed* cell counts to *expected* counts
  - ▶ The expected count is the count we would expect if the null hypothesis of no association were true (details deferred).
- ▶ The form of the statistic is

$$\chi^2 = \sum_{\text{cells}} \frac{(\text{observed} - \text{expected})^2}{\text{expected}}$$

## Sampling distribution of $X^2$

- ▶ Under the null hypothesis of no association between row and column variables, the test statistic  $X^2$  is approximately distributed as a chi-square distribution with  $(r - 1) \times (c - 1)$  degrees of freedom (df).
- ▶ Computer software gives upper tail probabilities of different chi-square distributions.

## Chi-square test for WHI example

- ▶ We can perform the chi-square test in R (see demo).

```
##  
## Pearson's Chi-squared test  
##  
## data:  wtab  
## X-squared = 4.8387, df = 1, p-value = 0.02783
```

- ▶ At the 5% level, there is statistical evidence of an association between hormone-replacement therapy and invasive breast cancer.

## Continuity correction

- ▶ The continuity correction to the  $\chi^2$  test improves the  $\chi^2$  approximation for  $2 \times 2$  tables.
- ▶ The corrected version of the statistic is:

$$\chi^2 = \sum_{\text{cells}} \frac{(|\text{observed} - \text{expected}| - 0.5)^2}{\text{expected}}$$



# Chi-square test with continuity correction for WHI example

```
##  
## Pearson's Chi-squared test with Yates' continuity correction  
##  
## data: wtab  
## X-squared = 4.5807, df = 1, p-value = 0.03233
```

- At the 5% level, there is still evidence of an association between hormone replacement therapy and invasive breast cancer.

## Expected counts

- ▶ As mentioned earlier, these are calculated under the null hypothesis of no association between the 2 variables in the table.
- ▶ Let's first discuss expected counts for the WHI example. Later, we'll generalize to arbitrary  $r \times c$  tables.

| ## |     | BC   |     |
|----|-----|------|-----|
| ## | EP  | BC-  | BC+ |
| ## | EP- | 7980 | 122 |
| ## | EP+ | 8340 | 166 |

- ▶ If  $H_0$  holds and HRT has no effect on breast cancer, the proportion of BC+ in each EP group should be the same and can be estimated by pooling:

$$\hat{p} = \frac{122 + 166}{7980 + 122 + 8340 + 166} = \frac{288}{16608} = 0.01734.$$

- ▶ Here is the table of counts with column and row margins added:

| ## |        | BC-   | BC+ | rowTot |
|----|--------|-------|-----|--------|
| ## | EP-    | 7980  | 122 | 8102   |
| ## | EP+    | 8340  | 166 | 8506   |
| ## | colTot | 16320 | 288 | 16608  |

- ▶ Focusing on the 1st row of the table, under  $H_0$  of no association, we expect that, of the 8102 women who are EP-,
  - ▶  $8102 \times \hat{p} = 140.5$  would be BC+, and
  - ▶  $8102 \times (1 - \hat{p}) = 7961.5$  would be BC-.
- ▶ Similarly, focusing on the 2nd row, we expect that, under  $H_0$  of no association, of the 8506 women who are EP+,
  - ▶  $8506 \times \hat{p} = 8506 \times \frac{288}{16608} = 147.5$  would be BC+, and
  - ▶  $8506 \times (1 - \hat{p}) = 8506 \times \frac{16320}{16608} = 8358.5$  would be BC-.

## Expected counts, notation

- Notation from the text:

|    |     | BC      |         |         |
|----|-----|---------|---------|---------|
|    |     | BC+     | BC-     |         |
| EP | EP+ | $a$     | $b$     | $a + b$ |
|    | EP- | $c$     | $d$     | $c + d$ |
|    |     | $a + c$ | $b + d$ | $n$     |

where  $n = a + b + c + d$

- The pooled estimate of the proportion of BC+ women is  $\hat{p} = (a + c)/n$ .
- Expected count for the EP+ and BC+ cell:
  - Of the  $(a + b)$  women who are EP+, we expect that  $(a + b) \times \hat{p} = (a + b)(a + c)/n$  would be BC+
- Notice that the expected count is of the form row total  $(a + b)$  times column total  $(a + c)$  divided by table total  $(n)$ . This is a generalizable pattern ...

## Expected counts: general formula

- ▶ For  $r \times c$  tables, the expected count for the cell in the  $i$ th row and  $j$ th column is the  $i$ th row total times the  $j$ th column total divided by table total.

## Accuracy of the $\chi^2$ approximation ( $r \times c$ tables)

- ▶ The  $\chi^2$  approximation for the null distribution of the test statistic is considered accurate when
  1. No more than 20% of cells have expected counts  $< 5$ , and
  2. All expected cell counts are  $\geq 1$ .
- ▶ Note: These rules-of-thumb are intended regardless of whether or not we use the continuity correction for  $2 \times 2$  tables.

## Accuracy of the $\chi^2$ approximation in WHI example

- ▶ The expected cell counts are as follows:

|    |     |          |          |
|----|-----|----------|----------|
| ## | BC  |          |          |
| ## | EP  | BC-      | BC+      |
| ## | EP- | 7961.503 | 140.4971 |
| ## | EP+ | 8358.497 | 147.5029 |

- ▶ *All* expected cell counts are greater than 5, and so the  $\chi^2$  approximation is considered accurate.

# Sampling

- ▶ The chi-square test is appropriate under different sampling schemes such as:
  1. Take simple-random samples (SRSs) from each of  $c$  populations and classify individuals in each SRS according to one categorical variable with  $r$  levels
  2. Take one SRS from a single population and classify individuals according to two categorical variables, one with  $c$  levels and the other with  $r$  levels
- ▶ The first scheme includes case-control sampling ( $c = 2$ )
  - ▶ e.g. an SRS of size  $n_1 = 500$  from the case population for non-Hodgkin lymphoma and an SRS of size  $n_2 = 500$  from the control population and then classify them according to whether or not they are exposed to some pesticide ingredient.
- ▶ The second scheme pertains to the WHI study
  - ▶ A sample of size  $n = 16608$  was drawn from the population of post-menopausal women and then cross-classified according to whether or not they were randomized to receive HRT and whether or not they developed invasive breast cancer.